

The electronic version of the book
is created by

<http://www.enverhoxha.ru>

ENVER HOXHA

SELECTED WORKS

V

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

ENVER HOXHA

SELECTED WORKS

PUBLISHED BY DECISION OF THE CENTRAL
COMMITTEE OF THE PARTY OF
LABOUR OF ALBANIA



ENVER HOXHA

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

ENVER HOXHA

VOLUME

V

NOVEMBER 1976 - JUNE 1980

«8 NËNTORI» PUBLISHING HOUSE
TIRANA 1985

FOREWORD

In the materials of this volume of Selected Works by Comrade Enver Hoxha, which belong to the period 1976-1980, the reader will be acquainted with the efforts and struggle of the Albanian people for the progress of socialism relying on their own forces, with the principled stand of the Party of Labour of Albania towards various international events and in defence of Marxism-Leninism, the cause of the revolution and socialism in the world.

The main event of this period in Albania is the 7th Congress of the PLA which took place in November 1976. In this volume, an important place is given to the Report delivered at this Congress by the First Secretary, Enver Hoxha. The Report makes a Marxist-Leninist synthesis of the revolutionary thought and action of the PLA after its 6th Congress, gives a tableau of the new perspectives for the construction of socialism in Albania and brings out the content of the new Constitution of the PSR of Albania, which sanctioned the further qualitative development of the Albanian socialist state in conformity with the new stage of the revolution — the complete construction of socialist society. Likewise, it deals with various problems of the international situation, the all-round crises of the capitalist-revisionist system, the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the struggle against the political and ideological diversion of the bourgeoisie and revisionism and the struggles which the peoples are waging against the two superpowers and other imperialist powers.

While making a detailed analysis of acute problems of the time, Comrade Enver Hoxha propounds and proves the important thesis that now «the question of the revolution and people's liberation is not just an aspiration but a problem presented for solution». He points out that the national liberation movement, the national democratic revolutions, are component parts of a single revolutionary process, the world proletarian revolution, and that the people's liberation struggle can achieve real victory only when it is linked with the cause of the proletariat and socialism.

In polemics with the anti-Marxist concepts of the Chinese revisionist leadership about the main enemy, Comrade Enver Hoxha also points out what a great danger the two superpowers, American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, represent to the revolution, socialism and the peoples, makes a profound principled criticism of the theory of «three worlds» and points out that class analysis of the social systems is the only criterion by which to assess and define the places which the various states occupy in the present division of the world.

Included in this volume of Selected Works are a number of the most important theoretical works of Comrade Enver Hoxha which came out during this period, such as «Yugoslav 'Self-Administration' — a Capitalist Theory and Practice», «Imperialism and the Revolution», and «Eurocommunism Is Anti-Communism». They deal with capital questions which confront the communist revolutionary liberation movement of the world today for the defence and further development of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine. The allround analyses which are made of the retrogressive, counter-revolutionary role of social democracy and various trends of modern revisionism, from Browderism to «Eurocommunism», occupy a special place.

In many materials a detailed and scientifically sub-

stantiated Marxist-Leninist analysis is made of the ideological and philosophical roots of Chinese revisionism, the anti-Marxist essence of «Mao Zedong thought» and the Chinese reality and the policy of the Communist Party of China, stigmatizing the stand of the Chinese revisionists towards the proletariat, the peasantry, the army, the national bourgeoisie and its parties, as well as towards contradictions and compromises. The reasons why the Chinese revolution did not develop into a socialist revolution are shown. The warmongering foreign policy of the social-imperialist Chinese leadership and its plan to make China a superpower are unmasked.

Special attention is devoted to problems of the Marxist-Leninist movement, its development, relations between the Marxist-Leninist parties and the role of their work in the working class and the ranks of the working masses for the extension and strengthening of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat. At the same time stern scientific criticism is made of concepts and stands of revisionists towards such fundamental problems as those to do with the revolution, socialist society, the so-called democratic socialism, the bourgeois state, «democratic» and «peaceful» transition to socialism in the framework of the existing bourgeois Constitutions, etc.

This volume also includes articles, talks and speeches, about the peoples' struggle for national and social liberation, about proletarian democracy and other questions of current interest and importance.

Some of the materials published in this volume have been abridged.

ON THE ACTIVITY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA

*Extracts from the Report (1) submitted to the 7th
Congress of the PLA (2)*

November 1, 1976

.....

I

THE NEW CONSTITUTION(3)— A GREAT HISTORIC VICTORY OF THE PARTY AND THE PEOPLE

Comrades,

It is the honour and very responsible task of the delegates of the 7th Congress to express the opinions of the entire Party on the new Fundamental Law of socialist Albania, the new Constitution of our state.

The 6th Congress of the Party put forward the task

1 In this volume, this report is published in abridged form. The unabridged edition has been published under the title: *Enver Hoxha Report Submitted to the 7th Congress of the PLA*, «8 Nëntori» Publishing House, Tirana 1976.

2 The 7th Congress of the PLA was held from November 1 to November 7, 1976.

3 The 8th Plenum of the CC of the PLA held in October 1975 examined the draft of the new Constitution which in January 1976 was published and presented to the people for discussion by the People's Assembly. About 1,500,000 people,

of drafting a new Constitution and instructed that it should be the continuation of the existing one, which would express the continuity of the revolution in Albania, the uninterrupted struggle to guarantee the freedom and independence of the Homeland and the building of socialism. On the other hand, it had to take into account our present reality, the stage which the development of the revolution has reached. The new Constitution must sanction the major revolutionary transformations carried out and the successes achieved, must reflect the general line of the Party for the complete construction of socialism and the further development of our state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The old Constitution was the Constitution of the building of the foundations of socialism, whereas the new Constitution will be the Constitution of the complete construction of the socialist society.

The draft-Constitution, which will soon be submitted to the People's Assembly for final approval, is a juridical document of special importance. It is a document of great theoretical and practical, political and ideological value, on which our social, economic, and cultural development at the stage of the complete construction of the socialist society will be based.

The new Constitution is permeated through and through by the ideology and fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, embodies the teachings and the revolutionary experience of our Party of Labour, and bears the stamp of the creative thinking of the broad masses of our people. It proclaims the basic principles of scientific socialism and makes them its own, principles indispensable

practically all the adult population of the country, participated in the meetings which were held, and about 300.000 people contributed to the discussion. It was approved by the People's Assembly on December 28, 1976.

for a genuine socialist society, in which the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established, in which the working class, with its own Party at the head, really plays its leading role.

Our new Fundamental Law reaffirms the correct Marxist-Leninist principles which were the foundation of the first Constitution of the People's Republic of Albania. But the new Constitution marks a further qualitative development of the existing Constitution, in conformity with the present stage of the revolution in our country.

While sanctioning the victories attained and the trends of development of the country on the road to socialism, the new Constitution also serves as a program of struggle and work for the future. Its aim is to give the maximum scope to the development of the productive forces and the relations of production of a genuine socialist society, to open the road of the revolutionary emancipation and education of our new man, to safeguard and strengthen the socialist order and the dictatorship of the proletariat still better, to create the best possible conditions for the country on its advance towards communism.

Summing up the line and experience Of our Party in the field of development of the socialist revolution, this important document also sanctions the juridical, political, ideological and economic dispositions to bar the way to revisionism and the restoration of capitalism. In this respect, our Constitution constitutes a valuable creative contribution of the Party of Labour of Albania to the theory and practice of scientific socialism.

The new Constitution does not conceal its class character. It proclaims and sanctions the character of our state as a dictatorship of the proletariat in power, it proclaims and sanctions the undivided leading role of the Party in the state and in the whole society, it proclaims and sanc-

tions the class struggle as the main driving force of our entire society.

Socialism, said Marx,

*«... is the class dictatorship of the proletariat, as the necessary transit point to the **abolition of class distinctions generally**, to the abolition of all the relations of production on which they rest, to the abolition of all the social relations that correspond to these relations of production, to the overthrow of all ideas that result from these social relations»**

In the revolutionary experience of our country the correctness of these teachings of genius of Marx has been completely confirmed. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the powerful and decisive weapon to carry the socialist revolution forward, to its complete and final victory. It is through the dictatorship of the proletariat that the vital task of the revolution, the allround development of the socialist economy and culture, the organization and management of the construction of socialism and of the classless communist society, is achieved. It plays a no less important role in the struggle to purge the socialist social life of all vestiges of the old society, to eradicate from the minds of the working people everything alien that drags them backwards, to carry out their communist education, to unite all the working people around the vanguard force, the working class and its Party, on the road of socialism and communism.

The experience of the revolution and the construction of socialism in Albania proves that the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary to the working class to suppress the resistance of the class enemies, old and new, and their efforts to restore the old order, to cope with the external

* K. Marx, F. Engels. *Selected Works*, vol. 1. p. 226, Alb. ed.

danger, which comes both from the aggressive intentions of imperialism and social-imperialism to strangle and destroy the socialist order with fire and steel, or with blockade and starvation, as well as from the ideological aggression of the capitalist-revisionist world, which day by day sends its waves of degeneration and counter-revolution crashing against our shores.

The preservation and ceaseless strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat throughout the period of transition from socialism to communism is also dictated by the negative experience of the Soviet Union and some other countries, where departure from the principles of the dictatorship of the proletariat gave birth to revisionism, the most dangerous weapon of the counter-revolution, which led to the destruction of the socialist order and the re-establishment of capitalist slavery and social-fascism.

The enemies of socialism, both internal and external, have always aimed their main blows against the dictatorship of the proletariat. Now, it is fashionable among all the revisionist renegades and the lackeys of the bourgeoisie to launch savage attacks on the dictatorship of the proletariat and indulge in unrestrained demagogy about the alleged restoration of the lost democracy. Their purpose is to attack the very essence of Marxism-Leninism and the revolution and to destroy the fundamental instrument of the proletariat for the building of the new socialist life. Therefore, the stand towards the dictatorship of the proletariat has served and continues to serve as the marker of the line dividing genuine Marxist-Leninists and proletarian revolutionaries from opportunists and renegades from the working class of every hue.

In our country the dictatorship of the proletariat has always stood strong and invincible, because the Party has carried out the teachings of Marxism-Leninism faithfully.

has waged the class struggle correctly, and has always maintained keen revolutionary vigilance. It has constantly strengthened and perfected the proletarian state and the defence of the country, and has consistently combated all alien manifestations which lead to the peaceful degeneration of the socialist social and state order.

Reflecting and summing up the rich revolutionary experience of our country, as well as international experience, rejecting the anti-Marxist theories of the revisionists that the stage of the dictatorship of the proletariat has allegedly been left behind, or about the «state of the entire people», the new draft-Constitution states in a clear-cut manner that the *«People's Socialist Republic of Albania is a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which expresses and defends the interests of all the working people»*.

The draft-Constitution is a vivid reflection of genuine socialist democracy and humanism. It is a confirmation of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism that the dictatorship of the proletariat is inseparable from the broadest, most thorough-going and complete democracy for the working people. Ensuring broad socialist democracy constitutes a fundamental condition for the protection and strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat itself, just as the dictatorship of the proletariat constitutes an indispensable and decisive condition for the existence of genuine democracy for the working people.

Our socialist democracy has guaranteed the working people the important right to have their say in the solution of social and state problems, to exercise control over everybody and everything, to participate effectively on a broad scale, in an organized way and in the most various forms, in the administration of the country. The Party considers this participation and its constant extension as

the fundamental direction of the development of socialist democracy, as a great motive force to promote the socialist construction, and as one of the most important factors to protect our state and our society against the danger of bourgeois-revisionist degeneration. This line of the Party has been fully sanctioned in the new Constitution.

The spirit of socialist democracy, which characterizes our entire social life, runs through the whole structure of our socialist state, from the people's councils at the base up to the People's Assembly. The draft-Constitution clearly defines that the state power is an indivisible whole and is exercised completely by the organs and representatives elected by the people directly. All the other state organs carry out their activity under the direction and control of the representative organs, are responsible and render account to them. It stresses that not only the elected state functionaries but also the appointed ones must render account to the masses and submit to their direct control. In this way, the struggle against the danger of estrangement of the representative organs from the people, the struggle against bureaucracy and the tendency to place the executive and administrative organs above the representative organs of power, is put on a constitutional basis.

With us the building and functioning of the entire socialist state and social mechanism proceed on the basis of the principle of democratic centralism, the essence of which is the centralized leadership by the working class of the entire life of the country through its Party and the proletarian state, the combination of centralized management with the creative initiative of the local organs and the working masses. By fully embodying this great Marxist-Leninist principle, the draft-Constitution is counterposed to all anti-Marxist concepts and practices of the revisionists, both the liberal-anarchist concepts that

negate proletarian centralism, and the bureaucratic centralist concepts, which prevent participation of the working masses in governing the country.

In socialist Albania, the rights of the working people to work, to education and medical services free of charge, to the means of livelihood in old age, freedom of speech, the press and organization, have been ensured under the law and guaranteed in practice, complete equality before the law, without any restriction or privilege in rights and obligations on account of sex, race, nationality, education, position or material condition, etc, is guaranteed. One of the great achievements of the historic work of the Party and the people's power is the emancipation of the Albanian woman and her complete equality with man in work and pay and in all fields of our life. All these colossal political and social victories achieved by our Party and people, occupy an important place in the new Constitution.

Our reality, our socialist democracy refute all the slanders of the bourgeois and revisionist ideologists who charge that the socialist order lacks democracy. With us, freedom and democracy are only for the broad masses of working people, and are not, and cannot be, for the enemies of the working class and the people, for those who seek to undermine the proletarian state power and the socialist social order, as the bourgeoisie and the revisionist traitors would like. In full compliance with the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, our Party and our dictatorship of the proletariat have not allowed and never will allow this kind of democracy. Our socialist democracy is true democracy for the people, for the masses of the working people, and for them alone.

During the popular discussion of the draft-Constitution, the entire people enthusiastically hailed the inclusion in the Constitution as a fundamental principle of the clause that the *«Party of Labour of Albania, the vanguard*

of the working class, is the sole political leading force of the state and the society».

With the greatest loyalty and unwavering consistency our Party has upheld the great principle that ensuring the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party constitutes the decisive condition for carrying out the revolution, establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat and building socialism. It has always been aware that the leadership of the Party represents the concentrated and highest expression of the leading role of the working class and the number one subjective factor for putting its revolutionary program into practice.

The fact that this has been made a fundamental principle of the Constitution is further evidence that our Party, as always, is determined to implement and defend the immortal teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on every issue and in all fields. The leading role of the Party in our society and state not only constitutes a basic demand of Marxism-Leninism, but also represents an historic reality.

With the Party in the lead, our people carried out the National Liberation War and won their freedom and independence, overthrew the old regimes and established the people's power. With the Party in the lead, great revolutionary transformations were carried out. Under the leadership of the Party, our people defended the country from the frenzied attacks of external and internal enemies, and secured and consolidated its political and economic independence. With the Party at the head, this Albania at which we rejoice today and which we must always unceasingly strive to make stronger and more prosperous, has been built.

But, as Marxism-Leninism teaches and as our own historical experience, too, has convinced us. it is not just for a certain time that the leading role of the Party is

necessary. It is indispensable for the entire period of the complete construction of the socialist society, up to communism. **The more the revolution advances and deepens, the more the leading role of the Party must be strengthened and perfected in every sphere of life, and state and social activity.** If this role is allowed to become weakened or eliminated, great dangers threaten the revolution and socialism and grave defeats await them.

The revisionist theories which claim that in the transitional period the leading role of the Party comes to an end, or turns into an educative function only, are aimed at leaving the working class and the people without a leadership so that the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism can be overthrown and the counter-revolution triumph.

By placing the principle of the leading role of the Party at the foundation of the Constitution, we are defending Marxism-Leninism from these frenzied attacks, defending and carrying forward the cause of true socialism in Albania.

The fact that Marxism-Leninism has now become the dominant ideology in our country represents another historical reality. Our entire political, economic, social, educational and cultural life is guided by the principles of the ideology of the working class and permeated by the principles of proletarian morality. As a result of the great work of the Party, of the ideological and cultural revolution, the revolutionary theory of the proletariat has been embraced by the broad masses of the people, it sets the tone for and determines the course of development of the entire spiritual life of our society. Marxism-Leninism, which illuminates our road to socialism and communism, has been transformed into a great motive force.

The Marxist-Leninist ideology, the line of the Party, enable the people to understand the present better and

have even greater confidence in the future. Life over the last thirty-five years has firmly convinced our people that only on the basis of the revolutionary outlook of the working class is it possible to establish, safeguard and strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat, to build socialism successfully and to march confidently towards the classless communist society.

This experience and these victories have had the result that the consistent defence and implementation of Marxism-Leninism has become the concern of all the working people and is considered by everybody as a question vital to the fate of socialism. Therefore, **the statement of the Constitution that «Marxism-Leninism is the dominant ideology» in our socialist state, that «the entire socialist social order is developed on the basis of its principles» is a great historic victory of socialism in Albania.**

One of the great principles of Marxism-Leninism and one of the main conclusions drawn from our Party's revolutionary experience is that it is absolutely essential to continue to wage the class struggle also in the period of the complete construction of the socialist society, right up to communism.

The modern revisionists, with the Soviet revisionists in the lead, claim that class struggle dies out with the liquidation of the exploiting classes. This is a fraud designed to disarm the working class and lull it to sleep, to open the way to the restoration of capitalism. This has been most clearly proved in the Soviet Union and the other former socialist countries, where the new capitalist bourgeoisie has come to power.

Our country's experience refutes these false and capitulationist theories about the dying out of the class struggle in socialism...

In compliance with the teachings of Marxism-Lenin-

ism and relying on this rich revolutionary experience, the draft-Constitution explicitly states that **in all its activity, our socialist state upholds the great Marxist-Leninist principle of the class struggle, which constitutes the great motive force to carry the socialist revolution forward.**

In drafting the new Constitution, the Central Committee has seen to it that the line of the Party concerning major questions of national sovereignty and defence of the country's freedom and independence is fully reflected and clearly formulated in it. In the circumstances that our country is encircled by imperialists and revisionists, that all-round political, ideological, economic and military pressure is being brought to bear against it, that chauvinistic theories on limited sovereignty are being spread, and the practice of robbing the peoples of their independence is being imposed by violence, these problems assume great importance, not only theoretical and juridical, but practical and political as well.

Proceeding from the sacred goal of preserving and unceasingly strengthening the freedom, independence, and defence potential of the Homeland and the gains of the revolution, **the draft-Constitution states that nobody other than the representative organs of state power can exercise the sovereignty of the people or any of its attributes in the name of our Republic, that the territory of the Homeland is inalienable and its borders inviolable.** Under the Constitution, the establishment of foreign military bases and the stationing of foreign troops, in whatever form, in the territory of socialist Albania are prohibited. As well as this, no one has the right to sign or accept the capitulation or occupation of the country.

These revolutionary principles of vital importance unequivocally and clearly express the sovereign right and determination of the Albanian people to defend their life, their achievements, and their free and independent

socialist Homeland to the end. At the same time, the principles sanctioned in the Constitution, especially the one about the prohibition of the establishment of foreign bases and the stationing of foreign troops, constitute a solemn pledge that the territory of socialist Albania will never be used as a base for aggression against the other countries.

Also of great importance for safeguarding the independence of the country and the socialist order is the provision in the draft-Constitution prohibiting the granting of concessions to foreign countries, the setting up of foreign economic and financial companies and other institutions or embarking on joint ventures with bourgeois and revisionist capitalist monopolies and states, as well as obtaining credits from them. This is an extremely important question of principle. No country whatsoever, big or small, can build socialism by taking credits and aid from the bourgeoisie and the revisionists or by integrating its economy into the world system of capitalist economy. Any such linking of the economy of a socialist country with the economy of bourgeois or revisionist countries opens the doors to the operation of the economic laws of capitalism and the degeneration of the socialist order. This is the road of betrayal and the restoration of capitalism, which the revisionist cliques have pursued and are pursuing.

Our people always regard the defence of freedom and national sovereignty as the duty above all duties. Therefore, the Party and the people's power have adopted a series of very important measures of a political, ideological, military and other character, which have also been sanctioned in the draft-Constitution, for the organization of a reliable and impregnable defence, capable of guaranteeing the socialist victories and coping with any enemy aggression, no matter where it comes from. **The Constitution also sanctions the great Marxist-Leninist principle that the defence of the Homeland and the gains of**

socialism are guaranteed by the armed people organized in the armed forces.

It is absolutely possible to ensure the national sovereignty, and political and economic independence and to guarantee the defence of the country, because in Albania the people are in power, sovereignty belongs entirely to the working people and is exercised by them alone, because the dictatorship of the proletariat, led by the Party of Labour, is in power here.

These basic principles, which have been sanctioned in the draft-Constitution, reflect the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist policy and line of the Party and, at the same time, comply with the ardent aspirations of the Albanian people who have fought and shed torrents of blood for their freedom, independence, and sovereign rights, for hundreds of years on end. This is why the entire people have expressed their unanimous approval of these great principles of the Constitution and their readiness to defend to a man their national sovereignty and every inch of their socialist Homeland at all costs and under any circumstances.

Our country's experience proves that the safeguarding of the economic and political independence and the defence of national sovereignty are closely linked with the consistent implementation of the principle of self-reliance. In connection with this major question, the draft-Constitution says that **throughout the construction of socialism, the People's Socialist Republic of Albania upholds the principle of self-reliance.**

Just as the freedom and independence of a country are not donated, neither are the revolution and socialism imported. They are the outcome of the resolute revolutionary struggle of the broad working masses of each country with the working class at the head and under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party. The principle of

self-reliance does not rule out the internationalist aid of the proletariat, revolutionaries, and socialist countries. However, the external factor, internationalist solidarity and aid, is an auxiliary and complementary element, but not the decisive one, despite its great importance.

In the National Liberation War as well as in the construction and defence of socialism, our Party has resolutely applied the Marxist-Leninist principle of self-reliance. Precisely for this reason our country successfully dealt with the nazi-fascist occupiers as well as all the pressures and blockades of the imperialists and revisionists, has built a powerful and independent economy and developed a powerful and reliable defence potential, and a culture and art of sound socialist content. By undeviatingly pursuing the Marxist-Leninist course of self-reliance, Albania will attain new, even greater, victories in the complete construction of the socialist society.

The draft-Constitution also sanctions a series of other important principles and norms, which underlie the construction and functioning of the entire economic and social, political and spiritual life such as those which govern the relations of ownership and distribution, the planned development of the economy, the socialist law, the relations between cadres and masses, between the state and the society, as well as the principles and norms which define the rights and duties of citizens, and so on. The sanctioning in the Constitution of the fundamental principles guiding the foreign policy of our state is of special importance.

The new Constitution provides a reflection of a true socialist society, built according to the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, embodied in, and borne out by, the revolutionary practice of our country. Therefore, in calling our Republic a People's Socialist Republic, the new Constitution expresses in the most complete and

clearest way the class content and the socialist reality of Albania today.

The approval of the new Fundamental Law of our socialist state by the People's Assembly will impart a fresh and powerful impulse to the entire work and struggle of our people for the construction and defence of socialism. The new Constitution will make the dictatorship of the proletariat in Albania even stronger and more invincible, it will open up broader vistas to the progress and prosperity of our Fatherland.

II

THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE COUNTRY AND THE TASKS OF THE PARTY

Under the leadership of the Party and inspired by its correct Marxist-Leninist line, our working class, the cooperativist peasantry and the people's intelligentsia, mustered all their energies, and in general, successfully fulfilled the tasks set by the 6th Congress for the development of the economy and culture.

By implementing the Party's directive that the economy must be developed in a proportionate and harmonious way, further growth and strengthening of all its branches was ensured in the 5th five-year period. In 1975, as against 1970, social production increased by 37 per cent and the national income by 38 per cent, at an average rate 3 times higher than the increase in the population.

During this period, proceeding on the road of socialist industrialization, the role of industry as the leading branch in the overall economic development was further enhanced. Now industrial production makes up about 65 per cent of total industrial and agricultural production. In 1975, as against 1970, industrial production increased by 52 per cent, at an average annual rate of 8.7 per cent.

During these years, vigorous revolutionary work was done to put into practice the correct policy of the Party for the rapid development and modernization of socialist

agriculture, as the basic branch of the economy. Agricultural production increased by 33 per cent, at an average annual rate of 5.9 per cent.

In this five-year period the volume of investments was 50 per cent greater than in the previous five-year period. Work was done on 310 important economic and social projects, half of which have already been commissioned.

On the basis of the overall growth of production, a further rise in the material well-being and the cultural level of the people was ensured. The real income per capita increased by 14.5 per cent, the target set by the 6th Congress. The purchasing power of the population has increased and supply has steadily improved. Eighty-five per cent of the people's needs for industrial and agricultural goods of everyday use were met by local products. During the past five-year period, 62,000 flats and dwelling-houses were built in towns and villages. The educational and cultural level of the masses of the people was raised higher. In the last five years, over 12,500 people graduated from higher schools, and 72,000 others from secondary schools. The rise in the well-being and the cultural level, the extension and improvement of the health services, resulted in the extension of the average life expectancy and a high rate of increase in the population.

This all-round material and cultural development has been accompanied with the adoption of important measures for the strengthening of socialist property, the further revolutionary improvement of relations of distribution and exchange.

The results achieved in carrying out the tasks laid down by the 6th Congress of the Party for the development of the economy and culture speak clearly of the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist line of the Party, the superiority of our socialist system, the high level of consciousness and creativeness of our people.

. . .
Proceeding from the Marxist-Leninist general line for the construction of socialism, the Central Committee of the Party has drawn up the draft-directives for the new five-year plan of the development of the economy and culture for the 1976-1980 period, which it now puts forward to the Congress for consideration.

These draft-directives have been discussed by the working masses, who expressed their opinions, discovered new reserves and possibilities, and made very valuable proposals for advancing the indices of the plan and defining the ways to ensure the fulfilment and overfulfilment of the targets.

The 6th Five-year Plan is a mobilizing and realistic plan. It is based on the efforts, energies, and mental and physical capacities of the people, on the possibilities and resources of the economy, on the internal socialist accumulation. The achievements to date, the material-technical base created, the great experience gained, the enthusiasm, readiness, and lofty patriotism shown by our people, are a reliable guarantee that it will be fulfilled successfully.

In compliance with the guidelines provided by the Party in the draft-directives for the development of the economy and culture in the 1976-1980 period, the following basic task is laid down:

«To go on at rapid rates with the socialist construction of the country for the transformation of socialist Albania into an industrial-agricultural country, with advanced industry and agriculture, according to the principle of self-reliance, for the further all-round strengthening of the economic independence of the country; to further improve the socialist relations of production and the superstructure; to strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat and enhance the defence potential of the

Homeland; to raise the material and cultural level of the working masses higher while carrying further the narrowing of distinctions between town and countryside. This is to be achieved on the basis of the consistent waging of the class struggle and the mobilization of all the forces and energies of the people under the leadership of the Party.»

To carry out this basic task, the 6th Five-year Plan envisages a further all-round development of socialist industry, giving priority, as before, to the development of heavy industry, the vanguard of the whole process of socialist industrialization of the country. With the commissioning of new projects with a high level of concentration of production and technical equipment, industry will assume new qualitative dimensions and features.

. . .

1. — THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRY — THE MAIN FACTOR FOR THE STRENGTHENING OF THE ECONOMY

In its program for the development and consolidation of the socialist economy, right from the start the Party has always followed a correct Marxist-Leninist line, giving priority to the setting up and expansion of industry, to strengthening and modernizing it. The victories achieved in all fields, in industry, the mines, construction, communications, etc., are the result of the courageous implementation of this correct policy of the Party for the socialist industrialization of the country. In 1975, as against 1960 when the Soviet revisionists began their savage blockade, total industrial production had increased 3.9 fold, of which the production of oil and chromium industries 3.1 fold, copper industry 21 fold, the electric power industry 7.1 fold, chemical industry 24.8 fold, and the engineering industry 14.4 fold over.

Looking at the results achieved and the prospects opened for the further development of our country, one can realize how correct and far-sighted was the struggle which the Party has waged against the «suggestions» and pressure of the Yugoslav and Soviet revisionists and the defeatist viewpoints of the internal enemies, who sought to divert our country from the correct path our Party had chosen for its socialist industrialization. They strove with might and main to sabotage the development of industry, concealing the geological data with the aim of proving that our country allegedly lacked the raw materials, that it was not worthwhile making investments in the mining industry, that it would be better to spend these funds on sunflowers and oranges.

To develop the various branches of industry and the people's economy as a whole, the Party has relied, first and foremost, on the mineral resources of the country and their utilization. Mining, which occupies the main place in heavy industry, ensures for the economy extremely valuable and irreplaceable raw materials, the staple food of industry and the main source of exports.

Our country extensively exploits such valuable resources as chromium and iron-nickel ore, copper, pyrite, oil, gas, and coal. Up till now, many kinds of minerals have been discovered. The facts show that underground in Albania there is no lack of bauxites, phosphorites, polymetals, and other minerals.

In the new five-year plan, too, the rapid and steady development of industry is to be directly linked with the expansion of the mining, extracting, and processing industry, which will continue to grow at higher rates of development than the other branches of industry.

...
In order to further strengthen the productive forces of the country, to create a more efficient structure of

industry and the other branches of the economy, to further consolidate our economic independence, the Party attaches extreme importance to the rapid development of the extracting and processing industry...

The Party has always considered the development of the oil, gas and coal industry as a problem of special political and economic importance, closely connected with the whole development of the country and the strengthening of its independence and defence potential. The ceaseless growth of industry, agriculture, transport and the other branches of the economy, the consolidation and modernization of the defence potential of the country, require ever more coal, motor fuel, lubricants, and gas.

Precisely because the oil, gas and coal industry is so vital for the economy and defence, the internal and external enemies have always striven to hinder and sabotage the rapid development of it by all manner of means. This is what the enemies of the Party and the people, Abdyl Këllezhi and Koço Theodhosi did, too. With refined methods, they caused confusion in gas and oil prospecting, and directed it on to a wrong anti-economic and anti-scientific course. By careless drilling, which yielded no results, they sabotaged the discovery of new sources. To cover the tracks of their sabotage activity in the extraction of oil, they encouraged barbarous methods of exploitation of the existing sources, with the aim of leaving the Homeland and the people without oil.

The damage caused by the enemies created some temporary difficulties, but the oil workers, led by the Party, are fighting persistently to overcome the consequences of the sabotage activity and to give the Homeland more oil and gas. They are working hard to expand the existing sources and are optimistic about discovering new oil and gas fields.

Under the conditions of a world energy crisis and

when the country's needs for oil and gas are constantly increasing, the oil workers are called upon to work with greater intensity and scientific discipline, so that the maintenance and exploitation of oil and gas fields is based on well-studied plans, making extensive use of those methods which raise the indices of exploitation and prolong the life of the fields. As the Party has always directed, **it is necessary to concentrate oil prospecting on already known and promising areas to ensure the discovery of new oil and gas fields, and to define the prospects for the coming five-year periods.** Oil and gas are among the most valuable assets of our country. Our generation is duty bound to think of the coming generations, too.

As concerns coal, the Party's directive has been and continues to be that this fuel must find extensive use whenever possible. The calorific power of our coal is up to the requirements of most branches of the economy. Therefore it should not be underrated by any means, as it was by the enemies, when they intentionally restricted the extraction of coal, replacing it with oil. This five-year plan envisages that the extraction of coal will be doubled. To reach this high objective it is indispensable **to bring the new mines into production as quickly as possible, to maintain the existing mines and increase coal extraction in them,** and in no case to allow stockpiled coal to deteriorate.

The Party has devoted great attention to the expansion and consolidation of the electric power industry, which has priority in the industrialization of the country and the general development of the people's economy. With the commissioning of the big Fierza hydro-power plant(4) and the new capacities that will be added during

4 Today the «Light of the Party» hydro-power plant. It was inaugurated on October 12, 1978.

this five-year period, the average annual growth rate of production of electric power will be 2.4 times higher than the average annual growth rate of social production during the years 1976-1980. The high growth rate of production in this branch must be accompanied by the establishment of a strict regime of saving electric power itself and fuel used to produce it. Hydro-power stations remain, as they have been up till now, the basis to increase production of electric power, whereas thermal-power stations must be built to run mainly on coal and gas.

Our Party's correct policy in appraising the value of our natural resources and consolidating the sound and reliable basis of the socialist industrialization of the country has found full application in the setting up of an extensive processing industry. One of the main characteristics of this five-year period is the fact that new branches are added to the existing processing industry, such as the full cycle ferrous metallurgy, the ferro-chromium and pyro-metallurgical industries, the copper rolling industry. New plants of the chemical industry, as well as many plants and factories for the enrichment of ores and fuels will also be commissioned. These create the possibility of processing more mineral and non-mineral raw materials locally, as well as the necessary basis to further develop the existing branches of industry and to set up new branches in the future. In this way, the level of self-sufficiency of the economy rises, the economy is further strengthened, export possibilities and the value of processed products are increased. Thus, the economy serves the strengthening of the defence potential of the country better.

With this development of the processing industry, in 1980, over 65 per cent of the volume of exports will be made up of locally processed goods as against 46 per cent in 1960. This is a significant index of the correct policy

followed by the Party. Continuing on this course, **a task for the future is that we must be able to process all our minerals locally, and cease exports of crude ores.**

During this five-year period our industry will be greatly strengthened. Large-scale production will start in the Elbasan metallurgical combine which, apart from pig-iron and high quality steel from smelting our ore, will also give our country nickel and cobalt which have very great value on the world market.

As early as its 4th Congress (5) the Party decided to build a metallurgical combine. But the Soviet revisionist leadership sabotaged the realization of this plan at that time. They refused to accord our country credits for this project, because they followed a neo-colonialist policy, they wanted our country to be economically dependent on them, and to impede the construction of socialism in Albania...

The ferrous metallurgy, with complex modern equipment and technology, is a new industry to us. Therefore, it is necessary for the Party to take firmly in hand the ideo-political and professional education of young metallurgical workers, from the rank-and-file workers and technicians up to the engineers and directors, so that they master the advanced technology and the difficult and delicate profession of the metallurgical worker, to give the country the maximum top-quality steel and other metals.

Another great project which will soon be commissioned is the oil refinery of Ballsh, where the crude oil will undergo a modern refining process. When this plant commences work, it will produce motor fuels and lubricants of high quality which will fulfil the needs of industry, agriculture and transport better, and the import

5 In February 1981.

of a number of kinds of motor fuels will be reduced, as will exports of crude oil.

The sense of frugality, the thrifty use of raw materials, especially oil, gas, coal and electric power, should be deeply implanted in the consciousness of all the working people. Savings must be made everywhere: in prospecting, drilling, exploitation, wherever such materials are used, since they represent a great and irreplaceable asset to our people and our economy. Excessive and unnecessary expenditure damages the construction of socialism.

On the basis of the exploitation and local processing of raw materials, such as oil, gas and phosphorites, the chemical industry will assume further development, especially through increased output of chemical fertilizers so necessary to expand agricultural and livestock production.

The building materials industry will also increase its production, especially that of cement, to completely meet the needs of construction and the economy, and for export as well.

The local production of pig-iron and various steels creates favourable conditions and opens up new prospects for the development of the engineering industry. **With the powerful and advanced machinery base, all the possibilities, now exist for it to go over, on a broader and more organized scale, to the production of all the special machinery for mining, farming and the other branches of the economy, to build complete factories and production lines on the basis of self-reliance...**

Along with the priority it has given to the complex development of heavy industry, the Party has always appreciated the importance of rapid development of the mass, consumer goods industry which is directly linked with the constant improvement of the living conditions of the people. To this end, **it is envisaged that the light**

and food-processing industry will be further developed and strengthened during the 6th Five-year Plan, increasing the production of food-stuffs, clothing and footwear, household utensils, etc. In this branch the Party's instruction that the needs of the people must be ever better fulfilled, as to volume, range, quality, and at reasonable prices, should be always kept in mind.

The development of industry gives all branches of the economy new and ever greater possibilities for their rapid development. It creates new material and financial resources. As a leading factor of the entire economy, industry will give a vigorous impulse, especially, to the development of agriculture, by supplying it with more chemical fertilizers, farm machinery and spare parts.

The Party has unshakeable confidence that the heroic working class and all the working people of industry will mobilize all their energies and knowledge to fulfil and overfulfil the important tasks of the 6th Five-year Plan, thus making another valuable contribution to the general development and progress of the people's economy, to the transformation of Albania into an industrial-agricultural country with developed industry and advanced agriculture.

2. — AGRICULTURE, THE BASIC BRANCH OF THE ECONOMY, MUST BE RAISED TO A HIGHER LEVEL

Our Party of Labour, enlightened by Marxism-Leninism, has always borne in mind that, besides developed industry, the construction of socialism requires advanced and modern agriculture. Agriculture is the basis of the economy, which, to a large extent, determines and conditions the fulfilment of tasks in the other branches, the raising of the general well-being of the people, and.

the strengthening of the defence potential of the country.

A real revolution has been carried out in all directions in our agriculture. A powerful material-technical base, which is serving the ever greater intensification of agriculture, has been set up. Agricultural and livestock products have rapidly increased from year to year, ever better satisfying the needs of the people and the economy. During the previous five-year plan alone, bread grain production increased by 35 per cent, of which, wheat production doubled. Production of cotton increased by 48 per cent, sugar-beet 76 per cent, milk 47 per cent, and so on. Our socialist countryside has radically changed its appearance and the standard of living and well-being of the peasantry is beyond comparison with the past. All these successes are evidence of the correctness of the line of the Party, of the course it has set for the socialist transformation of the countryside. The collectivization of agriculture, carried out over a period, step by step⁽⁶⁾, as well as the unceasing strengthening of the common property, are proving the superiority and vitality of the socialist cooperativist order right now, when all over the world, not only in the backward countries, but even in the so-called advanced countries, there is a great shortage of agricultural products. Many of these countries, including the revisionist Soviet Union, are holding out their hand to US imperialism for bread. The revisionist countries are experiencing a grave crisis in agriculture, precisely because they have abandoned the countryside and opposed collectivization, leaving the field free for the capitalist mode of production in the countryside.

...

In this five-year period, the main objective of the

⁶ The collectivization of Albanian agriculture was completed in 1967.

Party in agriculture is to achieve full self-sufficiency in bread grain. It has been planned that, from this year on, sufficient grain will be produced to satisfy all the needs of the country, to increase the state reserves and gradually create reserves in the agricultural economies as well, and to ensure better supplies of feed for the livestock. The production of bread grain in 1980 is expected to be 56-60 per cent, and that of potatoes 48 to 50 per cent, higher than in 1975.

Achieving self-sufficiency in bread grain is a task of great economic, political, and strategic importance. Home production of grain ensures the people's bread and imparts a powerful impulse to the entire economy, further cements the foundations of the independence of our socialist Homeland, is a guarantee that we shall be able to cope with any situation, in good times and bad, makes the country independent of imported grain once and for all, and releases large sums of foreign currency which can be used for other purposes.

The first year of the five-year plan closed with a great victory. The cooperativist peasantry and the other farm workers successfully fulfilled the plan in grain production, ensuring all the grain required within the country for the first time. This year's grain production was about 30 per cent larger than in 1975, which was a record year in the production of grain. Such results can be achieved only by an agriculture that is developed on a sound socialist basis, a patriotic peasantry, and a heroic people who loyally follow and implement the line and teachings of their Marxist-Leninist Party.

The vigorous growth in the production of bread grain is a result of the all-round efforts of the working people of agriculture to carry out a high level of cultivation and systematization of the land with good quality, a result of the use of selected seeds and more careful tending of

the crops. All these things confirm once again what the Party has repeatedly pointed out, that it is not the weather, not atmospheric factors, but primarily the persistent work of man that is decisive in high achievements in agriculture.

This good beginning in the fulfilment of the task of achieving self-sufficiency in bread grain must be consolidated and carried further from year to year. The party organizations, the organs of state power and the economy must sum up and publicize the experience gained, must encourage and support creative initiatives and take the necessary organizational measures for the most efficient utilization of the material-technical base, so that the targets set are not only fulfilled, but also overfulfilled.

The priority the Party has given and continues to give to bread grain production, does not rule out, but on the contrary, absolutely demands the complex and harmonious development of agricultural production on a broad front. The economy and the people need all kinds of agricultural and livestock products. They need cotton and sugar-beet and tobacco, just as they need olives and sunflowers. These products are required not only as food-stuffs for the population, but also for industry and, some of them, as export items as well. In the world today cotton textiles have become a luxury, and sugar and edible oil fetch very high prices on the world market.

Fruit and vegetable growing also calls for special care, **because extension of their consumption improves the dietary structure of the people and saves bread.** Vegetables and fruits are also an important source of income in foreign currency. Our country has all the conditions for abundant fruit and vegetable production all the year round. There are still many unproductive hillsides that can and must be turned into fertile orchards, vineyards and olive groves.

As regards industrial crops, olives, fruits and vegetables, the five-year plan envisages major tasks, therefore no underestimation of them, such as occurs in certain districts or agricultural economies, can be permitted.

Animal husbandry is a very important branch of farming. It constitutes an inestimable asset for the country, an irreplaceable source of meat, milk, wool and leather production, an important factor in raising the well-being of the people. **There can be no intensive agriculture without an advanced livestock-raising. That is why the party organs and party basic organizations and the state and economic organs must always pay great attention to its development.**

...

The Party has always stressed that the scientific treatment of the soil is of prime importance for the increase of agricultural and livestock production. Colossal investments have been made for land improvement, drainage and irrigation. Studies have been carried out also on pedological problems, on the ways of increasing fertility, the combination of crop rotation with the system of tillage and use of fertilizers, the protection of land from erosion, levelling and terracing, etc. But there are still many problems which require solution in these directions. **The fundamental thing is that everybody must increase his concern for the land, to extend, preserve, and enrich it.** While further extending temporary drainage, we must go over to a higher stage, that of permanent drainage. To transform the soil, to take in ever higher yields, one has to delve into the laws of agricultural science and apply them with strict discipline. The studies carried out on the improvement and increase of the fertility of the soil must be deepened and become the foundation of all the processes of agricultural work. If the party organizations and the state organs understand

the importance of these problems, and especially of their solution in practice, the necessary conditions will be created for the successful fulfilment of the tasks laid down by the Party at this Congress for increased agricultural and livestock production.

On the basis of the orientations of the Party in the five-year plan, the increase in agricultural and livestock production will be achieved by raising yield rates and breaking in virgin land...

Albania is a small country with a rugged mountainous terrain and a limited area of land in the region of plains. Therefore, **the line of the Party has been and still is that agriculture must be developed rapidly in the hilly and mountainous areas, too.**

Of course, the highlands have their own peculiarities, but there, too, the possibilities and reserves for increasing production and improving living conditions are great. To help in the development of the hilly and mountainous regions, the Central Committee of the Party and the Government have adopted a series of important measures, such as those to increase productive investments, to raise the prices at which the state buys a number of agricultural and livestock products and to reduce the price at which it sells nitrogenous fertilizers, for the state to pay for work done to break in new land, build irrigation projects and plant trees, and so on. The Party has never viewed the measures it has taken and will take for the development of the highlands from the angle of profits, as is the case with the capitalists and the revisionists. The aim of its policy has always been that the peasantry of these regions should live at the best possible level and these areas should always be kept populated, the same as the plains. At present, almost half the rural population of the country lives in these regions and about 45 per cent of the area of arable land is located there.

This is very important, both for the construction of socialism and for the defence of the country.

...

The forests are an asset of great national value.

Everywhere, especially in the highlands, there are suitable conditions for a further development of this important sector of the economy. Bearing in mind the great role of the forests in timber production, soil protection and improvement of the climate, it is necessary to increase care for their preservation and extension, not only to meet the immediate needs, but also to provide for the coming generations as well.

The state farms occupy an important place in the context of the development of agriculture. They represent the highest form of the socialist system of agriculture. **The most pressing task for the party organizations, the organs of the state and all the working people of the state farms is to make them, within the shortest possible time, the vanguard models of high yields, centres where the latest achievements of science are really put into practice and schools for the dissemination of advanced experience.**

Proceeding on the road of uninterrupted development of the cooperativist order, the Central Committee of the Party has taken measures to implement the directives of the 6th Congress to transform the economically strong cooperatives of the lowland areas into higher type cooperatives on the basis of the free will of the cooperativists. Today they occupy 23 per cent of the arable land and produce 25 per cent of the grain, 40 per cent of the sunflower and more than half the rice and cotton produced by the cooperative sector.

Despite the short time since their inception, they have already demonstrated their superiority in a number of ways. They have achieved relatively high yield rates

of agricultural and livestock products and sped up the rate of increase of production which, from year to year, is becoming more stable. The higher type cooperatives have fulfilled the targets of the plan better than the other lowland cooperatives. The state assists these cooperatives with investments and gives them powerful support by supplying them with material and technical means. New measures have been applied to strengthen their management, to strengthen them through means of production and the procurement of agricultural and livestock products, to further improve the distribution and utilization of their income and for the transition to payment of their members with guaranteed wages related to production.

The problems of increasing their economic and organizational strength, the further improvement of their planning, finances and accounting and the most efficient utilization of the material-technical base and the labour force, are problems of all the agricultural cooperatives, to which the organs of the Party, of the state and the economy must give greater attention and care. Increased care for the state farms and higher type cooperatives should in no way lead to diminished care and efforts to help the other cooperatives of the lowland and mountainous zones.

In the framework of measures for the solution of economic and organizational problems, **better studied work is required for the most appropriate distribution of agricultural crops, animal husbandry, and fruit-growing among the districts, regions and agricultural economies, and greater concentration and specialization of agricultural production.** The experience gained in the most advanced agricultural economies of the country should be well studied and publicized for better planning of agricultural crops, in the general context of the crop rotation system to be set up according to the concrete conditions

of each separate economy and district, in order to create the best possible relationship between the main branches and the other branches of production, with a view to obligatory fulfilment of the plan over the entire range of agricultural products.

The fulfilment of the 6th Five-year Plan will raise agriculture and our countryside to a higher and more advanced level, further strengthen the economy and improve the standard of living of the people. The Party expresses its profound conviction that, in implementing its directives and Marxist-Leninist line, the cooperativist peasantry, the working people of agriculture, our entire people will work with revolutionary enthusiasm, drive and mobilization to achieve stability and permanent growth in agricultural and livestock production.

.....

4. — THE PEOPLE'S WELL-BEING MUST BE INCREASED
AND IMPROVED

Concern for the constant improvement of living conditions and raising the cultural level of the whole people has been and remains at the centre of attention of the entire activity of the Party. During the past five-year period, thanks to the consistent implementation of the directives of the 6th Congress, the general well-being of the people has been constantly and steadily raised. Real per capita income increased by 8.7 per cent among the urban population and 20.5 per cent in the countryside. Our market has been and is stable. In no instance have the prices for foodstuffs and industrial goods been increased. On the contrary, for some articles they have been reduced.

In this five-year period, too, the people's well-being will be improved step by step. The Party has striven

and is striving to make the life of our people, both in country and town, ever more prosperous. Our well-being, the happy optimistic future, are guaranteed by the whole dynamic development of our socialist society. They are founded on the free work of our working people, liberated from every sort of oppression and exploitation. Well-being is expressed and finds its reflection in all aspects of the life of the people, it is a material and spiritual well-being for everybody. Socialist Albania was the first country in the world to do away with taxes. It has education and health services free of charge for the whole population of town and countryside.

In the coming five years the population will be better supplied with foodstuffs and industrial goods, the level of cultural and social activities will rise further, social services and health institutions will be extended and brought closer to the people.

The improvement of the housing conditions of the people constitutes a question of major importance for the Party and the state. In the future, too, great efforts will be necessary in this field, especially in the villages, because, apart from the need to improve housing conditions for the cooperativists, many young men and women from the towns will be going to work and live there permanently. To this end, it is planned to build about 65 thousand flats and dwelling houses, of which about 42 thousand in the agricultural cooperatives and state farms...

The organs and working people of commerce face the task of radically improving their service to the people and ensuring that they are supplied better and better. The Central Committee and the Government took measures to eliminate the hostile sabotage activity of Këço Ngjela in the Ministry of Trade. Now extensive work is going on to strengthen the management of trade in keeping with the teachings and directives of the Party.

The leading organs of production as well as those of distribution must make thorough and complex studies to ensure the best harmonization of production with consumption, to clarify the problems stemming from the increase in the population, the growth of its demands and purchasing power, and the distribution of productive funds. They, and the trading organs in particular, must become a strong barricade against the creation of stocks of unsold goods which cause disorder and great economic-financial losses.

Concern for the constant improvement of the material living conditions of the masses raises the need for a qualitative improvement in the work of all workers in the sphere of services. People must be served in a cultured manner and quickly, and conditions must be created so that people do not waste time in obtaining services and repairs. The organs of industry and commerce must see to it that more help is given to the solution of problems connected with lightening the burden of household work on women. In order to safeguard the health of the people it is necessary to strengthen and extend measures of hygiene and sanitation and prophylaxis, especially in the countryside and in the remote regions, further intensifying care for the protection of the health of mother and child.

The Party considers that one of the main ways to a systematic raising of the standard of living is the employment of all able-bodied citizens in socially useful work. The mass participation of women on all the fronts of socialist construction is a great victory. Today women make up 46 per cent of the total number of working people in our country.

In the new five-year plan another 95 thousand new workers will be employed by the state and 130 thousand will be engaged in the agricultural cooperatives. Socialism ensures jobs for all. A wide range of jobs is opening up

in mines, metallurgy, in the construction of hydro-power plants, and other important projects. Agriculture is another very extensive work front requiring large numbers of working people. **Therefore, the new forces must be directed where the jobs are opened and where the country's needs are greatest.** Hence, the Party must engage in large-scale work of education and persuasion, especially in towns, and combat concepts and manifestations of underestimation of work in agriculture, the mines, forestry, and construction.

The employment of the active population is an important indicator which speaks clearly of the great strength of our economic social order, which, with its high rates of development, has done away, once and for all, with unemployment and emigration — these grave scourges of the past that rendered life miserable and tore the loved ones from the bosom of the families to leave their bones in foreign lands. Today, unemployment and emigration have become chronic diseases in the capitalist-revisionist world. They cause the common people fear and insecurity for the present and the future, and lower their standard of living.

Our revolutionary practice proves the correctness of the road followed by the Party for raising the people's well-being also through the increase of social consumption at rates more rapid than the rate of increase of the direct wages fund. As a result of the implementation of this policy, the total fund of social consumption for 1975 was 2.1 times greater than that of 1965. This has enabled ever better fulfilment of the common needs of working people in the field of education, culture, health, and a series of other social-cultural services.

On the basis of the directives of the 6th Congress of the Party important measures were adopted for the improvement of the pay system. By the decision of the

Central Committee of the Party and the Council of Ministers, issued in April 1976, higher salaries exceeding 900 leks were reduced, the wages of the workers on the state farms were raised, and new measures of advantage to the countryside were taken. The implementation of these measures was coupled with a better supply of the market with mass consumer goods, of wider range and better quality and at stable prices.

This brought about a further narrowing of differences in pay between various groups and categories of working people, as well as of differences in income between town and countryside. The ratio between the average workers' wages and the highest salaries of officials is now 1 to 2, from 1 to 2.5 in the past. This is a correct, revolutionary course which our Party is consistently implementing.

One of the problems which has constantly concerned the Party has been and is the narrowing of distinctions between town and countryside. In this question it has been guided by the principle that **socialism is not built only in the town, just for the working class, but also in the countryside and for the peasantry as well.**

The differences in real income per capita between town and countryside, caused by the objective conditions of the great economic and social backwardness our country inherited from the past, constitute a contradiction which is being overcome step by step. Educational, cultural, and health institutions have been extended to the most remote regions. Following the great victory of the electrification of the whole country, the linking of all the villages by telephone was completed, and work is in hand to connect them all by road. Pensions have been established for the cooperativists, and a series of other problems of a social character in the countryside have been solved. With the April 1976 decision the state has undertaken to meet expenditure for social-cultural measures in the country-

side just as in the city. The percentage of pensions for cooperativists was raised to a level equal to that of town workers. Likewise, their minimum pension was raised. Maternity leave pay for cooperativist women has been centralized.

To narrow the distinctions between town and countryside further, the policy of the Party has been and is aimed at securing a more rapid rate of increase in the incomes of the peasant population than that of the town population. In the coming five-year period the rates of increment of real income per capita in the countryside will be more than three times higher than that of the town.

The implementation of all these measures to the advantage of the peasantry, without affecting the living standard of townspeople, has strengthened and will further strengthen the alliance of the working class with the cooperativist peasantry and the dictatorship of the proletariat in our country.

The objective of the Party is to make the life of the people as happy as possible, to ensure a general uplift of their well-being. But it is important for everybody to understand that in order to attain these objectives the principal factor has been and remains the all-round mobilization of the people of town and countryside to increase socialist production, to increase the productivity of labour, guided by our revolutionary principle that, before making claims on society, one must contribute the maximum.

.....

6. — THE PRINCIPLE OF SELF-RELIANCE MUST BE UNDERSTOOD AND IMPLEMENTED CORRECTLY

The complete construction of socialist society is closely connected with the understanding and implementation of the principle of self-reliance in every step and

every field of life. This great Marxist-Leninist principle of profound revolutionary content is not only a law for the construction of socialism, but also, in the present conditions, an urgent necessity for our country to cope successfully with enemy blockades and encirclement.

The principle of self-reliance has always been a guiding principle of our Party and people since the time of the National Liberation War, when we fought under the slogan, «Freedom is not donated, but won by the people themselves». Likewise, in the struggle for the construction of socialism and the defence of the Homeland, the Party follows and consistently implements this principle. The freedom won, all the successes achieved so far, our socialist and independent life, are practical verification of the Leninist conclusion that self-reliance, the internal factor, is the decisive factor, both in the struggle for the triumph of the revolution and the seizure of power, and in the struggle for the construction of socialism and the defence of the Homeland.

Our Party has always defended the principle that self-reliance is not a temporary policy imposed by circumstances, but an objective necessity for every country, big or small, developed or underdeveloped, a principle applying both in liberation wars and the proletarian revolution, and in the construction of socialism and the defence of the Homeland. The implementation of this principle bars all paths to the inflow of bank credits from bourgeois and revisionist states, by means of which the imperialists and the social-imperialists enslave countries and nation's, and fatten on their blood and sweat. The so-called aid of the imperialists and social-imperialists to the developing countries constitutes a great fraud and is aimed at exploiting the economies of these countries and dictating their imperialist policy to them.

The bourgeois-revisionist propaganda endeavours to

spread and cultivate among the peoples, especially in the developing countries, the sense of bowing and submission to the big imperialist powers. The Soviet revisionists, in particular, distort the revolutionary essence of the principle of self-reliance, labelling it as «slipping into positions of narrow nationalism», as «departure from the position of proletarian internationalism», as «rejecting reciprocal aid among socialist countries». With these anti-Marxist theses they seek to justify their policy of imperialist expansion and their practices of capitalist exploitation of other countries. Their aim is to undermine the confidence of peoples in the possibility of building an independent life, and generally, in their existence as free nations.

While working for the construction of socialism according to the principle of self-reliance, our Party has never dreamed of creating an autarkic economy, isolated within itself. At the same time, while combating any feeling of inferiority and worshipping everything foreign, it has not negated the value of progressive world thinking, of the achievements of science and technology in other countries. It has always prized the revolutionary experience of all peoples, everything that serves the cause of the emancipation and progress of mankind.

Far from excluding reciprocal collaboration and aid among the revolutionary and socialist forces, self-reliance presupposes it. The aid which the victorious revolution gives the countries and people fighting for national and social liberation, the mutual aid among countries building socialism, is an internationalist duty. It is devoid of any sort of selfish interest and inspired by the lofty interests of Marxism-Leninism. This aid is to the advantage not only of the country which receives it but also of the country which gives it, because the triumph of socialism in any country serves the triumph of revolution in the other countries, too, its triumph over capitalism and revisionism.

Day by day, the road traversed by our country has steadily strengthened the conviction and trust of the people in the correctness of the course steered by the Party, in the great possibilities which exist to carry forward the complete construction of socialist society by relying on our material and human resources.

The principle of self-reliance demands, first of all, firm reliance on the creative mental and physical energies of the people guided by the Party. Socialism is the work of the masses, therefore, everything produced and created is the fruit of work, of the sweat and brains of the people.

Understanding of the principle of self-reliance is complete when every collective and individual fulfils and overfulfils the tasks with which they have been charged without asking the state and the society for supplementary means. Hence, the task of striving, first and foremost, everywhere and with determination to increase work productivity, to increase production and reduce costs, to preserve, increase and use the machinery and equipment with high efficiency, to raise the technical-professional abilities of the working people and deepen the technical-scientific revolution.

The principle of self-reliance is correctly understood when it is implemented in every field of social activity, on a national and regional scale, when it is extended to every link and cell of our life, to every enterprise and cooperative, to every institution and army unit, when people work and live everywhere as in a state of siege.

.....

IV

THE STRUGGLE OF THE PARTY ON THE IDEOLOGICAL FRONT

The years that have elapsed have been years of major work and struggle for the uninterrupted revolutionization of the whole life of the country. This great process of transformation has led to the strengthening of the Party and the state power, the consolidation of the economic base, the development of education and culture and the defence potential of the Homeland. It has led to a rise in the consciousness of the working people, endowed them with deeper Marxist-Leninist convictions, created a militant spirit and greater mobilization at work, has encouraged the initiative of the masses, sharpened their political, and ideological vigilance and further strengthened their confidence in their own forces. In this all-round struggle, the fighting unity of the people around the Party has been enhanced, and the dictatorship of the proletariat defended and strengthened.

1. — WE MUST WAGE THE CLASS STRUGGLE CORRECTLY AND WITH DETERMINATION

The construction of socialism is a process of stern class struggle between the two roads, the socialist road and the capitalist road, a struggle waged on all fronts, political and economic, ideological and military.

In socialism, too, this struggle is an objective phenomenon, the main driving force that carries the revolution and the construction of socialism forward, that protects the Party, the state and the entire country from bourgeois-revisionist degeneration and the restoration of capitalism, that cleanses the consciousness of the working people and strengthens their proletarian spirit.

The major successes and victories our people have achieved under the leadership of the Party, in their struggle to develop the revolution and construct socialism, are linked with the fact that the Party has resolutely upheld the line of the class struggle and consistently waged it against internal and external enemies, as well as among the people and in its own ranks.

In the process of this struggle, a rich revolutionary experience of major theoretical and practical value has been gained from which our Party has drawn very valuable lessons and conclusions on how to build and defend socialism and strengthen the Party and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The class struggle waged during the whole existence of the Party, as well as recently, has shown that **the main danger and enemy to our Party and the entire international revolutionary communist and workers' movement has been and still is right opportunism, revisionism.** This danger always threatens a country which is building socialism under the conditions of capitalist encirclement, but it has now become greater still, especially since the liquidation of the socialist order in the Soviet Union and the bourgeois degeneration of many communist parties of the world. In a country where socialism is being built with success, the enemies find it difficult to come out openly with the banner of anti-communism. Pseudo-Marxism, revisionist counter-revolution, is their favourite weapon to overthrow socialism.

International experience and that of our country show that the hopes of the bourgeoisie and reaction for the restoration of capitalism are not based only on the remnants of the old exploiting classes nor only on the agents and diversionists in the pay of foreigners. Their hopes are based especially on other enemies of socialism who emerge from the socialist society itself, on people seriously contaminated by the hangovers of old ideologies, with marked individualistic and career-seeking tendencies, confused by the impact of modern bourgeois and revisionist ideologies, who yield to the pressure of external and internal enemies, and who, eventually, desert the revolution and degenerate into counterrevolutionaries.

In socialist society there exists the danger of the degeneration of individuals, of the emergence of new bourgeois elements, of their transformation into counterrevolutionaries. As Marxism-Leninism teaches, this comes about not only because the new socialist society still preserves traditions, customs, ways of behaviour and concepts of life of the bourgeois society from which it has emerged, but also because of certain economic and social conditions which live on in this society in the transitional phase. The productive forces and the relations of production, the mode of distribution based on them, are still far from being completely communist. The distinctions which exist in different fields, such as between country and town, manual and mental work, qualified and unqualified work, etc. which cannot be wiped out immediately, also exert their influence in this direction. To them must be added the powerful and all-round pressure which the capitalist and revisionist world exerts from outside. Socialism can greatly restrict the emergence of negative phenomena alien to its nature, but it cannot avoid them completely.

Therefore, the discovery and defeat of individual

hostile elements or a hostile group, at a given time, should not lull us to sleep and make us think that, with this, the enemies are done for. **As long as the class struggle continues, as long as the hostile bourgeois pressure from within and without exists, the danger of the emergence of new enemies and of their activity against socialism also continues to exist.** The Party and the people must always remain on guard, vigilant and revolutionary, must wage a resolute and uncompromising class struggle and block all the ways from which the enemies might emerge and harm us.

Socialist Albania provides a major example which shows that the emergence of revisionism and return to capitalism are not decreed by fate to be inevitable, as the bourgeois ideologists try to make out. It proves the vitality of socialism, the invincible strength of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, which, when they are consistently applied, carry the cause of the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat forward with sure steps. The correct understanding of this problem, the dialectical appreciation of it, is of great principled importance and is directly linked with the fate of socialism.

There exists a very close connection and coordination between the internal and external fronts of the struggle waged by the class enemies. They are united by their anti-communist ideology, and the need they have of each other's support in their struggle against the Party and the socialist order. It is important to recognize not only this fact, which will continue to exist as long as the imperialist-revisionist encirclement and the survivals of capitalism themselves exist within the country, but especially that this coordination may be strengthened and become extremely dangerous if we are careless, lacking in vigilance, and fail to carry out a resolute struggle against it.

The Party has carried out great and persistent work to give the people a correct understanding of the imperialist-revisionist encirclement and the struggle which must be waged against it. The results of this struggle are evident in all fields. Under the leadership of the Party, our people have coped resolutely with political pressures, economic blockades, military threats and the ideological aggression of the enemies. They have never been taken in, either by the blandishments and demagogy of the enemies or by their diplomatic manoeuvres.

However, it remains a major and permanent task of the Party in the future, too, to make old and young ever more conscious of the hostile nature of the imperialist-revisionist encirclement, of the dangers it represents and the tasks we face to cope successfully with the all-round pressure which it exerts on our country. Socialist Albania is a thorn in the flesh of numerous enemies who are striving in every way to undermine and destroy it. Whatever the tactics they use and the conjunctures created, they always remain enemies, therefore we should have no illusions about them.

The imperialist-revisionist encirclement is not in the least passive and merely geographical, but a threatening and active encirclement which fights us in all fields and in all directions. But there are still people who have a superficial and unduly simple understanding of this encirclement, who underrate the danger of military aggression, the difficulties stemming from the economic blockade, or the menace of the foreign ideological diversion. Such attitudes are very harmful.

Our socialist Homeland has been and is constantly under threat of military aggression by imperialism and social-imperialism. The aggressive policy of the super-powers is spearheaded first of all against socialism, the revolution and the liberation of the peoples, against those

forces that unmask and oppose their hegemonic and expansionist course. Therefore, the danger of foreign military aggression against socialist Albania is real and should be neither underrated nor overrated.

Besides their measures of coercion, the imperialist and revisionist enemies also use the tactics of peaceful degeneration of the socialist order, attaching special importance to their ideological aggression, precisely to the counter-revolutionary course which proved so fruitful in the Soviet Union and the other former socialist countries.

The imperialist-revisionist encirclement is operating very powerfully in the field of the economy as well. The savage economic blockade, discrimination in trade relations, the efforts to impede the development of production are the weapons of the enemies to sabotage the construction of socialism and undermine the economic and political independence of the country.

The aim of the external enemies is to put our internal front into disarray, to aid and abet the anti-socialist and counter-revolutionary elements within the country. Therefore, **we must cope with the united front of the enemies by strengthening our internal front in all directions, in the fields of defence and the economy, politics and ideology, always consistently waging the class struggle.** We must resolutely combat any spirit of euphoria and overestimation of our own forces, any lack of seriousness or of total mobilization in the struggle against the imperialist-revisionist encirclement.

Our people should live everyday with the external and internal political situations of the country, always see their tasks in close connection with these situations, work with a lofty spirit of self-denial and sacrifice, always be ready, vigilant and resolute fighters against all the attempts and pressures of the enemies. The struggle against the imperialist-revisionist encirclement is not a

single battle or a series of campaigns, but a continuous fight that must be waged every day.

Our Party has stressed that the struggle on the ideological front constitutes one of the main aspects of the class struggle. This is a fierce struggle waged on a broad front against all alien ideologies, old and new, which are kept alive, inspired and encouraged by internal and external bourgeois pressure. This is a major front of struggle, extremely important and complicated, which demands the permanent attention of the Party.

The successes which have been achieved in this field constitute one of the most important victories of the Party and the people. The petty-bourgeois psychology and mentality, backward customs and religious prejudices, manifestations and influences of alien bourgeois-revisionist ideologies have been dealt powerful and crushing blows. The aim of all this work has been to have our people always engaged in revolution, to ensure that they do not stand aside from it even for a moment, to encourage them to struggle and work selflessly, all their lives, for the great cause of the Party, for socialism and communism. The high level of political consciousness, the heroism at work, the sense of responsibility and the spirit of sacrifice are characteristic of our working people. This is testimony to the invincible strength of Marxism-Leninism and socialism, the correctness of the line of the Party.

But this healthy revolutionary reality should not induce us to relax our struggle on the ideological front, however slightly, because today, too, the question presents itself in the same way as Lenin presented it many decades ago:

«... either bourgeois or socialist ideology. There is no middle course... Hence, to belittle the socialist

*ideology in any way, to turn aside from it in the slightest degree means to strengthen bourgeois ideology.»**

The fact that the class struggle on the ideological front is waged in the ranks of the people and the Party, too, in everybody's consciousness, means that some people fail to distinguish the hostile content of these alien manifestations. Others underestimate this struggle, thinking that the hangovers from old ideologies constitute a potential rather than a real danger. They forget that these remnants and influences have not been and are not just something ugly, though passive, in people's consciousness, but are the source which incites anti-socialist attitudes and actions, such as thefts from, and damage to, socialist property, breaches of proletarian discipline at work, favouritism and nepotism, bureaucratic and liberal, patriarchal and conservative attitudes, etc. All these things, even when they are not committed by enemies or under their direct influence, are just as harmful and become serious obstacles to the construction of socialism. The hangovers of alien ideologies, the petty-bourgeois mentality, the feeling of private property and the placing of self-interest above public interest, constitute that hotbed in which bourgeois degeneration, revisionist and capitulationist views are bred and nurtured. Therefore, the struggle on the ideological front is not a passing campaign, but a continuous struggle for the triumph of proletarian ideology and morality, a struggle for the triumph of socialism and communism.

Our practice of revolution and socialist construction teaches us that unless it is waged in all its main directions, political, economic and ideological, no class struggle

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 5, pp. 452-453, Alb. ed.

can ever be complete. These three forms of class struggle are intertwined with and complement each other. At given periods, now one or now the other form of class struggle may come to the fore, but in every case it should be waged on all fronts. We should not forget that the enemy, too, wages his struggle in all directions: ideological, economic and political. Practice over the recent years has borne this out clearly.

Underestimation of one or the other aspect is fraught with negative consequences, leads to various distortions, and to the weakening of the class struggle as a whole. In practice, there is and can be no class struggle on any front outside the struggle to strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat, to ensure the leading role of the Party, and to defend the Homeland. The class struggle cannot be conceived apart from the efforts to fulfil the economic plan and the tasks in every other field of social activity or from the struggle to implant the proletarian ideology.

The class enemy tries to benumb the vigilance of the masses, it looks for periods of calm and lulls in the development of the class struggle in order to muster its forces and strike suddenly. The task of the party organizations, of all the working people, with the working class at the head, is to prevent the creation of such situations favourable to the enemy, and to be always on the offensive, to keep the edge of the class struggle constantly sharp, and be irreconcilable with the enemies and their ideologies.

Our Party has always waged the class struggle correctly and unerringly, according to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. This has been and remains a question of particular importance, for any deviation in waging the class struggle is fraught with grave consequences for the activity of the Party and the masses. It calls for maintaining a principled stand on all occasions, without slip-

ping either into opportunism or into sectarianism. In life, both these phenomena are encountered.

The passive non-militant stands observed in some party basic organizations and among cadres of the sectors, in which the various condemned hostile groups carried out their undermining activity, were opportunist. The enemies violated the line, directives, and orientations of the Party, displayed features of degenerate people, but these organizations and cadres failed to speak out and tell them firmly to stop their evil-doing activity in time. The «soft-hearted» attitudes towards the class enemy, the bourgeois sentimentality shown in some cases towards people who degenerate, who violate the norms of socialist society and the state laws, are opportunist, tolerant and conciliatory attitudes towards manifestations alien to our ideology.

Rigid and sectarian attitudes also damage the line of the Party. In the recent times such attitudes have been apparent among some communists and cadres who, when the Party exposed and condemned elements with a liberal, opportunist and hostile spirit, began to look with undue suspicion even at some small and unimportant blemish. The tendencies observed sometimes in some people to resort to administrative methods where persuasion and education should be used are also sectarian. Those who display sectarian tendencies often pose as «consistent and principled revolutionaries». But in fact they are opportunists and act in this way in order to be «on the safe side».

These opportunist vacillations stem from lack of a correct grasp of the nature of the two types of contradictions which exist in our society, from confusing antagonistic with non-antagonistic contradictions. The Party must make these matters completely clear and explain that **opportunism cannot be fought with success if sectarianism is not fought at the same time, and vice-versa.** On the

other hand, the class struggle must be waged neither in closed forms nor only from above, but jointly with the masses, with their broad and active participation. In this way the revolutionary education of the working people is achieved, and the unity of the Party and the people is strengthened and steeled.

The Party has emphasized that one of the most important aspects of the class struggle is the struggle against bureaucracy and liberalism, both dangerous enemies of the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism. The Party has done great and persistent work against both these negative phenomena and has taken a series of concrete measures, such as those for bringing the state power closer to the people and curtailing the administrative apparatuses, for ensuring the more active participation of the masses in the work of government, for strengthening and further improving the direct worker and peasant control, for eradicating the spirit of the bureaucratic hierarchy and democratizing life in the army, for barring all ways to the penetration of the alien ideology, and for revolutionizing the school, literature and arts.

But despite all the successes achieved and the heavy blows bureaucracy and liberalism have been dealt, the Party does not consider the struggle against them as over and done with. They always remain a serious danger, and the struggle against them must go on all the time. They are weapons in the hands of the class enemies to undermine the Party, the proletarian state, and our socialist life.

The analyses which the Central Committee has made in the sectors of culture, the economy, the army, etc., have shown that all the hostile elements, on the one hand, relied on liberalism and bureaucracy, and on the other hand, fostered these tendencies by all manner of means to further their counter-revolutionary aims. In their

efforts to undermine socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat it was not the line and the leadership of the Party they strove to put in the lead everywhere, but technocracy, they tried to weaken and eliminate control by the Party, the state, and the masses, so as to have their hands free and do as they liked, to encourage anarchist decentralization and create separate and independent organisms, to inflate the state apparatuses and institutions, to weaken their proletarian composition and encourage officialdom, to open the doors to the alien, to undermine confidence in our forces, etc.

But liberal and bureaucratic concepts and practices are not linked with the activity of the enemies only. They are encountered also among our people, in the work of our organs and apparatuses. The struggle against bureaucracy and liberalism will be a long one, because these things are deep-rooted, are linked with economic, social, and ideological factors, and encouraged by the internal and external enemies. The scale on which they spread depends on the political and cultural level of people, on the work of the Party for the revolutionary education and tempering of the working people, on the understanding of how dangerous they are and the ways to combat them.

Bureaucracy and liberalism are reactionary, idealist, anti-popular and anti-socialist ways of thinking and acting. It is the task of the party propaganda to expose the ideological class nature of liberalism and bureaucracy by theoretical and practical arguments. **The communists, the workers and the broad masses of the working people should rise with deep conviction against liberal manifestations, bureaucratic distortions and routine, to expose and combat them in every link and in all the forms in which they crop up.**

It is necessary to further strengthen and deepen the

struggle against technocratism and intellectualism as reflections of bureaucracy which lead to deviation from the proletarian ideology and the policy of the Party, weakening the leading role of the working class in our society, and disparagement of the creative role and thinking of the masses. In the recent years, especially, the technocratic and intellectualist influences have been expressed, among other things, in the overestimation of technology and special skills, in the failure to consider problems from the political and ideological angle, in the lack of faith in the drive and optimism of the masses.

The struggle against liberalism, as an expression of political and ideological opportunism, of concessions to the class enemy, of reconciliation with the influences of alien ideologies, with shortcomings and weaknesses, must become ever more intensive. It becomes even more essential to deepen this struggle because in recent years liberal manifestations and influences have emerged very sharply and have damaged the work in many sectors, such as in culture, the army, the economy, and elsewhere. Never, under any circumstances, should we underestimate these dangers, but we must always maintain keen political and ideological vigilance, strengthen the check-up from above and from below, enhance discipline and proletarian consciousness in everybody.

The Party should devote particular attention to uprooting liberal and anarchist concepts about democracy and freedom in the socialist society. Some people think that, being in a democracy, they have rights only and no duties at all, that the state and the society have obligations to them, which they never fail to demand, while they themselves are free to behave and act as they like, to violate discipline at work and social discipline, the laws of the state and the norms of our society, without a care in the world. These extremely harmful concepts

should be combated with determination, for they are alien to the principles of socialism.

A healthy spirit of lively political militancy exists in the ranks of our Party and among the people, and this constitutes a great victory for our Party. But this must in no way make us self-satisfied and close our eyes to manifestations of indifference which are observed among many working people and even among a number of communists and cadres. The struggle against manifestations of indifference remains a current task of the Party and its levers.

The Party has always stressed that **the class struggle in the field of ideology should be frontal and waged against both liberalism and bureaucracy, against the vestiges of the ideology of the old exploiting classes, as well as against the influences and manifestations of the bourgeois and revisionist ideologies of today.** While fighting against degenerating liberalism of bourgeois-revisionist origin, we must not underrate the struggle against various manifestations of conservatism either, which, owing to our historical conditions, still have roots and influences that are by no means superficial.

The 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th Plenums of the Central Committee of the Party have been great schools of class struggle in the period between the two Congresses. These plenums uncovered and made short work of the hostile groups of Fadil Paçrami and Todi Lubonja, of Beqir Balluku, Petrit Dume and Hito Çako, of Abdyl Këllezi, Koço Theodhosi and Kiço Ngjela, and others, who had engaged in a far-reaching undermining and sabotage activity in the field of ideology and culture, in the army, industry, planning, trade, and so on. (7)

7 As was later discovered, these groups were led by the former prime minister, Mehmet Shehu, who had placed himself

This was a major and extremely dangerous conspiracy. These enemies, in close collaboration among themselves and in co-ordination with certain foreign revisionist states, intended to liquidate the Party, to overthrow the people's power, to open the way to revisionism and to restore capitalism in Albania.

The traitor group of Fadil Paçrami, Todi Lubonja and company endeavoured to spread the bourgeois-revisionist ideology, culture, and way of life, to prepare a suitable ground for the political counter-revolution, in the field of ideology and culture. First of all, they aimed to cause confusion among the youth and the intelligentsia, to turn them against the Party and socialism, just as the enemies of Marxism-Leninism in the revisionist countries have done.

The traitor and putschist group of Beqir Balluku, Petrit Dume and Hito Çako was a faction at the head of the army, a group of plotters seeking to overthrow the Central Committee by force, by means of an armed putsch, and to wipe out the Party of Labour of Albania and the dictatorship of the proletariat, while relying also on armed intervention from abroad. To achieve their ends, they worked to weaken the organization of the Party and its leading role in the army, to replace the Marxist-Leninist ideology of our Party with revisionist ideology, to sabotage the military line of the Party and impose their capitulationist and traitor theses on it. They tried to undermine the defence potential of the country and to introduce in the army the detestable methods of the bourgeois and revisionist armies.

The traitor group of Abdyl Këllezi, Koço Theodhosi, Kiço Ngjela and company engaged in far-reaching hostile

in the service of a number of foreign secret services. (See: Enver Hoxha *The Titoites* Historical notes), the «8 Nëntori» Publishing House, Tirana 1982, Eng. ed. pp. 567-633.)

activities in the field of the economy. This group sought to distort the line of the Party for the development of the economy, the principles of its organization and management, and to introduce revisionist forms and methods of self-administration, and so on. They engaged in sabotage activities with grave consequences in such key sectors as planning, oil, foreign trade, etc. In this manner, they tried to weaken and undermine the base of our socialist order, open the way to the economic and political subjugation and enslavement of the country by foreigners.

These groups were imperialist-revisionist agencies in the bosom of the Party and state, composed of politically and morally degenerate elements who had become bourgeois and capitulated to the pressure of the external and internal enemies, to the ideological encirclement and aggression of international imperialism and revisionism.

The danger posed by these hostile groups was extremely serious, because they were filling important posts in the Party and state power and exploiting the great authority of the Party to cover up their hostile work. They masked their counter-revolutionary activity by pretending that everything was done in the name of the Party allegedly for the good of the Party and the people, allegedly for the creative implementation of its decisions and directives. They acted on the sly, never daring to come out openly against the line of the Party, because, like all the other enemies, they had no basis either in the Party or among the people. The strength and steel unity of the Party suppressed them. Its sound ties with the people overawed them.

For some time the enemies managed to act and cause damage without being discovered, because they found weak spots in the work of the Party and the state power. They exploited mistakes and shortcomings, manifestations of bureaucracy, liberalism and euphoria, which they did

their best to spread and encourage. They profited from the relaxation of vigilance and control, the failure to persistently implement the principles and norms of the Party and state, from various shortcomings in the educative work, from the failure to keep well in mind the teachings of the Party on the class struggle and the imperialist-revisionist encirclement.

All the organs of leadership, including the Central Committee and the Government, bear responsibility for these things that have occurred. Special responsibility, both collective and individual, falls on the party organizations, communists and cadres of those sectors where the enemies were most active. They bear responsibility because they have permitted the leading role of the party organizations to be weakened, because they did not consistently uphold the decisions and directives of the Party and the laws of the state, because some of them showed themselves to be politically short-sighted and liberal, while some others lacked the revolutionary courage to raise their voice, to denounce the enemies and put them in their place.

Because of the steel unity, the keen political sense and maturity, ideological clarity and revolutionary determination of the Party and its leadership, this hostile activity was discovered and smashed. Socialist Albania was saved from a great and dangerous conspiracy. From this fierce class battle the Party emerged stronger and more tempered, the unity of the ranks of the Party around the Central Committee, as well as the unity of the people around the Party, were raised to a higher level. The revolutionary vigilance of the Party and the masses was raised and strengthened. Our economy was further consolidated and marked new successes on the road of its socialist development, our arts and culture increased their party spirit and militancy. The army, all the armed

forces, have been united more tightly around the Party, their ideo-political tempering, revolutionary spirit and fighting readiness to confront and wipe out any enemy that might dare attack our socialist Homeland, have been raised to a higher level. In this struggle, our working class, the cooperativist peasantry, the youth, women, intelligentsia and cadres displayed their lofty patriotism, their unwavering confidence in the Party and its leadership, their loyalty to its correct line.

The uncovering and liquidation of the plot hatched up by the internal and external enemies is a great victory of our Party and people, a victory of Marxism-Leninism over revisionism.

2. — THE LEADING ROLE OF THE WORKING CLASS AND THE EDUCATION OF THE WORKING MASSES

Guided by the Party, the working class has stood in the forefront in the great historic events over the last 35 years of struggle and work for the liberation of Albania and the triumph of the people's revolution, the all-round revolutionary transformation of the country on a socialist basis. This is one of the principal factors in the consistent development of our revolution on the correct Marxist-Leninist course.

The working class is the leading class of the society. It has its own political party that leads it, and the Marxist-Leninist ideology that lights its way. It is the bearer of the ideals of socialism and communism. It is linked with the highest form of socialist property and the leading sectors of the economy, it is the most conscious, organized, and disciplined class. Its weight in production and the structure of the population is steadily growing.

As Marxism-Leninism teaches us, no class or social

stratum other than the working class can play the leading role in the struggle to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat and in the construction of the new socialist society. This role will be preserved and strengthened in the future, too, so long as classes and the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat exist.

In the interval between the two Congresses, the Party has done all-round work so that the role of the working class is felt and exerted powerfully everywhere, so that the working class sets the tone for the entire life of the country with its ideology, revolutionary vigour and example. Consequently, the political activity of the working class, its active participation in the solution of major problems of the Party and the state have increased and its direct control over the implementation of the Party's policy in all fields has been extended and strengthened. A very important indication of the enhancement of the role of the working class is the fact that a large number of cadres, who have emerged from among the ranks of the working class, have been brought into the organs and apparatuses of the Party, the state power, the economy and culture, and they have further invigorated and revolutionized all the work.

These results have been achieved through a fierce struggle against liberal and bureaucratic, technocratic and individualist concepts and attitudes, which expressed lack of confidence in the abilities of the working class, which did not accept its control, or accepted it for form's sake only, and which, in various forms and ways, overestimated the role of the apparatus, office workers and specialists.

In the future, too, the Party will work untiringly to ensure and strengthen more and more the leading role of the working class in the entire life of the country. The working class plays this role through its Party and its proletarian state. Without the Party, the leading role of

the working class would remain a demagogic and fraudulent phrase. **Only the revolutionary party of the working class, armed with the Marxist-Leninist theory, can make the working class conscious of its historic mission and clearly define the objectives of its struggle and the ways to attaining them. The Party organizes, educates and mobilizes the working class and all its allies and leads them in the complicated struggle to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat and build socialism.**

The revisionists of every hue, old and new, have spread and are spreading all sorts of views to negate the historic mission of the working class, especially to liquidate the leading role of its vanguard, the Marxist-Leninist party, in the revolution and socialist construction.

With their «theories» of the party and state of the entire people, of the party as merely an ideological factor or an instrument of co-ordination, with their sermons about spontaneity in the workers' movement, pluralism, and transition to socialism under the leadership of other political classes and forces, they intend to leave the working class without leadership and disarmed in the face of the enemy, which is organized and armed to the teeth, to sabotage the revolution, to eliminate the theory and practice of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Our Party has contemptuously rejected these reactionary theories, as well as the anti-Marxist and anarchist views of «self-administration», and «direct leadership» by the working class. It has put our working class in the historic role which belongs to it in the socialist society. This is in complete opposition to the concepts and practices of the Khrushchevite revisionists who treat the working class of their countries as merely a productive force, and have transformed it into an oppressed and exploited class, at whose expense the new bourgeoisie is growing rich.

In our country, there is no problem of the policy of the Party and state on which the working class and the other working masses do not have their say and in the solution of which they do not take an active part. The Party has attached and continues to attach great importance to consulting the working class and the other working masses, to the extensive development of criticism by the masses of shortcomings and weaknesses at work, and encouraging the active participation of the working class in governing the country.

The Party has paid and continues to pay special attention to the direct control by the working class and the other working masses, to the implementation of this great Leninist principle in practice. It regards this control, which is exercised under its leadership over all state and social activity, as a universal and permanent principle of our socialist society in all its spheres and links, as an expression of the exercise of the dictatorship of the proletariat by the working class in alliance with the peasantry. The worker control is one of the vital aspects of the class struggle to ensure the triumph of socialism, to prevent the degeneration of the socialist order, and is a great school for the revolutionary education of the working class and the other working masses.

The exercise of direct worker and peasant control has yielded results of great value in detecting and avoiding many shortcomings and weaknesses, manifestations of liberalism, distortions and violations of state laws and norms of our society. It has served as a powerful means to shake off the dust of bureaucracy and routine in many administrations, economic enterprises and cultural institutions, among party cadres and organizations, to create a lively revolutionary atmosphere all over the country, to implement the line of the Party correctly, and to carry out the tasks in all fields of socialist construction successfully.

Recently, the Party took important measures to put the worker and peasant control on a sound organizational basis and to raise it to a higher qualitative level. **The consolidation of the organization of worker and peasant control groups, the qualified guidance of this control by the party organizations and committees, orientation and guidance of it to the most essential questions connected with the implementation of the line and decisions of the Party, better combination of worker and peasant control from below with state control from above, the summing up of the revolutionary experience of this control, in order to make it ever more thorough and richer in content and find new fruitful forms of exercising it, have now come to the fore.**

The further enhancement and strengthening of the leading role of the working class, the growth of its ideological influence and the efficiency of its work depend, to a considerable extent, on its revolutionary education and tempering, on raising its consciousness to such a level as to enable it accomplish its mission in socialist society.

On this issue, the Party bears in mind the fact that our working class is relatively young, that the bulk of the workers come from non-proletarian strata, that its ranks are being replenished every day with young workers straight from school, who lack experience in work and in life. All these things, as well as the weaknesses in the educational work, are some of the reasons that many workers do not always play the role that belongs to their class as they should, fail to speak out courageously and with maturity, do not feel the great responsibility they have to ensure that the line and decisions of the Party are carried out correctly by everybody, inside and outside the enterprise, do not always work in a high revolutionary spirit, with proletarian organization and discipline.

Therefore, **in the future, too, the Party will have to**

work persistently to educate the working class with the Marxist-Leninist ideology, to make it conscious of its role and tasks, so that it will be a staunch fighter for the construction of socialism, the strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the defence of the Homeland. The working class itself must stand in the forefront of the struggle to carry out the tasks of the state plan, put the general interest above everything, protect the common property, work with high productivity and quality, strengthen discipline at work, become innovator and creator, preserve and further develop its proletarian features and ceaselessly raise its educational, cultural and professional level. In this way the working class can educate the cooperativist peasantry, the youth, the intelligentsia, all the working people of our country with its example and in its spirit.

The Trade Unions, which do great work to educate and mobilize the workers and the other working people for the construction of the new society, have a special role and responsibility to make this work more thorough and carry it further. The main task of the Trade Union organization has been and still is the communist education of the working people. Any tendency to underrate the educational work of the trade-union organizations and to convert them into adjuncts of administrations and the economic organs, is highly dangerous and leads to the diversion of the Trade Unions from their function as schools of communism.

The view to the effect that the Trade Unions should concern themselves with education alone and not involve themselves in economic problems, which is encountered in some cases, is also grossly wrong. Of course, the Trade Unions have no reason to do the work of state and economic organs, or duplicate them. But it would be utterly unforgivable for them not to interest themselves in pro-

duction, in the carrying out of the tasks of the state plan. This would create the danger of the bureaucratization of the management of the economy. The effect of the educational work of the trade-union organizations depends very greatly on linking it closely with production, a thing which cannot be done well without being familiar with the problems of the economy. At the same time, it devolves on the Trade Unions to wage a more energetic struggle against any bureaucratic action that infringes the rights of the working people, guaranteed by law, in the slightest degree.

While recognizing the leading role of the working class, the Party has always correctly assessed the place and the great potential of the **peasantry** in our society. In the fire of the war for the liberation of Albania and the establishment of the people's power, in the fierce class battles for the construction of socialism, the Party created and tempered the powerful alliance of the working class with the working peasantry under the leadership of the working class. This alliance has been and remains the basic principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the foundation of the unity of the people around the Party.

The Party and the state of the working class have implemented a broad program of an all-round political and ideological, economic and social-cultural character, that has led to deep-going revolutionary transformations in the countryside and the strengthening of the alliance of the working class with the peasantry. Today the whole of our countryside, without exception, has set out on the road of socialism. This is a great historic victory of the line of the Party and our revolution.

However, the Party is aware that essential distinctions between town and countryside exist and will be preserved for a long time to come. The struggle to reduce them is the main way to strengthen the alliance of the

working class with the cooperativist peasantry and an indispensable condition to close any paths to bourgeois degeneration. The Party is continually taking measures to ensure that the distinctions between countryside and town are steadily reduced.

Because of the great role it has played and continues to play in the socialist society, the peasantry of our country deserves everything that has been done to make the countryside progress and flourish. In the past it bore the main brunt of the earlier liberation struggles and the Anti-fascist National Liberation War, it became the decisive force for the reconstruction of the country, from its ranks it brought forth the new working class, it has always shown itself to be patriotic, revolutionary, and loyal to the Party and the cause of the working class.

In the future, too, the Party will give special attention to drawing the peasantry into increasingly active participation in the political, economic and social life of the country, to educating it politically and ideologically, to raising its educational, cultural, and professional level, and to consolidating the cooperativist system more and more. In the educational work, it should not be forgotten that, for known reasons, the manifestations of the feeling of private property and the hangovers of petty-bourgeois psychology still have strong roots in the countryside. They are a source of many evils, of hankering after narrow self-interest, absenteeism, damage to social property, and so on. The peasantry must resolutely combat these alien manifestations, strengthen the spirit of collectivism, take an active part in the class struggle and work hard for the progress of agriculture and our socialist countryside.

As always, the working class must stand by its ally, must exercise its control over all the state and economic organs concerned with the implementation of the Party policy in the countryside, and deepen the great revolu-

tionary movement «To make agriculture the concern of the entire people». Through its example, it must educate all the working people to love the countryside, respect and honour farm work, fight any manifestation of contempt for the countryside and for work there. At the same time, it is necessary to combat all manifestations of mistrust by the countryside for the town in order to strengthen the militant alliance between the working class and the cooperativist peasantry more and more.

The **intelligentsia** of our country, which has emerged from among the workers and the peasants, has played and continues to play an important role in the all-round development of socialist Albania. Unlike the revisionist countries where it became the main force of counter-revolution to liquidate the gains of socialism, our intelligentsia serves the dictatorship of the proletariat, the people and the revolution, it stands united closely around the Party. This is another great victory for the policy of the Party.

In struggle against liberal and technocratic concepts, manifestations of bureaucracy and intellectualist conceit, and tendencies to commandism and privilege-seeking, occasionally encountered among intellectuals, **the Party is moulding the intelligentsia ever more thoroughly with the Marxist-Leninist ideology, with the moral features and qualities of workers and peasants.** It educates it and makes it more conscious of its role in society, puts it in such conditions of work and life that it will always be close to the people and under the permanent control of the masses. At the same time, the Party requires that the intelligentsia must constantly increase its knowledge and put it at the service of the socialist construction of the country, and take an active part in the technical-scientific revolution and the entire development of the socialist culture.

The heroic youth of our country have been and remain an active force of the revolution and a loyal auxiliary of the Party. The 35-years' experience of the Party shows that when the inexhaustible revolutionary energies of the youth are merged with the energies of the working class and the other working masses, under the leadership of the proletarian Party, there is no force which can stop the triumph of the revolution and socialism.

Our youth are surrounded by the special care of the Party and the entire society. Great prospects, which guarantee their present and future and give a lofty content and meaning to their life, have been opened to them. The Party has ever better fulfilled the cultural and spiritual aspirations and various material needs of the youth, it has mobilized them in revolutionary actions and given them the role of active and important participants in the revolution and the construction of socialist society. Therefore, our youth, too, have always followed the Party enthusiastically, optimistically and faithfully, and have gone all out to make the Homeland flourish, and to strengthen its defence.

We see an entirely different picture in the bourgeois and revisionist countries, where uncertainty for the present and fear of the future nags at the youth day in and day out. Every second of every hour their minds are being poisoned by confusing propaganda, urging them to an empty, dissipated life, devoid of ideals, which alienates them from the revolution, which drives them to the road of crime and hooliganism, and casts them into anarchism, adventurism, Utopia and despair.

Our Party aims to keep the communist ideals and the healthy revolutionary spirit always alive in the minds and hearts of the youth, to educate them to be loyal fighters of the Party, ready to dedicate their energies, talent and lives to the construction of socialism and the defence of

the Homeland. Led by the Party, the youth must ceaselessly develop the spirit of revolutionary initiative and action in production and in all fields. They must deepen their irreconcilable stand and be constantly on the attack against the class enemy, against any influence of the bourgeois and revisionist ideology, liberal and conservative manifestations which inhibit progress. They must strengthen their will and perseverance to acquire knowledge and culture, become powerful supporters of technical and scientific progress. The fact that there are a few young people who ape certain aspects of the bourgeois and revisionist way of life, display certain symptoms alien to proletarian morality, who demand from society more than they contribute, speaks mainly of gaps and weaknesses in our educational work. The entire society, the family and the working collectives, the schools and various institutions, the mass organizations and the state organs must work, under the leadership of the Party, so that our younger generation will be a shock detachment in the front-ranks of the revolution.

The great actions of the youth to build railways, roads, break in virgin land, etc. by voluntary work, in which almost the entire younger generation have taken part, as well as their movements «We must learn from the working class», «We must work wherever the Homeland needs us», «We must go to work and live in the countryside», and so on, are valued, welcomed, and powerfully supported by the Party as great revolutionary actions and movements, as schools for the communist education and tempering of the youth. In the future, too, the Party will entrust the youth and their militant organization, the Albanian Labour Youth Union, with important actions, in the firm belief that our younger generation will, as always, carry them through to the end successfully. Allow me to greet especially those thousands

of young men and women who have responded to the call of the Party to work and live in the countryside, and express my conviction that thousands of others will follow their example to strengthen our socialist countryside and make it progress.

Under the leadership of the Party, the Albanian Labour Youth Union has played a great role in the education of the younger generation. It has gained wide experience in the organization and mobilization of the youth for the construction of socialism. In the future, the youth organization is called upon to further invigorate its political and ideological life and activity, to extend the scope of this activity in conformity with the age and wide-ranging interests of the youth, in work and defence, education and culture, science and technology, sports and physical culture, making better use of all that great material base the Party and the people's power have created.

The Party and the people want the youth to be healthy, strong, capable in work and defence. The large-scale development of physical culture and sports, to which the youth organization should pay special attention, is especially important in this direction.

The Youth Union should fight to strengthen its organization, discarding as dangerous any tendency to liberalism in the life of the organization, such as those which showed up prior to the 4th Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party and which were strongly condemned by the entire youth. The Youth Organization has been and will always remain a militant political organization, a loyal auxiliary of the Party.

The correct Marxist-Leninist policy of the Party has led to that true, deep-going, and very broad revolution which has taken place in the life of the Albanian woman.

Our experience has fully confirmed the necessity of linking the problem of the complete emancipation of the

woman with the question of national liberation and the cause of the proletariat. Without the participation of the woman the socialist revolution cannot be successfully carried out, and without the socialist revolution the complete emancipation of the woman cannot be achieved.

The energies and abilities of the woman, which lay dormant and suppressed in the past, have burst out powerfully and irresistibly in all fields of our socialist life. The Albanian woman has come out into the arena of the struggle for socialism full of dignity, and is outstanding for her high revolutionary spirit, her determination and patriotism, and distinguishes herself at work and in life. Today, she is found everywhere, in fields and factories, in schools and laboratories. Highly responsible positions in the Party and the state have been entrusted to her. New relationships of equality are being established between husband and wife at work and in the family. The emancipation of the woman is strengthening the socialist democracy day by day. This bears out Marx's affirmation that the level of emancipation of the woman represents a natural yardstick of general emancipation.

Our reality refutes all the bourgeois and revisionist «theories» on the roads to the emancipation of the woman. The attempts of the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries to turn the struggle for the emancipation of the working woman against her husband, children and family, are aimed at diverting her from the revolutionary struggle and disrupting the common front of the working class and the working people against the real oppressors and exploiters. The demagogy of the modern revisionists, too, relating the solution of this major social problem to the policy of «peace» and «disarmament», is intended to make the woman give up the revolution.

In the future, too, the Party will consistently fight to carry out its program for the complete emancipation

of the woman. **It is the duty of the party organizations, the state organs and all the mass organizations to always make a correct assessment of the real abilities of women, which the Party has so carefully awakened, cultivated and developed, though it is the task of the women themselves to fight like revolutionaries to assert their personality ever better.** At the same time, on the basis of the possibilities ensured by the economic development of the country, better material conditions must be created to lighten the woman's burden of household chores so as to raise the efficiency of her work on the production front and her activity in political, social and cultural life to a higher level.

We note with special satisfaction that, through their own efforts and thanks to the care of the Party, women are narrowing the educational, cultural and technical-professional gap between them and men. Now, 37 per cent of all the cadres with medium and higher training are women. In the future, we must fight to achieve complete equality in this field, too. The women comrades in leading posts have distinguished themselves for their loyalty to the line of the Party, their abilities as leaders and organizers, for their knowledge and culture. This confirms the correctness of the directive of the Party that women should be promoted boldly to posts of responsibility, from the lowest to the highest levels of the party and state organs. Those sectarian attitudes which underrate the abilities of women and hinder the implementation of this policy of the Party are very harmful.

Alien patriarchal and conservative, bourgeois and liberal concepts are still a great barrier to the all-round affirmation of the personality of the woman. Under the leadership of the Party, the active Organization of the Women's Union of Albania, the state and all the mass organizations, the school and society have the duty to

educate women and men in the spirit of the struggle for the complete emancipation of all members of our socialist society, so that everybody, men and women, young and old, may march ahead triumphantly.

Constant preservation and strengthening of the unity of the people around the Party constitutes one of the most fundamental problems of the entire work of the Party and its levers, a decisive condition for the triumph of the revolution, the construction of socialist society and the defence of the homeland.

The unity of our people is not a unity dependent on circumstances and temporary alliances. It is a live and militant unity of the people around the Party, created in the war for the liberation of the country and cemented in the struggle for the implementation of the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist policy and ideology of the Party.

But unity is not something given once and for all. The struggle to strengthen it must be continuous and permanent. The enemies have attempted to attack this unity, to create splits between the people and the Party, and they will attempt to do so again in the future. Manifestations of bureaucracy and liberalism, attitudes and actions which run counter to the decisions of the Party, and impair the correct relations of the Party with the masses also damage this unity. The remnants and influences of alien ideologies, which are opposed to the new norms of the socialist society, violate it.

Hence, the great tasks facing the Party to safeguard the unity of the people like the apple of its eye, to steel it and make it even more invulnerable. This requires that we maintain high revolutionary vigilance, wage the class struggle ceaselessly and correctly, carry out the party directives with precision, and solve the various contradictions which arise among the people in a timely manner.

The **Democratic Front of Albania**, this great political

organization which realizes the unity of the Albanian people under the leadership of the Party, has wide scope of action in this field. In cooperation with the other social organizations, the Front is called upon to carry out all-round work with the urban and rural masses to make the policy, orientations and directives of the Party clear to them, to educate them in the spirit of socialist patriotism, revolutionary vigilance, combat readiness and irreconcilability towards all alien manifestations, to constantly strengthen and temper the unity of the people. The Democratic Front has been and remains a great tribune of the revolutionary opinion of the masses, a powerful lever of the Party to draw the working people into governing the country and solving problems of the socialist construction and the defence of the homeland.

.....

4. — EDUCATION, CULTURE AND SCIENCE MUST BE RAISED TO THE LEVEL OF THE TASKS OF THE TIME

During the years since the 6th Congress great strides ahead have been taken for the implementation of the directives of the Party in the field of education, culture, art and science. These important sectors have been actively engaged in the great struggle waged by our entire people for the socialist construction of the country.

The Party has always shown particular care for education, for the uninterrupted raising of its ideological and scientific level.

Implementing the Marxist-Leninist program approved by the 8th Plenum of the Central Committee in 1968. and the 6th Congress of the Party for the revolutionarization of education, our school has undergone great changes and achieved many results in the strengthening of the

ideological axis, in the implementation of the three components: lessons, productive work, physical and military training, in raising the scientific level of the school and in linking it with life. Commendable work has been done in drawing up plans and programs and compiling new textbooks for all categories of schools. The system of education has been improved and extended. The possibilities have been created for the pupils and students to acquire more knowledge, to be better trained for production and defence, to be educated and tempered in the spirit of the working class, with proletarian discipline and morality. Our school is more and more consolidating itself as a socialist school, with original features and a popular character. It is further strengthening its revolutionary class spirit.

This process has gone through a stern class struggle, against conservative and liberal, bureaucratic and technocratic concepts and practices, against bourgeois and revisionist influences and borrowings, which were strongly criticized also at the 4th and 7th Plenums of the Central Committee. Despite all the struggle waged, the major tasks which the educational reform laid down for the revolutionization of the content of teaching and education have not been fulfilled completely. There are still shortcomings and weaknesses which must be overcome, there are problems which are being solved with difficulty and hesitation, especially those connected with the full harmonization of the three components. In the method of work of the organs of education there are still manifestations of practicalism, and little effort is made to study and sum up the practice of our school.

The former leaders of the Ministry of Education and Culture exerted a negative influence on the implementation of the program laid down by the Party for the development of education through their harmful work which

was characterized by a liberal and bureaucratic spirit, shallowness and inertia.

For the future, too, the strengthening of the ideological content of all the work of the school, constitutes the fundamental and most important aspect of the implementation of the policy of the Party for the revolutionization of education. The main thing is to work for a more thorough assimilation of Marxism-Leninism, of the theoretical thinking and teachings of our Party, which must become more and more the foundation of the process of teaching and education, must permeate all subjects. The bookish learning of Marxism, which is still apparent in the school, as well as the slowness in reflecting the experience of the Party and our socialist construction in the textbooks and in the teaching process, impede the strengthening of the educational and formative role of the school. Hence, the important task of improving the programs, textbooks and lessons in the subject of Marxism-Leninism, of ensuring a closer linking of the lessons with life, with the great work and struggle the people are waging under the leadership of the Party, of making extensive use of the studies and generalizations carried out in the field of social sciences.

The educational role of the school in the all-round communist formation of the new generation will be strengthened the more the school and the youth are engaged in the class struggle for the development of the revolution and the solution of the concrete problems of the socialist construction of the country.

In putting before the school the task of introducing the three components and of their harmonization, the Party is aiming to achieve two major objectives, the revolutionary education and tempering of the youth, and the raising of the quality of all the work of the school. But in practice, despite the efforts made and the results

achieved, we are still on the initial stage of the solution of this problem. What is required is the complete and organic integration of the three components, in content and in method, so that they complement each other.

The school, as the place where the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist pedagogical thinking of our Party is applied, has the duty to acquaint itself with and study the best achievements in this field, to disseminate them and carry them further in order to ensure more creative and fruitful teaching and educational work. This constitutes a wide and important sphere of scientific work in the education sector.

A major problem remains, that of giving the school a deeper mass character and of improving the school system, by setting up a broader and more varied network of schools, especially vocational ones, both full-time and part-time.

The university and the other higher schools where the specialists for different fields of activity are trained, have the task of turning out cadres formed and tempered politically and ideologically, with broad cultural horizons, armed with profound scientific knowledge, prepared for life. In collaboration with the ministries and with the Academy of Sciences, they should carry out more organized work for the post-graduate qualification of cadres. The higher schools should devote particular attention to studies and research as an indispensable prerequisite for raising the level of all their teaching work as well.

The major successes scored by our people's education are a result of the tireless work of the great army of teachers and pedagogues who, with a high level of conscientiousness and ardent love for their honoured profession, are making a valuable contribution to the revolutionary education of the youth. The militant communist spirit, a passionate love and a high sense of responsibility for their

work, persistence in perfecting their skills as teachers and educators, the struggle against any alien influence, should characterize them. The school and the teachers should closely follow the process of the revolutionary development of the country, the economy and culture, as well as the progress of world science and technology.

The Party has shown constant care that **culture, literature and the arts** develop in a pure and sound atmosphere, that they follow the revolutionary transformations of the country step by step and steadily strengthen their socialist content, their militant character, their popular spirit and their national features.

The 4th Plenum of the Central Committee sternly criticized some harmful manifestations that had to do with imitations of reactionary foreign trends, with the wrong treatment of contradictions in our society, with theories that disparaged folk creativeness. etc. It put forward important tasks over the entire front of culture. Their implementation gave a fresh impulse to the development of literature and art, to all cultural and artistic activity. Great progress has been made in all fields, in literature and music, in cinema and theatre, in painting and sculpture, in opera and ballet.

The writers and artists have always stood close to the Party, as its auxiliaries in the struggle for the communist education of the masses. Along with the experienced creative forces, new talents, that are making their contribution to the further development of our literature and arts, have emerged.

True art strengthens its innovatory features and achieves a high artistic level when it embodies a revolutionary content and is guided by the communist ideals. Therefore, **the continuous strengthening of proletarian partisanship remains a basic task for the development of our culture and arts, for their advance on the road of socialism.**

A better reflection of some of the major themes in our artistic creativeness, such as that of the hegemonic role of the working class in our society, the revolutionary transformations of our socialist countryside, the revolutionizing force of the communists, the treatment of cardinal themes and key moments of the history of our people, and particularly, of the National Liberation War and the socialist revolution, are an essential requirement to make our literature and art even more revolutionary.

With its revolutionary ideals and its objectives of serving socialism and the people, our art of socialist realism towers above the degenerate, decadent, bourgeois and revisionist art, counterposes itself to its reactionary, pessimistic and capitulationist philosophy. Literature and arts in the Soviet Union have been placed under the complete domination of the new bourgeoisie, and the writers and artists have turned into a caste in the service of the counter-revolution and the chauvinist and expansionist policy of Soviet social-imperialism. Negation of the major social problems, themes of disillusionment and bourgeois humanism, complete renunciation of the positive hero, lack of any revolutionary perspective, are characteristic of the revisionist literature and arts.

The socialist content of art is closely linked with its popular and national character. Under the present conditions, when, proceeding from their objectives of world domination, of the spiritual and political enslavement of the peoples, the US imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists are spreading the ideas of cosmopolitanism, of the so-called internationalization of art and culture, the struggle to defend the national culture of the peoples assumes very great importance. By defending and developing their national, democratic, and revolutionary culture, the peoples defend their independence, their existence and

their own traditions, and thus make their contribution to the treasury of world culture.

Our socialist culture has never shut itself away in its national shell. It has profited from the best achievements of progressive world culture and, on its part, being the bearer of our people's ideals of freedom, independence and socialism, has been and is close to other peoples as well.

The national character and the popular spirit are expressed through the truthful reflection of reality, from the standpoint of Marxist-Leninist ideology, the assimilation of all the experience of our culture, both its old progressive tradition and its new revolutionary elements, in a critical way, proceeding from the class standpoint, and firmly relying on the people's creativeness. The popular and national character is expressed not just in the creation of the works alone but also in their execution and interpretation.

Some kinds of arts, architecture in particular, are lagging behind in their expression of the national spirit and features. To eliminate this shortcoming further study and more research work is needed.

Guided by the teachings of the Party, the writers and artists should direct themselves towards the life of the people, create an art for the people, beautiful, clear and comprehensible to all, a profoundly popular art. The life of the people, their sharp wit, popular psychology and humour, should occupy a larger place in literary and artistic works, especially in the genres of the stage.

Those artists who work ceaselessly to raise their Marxist-Leninist ideological level, who master the teachings of the Party, who lead an active political life, who are thoroughly immersed in the life of the masses and have a profound knowledge of the road of the revolutionary historical development of our people and culture succeed best in these tasks. Revolutionary art is created by

revolutionary artists whose hearts beat in unison with the hearts of the people. They are required to reflect accurately in their works the fundamental processes and trends of development of our revolution, the contradictions of life, and to fight any manifestation of formalism and stereotyped treatment of them, to faithfully and creatively apply the method of socialist realism, which is the foundation of the proletarian art to which the future belongs.

Our socialist culture is penetrating more deeply among the people day by day and becoming part and parcel of their life. The publication of books and the production of films has been increased and the network of cultural-artistic centres throughout the country extended. The amateur movement has undergone great quantitative and qualitative development, and alongside professional art, is playing an important role in the progress of our new culture and the education of the working people. The masses, the man of work, the worker and the cooperativist, the woman and the youth, old and young, have mounted the stage.

The Party demands that mass cultural work must be raised to a higher level. To this end, it is necessary to form a broader concept about culture, viewing it in all the different aspects of life, and about the cultured man. All the many means the state has placed at the service of the masses should be properly used, and ways and forms found for our culture to go wherever the masses of the people live and work. Today, when the Party is striving to narrow the distinctions between town and country, the front of culture, too, is faced with important tasks connected with raising the cultural level of the peasantry, through a broad activization of the forces of the countryside as in the city.

The party organizations should have a better appreciation of the great role which culture, literature and arts

play in the education of the masses, and should consider them as important sectors of their activity, showing special care for the political and ideological education of the creative artists. The leadership of the Party, the consistent application of its line and directives in these fields is of decisive importance for their development on the right road. The state organs also face important duties to increase their concern about culture and arts, as well as to improve the forms and methods of handling them.

Under the leadership of the Party, the League of Writers and Artists should intensify its work for the ideological and professional education of writers and artists, becoming still more a centre where creative work is encouraged and its philosophical, ethical, and esthetical problems are widely thrashed out from the standpoint of proletarian partisanship.

In the all-round efforts to put the decisions of the 6th Congress of the Party into life, successes have been achieved, also, in the development of **science** and scientific experimentation. Functioning in our country today are various scientific organisms, specialized institutes and research centres, apart from those of the chairs and faculties of the higher schools. The founding of the Academy of Sciences was an important achievement.

Over this period, a series of important scientific and technical studies and experiments have been carried out in geology and mining, hydroenergetics, agriculture, etc. A number of valuable studies have been carried out also in the field of social problems, the Anti-fascist National Liberation War, history, archaeology, and the Albanian language.

The country's present stage of development and the great tasks ahead of us require that **scientific studies and research are transformed into a general method that must pervade and precede all activities, and give effective help**

in the solution of present and future problems of the construction of socialism and the defence of the Homeland.

Science is confronted with great tasks in designing and building large hydrotechnical and industrial projects, discovering and using new raw materials and other natural resources, finding new ways for the intensification of agriculture, etc.

The development of science raises the very important problem of carrying out intensified studies in a number of fields, such as biology, genetics, mathematics, physics, chemistry, physiology, etc., without which many problems of the development of applied sciences and technical progress cannot be solved, and a sound training of the various specialists and of the younger generation in our school cannot be carried out.

Great prospects are opened to the fruitful development of social and economic sciences, with the scientific study and summing up of the revolutionary thinking and practice of our Party and people as their fundamental object. Studies on the history, life, language and cultural and artistic traditions of our people constitute an important field.

As the Party has continuously stressed, the technical-scientific revolution in our socialist society cannot be carried ahead by a few specialized research institutions alone. The activation of the broad masses of workers and peasants, of cadres and specialists of production is of decisive importance in scientific experimentation. The specialized institutions and the centres of scientific research should link their activity more closely with the scientific experimentation of the masses, they should sum up advanced experience and disseminate scientific knowledge among the masses. This is also the way to protect them from the diseases of bureaucracy, technocratism and intellectualism.

At the present stage, all material-technical means and human resources exist to solve many complicated economic, ideo-theoretical, cultural and technical-scientific problems with our own forces. It is, therefore, necessary to further strengthen the confidence of the cadres, specialists, and working people in their own creative forces and capabilities, while at the same time getting to know, and applying, in conformity with our conditions, the achievements of world science and technology.

The fulfilment of the tasks in the field of science requires the taking of further measures for the training and qualification of specialized scientific cadres of different branches and the strengthening of the necessary material base.

The development of science and the technical-scientific revolution confronts the research institutions and the higher schools with major tasks for raising the quality and effectiveness of their scientific studies and research, in struggle with alien technocratic and intellectualist, idealist and metaphysical concepts. The Academy of Sciences should play a special role here, especially towards a better utilization and coordination of forces and means for science and research.

Under the leadership of the Party, the state organs, from the base to the centre, should increase the attention they devote to the organization, planning and development of the activity of the scientific-research organs and institutions, put forward concrete tasks and check up on their fulfilment, and render all the necessary help in the solution of the problems that arise.

THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND THE
FOREIGN POLICY OF THE PRA

The construction of socialism in Albania, the struggle of our people for the strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the defence of the Homeland, their efforts to build a secure future cannot be separated from the international situation in which we live, from the general historical process of world development today.

The Party has followed with great attention and analysed the events and the creation of new situations, the direction and intentions of the various political forces that are active in the international arena, and has always maintained a correct and principled stand in complete accord with the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, our national interests, the interests of the revolution and the liberation of the peoples.

In general, the present international situation appears very complex, full of great contradictions and confrontations that have now embraced the whole globe and all aspects of the human society today. Facing imperialism, social-imperialism and their savage, aggressive and expansionist activity, facing the bourgeoisie, the international monopolies and their barbarous exploitation, facing reaction and its violence and terror, with multiplied forces stand the world proletariat and the staunch revolutionaries, the peoples that are struggling for freedom and

democracy, for socialism. The world is at a stage when the cause of the revolution and national liberation of the peoples is not just an aspiration and a future prospect, but a problem taken up for solution.

In recent years, a powerful upsurge of the struggle of the proletariat can be seen in all the capitalist countries. The workers and the masses of the working people everywhere are fighting selflessly against political oppression and economic exploitation, to defend their democratic rights and ensure a better life. What distinguishes this struggle is the broadened scope of the demands of the working people which are more and more going beyond the bounds of economic demands. The strikes, protests, demonstrations of the working people in the United States of America, Britain, France, the Soviet Union, Poland, Italy, Germany, Spain, etc., which often end up in bloody clashes with the bourgeoisie and its apparatus of oppression, are striking at the very foundations of the bourgeois and revisionist rule. In these fierce clashes with capital and the bourgeoisie, the working class and the broad masses of the working people are more and more strengthening their proletarian consciousness, preparing and tempering themselves ever better for the coming class battles. The present struggle of the world proletariat once more proves the fundamental thesis of Marxism-Leninism, that the working class and its revolutionary struggle in the bourgeois and revisionist world cannot be suppressed either with violence or with demagogy. Despite the pressure, the demagogy, and the large-scale deceptive and disruptive propaganda of the bourgeoisie and its allies, the tendency to break away from the opportunist and undermining influences of social-democracy and the revisionists, who unfortunately still manipulate an important part of the working class, is broadening and deepening. The growth and strengthening of the new Marxist-Leninist

parties is vivid proof that the proletariat has never lost its faith in Marxism-Leninism, that it sees in Marxism-Leninism its most powerful weapon in the struggle against the bourgeoisie and for the triumph of the revolution.

Day by day, the liberation movement of the peoples is rising to a higher level, both in content and in intensity. The historic victory of world importance of the peoples of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, which was a victory not only over US imperialism, but also over the plots, intrigues and acts of interference of Soviet social-imperialism, proved that, with all their great power and wealth, with all their modern means of warfare, the superpowers are not able to subjugate the peoples and countries, even small ones, if the latter are determined to fight to the end and make any sacrifice. It confirmed the thesis that freedom and independence are won and defended with the gun. through struggle, that the strategy of the national liberation people's war is a strategy that ensures victory.

Today Asia, Africa, and Latin America constitute a broad front of struggle against US imperialism. Soviet social-imperialism, and the other imperialist powers. The peoples of these continents are making great and all-round efforts to strengthen their political independence, to shake off colonial and neo-colonial domination. All of us today, are witnesses of the determined efforts of the African peoples for their complete emancipation, after their emergence from centuries of slavery. The achievement of independence by countries that only a little while ago were under Portuguese colonial rule has further accelerated the struggle against racism and racial discrimination in Rhodesia and South Africa.

The struggle of the progressive and democratic forces against fascism and reaction is also growing and expanding. The overthrow of dictatorial regimes in some countries, the struggle of the patriots of Brazil and Bolivia, of

Thailand and Malaysia, the resistance of the peoples of Chile, Argentina, and Indonesia, against the fascist regimes have dealt telling blows at the reactionary forces and their imperialist supporters. The peoples of the Indian Ocean region, of South-east Asia and the shores of Africa are fighting persistently for the removal of the military bases and naval fleets of the two superpowers. Everywhere the peoples are awakening and growing ever more conscious of the danger that the policy of aggression, expansion and hegemony of US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism represents to their existence.

... It is this broadening and deepening of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, this great intensification of the liberation struggle of the peoples, the victories of socialism, all taken together, that have further weakened imperialism and social-imperialism, that have sharpened the contradictions of the capitalist system and shaken it to its foundations.

A direct result of this struggle and of the inevitable contradictions of their system is also the very grave crisis which all the capitalist and revisionist countries are going through today. During the whole period since the Second World War economic crises have followed one upon the other. But the present crisis is the greatest, a crisis sweeping over not only the developed countries, but also those less developed; it is an economic crisis, but also a political and ideological, a military and cultural crisis, affecting the structures and the superstructures of the bourgeois-revisionist system.

At first, this crisis was apparent in the form of a falling rate of production and an increasing rate of inflation. It became still more acute and assumed broader proportions because it was complicated with an extremely grave energy crisis and the currency crisis, which caused very great upsets in all the capitalist-revisionist countries.

Some of them, such as Italy, Britain, Poland, Yugoslavia, etc, are now experiencing extremely difficult situations.

A distinctive feature of the present crisis is that it is developing in the conditions of an acute sharpening of inter-imperialist contradictions in the rivalry of the superpowers for the division of markets and spheres of influence. The deeply aggressive policy of US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, their thirst for world domination and hegemony have led to a big increase in state expenditure for the maintenance of military forces and bases in foreign countries, for «military aid» and various subsidies to reactionary regimes. This has created great tensions in the economies of the superpowers and of their allies, who are compelled to take upon themselves no small part of the burden of the crisis. The militarization of the economies of the great imperialist powers, the increase in military expenditure and budgets for repressive apparatuses to unprecedented proportions, in general, the consumption of national income and assets for non-productive purposes, makes these upsets ever more marked.

The crisis is further sharpened by the unrestrained competition of the industrialized bourgeois and revisionist countries among themselves, as well as between them and the developing countries, the main producers of raw materials. The operation of the law of uneven political and economic development of capitalist countries drew the Common Market, Japan, Canada and others into the arena of the struggle for markets and privileges and of challenging US domination in the sphere of capital exports.

The present crisis has once again confirmed that, as a social system, capitalism can never escape its contradictions and its ills, that it is incapable of ensuring its own superprofits while at the same time preserving an internal social equilibrium. Life thus repeatedly proves the theory of Marx and Lenin that economic crises are fellow-

travellers of the capitalist system, that as long as private ownership and capitalist exploitation exist, economic crisis will exist, too.

All the capitalist and revisionist states try to saddle the masses of working people with the consequences of the crisis. And in fact, in order to keep their profits intact, the bourgeoisie, the monopolists and all exploiters everywhere have stepped up the oppression and exploitation of the proletariat and the working people, reducing their means of livelihood and curtailing their rights. In these moments of grave crisis for the imperialist and social-imperialist powers and the bourgeois state power of every country, millions of workers, the number of them has now reached about one hundred million, are being thrown out on the street, inflation is rampant, prices for necessities are becoming more and more out of reach. In present-day capitalist and revisionist society that phenomenon of polarization, which Marx described, is taking place: on the one hand the poverty of the working people is increasing and, on the other, the wealth of the capitalists is growing.

Big capital and its state power, social-democracy, the revisionists and other opportunists are accompanying this grave situation, this policy of savage oppression and exploitation, with a great amount of lying propaganda meant to convince the masses of the working people that the present upheavals are allegedly a passing phenomenon, that everything will get back to what it was before, hence they should patiently bear the heavy burden that has fallen on them, and not try to find its causes and rise in revolt. They are striving with every means to avoid the great danger, the revolution, which is the only way for the working class to escape from the crisis and the exploiting capitalist and revisionist system once and for all.

The bourgeoisie and its state power also utilize the trade unions, in which they have incorporated the proletariat and the working people of most bourgeois countries, for this counter-revolutionary aim. The trade unions are allegedly democratic, allegedly independent of the bosses and various «democratic», «socialist» and other parties. In reality, these so-called trade unions, openly manipulated by the bourgeois parties and led by the labour aristocracy, strive by all manner of means to mislead the working people and sabotage their revolutionary struggle. As well as this, the laws concerning the workers' activity and struggle for economic, social and other demands have been constructed and doctored by big capital in such a manner that every action must take place within the limits allowed by the bourgeoisie, that nothing should damage its interests, and in particular must not threaten the foundations of the capitalist state power. When it finds it impossible to cope with the revolts of the workers and people in the pseudo-democratic forms or with the «talking-shop» methods of parliaments, then the bourgeois state clamps down on them with its laws, its violence, its buldgeon. That is what is happening now in most countries where the crisis has sharpened the contradictions between labour and capital, and the revolt of the working people at the situation created is becoming ever more powerful.

In these situations the danger of fascism is becoming ever more threatening. It is a known fact that when capital finds itself driven into a blind alley and under the heavy blows of the working class, it is compelled either to declare itself bankrupt or to establish its fascist dictatorship and head for war. This danger of fascism is evident in Spain, Italy, and in many other countries. If the Italian fascist party, which is called the Italian Social Movement, lost votes in the recent Italian elections, this

is no defeat for it, because it has put its «squadristi» (8) contingents into the Christian-democratic Party.

«For it is the great significance of all crises,»
said V. I. Lenin, *«that they make manifest what has been hidden; they cast aside all that is empty form, superficial, and trivial; they sweep away the political litter and reveal the real causes of the class struggle that develops in reality.»**

The political, economic and social events of the world today, the causes that give rise to them, the circumstances of actions and the antagonistic forces taking part in them, are extremely variable in character, interests, duration and the forms of struggle employed. It is essential that we should grasp the main things, the issues of principle, and submit them to a Marxist-Leninist analysis if we are to make things clear to the Party and the people, to find our bearings in any activity and in any situation. Otherwise, it is difficult to reach correct and valuable conclusions.

Our Party is of the opinion that the world situation today is turbulent, and consequently, there is no room for complacency, passivity or euphoria. Therefore, analysis and assessment of, and a consistent class stand towards, the policy and activity of the imperialist bourgeoisie of the two superpowers, in the current conditions assume first-rate importance for all the revolutionary forces, all the nations and peoples fighting for liberation and independence, for peace and security among nations. A principled stand on this fundamental question constitutes the only correct basis for defining a consistent and revolutionary strategy and tactics, and the criterion for assessing

8 Members of the fascist terrorist groups.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 24, p. 219, Alb. ed.

who are the progressive forces, and separating them from the reactionary forces.

Concrete facts and actions, the objective reality, leads us to the conclusion that in the world today the two superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, are the biggest and most dangerous aggressive imperialist powers known in history. Each separately or together, the superpowers represent, in the same degree and to the same extent, the main enemy of socialism, and the freedom and independence of nations, the greatest force defending oppressive and exploiting systems, and the direct threat that mankind will be hurled into a third world war.

The world has encountered and continues to encounter the aggressive and expansionist aims of US imperialism. Ever since the end of the Second World War, US imperialism has been pursuing a criminal policy and carrying out criminal activity against communism and the freedom and independence of the peoples. It was US imperialism that unleashed the barbarous aggression in Korea and in Vietnam, committing some of the most hideous crimes mankind has ever known there. It was US imperialism that intervened in the Congo, that strangled the Dominican revolution, that carried the war to Laos and Cambodia, that set the Middle East ablaze and organized the fascist putsches in Chile and Argentina.

In accord with its imperialist nature, US imperialism has extended its tentacles to all the continents and is strengthening its positions everywhere, and in every way, through «aid», enslaving credits, various agreements and treaties, through military bases established in many countries, through brutal interference in the internal affairs of other countries, up to armed aggression. All these are the ugly features of savage US imperialism.

The numerous compromises and the unprincipled con-

cessions of the Khrushchevites have not made it any softer-natured or better-behaved. It still remains the political and economic bastion of the exploiting capitalist system, the great defender of colonialism and neo-colonialism, the inspirer of racism and the arch-gendarme of international reaction. Our Party consistently upholds the view that US imperialism is aggressive and will remain so as long as it has a single tooth left in its head.

As a result of revolutionary and liberation struggles, of its continuous degeneration and insurmountable internal contradictions, world imperialism has lost many positions. Suffice it to mention the disintegration of the colonial system and the winning of independence by many countries. In the future, imperialism will lose ever more positions as well. But at the same time imperialism, and US imperialism especially, will increase its efforts to win back its lost positions and to capture new ones. This is the dialectics of the development and decline of imperialism. **Therefore, now just as in the past, the consistent and unceasing struggle to expose the policy and foil the aggressive plans of imperialism, headed by US imperialism, constitutes an essential condition for the defence of freedom and socialism, for the triumph of the revolution and the liberation of peoples.**

The peoples of the world are also fighting a great battle against the other enemy, just as dangerous and barbarous, Soviet social-imperialism. The Policy of the Soviet revisionists is a typically aggressive colonialist and neo-colonialist policy which is based on the power of capital and force of arms. The struggle that the Soviet Union is waging today to occupy strategic positions in the Middle East, its expansion to the Mediterranean, to the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, its interference in Africa and in Latin America, its pressure on Europe and its meddling in the affairs of Asia, all these actions bear the stamp

of this policy. Like the US imperialists, the Soviet social-imperialists are striving everywhere to put out the flames of the revolution and the liberation struggles of the peoples.

In competition with US imperialism, the Soviet social-imperialists hatch up counter-revolutionary plots and intrigues against the peoples, stir up conflicts and sow discord among nations, strive to exert their control and dictate wherever they can. **Our Party has continuously stressed that any illusion or vacillation, however slight, in the stand towards the present-day Soviet Union is fraught with catastrophic consequences for those political forces and movements that continue to believe the demagoguery and lies of Moscow.**

In order to carry out their policy of expansion and hegemonism, imperialism, social-imperialism, and international capitalism, have created a series of military, political, economic, cultural and other organisms and institutions which, today, are their main weapons and means of domination over the peoples. At the same time, they have also worked out a whole series of theories, concepts and theses through which they try to deceive and intimidate the peoples and justify their hegemonism and oppression, to brainwash people in the direction they want. Military aggression, economic expansion, and ideological aggression, constitute the basis of the general line of these enemies whose main aim is to destroy socialism, to strangle the revolution and perpetuate their enslaving system.

Under these conditions the task of the revolutionaries and peoples is to counterpose their united and determined struggle on all fronts and in all directions to this general, all-round onslaught of the enemies, to expose and destroy all their weapons and bases, whether political or economic, military or ideological.

Now, as in the past, the main pillars on which all their hegemonistic and expansionist superpower policy is

based and carried out, the principal shields protecting their imperialist systems, the fundamental weapons for their rivalry and war preparations, are NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, the political and military alliances of the capitalist and revisionist countries, and their bases and armies in foreign countries.

NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, together with the bourgeois and revisionist armies of the member countries, provide the main protection for the capitalist and revisionist systems and the greatest armed force to attack the revolution and socialism, the freedom and independence of the peoples. The military blocs are the props of the internal reactionary, anti-patriotic forces, of forces who are selling and subjugating their countries to foreigners, and liquidating their national sovereignty. NATO and the Warsaw Treaty have been and continue to be instruments for the preparation and unleashing of war.

COMECON and the European Common Market have been created to serve this aggressive, oppressive and exploiting policy. Through COMECON, which is a Soviet revisionist organization for the enslavement of its member countries, the Soviet Union carries out its neo-colonialist policy in the satellite countries, pillages their wealth and achieves their economic integration into the Soviet state. The Soviet Union has impoverished its allies economically, has tied them hand and foot, imposes on them the prices it wants, controls the development of their economy according to its interests, grants them just as much of the raw materials necessary to keep their industry running, to the extent it desires and when it desires, without regard for its progress. The credits the Soviet Union grants to its satellites enslave them.

Like COMECON, the European Common Market is just such another reactionary organization. It is a large union of capitalist monopolies and trusts, bent on the savage

exploitation of the proletariat and the masses of the working people in Europe and other peoples of the world.

From its inception, the aim of the Common Market was to find ways and means of barbarous plunder for the great trusts and concerns and to rescue capitalism from crises and upheavals. In the international arena, the Common Market is a big neo-colonial power which not only competes with the superpowers for the exploitation of the developing countries, but also endeavours to regain and maintain the old privileges of the former colonial powers in these countries.

Though the United States of America is officially outside the Common Market, through the entanglement of US capital with the capital of each member country, the United States, indirectly, plays a very great role in it. In the Common Market, US imperialism has had and still has a powerful support against the social-imperialist bloc. Together with NATO, the Common Market constitutes an organized base and rear area of US imperialism in its rivalry and contest with the other imperialist power, the revisionist Soviet Union.

The Party of Labour of Albania, the Albanian state and people, are against NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, against COMECON and the Common Market, because these organizations are the basic instruments of the expansionist policy of the two superpowers, because they oppress, exploit and impoverish both the peoples of Europe and the peoples of the developing countries, undermine both the revolution and the liberation of the peoples, and are instruments of enslavement.

The Soviet Union declares that a «community of free and equal socialist states» has been created, but the Soviet fist rules this «alliance». There is nothing socialist about it, it is anti-Marxist and an outright fraud to keep the peoples under the yoke of social-imperialism.

The monopolists of Western Europe, both bourgeois and revisionist, have a great deal to say about the creation of the so-called United Europe. So far some sort of a «European Commission» has been set up with a «Parliament», a «common government», some formal laws, which has taken upon itself to create the state unification of the European countries. Plans are being mapped out for this part of Europe to have a joint army, armed to the teeth, and a «powerful» capitalist economy allegedly to confront the two superpowers. In fact, the creation of the United States of Europe is meant to eliminate the notion of nationality in various European countries, to integrate and amalgamate their culture and traditions, in other words, to do away with the individuality of the peoples and states of Western Europe under the management of the cosmopolitan reactionary bourgeoisie of this continent.

This «United Europe», its reactionary content, was exposed and condemned by Lenin as early as 1915 when he wrote:

«From the standpoint of economic conditions of imperialism — i. e., the export of capital and the division of the world by the 'advanced' and 'civilized' colonial powers — a United States of Europe, under capitalism, is either impossible or reactionary.» And further: *«Of course, **temporary** agreements are possible between capitalists and between states. In this sense, a United States of Europe is possible as an agreement between the European capitalists... but to what end? Only for the purpose of jointly suppressing socialism in Europe.»**

* V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, vol. 21, pp. 370, 372, Alb. ed.

World capitalism, which is proceeding irretrievably towards crises and decline, just as Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin predicted with such genius, has now reached the stage of imperialism in decay. In order to survive, it has devised new forms for the exploitation of the masses, not just on a national scale, but also on a world scale, has contrived its last and most sophisticated means of plunder, neo-colonialism, has created financial links and economic and military alliances through which it intends to hold in complete or partial dependence many states belonging to what is called the «second world», the «third world», the «non-aligned world» or the «developing countries». All these terms, which refer to the various political forces acting in the world today, cover up and do not bring out the class character of these political forces, the fundamental contradictions of our epoch, the key problem which is predominant today on a national and international scale, the ruthless struggle between the bourgeois-imperialist world, on the one hand, and socialism, the world proletariat, and its natural allies, on the other.

The most that these terms and divisions can indicate is the extent of the influence and impact of world capital, international or national, on various states and areas of the world. They can also indicate the more powerful or less powerful support points of imperialism and social-imperialism, and they may also indicate the existence of the peoples' aspirations to live free and independent of the superpowers. But, viewing the question from the angle of the class criterion, with some exceptions, in these states, antagonistic classes and the exploitation of man by man exist, and the proletariat and working people of these countries are ruled by the bourgeoisie in this or that form. Marxism-Leninism teaches us that in our epoch, countries are grouped according to the social system prevailing in them, into bourgeois-capitalist countries

and socialist countries. The theories on the so-called intermediate stage of non-capitalist development, so zealously propagated by the Khrushchevite revisionists, are meant to sabotage the sincere socialist aspirations that exist in many countries, to cause ideological confusion, and to undermine the struggle of the progressive forces.

Similarly, regarding the assessment of the policy pursued by various states and government, the Marxists proceed again from the class criterion, from the stands these governments and countries maintain towards imperialism and socialism, towards their own people and reaction.

On the basis of these teachings the revolutionary movement and the proletariat build their strategy and tactics, find and unite with their true allies in the struggle against imperialism, the bourgeoisie and reaction. The terms «third world», «non-aligned states» or «developing countries», create the illusion among the broad masses fighting for national and social liberation that a roof has allegedly been found under which to shelter from the threat of the superpowers. These terms conceal the real situation in the majority of these countries, which, in this or that manner, politically, ideologically, and economically, are bound to, and depend on, the two superpowers and the former colonial metropolises.

The Yugoslav revisionists champion the idea of «non-aligned countries». According to them, falling within this group are those countries which have not aligned themselves through military treaties with the big imperialist and revisionist powers, mainly with NATO and the Warsaw Treaty. But without formally participating in these two military blocs, many of these countries are so completely aligned with the superpowers and the big capitalist countries through a series of treaties and agreements, that the word «non-aligned» has a very hollow sound to it.

This situation of the «non-aligned» movement was borne out by the Colombo Conference. With difficulty it managed to cover up the divergencies and the opposing political aims which individual countries and groups of participating states are pursuing. This time nobody spoke out against or openly attacked the United States of America and the Soviet Union by name and opposed their aggressive and war-mongering policy and activity. However, they did find it opportune and advantageous to attack France!

Many states which pretend to be non-aligned have concluded among themselves defensive and aggressive military treaties in which imperialist powers take part, too. None of the participants have denounced these treaties. Soviet social-imperialism is trying to set up the «Asian Security Treaty», tomorrow a similiar treaty on «African Security», etc. All these are different forms of organization intended to turn an allegedly non-aligned country into a country enslaved from every viewpoint.

The slogan of «non-aligned countries» gives the false impression that a group of states which have the possibility of «opposing» the superpower blocs is being created. It gives the impression that these countries, all of them, without exception, are anti-imperialist, opposed to war, opposed to the dictate of others, that they are «democratic» and even «socialist». This helps to strengthen the pseudo-democratic and anti-popular positions of the leading groups of some states which participate among the «non-aligned», and creates the impression among the peoples of these countries that when their chiefs establish or dissolve relations of any kind and nature with the imperialists and the social-imperialists, openly or in secret, they do this not only in the capacity of «popular governments», but also in the capacity of a group of states «with which even the superpowers must reckon».

Our Party is of the opinion that the peoples must be told openly about the situations, because it is only thus that their true unity, the unity of the truly anti-imperialist and progressive states and governments is aided. In order to unite the peoples in the fight for freedom, independence and social progress, against any oppression and exploitation by whomsoever, first, it is necessary to establish the dividing line, to make clear who is their chief enemy, against whom they must fight, and with whom they must unite.

Their enemies are imperialism, social-imperialism and the international big bourgeoisie, which pursue a policy of expansionism and exploitation towards the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The superpowers and world capital want to keep intact all the international forms and institutions established in the old colonial period. When their interests are affected, even in the slightest, such as in the case of raising the prices of oil and some other raw materials, they rise in wrath and do not hesitate even to threaten war against the peoples and countries that want to establish sovereignty over their own national assets, that fight for justice and equality in world exchanges and economic relations.

But this plunder and savage exploitation cannot go on for ever. Now economic decolonization has been placed on the order of the day. and there is nothing which can stop this new revolutionary process which has emerged on the world stage. The peoples have the undeniable right to establish complete sovereignty over their natural resources and to nationalize them. However protracted and fierce the resistance and counter-attack of the imperialists and other exploiters may be. nothing can prevent attainment of this objective. Nothing can stop the struggle of the peoples for equality in the field of international exchanges, and to ensure that the income obtained from

the sale of raw materials is used to develop their industry and culture and improve their life.

The struggle of the peoples for economic independence is spearheaded against the superpowers, against the monopolies of the imperialist states, against the multinational companies. Therefore, the proletariat, all those who are for the revolution and socialism, must closely link their struggle with the struggle of the peoples for freedom and independence. This can be done only by resolutely struggling against the bourgeoisie of one's own country, by struggling against imperialism and predatory war. This is also the most effective and direct aid the proletariat can give the liberation movement of the peoples.

The aggressive policy and the counter-revolutionary activity of the superpowers, the international big bourgeoisie and reaction is developed amid great and irreconcilable contradictions between imperialism and social-imperialism, between them and their own allies. These contradictions, which are signs of their weakness and of the telling blows which the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and the peoples' fight for liberation has dealt them, again corroborate the immortal theses of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on the development of bourgeois society and the proletarian strategy of the revolution.

The major crisis which has descended upon the two superpowers and their allies has a powerful effect weakening the aggressive alliances they have set up. It has rocked many countries of the world on all the continents, and has aroused the well-based suspicion that the misfortunes which have beset them have their source in the aggressive and predatory activities of US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. This suspicion has caused splits in the alliances, so that some countries have, partly or

completely, broken away from them. Here declared and there kept secret, but always active and corrosive, mistrust towards them is constantly growing.

Now it is apparent that neither the US imperialists nor the Soviet social-imperialists can impose their respective hegemonism on their partners in the NATO bloc and the Warsaw Treaty as they wish. The deep cracks in the military, economic and political groupings of imperialism and social-imperialism are becoming more disquieting for the superpowers day by day. The centrifugal forces, whether of the western capitalist bourgeois states or of the eastern revisionist states, are becoming more apparent and active every day.

Within the revisionist bloc, Soviet social-imperialism is keeping a strict watch over its «allies» to prevent any attempt to break ranks. Despite this, the political animosity and ideological differences, if not as open as in Czechoslovakia at the time of Dubček, exist everywhere in secret and are manifested in various fields and forms, especially around economic issues. All the discontent that is showing up in the relations between the revisionist countries and the Soviet Union is covered over with the theories of «limited sovereignty» and «economic integration» expounded by Brezhnev, which means, in other words, in the interests of «socialism» the Soviet dictate over them must be preserved and must not be opposed.

The friction between the revisionist states of the East with the Soviet Union, their discontent, are further incited by US imperialism and its allies. The United States of America is making great efforts to weaken social-imperialism, to keep its aspirations for hegemony under tight rein, to split the satellites away from the Soviet Union and draw them closer to itself.

And this is the desire of the satellites of the Soviet Union, too. They have had and still have hopes of dev-

eloping this tendency with the aid of the United States of America. Aware of the economic weakness of the Soviet Union, its urgent need for technology, and especially its pressing need to release internal funds for armaments, now US imperialism is trying to make the most of this situation and to put its plans into practice. It is giving credits to the Soviet government, but giving them to the other revisionist countries, too, and at the same time encouraging the Western capitalist states to invest their capital in these countries. This venture is facilitated also by the fact that in these periods of crises West European capital is seeking economic expansion wherever it can.

Despite its efforts to keep its satellites under military and political yoke, economically subjugated and shackled with many steel chains, the revisionist Soviet Union is obliged to allow them to build contacts with the United States of America and the other big capitalist countries of Western Europe, to ask for and receive credits from them. Of course, for each credit they must pledge some economic-political collateral security, and it is precisely this which worries the social-imperialists most.

On their part, the Soviets, also, are trying to open some breach and infiltrate the Western countries. These countries made a great fuss about what was happening in Portugal, about the interference of the Soviet Union through the revisionist party of Cunhal. And, in fact, such an attempt was made. But all the fuss was raised more for sensation than from fear that the Soviets might eventually get a foothold in the Iberian Peninsula.

At present, the contradictions within the political, military and economic alliances headed by US imperialism have become very acute. The squabbles and competition between the monopolies of Western Europe and Japan, on the one hand, and the monopolies of the United

States, on the other, have now reached a new stage at which each party is trying to secure the maximum superior positions, privileges and favours for itself. The contradictions between them have been even further increased as a result of the energy and raw materials crisis, the narrowing of the sphere for the export of capital, and the increasing difficulties over securing profits through the neo-colonialist policy.

This is fully corroborating Stalin's analysis and prediction of 1952, when he said:

*«Outwardly, everything would seem to be 'going well'; the US has put Western Europe, Japan and other capitalist countries on rations; Germany (Western), Britain, France, Italy, and Japan have fallen into the clutches of the USA and are meekly obeying its commands. But it would be mistaken to think that things can continue to 'go well' for 'all eternity', that these countries will tolerate the domination and oppression of the United States endlessly, that they will not endeavour to tear loose from American bondage and take the path of independent development.»**

Within the framework of the alliances of the West, the greatest quarrels are those between the United States and the Common Market, which, under the pressure and through various manoeuvres of the Soviet bloc also tend to increase.

Because of the competition, in order to prevent the Common Market from affirming itself and becoming consolidated, the United States tries to manipulate its mem-

* J. Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, Tirana 1968, p. 39. Alb. ed.

bers separately and to incite them against one another. Besides its enslavement of the other weak members, the United States is making special efforts to impede the German-French rapprochement by weakening France and supporting Federal Germany and Britain.

It must be said that, despite the organisms they have created, the countries of Western Europe have not given up their great individual efforts in which each strives to grab for itself the maximum number of concessions and markets all over the world. Of course, this competition is directed against the two superpowers, but, in comparison with the economic, military and political might of the two big states, and especially that of US imperialism, these countries are weak. Thus, these countries of Western Europe do not manage to dip their finger «in the honey» as they would like, and not just in the economic field, in the developing countries, but when they raise their voice in political matters very little, if any, notice is taken of them. American imperialism has created such a situation that it has not only eliminated the possibilities of the economic intrusion of these countries, but it has also shut the mouths of its partners in alliance.

As Marxism-Leninism teaches us, from these situations the proletariat and the revolutionary forces reach the conclusion that they must intensify their all-round struggle against US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, and the reactionary capitalist bourgeoisie, the struggle to deepen the contradictions and divergencies that exist among their enemies. The enemies must not be given a moment's respite to come to agreement, to group their forces and organize themselves to fight the revolution, socialism, and the peoples with new strength. In this struggle the allies of the proletariat are all those who are oppressed by, and suffering at the hands of, the imperialists, the bourgeoisie and reaction, who want freedom and inde-

pendence for their peoples, those who oppose imperialism and social-imperialism and their hegemonistic plans.

Loyal to the interests of the revolution, socialism, and the peoples, our Party will support the proletariat and the peoples who are against the two superpowers and for their destruction, against the capitalist and revisionist bourgeoisie and for its overthrow.

In crisis and with many contradictions between them, in contradiction with their allies as well as with the peoples, the superpowers are trying to find new forms of collaboration amid divergencies, to invent new demagogical theories, to draft new enslaving plans and to redivide the world into new spheres of influence and markets.

Never before has the world been subjected to such a campaign of propaganda and diplomatic diversion as this the imperialists and the social-imperialists are engaged in at present, which is intended to prettify the hegemonic and expansionist policy of the superpowers, to justify their aggressions and to conceal their war preparations. Both in the East and in the West, the imperialist and social-imperialist leading circles claim that mankind is living in a period of «reduced tension», that the «cold war» and the confrontation threatening a clash between the superpowers have given way to «détente», peaceful coexistence; «international harmony», «general security», etc., that the dangers have passed and the clouds of war and disaster have been dispersed. By means of these high-flown slogans, the superpowers, the international bourgeoisie and reaction are trying to dupe the peoples, to weaken their resistance and to establish their imperialist control and domination.

The People's Republic of Albania does not accept and publicly exposes the so-called theory about the need to preserve the «balance between the superpowers» as a condition or a basis to avoid war and defend peace. It rejects

the imperialist concepts on the preservation of the «spheres of influence» allegedly as factors of stability and security, the concepts of «limited sovereignty» and the «interdependent world», of «bipolarization», the policy of blackmail, etc. These so-called «theories and doctrines» invented in Moscow and Washington are meant to create a capitulationist opinion that no state or nation can live outside the domination and tutelage of one or the other superpower.

The history of Europe has proved that the «balance of forces» among the big powers has always been a weapon in the hands of exploiting classes to suppress the national liberation and revolutionary movements. Intervention has been always the weapon of the system of balance, to restore it when it is upset or to guard against its being upset.

Peace and international security in Europe and in the world are not achieved through the establishment of «harmony» or «balance» between the superpowers, but through struggle against imperialist pressure and intervention, through efforts for the liberation of the peoples, through the strengthening of national independence and sovereignty.

The superpowers are carrying on a big trade in arms which is becoming the most lucrative business in our days. In the simple view, it might seem as if those arms add to and strengthen the fighting ability of the countries which receive them. In fact, this trade constitutes a new noose round the neck of the purchasers, chains which bind them hand and foot. Not only can these weapons never be fired in opposition to any eventual aggression by the sellers and their allies, but they cannot be fired at anyone at all without the sellers' permission.

By means of their arms trade the superpowers encourage minor arms races among small and medium-sized

countries, which then become the cause of quarrels and conflicts among neighbours, stirring up local wars, a thing which opens the way to the expansion and hegemonism of the United States of America and the Soviet Union. Through the arms trade, as well as the war psychosis which they develop with powerful propaganda, the two superpowers are trying especially to penetrate into Africa, the Middle East, Latin America and Asia.

In these countries, the United States of America and the Soviet Union are vying with each other. In order to subjugate various countries of these zones, they create and bring to power cliques of allegedly liberation colours and set them at loggerheads with one another according to the principle of «divide and rule». In fact, whether US imperialism, in its open and savage way, or Soviet social-imperialism, likewise in its way, which is just as savage but masked with a pseudo-socialist propaganda, they are working to aggravate relations, to stir up and inflate the contradictions among the peoples to further their own interests, to establish naval bases in various countries, to build military alliances, to conclude enslaving trade agreements, etc.

One of the most typical examples of this policy of the two superpowers is provided by the Middle East, where the main issue is oil. The hostilities between the Arab peoples and Israel, the situation amongst the Arab peoples themselves, who are split and in disagreement with one another, which is being aggravated by the Soviet-US intrigues, are a consequence of this key problem, of the endeavours of the two superpowers to seize the oil resources. The blood of the Arab peoples has been and is being shed on account of this wealth. United States imperialism openly assists Israel to keep the Arab world divided. The Soviet Union allegedly helps the Arab peoples by selling them arms, while it is sending large num-

bers of Soviet Jews to Israel where they are used as cannon fodder against the Arab peoples.

At the same time, the superpowers are also trying to elbow each other out. Notwithstanding its clearly pro-Israeli stance, US imperialism not only succeeded in keeping the course of «friendship» with Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf Emirates in its favour, but it also managed to undermine the Soviet positions in the area. Egypt's denunciation of the Egyptian-Soviet Treaty as well as the expulsion of the aggressive Soviet naval fleet from its ports is a defeat and not a victory for Soviet social-imperialism.

Now it is the Americans who have the upper hand in dictating their schemes in this region. Of course Soviet social-imperialism is not sitting idly by with folded arms, either. It is striving to make good its loss in Egypt, by clinging to the positions it still has in some Arab country, or by seeking to secure some new base, by attaching itself to new «friends».

On the African continent, the struggle between the two superpowers has just begun and is far from coming to an end. United States imperialism has long ago set up its own bases there. Its imperialist interests here are also interwoven with the interests of its West-European allies, and jointly they constitute a powerful barrier to Soviet penetration in this region.

The events in Angola are being advertised as a major Soviet «success», something which serves social-imperialism to pose as a liberator of the peoples. This also serves US imperialism and all world capitalism to fan up the psychosis of anti-communist fear and war, though communism has nothing whatsoever to do with it. The current struggle of the African peoples is a revolt against the interference and plunder of the two superpowers.

The big imperialist powers make the most of the dif-

ficult economic and social situations of the peoples, the countries and states of Africa, where they hatch up a thousand and one intrigues. These are never-ending intrigues engineered to retard the revival of this vast continent with a population which has lived in poverty for centuries but which has an ancient culture, which has new strength and energies, which imperialism, social-imperialism and world capital do not allow to be channelled on to the correct road to the progress, freedom, democracy, and full independence and sovereignty of these states.

Our Party upholds the thesis that both when the superpowers work together and when they quarrel, it is others who pay the bill. The collusion and rivalry between the superpowers are the two sides of the one contradictory reality, important expressions of the same imperialist strategy, to rob the peoples of their freedom and to dominate the world. They pose the same danger, therefore the two superpowers are the main and greatest enemies of the peoples. That is why one must never rely on one imperialism to fight or escape from the other.

There are states that, aware of a threat from either one or the other superpower, base their defence on the military protection of the United States of America, or of the Soviet Union. But military protection by the superpowers is an illusory defence because its aim is to convert the «defended» country into a protectorate. Shelter under the «defence umbrella» of the superpowers is always accompanied with political and economic concessions, with concessions in the realm of national sovereignty and restrictions in the field of decision-making on internal and external issues.

The peoples should not fall into the trap of the so-called «anti-imperialist front» advertised by the Soviet social-imperialists, in which they are seeking to embroil all those who are opposed to, and fight against, United

States imperialism. To join this «front» means to sacrifice the loftiest interests of your country, to expose the people to danger, to become a minion of the social-imperialists and cannon fodder for their ambitions. The contradictions between the Soviet Union and the United States of America are not contradictions between socialism and imperialism, as Moscow is trying to pass them off, but contradictions between two big imperialist powers.

While rejecting the demagoguery and deceptive tactics of «anti-imperialism» preached by the Soviet revisionists, it is necessary also to reject the «anti-social-imperialism» which the United States of America and the monopoly bourgeoisie of the world are propagating. The peoples cannot allow themselves to fall victims to the rivalry of the United States and the Soviet Union and become pawns in their imperialist manoeuvring.

The bourgeois and revisionist propagandists are now having a great deal to say about «secure borders», «renunciation of the use of force», «peaceful cooperation» and so on, presenting the Helsinki Conference as the model. Our Party declared its view about this conference at the proper time, calling it a «meeting of European insecurity». (9) We condemned it from the very beginning and refused to participate in it. We acted in this way proceeding from a Marxist-Leninist analysis of events. It was not only the Soviet revisionists, but the United States imperialists, too, who wanted that conference. They wanted it as a breathing space to get over the crisis, to build up their strength, to pull themselves together and to create the illusion that Europe is being secured, that it will not be attacked by the Soviets since it will be defended by the Americans. For the sake of appearances, the super-

9 See: Enver Hoxha, *Selected Works*, vol. 4, the «8 Nëntori» Publishing House, Tirana 1982, pp. 935-946, Eng. ed.

powers sought to freeze the situation in our continent, especially the relations between the two blocs of the East and the West.

The Helsinki Conference was a comedy, with the Soviet Union and the United States as the star performers. All the rest who took part in it, did not believe, either before or after the meeting, that it would do any good. The mountain laboured and brought forth a mouse. In fact, nothing has altered in the previous situation except that attempts are being made to create an atmosphere as though a political and ideological status quo and more developed economic cooperation between the states of Europe, with the exception of Albania, are being established. In all these directions, not only was the status quo not confirmed, but new conflicts, such as that between Greece and Turkey, flared up.

The clamour of the Kremlin bosses about a «peaceful spirit after Helsinki» has been increased, but alongside this the excursions of the Soviet naval fleet have been increased, too, and it has now begun to commit arrogant violations of the maritime sovereignty of the freedom-loving Nordic countries and to try to establish its domination over all the seas of the North.

As concerns the so-called securing of Europe against a world war, this has taken no step forward. What is more, this is unattainable, since neither the East nor the West can disarm themselves and can make not even the slightest attempt in this direction, because both the Soviet Union and the United States of America would be damaged. The only efforts these two imperialist powers are making, are to increase the number of their offensive weapons for war and their nuclear arms. The SALT meetings, likewise, have yielded no results whatever, they are bogged down. The parties in the discussion are simply indulging in fruitless talk.

The campaign about disarmament which the superpowers are conducting, their endless plans and schemes, the conferences and talks which have been going on for years on end, are a bluff and swindle aimed at disguising their arming. Their aim is to force the other peoples and states to reconcile themselves to, and allow the sanctioning of, the monopoly of nuclear and other modern weapons of the United States of America and the Soviet Union, and to recognize their right to uncontrolled and unlimited arming and ceaseless perfecting of the technology of weapons of mass extermination.

The imperialists and the social-imperialists know that, by maintaining their stocks and monopoly of the production of modern weapons, they can also maintain their blackmail and threat, the fear and insecurity which their military machine instils in others, and the permanent pressure which their weapons exert even if they are not fired.

The problems of war and peace have always preoccupied the peoples of the world, the broad working masses, who want no new disaster to befall mankind again. The danger is real. The superpowers are making preparations for a world war, and to this end, apart from their unrestrained arms race, they are also trying to create the circumstances which they judge suitable, by playing the bourgeois cliques in various countries off against one another, by stirring up nationalist sentiments, to set the peoples at loggerheads with each other, and so on. All this activity and these hideous methods of the superpowers lead straight to the road of preparation of a new world war.

These preparations are accompanied with blackmail and many threats, the work of US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism or other capitalist bourgeois countries. They have created the opinion that the future war which is in the making and may be launched, by one or the

other superpower, whether an all-out or a partial one, will be a lightning war, so short that within three to four days the Soviet social-imperialists will succeed in occupying the whole of Yugoslavia (since Albania, according to them, «will be swallowed at one bite»!!), and thus, the Soviet tanks will reach the eastern Atlantic seaboard, in Portugal, in a matter of ten days! This is the utterly misguided state of mind that is being nurtured every day by the propaganda of the superpowers to intimidate the states and the peoples, to weaken their defence, to lower the vigilance and morale of the masses of the people, to sap their revolutionary will to fight in defence of freedom and independence. Our Party holds that this propaganda and these views represent a special strategy and tactics to establish imperialist and social-imperialist control and domination over the national political, economic and military life of all states. Therefore as such, they must be resolutely combated. As to «Albania's being only one mouthful» — watch out, gentlemen, for socialist Albania is a hard bone that'll stick in your throat and choke you! Should the Soviet social-imperialists undertake such a venture against our country, they will suffer an irreparable defeat.

The same holds good for US imperialism, too. Should it dare perpetrate such aggression, it, too, will never come out of it alive. The lessons from its defeat in Vietnam and Cambodia are very fresh.

In any country, its freedom and independence are dependent mainly on the stand adopted, whether you decide to live free and on your feet, or on your knees as slaves. When you are determined to live free and stand ready to fight, then the blackmail is knocked back, strength is revived, the people's courage mounts, and it is difficult for the aggressor to attack you. This is how our people think, and they put this view bluntly to any enemy

who may imagine that he would have a «walk-over» in Albania, too. Our people have never been, and are not, afraid of any power, no matter whether it is a big power or a medium one, and no matter how well armed it may be, that might dare to attack our country. Our people will fight valiantly, intelligently, and with every means at their disposal, convinced that they will defeat the aggressors, whoever they might be. This stand is based on the sound reality of our country, on the steel-like unity of the people, on the lofty aim of defending the freedom and independence of the Homeland and the great victories of socialist construction, at all costs, which the Party has inculcated in everybody, old and young; it is based on the intensive military training of the entire soldier people and the configuration of the territory of Albania. The aggressors will find themselves quite unable to «walk over» Albania. Instead, they will find their own death here. The enemies can be sure of one thing, that they will never set foot on our soil, that their weapons and bombs will never be able to subdue the great resistance, the spirit of heroism, and the ardent patriotic feelings of the Albanian people.

Lenin teaches us that war breaks out when the depth and abrasiveness of the contradictions reaches the most acute stage, when all the talk, propaganda and «economic reforms» are no longer able to restrain it. The imperialists and the social-imperialists are heading for war. But they are not entirely free to act at will. Many factors exert their influence on this issue. War may break out in Europe, as it may in Asia, or in other regions, such as the Middle East, for example, where so many contradictions are entangled and such dangerous events are unfolding. No possibility can be ruled out.

The important thing is that the people should not fall into fatalism, become passive observers and be caught

unawares; they must be prepared for the worst and fight to prevent it from occurring.

Marxism-Leninism teaches us that imperialism and the war-mongers must be weakened through the revolutionary and liberation struggles of the peoples. If an aggressive imperialist war cannot be prevented, then it is the task of the revolutionaries and the proletariat to turn it into a liberation war.

It should be driven home to the peoples that the enemies of the revolution and the world proletariat, the enemies of freedom and the oppressed peoples, the instigators and the cause of war, are US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, and the reactionary bourgeoisie of each country. These powers constitute and represent the savage world capitalism, which has its source in, and draws its strength from, the inhuman exploitation of the masses and the peoples. A stern, consistent, and determined struggle must be organized against these savage powers, against their ideology and various forms of organization, from the different reactionary and demagogic parties, the trusts and multinational companies down to their smallest national and international organisms, from the banks and political and military alliances down to their aggressive armies, until, in the end, their state power is smashed right down to its foundations.

The present conditions demand that this merciless and all-round struggle is waged by all the peoples of the world, by all progressive people who have the true and complete interests of their nations at heart and have made them the aim of their struggle and life. If this struggle is led by the world proletariat and its vanguard, the communist party, which is guided by the unerring theory of Marxism-Leninism, it will be more resolute, unceasing, and ever mounting.

The imperialists and the social-imperialists have as

their close allies the reactionary bourgeoisie of each country where they exercise their influence. They use these allies to do their dirty work and wield the whip on their behalf, so they feed and arm them to have them ready as a striking force in a world conflagration and against peoples who rise in revolution against their internal and external oppressors. Therefore, these two forces cannot be separated from one another. Without combating the one, you cannot combat the other, without combating the internal reactionary force until you have overthrown it, you cannot combat the external enemy, you cannot prevent war. You must destroy every kind of base the superpowers have established and created in a given country, for in this way you weaken and destroy the world influence and strength they have based on the enslavement of peoples and countries.

It is essential that we Marxist-Leninists work to arouse the revolutionary spirit in the masses of the proletariat and its closest allies, the peasantry, the working masses, the progressive and patriotic people. This we must do without fail, because all the enemies are competing with one another to destroy socialism, to strangle the revolution and enslave the peoples.

We must base ourselves on the mobilization and strength of the peoples, on the unity of all those who want to throw off the imperialist-revisionist yoke. We stand for the unity of the world proletariat and all the true anti-imperialist and progress-loving forces who, through their struggle, will smash the aggressive plans of the imperialist and social-imperialist war-mongers.

Consistent in their Marxist-Leninist line, the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian people have been and are against the two superpowers, against predatory imperialist war, against the monopoly bourgeoisie and international reaction. Therefore, in the future, too, they

will spare no effort and will fight, together with all the other anti-imperialist and anti-social-imperialist peoples, with all the Marxist-Leninist parties, all the revolutionaries and the world proletariat, all progressive people, to foil the plans and manoeuvres of the enemies and ensure the triumph of the cause of the freedom and security of the peoples.

At every moment our country will be found standing beside all those peoples whose freedom and independence are threatened and whose rights are violated. We have repeatedly declared this stand, and not just in good times, but in dangerous times as well; the peoples of the world can be sure that socialist Albania is with them and fears no sacrifice.

*

* *

The important tasks set by the 6th Congress of the Party in the field of foreign policy and our country's relations with the other countries have been successfully fulfilled. Life and the development of events have fully vindicated the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist line and stands of our Party in the field of foreign policy.

The international position of Albania is unwavering. The People's Republic of Albania has expressed its opinion on international events and problems publicly, unhesitatingly, and courageously, and it has always maintained a wise and unwavering stand in defence of the interests of our socialist Homeland, the peoples, and general peace and security.

The authority and prestige of our country are ever on the rise. The voice and word of socialist Albania are

listened to, and respected by, the peoples, the revolutionaries and progressives. Its many friends and well-wishers love and respect socialist Albania for its frank and principled policy.

The People's Republic of Albania has its independent foreign policy. Its aim is that its opinion on foreign policy should find the approval of the progressive and freedom-loving peoples, the revolutionary progressive forces, the true Marxist-Leninists. We make no secret of this. This is also in the interests of all peoples, and of those states in the world which respect the freedom and independence of our country, irrespective of differences in the economic and social order.

Our socialist state does not interfere in the internal affairs of any country with which it has various political, economic and cultural relations. But this does not mean that, for the sake of these relations, or of good neighbourliness with the bordering states, or of the policy of non-interference in internal affairs, the Albanian state should not air its views on international policy in general, as well as on the ideological and political stands of these states, just as they, too, have the right to express their opinions on the ideological and political stands of the Albanian state.

We think that these attitudes should be no hindrance to economic, cultural and political relations in the fields in which it is considered that we have common interests, because these relations serve to develop friendship among the peoples. For our part, we shall conduct these relations only from the viewpoint of Marxism-Leninism. It is the right of the others to judge them from the viewpoint of their own ideologies, and they are welcome to do so.

The People's Republic of Albania holds that this is the way that relations should be developed with its neighbouring states as well as with the other countries with

which we maintain various relations. But the leaders of some states think, and this stems from their political and ideological views, that to have good neighbourly relations, in the afore-said forms, means that each side should shut its mouth about the ideological line followed by the other. They think that to trade with a given country means to cease polemics, to refrain from expressing one's opinions on the policy pursued and ideology upheld by that country. The polemic we conduct is always well-considered and based on facts. It singles out for criticism those stands and actions that assume an international character, that exercise a negative influence in the world, or that damage the interests of our state.

It is common knowledge that contradictions of a political and ideological character, sometimes very profound ones, develop between various countries and continually come to light. But irrespective of this, relations of good neighbourliness as well as economic, commercial, and cultural relations are maintained between our country and a series of states. Our differing political or ideological views do not constitute an obstacle in this direction.

The imperialists and the social-imperialists claim that the smaller states should not be allowed to raise their voice as loudly as the bigger states over different problems. True, Albania is a small state, but it cannot accept such a view. It rejects this discriminatory claim of great-power chauvinism. Our country does not agree that international politics should be a monopoly of the big states alone. They base this monopoly on their economic strength and the powerful propaganda means they have at their disposal, through which they strive to create the opinion and the mental attitude that the world can never find stability except under their tutelage. In other words, this means that he who wants to live in slavery, of course, should never speak his mind, but should be soft-spoken

and wear a sweet smile in face of the crimes, blackmail, fraud and double-dealing of the great or medium imperialist, capitalist or revisionist powers. They accompany these above-stated claims with the fear of war and with direct and indirect threats addressed to this or that state, with the threat and act of the cancellation of some promised credit, etc. Those states, whether big or medium, that submit to political blackmail or are afraid of war, are constantly in a fever and lose much, if not all, of their confidence in their own strength.

The bourgeois and revisionist politicians resort to all sorts of trickery, deceit, feints, flattery and hypocritical attitudes according to the circumstances created in the international situation. They are all trying to create, and to a certain extent have succeeded in creating, the opinion that this is the proper way to act, for this is how «politics» is conducted. According to them, to engage in «politics» means to change flags at any time and on any occasion, to have good relations with one or the other, not to do him some good but to outwit him, to conceal one's real intentions by covering them with smiles. Politicians of this sort aim, on the other hand, to create the false and very harmful opinion that those who openly defend the rights of the peoples, who do not conceal the opinions they have on states and their leaderships, are not skilful politicians, but inflexible and sectarian people.

We Albanians are a people who fear no one, who do not fear the attacks of enemies, let alone slanders, for we are convinced of the correctness of our line and determined to defend it. In case of war, if we are attacked, we have the rifle ready, likewise we have a ready tongue to reply to enemy slanders.

The bourgeois and revisionist world think that we are an isolated country. This is the capitalist-revisionist view of things. The imperialists and revisionists consider

that country which has closed its doors to the invasion of their decadent culture and degeneration through enslaving credits, tourists and spies, as isolated. From this point of view we really are, and intend to remain, an isolated country. But this is all to the good of our people. Our country is progressing and flourishing, and our people are living very well. If we were to act otherwise we would become slaves. We have known fascist slavery and the revisionist pressure and attacks, therefore it is not easy for them to deceive us with their slogans and ways of life. We do not and never will allow fascists, spies and agents, people who want to smuggle in bourgeois and revisionist degeneration, to enter Albania. But we are happy to welcome honest and correct people who wish Albania and her people well, friends of our country, even though their beliefs may be different from ours. We respect their friendly feelings and attitude towards the Albanian people. All these, and they are the representatives of the majority of mankind, are welcome here. With these we are friends, with the peoples fighting for their freedom and rights we are friends, with the proletarians and Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries we are friends. With the capitalists and revisionists, who want to enslave and oppress the peoples and suppress their progressive ideas, we have been and shall be enemies.

The capitalists and the revisionists measure isolation with trade. We have traded and continue to trade with all countries, with the exception of the United States of America, the Soviet Union, Israel, and some other states ruled by fascists and racists. But trade is of mutual advantage. The capitalists need our goods, just as we need some of theirs. If anybody thinks that Albania will die if some state, for evil aims, refuses to sell us these goods, he is grossly mistaken. The revisionist Soviet Union established a savage blockade against us, but Albania is living

and can live a thousand years without trading with the Soviet revisionists and in spite of their blockade.

Cultural exchanges with different countries are a very good thing. We have practised cultural exchanges and will go on practising them in the future, too, but in agreement and equality with one another. Those who want to have cultural relations with us, must respect our traditions, customs, feelings, and tastes. Decadent culture is not accepted in Albania. Others, for their part, have the right to accept such of our performances, films, books as are acceptable to their country. This, also, is a question of reciprocity. Our country carries on this practice with many states...

We want to develop these relations further, and with each passing year possibilities are created to expand them. Of course, we have our own art, music, literature, traditions and culture, which we love, and would like others to be acquainted with them as well. But we also respect progressive world culture, from which we take what is useful to us and spread what serves us in our country.

Our Party has always given importance and devoted the proper attention to the question of the promotion and expansion of international relations in all fields, between the People's Republic of Albania and the states in favour of respecting the well-known principles of equality, sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-interference in internal affairs and mutual benefit. During the years since the 6th Congress of the Party the activity of the People's Republic of Albania in the international arena has been constantly increased and strengthened. Today our country maintains diplomatic relations with 74 states. **(10)** The People's Republic of Albania takes an active part and has

10 Until the end of 1984 the PSR of Albania had established diplomatic relations with 101 states.

its say in the UNO and many international organizations, meetings and conferences, on the problems preoccupying mankind today.

...

Our Party and people have hailed the great victory achieved by the Vietnamese people in their armed struggle against US imperialism and its flunkeys. The liberation of South Vietnam and the unification of the whole country into a single state marked the realization of the lofty national aspirations of the Vietnamese people, for which they have made innumerable sacrifices. We will preserve and further strengthen the militant friendship between our two fraternal countries.

Our Republic maintains relations of friendship and fraternal collaboration with the People's Democratic Republic of Korea. Our Party and people support the just cause of the Korean people for the liberation of South Korea and the reunification of the country, and their struggle against the aggressive policy of US imperialism...

The Albanian people have hailed with joy the crowning with victory of the prolonged struggle of the Laotian people against the US imperialist aggressors and the local reactionaries, and the creation of the People's Democratic Republic of Laos. We stand for the development of friendly relations between the two countries, in the interest of our two peoples and of the struggle against imperialism and reaction.

The People's Republic of Albania has always stood for the development of normal relations with the neighbouring states on the basis of the well-known principles of equality, respect for state sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, and mutual benefit. The development of relations based on the policy of good neighbourliness responds to the interests and aspirations of the neighbouring and Balkan peo-

ples to live in terms of friendship and understanding with one another.

Our country maintains normal trade and cultural relations with Yugoslavia which are beneficial both to us and the Yugoslavs.

Our policy towards Yugoslavia has not changed and will not change, provided that the Yugoslav government, too, is correct towards us. The declaration of the Party of Labour of Albania, that in case of any eventual aggression against Yugoslavia by the Soviet Union or some other power the Albanian people will stand by the Yugoslav peoples, will always hold good. But the Yugoslav side must respond to this stand of Albania with just and correct actions towards us.

The Yugoslav state, of course, has the right to pursue whatever policy it finds most reasonable, but the Albanian state, also, has the right to criticize those acts which are detrimental to the good neighbourliness between our two countries. The Yugoslav government makes concessions to, provides facilities for, and admits to its ports the warships of the aggressive naval fleet of the Soviet social-imperialists. That is its own affair, but it also concerns Albania, the other Balkan countries, and the countries of the Mediterranean basin.

As a true Marxist-Leninist party, our Party has always maintained a correct stand with regard to our Albanian brothers who live on their lands in Kosova, Macedonia, and Montenegro. The endeavours made by some Yugoslav authorities to stir up enmity between the Albanians in Yugoslavia and the People's Republic of Albania are in vain, but they do great harm. We Albanians are still the same now as we were before, we maintain and will always maintain a Marxist-Leninist stand towards the peoples of Yugoslavia, as well as towards the problem of the Albanian population in Yugoslavia. Our fraternal

ties of blood and language with the Albanians in Kosova, Macedonia, and Montenegro, the ties of tradition and national customs give us the right, without interfering in the internal affairs of the Yugoslav state and respecting international norms, to concern ourselves to see that they enjoy all the rights, freedoms, and advantages that the other peoples of the Yugoslav Federation have. And this is not a question of some agricultural cooperative in Albania, which has a Macedonian population who enjoy all the rights provided by the Constitution of the People's Republic of Albania, or about some non-existent minority from Montenegro in Albania, as the Yugoslav propaganda claims. When we speak of our brothers living in Yugoslavia, we are speaking about more than one million five hundred thousand Albanians.

It has always been our opinion and desire that the ugly stands and acts of the time of Ranković should never be repeated, that the Albanian population in Yugoslavia should not be persecuted, or left in poverty, that the Kosova region should not be discriminated against in the political, economic, and cultural fields, and that it should be given equal treatment with the other nationalities. It would be considered as unfriendly policy towards the People's Republic of Albania if attempts, of whatever nature, by the Soviet revisionists to harm our country from Kosova were permitted.

We consider the peoples of Yugoslavia as fraternal peoples, and are convinced that, neither now nor in the future, will they allow the territory of their homeland to be treated like Czechoslovakia. They will accept nobody's yoke, they will not allow the Soviet tanks of the Warsaw Treaty, nor those of US imperialism, to «roll» freely over Yugoslav soil. Despite the irreconcilable contradictions of principle between us and the Yugoslav state and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia in ideology and poli-

tics, over which we have not shut our mouth and will not do so in the future, either, we respect and trust the peoples of Yugoslavia, because history has shown that they are valiant peoples.

In regard to our relations with Greece, for our part, they are based on the policy of good neighbourliness, of non-interference in each other's internal affairs, of mutual benefit and respect for territorial integrity, sovereignty and national independence. We have sought and wish to live in terms of friendship with the fraternal Greek people, and have made and continue to make every effort to ensure that the ties linking our two countries become constantly stronger. The present Greek government has sought and continues to maintain a friendly stand towards our country. This is in the interests of our two countries and to the detriment of our common enemies.

We realize that the present Greek government is a government of a coalition of parties, and that it has many opponents in the ranks of the opposition parties. Each of these parties has its own stand. Naturally, this is an internal question of the Greeks. Nonetheless, we think and desire that all these parties should consider the friendship, cooperation and good neighbourly relations between Greece and Albania as beneficial both to Greece itself and to Albania.

At any time and under any circumstance, the struggle of the Albanian people in defence of their independence, freedom and sovereignty is at the same time beneficial to the defence of the freedom and independence of Greece and its people. This we say to the fraternal Greek people with an open heart, for we are the descendants of those who aided them and stood loyal to the end to the revolution of the year 1821, when others abandoned and betrayed it. The friendship between our two peoples has been

tempered in our common fight against Italian fascists and the German nazis.

We Albanians do not want our policy with the Greek state to be a temporary policy dependent on circumstances, but a realistic, friendly, and durable policy between our two peoples. As for the monarcho-fascists and the crazy self-styled «Northern Epirots» who, from time to time, seek to create a tense atmosphere in the relations between our two countries with their absurd claims, we wish to say that their cries have brought only loud laughter from the Greek minority living happily in Albania. We tell them: Carry on, if you wish, with your old trade of styling yourselves as «Northern Epirots», because neither we nor the Greek minority in Albania have anything to fear from you, since the Albanians and the Greek minority are closely linked to each other like brothers.

We are convinced that there are reasonable politicians in Greece who view problems realistically and are clear that no evil will ever come to them from socialist Albania, and that the friendship of the Albanians is valuable to them, just as the friendship of the Greek people is valuable to us.

As for the overseas neighbour, Italy, we maintain normal diplomatic relations with it, and are trying to develop trade and cultural relations. But it is understandable that this does not depend on our side alone. We want and try to be friends with the Italian people. This desire emanates from the pure feelings of the Albanian people and the correct policy of our socialist state. We hope that every Italian, and every Italian politician who takes a realistic view of things, may also think that friendship with Albania is very important for Italy, as well.

To sum up, as regards these three neighbouring countries, it is our desire to live as good neighbours, in open

cooperation, without interfering in each other's internal affairs and without anybody trying, in one way or the other, to impose his own views.

Good relations exist between the Turkish Republic and Albania. Trade and cultural exchanges are developing normally. There is no obstacle to our peoples always being friends and living as good neighbours with each other.

We continue to cherish sincere friendship for the fraternal Bulgarian people. But we are obliged to point out that we do not trust the leadership of the Bulgarian party and state in the slightest degree, since it has demonstrated its hostility towards our country and has become a tool in the hands of the Soviet social-imperialists. Bulgaria has been turned into a country which concocts intrigues and has become a Soviet bridgehead. Proceeding from these positions, it is trying to blackmail the neighbouring countries, Yugoslavia, Turkey, Greece and Albania. With the social-imperialists behind it, Bulgaria is ready at an opportune moment to seize the Dardanelles, and thus the San-Stefano Treaty would be re-enacted. For these reasons, it is our desire that relations between Turkey and Greece proceed towards the best and most appropriate solution for the two Balkan peoples and states, via open and frank negotiations between the two parties. That would be a great victory for us other Balkan countries, as well.

With Rumania, too, as a Balkan country, we want to have good relations and develop them normally. We hail the efforts of the fraternal Rumanian people for the progress and prosperity of their country.

A great deal has been and is being said about all-round cooperation of the peoples of the Balkans, about a Balkan conference, and so on. Our Party and the Government of the People's Republic of Albania long ago stated their opinion about Balkan cooperation, and have explain-

ed why they did not take part in the Athens meeting. In our view, in the situation in the Balkans today, the indispensable conditions necessary for a multilateral meeting and agreement do not exist. We believe that, at present, the development of bilateral relations is the best way to create a spirit of trust and understanding in the Balkans and the conditions to achieve genuine and sincere cooperation on a broader basis in the future.

Our relations with the Arab Republic of Egypt, the Democratic and People's Republic of Algeria, and the other Arab countries are developing normally in a positive direction, on the basis of the traditional friendship which exists between the Albanian people and the Arab peoples, to the benefit of the struggle against the aggressive hegemonic policy of the two imperialist superpowers and reaction.

For the Arab peoples we nurture sincere feelings of affection and friendship which we shall continue to develop further. They are progressive and peace-loving peoples, who have made a valuable contribution to many aspects of world culture. We believe that the Arab peoples will achieve their complete liberation from the yoke of foreign capital and the blood-thirsty imperialists, and victory in their just struggle against the Israeli aggressors.

We will powerfully and firmly support the just cause of the Arab peoples to oppose imperialist-zionist aggression, to liberate the occupied Arab territories, and to cope with the conspiracies of US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. Our people and our country support the just struggle of the Palestinian people to gain their national rights, to return to their homes, of which they have been robbed by Israel, the instrument of US imperialism. We maintain ties with, and support, the Palestine Liberation Organization. We would like to see a strong militant unity, which is the reliable basis of their triumph over the

zionist and imperialist enemies, established among the Arab peoples.

The People's Republic of Albania maintains friendly relations with France, and they are developing in the interests of the two countries. We respect the French people for their revolutionary past and their progressive culture. Distinguished men of French science, art and culture are sincere friends of Albania. We maintain normal relations with the French state, though they do not approve of our regime, nor we of theirs. But we observe that the French government does not interfere in our affairs.

The same holds good for the governments of Belgium, Austria and Switzerland, with which the bilateral relations are correct. We observe with satisfaction that our country's relations with Sweden, Norway, Finland, and Denmark are extending, and we appreciate the realistic and friendly attitude of these countries towards Albania.

The People's Republic of Albania has established diplomatic relations with a large number of countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and will work to promote exchanges in various fields with Mexico, Peru, Tanzania, Pakistan, etc., step by step and within the possibilities. Albania is ready to establish relations with other states, too, which desire such a thing, on the basis of the recognized principles governing relations between sovereign countries.

With the Federal Republic of Germany we have unresolved problems dating back to the Second World War... The Bonn government, which poses as a democratic government, does not make even the slightest attempt to pay the reparations for the damage which the German nazi barbarity inflicted on Albania and its people. It should not think that this problem will remain just a propaganda issue. It will be pursued by our side, with evidence and facts, in all the international bodies.

Ever since the revisionist cliques in power in the countries of East Europe embarked on the road of hostility towards socialist Albania, blindly carrying out the commands of the Soviet revisionist leadership, they have reduced relations with our country to a very low and restricted level. As long as they follow this road, there can be no change in our relations with these countries.

The stand of Albania towards the revisionist Soviet Union, the enemy of Albania, socialism, the freedom and independence of all the peoples, remains unaltered. Our country has not maintained and will not maintain any relations whatsoever with the Moscow social-imperialists. The Soviet Union is in pursuit of openly expansionist aims, especially in the Balkans and the Mediterranean. It has hegemonistic designs not only on Rumania, but also on Turkey, Yugoslavia, Greece and Albania. It is seeking to achieve these ambitions through aggression or subversion. Under these conditions, we, the Balkan countries, have a duty to sharpen our political and military vigilance and be prepared to cope with a possible attack. It is common knowledge that the enemies strike wherever they find weakness and division.

Our stand towards the United States of America is already known. Albania and the Albanian people are not consumed with grief over the lack of relations with America, which has pursued and is pursuing a savagely hostile policy towards our country. In the future, as in the past, we shall always resolutely denounce and oppose the aggressive and hegemonistic policy of US imperialism, which is aimed against socialism and the freedom and independence of the peoples.

As regards Britain, this country is very closely linked with the policy of the United States, and in its stand towards Albania takes the same position. Consequently, our stand cannot be different, either. Britain must return

the gold it plundered from the Albanian people and make good the damage it has caused Albania. We will never renounce this right.

The Party of Labour of Albania is convinced that the stands of socialist Albania have always been and continue to be correct, and to a certain degree, express the aspirations not only of proletarian revolutionaries but also of progressive people who view many things as we do, but who for many reasons, do not express them openly.

In its analysis of situations, in the conclusions it has drawn, in the assessments it has made and the stands it has adopted, our Party has always acted and continues to act in close unity with the people. That is why the entire Party firmly defends this policy, why the entire people support and implement it. On the other hand, it is this unity, this correct Marxist-Leninist understanding of international events, the principled and resolute stands towards the lofty interests of our socialist Homeland, towards the great cause of the revolution, socialism and the liberation of the peoples, which constitute that sound guarantee that our country will always have unshakable international positions and will always advance on a reliable course, proud and undaunted.

.....

«Principal Documents of the
PLA», vol. 7

BRATISLAVA 1968

Article published in the newspaper «Zëri i popullit»

November 16, 1976

The history of international relations in recent years is full of many plots hatched up by the imperialists and social-imperialists against the freedom and independence of the peoples. Some have been carried out and the whole world has already seen how terrible they are. Others remain as projects locked away in the strong-rooms of military staffs and in the top government chancelleries, awaiting the set hours or suitable times. Meanwhile, others are being hatched up in the sinister bargaining which is carried on by the secret diplomacy and the intelligence and espionage agencies.

The contriving of plots is the strongest instinct of imperialist wolves, is that field of banditry which, more than anything else, fires the crazy dreams of enemies of the freedom and independence of the peoples with the lust for plunder and incites in them the unhealthy spirit of military and political adventures. The only concern which these gentlemen have now is lest their plots may be revealed prematurely and the peoples learn what terrible things are being prepared behind their backs. The whole arsenal of gangsters — treachery and perfidy, cynicism and lies, sweet deceptive words and lullabies

to put people to sleep — is fine for their morality. Indeed, when the imperialist and social-imperialist chiefs come out from their meetings and speak about fraternity and collaboration, about general peace and permanent security, then watch out, because they have the trap set and the dagger drawn.

We all remember the tragic events in Czechoslovakia in 1968, which no one can forget. They are a major lesson of history.

On August 3, 1968, the revisionist chiefs of the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Poland, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia gathered in Bratislava at a meeting which, as they said at the time, was in the «tradition of routine consultations». And the documents and the communiqués were signed according to all the rules which the pompous ceremonies, political frauds and the masking of military attacks require. The participants kissed three times as is the custom of the Holy Russian Church and had photographs taken as souvenirs for their successors. Facing the cinema and television cameras, as the whole world was to watch, the Soviet revisionists and their lackeys almost smothered in their embraces Dubček, the most eminent representative of «revisionism with a human face», and they all went home happy and contented.

No less sensational was the so-called «Declaration of the Communist Parties of the Socialist Countries» which was issued on this occasion. In it their «internationalism», «fraternal collaboration», and «opposition to imperialism» were praised to the skies, through a whole torrent of demagogic slogans. There was great ado, especially, about the «atmosphere of complete sincerity, adherence to principle, friendship and unity» and so on, which, according to them, had prevailed at the meeting. Brezhnev and Zhivkov, Gomulka and Kadar, Ulbricht and Dubček competed with one another over who could sing the loudest praises

of the Bratislava document which was a new foundation stone for the alleged strengthening of the freedom, independence, sovereignty and equality of the participating states and parties. «The participants in the meeting,» said the Declaration, «expressed their complete determination to do everything which depends on them for the further all-round development of collaboration between their countries on the basis of the principles of equality, respect for their national sovereignty and independence, territorial integrity, reciprocal fraternal aid and solidarity.»

Enthused by the «results», Dubček declared very confidently, «The economic development of our country can be ensured, and moreover, its security and independence guaranteed only in unity with the socialist countries.» The newspapers of Moscow, East Berlin, Warsaw and Sofia were filled with the decisions of plenums and statements of revisionist chiefs eulogizing the perfect solutions to problems which had arisen amongst them and the measures which had been taken to cope with the world situation.

But all this euphoria so artfully built up ended in a great tragedy, in an act of barbarity which repeated the terrible events of the occupation of Czechoslovakia by Hitler. The ink of the signatures to the «Charter of Bratislava» was not yet dry when, on the orders of Brezhnev, the Soviet tanks attacked Prague and occupied the whole of Czechoslovakia. The plot functioned perfectly. The preparations of Grechko and Yakubovsky for the attack were covered up beautifully by the demagogy of the meeting and the loud clamour of the revisionist propaganda machine. Those who put their trust in Brezhnev's word of honour and in the soothing assurances of his joint conspirators, Ulbricht, Gomulka and Zhivkov, paid dear for their naivety. At that time, in the columns of this newspaper we wrote that «the Bratislava Declaration is one

of the most hypocritical and demagogic documents of the revisionists». And time has proved us right.

The general secretary of the Soviet revisionist party was not yet a marshal and had not taken the reins of all the military commands into his hands at that time. Now he has gathered up all the levers of power for himself and put the badges of rank of a marshal of the Soviet Union on his epaulets.

Now the new czar of the Kremlin is making ready to go to the cardboard castle of mock anti-social-imperialism in Bucharest, where he will assemble his conspirators in the Warsaw Treaty. It is expected that communiqués and declarations will be signed as usual. Likewise, there will certainly be no lack of fine words in them about «friendship», «sovereignty», «equality» and «independence». In these «documents» it will not be difficult for any of them to register his «individual» views, just as he will be free, later, to make the interpretations which please him. However, history has proved, also, that the Soviet tanks are not guided by the fairytales of these declarations, just as Brezhnev is not guided by their morality.

The revisionists are utterly uninhibited in their ambitions for expansion and hegemony. The visits which Brezhnev undertakes to different countries of Europe, allegedly friendly or courtesy visits in return for visits made by heads of these countries to the Soviet Union, conceal grave and irreparable misfortunes for the peoples of those countries, for their freedom, independence and sovereignty, and likewise are dangerous for the peoples who are neighbours of those countries which welcome and farewell such conspirators as the inveterate revisionist, Leonid Brezhnev.

Any means which serves to establish their domination over the peoples and to rob nations of their freedom

is usable for the Soviet revisionists. The demagoguery and plots, the diabolical smiles and base deceptions of the Soviet revisionist chiefs go hand in hand. One serves the other.

Let us not forget the words of the revolutionary Czechoslovak communist, Julius Fučík, executed by the Hitlerites: «People, be vigilant!»

From the newspaper «Zëri i popullit»,
November 16, 1976

THE PARTY STANDING AT THE HEAD OF THE MASSES INSPIRES AND MOBILIZES THEM TO CARRY OUT THE TASKS

*From the talk with the First Secretary of the CC of the
Communist Party of Brazil, Joao Amazonas*

November 25, 1976

Welcome, Comrade Amazonas! We are very happy to see you in good health. On behalf of the Central Committee of the Party, I want to stress the great pleasure we feel over the fact that you and other comrades of the Communist Party of Brazil have come to our Congress. We consider the participation of representatives of Marxist-Leninist parties of other countries a great assistance to our Party and the international communist movement.

Our Party and people feel great joy that the 7th Congress became a tribune for the powerful manifestation of the proletarian internationalism and the Marxist-Leninist unity of the Marxist-Leninist communist and workers' parties which militate and struggle in different countries of Europe, Asia, Latin America, and elsewhere.

It is the duty of all us the Marxist-Leninist communist parties to use all the means at our disposal to make our militant internationalism and unity known, to explain their great importance at the present time, and to strengthen them ceaselessly in the future.

... We are of the opinion that the countries of Latin America have now become one of the most important centres of the revolutionary movement led by the Marxist-Leninist communist parties. Latin America, where big North-American capital rules, supported by the local comprador bourgeoisie and the military cliques, has become one of the weakest links of world capitalism. In struggle in each Latin-American country there is a revolutionary people, a courageous working class, there are the peasantry, the ally of the proletariat, a fiery youth, and progressive intellectuals. The historic duty devolves on the proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist communist party to make all these classes and strata its allies and lead them on the course of the revolutionary struggle against local reactionary cliques, American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism.

Of course, you know better than anyone else how strong the enemy is in your countries, where its weak points are, and how you will organize and develop the struggle against imperialism, social-imperialism, local capital, and the revisionist parties and pseudo-Marxist groups which they form, as well as against other anti-Marxist currents, which strive to create confusion and hinder you in your work and the struggle you wage. You are acquainted with all these forms of the organization of the enemy. The Party of Labour of Albania appreciates your struggle. It is our common struggle, because we are facing the same enemies who confront us with various tactics of struggle. Through our strategy and tactics we shall work and struggle to foil their plans.

We shall publicize and assist the revolutionary struggle of the Latin-American peoples, led by the Marxist-Leninist communist parties.

We, the Marxist-Leninist communist parties, must or-

ganize ourselves solidly, because, unfortunately, we have to expect other savage storms and attacks on the international communist movement. The Party of Labour of Albania, as a sister party of your parties, will always remain loyal to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

After the Brazilian friend expressed his thanks for these warm words, and expressed his opinions about the important problems which were raised in the conversation, and after he made an exposition of the situation in Brazil, and of the activity and tasks of his party, Comrade Enver Hoxha continued:

We are convinced that your Party will achieve all these things which you spoke about, because it is a strong party, which keeps the flag of Marxism-Leninism flying high.

The faith which you have in our Party encourages us greatly and charges us with great responsibility to prove worthy of it.

Not only must the Marxist-Leninist parties increase and multiply their efforts in the political and ideological struggle against external and internal enemies, but at the same time, they must assist one another even more to strengthen the international communist movement.

At our 7th Congress we spoke specifically about many international problems and tried to make a synthesis of these problems, (1) because our attitude towards American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and the reactionary bourgeoisie has long been defined. On this occasion we spoke openly not because we wanted to please someone, or avoid falling out with someone else, but because we thought of the interests of the international communist movement and the liberation of the peoples from enslavement and

1 See pp. 87-137 of this volume.

capital. Our Central Committee took up those capital problems long ago and has always demonstrated that we must speak openly about them, without regard for the sacrifices and obstacles which will emerge before us. If the communists do not fight against imperialists and modern revisionists then they are not Marxist-Leninists but opportunists. Our Party thinks that with a friend we should lay our cards on the table, and it sincerely accepts any criticism or any open Marxist-Leninist discussion from him.

Our 7th Congress laid down very important responsible tasks which the Party, by standing at the head of the people, the working class and the broad working masses, will carry out to the letter. Of course, this requires a high level of political understanding, Marxist-Leninist ideological inspiration, great organization, and tempering in practice, in work. The accomplishment of tasks also requires that the people acquire technical competence in any sector in which they work.

Now, following the Congress, a great mobilization of the masses of the people in work can be seen in our country. Everyone will read and study the materials of the Congress, individually or in groups. Our Party has gained good experience about how these materials should be handled, but since the forms that we used five years ago or those which we used last year are now outdated, the Central Committee has recommended that new and better forms should be found.

Extraordinary enthusiasm was displayed at the Congress; it was a manifestation of those revolutionary actions of the working masses, of the whole people, which yielded great results in the accomplishment of tasks. Our people are building their life with the maturity which characterizes them and with their own skilful hands. The materials of the Congress serve the development of the economy and culture and the strengthening of the defence

of the country, therefore we have exchanged opinions about how, along with the study of these materials, we can work out the ways to ensure that they assist our work properly. In this direction it is important to achieve that the line of the Party becomes the flesh and blood of the people. We have set a time-limit for the study and have instructed that the masses should link this study with the accomplishment of the plan. In order to achieve this, many measures have been envisaged and applied. As always, the accomplishment of the plan will be the result of great work and struggle. We have confidence in the strength of the Party, in the strength and enthusiasm of our working class and our people. We do not hide the fact that in the course of our work we will encounter difficulties, indeed, sometimes major difficulties, which we foresee up to a certain point, but we shall strive to surmount them by taking preliminary measures. There will also be shortcomings and mistakes but we shall correct them, because it is our duty to correct them.

I am not going to dwell on all these matters here, but I want to speak about the strengthening of the work of the Party in every sector, especially about the understanding of the political and ideological importance of the problems which the Party raises. If we do not succeed in doing such a thing, our work will be lame, the plan will not be accomplished, difficulties will be created for us, and we shall not achieve the progress which the Party requires in the socialist development of the country. You can set the lathe going, but if the turner does not have a political understanding of the importance of his work there, of the tools which he makes, and which are needed, for example, for the production of bread, and considers his working means simply as a lump of iron, he will turn out products of poor quality.

As you heard, at the Congress we said that we are

doing extensive work for the political and ideological education of the communists and the masses through schools, courses and seminars and through the work for the accomplishment of tasks. The Marxist-Leninist theory is taught in our country. We do not learn this theory as a dogma, or as a liturgy, but as it is, a living, militant, revolutionary theory closely linked with the problems of the life of the country.

We closely link the mass Marxist-Leninist education of the people, which we do in differentiated ways because of the differences in the cultural level of our people, with life, with the internal development, with events from the life of the Party and all the other factors which serve the accomplishment of our political tasks inside and outside the country.

Hence, the Party has achieved that, by means of the press and other forms of propaganda, the people understand its policy and the policy of our state of the dictatorship of the proletariat not only on internal questions, but also on external questions, understand the problems of the imperialist-revisionist encirclement, as well as all the other problems which emerge and develop in the course of life. To make these matters clear and establish a clear understanding of them, constructive debates and discussions are held.

We are not for «a hundred flowers», or for «a hundred schools», or in favour of «two lines» in the Party. We are against such erroneous theories, but we are not in the least against open debate in the basic organizations of the Party, the economic enterprises, or wherever people raise problems. We speak to the masses about all the key problems, for example, about the five-year plan as well as the annual plans. Such key problems we raise among the people first, so that they not only understand the political, ideological and economic importance of these

plans, but also draft them themselves, express their opinions, so that our economy and culture will develop correctly and such a mobilization is achieved and organizational forms constructed as to effectively assist the accomplishment of tasks. Subsequently, all these opinions and proposals go back to centre, where very serious debates are held in the government, the Political Bureau, and in the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Party. After the discussion, these elaborated proposals are sent back to the broad masses of the people and there detailed explanation of them begins, organizational measures for the accomplishment of the plan are taken and the work and check-up on the systematic accomplishment of the tasks commences.

We have given great importance to check-up. In this we have always based ourselves on the teachings of Lenin, organizing both state check-up and inspection and worker and peasant control in conformity with the conditions of our country. The Party sends many people organized in groups, trained and instructed about various sectors, to carry out surprise, unannounced inspections and to give assistance in the economic, cultural and educational institutions where they check up on the accomplishment of plans and programs, the training of teachers and pupils in the schools, the reserves, the realization of norms, proletarian discipline, the administration of property in the enterprise, in the health service and everywhere else. The comrades who take part in these control teams, and there are thousands of them, give their opinion about how to improve the work and take measures on the spot to correct the defects. For those matters which have greater importance they inform the highest forums of the Party, proposing the concrete measures which should be taken.

This work, Comrade Amazonas, has been extremely helpful to us, not only in the fulfilment of the plans but

also in teaching the broad masses of the people to run the country correctly, to become competent to deal with state and with Party problems, to prevent abuses and distortions, to be courageous, to criticize everything which is not going well and to take correct decisions.

Of course, we have not achieved perfection in the organizing of the worker and peasant control, but what we have done is a step towards putting into practice Lenin's great teaching, which is important because it opens the eyes of the broad masses of the people and not only educates them correctly in politics and ideology, but also makes them able to control various sectors of the social-economic life of the country and understand the whole process of the construction of socialism. This is the way in which we understand the work of the worker and peasant control which we are applying.

Another important matter which I wished to stress in this talk has to do with the understanding and application of proletarian democracy. As you know, proletarian democracy is democracy only for the broad working masses and not for the class enemies. Our Party, basing itself on Marxism-Leninism, has found the most appropriate forms for putting proletarian democracy effectively into practice. It is understandable, however, that this democracy in our country is also threatened by evils such as bureaucracy, indifference, intellectualism, technocracy, and so on.

The deepening of the understanding and application of proletarian democracy serves as a great ideological force which helps to provide correct theoretical and political explanations of the advantages of socialism and the evils of the remnants of the past, which exist and will continue to exist in the future, but which will gradually disappear as a result of waging the class struggle in the political and ideological fields. The remnants of the past,

which imperialism and revisionism incite, and which internal enemies or elements from the ranks of the people who degenerate spread energetically, we try to combat on all fronts and ceaselessly.

It is our aim that democracy should not be developed in close circles or only inside forums, but should be extended to include the masses. When somebody, whether a communist or not a Party member, makes a mistake, naturally, the relevant basic organization of the Party or state organ judges him and takes measures of an educational character to assist him. In most cases, his mistakes are also made known to the collective in which this person works. The Party gives the working collective the right and power to criticize all wrong actions by any person whoever he may be, not excluding the comrades of the leadership, and to give constructive ideas on the work and the persons involved in it.

If, say, some manager of an enterprise, Party secretary, chairman of a committee, or anyone else, exploiting his official position, behaves badly, proves despotic or takes revenge on his subordinates, the Party advises and encourages the masses to speak out openly, or to complain by letter, right up to the Central Committee of the Party. Working people come to meet us at the Central Committee or send us letters with very valuable proposals, suggestions, demands, complaints, etc. People complain or send letters not only when things in some sector are not going well, but also when they want to show the Party many ways to solve problems. Great attention is given to the letters that come from the people. The questions which are raised in them are studied with great care in the special sectors we have at the Central Committee, the government and at the base.

We strive all the time and with all our might to apply proletarian democracy really and not just in formal ways.

For the admission of someone to the Party, too, we pass him through the filter of the masses, the filter of the collective in which he works. First, the person concerned is admitted as a candidate for Party membership. The decision to admit him as a candidate or, after he has completed his probation period, as a Party member, or the decision to expel a communist from the Party is taken by the basic organization alone. It is the right of the Party to admit or expel members, but it always proceeds from the interests of the working class which aims and struggles to ensure that its vanguard will be pure, comprised of honest, courageous, valiant revolutionaries of a high political and ideological level. Therefore, the Party cannot base itself only on the knowledge of two or three individuals who recommend the person for admission as a candidate for Party membership, but before it decides whether or not to admit him to its ranks, it presents the matter to the collective for discussion and asks. «What do you know of this person? What good points and weaknesses has he and is he worthy of admission as a candidate member of the Party?» The workers begin to speak and give their opinions about the comrade who is to become a communist. The basic organization of the Party takes these opinions into consideration and, provided that the person discussed has many positive aspects and no political or moral blemishes, then he is admitted as a candidate. On the basis of the established rules, even after his admission, the candidate must do a probation period of three years in one of the most difficult sectors of work, such as in the mines, construction, agriculture, etc. After three years, the opinion of the working collective of the enterprise or the agricultural cooperative about the candidate is sought again. If he has worked well during the three-year period of probation, he is admitted as a Party member, or this decision might be postponed for

a further probation period, or if he is considered unworthy he is not admitted to the Party...

The enthusiasm which you saw during the proceedings of the Congress reflects the enthusiasm of our Party, our working class, our cooperativist peasantry, our youth and our people's intelligentsia, but we do not forget that even in socialist society there are individuals who degenerate. As soon as the Party sees that someone is taking a wrong course it works with him to correct him. At first it advises him, helps him, criticizes him once or twice, and then warns him and only when it sees that he is continuing on his wrong course against the Party or the state does it take measures of coercion.

...

As you heard at the Congress, we have acted sternly against enemies, because the class struggle is waged in socialism, too. We spoke in the Congress about the dangerous plot of the traitors Beqir Balluku, Abdyl Këllezi and their associates, and explained what they were aiming at...

Beqir Balluku and a group of militarymen who were enemies worked secretly behind the back of the Party to change our military strategy and tactics laid down on the basis of the line of the Central Committee. Their aim was to leave the whole coast and the cities open and undefended to an eventual enemy attack and to prevent the application, at any moment, of the military measures which the Central Committee had taken for the defence of the whole country, the mountains and the plains. According to their plans, at the first attack which might be launched on Albania by the Soviet revisionists, our whole army, organized in their way, should not defend every inch of the country, but should retreat to the mountains. The plan of Beqir Balluku and his gang was co-ordinated with the plans of a number of revisionist countries. However, the Party discovered and exposed these enemies.

This military plan was linked with an ideological plan to attack the superstructure, to use films, the theatre, and culture to introduce the bourgeois and revisionist way of life, especially among the youth. The enemies' aim was the degeneration and liquidation of the socialist order and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The leading role of the Party has great importance. We have always struggled for the perfection of the leadership of the Party and its work and the work of the state and the administration by exposing and rejecting the rigid and despotic bureaucratic schemes practised by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union after the death of Stalin. We have always evaluated the role of the leaders of the Party and the government correctly, by their actions and the decisions they take, by what they do in their life and work. The Party has submitted the activity of the leadership to the judgement of the masses of communists, first of all, but also to the judgement of the masses not organized in the Party.

The Party teaches its members and the masses that only that leadership, whether Party or state, which recognizes and corrects its mistakes, is worthy of respect. Within our forums, from the Central Committee, the Political Bureau, the government and right down to the basic organizations, we have created complete equality amongst individuals. There all are equal, communists, there are no badges of rank or privileges of office, all are charged with tasks and the actions of each are praised or criticized according to the case when the majority of those who make up the forums or the basic organization of the Party consider them so, and when it is considered that their actions are not right, measures are taken to correct them. We have created such a situation that when it comes to defending the overriding interests of the Party, those who make mistakes are criticized without

hesitation. In this direction, however, care is taken to preserve the sense of proportion and the comrades are criticized to the extent that they are to blame. When the mistake is a small one, the criticism is light and if the mistake is grave, the guilty person is criticized severely.

Likewise, we have worked everywhere among the masses, within the forums and outside them, to prevent the creation of any kind of cult around the comrades of the leadership, to ensure that despotism, haughtiness and megalomania are condemned and to avoid any underestimation of the collective leadership of the Central Committee and the Council of Ministers. Such activity has strengthened the revolutionary vigilance, has strengthened the struggle against cronyism, has increased the love for one's comrade, and teaches us that in work and for the interests of the Party there cannot and must not be any unhealthy familiarity. Although we cannot say that we have completely achieved our aim, we try to ensure that our people are not disheartened and embittered by correct Marxist-Leninist criticism. In this direction we have to do continuous political and ideological work. At the same time, we educate our comrades so that when any baseless, slanderous criticism is made, they take a strong stand against those who commit such acts of denigration. This does not mean the smothering of criticism. On the contrary, it is an encouragement for criticism, but criticism in the correct way, based on facts and arguments and not on concocted slanders.

The Party works hard to prevent rumour-mongering and gossiping. Unworthy stands inspired by motives of personal interest, unverified and exaggerated stands in the assessment of petty events, are not permitted amongst us. These stands honour nobody. Our Party tries to rescue the people who display such defects and the truth is that we have educated many of them, who have become fight-

ers for the Party, and we are educating many others. This is positive.

Our Party is relatively young, but it has learned a great deal from the working class and its own people and from the other Marxist-Leninist parties. Throughout its existence and in all its activity our Party has encountered great difficulties, plots, economic sabotage, groupings of anti-Party elements, agencies trained by the imperialists, the Soviet, Yugoslav and other revisionists, but the Party and the dictatorship of the proletariat in our country have faced up to the dangers and overcome them successfully. In this struggle against its external and internal enemies our Party has learned a great deal.

The revolutionary struggle of our working class and the working masses, under the leadership of the Party, provides it with unlimited experience and raises problems which absolutely demand correct solutions. It also brings to light the best forms of organization for the solution of the problems which emerge. Now, for example, after the Congress, many initiatives have been spread to all the enterprises. The five-year plan which we have drawn up sets high targets, nevertheless the workers and peasants have pledged to overfulfil them. Thus, new forms of work are emerging. So, we see in the struggle what strength socialism has, what great possibilities this social system provides for creative work in all the fields of life, including the economic, social and cultural fields, and the field of defence. Had you known our country not only before Liberation, but also in the first post-liberation years, in the first decade after the end of the war, you would see how much it has advanced in these years of people's state power.

We are the first generation of the Party. Now our comrades are becoming grey-headed and they are going on the pension, but they never cease their work, do not

agree to sit idle, and so we see them everywhere, in the jobs to which they had been appointed, where they receive only the pension. The pensioners in our country, with their great maturity and experience, solve a series of problems with which the organs of the state and the Party at the centre and the base charge them.

The Party is training the next generation which will take over and is taking over the responsibility. An elevation of a great number of people to the leadership of the work, which has extended in all sectors, can be seen everywhere.

This second generation of forty-year olds is training another younger generation in the work. Thousands of workers, who have graduated from the general or vocational secondary schools, not to mention those with higher schooling, have been appointed to state enterprises or agricultural cooperatives. The training of new workers is a great and important task of our Party. Socialism, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the correct leadership of the Party brought these people to light and developed them. By injecting new blood into its ranks the Party is kept eternally young. This new blood always invigorates the Party and serves to defend the People's Republic of Albania from any danger. This is a factor which contributes to the political, ideological and technical elevation of the people in the enterprises and institutions, organizations, schools and everywhere else.

By applying the principle of very great and universal importance of self-reliance, which we stressed forcibly once again at the 7th Congress of the Party, we have been able to create a sound economic situation in our country. The figures which we presented at the Congress are the best evidence of our successes. In our country all markets are regularly supplied with goods, prices are not going up, but gradually diminishing, while the capitalist and

revisionist states are inflicted with inflation and other incurable illnesses.

We have taken measures to further reduce the distinctions between town and countryside and will continue to do so. Thanks to these measures we have made a great stride forward in this direction. Schooling and culture in the village are developing just as in the city, but we must do more for the further improvement of the economic conditions in the countryside. At present the worker in the city has some conditions a little better, but we are struggling to ensure that the peasant will eventually have these, too. When we say that the peasants will have them, we have in mind the comparison with the workers' conditions, because in general, our peasant too, has built a very good life. In the villages there is no home without a radio and many peasants have TV-sets and washing machines. The distribution of domestic equipment there is aimed at lightening the burden on the women. Every type of foodstuff is available in the villages.

I am not going to speak at length on all legal rights in the economic and cultural fields which the peasants enjoy equally with the urban dwellers, such as the right to the old-age pension, paid maternity leave for the woman, and so on. The peasants also benefit from the abolition of all direct and indirect taxes.

On this course we believe that the 6th Five-year Plan, which the 7th Congress of the Party approved, will raise the level of the well-being of the people even higher, socialism will become still stronger in Albania, and the defence of our Homeland will be more powerful. We base these things on our own forces, on the work of the Party and the people. The Party will be tempered in new battles to defend all these victories, to defend Marxism-Leninism, and to fight more effectively and

sternly against American imperialism, Soviet revisionism, the reactionary bourgeoisie and all their lackeys of whatever hue. We shall fight without yielding for the triumph of the revolution, socialism and communism.

In this talk with the Brazilian guest, Comrade Enver Hoxha also dealt with some other questions. Amongst other things he pointed out:

Mao Zedong said that it will take 10 thousand years for the cause of the proletariat to triumph until the great force emerges which will carry the revolution ahead and destroy imperialism. However, we communists cannot close the perspective of the revolution to the proletariat by recommending that it supports the reactionary bourgeoisie of its own country, cannot close the perspective to the proletariat for the sake of collaboration with the United States of America. The proletariat is a colossal leading force for the revolutionary transformation of society. Were we to act otherwise, then we would be doing what the socialist Millerand(2) did in his time, who even formed his government. Marchais, also, is following the same course, but the French proletariat has not lost the strength which it inherited from the Revolution of 1848 and especially from the Commune of Paris, from

2 A. Millerand (1859-1943). While a member of the French Socialist Party, in 1899 he entered the reactionary government of Waldeck Rousseau, and as a member of the government and later as prime-minister and president of the Republic, assisted and supported the bourgeoisie's policy of oppression. He asserted the necessity of a certain socialization of the means of production, but was also a defender of private property. The opportunist leaders of the French Socialist Party and those of the 2nd International did not condemn Millerand's participation in the bourgeois government, which was a clear expression of the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie. Only Lenin condemned this first practical display of revisionism which openly betrayed the interests of the proletariat.

the experience of which Marx wrote his famous work. (3) How can it be thought that under the rule of the bourgeoisie the proletariat has achieved all the blessings, as the revisionists claim?! Such a conclusion is unthinkable because it does not respond to the reality...

Yugoslavia is not a socialist state, as it pretends to be, but a country dependent on the imperialism of the United States of America, on that of West Germany and on Soviet social-imperialism, etc. There is a clause in the Yugoslav Constitution which says that foreign capital has the right to invest in Yugoslavia in all the economic sectors in which it is interested. The shares are divided in this way: forty-nine per cent for foreign capital and fifty-one per cent for Yugoslav capital. Nevertheless, those who build the industry in Yugoslavia have raised their shares from the 49 per cent envisaged in the Yugoslav Constitution to 60 or 70 per cent.

The foreign monopolies have invested in Yugoslavia for the construction of modern factories, because it is in their interests to ensure that the production turned out by the cheap labour should cost as little as possible and the goods from these factories be sold to the Western countries, thus the United States of America and the other capitalist countries reap the profits. During this period Yugoslavia is not able to pay its debts because its obligations have amounted to billions. (4) Imperialism strips you of everything, therefore nothing is left for the economy of Yugoslavia.

Now the aim of the local and foreign capitalists is to deceive the worker there and keep him bound in chains. The capitalist method of industrialization and the

3 *The Civil War in France*

4 Yugoslavia's foreign debt amounts to more than 20 billion dollars today.

inflow of foreign capital not only does not ensure work for all the workers, but has compelled Yugoslavia to export labour power and its intelligentsia. One and a half million workers have emigrated from Yugoslavia to Europe where they live a difficult life.

As you know, there are more than 2 million Albanians in Yugoslavia. When the Turkish Empire was being carved up, an uprising, the centre of which was Kosova, broke out in Albania. The leaders of the Albanian National Movement gathered in Prizren and created the League of Prizren (5) to defend the national interests of Albania. The Great Powers and the neighbouring chauvinists wanted to partition Albania. Indeed, Bismarck went so far as to say that they were not going to bother about a few Albanian cottages. The League of Prizren organized and led the uprising which was bloodily suppressed. Through the open and secret treaties which they signed, these Powers cut up Albania, giving a great part of it to Serbia and other neighbours.

The Albanians in Yugoslavia have lived and continue to live enslaved, without freedom, and for years on end have been persecuted and forcibly expelled from Kosova to Turkey, where they were obliged to sleep outside in the streets or in mosques.

In 1946 we talked with Tito about the question of Kosova. I expressed the opinion that Kosova and the

5 On June 10, 1878, on the eve of the Congress of Berlin which was to revise the decisions of the Treaty of San Stefano, delegates from all the Albanian regions gathered in the city of Prizren and decided to form a political and military union which took the name «The Albanian League of Prizren». The League fought for self-government, national unity and the defence of the territorial integrity of Albania which was endangered by the chauvinist aims of the neighbouring states.

other regions inhabited by Albanians belonged to Albania and should be returned to it.

On the question of Kosova we have maintained a Marxist-Leninist stand, which consists in the defence of our Kosova brothers, who, within the Federation, must be given all national rights, must not be persecuted, expelled from the state, discriminated against, or violently oppressed.

When the internal situation in Yugoslavia became acute and the struggle for power with the Great-Serb clan became more fierce, Tito, who is a great political acrobat, seeing the difficult situation, made certain «concessions» towards the Albanian people of Kosova in order to manoeuvre better, and placed all the blame for the persecution of these people on Ranković. But the people of Kosova saw for themselves what was the true aim of Tito's «concessions» and promises.

We conduct trade with Yugoslavia and we also have cultural relations, but the Titoites pursue a hostile policy towards our country. The Cultural Convention has been prepared for five years now but they do not want to sign it, because in it we say: «We should have cultural exchanges with the peoples of Yugoslavia and the people of Kosova.» They do not like the fact that we speak about and are interested in the people of Kosova.

With Greece we have normal state relations. We think we should develop them further in the field of trade and culture. We can carry on trade with mutual benefit and have cultural exchanges.

These were some ideas of the Central Committee of our Party which charged me to talk with you. Thank you!

Published for the first time
with some abridgements from
the notes taken at this meet-
ing, which are kept in the
CAP

SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT THE BALLIST «DECALOGUE» OF MAO ZEDONG

December 28, 1976

This week, the Chinese revisionists headed by the Hua Guofeng group, which seized power in China through a military putsch, published a document of Mao Zedong's, a speech of ten points («On The Ten Major Relationships»), which he delivered at the enlarged meeting of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee in April 1956.

This document was written before the 8th Congress of the Communist Party of China, at which Liu Shaoqi delivered the main report. The report had a revisionist content. We who were present at the Congress were astonished over how this report could be delivered and at least how it was not condemned even later, together with Liu Shaoqi, who was liquidated. In this report to the 8th Congress, the problems were dealt with according to the ideas of Mao Zedong, and that is why even after the Cultural Revolution it was considered correct. **The ten points of Mao's Ballist «decalogue», which form his non-Marxist eclectic strategy and world outlook, confirm this.**

These ten points of Mao's were written and put forward after the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, where the revisionist renegade Khrushchev attacked Marxism-Leninism and slandered and threw mud at Stalin. **In this document Mao took the initiative,**

which might have been co-ordinated with the Khrushchevites, as it was in fact. Khrushchev had informed Mao of his revisionist ideas and about the actions he was to undertake. Mao was in agreement with Khrushchev, a thing which he stated publicly at the Moscow Meeting of 1957, where he praised Khrushchev, attacked Stalin, and approved Khrushchev's liquidation of the «anti-party group of Molotov and company». And in this way Mao assisted Khrushchev. He was in agreement with the line of the 20th Congress and against Stalin. The 8th Congress of the Communist Party of China was in tune with the Khrushchevites, because the two «chums» had the same ideas. Naturally, Khrushchev made promises to Mao, but did not keep them, and only deceived him until he could get over his difficulties.

Mao's aim was to help not Khrushchev but himself, so that China would become the main leader of the communist world and Mao would replace Stalin, whom they thought they had buried. Mao acted quickly to take hegemony.

Khrushchev for his part wanted to bring Mao Zedong into line and under his direction, meanwhile, however, the Party of Labour of Albania intervened by defending Marxism-Leninism and the Communist Party of China. The fire of the polemic was kindled at Bucharest and the Party of Labour of Albania continued it «with a volley of machine-gun fire» at the Meeting of 81 Parties in Moscow. Mao was for putting out this great fire, was opposed to the polemic. He wanted meetings, wanted social-democratic agreements because he himself was a social-democrat, an opportunist, a revisionist. But Mao could not extinguish the fire or the polemic, and seeing that he was unable to establish his hegemony, he changed his stand. Mao took a somewhat «better». anti-Soviet stand, and here he appeared to be in accord with us who were fighting Khrush-

chevite revisionism consistently. But even at this time he had hopes of rapprochement with the Khrushchevite revisionists. Efforts were made to this end by the Chinese leaders, but we opposed them.

When Khrushchev fell, Mao's hopes revived. He sent Zhou to Moscow, who proposed to us that we should go, too. But we resolutely refused this. This was a fiasco for Mao Zedong. Then, from the strategy of the fight on the two flanks he turned towards the United States of America. The frequent meetings between the Chinese and the American ambassadors in Warsaw prepared Kissinger's visit to China, and after that Nixon's visit, too. (1)

The Cultural Revolution fizzled out. This revolution stopped half-way, or to put it better, strengthened the personal position of Mao Zedong. The leftist elements «were liquidated with a single blow» by the rightists headed by Hua Guofeng. Thus, the revisionist line of Mao triumphed, and now this «decalogue», which is suitable for the rightists, has come to light. In this «decalogue» there is no mention at all of the world revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the class struggle, or aid for the peoples who want freedom and are fighting to liberate themselves.

This document is a reflection of the revisionist ideas of Mao who is for peaceful coexistence even with the United States of America, although this is not mentioned at all. I have glanced over this document, but it must be analysed thoroughly.

Nothing should surprise us in regard to the anti-Marxist, pragmatic, liberal, putschist stands full of zig-zags of Mao Zedong. Zhou Enlai, Deng Xiaoping, Hua Guofeng and other Chinese revisionists. These ideas of theirs are old, fifty years old, they are interwoven with

1 Nixon went on a visit to Peking on February 21. 1972.

idealism and mysticism, and given a coat of red paint which the sun of Marxism-Leninism peels off them.

One of the main aims of this «decalogue» of Mao's is to mark a dividing line between himself and Stalin, between the socialist construction in the Soviet Union and the ideology which guides the construction of socialism in China. In other words, Mao Zedong opposes the Marxist theory with his own ideas, «Mao Zedong thought,» as the Chinese now call them, claiming that they are «fundamentally the same as the theory of Marxism-Leninism», although in reality they are in opposition to it.

Lenin foresaw the activity of anti-Marxists, whether Mao, Maoists, and others when in 1913, in his work «The Historical Fate of the Doctrine of Karl Marx», he says:

*«The dialectics of history were such that the theoretical victory of Marxism compelled its enemies **to disguise themselves as Marxists**»**

As this «decalogue» shows, Mao Zedong has long been in opposition to the revolutionary theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism on many issues of principle. As emerges from this «decalogue», since the time of the «Long March», since the time he was in Yen-an, he had anti-Marxist views about the hegemony of the working class and preached the leading role of the peasantry in the revolution. And even today Mao makes the so-called third world «the centre and the leading force of the revolution», thus denying the leading role of the international proletariat. Mao's anti-Marxist views, which are reflected in this «decalogue» and were crystallized in the heat of the Chinese liberation war, not only do not advocate waging the class struggle, but openly advocate quelling it.

* V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 18, p. 653, Alb. ed.

Hence, these anti-revolutionary, reactionary theses of Mao's are fixed in the «decalogue» of 1956. Such flagrant anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist theses do not appear in the four volumes of his published works. As it turns out, Mao Zedong was an eclectic, a disguised revisionist who tore off his disguise when he came to agreement with the Khrushchevite revisionists to attack Stalin and to dethrone Leninism. Under the disguise of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Zedong unfurled his pseudo-Marxist theory and «from now on this theory was to lead the world proletariat and the revolution». Herein lies the source of «Mao Zedong thought», of its fraud, megalomania and of its denigration of Marxism-Leninism.

«Mao Zedong thought» also led the «Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution» in order to counter the Great October Socialist Revolution which, together with the theory of Marx and Lenin, in other words, had been «superse- ded», «outdated» for Mao. The times have changed, thus, according to him, «a new theory was needed to replace Marxism», and this was «Mao Zedong thought». This is the theory of modern revisionism which, like the Khrushchevite theory, retains its Leninist disguise. These two variants of modern revisionism are a single, inseparable whole, but the problem is which will dominate, the revisionist variant of Khrushchev or that of Mao, irrespective that both of them end up in the same road, that of anti-Marxism. The question of which great state will manage to dominate the other, which will make the law, is based on this rivalry.

On this course, both of them have taken the denigra- tion of Stalin's work of genius as their cue. The Khrushchevites slandered Stalin to the limit, while Mao profited from this denigration which was carried out against Stalin and used those facts which he needed to conceal his revisionist line, to extol this to the skies as Marxist-

Leninist, and to disguise himself better and gain ground over the Khrushchevites. **Mao said that 30 per cent of Stalin's work was wrong and 70 per cent was good. The great master of the scales! He weighs the work of Stalin with the same precision as tomatoes in the field are weighed!!**

The first point of the «declogue» of Mao Zedong presents the anti-Marxist thesis of giving priority to light industry and agriculture, and not to heavy industry. Mao Zedong backs up this Kosyginite-revisionist deviation with the argument that the investments in heavy industry are large and unprofitable, while the confectionary and rubber shoe industry brings in income and is more profitable. As for agriculture, it produces the people's food.

Mao's anti-Marxist thesis does not carry forward, but restricts the development of the productive forces. Agriculture and light industry cannot be developed at the necessary rates if the mining industry is not developed, if steel is not produced, if oil, tractors, trains, automobiles, ships, are not produced, if the chemical industry is not built up, etc., etc.

The development of industry, according to Mao, is an artisan process. Light industry, which Mao claims should develop, cannot be build up with bricks, bicycles, textiles, thermos flasks and fans alone. True, they can bring in income, but for the people to buy such things they must have buying power. In 1956, China, as a country with a big population, was backward economically, and many kinds of consumer goods had to be sold below cost price. At that time productivity was not great.

In this «declogue» Mao criticizes Stalin and the economic situation in the Soviet Union. But «the light cannot be hidden under a bushel». Reality shows that in the Soviet Union, during the 24-25 years from the revolu-

tion to the Second World War, under the leadership of Lenin and then of Stalin, thanks to a correct political line, heavy industry was built up to such a level that it not only gave an impulse to the internal economy of this first socialist country, but enabled it to resist the attack of the terrible juggernaut of Hitlerite German. Meanwhile, from 1949 down to the present day, nearly 30 years have passed with Mao's economic policy, and where is China with its industrial potential? Very backward! And allegedly «The Four» are to blame for this! No, it is not «The Four» that are to blame, but Mao's line, as is proved in the presentation of his views in the «decalogue».

But how could great socialist China get along without heavy industry? Of course, Mao thought that he would be helped by the Soviet Union in the construction of heavy industry, or he would turn to American credits. When he saw that the Soviet Union was not «obeying» him and did not give him the aid he sought, Mao began to cast steel with furnaces which were built on the footpaths of boulevards, or with mini-furnaces for iron. China remained backward, China remained without modern technology. It is true that the Chinese people did not go hungry as before, but to go so far as to claim, as Mao did, that the Chinese peasant in 1956, at a time when he was truly backward, was better off than the Soviet collective farmer, means to denigrate the collectivization of agriculture and the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union in the time of Lenin and Stalin.

Mao says scornfully: «What sense is there in talking about the development of heavy industry? The workers must be guaranteed the means of livelihood.» In other words, this is the «goulash theory» of Khrushchev. And as a conclusion, Mao says in his «decalogue» that they have not made mistakes like the Soviet Union, or to put it more bluntly (though he dared not say so openly), like

Lenin and Stalin allegedly made. However, to cover up his deviation, he does not fail to say that «they must develop heavy industry, but must devote more attention to agriculture and light industry». This view of his, which was applied in a pragmatic way and which has left China backward, has brought about that it will take decades until the year 2000 for China to overcome its backwardness to some extent... with the aid of American credits and capital which the new strategy is securing. There is no doubt that China could rely on its own strength; it has colossal manpower and also considerable economic power, but has remained backward because of its mistaken line.

The question is raised in the second point of the «decalogue» of where industry should be built, on the coast or in the interior. Mao says that «about 70 per cent of all our industry, both light and heavy, is to be found in the coastal regions and only 30 per cent in the interior. This irrational situation is a product of history.» It is self-evident that this industry was built by foreigners who had concessions there, drew the raw material from the interior of China and found slave workers on the coast. Mao gives importance to this method of development. He stresses that even in the future, industry should continue to be built in the coastal regions and to this end makes a fantastic reckoning that with the income from one light industry factory, «we (the Chinese) could earn enough in four years to build three new factories or two, or one, or at least half of one». This is like the theory of the revisionist Koço Tashko, who said at the 1st Conference of the Party at Labinot, that «we must carry out the revolution with much bloodshed, with little bloodshed, or possibly without bloodshed at all».

Regarding this question Mao draws the conclusion: «We must build industry in the interior also, so that we have it in time of war.»

But where will the war come from? From the United States of America, Japan, or the Soviet Union? Apparently, he is thinking, at the same time, that war will not come from any side, least of all from the sea, since Mao recommends that factories should be built on the coast.

It seems Mao is not thinking of the way they must depopulate the South and the Southeast to some extent in order to populate the North and the West.

In point three of the «decalogue» Mao Zedong defines the relationship between economic construction and construction for defence. When he says that they must reduce the expenditure for defence, it is quite apparent that he is basing himself on wrong definitions. According to Mao, the Chinese defence is allegedly more powerful than that of the Soviet Union before the Second World War.

Khrushchev publicized the allegation that Stalin had left the Soviet Union defenceless facing the Hitlerites. Mao, too, adopts this slander, while boasting that with those aircraft and those guns which he had (and with the atomic bomb which Khrushchev was to give him) the defence of China was secure.

The facts show that China remained backward. This was the result of the underrating of heavy industry and reliance on others to strengthen the defence capacity with a wrong military strategy. Now China has begun to change its mind about its defence, but together with this it has also changed its alliances. It has achieved rap-prochement with the Americans and has bought modern military equipment from them.

In the same point of the «decalogue» Mao expresses clearly that he is for light armament, for paying the Chinese soldiers (as a mercenary army) and for reducing the administration, but in this direction nothing has been done. On the contrary, the administration has been transformed into a malignant growth for China. We noticed

this when we were in China in 1956, and they themselves told us that all Chiang Kaishek's former officers were being kept on as paid officials.

Point four of the «decatalogue» speaks about relations between the state, the units of production, and producers. Naturally, we have never learned what this organization and this organizational division of China is and neither do we know what the relations are between the state, the units of production and the producers. China could and must have its own special features because it has a large, territory with many nationalities, and is not divided into republics, but provinces. We have been aware that there is democratic centralism there, but we could never have imagined that the provinces would not have authority in their own internal divisions and the factories would not be economically self-supporting. Mao tells us that in the Soviet Union (the time of Stalin is implied) there was great, bureaucratic centralism, and according to him, the hands of the Soviet republics were tied. How true this, is we do not know, but there is at least as much, if not more, bureaucracy and centralism in China today as there was in the Soviet Union. But China is on the line of the denigration of the Soviet Union of the time of Stalin, and acting like Khrushchev. Mao desires to show himself as more of a «Marxist-Leninist» organizer, but with these things he is doing, is he not proceeding on the road of Titoite «self-administration»?

At this same point Mao likens the army to the state, i.e., he calls the state weapon of the state and puts it above the party. In fact, in the old China and in this new one, the army has played a decisive role. It has supported one faction and liquidated the other.

Mao banalizes democratic centralism and economic independence from the centre with a ridiculous and simplistic example which makes one wonder how this «great

theoretician» explains such an important political, ideological and economic organizational problem of socialism in such a casual way?!

When he speaks about the peasantry, and Mao is speaking in 1956, only a few years after liberation, **he stresses that the system of collective farms and state farms in the Soviet Union is a failure, that the peasants there are crushed by taxes, that their products are bought at low prices, and other evils, whereas he all but says that in China the peasantry is living in plenty and content,** that production is ample, that prices are low, that the state accumulation is small. An astonishing analysis! We have personal knowledge of the situations both in the Soviet Union and in China, because we were in both countries in those years, therefore we know that what Mao says is not real.

At this point of the «decalogue», Mao's analysis about the relations of the state with agriculture, the communes and their members, about the division of their incomes, about the problem of investments, about the question of accumulation, and the standards of living of the peasant communes and of the city is not at all Marxist-Leninist, is not a clear and objective reflection of the situation, but merely a demonstration of the false «superiority» of Chinese agriculture over Soviet agriculture. Khrushchev came out as a «theoretician of agriculture» who was going to pull it out of «the mess that Stalin had got it into». Mao, too, is imitating this kulak and double-dealer.

Mao closes this very important problem with words intended to show that everything is going well in China; he puts heavy industry in third place, integrates bourgeois factory-owners into socialism; he preaches the same thing about the kulaks in the countryside, and so everything is to be put in order according to his Maoist theory, which is allegedly completely correct and infallible! In

reality, these ideas of Mao's are in opposition to those of Lenin and Stalin.

The megalomania of this revisionist «classic» and his denigration of the work of Lenin and Stalin could not be put more clearly.

In point five of the «decalogue», where he speaks about the relations between the centre and the base, Mao Zedong defines what these relations should be. Naturally this depends on what competences the centre has given to the base in China. All this is connected with the vast extent of the territory of this country. Here Mao Zedong puts forward that the example of the Soviet Union should not be followed in the concentration of all matters in the hands of the central organs while repressing the initiative of local organs, but that efforts must be made so that the local organs run things independently. With this Mao implies that the federal republics in the Soviet Union had no authority. This is a bluff, a lie, because as we know, the Soviet republics had their own plans of economic development, industrial plans, agricultural plans, etc., closely linked, of course, with the centre. Hence, to say that the republics of the Soviet Union, which are like the provinces in China, did not have their own authority, means to denigrate the socialism which was built there in the time of Stalin, means to try to show that the organization, management, ideology and policy of China are superior to those of the Soviet Union, that the Leninist practice of the economic construction of socialism in the Soviet Union is not correct, according to Mao, because Stalin allegedly distorted this Leninist practice! However, we know that Stalin faithfully implemented the economic, organizational and ideological policy of Lenin. This does not exclude the possibility that mistakes may have been made there during all that colossal work. Mao Zedong himself says that mistakes have been made in China, too,

but when he speaks about the Soviet Union, he greatly inflates these mistakes, indeed he enlarges them to such an extent that it is quite obvious he aims to denigrate the correct system of socialist construction in the time of Stalin.

It is absurd to claim that there was no initiative from the local organs in the time of Stalin. **Can it be that with this claim Mao Zedong wants to minimize and weaken the role of democratic centralism and justify the course of Titoite «self-administration»?** We do not forget Mao Zedong's high opinion of Tito. When he claims that Stalin was wrong in the question of Tito, this means that Mao Zedong must have approved the «self-administration» methods in the Yugoslav economy, that is, the methods of the Titoite revisionist «self-administration». Mao wants to implement this «self-administration» gradually in China. He does not fail to speak about the specific, either. It is interesting that the Chinese say that they want to build a specific socialism. On this question, they are at one with Tito, who has long been prattling about the construction of «specific socialism». This is not just a matter of the term which the Chinese use, but a matter of the content and the introduction of the experience a la Tito into that country.

In point six Mao speaks about the relations between the Han nationality and the minority nationalities which live in China. Say what you like in theory about the equality between nations, but in fact, the Han nationality rules in China. In relations between nationalities the Han people have held and maintain superiority, they dominate the other nationalities and order them about, regardless of the stale demagogic formulas which are used. In the time of Stalin, the state of relations between the Russian nationality and the national minorities was not as Mao claims. There were mistakes, but not in the way he says.

In China, democracy and equality between nationalities do not exist. As in earlier times, a military dictatorship exists there. That faction of that nationality which had the army with it imposed its will on the masses of the people and the party. **Hence, the army is at the head of the party and also at the head of the state there.**

In point seven, in connection with relations between party members and non-party people, Mao Zedong is completely on the opportunist, revisionist line. He does not put the communist party at the head, in the leadership. He implies that it is in the leadership, but demands and affirms that power must be shared with the bourgeois parties. Hence, Mao is for pluralism of parties in the leadership of the proletarian state. He considers it essential that these various parties must exist for many reasons: because of the criticisms which they can make of the Communist Party of China, because much can be learned from them, in order to uncover everything which is organized and done under the lap, etc. **He considers the existence of these parties a determining factor, or to put it better, a factor essential for the construction of socialism in China.**

With this Mao is in contradiction with Lenin who, of course, did not allow other parties, apart from the Bolshevik Party, to run the Soviet state. Hence, to accept the system of many parties in the leadership means to be guided by anti-Marxist ideological views. In this chapter, Mao tries to reduce these parties to a few people, to a few leaders who «make some criticism or approve the decisions of the Communist Party of China». This is not a matter of certain progressive democratic individuals, whom the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and our Party and all the other parties admitted to the Front, whom they have kept close and have consulted when necessary, **but Mao Zedong legalizes the existence of bour-**

geois parties in the leadership of the proletarian state. With this thesis of his he explains, allegedly, that «the democratic parties are the product of history» and that «everything that emerges in history is eliminated in history». It is clear to Marxist-Leninists that every party represents the interests of certain given classes or strata, therefore, what does it mean if you preserve the parties which represent the interests of the bourgeoisie in socialism? It means to fail to wage the class struggle, to fail to fight for the hegemonic role of the proletariat and its party.

According to Mao, these so-called democratic parties, including the Kuomintang, will disappear just as the communist party will disappear. «We will be very happy with the elimination of the communist party and the dictatorship of the proletariat,» he says.

Mao does not fail to say that at present they cannot do without the dictatorship of the proletariat and the party of the proletariat. He stresses this and says that the party must become powerful, indeed he cites Lenin on this, but only after he has spread his poison. Lenin said that we cannot do without the party of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the proletariat, and he explained the purpose of this dictatorship. In 1920 Lenin said:

*«Whoever brings about even the slightest weakening of the iron discipline of the party of the proletariat (especially during its dictatorship), is actually aiding the bourgeoisie against the proletariat.»**

Likewise Stalin says:

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 31, p. 33, Alb. ed.

*«It would be enough to shake the Party, to weaken it, for the dictatorship of the proletariat to be shaken and weakened in an instant.»**

In point eight in which he speaks about the relationship between the revolution and the counter-revolution, Mao Zedong says that the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary to suppress the counter-revolution and the counter-revolutionaries, but unfortunately he pampers the counterrevolutionaries. **«At first we killed some counter-revolutionaries,» he admits, «but we should not kill any more, should not imprison them, should not put them on trial, but should convince them, send them to the countryside where they will be reformed through labour,» etc., etc. «We can keep the law on capital punishment in force,» says Mao, «but should not apply it in practice!»** What is this? This is not class struggle. Such a stand does not wipe out the counter-revolution, does not eliminate the exploiting classes.

In this connection, amongst other things, Lenin teaches us that we must move

*«... right down to the wholesale deportation or internment of the most dangerous and stubborn exploiters and the institution of strict surveillance over them, so as to foil their inevitable attempts to resist and to restore capitalist slavery — only such measures can ensure real submission of the whole class of exploiters.»***

Many things must have been cut out from the theses of Mao's «decatalogue», because some months after the 8th Congress of the Communist Party of China, it was stated

* J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 7, p. 347. Alb. ed.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 31, p. 201, Alb. ed.

explicitly that the owners of factories should receive rent and be vice-directors of their factories, and this view is apparent throughout this thesis of Mao Zedong. He keeps the capitalist reactionaries in the management of factories which have been their property, gives them income from these factories which have been nationalized, but which are considered partly theirs, and forgets that these factories have been built and extended by exploiting the blood and sweat of workers. Can this be called class struggle? No, this is not class struggle at all. **According to Mao Zedong, these former owners must be integrated into society, become part of society, be educated in society.** (That means they must be integrated into socialism. Many bourgeois and revisionist «theoreticians» as well as the Titoites and the «Eurocommunists», etc., are now talking a lot about the integration of capitalism into socialism, etc.) «This will be a very good thing,» claims Mao, «for many reasons, one of which is that we (the Chinese) will provide a good example for other countries in the world in this way.» (A «fine» example of how the enemies of the people are not combated!)

Lenin thought completely differently. He says:

*«And the fight against this element cannot be waged solely with the aid of propaganda and agitation, solely by organizing competition and by selecting the organizers. This struggle must also be waged by means of coercion.»**

And again on this problem Lenin points out:

«... the very idea of the capitalists peacefully submitting to the will of the majority of the exploi-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 27, p. 295, Alb. ed.

*ted, the very idea of a peaceful, reformist transition to socialism, is not merely sheer philistine stupidity but also downright deception of the workers.»**

Another view of Mao's is that if we eliminate the capitalists, according to him, we shall also lose a source of information and thus will not know what is going on in their ranks. What «brilliant» conclusions in order to extinguish the class struggle! This was the sort of «class struggle» Zhou Enlai tried to persuade us to carry out when he accused us of not waging the class struggle! His aim was to see how far we were going in this struggle, whether we were on the line of Mao Zedong of extinguishing the class struggle, or on the Leninist and Stalinist road of waging this struggle sternly.

In the Communist Party of China Mao has cultivated his own cult and has not applied the great teachings of Marxism-Leninism, the class struggle, iron proletarian discipline, or the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Communist Party of China has been built up and imbued with liberal, reformist norms and two or more lines. Hence, for Mao and the Communist Party of China the basic theses of Marxism-Leninism are fictitious.

People like Mao Zedong accuse Stalin of having allegedly made mistakes in connection with the class struggle, while they themselves claim that in socialism the class struggle becomes gradually weaker. Indeed, Mao Zedong says quite openly that we should not wage the class struggle, should not execute the criminals, should not shoot the dangerous enemies, or put anyone in prison. However, this was never Stalin's way. In practice, he carried the struggle against the enemies of the people

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 31, p. 201, Alb. ed.

through to the end, sternly and with determination. Mao Zedong provides five or six excuses to exonerate the counter-revolution, to defend it and, in this way, tries to «prove» that his course is allegedly correct and Marxist-Leninist.

Mao claims he wants to eliminate violence, capital punishment, the law courts and the procuratorial organs, to avoid punishing counter-revolutionaries. He advocates only education and propaganda. Where is the class struggle on Mao's part in all this? Where does the dictatorship of the proletariat exist in his views and practice?

In point nine Mao speaks of the relations between right and wrong. What is his aim in speaking about these relations? In doing this Mao tries to attack Stalin. He says that «Stalin shot people for the most trifling mistake». This is a slander. Stalin did not shoot people for making mistakes. On the contrary, he struggled to correct those who made mistakes and there are documents which show this is true. Stalin directed that evil-doers should be put in prison or concentration camps, and that counter-revolutionaries, traitors, spies, and the other enemies of the people should be shot for especially dangerous crimes. If he had not done this, socialism could not have been built in the Soviet Union, and Stalin would not have been on the Leninist road. Mao Zedong is opposed to this line. He generalizes the issue and treats both those who have committed not very dangerous crimes, who certainly should not be shot, and counter-revolutionaries, in the same way. Who says that we should shoot those who have not committed grave crimes? Nobody. On the contrary, we are for correcting such people, and this is what we have done.

The tenth and final point of the «declogue» treats relations between China and other countries. These relations, as he explains them and raises them to theses, are

opportunist, revisionist relations. Their purpose is to avoid applying a correct revolutionary line in China in aid of the world proletariat and the world revolution, in aid of the Marxist-Leninist communist parties, so that they are prevented from fighting successfully against the bourgeoisie, capitalism and modern revisionism. In fact, Mao is a modern revisionist just like the Soviet, Titoite and other revisionists.

In connection with the foreign policy of China, the famous theses of Mao Zedong say: «Our policy is to learn from the strong points of all nations and all countries, learn all that is good in the political, economic, scientific and technological fields and in literature and art.» This is his whole policy. In order to do this, according to Mao Zedong, peaceful coexistence (revisionist) must be established with all the states of the world. For Mao there is no distinction between these states. Later, ignoring the socio-economic order which exists in one or the other country, Mao Zedong divided the world in three and is for the strategy of «three worlds.» He is not against any «world». He does not make any distinction even in the «first world» in which Mao puts imperialist America and the social-imperialist Soviet Union. Now he is pro American imperialism, tomorrow he might be against it; today he is against Soviet social-imperialism, tomorrow he might be for it. Hence, he shifts according to circumstances, as the revisionist interests of the Chinese state require and does not act on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist principles, does not think that the imperialist powers must be combated and the peoples' national liberation struggle supported.

With this line Mao Zedong cannot defend the peoples' national liberation struggle. Let him indulge in demagoguery and declare that «we, the Chinese, are with the peoples of the third world», but these are mere words. Since he

enunciates the tactic I mentioned above, since he is with American imperialism with which he does not want to fall out, because he must «learn» from it and get credits from it, either openly or secretly, Mao Zedong cannot be with the peoples of the so-called third world, who are fighting against American imperialism, cannot help them to escape from the yoke of American imperialism. Through demagoguery he tries to appear as a defender of states which are under the influence of Soviet social-imperialism, but he does this so that they come under the influence either of China or of the United States of America.

Pursuing an anti-Marxist strategy, Mao allowed Nixon to go to China without that state being officially recognized by the USA; likewise, to facilitate the visit of the American president, he agreed to remove the barrier of the question of Taiwan, which had been raised like a steel wall to any country which wanted to establish diplomatic relations with China. Since that time no more has been said about Taiwan. With this he is telling the United States of America that it can stay in Taiwan, in Japan, in Okinawa, Burma and elsewhere, and China and the present Chinese revisionist leaders have based the whole of their foreign policy and defence on this strategy of Mao's. Of course, the Chinese leadership must have agreed that the Americans could stay in South Vietnam, too. and the war cease, that the Vietnamese should establish friendship with the Americans. This must have been why the opposition arose between the Chinese and the Vietnamese, who, at one time, declared openly, «We (the Vietnamese) do not allow any other state to meddle in our internal affairs...»

Mao Zedong accuses Stalin of left adventurism, of having exerted great pressure on China and the Communist Party of China. Stalin must have had no faith in the leadership of the Communist Party of China. **When**

China was liberated, Stalin expressed his doubt that the Chinese leadership might follow the Titoite course. Glancing over all the main principles of Mao Zedong's revisionist line, in regard to all those things which he raises against Stalin, we can say without reservation that Stalin was truly a great Marxist-Leninist who foresaw correctly where China was going, who long ago realized what the views of Mao Zedong were, and saw that, in many directions, they were Titoite revisionist views, both on international policy and on internal policy, on the class struggle, on the dictatorship of the proletariat, on peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems, etc.

By printing this «decatalogue», Hua Guofeng and company want to legalize their revisionist line, to legalize their counter-revolutionary activity, to legalize the stopping of the Cultural Revolution, because they think that this will make things easier for them, although, as I have written earlier, the Cultural Revolution in China was not on a revolutionary basis, but on an opportunist basis. It was a struggle of one opportunist group, headed by Mao Zedong, against another opportunist group, headed by Liu Shaoqi, Zhou Enlai, Deng Xiaoping, Peng Chen, etc., which had usurped power. Mao Zedong had been endangered by the opposing group, which would have tossed him into the rubbish basket of history as he tossed Liu Shaoqi. Mao knew how to take advantage of the cult about him, which had been built up sky-high, although he accused others as boasters over the question of cult. According to Mao, these boasters are Stalin and his associates. Hence, Mao took advantage of the unrestrained cult around his person, which had been fostered during his whole lifetime, aroused the army, relied on it and the school youth, and launched the so-called Cultural Revolution. But he prevented this revolution from being carried

through to the end, because it was endangering all the opportunist cadres of the group of Liu Shaoqi and Zhou Enlai, was endangering even Mao Zedong himself. And after a time, he turned the helm in another direction, supported the rightists and gave power to Zhou Enlai who elaborated his plans and put them into operation.

During this period, new elements who emerged in the process of the Cultural Revolution, especially «The Four» who are now called «traitors» by Hua Guofeng, saw this terrible abyss for which China was heading, and with their own methods, in their own way, which it seems were not well-studied and mature, and perhaps even not completely correct, but were at least more or less revolutionary, tried to set a limit to this hostile activity which was leading China to social-imperialism. On the death of Mao the rightists managed to take power. Immediately, with one blow, as they say, they struck the leftist elements and suppressed the revolution. Hence, the counter-revolutionaries who had been brought into the state and the party by Mao Zedong and his followers, suppressed the revolution in China.

THE JUST CAUSE OF THE ARAB PEOPLES IS INVINCIBLE(1)

Article published in the newspaper «Zëri i popullit»

November 24, 1977

In recent days the problems of the Middle East have become an object of great interest for all international public opinion. The reason for this is the visit which the Egyptian president, Sadat, paid to Jerusalem and the talks which he held with Israeli prime minister, Begin. (2)

Words about «peace» there are in plenty, but the real and just solution of the problems of the Middle East is not apparent on the horizon. Israel, that armed instrument of the political, economic and military interests of the American imperialists in the Middle East, is still keeping the Arab territories occupied, the Palestinians are still left without their homeland and the superpowers are still intriguing and interfering in the internal affairs of the peoples of that zone.

Time after time, the enemies of the Arab peoples bring out with great publicity all sorts of plans and

1 The political events and problems of the Middle East have been extensively treated in Comrade Enver Hoxha's book, *Reflections on the Middle East*, published in Albanian and some foreign languages in 1984.

2 In November 1977.

projects allegedly to solve the problems which are concerning the Middle East and to put an end to the Arab-Israeli conflict which has been going on for thirty years. A great deal of talk has been heard about these plans, Rogers or Kissinger plans, Gromyko or Vance plans, plans of sheiks and emissaries of UNO. But these plans have changed nothing and could not have done so. The aim of all of them has been to quell the liberation struggle of the Arab peoples, to compel them to relinquish their supreme national interests, to abandon the Palestinian people and leave them in the lurch, to capitulate to the blackmail of Israel and to submit completely and finally to foreign imperialist domination.

The Arab peoples are well aware who their enemies are, know that the aggressors must be unmasked, isolated and fought. They know that Israel is a savage, insatiable aggressor against the Arab peoples, against their freedom and independence. On several occasions it has shed the blood of the fraternal Arab peoples, has occupied their territories and has kept them under continual threat of further expansion. Every day Israel is attacking, maiming and killing an ancient and glorious people, such as the fraternal Palestinian people, whom the Zionists, with the urging and support of the American imperialists, have left without homes or homeland. In flagrant violation of all historical, international and human justice, the Palestinian people have been forcibly driven from their homes, from the territories on which they were born and have lived for centuries, where they developed their lofty civilization from which the whole of mankind has benefited. Now they have been dispersed and are living the miserable life of refugees, as guests in the homes of their Arab brothers. Despite their suffering and fragmentation, the Palestinian people have retained all their fighting spirit and lofty national consciousness. They have never

laid down their arms in the fight to gain their freedom, their rights and their homeland. The heroic liberation struggle which the Palestinian people have always been waging will remain throughout history as a great example of those small peoples whom no enemy, however mighty, can intimidate, who, when it comes to defending their freedom and rights, are ready to make any sacrifice, to endure any suffering and hardship, however protracted and stern the fight may be.

The Albanian people, who feel a close affinity with the Palestinian people and their struggle, nurture a sincere affection and great respect and admiration for this long-suffering, valiant people and have unwavering confidence in their final victory.

Numerous efforts have been and are being made from various directions to bring about agreement and compromise with Israel, neglecting and violating the vital interests of the Arab peoples, especially, the interests of the Palestinian and Syrian peoples. This is to be condemned and cannot be accepted either by the Arab peoples and their true friends, or by anybody to whom the freedom and independence of the peoples is dear. Our people, as close and loyal friends of the Arab peoples, consider these attempts to reach agreement as activity aimed against the interests of the Arabs, as pro-imperialist and further incitement to Israeli aggression.

All progressive and patriotic Arab opinion, from the Palestinians, the Syrians, the Algerians, the Iraqis and the Libyans to the Egyptians, has expressed open opposition to agreement and compromise with Israel. Likewise, all who are genuine fighters against American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, who are opposed to reaction and oppression, all who are for the freedom of peoples and support their liberation struggle, have criticized and firmly condemned the agreements with

Israel, have adopted a clear-cut stand against any compromise with it.

Contrary to this widespread healthy opinion, however, it is noticeable that at present the «non-aligned» forces are playing no role. They are keeping quiet and trying with difficulty to manoeuvre to get out of the difficult position in which the plan for agreement with Israel is putting them. What has happened to all those speeches and pledges about defending the rights of the Arab peoples and the Palestinians? What has happened to all those resolutions and decisions about the «just settlement» of the conflict in the Middle East, that opposition expressed from the tribunes of conferences to the imperialist interference in that zone?

This silence on the part of those unrestrained lovers of empty talk is not accidental. The things that have occurred, the concrete events, the development of the class struggle have brought to light the falsity of «theories» or «movements» which are intended to quell revolutionary and liberation struggles and to deceive the peoples. This falsity is being revealed by the imperialists themselves who, when it comes to defending their own interests, do not worry at all about the difficult positions in which they place their friends. What can the theoreticians and supporters of the «non-aligned» movement say when the standard-bearers of «non-alignment» openly show themselves to be committed to and dependent on imperialism, that they are playing the imperialists' game, that the policy they pursue is independent formally, but in reality is dictated by others and defends interests alien to the Arab peoples?

The «non-aligned» movement may still continue to exist in conferences, meetings and propaganda, but it has been dead since the time when, in the Middle East and the Ogaden desert, in Angola and Zaire, it proved in-

capable of hiding the fact that many governments of countries which pose as non-aligned are linked with this or that big capitalist or imperialist power, that on many occasions they play the game of imperialism and defend its neo-colonialist and expansionist interests. Now it is incapable of covering up and justifying the interference, intrigues and manoeuvres of the imperialist superpowers in many «non-aligned» countries with empty words, or concealing and justifying the pro-imperialist actions of many heads of these countries against liberation struggles.

In connection with the agreement and compromise with Israel there is no apparent activity of the so-called «third world», either. We do not see the supporters of the «theory of three worlds», who shout so loudly and try to prove with quotations that they unreservedly support the liberation struggles and defend the interests of peoples of the world, defending the just cause of the Arab peoples or coming out in their support. Why is this? Can it be that the interests and territories of the Arabs, the future and 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 peoples and ordinary folk are quite unable to understand?

The very embarrassing position of the supporters of the «theory of three worlds» for whom the agreement and compromise with Israel has torn to shreds the scheme which links their «worlds», is understandable. The question is simple: in whose favour is this agreement? In favour of the «first world», the «second» or the «third»? Does it serve the liberation of peoples or national oppression, the anti-imperialist struggle or the quelling of this struggle? Their silence shows that this agreement cannot be used for their propaganda purposes, that in this case their

slogans and «theories» are quite unable to alter the nature of the fact.

Can the policy of the American imperialists which defends and supports their most aggressive satellite, Israel, be considered a non-aggressive policy, a retreat? At the present time aggressive war is being prepared step by step, through minor wars, by inciting separate aggressions and kindling local conflicts. If the American imperialists proclaim that they are allegedly for the «status quo» this does not mean they have given up their aggressive and expansionist aims, but that the status quo serves their hegemonic aims to the detriment of the Arab peoples and in favour of the imperialist interests of the United States and its ally, Israel.

We are against and condemn Carter's efforts to conceal his aggressive policy. Likewise, we are against the presentation of the American policy of the «status quo» not as aggressive, but as a defensive policy. The teeth of American imperialism have not yet fallen out nor have its claws been clipped. To defend the policy of the «status quo» means to defend imperialist occupations, to defend the division of the world between great powers, to defend neo-colonialism and the exploitation of oppressed peoples by imperialism and all the other capitalist powers. To defend the «status quo» means to give your blessing to the occupation of the Arab territories by the Israelis and the violent expulsion of Palestinians from their homes, means to defend the military bases in foreign countries, the aggressive blocs of imperialism, the multinational monopoly companies and the whole imperialist system of oppression and exploitation.

The Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian people scornfully reject all the imperialist calculations. Our people have always been and are with the just cause of the Arab peoples and will be beside them in any

situation, good or bad, in joys and victories, in grief and in temporary defeats. The Albanians are a small people, but for the peoples who are fighting for freedom and justice, such as the Arab peoples and the peoples of Africa, they are unwavering loyal brothers.

The daily facts of international life show clearly that the general policy which the imperialist superpowers pursue has been constructed in conformity with their own selfish interests, each proceeding from the aim of establishing its hegemony more firmly and quickly over the peoples of all continents. Each of the imperialist superpowers, both when it has planted its claws deep in the flesh of the victim and when it has just taken the first steps in its expansion, struggles to impose its policy on other countries and groups of countries.

The Soviet social-imperialists are striving with all their might to deceive the leaders of various countries of Africa by hiding behind the mask of «a socialist country» and presenting themselves as champions of freedom. They sell these countries armaments and in return gain the right to establish military bases for their own interests of domination and to further extend their imperialist expansion.

At the same time, another imperialist power, the United States of America, is maneuvering through its agents, by means of credits, weapons and dollars, and leaving no stone unturned to trip up the Soviet social-imperialists. There is no limit to the contest of superpowers for domination and hegemony, it recognizes no rules or morality, deception and perfidy go hand in hand with crime and violence.

The peoples, the various countries which become objects of the savage Soviet-American rivalry, fall victim to these dangerous games of superpowers. Now we see that Ethiopia and Somalia whose freedom-loving and

peace-loving peoples, both with ancient cultures, and who have suffered every kind of horror at the hands of the Italian colonialist occupiers, have gone to war with and are killing one another. Do these peoples want this war which causes them so much suffering and misery? Not at all. Could they settle the disagreements which exist between them without the need to fight against and slaughter one another? Of course, they have possibilities to settle these disagreements by finding the most suitable ways. Then, why are they fighting? It is clear that others, the imperialist powers and superpowers, have driven these peoples to war for their own hegemonic and predatory interests.

Meanwhile, as the blood of these unhappy peoples is being shed in torrents and the hatred between them mounts, there are imperialist and capitalist powers which sometimes take one side, sometimes the other, sometimes applaud one country, sometimes the other, without making the slightest gesture to help these long-suffering peoples gain peace and the possibility to build their own lives in complete freedom and independence.

The policy of the Party of Labour of Albania has always been in support of the national liberation struggle of the peoples, in defence of their interests. It has always been open and principled. As was pointed out at the 7th Congress of the PLA, our Party thinks that we should speak openly to the peoples about the situation because this is the only way to assist their true unity, the unity of truly anti-imperialist and progressive states and governments. In order to unite the peoples in the struggle for freedom, independence and social progress, against every kind of oppression and exploitation by anyone, first of all, the demarcation line must be laid down, it must be made clear who their main enemy is, against whom they must fight and with whom they should unite.

The peoples must guard against the intrigues of the imperialist superpowers, who come out as friends and benefactors, but whose true aim is to dominate and lay the basis for the establishment of their hegemony. This is occurring in Angola, in Zaire and elsewhere. This has been going on for a long time in the Middle East, too, with the drama which is being played with the fate of the Arab peoples, in which the imperialist superpowers are pulling all the strings, alternating with one another, in order to fulfil their expansionist exploiting ambitions.

The history of liberation and revolutionary struggles and the practice of day-to-day international life teaches us that the enemies must not be left in peace so that they have time to come to agreement, to group their forces, and organize themselves in the struggle against the peoples. We are fully confident that all those who are oppressed and suffering at the hands of the imperialists and reaction, all those who want the freedom and independence of their countries, will mobilize themselves still more in order to expose the plans and aims of the imperialist superpowers to strangle the revolution and enslave the peoples, and will further enhance their revolutionary struggle to resist and conquer the enemies.

From the newspaper «Zëri i popullit»,
November 24, 1977

WHEN THE PRESENT STANDS ON STEEL FOUNDATIONS THE FUTURE IS SECURE

*From the speech delivered to the cadres of the district
of Gjirokastra*

March 18, 1978

Dear comrades,

We communists and cadres must think all the time, every year, every month, every day, and every hour, about the happy future of our people, about the continuous strengthening of our socialist society, about the consolidation of the victories we have achieved and will achieve under the leadership of our Marxist-Leninist Party. We must never do anything without weighing it up well and considering it from this stand-point. The future is built on the basis of the present. If the present is built correctly, if it stands on sound, steel foundations, that is, if the walls and battlements of this fortress are solidly built, the future is secure. Otherwise, what has been created may be damaged. We must never allow the things we have gained to be damaged. Therefore, every idea, every action, must be carefully weighed up, analysed and applied well. Properly combined with each other, thought and action must bring the material, political, ideological and moral fruits envisaged. Otherwise, our people, who have fought and are fighting for the happy present and

for the even more prosperous and secure future, cannot be assured of the continuation of the construction and strengthening of socialism.

We must always draw correct conclusions from history and from events in the world, find out the causes of those events which constitute the history of a people, or human history. We must examine these events from the stand-point of dialectical and historical materialism and from this stand-point alone. In this way we serve the interests of the working class, its dictatorship and the construction of socialism in our country.

The events which occur in the world and inside the country, whether political, ideological, economic or military, simple or complicated, must not be simply watched like a newsreel film which passes before our eyes. We must delve into them and examine the reasons for them and their consequences, must know what influence, for good or evil, they could have in the world and within our country so that we benefit from the events, draw the necessary deductions and arm the Party and the people with sharp weapons to fight against the shortcomings and difficulties which arise for us and to consolidate the victories achieved.

The peoples throughout the world are advancing towards the revolution

We see that the world is in movement. **The peoples throughout the world are advancing towards the revolution**, towards economic, political and military liberation from the yoke of the neo-colonialists and imperialists of every hue, whether capitalist imperialists or revisionist imperialists, in the West or in the East, in Central Europe, Central Asia or in the Far East.

The revolution is advancing all the time and the peoples, the proletariat, are fighting against capitalism and all the political-ideological trends which are trying to enslave the minds of the broad masses of working people. These political-ideological trends have been organized into various parties of the bourgeoisie and revisionism and are fighting jointly, in different ways, with various slogans and various plans, to hinder the revolution. Of course, it is impossible for them to stop the revolution, but they cause damage and difficulties for it, sometimes drown it in blood and from time to time, in certain countries, drive it up a blind alley or compel it to take a zigzag course.

All these actions of world capital in struggle against the proletariat and the peoples who aspire to freedom, democracy, sovereignty and socialism cause disturbances and changes in various countries.

These changes result from the class struggle, from the stern opposition between oppressors and oppressed, from the inevitable and undying contradictions between capital and the proletariat. These contradictions build up to ever more acute levels and the time comes when their development turns from quantity into quality. In the final analysis, their qualitative explosion is the revolution. In order to escape the revolution and socialism, to prevent the working class from becoming the leading class, seizing power, and crushing and destroying the capitalist jungle, the capitalists, revisionists and their hangers-on adapt themselves to the situations and the moments. Faced with this typhoon, this mighty storm which is brewing in their lair, they are obliged to create and adopt forms of government disguised even with leftist formulas and slogans, although in reality they are rightist. For their part, they do everything to keep the power of the capitalist bourgeoisie, the power of capital, in existence, to

safeguard the profits which the bourgeoisie has gained from the toil and bloodshed of the peoples.

Therefore we must follow all these changes which we see every day on all continents with the greatest care and thoroughly study the reasons for them, the methods and ways which the capitalist bourgeoisie employs to conceal its aims of prolonging its existence and domination.

Let us look at the facts of what is going on both in the revisionist countries and in the capitalist countries.

Many revisionist countries, before they became such, were socialist countries. Starting from the Soviet Union and the European countries of people's democracy the regimes changed: right opportunist, putschist, anarchist, Trotskyite, revisionist reaction overthrew the socialist state and destroyed the dictatorship of the proletariat. The new bourgeoisie, created in these countries gradually and in different forms, seized power and brought about the transformation from a socialist country to a capitalist-revisionist country and subsequently from a capitalist-revisionist country, like the Soviet Union, into a social-imperialist country.

Although this transformation which occurred in these erstwhile socialist countries inflicted extremely great damage on the revolution, it could not and never will be able to crush it. The revisionist ideology which serves the leading cliques of those countries strives in a thousand ways and a thousand forms to throw mud at and blacken the Marxist-Leninist science, but it is suffering defeat, just as the theories of social-democracy have always suffered defeat, because they are contrary to the theory of Marx, Engels and Lenin. The transformation which is being carried out in those former socialist countries is not permanent, but time will be needed for the revolution to triumph there again, to overcome revisionism and

social-imperialism and restore the dictatorship of the proletariat. Such a thing can be done only through struggle, through a long and bloody struggle in which two forces, which are in irreconcilable opposition, mortal enemies, will confront each other.

In those countries, on the one side stands the new revisionist bourgeoisie which controls the apparatus of oppression and the political apparatus which it has turned into weapons of the fascist dictatorship, while on the opposite side stands the proletariat, the working class which is exploited and oppressed. This situation exacerbates the existing contradictions, prepares the revolution which will build up, perhaps slowly and through many obstacles, but it will develop and this development, as I pointed out above, will turn from quantity into quality. So, the time will come when the revolt, the discontent of the people, will reach such a level that the new revisionist leadership, the new bourgeoisie, will be unable to govern through the new forms of oppression which it has created and will have no possibility to stem the overwhelming tide of the revolution.

At the moment, in those revisionist countries in which the temporary transformation from socialism to capitalism has taken place no revolutionary movement is apparent on the surface. Nevertheless, I believe that such a movement is forming deep underground, because it is impossible that the revolutionary elements, the resolute communist elements with the ideology of Marxism-Leninism, that fought and triumphed at the time of the revolution under the banner of the Marxist-Leninist party, have failed to leave any traces among the working class and the masses of the people of those countries. I believe that these traces exist deep underground and that these elements will gradually converge, cohere into a great force which will rise in struggle against that class which over-

threw the dictatorship of the proletariat in those countries. This cohesion and concentration cannot be seen at present because of the barbarous oppression which is exerted by the fascist dictatorship of the new revisionist-bourgeois class.

However, we must delve even more deeply into this question to discover all the reasons for it, the causes and the alien phenomena which had penetrated those countries and which, you might say, brought about the decay of the socialist regime. So we must discover the reasons which permitted the penetration of phenomena alien to socialism and prevented the taking of measures for the political-ideological and organizational strengthening of the work of the Party, for the construction of socialism and the development and progress of the socialist culture, so as to hinder this undermining activity by the weak capitalist element, which found breaches, found somewhat favourable soil and developed disguised in various ways and, while cheering for socialism and for the communist party, in reality was preparing the terrain for the overthrow of the socialist regime and the liquidation of the Marxist-Leninist communist party.

The Marxist-Leninist parties of the countries where the revisionists seized power and carried out the temporary capitalist transformation had many weaknesses which were not appreciated to the extent they should have been. Those parties did not study and analyse the problems in their full depth and extent, and consequently, did not come to correct conclusions in order to remedy a dangerous and difficult situation which was created for them.

In these parties there was any amount of talk and slogans, Marxist-Leninist norms existed, there were resolute revolutionary communists, and in these countries there was a sound working class and a leadership which

had emerged from the working masses. Likewise, there was talk of the finest proletarian democracy, talk about opposition to bureaucracy and arbitrary actions to the detriment of socialism, talk of wide-ranging political work of persuasion, explanation and mobilization, talk of opposition to routine and many many other evils left over from the old capitalist life, opposition to the petty-bourgeois remnants in people's minds and hearts which showed up in the daily life of the construction of socialism. Of course, these parties did not sit idle, but the remedies had little effect on all these ailments, because a study of these negative phenomena, of these ailments, to the depth and extent required was not carried out. As a result the correct diagnosis was not made because those who made the diagnosis were themselves infected by these ailments, and when it is left to infected persons to diagnose the illnesses, the illnesses become more serious and the cure more difficult. This is what occurred with the former Marxist-Leninist parties and the former socialist countries in which the revisionists managed to seize power.

Therefore we must profit from all this experience and must examine our affairs in detail, bearing in mind those causes, those reasons which brought the catastrophe in the former socialist countries which I mentioned above. We have to understand that those rightist changes, those negative phenomena which damaged the revolution and destroyed socialism in those countries did not show up all at one and the same time, but evolved gradually until they assumed such a form that, following a major historical event such as the death of Stalin, for example, which was a great loss for the revolution, the development on the road of socialism was interrupted and a regressive, reactionary situation was created. The precursors of this plague, the Khrushchevite revisionists, who had remained

disguised up to that time, began to come out openly with slogans which were allegedly appropriate to the situation created after the death of Stalin. Naturally, that was a sad situation, not only for the Soviet peoples who lost their great Marxist-Leninist leader but also for the whole revolutionary and progressive world which lost a great Marxist-Leninist leader, the faithful disciple of Karl Marx and Vladimir Ilyich Lenin.

Immediately after the death of Stalin, the Soviet revisionists took all-round measures to achieve their anti-Marxist purposes. They found support for this in those infected strata of their society who refused to accept the dictatorship of the proletariat, its laws, discipline and ideology, and who aspired to a great liberalization in every field of social activity. The representatives of all these strata which had been created under cover, were the Khrushchevites who, after the death of Stalin, began to emerge on the scene, claiming that they retained the characteristics of communists, and also had an allegedly Bolshevik past. Now they presented themselves as «new» Bolsheviks able to adapt the «Marxist-Leninist» ideology to modern situations. Precisely these individuals set to work to prepare the Soviet people and proletariat to accept the regressive change which occurred in that country.

But what happened to the Soviet proletariat and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, to the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin, which carried out the Great October Socialist Revolution, which defeated the Hitlerites, which liberated the peoples from fascist bondage and had become the hope to world revolution? **The first homeland of the proletarians of the world and the Bolshevik Communist Party were not prepared and did not prove sufficiently vigilant to understand the capitalist-revisionist fraud which was being perpetrated against**

them and take all the measures to become a barricade against this plague.

It is not important how power was seized by the Khrushchevite revisionists, who overthrew the dictatorship of the proletariat through a putsch in the Kremlin. Of great importance, however, are the views of those against whom this putsch was carried out, that is, the people of Molotov's group who were not in a position to resist and indeed made things easier for the revisionists, headed by Khrushchev, to carry out such an act after the death of Stalin.

Stalin always propagated and applied the laws of the proletarian revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Leninist norms of the party, but the others around him, from those on the top to those with less responsibility, all hid and disguised themselves behind him as long as he was alive. It was precisely these individuals who had created the cult of Stalin to cover their own sinister actions and had violated the laws of the proletarian revolution and the laws of the Bolshevik Party, who subsequently accused Stalin of the cult of the individual.

Stalin was a modest man, but these individuals were not, because they were bourgeois and revisionists. According to these conspirators it was not the masses of the people but a few individuals who carried out the revolution, therefore they gave themselves great importance. They protected themselves, protected what they were up to and disguised it by building up the cult of Stalin, who combated this cult, but the whole party should have combated it. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union did not properly understand Stalin's bolshevik teaching that the party was above all, a party which had to apply the genuine Marxist-Leninist revolutionary norms and put the teachings of the great Lenin into practice.

The Khrushchevite revisionists accused Stalin of sec-

tarianism and the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin of being a sectarian party, a party which did not adapt itself to situations. What were these situations which Stalin and Lenin before him faced up to? These were grave situations for the proletarian revolution which had triumphed for the first time in the Soviet Union, for socialism which was built in the Soviet Union, for the world which was threatened with and eventually hurled into war by world capitalism and German nazism. The Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin and Stalin, in particular, had to cope with this very difficult situation both nationally and internationally.

The pressure of imperialism, of world capitalism, on the Soviet Union, where the revolution had triumphed and which had become a source of inspiration for the world proletariat, was very great. The Soviet Union and the Bolshevik Party had to withstand not only the intervention, not only the ideological, political and military encirclement and pressure but also the attack which came from world capitalism and fascism. They withstood all these critically difficult situations successfully.

But how was this party able to withstand such situations? By being right opportunist, by making concessions at home and abroad? No, certainly not! Such a thing would have been a catastrophe both for the Soviet Union itself and for the whole of mankind. However, Stalin with his courage and wisdom and the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin with its correct stands averted this catastrophe. Gradually, however, the capitalist elements operated in disguise from within, under the banner of Marxism-Leninism, in order to undermine the construction of socialism and to restore capitalism.

Naturally, the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union had to strike hard at the internal enemies, the Trotskyites, the Bukharinites, the Zinovievites, the

Tukachevskys, and others, all of whom were in the service of world capital and wanted the Soviet Union to change colour, to turn into a bourgeois-capitalist democracy. A revolutionary struggle had to be waged against all this scum.

However, neither world capitalism nor the disguised revisionists, the Trotskyites, the Bukharinites and the others wanted this revolutionary struggle and could not reconcile themselves to it. Today we find their disguises on the faces of the Khrushchevite revisionists. Therefore, after the death of Stalin, they rose in a joint chorus with the foreign enemies and described the great era of Stalin as an era of terror which came to an end with his death. The Khrushchevites tried, and they succeeded in their attempt, to deceive the Soviet peoples and the Soviet proletariat that from now on, after the war, «complete» and «true» freedom ought to exist in the Soviet Union. These traitors to Marxism-Leninism, these revisionists and renegades, exploited precisely that colossal economic and political strength which had been created by the Communist Party led by the true Bolsheviks, with Lenin and Stalin at the head, by pursuing a correct line always based on the doctrine of Marx. Without this line, that great economic and military force which defeated the Hitlerites could not have been created.

It is also a fact that in Poland, although the dictatorship of the proletariat was established, although it bordered on the Soviet Union, an ally which assisted it, socialism did not advance at the rates required in that country. When the United Workers' Party of Poland, headed by Boleslav Bierut, stood on sound positions socialism grew steadily stronger there. In Poland the Communist Party united with other parties which were bourgeois. Perhaps, this unification was necessary, but the bolshevik work of the Communist Party of Poland should

have been at such a level that the sections of those parties which were incorporated into it were not only assimilated, but also thoroughly educated with the Marxist-Leninist norms. We are unable to judge to what extent it did this work, but we can give the opinion that it did not do it to the proper extent. Industry developed in Poland, the proletariat increased, progressive ideas were propagated amongst the masses, but in one way or another the bourgeois capitalist elements still remained in power. The land reform was not carried out there and there was no collectivization. Besides this, the traditional hostility of the Polish bourgeoisie against czarist Russia existed in Poland. The hostility of this bourgeoisie, which had not been hit hard by the Polish proletariat and its party, further increased its hatred of the Soviet Union and the party of Lenin and Stalin. And we saw that after the death of Bierut there were disturbances in Poland, the Gomulkas, Cyriankiewiczzes and other elements of the bourgeoisie, anti-Marxist and capitalist elements, have come to power and, together with the Khrushchevites, carried out the transformation of the socialist regime into a fascist, bourgeois, capitalist regime.

A similar thing occurred in Hungary, too. The Communist Party of Hungary was united with the social-democratic party and it was thought that this unification was complete and everything was achieved successfully. That is, it was thought that the members of the social-democratic party, which was a bourgeois party, had become communist. In fact, these people stuck to their old views and the dictatorship of the proletariat in that country did not develop on the basis of the Leninist ideology, did not take the appropriate forms of normal development in conformity with the concrete conditions of Hungary and in the way that Marx and Lenin teach. Thus, with the advent to power of the Khrushchevites,

Rakosi and his comrades, who were positive elements in the Workers' Party of Hungary, were discredited and sabotaged to the point that the counter-revolution burst out in Hungary, as we know, and the Soviet tanks had to intervene in order to restore to power the counter-revolutionaries who were labelled Marxist-Leninists, but who were nothing but revisionists, comrades-in-arms of the Khrushchevite revisionists.

In Yugoslavia matters took an even worse course. Titoism, which our Party has fought and will continue to fight sternly, is one of the most dangerous agencies of world capital and of American imperialism, in particular. Titoism has completely liquidated the former Communist Party of Yugoslavia and has created a capitalist structure. This anarcho-syndicalist capitalist structure, which is called self-administration and has nothing in common with Marxism and socialism, comes directly to the aid of capital in decay, not only for the retention of capitalism within Yugoslavia, but also as a «model» which world capital needs to sabotage the revolution. In the international arena this capitalist structure and anti-Marxist superstructure is covered with the pseudo-theory of the «non-aligned world.» About a week ago, Carter welcomed Tito to the White House and described him as a great statesman for the following reasons: because he criticized Stalin, because he created the system of self-administration, and because he leads the «non-aligned world».

The lackey Tito continues to apply these three basic orientations on behalf of his patron, American imperialism.

... In general, these are the reasons which made possible the regression in the countries and parties that I mentioned above. The task devolves on us to study and delve deeply into these problems, into these unpleasant facts and events in the history of the communist and workers' movement, to disclose the reasons for, causes and

consequences of them as correctly and realistically as we can, to arrive at accurate and convincing conclusions and to make them weapons to ensure that such a calamity is never permitted to occur in our country.

Now let us turn to the other side — the capitalist countries. Is imperialism today in its former phase? No, it is not. Imperialism is undergoing evolution, because as capitalism in decay it is bound to do so. Lenin foresaw this. Imperialism is the final phase of capitalism and the epoch we are passing through is the epoch of proletarian revolutions. This is clear. And when we say that this epoch is the epoch of proletarian revolutions, with this we must understand that the pressure of the broad masses of the people, the powerful pressure of the proletariat in all the capitalist countries, is such that the old capitalism has been forced to find and has found another form of government, oppression and exploitation.

Before the Second World War colonialism existed. After the Second World War this colonialism assumed another form, allegedly more democratic, although equally oppressive and exploiting, which is called neo-colonialism. Now this neo-colonialism exploits the peoples of the world while allegedly giving them a certain freedom, a certain independence and a certain sovereignty, all of which in fact are fictitious, false, because these peoples and states are under a double bondage: bondage to internal capital and bondage to foreign capital. These two types of capital are interdependent, in alliance with each other to oppress and exploit the peoples and to prevent the broad masses and the proletariat from hurling themselves into revolution.

Today we see that transformations are occurring in this part of the world, too, transformations which, on the one hand, express the decay of the imperialist-capitalist system and, on the other hand, indicate the vigour of the

broad masses of the people and the proletariat. As I pointed out above, capital has created new forms of government in these countries. It disguises these forms with an allegedly new economic policy, with a new modern revisionist ideology, with a new life in the American style, with «greater freedom», which means more corruption, with what is claimed to be great democracy, but which in reality is a «democracy» under the tight control of the police, the security service, the CIA and the army, which are all armed to the teeth and in the hands of the capitalist bourgeoisie and American, French, British and other imperialisms.

It is known that in the various capitalist states in the West there is no harmony, either internally or amongst themselves externally. Internally they have profound contradictions caused by the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and the peoples. This struggle is still diffuse, but it will turn from quantity into quality. And at the most suitable moment, when all the conditions are ripe, the revolution will burst out. as Lenin has foreseen. The fact is that in order to resist the change from quantity into quality, the various capitalist groups of a particular country, combined with foreign capitalism, create further contradictions within the country. These contradictions are added to the major contradictions which exist between the working masses who are exploited and the ruling classes who exploit them. The increasing decay upsets the stability in those capitalist countries. This is a process which is developing and will continue to develop further. In order to halt this process of decay, the modern revisionists, the parties of social-democracy, the parties of capital in all their different forms and the bourgeois capitalist state, all in agreement together, strive to find such forms and ways of thinking, living and acting in order to cause the degeneration of the masses and the

proletariat, to weaken and reduce their revolutionary impulse.

In the capitalist countries, the modern revisionists play a special role in aid of capital. Thus, in France, for instance, the French revisionist party has rejected all the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism and the achievement of the proletarian revolution. This party of Marchais, which has no connection with Marxism, advocates the revolution, not through violence, however, but through reforms, in parliamentary and pluralist ways, that is, completely contrary to Lenin's teachings about the revolution. The French revisionist party rules out the dictatorship of the proletariat. It preaches the unity of all bourgeois capitalist and Trotskyite parties in order to take power and allegedly to transform the bourgeois-capitalist state into a socialist state. The purpose of these things, which this «communist» party advocates, is to disorganize the proletariat, to keep it linked to this party and permit it to raise its voice only for certain economic claims and not political claims, and to divert it towards a non-revolutionary reformist struggle.

In Italy, likewise, the Italian revisionist party is striving to become a worthy servant of Italian capital and an ally of American imperialism. This party is in favour of the presence of American bases in Italy, in favour of NATO bases, just as the Communist Party of Spain is in favour of the presence of NATO in its country. I have spoken about these parties in particular on other occasions, but here I want to dwell on the question of the evolution of the Francoite dictatorship in Spain.

The Francoite dictatorship in Spain underwent an evolution. After the death of Franco, you might say that his dictatorship died, too. It underwent a transformation, or rather a toning down. At first it was a bloody dictatorship, it killed and maimed and savagely cracked down

on the people and everything which was for liberation and progress. Nevertheless, despite the fact that Franco suppressed any kind of democratic strivings of the proletariat and the masses with his fascist dictatorship, the whole development of world capitalism, trying to avoid destruction, exerted an influence on the Spanish state, too. Thus, with the passage of time, the fascist dictatorship of Franco was obliged to tone down its former virulence and the more time passed, the more this dictatorship proved to be tamed under the pressure of the proletariat and the working masses who were in motion. The original fiery falangists aged and were replaced by a new generation of falangists who wanted a certain «democratic» freedom like that of France, the United States of America, or Italy. We see that in the last years of Franco's life strikes and demonstrations took place and although they were suppressed with fire and steel, further strikes and demonstrations were held, and this shows the vitality of the Spanish proletariat.

Hence, in order to defend itself from the revolution the capitalist bourgeoisie with its liberal forms and ideology exerted its influence and obliged even the fascist dictatorship to undergo an evolution. Thus, when Franco died, it was thought that civil war might occur in Spain, but unfortunately this did not happen. A new monarch took Franco's throne and in the first days of his career he proclaimed general elections. With this he wanted to tell the people that allegedly the fascist dictatorship of Franco had changed. In reality, however, this was a form to deceive the Spanish people. King Juan Carlos, who came to power, was one of the old Francoites who appointed Suarez as prime minister. Who was this Suarez? Suarez was a member of the falangist party, but only 38 years old, while the king was 35. Hence, the Spanish people, who had evolved and wanted to be liberated

from the savage fascist dictatorship, were left in the hands of these two young men.

This whole situation also brought about the reactionary transformation of the party of Ibarruri. It was the party of Ibarruri that had waged the war against Franco, while now it has turned into a servant of the bourgeoisie, betraying the interests of the Spanish people and the Spanish proletariat. Carrillo, the general secretary of that revisionist party, legalized the party, accepted Suarez's reforms, accepted the monarchy, accepted the flag of the Spanish monarchy and declared: «We do not wish to build socialism in the old form, we are no longer for violent revolution (as Marx and Lenin advocated), we call ourselves Eurocommunist and want to go to socialism in pluralism together with all the other parties. The Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the revolution is outdated.»

Hence, we see that in the world of capitalism and imperialism, too, from time to time transformations disguised as leftist, but which are always rightist, are carried out in order to hinder the revolution, to deceive the masses of the people and the proletariat. And the pseudo-Marxists, the revisionists who militate in the ranks of the former communist parties of Western Europe and the rest of the capitalist world, with the exception of the new Marxist-Leninist communist parties, are mixed up in this and are ardently serving this cause.

Also making its bid on this course of the defence of capitalism and imperialism and of American imperialism, in particular, is the theory of «three worlds» the partisans of which deny the revolution and hinder the people's struggle for freedom and independence.

From all these events and many others like them, which are not all that simple, we must draw many lessons for the present and future of socialism in our country.

The problems of each stage must be solved with prudence and maturity, never forgetting the future

Comrades,

How is the situation with us? The situation in our country is very solid. Our Party is on the sound rails of Marxism-Leninism. Socialism is being built successfully in Albania, the revolutionary, socialist, patriotic spirit is mounting ever higher. We must consolidate all these victories and work consistently to advance, always guided by the compass of Marxism-Leninism. We must thoroughly master Marxism-Leninism as a theory, but this alone is not enough. We must apply this theory in all directions of the many-sided development of our society, **always firmly bearing in mind the fact that our Albanian socialist society is being built and developed in an ocean of capitalist-revisionist hostility**, which is striving in every way to exert a direct or indirect influence to hinder us and which **could hinder our advance**.

This is why our Party has always stressed this question. **The communists, the leadership of our Party and state, must know and study all the events occurring in the world, must weigh up these events and draw from them the proper conclusions, whether pleasant or bitter, for us.** The pleasant ones should help us to strengthen the situation and the bitter ones, likewise, should help us to take all measures to ensure that nothing bad occurs in our country. This is a continuous, stern, and many-sided struggle which our Party must wage. **Such a thing demands great maturity, cool-headedness, love for socialism, for the Party, for the Homeland, for the things we have achieved and for our people. It demands pure, clear thinking about the consolidation of the unity of the peo-**

ple politically and ideologically under the example of the steel unity of the Party. If we do not look at these things in this way, the possibility that bourgeois-revisionist decay will infiltrate into our country and damage us becomes greater.

Our Party must always bear in mind these dangers which assail it and our socialist country. It must wage a continuous struggle against these dangers and this is a political-ideological and an economic-organizational struggle. For this reason the sound education of the cadres of the Party and the broad masses of the people is of prime importance, because the Party and the people have to understand that socialism can be built only under the leadership of a party that always applies the principles of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin precisely and in every situation, that socialism can be built successfully and defended from any enemy if the universal truths of the science of Marxism-Leninism are properly combined with the various situations through which the country passes in the course of its development.

The Party has to understand and make clear to the masses that **each stage of development, of progress, creates new conditions in our socialist society. If these new conditions are created as they should be, the country advances confidently towards progress. If these conditions are not understood and develop in distorted ways, the country does not move in the direction of progress, but towards regression.** The Party must always take account of these two eventualities and fight persistently and ceaselessly for progress against regression.

The evil, the diseases that could infect our Party, the working class, the peasantry or our intelligentsia are so numerous and complicated that only a genuine Marxist-Leninist party can classify them and recognize the degree of their danger, which is not the same for all.

However, the general characteristic of these illnesses is that they gather and accumulate into a single whole to damage this healthy body. At the same time our Party must be able to determine the true diagnosis for and apply the effective cure to overcome each of these illnesses which appear in the life of our people during the period of the construction of socialism.

In our country the working class under the leadership of its Marxist-Leninist Party of Labour is in the lead. It has established the dictatorship of the proletariat and each year and each five-year period it has accomplished important economic and cultural plans which have changed the structure and superstructure of our country. We are building and working for the consolidation of socialism, have created the new man with the socialist world outlook and are educating him day by day. We have built heavy and light industry and along with that we have placed our socialist agriculture, the basis of our economy which industry leads, on sound foundations. A new culture of socialist realism is developing and advancing in all forms in our country. Whole generations of young people who have been born in socialism are growing up in Albania, young people who are building socialism themselves, who have been educated by our Party and their parents, who yesterday fought for the liberation of the country and today are fighting for the construction of socialism in Albania, for the defence of the victories achieved and for the preservation of the independence and sovereignty of the country.

All these generations, old and young, in complete unity, take part in the construction of socialism and work together to ensure that our society forges steadily ahead for the further development of the productive forces of the country, for the further development of our culture and education, with a thoroughly Marxist-Leninist ideol-

ogical content, while preserving the best features of the finest things in the heritage of our people. And the fact is that **our culture has been built and developed in conformity with the new socialist structure, has been able to harmonize the moral qualities of our people, their penetrating thinking and fine feelings, with the Marxist-Leninist ideology.**

All these victories of the Party and the people constitute a solid foundation **which must be kept sound and pure because the danger exists that it could be damaged.** The dangers which threaten to damage this foundation are those which I pointed out a little earlier, therefore, the Party must not fail to clear these dangers from its course, from the course of advance towards the strengthening of socialism and classless communist society. Taking all these things into account, it emerges clearly **what a great role must be played by the Party with its line, which must always be a Marxist-Leninist line in conformity with the conditions of our country, with the stages and the problems of each particular stage, which must be solved prudently and with maturity, while never losing sight of the perspective,** the future, that we must reach. **Well considered, well studied and well applied, the present prepares a clear and brilliant future.** If I can put it this way, we are climbing the steps of the transformation of our society one by one. We overthrew feudalism and drove out the occupiers, proclaimed the People's Republic, commenced the construction of socialism, are working to consolidate this construction of socialism and are climbing towards communist society. **It will still take decades to reach communist society, because, first of all, our revolution must not suffer any defeat and when I speak of the revolution I have in mind all aspects of it,** which must advance harmoniously, and, on the other hand, in the world, outside the borders of our country,

favourable revolutionary conditions must be created. That is to say that countries and peoples must gain their true freedom, true independence and sovereignty and set out on the course of the construction of socialism.

At all times the Party teaches us that we must carry out the socio-economic development, the development of culture and education and the defence of the Homeland according to a line, according to a well-considered, balanced plan, that is, on the basis of a plan which must be accomplished with the creative mental and physical forces of our people. The communists struggle to ensure that the people are linked with the Party like flesh to bone and have complete confidence in their Party, not simply because it is in power but because it is the vanguard of the working class, the keen weapon of the working class, formed from the most resolute, advanced and self-sacrificing individuals who always live, think and fight for the interests of the people.

In the course of our advance and the successes we have achieved we must always examine the shortcomings, mistakes and the difficulties which we have encountered and which we have overcome in many ways.

It is essential that the Party, the people and the coming generations realize that life is a struggle, a class struggle. The most advanced classes, headed by the working class, fight continuously, fought yesterday against the exploiting classes who were overthrown and are fighting today against elements and remnants of those classes. Never should the Party and our people think that the danger of the restoration of the exploiting classes, even when dressed up as revisionists, has been eliminated. In fact, the Party did not eliminate those classes physically, with the exception of those elements who at that time had committed grave crimes against the people, against the dictatorship of the proletariat, against the

common property and our socialist society, or those who do so today. As for the others, the Party puts them to work like everybody else, in order to educate and save them through work. Nevertheless, the Party, the people and the coming generations must never allow these elements of exploiting classes to be placed in leading positions in our state without having passed severe tests or made great sacrifices. Such a thing must be properly understood, because it constitutes a great danger to the fate of the dictatorship of the proletariat since the reactionary forces, defeated politically, ideologically, militarily and economically, never for a moment give up the idea of recapturing power and re-establishing the bourgeois state.

Therefore, our working class, peasantry and people's intelligentsia must safeguard and protect the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat from the strivings and viles of remnants of the bourgeois class, as well as from the new revisionist elements which emerge even in the period of our state power. They have to bear in mind that such elements strive to find the forms and methods in which to operate to bring about the decay of this state, to penetrate gradually into that terrain wherever there are weaknesses, where the work of the Party, its propaganda and education, the achievements of the Party in the economy and in all fields are not given due prominence, are not properly utilized and made the most of by people. And to prevent this coming about everybody must be brought up in the spirit of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The dictatorship of the proletariat expresses that correct Marxist-Leninist line which the Party lays down for all sectors of the life of the country. The application of this line means the advance, the education of the broad masses of the people in the spirit of socialist realism, the efforts which are made to educate and transform

elements from the classes which lost power and, especially, the children of those classes. The Party works to ensure that these young people, too, become good workers, to cleanse their consciousness and turn them into people of our society, that is, not to allow these young people whose class origin is not good to nurture secret hostility and struggle under cover to attack the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the course of this long, difficult, but heroic class struggle which our Party has waged successfully, hundreds of elements who are undesirable or harmful to our society have been hit, while others have been criticized for various faults or punished according to the crimes they have committed. Nevertheless, not all these elements have been isolated and we must always bear this in mind. A good part of them live in our society, work in our society, here among us. They have their own circle and relatives, have their heirs who, to a greater or lesser degree, nurture feelings of resentment over the just punishment of their fathers or their brothers who have taken a wrong course. In general, of course, these individuals do not approve the evil activity of the particular member of their family, but the Party is duty bound to work with them so that they not only acknowledge and condemn the mistake their relative has made, but are also educated and draw lessons from this or that case and are not left harbouring feelings of resentment, even in latent form. This we must achieve through our continuous painstaking work, because **at a moment of difficulty** for such a person, **this resentment increases and assumes more severe forms**, forms which infect his thinking and make it more unhealthy, cloud his political ideas so that he exerts a bad influence on his circle, old and new.

The Party must continue its work for the differentiated education of individuals, that is, it should not con-

sider everyone to be of the one level, with the same degree of ideological, political, cultural and educational uplift. **It must not think that the feelings, aspirations and desires of everybody in our country are clear-cut and that the word of the Party carries the same weight with all.** The Party should not proceed from the idea that those persons who stick their necks out a bit or those who try to escape notice are not on the line of the Party and immediately take a stand against them. When it comes to the education of people there are cases in which it is thought that all ought to think in the same way and **efforts are not made to adapt the propaganda to people as they are, rather than as they ought to be.** This is a matter that I have stressed at other times, too.

Our propaganda must be adapted to the society and to the people. There are some elements of our propaganda and education which are fixed, the same for all, but there are also nuances, there is development of this education and propaganda which must avoid stereotypism, routine and bureaucracy.

If attention is not paid to these matters all these things create an unhealthy situation among those vacillating individuals who are not completely committed to the new socialist life, although they like it more or less and struggle and work for it, but their sentiments are not yet channelled on the course of the working class, their ideas are not all as clear as they should be and as the Party wants them to be. Therefore it is the duty of the Party and its propaganda to educate and temper these people, to clarify their thinking and form sound opinions among them. Thus, our whole society, or at least the overwhelming bulk of it, should support the construction of socialism in our country and the line of the Party heart and soul, with all its physical and mental forces.

But is this work done properly by the organizations

of the Party, the organizations of the trade-unions, the youth, the women, etc.? Of course, all these organizations are doing a great deal of work in this direction, but what I am getting at is that the intimate, detailed, differentiated work which the Party requires is not being done to the extent and in the way it should be. My opinion is that the cadres of the Party and the organizations of the masses do not always elaborate the line of the Party extensively and thoroughly so that it is carried to the broad masses of the people with a militant, revolutionary spirit, so that it encourages, arouses and activates people. This Marxist-Leninist political-educational work, this revolutionary action, which goes on every minute and hour of the day, should not weary and bore people, but should stimulate them, open up horizons for creative work, for work which is enjoyable and fruitful at the same time. **Through well-considered political-educational work we should enable the new man of socialist society to find in the line of the Party, the course in which it leads him, the source of a happy and contented life.** This is the way to combat the old remnants which we must never imagine have been wiped out.

Let us take the question of religion, for example. On this question there are people in the Party and the party committees, let alone amongst the masses, who think that the influence and remnants of religion were liquidated with the closing of churches and mosques. Such an idea is mistaken and harmful. The elimination of those religious institutions did not liquidate, but only weakened, the atavistic influence of religious beliefs. True, as a result of the propaganda of the Party and the cultural and ideological development of the broad masses obvious successes have been achieved in the atheist formation of the younger generations, in particular. From the older generations, too, we inherit good traditions of an attitude

of indifference and criticism towards religious institutions which, in general, have supported the invaders, the bayraktars, the beys, the big aghas and kulaks throughout the history of our people. Nevertheless, we must not forget that culture among the broad masses of the people is not yet developed in sufficient breadth and depth for them to understand the worthlessness of theology from the philosophic stand-point and that it is the Marxist-Leninist science which has exposed this worthlessness and the idealist philosophy which supports theology. Therefore, everyone must understand that the influence of religion is not eliminated so easily. After several generations the Party will still have to struggle against the remnants of religion which will be expressed in various forms in conformity with the development of our country, while also bearing in mind the influence from abroad, because foreign influence and pressure must be taken into account in these matters.

The more vigorous our economic and political-ideological development and the more organized the propaganda and educational work of the Party with the people, the less room there will be for these remnants of religion to establish themselves. However, we must not forget that although religion has not been so virulent amongst us as it has been in other countries, for the reasons which we have explained, still it has been interconnected with the events, the customs, the opinions of Albanian society of various periods and has been able to exert a greater or lesser influence on these events and happenings and the character of our people.

Therefore, we have the duty to combat these remnants in intelligent, prudent and well-organized ways and must never overlook them, never underestimate them, because we see that in the countries where modern revisionism is ruling, such as the Soviet Union and other

countries, where the new bourgeois-capitalist class seized power from the proletariat, churches and mosques have recommenced their activity, which they carry on openly. Hence, the communists must fight wisely in this direction and this matter must not be neglected.

Likewise, the Party must not think that all its members, who have been punished for various faults and have been expelled from its ranks, are fully convinced that the Party's stand towards them has been just. No, it is difficult for them to truly acknowledge and fully admit the mistake and fault which caused their expulsion from the Party. Generally speaking, within themselves, they cling to the opinion and feeling that they were right, while the Party which punished them by expelling them from its ranks was not right. In this direction our Party has always acted cautiously and prudently. Perhaps, an occasional mistake has been made, but it has been corrected. Many times the Party has reviewed the appeals of these individuals and has done detailed studies of their cases. It has recommended that attention should be paid to those people who have been in the Party and now are not its members, and takes great care that they remain close to the Party because they know its line, recognize the benefits of this line, but they also have to recognize their mistakes.

The directive which the Party has issued and constantly repeats is that these elements must be kept close to the Party. If this directive is not taken into account and properly applied, then we ourselves are permitting the creation of a contingent of people with schooling and experience, but who have been and many still are infected, who could increase the contingents of discontented people who, at the moment, perhaps, do not display their discontent, but at difficult moments which might occur for the Party these elements gather together and attempt

to seize power, as has occurred in other countries where socialism has been destroyed and capitalism restored.

In our country the peasantry is closely linked with the working class and is working and building socialism in the countryside. The cooperativist peasantry can see the advances with its own eyes. With its mind, with its hands, with the modern means of agriculture which the Party and the people's state power have secured for it, with the cadres which the latter have trained, with the information of agro-technical science, it has completely transformed the countryside, agriculture and its life. The whole countryside is flourishing. Nevertheless, we must not fall into self-satisfaction, thinking that the Marxist-Leninist education is understood in all its dimensions and that there is a complete, deeply-implanted understanding about socialism in the countryside by the cooperativist peasantry. The fact is that there are cooperative members who are fined by the village people's courts. Why are they fined? They are fined because they damage the common property of the cooperative, especially, by letting their household livestock into the fields of the cooperative. The imposition of fines creates discontent amongst those who are punished. But can this be avoided? Of course, it can be avoided, but, we must understand, not with a wave of the magic wand. Such a thing can be avoided only through political and ideological education and technical-organizational measures.

...

Therefore it is impermissible that the shortcomings and weaknesses in the work should ever escape the eye of the Party, because they are like black oil stains which we must remove, otherwise they ooze and spread and can become a danger to the Party and socialism at an unguarded moment. If the mistakes are allowed to get worse

and assume major proportions, this shows that the organizations of the Party are not in revolutionary positions, that they have gone to sleep or have become dizzy with success, that they have not shaken themselves up to get rid of the dust that gathers in the course of the work, and that they have not waged the class struggle as they should. The proper waging of the class struggle, that is, the application of the line of the Party from the revolutionary stand-point, should be conceived not as imposition of the line, but on the contrary, as the adoption, embracing and assimilation with ardent revolutionary desire and will of the enlightening principles of scientific socialism and the major tasks which the Party lays down for the good of the Homeland and the people. Therefore, careful work must be done to ensure proper understanding of the dictatorship of the proletariat, its laws, the democracy for the people, proletarian discipline and so on. Provided the work is done so that proper understanding of these things is achieved we will be able to combat those evils which I mentioned above, to educate our people in the right spirit, to overcome the ills and the remnants of the past and, in this way, we shall achieve the success we deserved while getting rid of the slag, because there will always be some slag, but the more we advance in this Marxist-Leninist revolutionary spirit the less slag there will be.

The line of the Party must be understood properly by everybody; it is neither opportunist nor sectarian. It has been said that the present danger is right opportunism. This is true, but left opportunism, sectarianism, is no less dangerous than right opportunism. The line of the Party is opposed to these two extremes. **The ideology of our Party is that ideology which fights opportunism, but it also fights sectarianism at the same time.**

To some it seems that these are moments in which

to be sectarian. They are wrong, because sectarianism at the present time — supposing for a moment that it is and ought to be on the agenda — causes discontent among people, imposes a restriction and an obligation outside the norms of the Party. Sectarianism is caused by those who think they are omnipotent, those who are conceited and arrogant. It has to be realized that a number of individuals conceal this arrogance and conceit by allegedly fighting certain opportunist manifestations. Hence, **sectarianism increases the ranks of the discontented who at the moment are keeping quiet, but at some dangerous moment**, when they think that their time has come they will say: «Now we can breathe freely», and cause disaster. **Those comrades who think that sectarianism is not dangerous at this moment are preparing the opportunism of the future.** Therefore, **the Party is obliged to fight the two extremes, both the current opportunism and the current sectarianism.** And it advises and instructs that correct Marxist-Leninist stands must be maintained.

The Party attacks the class enemy without mercy. In all its instructions and activity it consistently demands that the unity with the people must be safeguarded and strengthened. The sound unity of the people around the Party is safeguarded, developed and strengthened when the line of the Party is applied wisely, without deviations either to the left or to the right, that is, when the Party condemns sectarianism and opportunism, and when I say condemns I mean through education and correct organizational measures, and with administrative measures only when necessary. Administrative measures are always the last resort, when the cup is full, while education must be daily. As I said earlier, in life the characters of individuals are moulded in different forms, with different intensities and in the course of the work one understands and proceeds more correctly while another

goes a little astray, and hence, he must be brought back to the right road, one advances quickly, the other slowly, or sticks in the one place and so on. Hence, in regard to all these questions, if the line of the Party is thoroughly studied and properly applied by the Party members, by the activists and the broad masses of the people, it will be seen that it contains all these appropriate forms and methods of work which put people on a sound basis and consolidate the triumph of socialism in our country.

No situation must catch us off guard

All these problems I have raised to point out that the Party and its leadership must devote continuous care to see how the line of the Party is applied in all its aspects and to take appropriate measures to ensure that everything is done correctly and in time and to create contentment with their work and life among the broad masses of the people. They must develop creative thinking, inculcate the sense of love amongst people, a revolutionary love, not clanish but proletarian, educate people to think with pure proletarian justice, the justice of the masses in everything. **The Party should combat the bad traits which emerge and develop in an unformed character and should work ceaselessly to ensure that the character of each individual is imbued with the Marxist-Leninist ideology and lofty human virtues.**

I am saying all these things so that the Party will bear in mind that the economic achievements play a decisive role in the progress of our society and **the economic development must be guided by a correct, wise, far-sighted policy. We must never blunder on blindly, without weighing up the possibilities and defining clear objectives for the present and the future.**

We must strive to ensure that our country, our economy and our society are always advancing and developing. If we do not struggle and work on this course, not only will socialism not be built, but the foundations of this society will be weakened and so will that cohesion which keeps our people alive and strong as a people and a nation. Those peoples who do not advance are doomed to disappear. The history of mankind over many thousands of years confirms this.

We Albanians are a people who, through the centuries, have fought, have worked, have advanced and we have had defeats, too, but we have not disappeared. Of all the Illyrian tribes we Albanians are the only ones who are living and advancing and now we are building socialism. This is a special, distinguishing characteristic of a people with vitality, a people who have known how to survive, who have understood that development gives you life, progress gives you strength, impels you to advance, that it transforms man, the economy and culture and ensures the transition from one form of society to another more advanced form. Therefore, we must never allow these virtues to be lost, but on the contrary, must give them brilliance and encourage them to flourish as never before because now we are guided by a vanguard Party which develops these virtues with revolutionary rates, implants them in the consciousness and the life of the working people, makes these revolutionary principles and practices the flesh and blood of our people who are forging ahead, living happily, struggling with courage and confidence, overcoming the difficulties, building and advancing.

Therefore, at all times and in every action, we members of the Party of Labour of Albania must think about our people, about our Homeland, must protect this people and this Homeland from the many dangers which assail them from within and without, because the internal

dangers are always linked with the external ones. When we have a healthy, clean, revolutionary internal situation there is less room for any evil and the regressive counter-revolutionary external situation has less influence internally. Therefore, **we must give unremitting attention, in a correct Marxist-Leninist revolutionary way to the present so that no evil will occur in the future to our socialist Homeland, our heroic Party and the younger generations of our country.**

The Party must understand the stages of development of socialist society, must understand that development, whether economic, cultural, political, or ideological, creates new opinions, creates new desires and demands, gives birth to aspirations and hopes, which must not be underrated because they constitute this rich material and spiritual human life which we must always build and keep pure and healthy.

The coming generations of our country, who will live in a period more advanced than this of ours, must understand this dialectical development, this materialist development of our society, whence we have come, how we have developed, what difficulties we have overcome, what line we have applied, what orientations we have worked out and what were the foundations of this advanced society, the blessings of which they will enjoy. Hence, the members of the new generation should not think that the situation in which they live has come about spontaneously, or that this is a static situation which will not undergo further changes. No, it will change, but **the Party must educate the coming generations so that the changes are always made towards progress,** towards classless society, towards communism and not towards degeneration as occurred in the Soviet Union and the other former socialist countries. Our Party, the present and future generations, will fight together

with the international proletariat and the peoples so that revolutions will break out in the capitalist countries, too, to bring about the collapse of the old oppressive, bourgeois-capitalist society and in place of it build a new society, socialist society.

Hence, our Party, the members of our Party, wherever they live and work, must not plod on like «cart-horses», must not have a limited view of their duties, but **as communists must extend the range of their vision beyond their set job, beyond their set task, and understand that they have a great mission and role and heavy responsibility.** The work of a communist does not end simply with the accomplishment of this or that individual task which has been allocated to him. The communist has the duty to lead, to lead the people, to lead the class on untrodden paths, find the solution to future problems and create the means in order to build this new road in unity of thought and deed. Only in this way will the present and future line of our Party, which is enlightened by the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, be applied. The members of the Party must never forget this great duty and must never do imprudent, ill-considered things in their actions and conduct at home, at work and in society. In their thoughts and deeds everything should be balanced. Those who think and act in this way serve the Party best, further enhance its great role and think of the interests of the people and their future.

In this way alone the line of the Party and its application are made more clear, the propaganda becomes more clear, the policy of the Party stands out more brilliantly and the struggle against bureaucracy, indifference, inertia, routine and personal interest, which is frequently given precedence over the general interest, is waged with greater success, and personal squabbles with this one or that, cases of favouritism, evil customs and unpleasant

behaviour are avoided. **All these things constitute that complex of problems of life, which only a person with political and ideological clarity can solve correctly, cure the evils, and get rid of the bad things from his own consciousness and from the life of society.**

A Marxist-Leninist understands that this development proceeds through the class struggle, which is the powerful engine for the construction of the new socialist society, and that this class struggle is waged within the ranks of the people and also inside the Party. This means that within our society there are contradictions which we must know how to resolve correctly, and such contradictions will exist in the future, too. As a result of the experience gained we should have fewer non-antagonistic contradictions and should work patiently and persistently to resolve them correctly. However, it is impossible that in this struggle we will not run up against remnants and old ways of thinking which may be advertised as «modern», but which, in fact, are still regressive, just as dangerous as the old remnants and ways of thinking. The modern degeneration which the anti-Marxist ideologies in the service of capitalist society try to spread contains in itself remnants of the past cloaked with new forms of degeneration developed in imperialism, which is in decay and striving to avoid giving up the ghost by doing its utmost to degenerate and corrupt the broad masses of the people and the proletariat, who are striving to destroy imperialism once and for all.

Our Marxist-Leninist Party must become an insurmountable barrier, made more and more powerful each day against these evils. **It must forge a sound unity of the old cadres with the new cadres, must inspire the old cadres, who will hand on to the youth the majestic banner of the war-time generation, to do everything in their power to continue to struggle and, if need be, to make**

new sacrifices for the future of the younger generation and the generations to come.

Through its work, also, the Party must **make the younger generation acquainted with the period in which their parents lived, so that they understand the difficulties which they overcame and the methods they employed, and appreciate those good methods which were sometimes severe, because the situation demanded them. Nevertheless, this has always been a revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist severity.** It has never been a severity for coercion, on the contrary, it has been severity in order to create a sound situation, a new future, in which the experience of the elderly is combined with that of the younger generation in a unity of complete serenity, sincerity and love for one another, a love which characterizes the unity of the Party and the unity of our nation.

No situation of any sort must find our revolutionary working class, our progressive people and our Marxist-Leninist Party unprepared and off guard. At no time should there be divisions such as there were and are in the former socialist countries, but there should always be a continuous unity of generations for the ideals of communism.

It must be implanted deeply in people's minds, so that all of us understand politically and ideologically that the people are immortal, that the working class is the most advanced class, is in the lead of the country and that the Party and the Party alone is the keen edge of the sword of the working class which never gets rusty. It always remains gleaming and strong if its theory and its line are understood and applied correctly. We must concentrate on this with all our strength, because this is the key which helps and will always help to solve all the present and future problems correctly.

PROLETARIAN DEMOCRACY IS GENUINE DEMOCRACY

*Speech delivered at the meeting of the General Council
of the Democratic Front of Albania*

September 20, 1978

Comrades,

As you have been informed, the Presidium of the People's Assembly has issued the decree on the election of the deputies to the 9th Legislature of the People's Assembly, to be held on November 12, this year. At this meeting of the General Council of the Democratic Front, we shall take up the tasks facing our organization over the election campaign and its successful conclusion.

Elections to the People's Assembly are a great political event directly concerning all the citizens of our Republic, because they will elect the deputies to the supreme state organ which represents and expresses the will and sovereignty of the people.

In our country, elections to the People's Assembly have always been a powerful manifestation of the unity of the people rallied around the Party, of their determination to defend the Homeland and promote the cause of socialism in Albania. These outstanding characteristics will be expressed even more powerfully in the forthcoming elections, too.

It is the duty of the Democratic Front, under the.

leadership of the Party, to turn this campaign into an all-round political, economic and cultural action of the broad working masses. The election campaign must inspire an even greater enthusiasm and more vigorous drive at work of the working class, the cooperativist peasantry and the people's intelligentsia, in order to fulfil their tasks in all fields, especially to conclude this year's state plan with success and to make the best possible preparations for next year.

The Albanian people come to the new elections more than ever united around the Marxist-Leninist line of the Party, firmly convinced of its correctness and determined to carry it out to the letter. Our people are characterized by their healthy patriotic spirit, boundless love for their socialist Homeland and unflinching determination to safeguard its freedom, independence and sovereignty.

The entire Albanian people's unanimous endorsement of and support for the stand of our Party and Government towards the counter-revolutionary and anti-Albanian acts of the Chinese revisionist leadership once again demonstrated their close ties with the Party, their determination to cope with any difficulty and to break any imperialist-revisionist blockade and encirclement.

The November elections find our country with a strong economy, a stable and dynamic economy which develops harmoniously and uninterruptedly. This is a result of the correct line pursued by the Party for the all-round development and progress of the country.

...

*
* *
*

The People's Socialist Republic of Albania and our socialist society are radically different from the capitalist

and revisionist states and societies in the various countries of the world. In what does this difference consist? In the first place, it consists in the economic base, the social structure and superstructure which reflects this base. In capitalist and revisionist societies, the base and the superstructure have an antagonistic internal structure whereas in our socialist society they are free from class antagonisms and, as such, they are constantly perfected.

In our conception of the base and the superstructure, which characterize every socio-economic formation, we are guided by the theoretical principles inherited from Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. Our Party has correctly mastered and implemented these principles in theory and practice, that is why our country, once economically poor and culturally and educationally backward, has been transformed into a free, independent and sovereign country with a developed socialist economy, an advanced culture, educational system and science, a powerful defence potential and a correct and principled foreign policy.

The connection and interaction between the base and the superstructure, in which the principal role is played by the economic base, as well as the continuous revolutionization of our socialist superstructure, have convinced our people about the correct road of progress of our socialist society. The working class, its Marxist-Leninist vanguard, have led us on the course of the construction of socialism, and that is why great successes have been achieved on this road.

In the People's Socialist Republic of Albania, the working class, the cooperativist peasantry and other working people exercise power through the representative organs as well as directly. In Albania the masses of the people actively participate in governing the country, in managing the economy, in discussing laws and economic plans, in checking up on the activity of the organs

of power, and so on. They have the right to air their views freely on all problems of social or personal interest. They have been given this right by the Party under the Constitution, therefore, in socialist Albania alone can there be talk of genuine democracy in the full meaning of the word, which is not only proclaimed in words but guaranteed in deeds as well. These rights are formally proclaimed by the bourgeois and revisionist Constitutions, too, but in reality, they do not guarantee the premises for the implementation of the rights proclaimed. Attacking the bourgeois deception of the so-called equality of rights in the capitalist state, Stalin wrote that they

*«Talk of equality of citizens, but they forget that there can be no genuine equality between boss and worker, between landowner and peasant so long as the former are in possession of wealth and political power in society and the latter are deprived of both, so long as the former are the exploiters and the latter the exploited.»**

In our country socialism is being built successfully in the economic, cultural, educational, scientific, defence and other fields, in the interest of the broad masses of the people. Albania is steadily forging ahead towards an advanced socialist society and preserving the sovereignty of the people intact. Our Constitution reads: «All state power in the People's Socialist Republic of Albania emanates from and belongs to the working people.»

Our Party has worked constantly to ensure that our country is liberated from foreigners in every respect, that it is completely independent of the outside world and never endangered by the classes which our revolution has deprived of their economic, political and moral power.

* J. V. Stalin. *Works*, vol. 14, p. 61, Alb. ed.

Our Marxist-Leninist Party is inspired and nourished by the Marxist-Leninist ideology and its only aim is to raise the wellbeing of the people, to complete the construction of socialism under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The socialist socio-economic system cannot survive without true proletarian democracy, without close and sincere co-operation between the various strata of the working masses which the Party makes conscious. Our society is distinctive because it is governed by the laws of the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist democracy, and is conscious that the rights and duties of citizens are built up on the basis of reconciling the interests of society and the individual, giving priority to the general interests. The priority of the general interest must guide everybody's thoughts and aspirations. For the general interest to take precedence and the blessings of our socialist system be realized, broad participation of the working masses in running the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the economy is an absolute necessity.

We can say proudly that our country is truly socialist. There is no other country in the world where citizens are so equal before the law, where differentials between workers' wages and officials' salaries are so small as in our country. The ratio of remuneration between the worker and the highest ranking functionary is one to two. Foreigners ask: How is it possible that the difference between salaries of high ranking functionaries and workers' wages, is so small? The answer to this question is not difficult. This is so in our country because the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, with its just laws, has sanctioned the Marxist-Leninist principles in regard to remuneration. Referring to this problem, Lenin wrote that the turn from bourgeois democracy to proletarian democracy is

*«... the abolition... of all monetary privileges to officials, the reduction of the remuneration of all servants of the state to the level of **workmen's wages**'».**

One of the measures taken by the Paris Commune which Marx laid stress on was the reduction of the pay of officials. We allow no distortion in the implementation of the principle of remuneration according to the amount of work done, hence there is not, nor will there ever be, any stratum of working people placing itself above the others and taking decisions according to its desires and interests.

In the People's Socialist Republic of Albania, not only has the way been barred by law to revisionist tendencies, but great educative work is being done to make people increasingly conscious so that every worker is paid according to the quantity and quality of work accomplished. Except for some degenerate elements the bulk of the members of our society regard purifying their conscience of capitalist hangovers as a major duty. In our country love and respect of man for man has been strengthened. Everyone does patient work to help his comrade correct his mistakes and condemns any violation of the laws regulating the juridical relations and socialist norms of our society.

This revolutionary situation has been achieved because there is complete freedom of speech in our country, with thorough and extensive discussions of most varied problems by the masses, and because true proletarian democracy is implemented in a consistent manner. This accounts for our situation.

Let those who think that there is no freedom for

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 25, p. 496, Alb. ed.

citizens and no democracy, because there is no plurality of parties and no endless talking in parliament in Albania, say what they will. The most complete freedom for the working masses in the most appropriate and democratic forms, exists here, otherwise the country would not have flourished as it has and the monolithic unity of the people around the Party could not have been achieved. Our Party-people unity is the key to our victories, and it is precisely with the intention of corroding this golden key that the capitalist and revisionist enemies resort to the most cynical calumnies.

If some bourgeois or revisionist foreigner were to listen to discussions by the representatives of the people in our People's Assembly, he might say: There is no debate here as in our parliaments. This is not normal. It is true that there is no debate for debate's sake in the People's Assembly, but this does not mean that there is no debate. Political or economic problems taken to the People's Assembly for discussion have previously been fiery and constructively debated, subjected to discussion and suggestions in the ranks of the working masses and their organizations, and the deputies have to attend them in order to listen to the voice of the masses and actively contribute to the discussion. Nothing has been achieved smoothly in peace and quiet as this or that person may wish, or through dictate from above; but everything has been viewed from the angle of the general interest. So long as problems have been discussed and thrashed out before being taken to the highest organ of the people's power for endorsement, why should we engage in debate for debate's sake, shout and scream at each other in our Assembly, just «to make a show of democracy», as in the bourgeois parliaments.

It is not true that there is no debate in our organs of state power, either in the People's Assembly or in the

people's councils at all levels. Not only in the organs of state power, but also at workers' meetings, when a plan or law is under discussion there are many contributions in the spirit of a broad popular debate, which brings to light the most unexpected things in order to find the most rational solution. Such debates are not encountered in any country of the capitalist and revisionist world. Hence, in these directions, too, the great superiority of the new, socialist society is evident, and we must always work for its development, strengthening and defence, as the Marxist-Leninist ideology teaches us. It is this society and this ideology which make possible the development of the virtues of the people, which create the most appropriate conditions for the development of the economy in the general interest, and not in the interest of a class of exploiters. Socialist society and Marxism-Leninism teach us how to always find the most perfect methods of administration of the people's material and moral values and place them in the service of the Homeland.

In all non-socialist socio-economic formations, in all capitalist and revisionist states, society is not led by the working class, and, consequently, not by its revolutionary party nurtured with the theory of Marx and Lenin. Various antagonistic classes exist there, led by their parties, which do not represent the true interests of the masses of the people but those of the worker aristocracy or the big aristocracy of the bourgeoisie. In their political activity, these parties pretend to do battle with one another, and wage an allegedly «democratic» parliamentary struggle, but the bourgeois parliament

*«... is given up to talk for the special purpose of fooling the 'common people'».**

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 25, p. 501, Alb. ed.

No matter how they try to pass themselves as «democratic» the states ruled by the political parties of the bourgeoisie have, in fact, not even a shred of true democracy or freedom, whether individual or social, in their activity.

In some of the non-socialist countries the «democracy» is expressed formally in the organization of many parties which, in the course of campaigns for parliamentary elections, through their powerful influence on the working masses, by deceiving them and rigging the elections and manipulating their results, manage to send a group of their deputies to parliament. The deputies of these parties are nothing but deceitful politicians specialized in defending the order in power, and strengthening the capitalist state positions of the trusts and monopolies. In parliament, they pretend to have given «freedom» and «democracy» to their country and people. No matter how much the bourgeois deputies engage in idle talk about «human rights», in the final analysis, it is capitalism, the big bourgeoisie, which rules there, and now and then shares power with the middle bourgeoisie and keeps under its domination the proletariat, the poor peasantry and the rest of the working people, such as the artisans and the poor intellectuals, a social stratum whose revolutionary spirit has been weakened by unemployment and hunger. As Marx says, these wretched electors decide

*«...each three or six years... which member of the ruling class is to misrepresent and oppress the people in parliament...»**

Political parties, whether in power or in the opposition, have set up their own trade unions which they

* K. Marx — F. Engels. *Selected Works*, vol. 1, Tirana 1975, p. 546, Alb. ed.

direct in allegedly democratic forms to make protests or claims. All the protests and claims encouraged by these parties have no political character, they are not intended to overthrow the capitalist order which ruthlessly exploits the working people, but are aimed at insignificant economic reforms which do no great harm to the bourgeoisie (therefore, at times, it accepts them) and bring no substantial gains to the proletariat and the other oppressed and exploited strata. But these «claims» are important for the defenders of the bourgeois order, because, through them, they aim to create the false impression that the working class and the other labouring people are «free» to have their say under capitalism. In order to be convinced of the deceptive nature of these actions, it is enough to mention that, when the masses of the people go beyond the guidelines set by political parties, in their demands and insist on really securing the true freedoms and rights that belong to them, then the forces of capitalist law and order step in and drown their protests in blood. World history has innumerable facts of this kind.

The capitalists try to prove their false thesis that there is «democracy» in their social system with the stale argument that the political parties there have their own press in which they can express their views on the problems of the country, the state, and its personages. Exposing the «freedom of the press» the bourgeoisie speaks about, Lenin wrote:

«The capitalists... call 'freedom of the press' the situation in which censorship has been abolished and all parties freely publish all kinds of papers.

«In reality it is not freedom of the press but freedom for the rich, for the bourgeoisie to deceive

*the oppressed and exploited masses of the people».**

But what is bourgeois democracy in reality? It is a form of the domination by the bourgeoisie, while the rights and freedoms, though proclaimed «for everybody», have an utterly formal and deceptive character, because in the conditions of the existence of private property, the socio-economic means which would ensure the actual implementation of these rights and freedoms do not exist. This bourgeois democracy allows you to criticize this or that person in the papers, at meetings, or in parliament, you are allowed to criticize the party in office or the government in power, you can talk on and on, but you can change nothing, you must confine yourself to words only, because the capitalist economic and political power with its apparatus, is ready to hurl itself brutally upon anyone who opposes the ruling class, the financial oligarchy, in deeds. Recalling the severity of the French bourgeoisie in its onslaught against the workers, after the June 1848 uprising, F. Engels wrote:

*«It was the first time that the bourgeoisie showed to what insane cruelties of revenge it will be goaded the moment the proletariat dares to take its stand against the bourgeoisie as a separate class, with its own interests and demands.»***

Can we call the form of bourgeois power which relies on the principle that the majority must submit to the minority «democracy»? Absolutely not. This is democracy in name only, it does not bring the masses of the people

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 25, p. 444, Alb. ed.

** K. Marx — F. Engels. *Selected Works*, vol. 1, Tirana 1975, p. 496, Alb. ed.

any benefit. This «democracy» does not ensure any true freedom for the people, does not make a country independent of other states more powerful politically, economically or militarily. This is because this kind of democracy is connected with other more powerful capitalist «democracies» which impose their will. Capital, national or international, imposes its own will, desires and views on the broad working masses. In the capitalist or revisionist countries, when something is presented as the «will of the working masses», it must be understood that what really lurks behind it is the will of the worker aristocracy.

The laws which are approved in bourgeois and revisionist parliaments express the will of the ruling class and defend its interests. The parties of capital which make up the parliamentary majority benefit from these laws. But the other parties, those which are allegedly in the opposition and often represent the interests of the worker aristocracy and the rich peasants, do not fail to benefit either. These «opposition» parties, which are allegedly opposed to the parties of the parliamentary majority, which support big capital, clamour, «criticize», and so on, yet all their clamouring does nothing to end unemployment, emigration, or inflation. However much the opposition may shout in parliament, prices go up, degeneration and dissipation increase, crimes, killings, hold-ups and kidnappings, go on day and night in the streets, becoming more and more alarming. And the capitalists and revisionists call this chaos and confusion, this freedom for evil-doers to perpetrate crimes, «genuine democracy»!

This is the complex of immorality in which the notorious bourgeois-democratic power is wallowing, dominated by a number of bourgeois parties in the capitalist countries, or by one anti-Marxist party in the Soviet

Union, Titoite Yugoslavia and some former countries of people's democracy which have turned capitalist.

Up till the time of the spread of Titoite and Khrushchevite modern revisionism, the so-called pluralism was confined to the participation of such pseudo-democratic parties — radical, socialist, social-democratic and many other parties with such names — in the oppressive capitalist power. When the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin was demolished by Khrushchevite revisionism, when Titoism laid the foundations of a capitalist regime in Yugoslavia, the other communist parties, with the exception of the Party of Labour of Albania, degenerated and turned into revisionist, reformist parties which sought close collaboration with the parties of capital, in running the bourgeois-capitalist society. Today the revisionist parties of France, Italy, Spain, Belgium, etc., have openly proclaimed this aim.

There is no need for explanation to prove that the participation in the state of many bourgeois, capitalist, revisionist and fascist parties of such capitalist and imperialist countries as the United States of America and others, has not in the least transformed their societies from reactionary into progressive societies. On the contrary, under imperialism, the turn is made from democracy to reaction. A society which defends and is based on the exploiting order is neither progressive nor democratic. Likewise, when state power is in the hands of a single party, which does not pursue a Marxist-Leninist line, which is not a party of the proletariat, it can never lead to the construction of socialism. On the contrary, no matter what such a party calls itself, whether «Marxist» or «Marxist-Leninist», it is in reality a party of the bourgeoisie or a fascist party, which has the task of financing the private or state capitalist property in order to nurture a new class of rulers.

Such a party is obliged to preserve some allegedly Marxist forms; it seeks to give the power it wields socialist forms and labels but its essence and intentions, as well as those of its state are anti-socialist, because its objective is to realize a regressive turn of the country and re-establish capitalism. In this case, the new bourgeoisie gradually assumes power to the detriment of the proletariat and its natural allies. This process has been proved in Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union and in many other countries of former people's democracy, where party pluralism does not exist. In these countries capitalism has been re-established in various forms, and a class of new exploiters is emerging and growing strong. If the country which goes through this regressive process is big in territory, population, or economic potential, the state of this country turns social-imperialist, and if, on the contrary, the country is small, its state becomes a satellite of world capitalism, dominated by foreign capital and neo-colonialism, which exploit the wealth of this country and the toil of its people. Thus, none of the so-called democratic states, whether with a system of pluralism, or one in which a single non-Marxist-Leninist party rules, wants to replace the old exploitative capitalist society with the new socialist society. In the old society where private ownership and capitalist exploitation exist there can be no genuine freedom, democracy, independence or sovereignty for the people.

*«The dictatorship of the proletariat alone,» Lenin teaches us, «emancipate humanity from the oppression of capital, from the lies, falsehood and hypocrisy of bourgeois democracy — democracy **for the rich** — and establish democracy **for the poor**, that is, make the blessings of democracy **really***

accessible to the workers and poor peasants...».*

Capitalist exploitation cannot be carried out without intensive political propaganda to befuddle people's minds or without a number of drastic laws which place maximum restrictions on workers' rights. The colossal propaganda apparatus at the disposal of the bourgeoisie is at work every minute of the day against the proletariat and its dictatorship, against the people who have thrown themselves into struggle to defend their rights. The entire economic and political potential of the capitalist-revisionist societies is in the hands of a handful of magnates, wealthy people, who have set up an extensive and strong network of state mechanisms in order to maintain their power through violence. The army, the police, agents, courts and other means of class coercion, which clamp down hard on any opposition, individual or collective, on the part of the proletariat and other working people, and suppress the people's revolts, serve this goal.

The bourgeois and revisionist champions of the capitalist state present nationalization of some sectors of the economy, transport, etc., as a symptom of the «transformation» of the capitalist system. In their opinion, this process of «transformation» can go further, provided the proletariat becomes «reasonable» and «moderate» in its claims and obeys the traitorous political parties and the trade unions which they manipulate. These «theoreticians» are reformists, as they hold that the capitalist state can be transformed into a socialist state through reforms. Structural reforms have been carried out by capital in various capitalist, revisionist, or imperialist countries, but all these reforms have not brought about the victory of the revolution and the revolutionaries. On the

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 28, pp. 424-425, Alb. ed.

contrary they have created a situation which has rescued capital from its overthrow, and the exploiting class from its grave-diggers.

What modern revisionism has on its agenda is reformism, which constitutes the essence of its views, theories and practices. Reformism is opposed to the Marxist-Leninist ideology and the over-throw of capitalism through the violent revolution. The driving force of the proletarian revolution is the merciless class struggle by the proletariat and its allies, the poor peasantry and the other oppressed strata, against the bourgeoisie, state monopoly capital and finance capital, whereas reformism negates the necessity for the class struggle, the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Hence reformism is the grave-digger of the revolution, it is the antithesis of Marxism-Leninism; that is why it has been adopted by the revisionist parties of such countries as the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, China and the former socialist countries as well as all revisionist parties throughout the world. In order to put down the revolution and to distort the basic theses of Marxism-Leninism, some parties, which call themselves «Eurocommunist», have openly rejected the Marxist-Leninist theory. These parties, with the «Communist» Party of Spain in the lead, have abandoned Leninism. The «Communist» Party of Spain has gone so far as to drop the name «Leninist» so that the bourgeoisie will understand that now the period of the violent overthrow of capitalism and the seizure of power by the proletariat is supposedly over, that the revisionist parties are being transformed into parties of the bourgeoisie and are ready to give any other proof in order to win the trust of national and international capital.

Likewise, the question of technological and scientific progress cannot be confused with the revolutionary tran-

sformation of society, with the liberation of the proletariat and all working people from the old exploiting system, and the establishment of the new socialist order. Advanced technology and science are the fruit of the mind of the people, of workers and intellectuals, but under exploiting social orders, technology and science are used to strengthen the economic, political and ideological positions of ruling classes inside and outside their countries. The development of science and technology, and the increase in the number of specialists, cannot eliminate the evils of capitalism, as the bourgeois and revisionist ideologists make out. Experience shows that the productive forces may be developed and science and technology may progress, but for the transition from capitalism to socialism the violent socialist revolution remains irreplaceable.

Our Marxist-Leninist theory has made it quite clear that there can be no transition to socialist society while remaining within the framework of the capitalist order, but only by overthrowing this order and its institutions from their foundations, by setting up the state power of the proletariat, which is led by its vanguard — the Marxist-Leninist communist party.

The policy of our Party and state defends the oppressed who rise in revolution, and fights the oppressors who are doomed to disappear as a class. Our Party states openly that the wiping out of the exploiters can be achieved with no other means than through fighting, violent revolution, and not through reforms of the structure or the superstructure. To achieve the complete and genuine liberation of the working class and all the working people of the world, it is necessary to overthrow the old power to its foundations and establish the new state of the proletariat in its place.

We are against decentralization of the socialist econ-

omy and in irreconcilable struggle against the capitalist-revisionist theory of «self-administration», «self-government of enterprises», which Titoism and its supporters sought to smuggle into our country through the traitors Beqir Balluku, Abdyl Këllezi, Koço Theodhosi and others. The socialist economy of our country is developing on a scientific basis, according to a unified general plan, with the aim of satisfying the material and cultural needs of our society. Our Constitution says: «The state organizes, manages, and develops all economic and social life by a unified general plan...»

It is the right and duty of our state to supervise the implementation of this plan at all links and in all indices. This is realized through worker and peasant control, through control by the state, the Party and the organizations of the masses, which are forms of proletarian control.

Of course, this effective control is based on complete freedom of criticism and on a high level of self-critical consciousness, which serve to ensure the smooth running of the work, a correct understanding of tasks, and the communist education of people. Checking up on the fulfilment of the tasks of the plan is a complex problem of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the policy of the Party, our Marxist-Leninist ideology, which is part and parcel of the great work which the Party leads.

The capitalist bourgeoisie and the revisionists attack us because we base ourselves firmly on the dictatorship of the proletariat. They level the accusation at us communists that in our society the individual allegedly counts for nothing! This is a gross slander designed to cover up the brutal oppression of the proletariat and the working people by capital. The existence of antagonistic classes is the source of the suppression of the personality of man

and the working masses. On the contrary, if there ever exists a social system which really frees man from anguish, worries, mean feelings of jealousy and the old idealist hangovers, this is the socialist social system which is the only system that brings about the elimination of exploiting classes, private property and puts an end to the exploitation of man by man.

The demolition of the power of exploiting classes, which impose barbarous domination over the working people, and the establishment of the power of the working class liberates man and elevates him to a high pedestal, enables him to work with a will, to run things with a clear conscience, to criticize and praise when he should. Socialism puts man in such a position that he feels and sees for himself that he is not isolated from the world, but is a member of a new society, which has as its aim the advance of the individual within the framework of the development of the society. In this society man is raised to his rightful place, on the basis of his abilities and the work he does, he is free to work and enjoy the fruit of his toil. Neither the bourgeois, the capitalist, nor the revisionist can understand the freedom of the individual in our society because they measure individuality with their own yardstick of the standardization and manipulation of people.

By accepting the independence of the individual from society, the exploiting classes aimed to ensure privileges for people of their own class, to give them knowledge, freedom and authority to rule others, order them about. Our regime has struck at the roots of bourgeois individualism and created unlimited possibilities for the individual and society to develop their abilities and enjoy all the constitutional rights and freedoms.

Naturally capitalism and its propaganda have to combat our socialist reality, our dictatorship of the prolet-

ariat, because they cannot reconcile themselves to our morality which does not permit man to be exploited economically, politically and morally and his freedoms to be trampled underfoot. But our socialist reality cannot be overshadowed by any idealist propaganda and «theory», whether capitalist or revisionist.

The capitalist world has plunged into a great crisis. The advocates of the bourgeois order, the bourgeois economists and sociologists, compelled by reality, see that the theses of Marx and Lenin on capitalism and imperialism have not grown outdated, that in present-day capitalist society capitalism and imperialism are in a process of decay just as Marx and Lenin predicted, but, in order to emerge from the crisis, these champions of the old order are clamouring about the «fight against terrorism», the prevention of the revolts and the revolution of the masses of the working people against the capitalist order, or the fight against «disturbances», as they call them. Otherwise, cry these sociologists and economists of the bourgeoisie in despair, capitalism cannot emerge from the crisis and «stabilize» its system.

The capitalist and revisionist countries, where it is claimed that man allegedly enjoys democratic freedoms and every other «blessing», are seething with protests of the masses. If there is real freedom and the masses enjoy all material blessings, as claimed, then why are millions of people continually turning out in the streets and clashing with the police of the bourgeoisie? It is plain that the masses are protesting because their life is far from good, that they are suffering economically, politically and in many other directions, and that is why they try to overthrow the state which is against genuine democracy.

The bourgeois state of the period of the domination of state monopoly capitalism seeks to give the impression that parliament in which various parties, allegedly

ected by universal suffrage, are represented, makes the law there. But it is common knowledge that the system of elections and the many restrictions imposed by law ensure that those political parties which are the strongest pillars of capital always gain the majority in parliament. The parliamentary game in these countries is a mere masquerade, a means which serves the state power of the bourgeoisie to give the false impression that «democracy» exists there and to present this false democracy as real. The top organs of the capitalist and revisionist state power and administration there are in the hands of the «delegates» of that power which is not sanctioned by law, which formally stands outside the government, but which in fact is in power. This is the power of the big capitalists who, through the power of their money, have placed their factotums in the government or parliament to defend their interests from the «trouble-makers», from those who rise in revolt and want to gain the rights which the capitalists have seized. To this whole complex the champions of capitalism and revisionism have attached the name «genuine democracy».

Lenin said that, at given moments, the tribune of the bourgeois parliament may be utilized by the revolutionaries as one of the forms of their legal work in order to expose the capitalist system. However, at the same time he stressed that this should not create the illusion among the communists and the masses that power can be seized through the parliamentary road.

In bourgeois-capitalist and revisionist society «parliamentary cretinism» is that form of «democracy» which the bourgeoisie uses to conceal the oppressive nature of its state power, which it wields through the majority of seats it secures in elections. But, in addition to the state power, the bourgeoisie also dominates that mighty extra-state power, that is, the monopolies, trusts, joint com-

parries and their investments inside and outside its own country. This power of big private property constitutes the economic force which appropriates the toil of the working people inside or outside the country and is in a position to buttress the superstructure to adapt it better to the savage capitalist rule. The bourgeois superstructure is a means for the implementation of a policy of enslavement of the peoples, a military, ideological and political force against the proletariat, the poor peasantry and working intelligentsia. It also endeavours to bring about the degeneration and destruction of the norms of proletarian morality in order to spread bourgeois morality which is rotten in the true sense of the word.

The bourgeois parliament opens its doors to the «elected», but the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie does its own work. There they hold endless discussions and voting after voting, and things still go on according to the desires of those who make the law, the rich, the owners of trusts, monopolies, and the banks, whose power, the second capitalist state, manipulates parliament and the government, in spite of the fact that such manipulation is not envisaged in the Constitution in force. Proceeding from these reasons. Lenin wrote:

*«... in any parliamentary country... the real business of 'state' is performed behind the scenes and is carried on by the departments, chancelleries and General Staffs.»**

In Albania, the national liberation councils which were created under the leadership of the Party at the time of the Anti-fascist National Liberation War and strengthened after Liberation and during the period of the construction of socialism, are organs of the dictatorship

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, vol. 2, Tirana, 1958, p. 174. Alb. ed.

of the proletariat, elected by the people and representing the will and desires of working people. The representative organs of the people in the state power are the People's Assembly and people's councils. Under the Constitution of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania «the representative organs direct and control the activity of all other state organs, which are responsible before them and render account to them.»

With us democracy is not a trick to mislead the people, but is put into practice. Here, there is no dual power, one recognized by the law and the other existing *de facto*, but only the unified state power, which stems from the people and belongs to them. Our state is the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which has made the laws and created its own revolutionary apparatus, its new method and style at work, which expresses and defends the interests of the working people.

In our country it is not violence which makes people observe the laws of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but their full conviction that the observance of laws benefits them and society. Our people implement the laws in a conscious manner, because they play a large part in drafting them.

In the capitalist and revisionist countries the law is enforced through the savage violence of the bourgeoisie. There can be no pretence of voluntary implementation of the laws by the people as long as their content is in open contradiction with the interests of the people there. Speaking of the injustice of the bourgeois law, Marx says:

*«Each paragraph of the Constitution contains its own antithesis... liberty in the general phrase, abrogation of liberty in the marginal note.»**

* K. Marx — F. Engels, *Selected Works*, vol. 1, Tirana 1975, p. 265, Alb. ed.

In those countries the citizen is a commodity and is treated precisely as a commodity, whereas in our country, each citizen of the Republic is valued highly and plays a great role in society. For the citizen to play this role in a more active manner, it is necessary that he must be raised to a still higher level ideo-politically, culturally, and scientifically, and become conscious of his own role.

Comrades,

It is the task of the Democratic Front to fight ceaselessly for the defence and development of our democracy, this major victory of the Party and the people, and for the implementation of the laws and norms which regulate our socialist life.

It must work unceasingly to solicit the opinion of the broad working masses ever better, to help them have their say on all state and social problems, so that the workers and peasants exercise their control over the state, economic and other organs.

Our Democratic Front is not an amorphous, lifeless organization. On the contrary, it is an organization with such political dynamism as to see every problem from the revolutionary angle and find the most suitable forms for its solution in a revolutionary manner.

The Democratic Front is led by the Party of Labour of Albania, that is, by the vanguard of the working class and expresses those ideas, those aspirations, and that policy which bring benefit to the Albanian people, while it exposes and fights everything which may harm our socialist Homeland. Thus, the policy of the Front is a monolithic, consistent policy, because in the Front there are no antagonistic political trends, no various parties

defending the interests of different classes. The political struggle of the Front conforms completely with the policy of the Party, with the policy of our socialist state. The policy of the Democratic Front of Albania reflects and supports the revolutionary laws of our People's Socialist Republic.

The enemies of our country abroad think that the policy of the Democratic Front of Albania is an inert, stereotyped policy devoid of content. They want the policy of our Front to be a confused and contradictory policy, a product of various tendencies, of contending views and aims, because this alone, they claim, is democracy. These opponents of our Front, our revolutionary organization, are not in a position to understand that when the people are united, as our people are, they can and do hold correct, clear and unified political views on principles and objectives, and, when we say unified, we mean not a lifeless and stereotyped policy, but a policy which is in a position to supply answers and solutions to all problems, whether complicated internal problems or very intricate external ones, through debate and discussion.

Where does the Democratic Front find such strength and maturity? Precisely from the fact that the composition of this organization is really democratic, because our Front is an organization of the broad masses led by a Marxist-Leninist Party, which represents the most perfect democracy, the genuine democracy of the proletariat. The proletariat and its Party are always in struggle and revolution for the construction of a happy society for the people, a free society, a democratic society, a society which day by day rises higher and higher from the standpoint of its economic and intellectual development, its knowledge and sound proletarian morality. And this is brought about through a continuous creative struggle which calls for efforts and democratic debate.

Our Democratic Front pursues this policy and fights to achieve these objectives. The implementation of such a policy cannot be the work of an organization created merely for the sake of appearances, to mislead the masses of the people at home and abroad that allegedly a political organization exists at a time when such a thing is non-existent.

How does our Democratic Front see world developments? Our Front sees them with a realistic eye. This means that it is orientated by materialistic dialectics, by historical materialism, it bases itself on our scientific ideology, on Marxism-Leninism. It is precisely this which ensures that the policy of the Party, which is pursued by the Front, too, is not a baseless, wavering, pragmatic and unprincipled policy. The policy of the Democratic Front is, therefore, a policy of a class character, and when we say of a class character we mean that it has always had in mind the class struggle being waged within the country and in the international arena, and bases itself on this.

Our Democratic Front encourages sincere love for the peoples of the world and, in the first place, the peoples seeking liberation, the peoples languishing in enslavement under the heel of capital. This policy of the Front gives all-out support to the aspirations of these peoples. With its consistently correct, humanitarian and revolutionary word, our Democratic Front never hides the truth about the materialist development of history from the oppressed and exploited peoples and classes of the world, who aspire to freedom, genuine democracy and sovereignty, it never hides from them the fact that their victory cannot be achieved without fierce class struggles, without battles, at times even bloody battles, against the capitalist oppressors and exploiters. This is the basis of the Marxist-Leninist policy of the Democratic Front, which is also the basis of the policy of our Party of Labour.

The policy of the Front is a policy which supports and complies with the interests of the struggle which the world proletariat and the suffering and oppressed peasantry of any country are waging; it supports the struggle of the urban poor, the progressive intelligentsia, youth, all those who want to build a dignified, worthy and decent life, a life in which everything is earned with toil which must not serve to fill the pockets of thieves and capitalists.

In our policy we do not budge from these principles. Our Democratic Front cherishes feelings of love for the peoples of the world and they love the Albanian people. Albania is a typical example of a small country which enjoys great sympathy everywhere in the world, which is building socialism by relying on its own forces, «raising itself by its own bootstraps» as the saying goes. Its aim is not to instigate wars, to conquer countries and peoples. On the contrary, its people desire to live on terms of friendship with other peoples and that is why their sympathy for the Albanian people is great, obvious and tangible.

However, the various peoples of the world live in countries with regimes different from ours. They are not governed by such a regime as the dictatorship of the proletariat established in our country. The governments of these countries do not pursue the same policy as ours. Therefore, without budging from its basic principles, our state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and consequently, our Democratic Front, led and correctly inspired by the Party is able to make the necessary analyses of the evolving situations in the world, the individual characteristics of the various states, the aims and objectives of these states towards their own peoples, other peoples, and especially our people. This permits us to build a correct and sound policy, and not a policy based on

passing circumstances. On the basis of these universal principles, our Party and the Democratic Front are able to differentiate between the level of friendship of one or the other bourgeois state for Albania and the small states in general, they can assess the danger posed by one big capitalist power in comparison with another big capitalist power, as well as the danger it poses to other smaller capitalist states, they know how to distinguish the great danger posed by the imperialist and social-imperialist superpowers, in general, and to adopt the proper stand towards all of them. The stand adopted by our Party, our socialist state and the Democratic Front of Albania, are not opportunist and unfounded, nor dictated by somebody else, but are principled, well-wishing and sincere stands. They are stern and irreconcilable towards enemies, but friendly and correct towards those bourgeois states which pursue a policy of friendship with socialist Albania and adhere to certain democratic principles, allow some reforms, and so on, within their own countries. We have our own views on the «democracy» that exists in these countries as well as on these kinds of «reforms», their content and the aim they are instituted for. This is a right of ours which nobody can deny us, just as nobody can prevent us from expressing our views freely. This is precisely what we do when we explain to the peoples theoretically and politically the content of the «democracy» and «reforms», their limitations, character, and so on, in a bourgeois state. But we do this without interfering in others' internal affairs, because, after all, the peoples of various countries are capable of deciding for themselves the value of these phenomena in their own states.

Nevertheless, our Party and Democratic Front make distinction and they do this to defend the interests not only of their own people and country, but also those of the other peoples, for they never separate the general

interests of their country and people from those of the peoples of the world and the world proletariat. Herein lies the great and mighty truth expressed in the policy of our Party and the Democratic Front, herein lies the source of the support the policy of our state enjoys in the world.

Our policy is not like the policies of the bourgeois and revisionist capitalist states which twists and turns like the yellow leaves in the autumn breeze. No, our policy has not wavered nor will it ever waver from the principle that we must and will be brothers with the peoples, united with them for the same aims: true freedom, democracy, sovereignty and independence; we are linked with the peoples in the struggle against the oppressors and exploiters of the peoples, in the struggle against those who instigate and prepare predatory imperialist wars, which are waged at the expense of the peoples. We will never shift from this policy, which will remain unchanged on our part whatever the form of government this or that people are under.

Therefore, when socialist Albania declares that it wishes to live in good friendship, especially with the neighbouring countries, and that it regards their peoples as brothers, this is a permanent truth. We are pleased to see that some leaderships of these and other countries, though they have social orders different from ours, pursue a friendly policy towards our country. For its part, the Albanian proletarian state, too, pursues a friendly policy of mutual interest, that is, it makes the proper distinction in regard to those various bourgeois states which are progressive and well-disposed to it. We want to have similar relations with all those states, big or small, which respect the People's Socialist Republic of Albania and desire to maintain friendly economic and cultural relations with our country, in spite of the fact

that they may be opposed to it on a series of issues, just as we are in opposition to them on a series of questions of principle.

We declare that ill-intentioned relations are always harmful and fraught with danger, and it is difficult to conceal them. Life itself and the history of mankind have taught our people to be always on their guard against relations behind which lurks perfidy. There are already many individuals or official circles abroad, who know that the Albanian people have always condemned perfidy, for it has never been in their character. We condemned the perfidy and betrayal of Marxism-Leninism committed by the Titoites, the Soviet revisionists as well as the Chinese revisionist leaders. Our rupture with these reactionary revisionist groups came about because of profound ideological and political reasons and not over minor issues. They were not simply of a national character, because they affected not only Albania's economic interests. No, they had and have a more international character, because they violate those great principles for which the peoples, the world proletariat and progressive mankind are fighting.

The policy of our Party and Front has been and is known to young and old at home and abroad, therefore it is not necessary to go into detail about it in this speech. I merely wish to stress to certain circles abroad that the policy of our Party and the Democratic Front of Albania will not vacillate or depart, in the least, from its correct, defined and permanent principles based on Marxism-Leninism. Our policy will always be a principled class policy complying with the lofty interests of our country, socialism and the liberation struggle of the peoples. Our people will always fight unwaveringly against US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and all reactionaries: nobody should cherish the slightest illusion

that socialist Albania will change its stand towards them. Likewise, the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian state will fight and expose Chinese social-imperialism which has taken sides with US imperialism and world reaction in its struggle against the peoples, especially against socialism in Albania.

On the other hand the People's Socialist Republic of Albania has always pursued a friendly policy towards all those states which wish our state well, and do not seek to harm it just as we never try or intend to harm their peoples, but always wish to be in harmony and co-operation for the sake of the lofty aims and ardent desires of all the peoples of the world who aspire to liberation, freedom, democracy, independence, sovereignty and socialism.

Comrades,

The campaign for the election of deputies to the People's Assembly is a great political action of our organization of the Democratic Front. Let us, together with all the other mass organizations, do our utmost to go to the elections of the deputies to the People's Assembly with still greater results at work. With unshakeable confidence in the correct line of the Party, and the brilliant prospects opened to our people, let the political enthusiasm and mobilization of the workers, peasants, youth, the women, our entire working people, burst out powerfully in this campaign in order to crown these elections with full success.

Long live our heroic people!

Long live the Party!

Long live the Democratic Front!

«On the People's Power»
Collection of Works

YUGOSLAV
«SELF-ADMINISTRATION» —
A CAPITALIST THEORY
AND PRACTICE

Against E. Kardelj's anti-socialist views expressed in the book, «Directions of the Development of the Political System of Socialist Self-administration».

A great deal of publicity is being given to a book published in Yugoslavia last year under the title *Directions of the Development of the Political System of Socialist Self-administration*, by the leading «theoretician» of Titoite revisionism, Eduard Kardelj.

The anti-Marxist ideas of this book were the basis of the entire proceedings of the 11th Congress of the revisionist party of Yugoslavia, to which the Titoites, in an effort to disguise its bourgeois character, have given the name «the League of Communists of Yugoslavia».

As the 7th Congress of the PLA pointed out, the Titoites and international capitalism are publicizing the system of «self-administration» as «a ready-made and tested road to socialism», and are using it as a favourite weapon in their struggle against socialism, the revolution and liberation struggles.

In view of its danger, I think I must express some opinions about this book.

As is known, capitalism has been fully established in Yugoslavia, but this capitalism is cunningly disguised. Yugoslavia poses as a socialist state, but one of a special kind, which the world has never seen before! Indeed, the Titoites even boast that their state has nothing in common with the first socialist state which emerged from the October Socialist Revolution and which was founded by Lenin and Stalin on the basis of the scientific theory of Marx and Engels.

Right from the start the Yugoslav renegades deviated from the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism on the socialist state and have worked to prevent the establish-

ment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, so that Yugoslavia would proceed on the road of capitalism.

On another occasion, I have explained that both prior to and after the liberation of Yugoslavia, the Titoite renegade group, which disguised itself and posed as a supporter of the socialist system established in the Soviet Union, and which trumpeted that it would build socialism on the basis of the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism, in reality was opposed to this ideology and the Soviet revolutionary experience. This correct conclusion emerges clearly from the content of Kardelj's book, too.

1. — A Brief Glance at the History of the Titoite Revisionists

The National Liberation War of Yugoslavia, under the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, was the embodiment of the valour and courage of the people and the honesty of the genuine communists of Yugoslavia. During this war, however, certain dubious trends appeared in the Yugoslav leadership, which made one think that in its stand towards the anti-fascist alliance of the Soviet Union, the United States of America and Britain, the Tito group leaned rather towards the Anglo-Americans, and this became quite clear later. At that time, we observed that the Titoite leadership maintained very close contacts with the Western allies, especially with the British, from whom it received first-rate financial and military aid. Likewise, we were struck by the obvious political rapprochement between Tito and Churchill and his envoys(1), at a time when the National Lib-

1 Tito met and held talks with Churchill in August 1944 in Naples of Italy. He also met the commander of the Allied

eration War of Yugoslavia ought to have been closely linked with the liberation war of the Soviet Union, because the hope for the all-round liberation of all the peoples, as far as the external factor was concerned, was precisely this war.

The tendencies of the Titoite leadership to oppose the Soviet Union became more evident on the eve of the victory over fascism, when the Red Army, in hot pursuit of the German army, entered Yugoslavia to assist the National Liberation War there. Especially at the time when the conclusions of this great war were being reached among the great and small belligerent powers, it was obvious that Titoite Yugoslavia had the support of British and US imperialism. At that time, the diplomatic and ideological frictions between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia grew more evident. Among other things, these differences were over territorial problems. Yugoslavia claimed territories in the North, especially on its border with Italy. But it was silent about its southern borders, especially its border with Albania, about Kosova and the Albanian territories in Macedonia and Montenegro. The Titoites could not speak about them, because they would encroach upon the chauvinistic platform of the Serbiannationalists.(2)

Now it is common knowledge that the differences between the Yugoslav leadership and Stalin were deep-rooted. The revisionist views of the Yugoslav leading group were crystallized long before the liberation of their country, possibly in the days when the Communist Party

Mediterranean Forces, General Wilson, as well as the commander of the 8th Army, Fieldmarshall Alexander.

2 The Yugoslav revisionists' stand towards this problem is analysed in detail in Comrade Enver Hoxha's Work, *The Titoites (Historical Notes)*, «8 Nëntori» Publishing House, Tirana 1982, pp. 74-122, Eng. ed.

of Yugoslavia took part in the Comintern and worked in total illegality under the regime of the Serbian kings. Even at that time, its leadership had deviationist, Trotskyite views, which the Comintern condemned whenever they were expressed. Later Tito «wiped off» the condemnations of the Comintern, even going so far as to rehabilitate the greatest deviationist, Gorkić,⁽³⁾ the former general secretary of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia.

After the liberation of Yugoslavia a problem of great importance arose: what direction was Yugoslavia to take? This direction, of course, would depend to a great extent on whether the world outlook of the leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia was Marxist-Leninist or revisionist. They passed themselves off as Marxist-Leninists, and at first that is what we believed them to be. In fact, however, not only from their activity in general, but also from their concrete attitudes towards us, we observed that many things about them were not in accord with the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism. We saw that they were deviating as far as they possibly could from the experience of the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union.

The tendency of the Yugoslav leading group, headed by Tito, Kardelj, Ranković and Djilas, which was noticed as early as the time of their illegal activity, but especially after the liberation of Yugoslavia, was that the Communist Party of Yugoslavia should not come out openly under its own name, but should be disguised, as it was, under the cloak of the so-called Popular Front of Yugoslavia. This illegality was justified under the pretext that otherwise they risked «alarming and frightening the big and petty bourgeoisie of town and countryside», which «might

3 Milan Gorkić was condemned by the Executive Committee of the Communist International in 1937.

abandon the new state power which had emerged from the revolution», and that «the Anglo-American allies might be frightened by communism». Efforts were made to convince the bourgeoisie that the communists were not in power, that the communist party, though it existed, was, so to say, a participant in a broad front, in which the men of Mihajlović, and Nedić, and Stojadinović and all the other reactionary vices in Yugoslavia could participate.

Tito even formed a provisional government with Subašić,⁽⁴⁾ the former prime minister of the royal government in exile in London, but under constant pressure from the people he did not permit him to govern very long and liquidated him. At that time he pretended that he had not wanted Subašić, but the allies had imposed him, while later he accused Stalin of the same thing.⁽⁵⁾ The truth is that Tito accepted Subašić to please Churchill, because he did not like Stalin.

From the very beginning, the views of Tito and his associates showed that they were far from being «hard-line Marxists», as the bourgeoisie calls the consistent

4 He became foreign minister of the Yugoslav Government after the liberation of Yugoslavia, and resigned on October 5, 1945.

5 In his letter to Subašić, in October 1945, upon the latter's resignation, Tito wrote: «Your resignation has astonished me extremely... Which part of our agreement has not been fulfilled? First, a united government with the participation of all those ministers of the London government that you proposed was founded..., many laws, in the drafting of which you took part, were endorsed. The existence of parties was approved and they began to operate. Freedom of the press exists, indeed, the fact that even the opposition has its publications proves that this is true. This means that all those commitments I accepted in the agreement we signed jointly... are being carried out. By accepting your declarations and collaboration, I rejected everything that could divide us.»

Marxists, but «reasonable Marxists», who would collaborate closely with all the reactionary bourgeois politicians of Yugoslavia, old or new.

Although it posed as being illegal, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia operated legally. Nevertheless, Ranković and Tito did not give it the power and the leading role it should have had, because they were not for the construction of socialism in Yugoslavia. Tito and Ranković distorted the Marxist-Leninist norms of the structure and role of the party. The Communist Party of Yugoslavia, from the very beginning, was not built on the bases and the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. This party, which was allegedly merged in the «Popular Front of Yugoslavia», made the law, together with the Army, the Ministry of the Interior and the State Security service. After the war, this party, which had led the war of the Yugoslav peoples, became a detachment of the state organs of repression, which were the Army, the Ministry of the Interior, and the UDB. Together with them, it became an organ of oppression of the working masses, instead of being the vanguard of the working class.

From the propaganda developed and the authority the party had won during the National Liberation War and in the initial steps of the construction of Yugoslavia after the war, the Yugoslav working class had the impression that this party was in the vanguard. In reality, it was not the vanguard of the working class, but of a new bourgeois class that had begun to assert itself, that relied strongly on the prestige of the National Liberation War of the peoples of Yugoslavia for its own counter-revolutionary aims, while it obscured the perspectives of the construction of the new society. Such a degenerate party was bound to lead Titoite Yugoslavia on to anti-Marxist paths.

The anti-Marxist course of the Yugoslav Titoites, of the Tito-Kardelj-Ranković group came into open opposition, as it was bound to do, with Marxism-Leninism, the communist parties, the Soviet Union, Stalin, and all the countries of people's democracy which were created after the Second World War. Of course, this clash developed gradually, till the critical moment came, when the tares were sorted from the wheat. (6)

It is an incontestable fact that the peoples of Yugoslavia fought. Yugoslavia made great sacrifices, just as Albania did. The anti-Marxist Yugoslav leaders misused this fight for their own ends. For public opinion at home and abroad, they also exploited the high assessment which the Soviet Union made of Yugoslavia, in which that country was described as an important ally on the Marxist-Leninist road to socialism.

Before long, in their relations with the newly-created states of people's democracy, the Titoites were displaying tendencies to domination, expansion and hegemony, which were apparent everywhere, but more especially in their relations with our country. As we know, they sought to impose their anti-Marxist political, ideological, organizational and state views on us. They went so far as to

6 This came about in June 1948, when the meeting of the Informbureau of the Communist Parties, which examined the situation in the Yugoslav Communist Party, was held in Rumania. The relative resolution adopted on this problem says that the leadership of the Yugoslav Communist Party has abandoned internationalism and set on the road of chauvinism, that «... such a nationalist orientation could only lead to the degeneration of Yugoslavia into an ordinary bourgeois republic, to the loss of its independence and its transformation into a colony of imperialist states.» Life fully confirmed these predictions. (Resolution of the Informbureau on the situation in the Yugoslav Communist Party, published in the organ of the Informbureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties, *For a Stable Peace, for People's Democracy!*, July 1, 1948, No. 16).

make despicable attempts to transform Albania into a republic of Yugoslavia. In this disgraceful, but unsuccessful enterprise, the Titoites encountered our determined opposition. At first, our resistance was uncrystallized, because we did not suspect that the Yugoslav leadership had set out on the capitalist and revisionist road. After some years, however, when its hegemonic and expansionist tendencies were clearly displayed, we opposed it sternly and unreservedly.

The Titoites tried to impose their will on us by resorting to the most varied kinds of pressure and blackmail. To this end, they also organized the Koçi Xoxe (7) conspiracy. They pursued this same imperialist practice towards other countries, too, like Bulgaria, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, although not to the same extent. All these ugly acts clearly showed that Yugoslavia was not advancing on the road to socialism, but had become a tool in the service of world capitalism.

With each passing day it was becoming clearer that a socialist society of the Leninist type was not being built in Yugoslavia, but that capitalism was developing instead. Meanwhile, the steps taken on this capitalist road were disguised with the alleged quest for a new, specific form of «socialism». Precisely for this purpose, the Yugoslav revisionist leadership with Tito, Kardelj and Ranković at the head, in an effort to somehow justify their betrayal «theoretically», borrowed the most varied ideas from the arsenal of the old revisionists, and in this way strengthened their fascist-type state with

7 Former organizational secretary of the CC of the CPA and minister of Internal Affairs. He was recruited by the Yugoslav secret service in the beginning of the summer of 1943 and carried out uninterrupted, anti-Albanian and anti-Marxist conspiratorial activity until he was discovered and received the deserved condemnation.

every possible means. The Army, the Ministry of the Interior, and the UDB became all-powerful.

Though it was establishing capitalism, the Yugoslav revisionist leadership tried to create the opinion among the masses of the people that the war aims were not being betrayed in Yugoslavia, that a state with a socialist orientation existed there, in the leadership of which was a communist party that defended Marxism, and allegedly, precisely because of this, it had come into opposition with the Soviet Union, Stalin, the communist parties and the countries of people's democracy.

To protect their positions, badly shaken as a result of their exposure before internal public opinion and in the international communist and workers' movement, the Titoites, in continuation of their deceptive policy, proclaimed that they would take «serious» actions for the construction of socialism in the countryside, for the collectivization of agriculture according to Leninist principles, and therefore, they formed the so-called *zadrugas*. As for the seriousness of the intentions of the Titoite renegades about the construction of socialism in the countryside, it is enough to recall that the *zadrugas* collapsed before they were properly established, and now no trace remains of the collectivization of the Yugoslav countryside.

Up till 1948, when the final rupture came between the Soviet Union, the countries of people's democracy and the international communist movement, on the one hand, and Yugoslavia, on the other, the latter was still in the initial phase of chaotic capitalism, in a state of political, ideological, economic disorganization, in an extremely grave situation. This impelled the Tito-Kardelj-Ranković group to act more openly, to link itself more closely with world capitalism, especially US imperialism, in order to maintain its power and to change the situation to its advantage.

After 1948, plunged into a grave political, ideological and economic crisis, Yugoslavia found itself in a quandary, because of the anti-Marxist deviation of its leadership. The Titoite renegades were, so to say, wanting to sit on two «chairs». They wanted to sit on the «chair» of Marxism-Leninism, merely for the sake of appearances, only for form's sake, while on the other, the capitalist-revisionist «chair», they wanted to plant themselves firmly; but, in order to achieve this aim, a certain amount of time would be necessary. The period from 1948 onwards was very troubled by grave crises, confusion and chaos.

The Tito-Kardelj-Ranković renegade group faced the question: How to hang on to power and crush any resistance of the proletariat and the peoples of Yugoslavia, who had fought for socialism in friendship and complete unity with the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy? With this aim in view, the Yugoslav revisionists worked, in the first place, to liquidate any trace of Marxism-Leninism left in their party, in order to transform it into an instrument of their bourgeois-revisionist ideology and policy, to divest it of any leading function, while converting the working class into an inert mass which must not be given the possibility to see the betrayal and act against it as the decisive political force of the revolution. The norms of democratic centralism in the party were violated. The party was made subordinate to the UDB, which was used by the Titoites as a means to suppress all the elements who were not in favour of the retrogressive anti-Marxist turn. The party was «purged» of all those who were loyal to socialism. Though it appeared to retain some norms of elections, meetings, and conferences, in reality its bureaucratic leadership concentrated all the power in this allegedly Marxist-Leninist party in its own hands and transformed it into a simple tool implementing its orders and those

of the State Security service. Thus, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia was radically transformed and lost all the features of the vanguard party of the working class, the leading political force of society. This was a great victory for capitalism, for the foreign and local bourgeoisie.

In order to maintain their domination, the Titoite renegades had to quietly liquidate the state power which had emerged from the National Liberation War and to build another state power, a ferocious fascist dictatorship.

In other words, the Tito-Kardelj-Ranković leading group undertook the liquidation of all Marxist-Leninist features of the revolution and set out in quest of allegedly new «socialist» roads, which were capitalist in fact, in the economy, internal and foreign policy, education and culture, and in all sectors of life. In this situation, the State Security organs and the Yugoslav Army became the favourite savage weapons in the hands of this handful of renegades, which meted out draconian punishment to anyone who dared denounce the betrayal. The mass persecutions and killings of all sound Marxist-Leninist elements began. The dreadful concentration camps, one of which was that of Goli Otok were crammed with prisoners and internees.

At that time Yugoslavia's economy was in very bad shape because of the war devastation, the confused policy of the Yugoslav leadership, and because, after the breaking off of all relations with the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia no longer received the considerable aid it had received in the first years after liberation, as well as because it could no longer plunder the other countries of people's democracy, like Albania, through the «joint» companies set up on an unfair basis, which benefited only one side, Yugoslavia.

Certainly, the Yugoslav renegades could not get out of the crisis through terrorism alone. As a long-standing

agency of world capitalism, they turned immediately in that direction for aid, and US imperialism, in particular, was ready to give Tito and Co. all the aid and support they needed to save their skins and to make them an important tool in its fight against socialism, the revolution and liberation movements. The imperialist powers had been waiting impatiently for such a turn, because they had been prepared for this since the time of the war. Therefore, they did not fail to give them major economic «aid», and also gave them strong political and ideological support. They even supplied them with various weapons and military equipment, and linked them with NATO through the Balkan Pact. (8)

In the first period, Yugoslavia was «aided» by capital investments from foreign companies, (9) especially in industry and agriculture.

In the field of industry, where US imperialism showed itself particularly «generous», its «aid» enabled work to begin for the reconstruction of the old existing factories, so that these could be made more or less operational and their production would suffice to prop up the bourgeois-revisionist regime which was crystallizing and which had turned its face towards world capitalism.

The Titoite regime also had to liquidate that half-

8 On the basis of the military agreement between the USA and Yugoslavia, signed on November 14, 1951, the Yugoslav armed forces were actually put under Pentagon control. In 1953 the triple Treaty of Collaboration and Friendship, which in 1954 was changed into a military pact, was concluded between Yugoslavia, Greece and Turkey. This pact tied Yugoslavia also to NATO of which Turkey and Greece are members.

9 According to the newspaper *The Times*, April 17, 1951 in October 1949 the International Reconstruction Bank accorded Yugoslavia a loan of 2,700,000 dollars whereas, in the same year, the International Monetary Fund gave it two loans amounting to 12,000,000 dollars. The American Congress authorized a loan of 38 million dollars in December 1950 and an additional 29 million dollars in April 1951.

baked system of collectivization of agriculture which had been set up in a number of peasant economies and to create a new system in which the kulaks and the big landed proprietors would be favoured again. Forms and means were found for the redistribution of the land, under which the old kulaks were re-established without causing great upheavals in the country. The state adopted a series of capitalist measures, such as the breaking up of the machine and tractor stations and the sale of their equipment to the rich peasantry which could afford to buy them, and the imposition of heavy taxes on the peasants. The state farms, likewise, were transformed into capitalist enterprises in which foreign capital, also, was invested, etc.

The local merchants and industrialists, to whom major concessions were made, benefited greatly from the foreign capital invested.

These measures proved beyond any doubt that the «socialism» which was being built in Yugoslavia was nothing other than the road of integration into capitalism.

Thus, the ground was prepared for the penetration of foreign capital on an ever larger scale in a political, ideological and organizational environment very suitable to world capitalism, which, by aiding the Titoite regime, would use it as a bridgehead for its penetration into the other countries of people's democracy.

This political, ideological and economic orientation of Titoite Yugoslavia towards capitalism brought about that the class struggle there took another direction, and developed no longer as a motive force of the socialist society, but as a motive force in the struggle among opposing classes, as is the case in any capitalist state where the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie prevails. The Titoite bourgeois-revisionist state spearheaded the class struggle in Yugoslavia against the progressive elements of the work-

ing class, against the communists who resisted the course of betrayal.

Democratic centralism was soon liquidated, also, in the field of the economic and state administration. It is true that in Yugoslavia some factories had been nationalized, foreign trade had been proclaimed a state monopoly and it was alleged that the principle of democratic centralism was implemented in the organization and activity of the state and the party. But these measures of a seemingly revolutionary character were neither complete nor consistent. The centralism in Yugoslavia did not have the true Leninist meaning that the entire economic and political life of the society should be carried on by combining the centralized leadership with the creative initiative of the local organs and the working masses, but was intended to create a dictatorial force of the fascist type, which would be in a position to impose the will of the ruling regime on the peoples of Yugoslavia from above. With the passage of a few years, these initial measures, which were advertized as allegedly socialist tendencies, took a clearly anti-Marxist, counter-revolutionary direction. The entire state organization and state activity in the economic field assumed capitalist features, in open opposition to the fundamental experience of the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin.

In the years immediately after 1948, we can say that the principle of centralism was implemented in the activity of the Yugoslav state, because the Federation of Yugoslavia was burdened with very grave difficulties which, decentralized, it could not solve successfully. The times were such that the preservation of centralism was required, because the Federation was made up of republics, each of them with different nationalist political currents which were seeking to break away from it. But

that sort of centralism was bureaucratic centralism, the economic plans were decided from above without being discussed at the base, were not well-studied and were not designed to promote an harmonious development of the various branches of the economy of the republics and regions of the Federation, the orders were arbitrary and were executed blindly, and the products were procured by force. From this chaos, in which the initiative of the local organs of the party and state and the initiative of the working masses were nowhere; to be seen, of course, disagreements were bound to emerge, as they did in fact, and they were suppressed with terror and bloodshed.

Such a situation was encouraged by the capitalist states which had taken the Titoite regime under their wing in order to give Yugoslavia a capitalist orientation. Profiting from this state of affairs, the various imperialists competed with one another in their efforts to get a tighter grip on this corrupt state, so that, together with the credits they provided, they could also impose their political, ideological and organizational views.

The foreign capitalists who supported the Titoite renegade group, recognized clearly that this group would serve them, but they felt that, after the turbulent and chaotic situation had been overcome, a more stable situation had to be created in Yugoslavia. Otherwise, they could not be sure about the security of the big investments they were making and which they were to increase in the future.

In order to create the desired situation in favour of capitalism it was necessary to bring about the decentralization of the management of the economy and the recognition and protection by law of the rights of the capitalists who were making large investments in the economy of this state.

The Titoite leadership understood clearly that world

capitalism wanted Yugoslavia as a tool in its hands, to be in the best possible position to deceive others. Consequently, it could not accept a bloodthirsty, openly fascist regime such as that which the anti-Marxists, Tito-Kardelj-Ranković, had established. For these reasons, in 1967 the Tito-Kardelj group took measures and liquidated the Ranković group, which was blamed for all the evils of the Titoite rule up till that period.

With the liquidation of Ranković, the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia did not emerge from the grave crisis into which it had entered. It continued to be treated according to the old Titoite views, the essence of which was that the League should keep up only its «communist» disguise, but never play the leading role in the state activity, the army, or in the economy. The Titoites had even changed their party's name, calling it the League of «Communists», allegedly in order to give it an authentic «Marxist» name, taken from the vocabulary of Karl Marx. The only officially recognized role of this so-called League of Communists was an educational one. But even this educational role was non-existent, because Yugoslav society, which was lulled to sleep with the propaganda of an allegedly Marxist-Leninist policy and ideology in the cradle of the so-called Socialist League of Yugoslavia, was led astray on the capitalist road.

Although it emerged from illegality as a result of the capitalist decentralization, the Yugoslav revisionist party dissolved into that sort of ideological pluralism which later would be called a «democratic» system. The main aim was that, after the party had been transformed into a bourgeois party, the capitalist features of the economic development of the country should be completely crystallized.

Thus, suitable ground was prepared in Yugoslavia for the flourishing of anarcho-syndicalist theories, against

which Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin had fought. These were the conditions in which the pseudo-Marxist-Leninist theory on the political system of «socialist self-administration», which Kardelj deals with in his book, was concocted.

I have dwelt at some length on the historical side of the evolution of Yugoslavia on the revisionist road, not because these problems are unknown to us, but in order to bring out more clearly the falsity of the «theoretical» ideas of Kardelj who, as Tito's collaborator in the great betrayal of the revolution and socialism, cannot adopt any position other than that which presents white as black and calls capitalism socialism. Now, seeing the inglorious pass to which they have brought their country, these renegades are trying to find «theoretical» justifications for the chaotic situation of which they are the authors. This also explains Kardelj's obscure ideas. The Yugoslav reality is chaotic and all the «theorizing» about it is confused. It cannot be otherwise.

2. — The System of «Self-administration» in the Economy

The theory and practice of Yugoslav «self-administration» is an outright denial of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the universal laws on the construction of socialism.

The essence of «self-administrative socialism» in the economy is the idea that allegedly socialism cannot be built by concentrating the means of production in the hands of the socialist state, by creating state ownership as the highest form of socialist ownership, but by fragmenting the socialist state property into property of individual groups of workers, who allegedly administer

it directly themselves. As long ago as 1848, Marx and Engels stressed,

*«The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state, i.e., of the proletariat organized as the ruling class...»**

Lenin stressed the same thing when he sternly combated the anarcho-syndicalist views of the anti-party group of the «worker opposition», which demanded the handing of the factories to the workers and the management and organization of production not by the socialist state, but by a so-called Congress of producers, as a representative of separate groups of workers.**(10)** Lenin described these views as

*«... a complete break with Marxism and communism.»***

He pointed out,

«any justification, whether direct or indirect, of the ownership of the workers of an individual factory or an individual profession over their individual production, or any justification of their right to tone down or hinder the orders from the

* K. Marx — F. Engels, *Selected Works*, vol. 1, Tirana 1975, p. 42, Alb. ed.

10 The 10th Congress of the CP(b) of Russia, held in March 1921, condemned the views of the «worker opposition» and of the other factionalist groups and ordered their immediate dissolution.

** V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, vol. 32, p. 283, Alb. ed.

*general state power, is a very gross distortion of the fundamental principles of Soviet power and complete renunciation of socialism.»**

In June 1950, when he presented the law on «self-administration» to the People's Assembly of the People's Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, while propounding his revisionist views on ownership under «socialism», among other things, Tito said, «From now on, state property of the means of production, factories, mines, railroads will gradually go over to the highest form of socialist ownership: state ownership is the lowest form of social ownership, not the highest form...»; among «the most characteristic acts of a socialist country» «is the transfer of factories and other economic enterprises from the hands of the state into the hands of the workers, for them to manage...», because in this manner the «slogan of the action of the working class movement 'Factories to the Workers!' will be realized.»**

These assertions of Tito's and the reactionary anarcho-syndicalist views of the «worker opposition», which Lenin exposed in his time, are as alike as two drops of water. They are also closely similar to the views of Proudhon, who in his work. *The Theory of Property* claimed that «the spontaneous product of a collective unit... can be considered as the triumph of freedom... and as the greatest existing revolutionary force that can oppose the power of the state.» Or, here is what one of the chiefs of the Second International, Otto Bauer, said in his book, *The Road to Socialism*: «Who, then, will lead socialized industry in the future? The government? No! If the

* V. I. Lenin, *On Democratization and the Socialist Character of the Soviet Power*.

** *Factories to the Workers*, Prishtina 1951, pp. 37, 19, 1.

government were to run all the branches of industry without exception, it would become extremely powerful over the people and the national representative body. Such an increase of government power would be dangerous to democracy.»*

In unity with Tito's views, E. Kardelj also stresses in his book: «Our society is compelled to act in this manner since it has decided on self-government and the self-governing socialization of the social property, and against the perpetuation of the state-owned form of socialist relations of production» (p. 66) [11]. This means that the system of private property has been established in Yugoslavia, and state socialist property, the property of the entire people, does not exist.

The situation is completely different in our country, where this common socialist property is managed by the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat with the participation of the working class and the masses of working people in direct, centralized forms, which are planned from below and orientated from above.

The course of the decentralization of the means of production, according to the anarcho-sindicalist ideas of workers' «self-administration», is, in essence, nothing but a subterfuge to preserve and consolidate capitalist private ownership over the means of production, although in a form disguised as «property administered by groups of workers». In fact, all the confused and obscure terms invented by the «theoretician» Kardelj in his book, such as «fundamental organization of united labour», «complex organization of united labour», «workers' councils of the fundamental or complex organization of united labour».

* Otto Bauer, *The Road to Socialism*, Paris 1919. p. 18.

11 All quotations from E. Kardelj's book are taken from its Albanian translation by the Prishtina Publishing Board in 1977 (note by «8 Nëntori» Publishing House. Tirana).

«self-governing communities of interests», etc., etc., which have even been written into the law of the Yugoslav capitalist state, are nothing but a glossy facade behind which is hidden the stripping of the working class of its right to ownership over the means of production, its savage exploitation by the bourgeoisie.

This private property exists in Yugoslavia not only in disguised forms but also in its usual form, both in town and countryside. This, too, is admitted by E. Kardelj in his book when he says, «In our society such rights as... the right of personal property, or, within given limits, also of private property... have special importance...» (p. 177). Kardelj tries in vain to mitigate the negative effect which the open acceptance of the right to private property might have, even in the form of small-scale production, which, as Lenin says, gives birth to capitalism every day and every hour. The Yugoslav revisionists have even promulgated special laws to encourage the private economy, laws which recognize the citizens' right «to found enterprises» and «to hire labour». The Yugoslav Constitution says expressly: «Private owners have the same socio-economic position, the same rights and obligations as the working people in the socio-economic organizations.»

Small-scale private property reigns supreme in Yugoslav agriculture and occupies nearly 90 per cent of the arable land. Nine million ha. of land belong to the private sector, while over 10 per cent, or 1,15 million ha., belong to the monopoly capitalist or the so-called social sector. Over 5 million peasants in Yugoslavia are engaged in working privately-owned land. The Yugoslav countryside has never embarked on the road of genuine socialist transformations. Kardelj has not one word to say about this situation in his book, and he avoids dealing with the problem of how his «self-administration» system is extended to agriculture. However, if he pretends that

socialism is being built through this system, then how is it possible that he should have forgotten about «building socialism» in agriculture, too, which accounts for nearly half the economy? The Marxist-Leninist theory teaches us that both in town and countryside, socialism is built not on the basis of state capitalist property, the property allegedly administered by workers' groups, or of private property in its open form, but only on the basis of socialist social ownership over the means of production.

In Yugoslavia, ownership of 10 to 25 ha. of land as private property* is permitted. But the Yugoslav law which permits the buying and selling, renting and mortgaging of land, the buying and selling of agricultural machinery, and hired labour in agriculture, has enabled the new bourgeois class of the countryside, the kulaks, to add to the area of their land, means of work and implements, tractors(12) and trucks, at the expense of the poor peasants, and consequently, to step up and intensify their capitalist exploitation.

Capitalist relations of production are so deeply entrenched in the Yugoslav economy that even the capitalists and foreign firms now have a free field of action in making investments and, together with the local bourgeoisie, exploiting the local working class and the other masses of working people in Yugoslavia. The system of Yugoslav «self-administration» can fairly be described as a state of the co-operation of Yugoslav capitalism with US capitalism and other capitalists. They are partners sharing Yugoslavia's assets in everything — in factories, means of communication, hotels, housing, down to the living people.

* V. Vasić, *The Economic Policy of Yugoslavia*, Prishtina University Press, 1970.

12 In 1980 the kulaks possessed 93.5 per cent of the total number of tractors.

If the Yugoslav economy has made some steps forward in its development, this is in no way due to the system of «self-administration», as the Titoite revisionists try to make out. Large amounts of capital from the capitalist world have been poured into Yugoslavia in the form of investments, credits and «aid», and these comprise a considerable part of the material base of the Yugoslav capitalist-revisionist system. The loans it has received amount to over 11 billion dollars. From the United States of America alone Yugoslavia has received over 7 billion dollars in credits.

It is not without a purpose that the international bourgeoisie has propped up the Yugoslav «socialist self-administration» system with such a material and financial base. The crutches supplied by Western capital have kept this system on its feet as a model of the preservation of the capitalist order under pseudo-socialist labels.

With their investments, foreign capitalists have built numerous industrial projects in Yugoslavia which turn out products ranging from the highest to the lowest quality. Most of the best products are, of course, sold abroad, and only a fraction of them are marketed within the country. Although there is great capitalist overproduction abroad, and all the markets there are monopolized by the same capitalists who have invested in Yugoslavia, nevertheless, they sell the best Yugoslav goods precisely on these markets for fabulous profits, because labour power in Yugoslavia is cheap, products are turned out at a lower cost in comparison with the capitalist countries, in which the trade-unions, to some extent, play a certain role in pressing the workers' demands against capital. The multi-national companies which operate in Yugoslavia, too, get the best products which the factories in Yugoslavia produce. However, on top of the profit they extract in this way, the foreign capitalist investors

also squeeze out other profits from the interest on the capital they have invested in Yugoslavia. These profits are often taken in the form of raw materials or processed goods.

The demagogue Kardelj has a great deal to say in his book about the «self-administration» system, but he maintains total silence about the presence and very major role of foreign capital in keeping the «self-administration» system on its feet.

In the bourgeois countries, says Kardelj, the real power lies and «is manifested, first of all, in the linking of the state executive power with the political cartels, outside parliament... Parallel with the growth of the prerogatives of the extra-parliamentary internal power,» Kardelj continues, «there is a new phenomenon characteristic of contemporary social relations in the highly developed capitalist countries — the creation of the international, or world-wide extra-parliamentary power» (p. 54). With this, Kardelj seeks to prove that the Yugoslav «self-administration» has allegedly escaped from such a situation. Whereas, as we explained in the foregoing, the reality presents quite another picture: Yugoslav «self-administration» is a Yugoslav and foreign capitalist joint administration. The foreign capitalists, that is, the companies, concerns, and those who have made investments in Yugoslavia, determine the policy and the all-round development of Yugoslavia just as much as the Yugoslav state power itself.

In fact, the so-called self-administration enterprises, whether big or small, are compelled to take account of the foreign investor. This investor has his own laws, which he has imposed on the Yugoslav state, has his own direct representatives in these joint enterprises and has his own representatives or influence in the Federation. In fact, directly or indirectly, the investor imposes his

will on the Federation, the joint enterprise or company. This is precisely what «self-administration» is designed to conceal. Such is the camouflage, the *tour de passe-passe**, as the French say, which Kardelj has to perform, to «prove» the absurdity that Yugoslav «self-administration» is genuine socialism.

But what he endeavours to deny in his book is being proved every day with many facts by the Western press, indeed even by the Yugoslav news agency TANJUG, which, on the 16th of August this year, announced new regulations issued by the Federal Executive Veče dealing with foreign investments in Yugoslavia. Under these regulations the rights of foreign capitalist investors in Yugoslavia are extended even further. «Under this law,» the above agency stresses, «the foreign partners, on the basis of the agreements concluded between them and the organizations of socialized labour of this country, can make investments in currency, equipment, semi-finished products and technology. Foreign investors have the same rights as the local organizations of socialized labour which invest their means in any other organization of united labour.»

Further on TANJUG stresses, «Under this set of regulations greater interest (on the part of foreigners) is anticipated, because it guarantees the security of the joint economic activity on a long-term basis. Besides this, there is now practically no field with the exception of social insurance, internal trade and social activities, in which foreigners cannot invest their means.»

The country could not be sold to foreign capital more completely than this. And after this purely capitalist reality, the «communist» Kardelj has the temerity to claim, «... our society has assumed a much stronger

* Conjuring trick.

socio-economic content and structure of its own, which arises from the socialist and self-administrative relations of production...» which «...make possible and ensure that our society will develop more and more in a free, independent and self-governing manner...»! (pp. 7-8).

In Kardelj's book, the individual is the prominent element of society, the element which produces, the element which has the right to organize and divide the production. According to him, in the «self-administrative» system, this element socializes the work in the enterprise and leads through the so-called workers' councils «elected» by workers and allegedly, together with the appointed administrative officials, regulates the work, the income and the entire fate of the enterprise, etc.

This is the form typical of capitalist enterprises, where in fact, it is the capitalist who rules, surrounded by a large number of officials and technicians who know the situation about the production and organize its distribution. Naturally, the bulk of the profits goes to the capitalist who owns the capitalist enterprise, that is, he appropriates the surplus value. Under Yugoslav «self-administration» a large part of the surplus value is appropriated by the officials, the directors of the enterprises and the engineering-technical staff, while the «lion's share» goes to the Federation or the republic, in order to pay the fat salaries of the horde of officials of the central apparatus of the Federation or the republic. Funds are needed, also, to maintain the Titoite dictatorship — the army, the Ministry of the Interior and the State Security service, the Foreign Ministry, etc., which are in the hands of the Federation and which are being inflated and extended continuously. In this Federative state a huge bureaucracy of non-producing officials and leaders, who are paid very high salaries from the sweat and toil of the workers and peasants, has developed.

Apart from this, a considerable part of the income is set aside for the foreign capitalist who has made investments in these enterprises and has his own representative in the «administrative council», or on the «workers' council», that is, he participates in the leadership of the enterprise. Thus, under this system called «self-administrative socialism», the workers find themselves under unrelenting, total exploitation.

The machinery of the «workers' councils» and «self-administration committees» with their commissions has been devised by the revisionists of Belgrade simply to create the illusion among the workers that «by being elected» to these organisms, by taking part and speaking in them, it is allegedly they who decide the affairs of the enterprise, of «their» property. According to Kardelj «...in the fundamental organization of united labour... the workers run the work and activity of the organization of united labour and the means of social reproduction..., decide on all the forms of uniting and co-ordinating their own work and means, as well as on all the income they make with their united labour..., and divide the income for personal, joint, and general consumption in accord with the bases and criteria laid down on the basis of self-administration...» (p. 160), etc., etc.

All this is just a tale, because in the conditions when bourgeois democracy prevails in Yugoslavia, there is no genuine freedom of thought and action for the working people. The freedom of action in the «self-administration» enterprises is false. In Yugoslavia, the worker does not run things, nor does he enjoy those rights which the «ideologist» Kardelj proclaims so pompously. In order to show that he is a realist and opposed to the injustices of his regime, Tito himself admitted recently in the speech he delivered at the meeting of leading activists of Slovenia that «self-administration» does not stop those who

work badly from increasing their incomes at the expense of those who work well, while the directors of factories, who are to blame for the losses incurred, can dodge their responsibility by taking responsible positions in other factories, without fear that somebody may reprimand them for these offences they commit.

Although «in theory» E. Kardelj liquidated the bureaucracy and technocracy, eliminated the role of a dominant technocratic class, in reality, in practice, that class was rapidly created and found a broad field of activity in this allegedly democratic system, in which the role of the working man is supposedly «decisive». In fact, the role of that stratum of officials and the new bourgeois who dominate the «self-administration» enterprise is decisive. It is they who draft the plan, who allocate the amount of investments, and everybody's income — the workers' and their own, and, of course, they take good care of themselves. The established laws and rules provide for the leadership to take a greater share of the profits than the workers.

In Yugoslavia, this narrow stratum of people, fattened on the workers' sweat and toil, who take decisions in their own interests, turned into a capitalist class. This is how the political monopoly in decision-making and division of income by the élite in enterprises of socialist «self-administration» was created, while Kardelj continues to harp on the same old tune as if this political system, invented by the Titoites, contributes to the creation of conditions for the genuine realization of the workers' «self-governing» and «democratic» rights, which the system recognizes in principle.

The formation of the new capitalist class was encouraged precisely by the system of «self-administration». Tito himself has admitted this bitter fact in a «severe criticism» he allegedly made of the exploiters of workers,

all those who run this system of «socialist self-administration» for their own profit. In many speeches, try as he would to hide the evils of his pseudo-socialist system, he has had to admit the existence of the great crisis of this system and the polarization of Yugoslav society into rich and poor. «I do not consider what someone makes from his earnings enrichment, even when he has been able to build a holiday cottage with his profits,» he says. «But when it comes to a matter of hundreds of millions or even billions, then this is theft... This is not wealth gained by the sweat of one's brow... This wealth is being created through speculations of different kinds inside and outside the country... Now we must look into what's being done with those who are building houses, who have one in Zagreb, one in Belgrade, another at the seaside, or some other place. One such person has not simple holiday cottages, but villas he rents out very well. Besides this, they have not just one, but two, or even three cars per family...»* On another occasion, in order to show that he is against the stratification of society into rich and poor, he mentioned that a few wealthy private persons have about 4,5 billion dollars deposited in the Yugoslav banks alone, without taking account of how much they have deposited in foreign banks and how much they carry in their pockets.

In writing about the system fabricated by the Titoite revisionists, Kardelj is compelled to make passing mention of the need for the fight «...against the various forms of distortions and attempts to usurp the rights of self-government of the workers and citizens» (p. 174). But again he seeks the way out of these «misuses» within the system of «self-administration» by extending «the respective mechanism of democratic social control» (p. 178).

* Tito's interview to the editor of the newspaper *Vjestnik*, October 1972.

Here the question arises: to what class is Kardelj referring when he speaks about the «usurpation of the workers' right of self-government?» Of course, though he does not say so, here he is referring to the old and new bourgeois class which has usurped the power of the working class, is riding on its back and exploiting it to the bone.

Kardelj tries in vain to present the «workers' councils», «the fundamental organizations of united labour», etc., etc., as the most authentic expression of «democracy» and the «freedom» of man in all social fields. The «workers' councils» are nothing but entirely formal organs, defenders and implementors, not of workers' interests, but of the will of the directors of enterprises, because, being materially, politically and ideologically corrupted, these councils have become part of the «worker aristocracy» and «worker bureaucracy», agencies to mislead and to create false illusions among the working class.

The Yugoslav reality speaks clearly about the lack of genuine democracy for the masses. And it could not be otherwise. Lenin stressed,

*«'Industrial democracy' is a term that lends itself to misinterpretations. It may be read as a repudiation of dictatorship and individual authority. It may be read as a suspension of ordinary democracy, or as a means for evading it.»**

There cannot be socialist democracy for the working class without its state of dictatorship of the proletariat. Marxism-Leninism teaches us that negation of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the very negation of democracy for the masses of working people.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 32, p. 80, Alb. ed.

The negation by the Yugoslav revisionists of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist social property on which it is based, has led them to a decentralized management of the economy without a unified state plan. The development of the national economy on the basis of a unified state plan and its management by the socialist state on the basis of the principle of democratic centralism is one of the universal laws and fundamental principles of the construction of socialism in every country. Otherwise, capitalism is built, as in Yugoslavia.

Kardelj claims that in their «self-administration» organizations the workers have the right «...to administer the activity of the organization of united labour» (p. 160), that is, of the enterprises, hence, they can also allegedly plan production. But what is the truth? The worker in these organizations neither runs the enterprise nor constructs that so-called plan at the base. These things are done by the new bourgeoisie, the leadership of the enterprise, while the workers are given the impression that the «workers' councils» supposedly make the law in this «self-administration» organization. This happens in the capitalist countries, too, where the power of the private enterprise is in the hands of the capitalist who has his own technocracy, the technocrats who run the enterprise, while in some countries there are also the workers' representatives with a negligible function, just enough to create the illusion among the workers that they, too, allegedly take part in running the affairs of the enterprise. But this is a fraud.

The so-called planning which is done in the Yugoslav «self-administration» enterprises cannot be called socialist. On the contrary, being carried out according to the example of all capitalist enterprises, it leads to the same consequences which exist in every capitalist economy,

such as anarchy of production, spontaneity, and a series of other contradictions, which manifest themselves in the most overt and savage manner in the Yugoslav economy and market.

«...The free exchange of labour through the production of commodities and the free, self-governing market (emphasis ours) at the present level of socio-economic development», writes Kardelj, «is a condition for self-government... This market... is free in the sense that the self-governing organizations of united labour, freely and with the minimum administrative intervention, enter into relations of the free exchange of labour. The suspension of such freedom is bound to lead to the regeneration of the state-property monopoly of the state apparatus» (p. 95).

There could be no more flagrant denial than this of the teachings of Lenin, who wrote,

*«We must foster 'proper' trade, which is one that does not evade state control», «... for a free market is development of capitalism...»** (emphasis ours).

From the political economy of socialism it is known that, under socialism, trade, like all other processes of social reproduction, is a process which is planned and directed in a centralized manner, which is based on the socialist social ownership of the means of production, and itself is a constituent part of the socialist relations of production. To the revisionist Kardelj, however, these teachings are quite alien, and this results from his denial of the economic role of the socialist state and socialist property. The Yugoslav home market is a typical decentralized

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 32, pp. 426, 413, Alb. ed.

capitalist market where the means of production are freely sold and purchased by anyone, a thing which is contrary to the laws of socialism. For these reasons TANJUG is forced to admit that entrepreneurs, middlemen and speculators dominate all Yugoslav market. Chaos, spontaneity, catastrophic fluctuations of prices, etc. prevail in the market. According to data from the Yugoslav Federative Institute of Statistics, prices for 45 main products and social services increased 149.7 per cent in the period from 1972 to 1977 in Yugoslavia.

In regard to sales of commodities inside the country, purchasing power is very weak in Yugoslavia, because of the low wages of the workers, and also because, in the final balances of enterprises, there is not much left to be distributed among the workers. The enterprise wants to sell its products anywhere it can and in an independent manner, because the principal leaders, that is, the bosses, the new bourgeoisie, want to create profits. But where can they create the profits they want when the buyer is poor? So, they have turned to other forms, one of which is the sale of goods on time-payment. The selling of goods turned out in these «self-administration» enterprises on time-payment is another chain around the necks of the Yugoslav workers, just as the workers of the capitalist countries are chained by the same capitalist system, which, in Yugoslavia, is called «socialist self-administration».

Similar features also characterize Yugoslav foreign trade in which no state monopoly exists. Depending on the wishes of its owners, every enterprise can conclude contracts and agreements with any firm, multi-national company, or foreign state to buy or sell raw materials and machinery, finished products, technological means, etc. This anti-Marxist practice, also, has had its influence on the Yugoslav state becoming a vassal of world capital,

on its deep involvement in the economic and financial crisis which has the entire capitalist-revisionist world in its grip, a crisis which is manifested in other fields, too.

As a die-hard revisionist, E. Kardelj also denies the role of the socialist state in other fields, such as financial relations and other activities of various character. He writes, «Relations in the fields in which the self-governing communities of interest are founded, are realized according to regulations, without the intervention of the state, that is, without the intermediary of the budget and other administrative-fiscal measures...» (p. 167).

In Yugoslavia, just as in the other capitalist countries, the system of the provision of credits by the banks instead of the budgetary financing of investments for the development of the productive forces and other activities, has assumed very widespread proportions. The banks have become centres of finance capital, and it is precisely they that play a very important role in the Yugoslav economy in the interest of the new revisionist bourgeoisie.

Thus, an anarcho-syndicalist system has been established in Yugoslavia, and this has been named «socialist self-administration». What has this «socialist self-administration» brought to Yugoslavia? Every kind of evil. Anarchy in production, in the first place. Nothing is stable there. Each enterprise throws its products on the market and capitalist competition takes place, because there is no co-ordination, since it is not the socialist economy which guides production. Each enterprise goes it alone, competing against the others, in order to ensure raw materials, markets and everything else. Many enterprises are closing down because of lack of raw materials, the huge deficits created by this chaotic capitalist development, the build-up of stocks of unsold goods due to the

lack of purchasing power, and the saturation of the market with outdated goods. Yugoslavia's handicraft services are in a very serious state. Referring to this problem at the meeting of Slovenia's leading activists. Tito could not hide the fact that «Today you have to sweat a good deal to find, for example, a joiner or some other craftsman to repair something for you. and even when you find him, you are fleeced so blatantly that it makes your hair stand on end.»

Regardless of the previously mentioned fact that some of the modern combines turn out good quality products, a difficult situation is created for Yugoslavia because it has to find a market for the sale of these commodities. Because of these difficulties Yugoslavia's balance of foreign trade is passive. In just the first 5 months of this year the deficit was 2 billion dollars. At the 11th Congress of the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia, Tito declared, «the deficit with the Western market has become almost intolerable». Nearly three months after this congress, he declared again in Slovenia. «We have especially great difficulties in trade exchanges with the European Common Market member countries. There the imbalance to our disadvantage is very great and constantly increasing. We must talk with them very seriously about this. Many of them promise us that these things will be put in order, that imports from Yugoslavia will increase, but up to now we have had very little benefit from all this. Each is putting the blame on the other.» And the deficit in foreign trade, which Tito does not mention in this speech of his, exceeded 4 billion dollars in 1977. This is a catastrophe for Yugoslavia.

The entire country is in the grip of an unending crisis, and the broad working masses live in poverty.

Many Yugoslav workers are unemployed, are being thrown out on the street or emigrating abroad. Not only

has Tito acknowledged this economic emigration, this capitalist phenomenon, but he has even recommended that it should be developed. Unemployment cannot exist in a socialist country and the clearest example in this direction is Albania. Meanwhile, in the capitalist countries, among which, of course, Yugoslavia is included, unemployment exists and is developing everywhere. When Yugoslavia has over one million unemployed, and over 1.3 million economic emigrants are selling their labour power in Federal Germany, Belgium, France, etc., when the wealth of individuals occupying important posts either in the state administration or in enterprises and institutions is increasing rapidly, when the prices of consumer goods are mounting day by day, when the bankrupt enterprises and branches number thousands, the system of Yugoslav «self-administration» is proved to be a great fraud. And yet Kardelj has the temerity to write, «in our conditions, socialist self-administration is the most direct form and expression of the struggle for the freedom of the working man, for the freedom of his labour and creativeness, for his decisive economic and political influence in society» (p. 158).

Going even further in his bourgeois-type demagoguery of stale phrases, Kardelj reaches such depths of deception as to say, «With the Constitutional and legal guarantee of the workers' rights on the basis of their socialized labour in the past, our society further extends the dimensions of real freedom for the workers and working people in the material relations of society» (p. 162). What does this apologist of the bourgeoisie have in mind when he talks of the «extension of the dimensions of true freedom for the workers»? Is it the «freedom» to be unemployed, the «freedom» to abandon their families and homeland in order to sell the power of their muscles and minds to the capitalists of the Western world, or is it the

«freedom» to pay taxes, to be discriminated against and savagely exploited by the old and the new Yugoslav bourgeoisie, as well as by the foreign bourgeoisie?

3. — «Self-administration» and the Anarchist Views on the State. The National Question in Yugoslavia

In Yugoslavia, organs of state power as genuine representatives of the people do not exist. There is only the bureaucratic system called «the system of delegates», which is presented as the alleged bearer of the system of state power, and that is why no elections for deputies to the organs of state power are held. The Titoites want to justify this fact by arguing that the representative organs are allegedly expressions of bourgeois parliamentarianism and of the Soviet socialist state which, according to them, Stalin had allegedly turned into an institution of the bureaucracy and technocracy. The experience of the Soviets of the worker and peasant deputies, set up by Lenin on the basis of the great experience of the Paris Commune, has been ruled out in Yugoslavia, because they have been described by the Yugoslav revisionists as «forms of state organization which create personal power».

Elaborating the revisionist idea of «specific socialism», around the '50s, the Titoites proclaimed world-wide that they had definitively rejected the socialist state system and replaced it with some kind of new system, «self-administrative socialism», in which socialism and the state are alien to each other. This revisionist «discovery» was nothing but a copy of the anarchist theories of Proudhon and Bakunin on «workers' self-administration» and «workers' factories» which have long been exposed, as well as a gross falsification of the real ideas of Marx

and Lenin on the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Karl Marx wrote:

*«Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period, in which the state can be nothing but the **revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.**»**

The political system of «socialist self-administration» in Yugoslavia not only has nothing in common with the dictatorship of the proletariat, but is opposed to it. This system has been built on the model of the administration of the United States of America. Talking about the Yugoslav system of «self-administration», Kardelj himself has written: «...We may say that this system is a little more akin to the organization of the executive power in the United States of America than to that of Western Europe» (p. 235).

Hence, it is clear that there is no denial of the fact that the organization of the Yugoslav government is a copy of the organization of capitalist governments, but what may be discussed is the question: which capitalist government has been imitated more closely, the American government or one of the governments of Western Europe? And Kardelj gives the answer to this question, when he says: the organization of the executive power of the United States of America has been taken as a model.

The Yugoslav revisionists' views on the state are com-

* K. Marx — F. Engels, *Selected Works*, vol. 2, Tirana 1975, p. 24, Alb. ed.

pletely anarchist. It is known that anarchism calls for the immediate abolition of any kind of state, hence, of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Yugoslav revisionists have abolished the dictatorship of the proletariat, and in order to justify this betrayal, they talk about two phases of socialism: «state socialism» and «true humanitarian socialism». The initial phase, according to them, covers the first years following the triumph of the revolution, when the dictatorship of the proletariat exists, which is expressed in the «étatist-bureaucratic» state, just as in capitalism. The second phase is that of going beyond the «étatist-bureaucratic» state and its replacement with «direct democracy». With these views the Titoites not only deny the need for the dictatorship of the proletariat in socialism, but also counterpose to one another the notions of socialist state, dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist democracy.

They disregard the teachings of the classics of Marxism-Leninism that during the whole historical period of the transition from capitalism to communism the socialist state is constantly strengthened. That is why E. Kardelj writes that the society in Yugoslavia is based less and less on the role of the state apparatus. According to him, the state is allegedly disappearing in Yugoslavia at the present time.

But with what does Kardelj replace the role of the state apparatus? He replaces it with «the workers' initiative»! He puts it like this, «the further functioning of our society will be based less and less on the role of the state apparatus, and more and more on the power and initiative of the workers» (p. 8). What absurd reasoning! For one to speak about the initiative of the workers, in the first place, the workers must be free and organized, they must be inspired by clear-cut directives, and effective measures must be taken for the implementation of

these initiatives. In Yugoslavia, who is engaged in the organization of the workers and their inspiration with clear-cut directives? The «self-administrative community», says E. Kardelj, reasoning in an abstract manner. He leaves the main role in this kind of community to the individual «in the united self-administrative work for his own interests». As to what is meant by this «self-administrative community» of individual interests which is placed at the centre of Yugoslav society, nothing at all is clearly explained, but what is most striking in these ideas is bourgeois individualism, which exalts the absolute rights of the individual in society and his complete independence from society, the putting of personal interests above the interests of society.

According to this «theoretician» who permits himself such judgements, the strengthening of the state and its apparatus is characteristic of forms of socialist relations of production based on state ownership... (p. 8), whereas in Yugoslavia, says he, the process of strengthening the «self-administrative» role of the working man will develop more and more in place of the state. Hence, in a true socialist state where Marxist-Leninist science and the Leninist revolutionary practice are applied, according to this «philosopher», man cannot be free and master of his fate, but is transformed into an automaton, whereas under Yugoslav «self-administration» the working man allegedly assumes great importance, and precisely in this «self-administration», in «the democratic mechanism of delegation of Yugoslav society», he allegedly understands his great role! Which classes do these state organs represent, what ideology guides them, on what principles have they built their activity, and to what forum do they render account? Of course, all these questions remain without clear answers, because any accurate answer to them would shed light on Yugoslavia's capitalist political system.

Making no distinction at all as to what state, party, or system he is referring and attacking the state in general for being inhuman, Kardelj sticks to his anarchist positions when he writes, «Neither the state, nor the system, nor the political party can bring happiness to man. Man alone can bring happiness to himself» (p. 8). This very clearly brings to light the tendencies to spontaneity in the anti-Marxist theory of «socialist self-administration», according to which the working class need not organize itself in the party or the state to achieve its aspirations, because with the passage of time, even while wandering in the dark, one day it will achieve the happiness it is seeking.

To forestall the question: since the state is allegedly unnecessary, why is it not eliminated in Yugoslavia? Kardelj writes, the state «must interpose in the role of arbiter only in those instances when the self-governing agreement cannot be achieved, while from the aspect of social interests, it is essential that a decision be taken» (p. 23). And to prove that allegedly the need for state arbitration to settle disagreements is seldom felt, he says, «The free exchange of labour has an essential influence in reducing antagonisms between physical and mental work. In relations of this kind, mental work is no longer superior to physical work, but is only one of the components of the free united labour and of the free exchange of different forms of the results of labour» (p. 24). Upon reading these phrases, the question arises in everybody's mind: can it be the Yugoslav social order to which the author is referring? When were the antagonisms between mental and physical work in Yugoslavia ever so reduced?!

The reality of developments in Yugoslavia proves the opposite. Between mental and physical work there are essential distinctions which cannot be reduced by words.

It is astonishing that there should be talk about the reduction of antagonism between mental and physical work in the Yugoslav state when it is known that there the differentials between workers' wages and intellectuals' salaries alone, without mentioning other distinctions, have reached a ratio of one to twenty, if not more.

Kardelj considers «self-administration in the united work» as «...the genuine material basis for self-government in society, too, that is to say, in the socio-political communities which exercise state power, from the commune up to the Federation, as well as for the realization of the democratic rights of working people and citizens in the running of the state, or society, respectively. Self-government is the material basis, also, for the development of the workers as a creative individual in the utilization of social means of every kind» (p. 24), and many other such phrases.

Seeking to present the so-called self-administration as the material premise for human happiness which has allegedly been «discovered» by the great brains of Yugoslavia, Kardelj resorts to twisted phrases and ecclesiastical language, preaching a long sermon and saying nothing. He reels of contradictory ideas about «scientific socialism», and uses lengthy expressions in order to give his words an allegedly profound philosophical meaning.

But how is the Yugoslav political system working out in practice? When it comes to answering this question. Kardelj is forced to admit: «In this respect, the system itself has too many weak points. A whole series of weaknesses in the functioning of the organizations and institutions of our political system quite naturally creates the belief that powerful sources of bureaucracy and technocracy are still operating, that our administration is complicated and that is why bureaucracy is rampant, that some organs and organizations are closed in on them-

selves, that there are many gaps and eases of duplication of work, that the forms of democratic communication between self-government and state organs and the entire social structure are weakly developed, that we hold many useless and unproductive meetings, that the meetings and decisions are frequently insufficiently prepared from the professional viewpoint, that in the fight for his rights the citizen often has difficulties in overcoming administrative obstacles, etc.» (p. 193). When the «self-administration» system has been overwhelmed by bureaucracy, when the state and administrative organs are closed in on themselves, take worthless decisions and shut out the citizens who want them to do something about their many troubles, then who, apart from the Tito clique, needs this system? How can the Yugoslav citizens govern themselves, when they cannot overcome the «administrative obstacles»? Despite the great desire of the devil not to show his cloven hoof, despite all the reservations and efforts to gloss over things which the Titoite ideologist makes in order to cover up the ills of his system, even from what he himself admits, the truth emerges.

Kardelj writes, «Both the structure of delegates' assemblies and the way decisions are taken in them are so organized that in principle, they ensure the leading role of the united labour in the whole system of taking state decisions» (p. 24-25). Here he is juggling with words in order to show that the «delegates' assemblies», which in reality are like the assemblies set up by capitalist trade-unions, at which the trade-union members make speeches, can allegedly exercise state functions. Therefore, according to him, the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat is superfluous.

Here, of course, it is not just a matter of replacing the name of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which terrifies the bourgeoisie and the revisionists, with another

name — «delegates' assemblies». No, the issue here is the alteration in the class character of the socialist state, so that not the working class, but the new bourgeoisie, has power. It is not difficult to see that the aim of these stands is to justify the course of returning to capitalism, and as far as possible, the Titoite betrayal.

In order to present their notorious system of «socialist self-administration» as fair and acceptable, the Titoites oppose it to the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Making no distinction between capitalism and socialism, the Titoites consider all other political systems «dogmatic». After calling their dreams the «socialist system of self-administration», in order to demonstrate the superiority of their system, they compare it with the capitalist social order.

Of course, the Yugoslav revisionists cannot fail to «find fault» with the parliamentary political system of bourgeois society, which Kardelj defines as a «multi-party» system, for otherwise they would expose themselves as advocates of bourgeois parliamentarianism, which Marx and Lenin sternly criticized in their time. Therefore, they declare that it is a mistake to consider this political form of the bourgeois state as having a universal and eternal character. It is common knowledge that Kardelj was not the first to «criticize» the bourgeois ideologists' notorious thesis about the universal and eternal character of capitalism. Refuting the views of social-democracy, the classics of Marxism-Leninism have proved scientifically that the capitalist system is by no means of a universal and eternal character, that it is doomed to extinction, that the capitalist state, which is the offspring and bulwark of this anti-popular system, must be destroyed to its foundations and instead a true socialist system must be established, but not a bastardized system which starts from capitalism and returns again to

capitalism, as the Yugoslav political system of «self-administration» does.

Kardelj «criticizes» the bourgeois parliamentary system, but lightly and gently, because it hurts him to do so, therefore immediately after criticizing it, he lauds to the skies and makes a fetish of its contribution to the democratic development of mankind. In order to magnify this contribution to such an extent that the reactionary character of today's bourgeois parliament pales into insignificance and, in particular, to show the «organic link between parliamentarianism and man's democratic rights», for the first time he quotes (or rather misquotes) Marx: «The parliamentary regime lives on debate — then how can it ban discussion? Every social interest and institution is transformed here into general ideas, and it is as such that they are thrashed out — how is it possible, then, for any interest or institution to stand above all ideas and impose itself like a religious dogma?... A parliamentary regime allows the majority to decide everything — how is it possible then, that the overwhelming majority outside parliament can fail to want to take decisions?»

This quotation from Marx is like a square peg in a round hole in the context of this book, therefore, it can hardly serve to prove what Kardelj wants. Marx's idea, out of context and impermissibly mutilated, in the tricky way it was quoted by this revisionist, casts doubt on the undeniable fact that Marx was absolutely opposed to the venal and rotten parliamentarianism of the bourgeoisie.

This is an abortive attempt on the author's part because Marx's stand is known world-wide. In criticizing the bourgeois parliamentarianism and the bourgeois theory of the division of powers, Marx never said that representative institutions should be done away with and the

principle of elections abandoned, as was done in Yugoslavia, but he wrote that in the proletarian state such representative organs should be set up and operate that are not «talking shops», but real working institutions, built and acting as

*«... a working body, executive and legislative, at the same time.»**

Bourgeois parliamentarianism has gained «great strength» because, according to the author of the book, socialist practice, with the exception of Yugoslavia, has allegedly been unable to develop new forms of democratic life corresponding to socialist relations of production more rapidly and extensively. The new form of democratic life, according to Kardelj, has allegedly been realized under «socialist self-administration» which has crossed the Rubicon of the class power of monopoly owners and technocratic managers of capital. It is surprising that he should describe all the efforts of the democratic forces to find forms of democracy as «artificial constructions» of the bourgeois parliament, as attempts to unite «several things that cannot be united», while he calls the constructions of Yugoslavia's «socialist self-administration», those bastardized grafts on the bourgeois-revisionist forms of government, original and socialist! If ever there were fraud in the construction of the government it is to be found, in the first place, in the «self-administration» concocted according to the anti-Marxist and anti-democratic theory of the Titoites. Regardless of the numerous deceptive statements made about it, Yugoslav «self-administration» is a copy of bourgeois parliamen-

* K. Marx — F. Engels, *Selected Works*, vol. 1, Tirana 1975, p. 544, Alb. ed.

tarianism and capitalist relations of production, it is a chaotic appendage of the world capitalist system, of the structure and superstructure of this system.

«Our socialist democracy,» writes Kardelj, «would not be an all-embracing system of democratic relations without the relevant solution of the problems of relations among Yugoslavia's nations and nationalities» (p. 171). Although this was the occasion when the revisionist ideologist should have explained how the political system of «socialist self-administration» has solved the problem of nations and nationalities in Yugoslavia, he has skirted so widely around this major problem, so serious and delicate for his Federation, that after reading his book of 323 pages, one can barely recall that it made any mention of nations and nationalities.

How does the problem of nations and nationalities in Yugoslavia stand? The Yugoslav Federation inherited deep-rooted conflicts in this field. The policy of the Great-Serbian monarchs and reactionary chauvinistic circles in Yugoslavia was such that, historically, it stirred up conflicts and enmity among nations and nationalities.

After the Second World War, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia launched the slogan of «unity-fraternity», but this slogan proved quite inadequate to resolve the differences inherited from the past, therefore the old conflicts, the savage lust for domination over others, did not disappear.

Tito and the renegade clique around him did not develop a Marxist-Leninist national policy in regard to the tendencies of republics and regions to break away from the Federation. On the contrary, the relations among nationalities remained the same as in the time of the Great-Serb monarchs, and in regard to some nationalities the genocide went on as before. This policy served to fuel the hatred and feuds among the nations

and nationalities of Yugoslavia. The «unity» and «fraternity» of peoples about which there is a great deal of talk in Yugoslavia, has never been presented on the just basis of the economic, political, social and cultural equality of nations and nationalities.

Without achieving equality in these fields the national question in Yugoslavia cannot be solved correctly. For three decades now, apart from its demagogy about the «self-governing community of nations and nationalities of a new type», «self-administrative socialism» has done nothing about the implementation of the sovereign rights of these different nations and nationalities in the republics and regions of Yugoslavia. Thus, for example, the Kosova region, with an Albanian population almost three times greater than the population of the Republic of Montenegro, has marked economic, political, social and cultural backwardness,⁽¹³⁾ in comparison with the other regions of Yugoslavia. In the larger republics, too, as compared with the other republics, impermissible distinctions exist in all fields of life. This situation is the weakest spot which is shaking the Federation of the Yugoslav revisionists to its foundations. The pious hopes about the solution to the old and new differences among Yugoslavia's nations are devoid of prospect.

From an objective scientific analysis of this very difficult and troubled situation, the incontestable conclusion emerges that the national question in Yugoslavia will not be solved unless Marxism-Leninism is implemented there, that is to say, unless the so-called self-administrative capitalist order is overthrown.

The Titoite renegades are aware of this danger, therefore, when they have to mention the issue of na-

13 According to data in the Yugoslav press, the per capita income in Kosova is 6 times lower than in Slovenia, about 5 times lower than in Croatia and 3.5 times lower than in Serbia.

tions and nationalities, they try to skate over it with pompous statements, without getting to the crux of the problems, or by seeking false testimony from other revisionists, as they did when they gave great publicity to the declarations of the Chinese revisionists about the «Marxist-Leninist solution of the national problem in Yugoslavia».

In words the revisionists may present the relations among the nations and nationalities of Yugoslavia as they like, but the bitter truth of this problem will terrify them even when they are in their graves.

The national question in Yugoslavia will be solved by the peoples themselves, who are included in the present Federation, and not by those who, regardless of what they say, in fact are still pursuing the reactionary, chauvinistic policy of their predecessors.

Continuing to deliver his judgements, speaking about the policy of the Yugoslav state, the inveterate revisionist Kardelj says that «it is no longer the monopoly of professional politicians and political cartels behind the scenes, but instead it becomes a matter of the direct activity and taking of decisions by the self-governors and their organs» (p. 25). There! says Kardelj, henceforth do not criticize us for betraying the interests of the working class, because the Yugoslav worker is master of the policy of the country and of the defence of his «self-administrative» interests, unlike in the other states where professional politicians are the masters. And here, too, with evil intent, he does not differentiate between capitalist and socialist countries, but lumps them all together in the same bag, because in this way it is easier to present black as white.

He knows that in order to further the dishonest objectives he has in mind, the manifestations which expose the «self-administrative» reality must be minimized in

every way. Therefore, he belittles the fact that the Yugoslav worker has no possibility of exercising his rights in the political and economic field, and explains that this comes about «because of a series of objective and subjective reasons, among which, undoubtedly, is the relatively low level of education and culture, and the level of the application of science — the worker is not yet able to master, orientate, or completely control, in a conscious and creative manner, all the processes which this socio-economic position imposes on him» (p. 27). Obviously this is written in an effort to defend his anti-worker and anti-socialist stand-points. At present the Yugoslav worker understands nothing of this illusory theory, and does not see any of these false and absurd ideas which are unacceptable to him, being implemented in practice.

Since the low cultural and scientific level of the workers is an obstacle, as Kardelj says, the main role in the «self-administrative» society is played by the educated and skilled people, who make up the élite that rules in the «socialist community». Under these circumstances, in most instances, decisions will be taken precisely by this élite, by the cultured element of the new bourgeoisie which makes the law in Yugoslavia. Who is to blame that the élite is becoming prominent and the role of the workers diminishing? There is no doubt the blame lies with the social system itself, which generates the new capitalist class and provides it with the possibilities to strengthen itself economically at the expense of the workers and become educated, while the working class is left at a low level. Kardelj cannot deny the fact that, in practice, decisions are taken by a relatively narrow circle of people in Yugoslavia. However, he has nothing to say about the fact that this is precisely how the political monopoly of the élite in taking decisions and in the

division of the income in the enterprises of «socialist self-administration» is created. This political monopoly, which the Yugoslav revisionists allegedly guard against and combat, is deeply entrenched in their so-called political system of «socialist self-administration».

In the «self-administrative» society, as Kardelj puts it, «...instead of the old relationships: the worker — the state — social activities, a new relationship must inevitably be constituted between the workers engaged directly in production and the workers in social activities» (p. 23). According to him, the correct way to build social relations is not that followed by a socialist regime where scientific socialism is applied, where there is unity between the workers directly involved in production and the workers engaged in social activities, where there is vigorous sociopolitical activity and such an organization of the economy in which the principal role is played by the working people organized in their socialist state. The correct way, according to Kardelj, is that of building «new» social relations without the participation of the state!

These ideas are expressions of pure anarchism. All these phrases are poured out to obscure every advantage a genuine socialist regime offers, and to make people believe that in Yugoslavia they are allegedly marching towards the unity of the workers and intellectuals through the «free exchange of labour», which reduces their antagonism as if by magic.

In Kardelj's «theory» there is not, nor can there be, any mention of the violent overthrow of the capitalist state, the seizure of power by the working class and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Although he quotes Marx's words, «violence is precisely what we are obliged to use at the given moment, i.e., in order to give definitive legal sanction to the power of labour,» he does this only to prove that Marx allegedly

leaned more towards the triumph of the proletarian revolution by peaceful means, while considering violence an exception and making it conditional on some particular social, circumstances. And with such sophistry Kardelj seeks to create the impression that the working class nowadays can achieve its historic interests not through the revolution, but in alliance with the various political parties of the capitalist countries. Kardelj has cunningly copied this quotation to pit Marx against Marx in regard to the possibility of the peaceful transition to socialism, from his revisionist predecessors, against whom Lenin wrote,

*«The reference to what Marx said... about the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism... is completely fallacious, or, to put it bluntly, dishonest, in that it is juggling with quotations and references.»**

Kardelj needs these falsifications in order to lend a hand to the «Eurocommunists», with whom he is in complete accord. The Italian, French and Spanish revisionist parties have declared that they will allegedly achieve socialism through the development of bourgeois democracy and freedoms, through the force of numbers of votes in parliamentary elections. According to the «Eurocommunists», the ability of the working class will be expressed in the extent to which it will gain the key positions in the structure of capitalist society and the state, as well as in the running of society. According to them, the transformation of the character of the relations of production from capitalist to «self-administrative», or «socialist», will become possible in this way. It is

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 28, p. 107, Alb. ed.

precisely on this issue that the Titoite theory and the theory of «Eurocommunism» are united. The «Eurocommunists» are obliged to accept European bourgeois political pluralism and unity among bourgeois parties allegedly in order to ensure many rights for the working class through reforms, and then go over to «socialist» society in this way. These aspirations of his friends Kardelj describes as «structural changes», which, without fail, must exert such an influence that the process develops and transforms both the position and the role of parliament itself.

Kardelj's theory claims that, in the crisis of the capitalist system, the «communist» parties of Western Europe must find an appropriate way to secure for the working class an alliance with the broadest «democratic» forces, while preserving the parliamentary system, the democratic achievements of which, he says, cannot be denied. Through this sort of alliance, according to revisionist logic, a more favourable «democratic» situation can be created in the parliamentary system and, in the long run, the parliamentary system «will be transformed», though nobody knows how, into a decisive power of the people! This is the course Titoism sets for the other revisionist parties to assume power in peaceful ways.

In the bourgeois states, however, power is in the hands of the capitalists, the national businesses and cartels and multinational companies. These forces of capital have the main keys to the management of the economy and the state firmly in their hands, they make the law and, through a fraudulent democratic process, appoint the government, which is under their orders and is presented as an official administrator of their assets. The bourgeoisie does not safeguard its power in order to hand it over to the «Eurocommunists», but in order to protect its class interests, even with bloodshed, if need be. To

fail to see this reality, which life is confirming every day, means to close your eyes and indulge in day-dreaming. If the «Eurocommunists» do indeed succeed in gaining one or more positions in the bourgeois governments, in reality they will go there as representatives of capitalism, just like the other bourgeois political parties, and not as representatives of the proletariat.

The bourgeois pseudo-democracy, the parliament which allegedly chooses the government, is nothing but a puppet in the hands of the power of capital which operates «behind the scenes» and, in various forms, dictates everything from outside. The various parties represented in parliament, as well as the trade-unions which allegedly fight to defend the workers, give various nuances to these different forms of the real power exercised «behind the scenes». In reality, all the bourgeois-revisionist parties and trade-unions in the capitalist state, regardless of the names they assume, are dependent on the owning class.

Kardelj says the «Eurocommunists» are right when they link their political struggle for «socialism» with defence of the institutions of pluralism of political forces, because, as he puts it, «...in the present situation of the countries of Western Europe, this is the only realistic road to the unity of the forces of the working class itself, as well as to linking it with the other peoples' democratic forces, this is the only thing which can essentially strengthen the social and political positions of the working class, i.e., make it capable of changing society, and not just of criticizing it» (p. 41).

Speaking about the links, solidarity and unity of the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia with the «Eurocommunists» and all the other revisionist parties which, in one way or another, in this or that form, defend capitalism and fight the revolution and true socialism, Kardelj says, «We have reason to defend the parliamen-

tary system and political pluralism when the reactionary forces of bourgeois society attack it» (p. 61). This «ideologist» wants to say that the working class and the pseudo-communists of Western Europe are right to unite with the capitalist institutions, parliament and the bourgeois government, because through this union and only in this way will the working class become capable of changing society!

From the foregoing it comes out clearly that the Yugoslav «self-administrative» society is for the close alliance or fusion of capitalism with socialism, because the present-day capitalists allegedly have no objection to the building of a new society in which the working class will gain ability and assume its full democratic «self-administrative» rights. Hence, it is not difficult to see that the author of this book recommends that there must be a transition from the «consumer society», in which the technocrats have allegedly seized power, to a «self-administrative society in which the individuals are associated in united labour» and this transition can be considered a triumph of socialism! There is nothing resembling genuine scientific socialism in these judgements and stands of inveterate renegades. As loyal servants of the capitalist bourgeoisie, the Titoites deny the proletarian revolution and the class struggle with these things they are writing. In claiming that the «consumer society» can be transformed into socialism gradually, without violent revolution, but by virtue of the «Holy Spirit», they seek to disarm the proletariat and smash its Marxist-Leninist party.

In the capitalist countries, «reveals» Kardelj, the executive power is linked with political forces which act and impose their policy from outside parliament. Here, again Kardelj is saying nothing new but simply repeating as his own observation that idea which Lenin

expressed in his masterly exposure of the falsity of bourgeois democracy. It is a fine thing to assimilate and repeat Lenin's ideas, but it is neither Lenin nor Leninism that concerns Mr. Kardelj. He is afraid of the «politicism» and the «political monopoly» of Leninism, although it pleases him «to politicize» others and make them believe that under capitalism the executive power is really manipulated by forces outside the state organs, whereas in Yugoslavia, the Presidency of the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia and the Federative Executive Council which constitutes the government, have miraculously escaped this danger because they have allegedly divided their competences «in a precise manner» (p. 235). Apart from this, in Yugoslavia, always according to Kardelj, the political strength is concentrated in the delegates' assembly, and moreover, not just in this but in the interconnection of this assembly with the whole social structure (p. 235). In regard to its «full powers and authority», this «delegates' assembly» is reminiscent of the so-called councils of local self-government in the bourgeois countries, which Lenin has ridiculed, saying that they

*«... may be 'autonomous' only in minor matters, may be independent only in tinkering with wash-basins...»**

It is said that under «workers' self-administration», the «delegates» voice their opinions freely. In theory, of course, not only the «delegates», but also the workers have all rights, but in practice they enjoy none. In the political system of Yugoslav «self-administration» every-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 10, p. 366, Alb. ed.

thing is decided from above and not from below. The protests of the Yugoslav workers against the enrichment and corruption of leading officials, their coming out with demands for the elimination of economic and social distinctions, for the abolition of private enterprises, for checking political and moral corruption, their protests against national discrimination, etc., are already well-known. The book is full of very long phrases which, while wearying the reader, are intended to make him believe the abstract idea that «socialist self-government exists in Yugoslavia», that «workers' self-administration reigns» there, at a time when the only keys the workers hold will open no doors. The keys to the government of the country are held by the new Yugoslav bourgeoisie which operates from rightist positions, while disguising itself with leftist slogans.

4. — The System of «Self-administration» and the Negation of the Leading Role of the Party

The Yugoslav revisionists also take an anti-Marxist stand towards the leading role of the communist party in the construction of socialism. According to Kardelj's «theory», the party must not lead any economic or administrative activity. But it can and should exercise its influence only through its educational activity among the workers, so that they understand the socialist system well.

The negation of the role of the communist party in the construction of socialism and the reduction of this role to an «ideological» and «orientating» factor is in flagrant opposition to Marxism-Leninism. The enemies of scientific socialism support this thesis by «arguing» that leadership by the party is allegedly incompatible with the decisive role which should be played by the

masses of producers, who, they claim, should exercise their political influence directly, and not through the communist party, because this would bring about «bureaucratic despotism»!

Contrary to the anti-scientific theses of these enemies of communism, historical experience has shown that the undivided leading role of the revolutionary party of the working class in the struggle for socialism and communism is absolutely essential. As is known, leadership by the party is a question of vital importance for the fate of the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. It reflects a universal law of the socialist revolution. Lenin says,

*«... the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be realized except through the communist party.»**

The direct political influence of the working masses in socialist society is not in any way hampered by the communist party, which represents the working class, whose interests do not run counter to the interests of the other working people. On the contrary, it is only under the leadership of the working class and its vanguard that the working masses participate broadly in governing the country and realizing their interests. In a genuinely socialist country, such as Albania, the opinion of the working masses on important problems is consulted directly. There are countless examples of this, from the discussion and approval of the Constitution to the drafting of economic plans, etc., etc. «Bureaucratic despotism» is a characteristic of the capitalist state and can never be attributed to the leading role of the party

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 32, p. 226, Alb. ed.

under the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which from its nature and class character, is sternly anti-bureaucratic.

Continuing the exposition of his revisionist views on the role of the party, Kardelj writes that, «although it must fight to ensure that the key positions of state power are in the hands of those subjective forces which are on the side of socialism and socialist self-administration», the League of Communists «cannot be a class political party» (p. 119). So, that is the sort of the party the Yugoslav revisionists want! They do not want, and in reality do not have, a political party of the working class, but a bourgeois organization, a club which anybody may enter or leave, when and how it pleases him, provided only that he declares he is a «communist» without needing to be such. Of course, this is quite normal for such a party as the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia, which has nothing communist about it.

There never has been non-class party or state, nor will there ever be. Parties and the states are class products. That is how they came into existence and how they will be right up to communism.

Although Kardelj portrays the leading role of the League of «Communists» as liquidated, still, for purposes of demagogy he does not forget to say that this League, «with its clear stands (which in fact are far from being clear, but on the contrary, are obscure and murky) must work hard to find means to solve many problems about the ways and forms for the further development of the political system of socialist self-administration». If the happiness for the people cannot come from the state or the party, as the renegade Kardelj writes, then why should these prerogatives be given to the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia? If, as is claimed, the Yugoslav society of «self-administration» has no need for the

leadership of a single political party, why then, does it need the leadership of the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia?

Whereas Marx is for a genuine party of the working class, which must lead this class and make it conscious of its historic mission, according to Kardelj, the proletariat can carry the country forward and realize its aspirations spontaneously, even without the leading role of the party. He says this in order to justify the theory of «self-administration», a theory which is for political pluralism, that is, for the unity in the so-called Socialist League of Working People of all social forces, regardless of their ideo-political differences, and for a party which has no communist value at all, but to which he attaches the label of leadership in the whole anti-Marxist system of «self-administration».

The revisionist Kardelj refers to the bureaucracy of the Western parties of capital. Here, too, he has discovered nothing new, because it is well known that bureaucracy is inherent in and characteristic of capitalism. However, he denounces the bureaucracy in other parties, not in order to criticize them, but to hide the bureaucratization and subsequent liquidation of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia after it was stripped of any prerogatives that belonged to it. The Titoites call the displacement of the party to the tail-end of events, phenomena, or processes of political and social life and its transformation into a party of the bourgeoisie, debureaucratization and, in order to cover up their betrayal, they have left it flaunting the name the «League of Communists of Yugoslavia».

Whether or not a party is communist, whether or not it is a party of the working class, cannot be judged from the name it bears, but only from who leads it in fact and what activity it carries out. Lenin said,

*«... whether or not a party is really a political party of the workers depends... also upon the men that lead it, and the content of its actions and its political tactics.»**

And in fact, not only has the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia not escaped the process of bureaucratization, but it has long since ceased to be a party of Yugoslav communists. Its inflation with numerous apparatuses, with a great number of bureaucratic salaried officials, just like the Western revisionist parties or the social-democratic parties, is one of the factors which have brought about that it is no longer the vanguard of the working class, but a party opposed to this class.

Rule by the working class and its vanguard party, as the leader of the state and society, does not exist in Yugoslavia. According to Kardelj, it turns out that in Yugoslavia the League of «Communists» has no rights at all to political leadership in the state system, for power there is exercised «...through the system of delegation, while the League of Communists, as part of the self-governing system, is one of the most important factors of social influence in the formation of the consciousness of self-administrators and the organs of delegates» (p. 73). I think there is no need for further explanation. What this renegade writes is enough to convince us that the dictatorship of the proletariat, as the political rule by the working class and state leadership of society by this class, does not exist in Yugoslavia. And since this dictatorship does not exist there, we cannot speak of the existence of the party of the working class, either, but only of a party of the bourgeoisie.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 31, p. 285, Alb. ed.

Kardelj pretends that «the one-party system» in a socialist country is a specific transformation of the bourgeois political system, and the role of the one party (here he implies the Bolshevik Party) is the same as that of «the multi-party system» of bourgeois political pluralism with only one «minor» difference, that in the one-party political state its leaders only remain at the head, whereas in the multi-party state the leaders change. This double-dealer puts the bourgeois parties on a par with the Bolshevik Party, founded by the Russian revolutionaries under Lenin's leadership. To him, the leadership of the state and society by the genuine party of the communists is no different from the rule of the bourgeoisie through the multi-party system. This proves once again that the Titoites, like the bourgeoisie, consider political parties and the state as institutions that allegedly stand above classes.

Between the working class and the bourgeoisie there is a life-and-death struggle and both these classes are organized in political parties to defend their own antagonistic interests and to rule the society, but this does not mean that the party of the working class, the Marxist-Leninist party, is no different from the bourgeois party. On the contrary. When the Communist Party of Yugoslavia was transformed into a bourgeois party by no means did it become a party above classes, but was transformed from the vanguard of the working class into an instrument of the bourgeoisie. It lost its proletarian class character only, but did not lose all class character because it became the party of the new bourgeois class. The difference between the communist party and a bourgeois party in the leadership of the state is not a «minor» one, but a very great, profound, class difference of principle, which cannot be reduced to the «rotation» of party leaders in political power, as this renegade claims.

With these «theories» about the «minor difference» between the bourgeois political system and the socialist system, the bourgeois party and the Marxist-Leninist party, the Yugoslav revisionists want to say that their hankering for capitalism should not be taken as something of great consequence. It is quite obvious that the Yugoslav revisionists cannot reflect in theory positions different from those they have maintained in practice.

Prattling about the «shortcomings of the one-party system», hence, trying to attack the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union of the time of Lenin and Stalin in this way, Kardelj writes, «First of all, the tendency of personal union of the chiefs of the party with the state executive apparatus manifests itself in it, and thus, it becomes an instrument for the operation of techno-bureaucratic tendencies in society» (p. 64).

In order «to escape» this «techno-bureaucracy» and this tendency to «personal union of the chiefs of the party with the state executive apparatus in socialism», which they arbitrarily attribute to the Bolsheviks, the Yugoslav revisionist gentlemen have created their own system, which is nothing but a dictatorship of the Titoite group. In the so-called assemblies of self-administrative, communities and in their executive apparatuses, as the author of the book himself admits, «...bureaucratic-centrist tendencies are now manifesting themselves very powerfully» (pp. 231-232). In Yugoslavia the executive power is manipulated by Tito and the clique around him. Despite all their assurances that allegedly they do not aspire to power, the President of the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia is President of the Yugoslav state for life, and all the functionaries with key posts in the state, the army, the economy, foreign policy, culture, the social organizations, etc., also hold important positions in the

League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia. The whole thing is that, while they assail the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the leadership of the proletarian party in socialist society, in practice, the Yugoslav revisionists strive to keep the reins of state power firmly in their grip. The so-called Presidency of Yugoslavia was not created there in order to ensure collective state leadership, to fight the bureaucracy on which it relies, or to defend the Yugoslav state from the dominant forces outside it, as we have sometimes heard it said, but in a desperate effort to ensure the domination of Titoism after the death of Tito. This shows that not only in content but also in form the Yugoslav regime is nothing but a capitalist state which oppresses the people while trying to disguise itself behind deceptive slogans.

Kardelj cannot erase that black period in Yugoslavia's history when, as a result of the betrayal by the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and the establishment of the Titoite dictatorship, the peoples of that country suffered the most unrestrained violence, terror and injustices on their own back. Kardelj, the Titoite spokesman, tries to gloss over this black period with a few slogans in order to persuade the peoples of Yugoslavia not to complain of their sufferings by saying, «our socialist revolution, too», in its initial phase, sanctioned a particular form of one-party system of revolutionary democracy, though never in its «classical» «Stalinist» form (pp. 64-65). This brazen renegade dares to speak ill of the «classical Stalinist form» which was a form so profoundly democratic and socialist that the Tito-Kardelj-Ranković regime was never remotely like it, and even to make such a comparison is insulting. The monstrous crimes in Yugoslavia were perpetrated not in the period of friendship with Stalin and the Soviet Union of his time, but precisely after the rupture of this friendship, when

Yugoslavia openly embarked on the road of «self-administration».

At present in Yugoslavia, according to Kardelj's «theory», the personal union of the executive organs of the «League of Communists of Yugoslavia» with the executive organs of the state has been «totally» and «radically» done away with, allegedly because the «League of Communists of Yugoslavia» has no prerogative to perform the role of the leading ideological and political force in society. Its only role is to exert its influence on the masses.

But how and for what is this League to exert its influence on the masses when it has no prerogative to lead? In no way at all. In a moment of despair Tito has admitted, «the League of Communists of Yugoslavia has been reduced to an amorphous, apolitical organization.» But Kardelj, with a view to preventing the Titoites being shown up in their true colours, corrected his boss, by writing that allegedly the «League of Communists has become one of the most powerful pillars of the democracy of the new type — the democracy of the pluralism of self-governing interests» (p. 65).

If Yugoslav «self-administration» has deprived the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia of political leadership, it is self-evident that this «self-administration» has automatically divested the working class of its political role, since this class can enjoy its prerogatives only through its vanguard, the communist party. If the vanguard of the class is deprived of its leading prerogatives, it is absurd to claim that the class exercises the rights which belong to it. Under these circumstances, it is self-evident just how much the proletariat and the other working masses can be «self-governing», under this sort of democracy «of a new type»! Here is what Kardelj says in regard to this question: «The League of Communists does

not exercise its rule through the political monopoly, although it expresses a specific, but very important form from the socio-historical stand-point of the interests of the working class, and along with this, the interests of all the working people and the society — in the system of self-administration and the state of the working class and the working people, a system which is based on the democratic pluralism of the interests of self-governing subjects» (pp. 65-66).

All this highfaluting and confused phraseology shows only the incontestable fact that in Yugoslavia the party counts for nothing, that it exists only on paper. Although formally he defends the stand-point of strengthening the role of the party, as he understands this role, Kardelj could not avoid such admissions as: «The League of Communists of Yugoslavia is not sufficiently present politically and creatively... in the whole democratic system of self-administration and the formation of the policy and practice of the other socio-political organizations...» (pp. 263-624). Then, where is the League present, when apparently it is not present in the directions it should be, when as TANJUG, the Yugoslav news agency reported recently, two thirds of the villages in Yugoslavia have no basic organizations of the «League of Communists» at all? This question is too awkward for Kardelj to give it any answer, but concrete analysis of the practical activity of the League proves beyond all doubt that, as a «party of communists» it is not present anywhere, whereas as a party of the new Yugoslav bourgeoisie and the Titoite fascist dictatorship, it is everywhere.

In this Yugoslav «self-administrative socialism», which Kardelj has undertaken to expound «theoretically», the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia always has a specific position. This specific position which can be seen everywhere in the pages of the book, can be interpreted

as one likes, that is, as a specific position in the education of the workers, a specific position in relation to the proletariat, a specific position in the so-called system of delegates, in which it must not take part and lead for fear of its «political monopoly», and other such specifics. This party, with such an endless series of specific positions, has the right, within the framework of the delegation of the so-called Socialist League of the Working People of Yugoslavia, to have its own delegation to assemblies, through which it collaborates with the other «self-administrative» delegations. This shows that the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia has no independent political power and has long been serving as an agency of anarchist Yugoslav federalism. It exists to give satisfaction to the foreign capital, which has entrenched itself in Yugoslavia, to reassure it that «self-administration» does not infringe the system of private ownership, that no party, whatever it is, will change the course of this anarcho-syndicalist state.

According to E. Kardelj, the role of the individual in society is everything, whereas the working class and its party are nothing. According to him, the vanguard of the working class turns out to be not the Marxist-Leninist party but the «self-governing communities», an abstract organization invented to indicate some allegedly grand thing, which has no real existence. This revisionist does not see the working class as the leading class of society, but confuses it with the entire mass of working people. The whole Yugoslav people, he says, can be called a vanguard, of course placing the individual, who «freely» (that is, in an anarchist way) expresses himself and realizes his aims (in this anarchist society) at the head of this vanguard. From this reasoning of Kardelj's it is clear that the working class in Yugoslavia has long since ceased to act as a united class and has lost the

role of the leading class in Yugoslav society. With the party and the state power no longer in its hands, the Yugoslav working class is not in power but, on the contrary, has been put in the position of a class exploited by the new bourgeoisie, which rules the working masses through the state power it manipulates.

To escape the accusation that his stand denying the leading role of the party of the working class is betrayal of the interests of this class, this notorious traitor has extracted the following quotations from the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* by Marx and Engels: «The communists do not form a separate party opposed to other working class parties», «they have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole», «they do not set up any sectarian principle of their own by which to shape and mould the proletarian movement». With these quotations Kardelj wants to create the impression that Marx and Engels were allegedly of the opinion that the communists have no need for a party of their own, since it is not a party with characteristics, interests and principles different from those of other workers' parties. What a renegade! Entirely devoid of conscience, he sees the proletariat through the spectacles of an anti-Marxist social-democrat, as an amorphous mass which is allegedly fighting for general interests but which has no principles, no class or revolutionary orientation, no fighting program on how to win its rights!

In the second chapter of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, this work of scientific communism, Marx and Engels brilliantly defined the historic mission of the communist party, as an inseparable part of the working class, as its vanguard detachment, etc., etc., but never have they expressed the idea that the communists should not have their own party. On the contrary, it was pre-

cisely so the communists would have their own party that they wrote the Manifesto of this party, which was considered as the first scientific programmatic document of communism.

5. — Ideo-political Pluralism, «Democracy» and «Socialist» Construction in Yugoslavia

With his theory Kardelj puts the «pluralism of the interests of working people» in the forefront, and in this pluralism he especially emphasizes the role of the so-called Socialist League of Working People, which according to him, is able to unite all the social forces, regardless of their ideological differences. In reality, this «Socialist League» is an association which exists only formally and which counts for nothing in Yugoslavia. Kardelj rather lets the cat out of the bag about this when he writes, «I think it is no exaggeration to say that underrating the social role of the Socialist League... is a phenomenon fairly widespread in the League of Communists, and indeed, not only among the rank and file» (pp. 272-273). Further on, talking about the activity of this «association of all organized forces of society», as they call it in Yugoslavia, Kardelj is again obliged to mention its formal character, writing, «The Socialist League frequently solves problems more in appearance, that is, through resolutions and declarations, and less in reality» (p. 276). These admissions of what Kardelj treats simply as some weak points, are sufficient to prove incontestably what this lifeless association represents.

According to Kardelj, the pluralism of «socialist self-administration» is expressed in the context of the «Socialist League», which includes all the «progressive dem-

ocratic» tendencies (all trends, even the regressive ones) the representatives of which are entitled to have their say and decide on the policy of Yugoslavia. In reality, apart from the Tito clique, nobody else can take decisions in this front, which Kardelj calls pluralism of «self-administrative» interests, in order to show that Yugoslavia is allegedly not for the creation of many parties, but for a single party, on condition that it is not the only force which leads the society.

«The League of Communists of Yugoslavia,» says Kardelj, «has a special political responsibility in society, which — naturally — it shares with all other socialist social forces» (p. 74), and because there is such a sharing of responsibilities, «democratic pluralism» is supposed to exist in Yugoslavia. According to him, «democratic pluralism», that is, not multi-party pluralism but pluralism within the framework of the «Socialist League» which also preserves the one-party system, is recommended as more suitable to Yugoslavia. In other words, this idea means that the «League of Communists» and other «social-political» organizations which are «...independent organisms... in which the League of Communists takes part and co-operates as a component part of them...», operate within the framework of the so-called Socialist League (p. 267).

Without dwelling any longer on this, we can say that, whether it is called «democratic pluralism», «pluralism of the interests of working people», or any other name, in fact, this «pluralism» has only formal differences from bourgeois pluralism. If in a capitalist state there are many parties which are active and influential in parliament, expressing the interests of the main strata of the bourgeoisie or some other class, in Yugoslavia, likewise, the League of «Communists» operates along with other leagues, which are not called parties but social-

political organizations, which try to express the interests of the petty bourgeoisie, the worker aristocracy, etc., etc., and defend these interests in the Yugoslav capitalist state. For these reasons, the conclusion of the Yugoslav revisionists that «not only is our political system not a one-party system, but it rules out such a system in the same way as it rules out the multi-party pluralism of bourgeois society», is an absurdity, a thesis borrowed from the anarchists and anarchosyndicalists against whom Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin waged a stern struggle.

The theory advocated by Kardelj on «political pluralism», in regard to equal rights for different parties in the socialist state, their reciprocal control, etc., will also suit Hua Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping.

While boasting about the directions of the development of the political system of «socialist self-administration», in order not to overdo it, Kardelj is obliged to admit that there are also exaggerations, mistakes, and shortcomings, because «in many spheres the new relations are not yet in existence or functioning satisfactorily» (p. 26). Even had he not admitted this, however, the Yugoslav reality is proving every day that this «self-administration» has reached an impasse, therefore those who are closely acquainted with Yugoslavia and its political system cannot believe his consoling statements describing «self-administration» as the «most highly developed socialist system».

The political system of «self-administration» in Yugoslavia is a brazen disguise to cover up the revisionist betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, scientific socialism and communism. The Yugoslav Titoites, as anti-Marxists, are not and never have been for the construction of socialism, but for the perpetuation of capitalism in different forms. They are trying to concoct all sorts of «theories»

with the aim of, at least, delaying the process of decay of the capitalist social order, since they are powerless to halt it. For the Yugoslav revisionists, any people and any state can build socialism without basing themselves on the universal laws and principles of the Marxist-Leninist ideology. They do not accept that socialism must be a single socio-economic system and claim that various forms of socialism can exist. Deliberately misusing and distorting the correct Marxist-Leninist thesis about the creative application of the ideology of the working class in the specific conditions of each country, they insist that there are no universal laws for the construction of socialism in all countries, and that each country can build a «socialism» different from the others, according to its own will and in its own way.

The truth is that for the construction of socialism it is absolutely necessary that the concrete conditions of each country should be taken into account, but socialism in any country can be built only on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, on the basis of laws and principles common to all countries, laws and principles from which you cannot deviate if you do not wish to end up in capitalism, like Yugoslavia.

In order to «substantiate» the thesis that each country should build its own specific socialism, the Yugoslav revisionists say, through Kardelj, that «socialist self-administration cannot be imposed, for instance, on the bourgeois democracies of Europe or the American democracy», because they have not yet attained the conditions Yugoslavia has. According to them, the advance to socialism can be made either through the political pluralism of the Western parliamentary system or even without such pluralism. Hence, any country can build its specific socialism without relying on any experience, not even on the theory of scientific socialism of Marx and Engels.

However, since they present their «self-administration» as the finest system on earth, they think that regardless of the specific road that each country follows for the construction of socialism, this system can be adopted and applied on an international scale!

Impelled by his subjectivism and his unrestrained antipathy to the experience of the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union in the time of Lenin and Stalin, Kardelj vents his anger so furiously on this experience and so greatly loses his balance of judgement that he calls it a reactionary process and equates it with the European-type political pluralism. Here is what he says: «Therefore, the attempts to impose the specific political pluralism of the European type, for example, where neither the conditions nor any need for such a system exist, truly play the same reactionary role in the contemporary social processes as the attempts to have this or that 'model' of socialism imposed on countries which have neither the conditions nor the need for such a 'model'» (p. 49).

This whole tirade is simply playing with words with just one aim: to reject Marxism-Leninism and the universal laws of the construction of socialist society, to deceive the masses and perpetuate the capitalist system by painting it up in various «socialist» colours. This is why in his potboiler entitled, *The Directions of the Development of the Political System of Socialist Self-administration* he says not one word about really destroying the power of capital.

According to this «great Yugoslav ideologist», whereas the political pluralism of bourgeois parliamentarianism is a system which transforms the individual into an «abstract political citizen», makes him passive and prevents him from becoming an exponent of concretely defined human or social interests, in Yugoslavia, on the contrary, there is allegedly no danger that the citizen

may be transformed into an «abstract political citizen», because «self-administration» is supposed to teach him to defend his own concrete interests first of all! Like Kardelj's other theses, this thesis, too, is far from the truth. His «politicized» citizen in the capitalist countries is not sitting back with folded arms. True, in those countries, he has been denied his rights, true, the laws of capital have barred the paths to the defence of the interests of the working man, but nevertheless the workers there still strive and struggle to break the chains of capitalist slavery. Denial of this struggle that the working class is waging under capitalism is contrary to the facts.

In the capitalist social order not all obey the policy and norms of bourgeois morality. On the contrary, the overwhelming majority of the members of capitalist society — the proletariat and the other oppressed and exploited working masses — not only do not obey the policy and morality of the bourgeoisie, but they oppose and resist them in many forms and by many means. Kardelj could not but have heard of this, but he distorts the facts in order to assert that allegedly under his «specific socialism» the individual, the man, the citizen, occupies the main place and is not «politicized» by the party, that under the political system of «self-administration», and only under that system, this concrete individual can easily defend his concrete interests! If we are consistent and reason through to the end according to Kardelj's logic, then we must accept the absurdity that over one million unemployed who are going hungry in Yugoslavia have suffered this fate not through any fault of the system of «self-government», but through their own negligence, because they have not bothered to defend their concrete interests! In «socialist self-administrative» Yugoslavia, the working people have been disarmed polit-

ically to such a degree that they are unable to defend even their most basic rights. In fact, the vast majority of them have been turned into people whose only concern is how to hang on to their jobs or to find work when they have none, how to ensure the means of livelihood within the country or abroad. It is true that very few working people are interested in what this «self-administration system», «united labour», «democratic pluralism», etc., are. This, too, is one of the aims of the Titoites who, with their invention of «self-administrative socialism», want the workers to involve themselves as little as possible in defending their rights, to concern themselves as little as possible with politics, to pursue only their own narrow interests and neglect their common class interests.

In the system of bourgeois parliamentarianism, according to Kardelj, the working class inevitably becomes «politicized», because trade-unionism and the trade-union struggle on their own do not lead it to political power. Further on he writes that such a «politicization» divides the working class into parties, and thus, he claims, gives rise to the new danger that «the bureaucracy of the party» may begin to operate in the name of the class.

It is true that the struggle in the context of trade-unionism in the capitalist countries does not secure political power for the working class. That is why the workers organize themselves in political parties to defend their class interests. But Kardelj is not out to expose trade-unionism, nor the various «workers'» parties that are set up in the West, with which the Yugoslav revisionists are allied. He wants to show that these factors, from bourgeois parliamentarianism and the bourgeois parties to the other parties, communist or revisionist, and the trade-unions, are all equally disruptive to the workers' movement and this is why, according to him, these par-

ties should be done away with. The bourgeoisie and the revisionists are not upset by this stand of their friend, because they understand very well that Kardelj is talking about the liquidation of the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties only, while the other parties of the bourgeoisie, also, may exist, because these parties, whether they are one, two, or more, do not become obstacles to the transformation of the capitalist order into a «socialist order»!

It is not surprising that Kardelj writes «in theory» quite differently from the way matters stand in practice. With the theoretical fairy tales he spins, this charlatan is hiding the many manipulations which have gone on in Yugoslavia in order to transform that society, which initially, just for the sake of appearances had allegedly taken a certain socialist orientation, into a capitalist society. Although because of the position he defends Kardelj is not and cannot be consistent, in fact, he stands for the bourgeois parliamentary system, which he toils to present on paper as different from the «specific» Yugoslav system. His inconsistency is apparent when he does not completely reject that system, but describes it as a democratic system in which «...the working class and all the other democratic forces perform an important, progressive, historic role, when they fight for the strengthening of the social position of parliament and the extension of its authority as against the extra-parliamentary forces of power» (p. 55).

This «theorizing» of Kardelj's is not in any way intended to expose the tendencies which can be seen today in the development of the capitalist state, where the executive power (the government) is continually extending its authority at the expense of the legislative power (parliament), thus preparing the conditions for the transition to the establishment of fascism, when the monopoly bourgeoisie considers this necessary. He is not

worried in the least about the increasing trend to fascism which is threatening many capitalist states today, because his state, also, is on the same course. Therefore, he wants to prevent the working class from accomplishing its historic mission by overturning the state power of the bourgeoisie through revolution, as Marx and Lenin teach. By writing in favour of bourgeois parliamentarianism, he unintentionally reveals that strong pressures are being brought to bear on the Titoites in this direction, especially by big US and West-European capital which have investments in Yugoslavia. These pressures are exerted to ensure that the bourgeois democracy in Yugoslavia develops on a more extensive scale, and that many parties: social-democratic, revisionist, «communist», etc., are created there. However, although the Yugoslav revisionists are not against the multi-party parliamentary system, still, they do not want to destroy their one-party system which they have publicized as «self-governing», not only because this would unmask them, but even more, for fear of the danger that might be created for the Titoites' monopoly in all state affairs, in the army, the UDB and in the other organs of repression, as well as in the organs of deception for brainwashing the people with bourgeois ideas.

In reality, Kardelj does not reject what he calls «political monopoly» in the running of society and which he declares has been retained as a privilege of the chiefs of political parties and the executive organs of bourgeois «democracy». That is, he does not reject the parliamentary and the extra-parliamentary system, but he expresses opposition to «the remnants of this system» which, he alleges, socialism inherited in its initial phases and forms.

It is obvious that, without attacking the form of bourgeois parliamentarianism. Kardelj seeks to liken it to

the state organs of genuine socialist society. These ideas are even more apparent when he says that, in the conditions when the means of production are nationalized, parliament without the workers' «self-government» would be identical with the one-party political system of socialism, based on «the étatist form of social property». With the political system «in the étatist form of social property» Kardelj means our state power of people's councils, as well as the Soviet state power which Lenin established in the Soviet Union in order to build the new socialist society under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party.

In negating the aims of the October Revolution and the great work which was done for years on end under the leadership of Lenin, and later Stalin, for the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union, the revisionist Kardelj is labouring to prove that allegedly Yugoslavia, which has abolished the «étatist» social property and has transformed it into «socialized property», that it has not betrayed, as it is accused of doing, but has invented a genuinely «socialist» state, a «self-administrative socialism», and although «theoretically» he does not recommend it for all, his heart is set on having everybody follow it in practice.

According to Kardelj, the «one-party system» in Yugoslavia no longer corresponds to the variant of «specific socialism». It was imposed, at first, because of the development of the socialist revolution, as an element of the initial structure of the dictatorship of the proletariat, whereas now it is described as «...incompatible with the socio-economic and democratic relations of socialist self-government and with its democratic pluralism of self-governing interests» (p. 63).

The Yugoslav revisionists pretend they do not agree with the multi-party system of rule of bourgeois society, and neither do they want to accept the leadership of

the state and society by a single political party of the working class, therefore they claim to have discovered the «golden mean», their so-called «democratic pluralism». The truth is that the system of Yugoslav «self-administration» contains elements of both the «one-party system» and of the «multiparty system». But this is nothing but a mongrel capitalist system, an ugly offspring spawned by the Yugoslav bourgeoisie in order to rule the working masses and disguise itself behind a «Marxist» facade.

In order to malign Lenin and Stalin, the Titoite author wants to pit these two great leaders of the world proletariat against each other, to «prove» that allegedly they did not have identical concepts about the political system of the socialist state. Look how he slanders: «Between Lenin's concept of the political system of the socialist state and that of Stalin, there was a great incompatibility. The basis and the essence of Lenin's concept of the Soviet power is direct democracy...» (p. 67).

It is known world-wide that Stalin was a zealous disciple, loyal comrade and very close collaborator of Lenin's. Hitherto, no one, apart from enemies, had dared to oppose Stalin to Lenin. These insinuations are made for hostile purposes, but the international communist and workers' movement is used to the manoeuvres of the revisionists, who at one time declared themselves to be Marxist-Leninists, but «non-Stalinists», whereas now they are making efforts to oppose Lenin to Marx, and are discussing whether or not they should be just «Marxists», or «Marxist-Leninists». Tomorrow, no doubt they will throw off all disguise and come out openly as renegades and traitors saying they do not stand for Marx, either. For this purpose, too, they will invent adequate «theories», which may be anything but not communist or proletarian.

Lenin, as a true Marxist, spoke out for socialist

democracy, the direct participation of the working masses in running the country, and he put these revolutionary ideas into practice during the years he remained at the head of the Soviet state. Following him, Stalin continued on the same course. However, with socialist democracy and the direct participation of the masses in governing the country, Lenin did not in the least mean the weakening of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the leading role of the Bolshevik Party. He never counterposed the dictatorship of the proletariat to genuine democracy, which he defined as

*«...a state that is democratic in a new way (for the proletariat and the propertyless in general) and dictatorial in a new way (against the bourgeoisie).»**

It is quite evident that Lenin was not, and never could be, for the replacement of the dictatorship of the proletariat with this «self-administration» system which the Yugoslav revisionists invented in order to return to capitalism.

In the time of Lenin and Stalin, the class in power in the Soviet Union was the working class, which, through its party, led, managed, planned and successfully carried out the tasks of the construction of socialism. In Yugoslavia they have totally disregarded the major role of the socialist state, which they have identified with the so-called «system of delegates», which, as Kardelj himself admits, has «...serious weaknesses in all the aspects of its functioning» (p. 213).

Kardelj himself understands that his reference to Lenin about democracy cannot serve him in the least to

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 25, p. 488, Alb. ed.

justify «self-administration», therefore, through sophistry, he tries to convince people that Lenin's idea «...was not elaborated right down to its factual consequences... but it is clear that its essence is precisely direct democracy, i.e., self-government» (p. 67). Kardelj «philosophizes» and seeks to make up for his lack of arguments with arbitrary and fantastic interpretations to his own liking. He seeks to persuade the reader that Lenin began well, but subsequently had no opportunity to develop the idea of «self-administration» further, to suit the taste of Tito and himself. The idea expressed by Lenin, that the proletariat would lead, organize, and run the Soviet power and govern the country through its party, has been and is fundamental to the Marxist-Leninist theory. It is precisely this essential question of theoretical and practical importance that the Titoites evade, and they try to disguise this deviation by distorting Lenin's correct theses.

According to the Titoites, Stalin «...stood for a concept of indirect democracy, i.e., in essence he adopted the classical political system of the bourgeois state and its political pluralism, except that he gave one party the role which the multi-party system has in the bourgeois parliamentary state» (p. 68). They allege that Stalin deviated from the Leninist concepts, because he allegedly implemented «indirect democracy», running the state through one party, which closely resembled the bourgeois parties, and the trappings of the parliamentary system. This is the «devastating» criticism this pseudo-Marxist makes of the activity and work of Joseph Stalin! Stalin, like Lenin, viewed democracy from the class angle, as a form of the political organization of society, as a political condition for drawing the masses into governing the country, to defend and strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat, to block the way to revisionist degeneration and the restoration of capitalism. Stalin, as the Marxist-

Leninist he was, quite rightly sternly opposed one-sided, liberal and anarchist concepts of democracy and took a stand against petty-bourgeois distortions and misrepresentations about the rights and freedoms that proletarian democracy ensures. And he was absolutely right. The revisionists, on the contrary, want to transform proletarian democracy into bourgeois democracy in theory, just as they have done in practice. This is why they are against Stalin.

The Yugoslav pseudo-Marxists justify their criticism of the genuine socialist system under the pretext that the notions of «worker» and «working class» have allegedly changed today, that changes have occurred, also, in the meaning of the notion «citizen». According to them, «the working class has become an abstract political subject, which does not exercise power, but in whose name power can be exercised». Thus, this means that under a genuine socialist system, it is not the working class which exercises power, but someone else, who acts over the head of the working class on its behalf. This is a gross deception, a shameless distortion of the reality. This means to adopt the philosophical stand-point of idealism and to take as true, not what exists objectively, but what is in your mind.

Proceeding from this position, the revisionist Kardelj comes out with the idea that, in the relations of production in the socialist order, in his relations with other workers, in his social position, etc., etc., in fact, the worker counts for nothing! And according to Kardelj, this is how «...the dogma of social ownership as state ownership was created, and along with this, the necessity for the centralized state, for the leading role of the state and party apparatus..., while the class interests and aspirations of the individual worker... are discredited and, hence, considered as acts transgressing universal laws...» (p. 70).

This is how Kardelj distorts the genuine socialist system and the socialist relations of production of the time of Lenin and Stalin, and consequently, the construction of socialism in our country, too. By speaking against democratic centralism, the leading role of the party, the state form of socialist ownership, etc., he wants to show «the superiority» of the system of «self-administration», but in reality, he exposes himself by coming out openly against the immortal ideas of the classics of Marxism-Leninism on these cardinal problems. In fact these «accusations» he levels against us, rebound as counter-accusations against the Yugoslav political system of «self-administration». Now the Yugoslav reality is proving with each passing day, and will prove even more clearly tomorrow, precisely where the Tito and Kardelj clique is leading Yugoslavia, its peoples and the working class.

The Titoites say that theirs is a «self-administrative» system. But who are those that govern themselves in Yugoslavia? The workers, the peasants? Neither the workers, nor the peasants. They are just as much oppressed as their counterparts in the capitalist countries. The «self-administrative» system is ruled by those who are at the apex of the pyramid, the new bourgeoisie, who have climbed on the backs of the people by using the label of «communists», but who, in fact, are nothing but bourgeois technocrats who run the bureaucratic, étatist, fascist, state. The «delegates' assemblies», the state executive organs in the system of delegates, etc., are made up of such elements.

As is known, the mass organizations occupy a special position and play an important role in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat. They are the levers through which the party links itself with the masses and implements the political rule of the working class and socialist democracy. In socialism the social organizations

are conveyers of the line of the proletarian party to the masses, powerful weapons of the revolution and the socialist construction, militant tribunes from which popular opinion is expressed. Their task is to educate the masses and make them conscious of the need and capable of taking part actively in the socialist construction and government.

As component parts of the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, these organizations carry out their tasks under the leadership of the party of the working class, in the context of their own special functions and specific nature.

The social organizations cannot operate in isolation from the proletarian party, the other organizations and the socialist state. If the contrary were admitted, then, theoretically, it would be meaningless for them to be elements of a single system and, in practice, they would turn into lifeless organisms which would have no purpose and perform no task to the advantage of the socialist social order.

In Yugoslavia the mass organizations, like the party and the state, have been treated and evaluated from out-and-out anarchist positions. Contrary to Lenin's idea that the mass organizations are

*«... the closest and essential collaborators of state power...»**

in that country, the idea that co-operation of these organizations with the socialist state is a form of «bureaucratie étatism» has been supported. Moreover, the Yugoslav revisionists conceive these organizations in such a way that each of them can operate independently even

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 33, p. 202, Alb. ed.

from the party. Kardelj says, «We have long since abandoned the outlook that these organizations are supposed to be transmission belts of the League of Communists» (p. 267). This in no way implies that the single party in Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav state, which are in the hands of the bourgeoisie, have no power at all over these organizations. On the contrary, the Titoites have never relinquished their manipulation of the masses through the social organizations, but in saying what he does, Kardelj is driving at something else. His sole aim is to undermine the links of the Marxist-Leninist parties with the masses, whereas all revolutionary experience shows that these parties can create and maintain real links only with the masses organized in the respective organizations led by the proletarian party.

It is well known that the idea of the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party is closely linked with the idea of its revolutionary ideology, therefore, to detach the mass organizations from this party means to detach them from the Marxist-Leninist ideology, and to fill the vacuum with revisionist bourgeois ideology. This is quite obvious when Kardelj, speaking of man as a member of the «Socialist League» writes: «...it is not laid down that his ideological views must always be in conformity with the ideology of Marxism in every sphere...» (p. 280). This means that the Yugoslav working man can be guided by bourgeois, feudal, fascist and other outlooks and ideas, while having the support of the regime in this ideological confusion.

The fact that the mass organizations are component parts of the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, does not mean that they should be turned into «partners» or «appendages» of the state apparatus, under the disguise of «democracy» and of giving them some «state» competences, as has been done in the revisionist Soviet

Union. Firmly adhering to Marxism-Leninism, the genuine party of the working class must be careful to ensure that the role of social organizations is not diminished, but grows steadily stronger. In Yugoslavia, as Kardelj writes, the phenomenon of the basic organizations of the trade-unions «...being appendages of the organs of management...» (p. 295) is observed. This has occurred because the role of social organizations, their place in society and the relations they should have with the party and the state, have been defined from distorted positions.

In this book, Kardelj refers especially to the «Socialist League of the Working People», the trade-unions, the «League of Socialist Youth», etc., about which one could write and polemize at length. But here we have not gone into detail, deeming it better to emphasize only the deviations from principle by the Yugoslav revisionists in regard to the organization, aims and activity of the mass organizations.

The Yugoslav revisionists also take a reactionary stand towards the role of religion and its ideology. As is known, religious ideology has always served the exploiting classes to oppress and exploit the masses. It has been a means to implant in the minds of people the feeling of helplessness in the face of sufferings, misfortunes and hardships. Religious ideology bemuses people and paralyzes their activity to transform nature and society. That is why, as is known, Marx compared religion to opium. He wrote,

*«Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world... Religion is the **opium** of the people.»**

* K. Marx — F. Engels, *On Religion*, Tirana 1970, p. 45, Alb. ed.

Precisely because of the reactionary role it plays, the ruling classes have always supported religion and still do. In essence, the capitalists, the revisionists and the reactionary clergy have the one language. The Marxist-Leninist party cannot reconcile itself to religious ideology and its influence. The theoretical basis of the policy and program of a genuine party of the working class is the Marxist-Leninist philosophy, and not idealism and religion. The class struggle for the construction of socialism cannot be separated from the struggle against religion.

In Yugoslavia, religion has been assessed and treated in exactly the same way as in the other capitalist states. There, the poisoning of the masses with religious ideology is considered merely a private matter, and the party and the state are simply onlookers, because, according to them, religion «...is no obstacle to the religious man's integrating himself, on the basis of equality, into the socialist life of society» (p. 178). It is self-evident what a fine socialism this is, when the religious ideology is not at all opposed to it, and when, as Kardelj writes, «For the overwhelming majority of religious working people socialism has become their most profound conviction...» (pp. 179-180). Now we are hearing from this «great philosopher» that even the clergy with profound idealist and religious convictions have allegedly fallen in love with socialism, with the social order based on Marxist philosophy, dialectical and historical materialism! If they read these phrases by the Titoite renegade, not only will the workers, communists and every honest person in the world be astonished, but even the clergy will laugh, since hitherto it has never crossed their minds to say that they love socialism, which they have never ceased to execrate whole-heartedly. Since they have reconciled themselves to religious ideology, it becomes even more clear how «Marxist» the Yugoslav revisionists are, how «materialist» their

ideology is and, consequently, to what degree the political system of «self-administration», which is based on this ideology, is socialist.

The Party of Labour of Albania has consistently implemented the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist democracy, the leading and indivisible role of the party of the working class, and the necessity of waging the class struggle. Our historical reality proves in the most convincing manner that, when the universal laws of Marxism-Leninism are implemented, taking account of the specific features of each country, the revolution triumphs and the process of the construction of socialist society cannot be halted. The example of Albania refutes all the «theorizing» of capitalist and revisionist philosophers against the dictatorship of the proletariat, the leading role of the party, and the waging of the class struggle.

Our great victories on the front of socialist construction are due, first of all, to our loyalty to Marxism-Leninism. If we have always triumphed over our enemies, this has come about precisely because we have been principled, honest and courageous revolutionaries.

Precisely because the practice of the socialist construction in Albania has embodied the Marxist-Leninist theory, it has been subjected to attacks and has drawn upon itself the fire of the enemies of this theory.

We will clash boldly with the opponents of our ideology, because, when it is a question of defending the Marxist-Leninist principles, we cannot engage in underhand bargaining and compromises, such as the capitalists and the revisionists want to impose on us.

The struggle between Marxist-Leninists and betrayers of the ideology of the proletariat continues and will continue until revisionism, which emerges and develops as

an agency of the bourgeoisie and imperialism, is wiped from the face of the earth. It is our duty, as Marxist-Leninists, to defend the revolutionary world outlook of the working class. In the present conditions, when Chinese revisionism has been added to the old revisionism, this task has become even more imperative. To accomplish this task successfully, we must acquaint ourselves with, analyse and denounce the anti-Marxist and counter-revolutionary theories and practices of enemies who, under the slogan of the «struggle against dogmatism», attack the Marxist doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the party of the new type, first of all.

Socialist society grows stronger in struggle against its enemies, therefore, we communists must stand in the forefront of this struggle until victory is achieved. We are revolutionaries and defend the socialist socio-economic order, which is the new order, the most progressive order in the world, while the revisionists are reactionaries because they kowtow and capitulate to the old bourgeois order. The future is gloomy for our opponents and bright for us. However, the future does not come of itself, it must be carefully and continuously prepared, with struggle in the fields of politics, ideology, economics, defence, and so on.

Kardelj's book, like many others, which the international bourgeoisie and revisionism are publishing to propagate their reactionary, anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist ideas, must be exposed so that communists, workers and progressive people, who are not acquainted with the revisionist reality, or know it only slightly, are not deceived by its «left» slogans. In order to strengthen our vigilance, to be equal to the mission with which we are charged as communists, we must remember Lenin's great observation,

*«People ... always have been the stupid victims of deception and self-deception in politics, and always will be, until they learn to see behind the different moral, religious, political and social phrases, declarations and promises, the interests of some particular class.»**

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 19, p. 9, Alb. ed.

IMPERIALISM
AND
THE REVOLUTION

FOREWORD TO THE FIRST EDITION*

From the time the «Manifesto of the Communist Party» of Marx and Engels was published in 1848 to this day the struggle between revolutionary Marxism and opportunism, in both the political and the ideological fields, has centered around one problem: is the revolution necessary for the transformation of society on a socialist basis or not, do the conditions exist to carry out the revolution or not, can it be carried out in the peaceful way, or is revolutionary violence indispensable?

With all their theories, of which there are scores if not hundreds, the bourgeoisie and the opportunists have always tried to negate the incontrovertible truth that the fundamental contradiction of capitalist society is that between the exploiters and the exploited, to deny the place and role of the working class in history and to negate the class struggle itself as the determining factor of the development and progress of human society. Their aim has always been to disorientate the proletariat ideologically, to hinder the revolution, to perpetuate capitalist exploitation, and to destroy Marxism-Leninism, the triumphant science of the revolution and the construction of socialism.

All these opponents and enemies of the proletariat and the revolution have tried to proclaim Marxism-Leninism outdated and to create various «theories», allegedly adapted to the new historical conditions, to the

* In Albanian.

changes that capitalism and imperialism have undergone, and the evolution of human society, in general.

Thus, Bernstein proclaimed Marx outdated, and Kautsky, deliberately misinterpreting the transition of capitalism to imperialism, negated the revolution. Their example and methods have been followed by all the modern revisionists, too, ranging from Browder and Tito, Khrushchev and the «Eurocommunists», to the Chinese «theoreticians» of «three worlds».

Under the false pretext that they are implementing and developing Marxism-Leninism in a «creative manner», adapting it to the new conditions existing in the world today, all these anti-Marxists are trying to negate the scientific ideology of the working class and to replace it with bourgeois opportunism.

The proletariat, the revolutionaries and their genuine Marxist-Leninist parties have always waged an unrelenting stern struggle against modern revisionism and its various trends, and this struggle will never cease.

The revisionists, the reactionary bourgeoisie and its parties try to label our theory, Marxism-Leninism, a dogma, something rigid, petrified, which allegedly cannot adapt itself to the contemporary realities of the time which are full of dynamism and life. But speaking of dynamism and vitality, Marxism-Leninism is the only theory with these qualities, because it is the theory of the working class, the most advanced class of society, the most active and revolutionary class, which thinks correctly, which produces the material blessings and is always in activity.

The efforts of the bourgeoisie and its ideologists who are trying to convince mankind that Marxism-Leninism is allegedly outdated and out of step with «modern times», are intended to combat the scientific ideology of the proletariat and to replace it with theories which preach a degenerate life, the life of a lumpen, a society

of un-restrained degeneration, a so-called consumer society. The theories which claim that the forms of a new society in continuous movement and advance have now allegedly been found, are also intended to deal a blow at the progressive revolutionary thinking of the proletariat, at the ideology guiding it, as well as to perpetuate capitalist oppression and exploitation.

Our theory, as Lenin teaches us, judges and defines the forms and methods of class struggle correctly. It remains closely linked with the practical problems arising from life, from the epoch. This weapon helps us to analyse and understand correctly the course of development of human society at every moment, to analyse and understand correctly every historic turning-point of society and to carry out the revolutionary transformation of society.

At its 7th Congress, our Party exposed all the different revisionist currents, including the Chinese theory of «three worlds». Stressing the vital importance of Marxism-Leninism for the triumph of the revolution, socialism and the liberation of the peoples, it resolutely rejected the bourgeois-opportunist theses and views on the present stage of the world historical process, which repudiate the revolution and defend capitalist exploitation, and emphasized strongly that no change in the evolution of capitalism and imperialism justifies the revisionist «inventions» and fabrications. Principled criticism and ceaseless exposure of the anti-revolutionary and anti-communist theories are absolutely necessary to defend Marxism-Leninism, to carry forward the cause of the revolution and the peoples, to demonstrate that the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin is always young, and remains the unerring guide to future victories.

April 1978

NOTE TO THE SECOND EDITION

The book «Imperialism and the Revolution» was first published [in Albanian] in April 1978 for distribution within the Party.

In accord with the wishes of the communists who have read this book, it is now made available to the public. Some events that have taken place during the period since the first publication have also been included.

December 1978

PART ONE

I

THE STRATEGY OF IMPERIALISM AND MODERN REVISIONISM

In analysing the present international situation and the situation of the world revolutionary movement, the 7th Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania pointed out the dangers imperialism and modern revisionism represent for the revolution and the liberation of the peoples, stressed the need for a merciless fight against them and the active support that must be given to the Marxist-Leninist movement in the world.

These questions have great importance because the construction of socialism, the struggle to strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat and the defence of the Homeland are inseparable from the international situation and the general process of world development.

Today big forces, representatives of darkness, of the enslavement and exploitation of the proletariat and the peoples — American imperialism and its agencies, Soviet social-imperialism, Chinese social-imperialism, the big bourgeoisie and reaction, have risen against and are fighting Marxism-Leninism. Such ideological currents as social-democracy, modern revisionism and many other counter-

revolutionary currents have also risen against our revolutionary ideology.

In our struggle against all these enemies we must base ourselves firmly on the Marxist-Leninist theory and the world proletariat. Our struggle on the theoretical plane will be crowned with success when we make a correct dialectical analysis of the international situation, of events which are developing, the objectives and aims of all the social forces in motion, which are in contradiction and struggle with one another. Scientific analysis of the international situation and clarification of the strategy of the revolutionary struggle help us define the correct tactics in differing circumstances, in order to win battle after battle. That is how our Party has always acted.

Socialism is in struggle with capitalism, the world proletariat is locked in a merciless and continuous struggle with the capitalist bourgeoisie, the peoples of the world are in struggle with their external and internal oppressors. The world proletariat is guided in the struggle by its Marxist-Leninist ideology, which explains the necessity for this struggle and mobilizes the forces in battle. This is why capitalism and imperialism have always organized a bitter struggle against the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

Karl Marx discovered the laws of social development, of revolutionary transformations and the transition of society from a lower to a higher social order. He made a scientific analysis of private ownership of the means of production, the capitalist mode of distribution and the surplus value which the capitalist seizes. He created the scientific theory on classes and the class struggle, and defined the ways of the struggle of the proletariat to overthrow the bourgeoisie, to destroy the capitalist system, to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, and build socialist society.

Various reactionary theoreticians in all countries of the world have striven in every way to denigrate Marx's theory, to throw mud at it, to distort it and combat it. But this theory, which is a true science, has succeeded in dominating progressive human thinking and has become a powerful weapon in the hands of the proletariat and the peoples in the fight against their enemies.

By applying the Marxist theory and developing it further, Lenin gave the proletariat and its vanguard, the Marxist-Leninist party, a rich scientific theory on the conditions of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. Lenin developed Marxism not only in theory but also in practice. Applying the doctrine of Karl Marx, he led the Bolshevik revolution and carried it through to victory. Lenin's work was further developed by Stalin.

The triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution dealt the first crushing blow to imperialism, the entire world capitalist system. It marked the beginning of the general crisis of capitalism which has grown deeper and deeper.

The creation and consolidation of the Soviet state was a colossal victory which showed the proletariat and the peoples that the enemy they faced, capitalism and imperialism, could be conquered and destroyed. The Soviet Union was the living proof of this.

Infuriated by the loss the October Revolution in Russia inflicted on it, the imperialist and capitalist world coalition reinforced its instruments of political, economic and military struggle against the new state of the proletarians and the spread of Marxist-Leninist ideology throughout the world. The imperialists, the reactionary bourgeoisie, European and world social-democracy, together with the other parties of capital, prepared the war against the Soviet Union. Together with the Hitlerites, the Italian and Japanese fascists, they also prepared the Second World War.

But in this war the vitality of socialism and Marxism-Leninism, which emerged victorious, was confirmed even more clearly.

After the victory over fascism, great changes in favour of socialism occurred in the world. New socialist states were set up in Europe and Asia. The socialist camp, with the Soviet Union at the head, was created. This was a new great victory for socialism and Marxism-Leninism, and another great defeat for capitalism and imperialism.

The capitalist system came out of the Second World War deeply shaken and with its equilibrium entirely upset. Germany, Japan and Italy emerged from the war as defeated powers with their economies ruined. They lost the political and military positions they had occupied previously. Although they emerged victorious from the war, other imperialist states, such as Great Britain and France, had been so greatly weakened, economically and militarily, that their role as great powers had declined drastically.

The general crisis of capitalism was further deepened with the collapse of the colonial system. As a result of this collapse a series of new national states emerged, while in those countries which still remained colonies or semi-colonies, the liberation movement against the imperialist yoke grew.

These changes created most favourable conditions for the triumph of socialism on a world scale. Because of the deep economic and political crisis and the growing discontent of the masses, many capitalist states were on the verge of revolutionary outbreaks. In these extremely grave and critical circumstances, American imperialism came to their aid.

Unlike the other imperialist powers, the United States of America emerged stronger from the war. Not only had it suffered no damage, but it had accumulated colossal

wealth and had immensely increased its economic and military potential, and its technical-scientific base. Fattened on the blood shed by the peoples, this imperialism became the sole *leadership** of the entire capitalist world.

American imperialism mobilized all the reactionary forces of the capitalist world to rescue the old capitalist order and crush any revolutionary and national liberation movement which endangered it, to destroy the socialist camp and restore capitalism in the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy and to establish its hegemony everywhere in the world.

To attain its objectives, US imperialism, along with world capital, set in motion its gigantic bureaucratic-military state machine, its great economic, technical and financial potential, all its human forces. US imperialism assisted the political, economic and military recovery of the shattered European and Japanese capitalism and, in place of the collapsed colonial system, set up a new system of exploitation and plunder — neo-colonialism.

American imperialism mobilized its many means of propaganda, its philosophers, economists, sociologists, writers, etc., in the frenzied campaign which began against Marxism-Leninism, against communism, against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries of Europe and Asia.

At the same time, American imperialism implemented an openly aggressive policy. Every field of life, the economy, politics, ideology, the army and science in the United States of America was swept by war fever, militarization and anti-communism.

To conquer socialism, to put down the revolutionary liberation movements, to combat the great influence of the Marxist-Leninist theory and establish its hegemony

* English in the original.

in the world, American imperialism went about it in two ways.

The first was that of aggression and armed intervention. The American imperialists set up aggressive military blocs such as NATO, SEATO, etc., stationed armed forces in large numbers on the territories of many foreign countries, set up military bases on all continents, and built powerful naval fleets which they deployed throughout the seas and oceans. In order to crush and stamp out the revolution, they undertook military intervention in Greece, Korea, Vietnam and elsewhere.

The other way was that of ideological aggression and subversion against the socialist states, the communist and workers' parties, and of efforts to bring about the bourgeois degeneration of these states and parties. In this direction, American imperialism and world capital as a whole employed powerful means of propaganda and ideological diversion.

But American imperialism and world capitalism, which was recovering after the war, were facing a powerful adversary, the socialist camp with the Soviet Union at the head, the world proletariat and the freedom-loving peoples. Therefore, they had to be very careful in their reckoning with this colossal power, which was guided by a correct and clear policy, by a triumphant ideology which had captured and was more and more capturing the hearts and minds of workers, revolutionaries and progressive elements.

Despite the efforts of US imperialism and world reaction to crush and destroy the revolutionary movement of the proletariat and the liberation struggle of the peoples, they were mounting and growing stronger. Under Stalin's leadership, the Soviet Union very quickly healed the wounds of war and was advancing at rapid rates in all fields, in the economy, science, technology,

etc. In the countries of people's democracy the positions of socialism were being consolidated. The communist parties and the anti-imperialist democratic movement were extending their influence among the masses.

In these conditions, world imperialism and capitalism utilized the modern revisionists, and the Yugoslav ones among the first, in their fight against socialism and the liberation movements of the peoples.

It was a stroke of good luck for world capitalism that Yugoslavia, a country called a people's democracy, came out in opposition to and entered into open ideological and political conflict with the Soviet Union, because within the ranks of the socialist camp one member country had rebelled. World capitalism gave great publicity to this event, which helped it in its fight against socialism and the revolution.

But although it inflicted great harm on the cause of the revolution and socialism, the Titoite betrayal did not succeed in splitting the socialist camp and the communist movement, as the bourgeoisie and reaction hoped. The communists and revolutionaries all over the world sternly condemned this treachery and pointed out the danger posed by Titoism, as an agency of imperialism against communism.

It was the Khrushchevite revisionists, who seized power in the Soviet Union after Stalin's death, that rendered the greatest service to world capitalism in its fight against socialism, the revolution and Marxism-Leninism. The emergence of the revisionist group of Khrushchev was the greatest political and ideological victory for the strategy of imperialism after the Second World War.

The counter-revolutionary overthrow in the Soviet Union caused immense rejoicing among the US imperialists and all the other capitalist powers, because the most

powerful socialist state, the bastion of the revolution and the liberation of the peoples, was abandoning the road of socialism and Marxism-Leninism and would be transformed, in theory and practice, into a base of the counter-revolution and capitalism.

The about-turn which took place in the Soviet Union led to the split in the socialist camp and the international communist movement. It was one of the main factors which influenced the spread of modern revisionism in many communist parties and created favourable conditions for this. The Khrushchevite revisionist trend gravely damaged the cause of the revolution and socialism throughout the world.

A stern struggle began between the genuine Marxist-Leninist and revolutionary forces, on the one hand, and Khrushchevite revisionism, on the other. Right from the start, the Party of Labour of Albania raised high the banner of implacable and principled struggle against Soviet revisionism and its followers, courageously defended Marxism-Leninism, the cause of socialism and the liberation of the peoples, just as it had fought and was fighting resolutely against Yugoslav revisionism. All over the world, the genuine Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries, also, rose against the Khrushchevite betrayal. From the ranks of the revolutionary proletariat of different countries emerged new Marxist-Leninist parties, which shouldered the heavy burden of leading the struggle of the working class and the peoples against the bourgeoisie, imperialism and modern revisionism.

The hopes of imperialism and revisionism of finally destroying socialism, extinguishing the genuine international communist movement and crushing the peoples' struggle were not realized. The Khrushchevite revisionists soon revealed their anti-Marxist counter-revolutionary features. The peoples saw that the Soviet Union had been

transformed into an imperialist superpower, which was contending with the United States of America for world domination, that, along with US imperialism, it had become another great enemy of the revolution, socialism and the peoples of the world.

On the other hand, the grave economic, financial, ideological and political crisis which swept the entire capitalist and revisionist world, not only showed the further decay of the capitalist system and its unalterable oppressive and exploiting nature clearly, but also exposed the demagoguery and hypocrisy of all modern revisionists, who were prettifying the capitalist order.

But at the time when the revolutionary movement was growing and becoming consolidated throughout the world, when capitalism was being squeezed ever more tightly in the grip of the crisis, and when Khrushchevite revisionism and the other trends of modern revisionism were becoming exposed in the eyes of the proletariat and the peoples, Chinese revisionism came out openly on the world scene. It became the close ally of US imperialism and the big international bourgeoisie to smother and sabotage the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and the peoples.

A very complex situation has been created in the world at present. Operating in the international arena today are various imperialist and social-imperialist forces which, on the one hand, are fighting in unison against the revolution and the freedom of the peoples, and on the other hand, are contesting and clashing with one another over markets, spheres of influence and hegemony. Now, in addition to the Soviet-American rivalry for world domination, there are the expansionist claims of Chinese social-imperialism, the predatory ambitions of Japanese militarism, the strivings of West-German imperialism for new living space, the fierce competition of the

European Common Market, which has turned its eyes towards the old colonies.

All these factors have further exacerbated the many contradictions of the capitalist and revisionist world. At the same time, the prospect of the revolution and the peoples' liberation has not been eliminated as a result of the betrayal of the Titoite, Soviet, Chinese and other revisionists, but, on the contrary, after a temporary setback, the revolution is now on the verge of a fresh leap forward. It will certainly forge ahead on the course history has set for it and will triumph on a world scale.

Nothing can save imperialism, capitalism and revisionism from the remorseless vengeance of the proletariat and the peoples, nothing can rescue them from deep antagonistic contradictions and never-ending crises, revolutions, their inevitable demise.

It is precisely this situation which is driving imperialism to seek new roads and paths, to build new strategies and tactics, in order to escape the catastrophe awaiting it.

The Strategy of World Imperialism

US imperialism and the other capitalist states have fought and are fighting to maintain their hegemony in the world, to defend the capitalist and neo-colonialist system, to emerge from the great crisis which has them in its grip, with the fewest possible losses. They have striven and are striving to prevent the peoples and the proletariat from fulfilling their revolutionary aspirations for liberation. US imperialism, which dominates its partners politically, economically and militarily, has the main role in the struggle to achieve these aims.

The enemies of the revolution and the peoples want

to create the impression that, because of the changes that have occurred in the world and the losses that socialism has suffered, circumstances entirely different from those of the past have been created. Therefore, although they have fierce contradictions with one another, US imperialism and the world capitalist bourgeoisie, Soviet social-imperialism and Chinese social-imperialism, modern revisionism and social-democracy are seeking a *modus vivendi*, a hybrid «new society», in order to keep the bourgeois-capitalist system on its feet, to avert revolutions and to continue their oppression and exploitation of the peoples in new forms and by new methods.

Imperialism and capitalism have come to understand that now they can no longer exploit the peoples of the world with the previous methods, therefore, provided their system is not threatened, they have to concede something, which will cause them no harm, in order to keep the masses in bondage. This they want to do with the investments and credits they distribute to those states and cliques in which they have established their influence or by means of arms, i.e., local wars, either by taking a direct part in them or by inciting one state against another. Local wars serve to make those countries which fall into its trap more deeply subject to the hegemony of world capital.

All the «theoreticians» in the service of world capital, in the West and in the East, are trying to find the formulae for this «new society». At present they have this «new» form in the capitalist-revisionist society of the Soviet Union, which is nothing but a degenerate society, they have found it in the capitalist system of Yugoslav «self-administration» and in some so-called socialist oriented regimes of the «third world». They are trying to find a capitalist «new society» of this type also in the Chinese variant, which is now crystallizing.

From the programmatic statements which President Carter made on May 22, 1977, in which he presented the outlines of an allegedly new policy of the United States of America, it is clear that the general and fundamental characteristic of this «new policy» in the present conditions is the fight of this superpower to cope with the proletarian revolution and the national liberation wars of peoples who aspire to liberate themselves from the yoke of big world capital, especially from US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism.

As we pointed out in the foregoing, the capitalist world is searching for a way out of the abyss, even if only for the time being. Naturally, US imperialism is striving to find this way out and, possibly, to co-ordinate it with Soviet social-imperialism, with its NATO allies, with China, as well as with other industrialized capitalist countries. Carter appealed to the Eastern, Western and the OPEC member countries and demanded that they work together and «effectively help the poorer countries». US imperialism tries to present this collaboration as the only alternative to wars, the only way to stop wars.

In his speech, the US president said, today «we have been freed from that constant fear of communism, which at one time led us to embrace every dictator who was obsessed by the same fear».

Of course, when Carter, this faithful representative of the bloodiest imperialism of our time, speaks of being «freed from the fear of communism», he means communism a la Yugoslav, a la Khrushchev, a la Chinese, whose masks only are communist, but the capitalist bourgeoisie has not been and will never be freed from the fear of genuine communism. On the contrary, imperialism and social-imperialism have always been terrified of genuine communism and they will be even more terrified of it. It is this fear and dread that are driving the imperialists and the

revisionists into each others' arms, to co-ordinate their plans and seek the most appropriate forms in order to prolong the existence of their rule of oppression and exploitation.

In these moments of deep economic, political and military crisis, the imperialists of the United States of America are trying to consolidate the victories of imperialism, attained through the betrayal by modern revisionism in the Soviet Union, the former countries of people's democracy and in China, and to use them as a barrier against the revolution and the revolutionary liberation struggle of the proletariat and the peoples.

The US president also admits that, out of fear of communism, in the past the capitalists and the imperialists embraced and supported the fascist dictators like Mussolini, Hitler, Hirohito, Franco, etc. The fascist dictatorships in the respective countries were the ultimate weapon of the capitalist bourgeoisie and world imperialism against the Soviet Union of the time of Lenin and Stalin and against the world proletarian revolution.

The US president declares with an air of confidence that the communist (read: revisionist) states have altered their appearance, and he is not mistaken in this. He says, «this system could not last for ever unchanged.» Of course, he is confusing the revisionist treachery with the genuine socialist system, with communism. US imperialism considers the Khrushchevite Soviet system as a victory of world capitalism and from this it deduces that the threat of a conflict with the Soviet Union has become less intense, though it does not deny the contradictions and rivalry for hegemony with it.

According to Carter, the US government will make every effort to maintain the status quo. In other words, this means that both US imperialism and the other imperialist states will strive to maintain and strengthen their positions in the world, while they hope that together

they can solve the disagreements which may exist, and which in fact do exist, with friendly countries and their allies, within this status quo.

As a conclusion, says Carter, «the US policy must be based on a new, wider mosaic of global, regional and bilateral interests.» After analysing this new, wider «mosaic» of global, regional and bilateral interests, he reaffirms that «the United States of America will honour all its commitments to NATO, which must be a strong organization, because the alliance of the United States of America with the great industrialized democracies is indispensable, since it defends the same values, and therefore we should all fight for a better life.»

As can be seen, the United States of America, too, is joining the Soviet modern revisionists, the Chinese revisionists and the «big industrialized democracies» in their efforts to create a «new reality», a «new world». In other words, through demagoguery, the United States of America is trying to adapt its policy to the new situations. In order to maintain the status quo, to halt the drive of Soviet hegemonism, to weaken Soviet social-imperialism and to win China over to its side, so that it is ever more deeply committed to the imperialist camp, in order to quell the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and the peoples, the United States of America has to make some phoney political concessions. But it is making no concessions in military matters, no concessions in the policy of keeping the states and the peoples in bondage and under control, in the policy of the exploitation of the national wealth of the other countries to its own advantage and that of the industrialized countries.

This is the «new policy» of the United States of America. It is clear to us that this is by no means a new policy, but an old predatory imperialist, neo-colonialist, enslaving policy of ruthlessly exploiting the peoples and

their wealth, a policy of putting down revolutions and national liberation wars. US imperialism now wants to give this old, permanent policy an allegedly new, fresh coat of paint, to arm counter-revolutionary elements, whether in power or not, with weapons to fight communism which raises the peoples and the proletariat in liberation wars and revolution.

Contrary to the Chinese theory of «three worlds», which is a fraudulent capitalist and revisionist theory, US imperialism is still on the offensive. It is striving to preserve its old alliances and to create new ones to its own advantage and to the disadvantage of Soviet social-imperialism or whoever else might threaten US imperialist power. In particular it is trying to strengthen NATO, which has been and remains an aggressive political and military organization.

In all its strategic manoeuvring the United States of America is not aggravating its relations with the Soviet Union beyond a certain point and is continuing the SALT negotiations with it, although Carter stated that the USA was going ahead with the production of neutron bombs. Despite this, between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, there is an obvious tendency towards maintaining the status quo.

Of course, while the United States of America and NATO are striving to preserve this status quo with the Soviet Union, at the same time, they have contradictions with it, but these contradictions have not yet reached such a level as to justify the Chinese refrain that war in Europe is imminent.

At present, US imperialism is supporting China so that it becomes stronger militarily and economically. US capital is pouring into China, where not only the principal American banks, but also the American state, are making large investments through credits.

The United States of America is playing the China card heavily, but is hedging its bets. At the same time it is continuing to play the card of Japan, too. The United States of America wants smooth waters between itself and Japan, wants the aid between them to be mutual so that Japan, according to the American aims, will be strengthened and become like an Israel in the Far East, the Pacific, Southeast Asia and, why not, if required and when the time comes, in its confrontation with China too, eventually.

This is the situation in which China signed the treaty of friendship and co-operation with Japan. But this treaty has begun to assume major dangerous and ugly proportions for the fate of the world from many angles, and it will do in the future, because close economic and military collaboration will be established between Japan and China, which will have as its objective the creation of separate and joint spheres of influence, particularly in Asia, Australia and the whole Pacific basin. Naturally, this collaboration will begin to be built under the shadow of the alliance with the United States of America and the propaganda of war against Soviet social-imperialism. The main aim of this Sino-Japanese alliance is the containment and weakening of the Soviet Union, its eviction from Siberia, Mongolia and elsewhere, the elimination of its influence in the whole of Asia and Oceania, and all the ASEAN member countries.

This is the strategy of US imperialism, but at the same time, also, of Chinese imperialism and Japanese militarism. The United States of America will try to assist China and Japan and keep them under its direction, to strengthen the alliance with them and hurl them against the Soviet Union. But there is also the possibility that the day may come when the diabolic, hypocritical, empire-building, unprincipled policy in the imperialist-

militarist spirit, pursued by China and Japan, will turn against the superpower which helped them to recover, just as Germany did in the past, when it became a terrible fascist power, attacked the allies of the United States of America and went to war even with the latter, in the time of Hitler.

The United States of America will try to hold the balance between the Chinese power and the rising Japanese power. But one fine morning, this balance will slip from its grasp and the Sino-Japanese imperialist-militarist alliance will become a threat not only to the Soviet Union, but also to the United States of America itself, because the interests of these two big imperialist countries of Asia, China and Japan, converge in their aims of domination in Asia and elsewhere, and of weakening US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism.

In NATO, the United States of America has a dominant position and great military, political and economic influence. However, despite its unity, within NATO a differentiation has begun from the stand-point of the influence of its various member countries and the emergence of one state over the others.

Year by year, the Federal Republic of Germany is becoming stronger within this organization. Its economic and political power and its trade in arms go beyond the bounds of the European Common Market. Now we may say that the policy of West Germany is assuming the features of totalitarian fascist revanchism, seeking to create its own spheres of influence. Naturally, this does not suit either Britain or France, the two original main partners of the United States of America in NATO.

West Germany is seeking the reunification of the two German states so as to create one powerful state with a great military potential which will be a threat to Soviet social-imperialism and, in case of a general con-

flagration, in alliance with Japan and China, may become a danger to the whole world. It is developing very close relations with China, in particular. Among the European states, it occupies the main place in trade exchanges with China. West Germany is the biggest and the most powerful European supplier of credits, technology and modern armaments to China.

Britain and France are also very interested in China, therefore they are developing their relations with it. However, China is more interested in Bonn. This is worrying Britain and France, because by becoming stronger, the Federal Republic of Germany may become even more dominant over the other partners of NATO and the European Common Market. Hence, we observe that both the British and the French governments speak of friendship and relations with China, but they do not forget to stress that they want further development of their economic and friendly relations with the Soviet Union, too. Bonn says this, too, but it is rapidly developing its relations with China, which presents itself as the main enemy of the Soviet Union. The powerful revanchists of Bonn are openly advertising themselves as China's closest allies. Therefore, China does not regard Federal Germany in the same light as France and Britain.

The Strategy of Soviet Social-imperialism

Having seized state power in the Soviet Union, the Khrushchevites set themselves as their main objective the destruction of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the restoration of capitalism and the transformation of the Soviet Union into an imperialist superpower. (1)

1 See Enver Hoxha, *The Khrushchevites (Memoirs)*, «8 Nëntori» Publishing House, Tirana 1984, 2nd Alb. ed.

After they had consolidated their positions following the death of Stalin, Khrushchev and the group around him first of all launched their attack on the Marxist-Leninist ideology and began their struggle to dethrone Leninism by attacking Stalin and levelling against him all the slanders the filthy propaganda of the world capitalist bourgeoisie had long been fabricating. Thus, the Khrushchevites became the spokesmen and the executors of the wishes of capital against the Marxist-Leninist ideology and the revolution in the Soviet Union. They went to work systematically to liquidate the entire socialist structure of the Soviet Union, they fought to liberalize the Soviet system, to transform the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a bourgeois state, and to transform the socialist economy and culture into a capitalist economy and culture.

The Soviet Union, which had turned into a revisionist country, into a social-imperialist state, built up its own strategy and tactics. The Khrushchevites worked out such a policy as to enable them to disguise all their activity with Leninist phraseology. They elaborated their revisionist ideology in such a way as to palm it off upon the proletariat and the peoples as the «Marxism-Leninism of the new period», so they could tell the communists, inside and outside the country, that «the revolution was continuing in the Soviet Union in the new political, ideological and economic conditions of world development», and not only that this revolution was continuing there, but that this country was allegedly going over to the stage of the construction of a classless communist society, where the party and the state were withering away.

The party was stripped of its attributes as the vanguard of the working class, as the sole political leading force of the state and society, and was transformed into

a party dominated by the apparatchiki and the KGB. The Soviet revisionists called their party the «party of the entire people» and reduced it to such a condition that it could no longer be the party of the working class, but the party of the new Soviet bourgeoisie.

On the other hand, the Soviet revisionists preached Khrushchevite peaceful coexistence as the general line of the international communist movement and proclaimed «peaceful competition with US imperialism» as the road to the triumph of socialism in the Soviet Union and other countries. They also declared that the proletarian revolution had allegedly entered a new stage, that it could triumph also in ways other than the seizure of state power by the proletariat through violence. According to them, state power could be taken in peaceful, parliamentary and democratic ways, through reforms.

Gambling on the name of Lenin and the Bolshevik Party, the Khrushchevite revisionists did their utmost to impose this anti-Marxist line of theirs, this revision of the Marxist-Leninist theory in all fields, on all the communist parties of the world. They wanted the communist and workers' parties of the world to adopt this revisionist line and transform themselves into counter-revolutionary parties, into blind tools of the bourgeois dictatorship, to serve capitalism.

But this was not fully achieved as they desired, first and foremost, because the Party of Labour of Albania remained unwavering in its consistent implementation of Marxism-Leninism and in defence of its purity. At those moments there were some other parties which, for their own, not purely Marxist-Leninist reasons, wavered, did not fully accept the Khrushchevite orientations, while some accepted them reluctantly, but later submitted to them. At those moments, the Communist Party of China, too, opposed the Khrushchevites, but as the facts show, it

proceeded from aims and objectives quite the opposite of those which impelled the Party of Labour of Albania to throw itself into the struggle against Khrushchevite revisionism.

With their advent to power the Khrushchevites also prepared the platform of their foreign policy. Just like US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, too, based its foreign policy on expansion and hegemonism by means of the armaments race, pressure and blackmail, and military, economic and ideological aggression. The aim of this policy was the establishment of social-imperialist domination over the whole world.

In the Comecon countries, the Soviet Union is implementing a typically neo-colonialist policy. The economies of these countries have been transformed into appendages of the Soviet economy. The Warsaw Treaty serves the Soviet Union to keep these countries under its yoke, enabling it to station there large military forces, which are no different from occupation armies. The Warsaw Treaty is an aggressive military pact which serves the policy of pressure, blackmail and armed intervention of Soviet social-imperialism. The revisionist-imperialist «theories» on «the socialist community», «the socialist division of labour», «limited sovereignty», «socialist economic integration», etc., also, serve this neo-colonialist policy.

But Soviet social-imperialism is not satisfied with the domination it exercises over its satellite states. Like the other imperialist states, the Soviet Union is now fighting for new markets, for spheres of influence, to invest its capital in various countries, to monopolize sources of raw materials, to extend its neo-colonialism in Africa, Asia, Latin America and elsewhere.

Soviet social-imperialism has a whole strategic plan which includes a series of economic, political, ideological

and military activities for the purpose of extending its expansion and hegemonism.

At the same time the Soviet revisionists are working to undermine the peoples' revolutions and the liberation wars by precisely the same means and methods as those employed by the US imperialists. Usually, the social-imperialists operate through their tools, the revisionist parties, but, according to the occasion and circumstances, they also try to corrupt and bribe the ruling cliques in the undeveloped countries, offer enslaving economic «aid» in order to get a foothold in these countries, stir up armed conflicts among the different cliques, siding with one or the other, organize plots and putsches to bring pro-Soviet regimes to power, and even resort to direct military intervention, as they did, together with the Cubans, in Angola, Ethiopia, and elsewhere.

The Soviet social-imperialists carry out their intervention, their hegemonic, neo-colonialist actions under the disguise of aid to and support for the revolutionary forces, the revolution and the construction of socialism. In reality they help the counter-revolution.

The Soviet Union tries to open the way to realizing its expansionist, neo-colonialist plans, by presenting itself as a country which is pursuing a Leninist internationalist policy, as an ally, friend and defender of the new national states, the undeveloped countries, etc. The Soviet revisionists preach that, by linking up with the Soviet Union and the so-called socialist community, which they proclaim as the «main motive force of world development today», these countries can advance successfully on the road of freedom and independence, even of socialism. This is why they have also concocted the theories of the «non-capitalist road of development», countries of «socialist orientation», etc.

Despite what they pretend, the strategy of the Soviet

social-imperialists has nothing in common with socialism and Leninism. It is the strategy of a predatory imperialist state which wants to extend its hegemony and domination to all countries on all continents.

This hegemonic and neo-colonialist policy, which the revisionist Soviet Union is pursuing, clashes, as it is bound to do, with the policy which the United States of America is pursuing and on which China, too, has set out. This is a clash of interests among imperialists in their struggle for the redivision of the world. It is precisely these interests and this struggle that pit the one superpower against the other, that impel each of them to use all the forces and means at its disposal to weaken its rival or rivals, although their clashes have not yet reached such a degree of exacerbation that they hurl themselves into armed conflicts.

The Strategy of Chinese Social-imperialism

The events and facts are demonstrating ever more clearly that China is sinking deeper and deeper into revisionism, capitalism and imperialism. On this road, it is working to attain a series of strategic objectives, on a national and international level.

On a national level. Chinese social-imperialism has set itself the task of abolishing any measure of a socialist character which may have been taken after liberation, and building in the country a capitalist system in the base and the superstructure, of making China a great capitalist power by the end of this century through the implementation of the so-called «four modernizations», of industry, agriculture, the army and science.

It is striving to create such an internal organization of the country as to ensure the domination of the old

and new Chinese capitalist bourgeoisie over the Chinese people. Chinese revisionism is trying to establish this organization and this domination in the fascist way, by means of the club and oppression. It is working to create a unity between the army and the civilian base, so that the latter will serve this army of oppression.

The forms and methods which have attracted the attention of the Chinese leadership most and which may be implemented in China are those of the Titoites, especially the system of Yugoslav «self-administration». Many Chinese commissions and delegations of all sectors and profiles have been charged with studying this system and the experience of Yugoslav capitalist «socialism» in general, on the spot.

Already a start has been made on putting this system and experience into practice in China. On the other hand however, it is impossible for the revisionist leaders of China not to see the failures of the Titoite «self-administration», not to bear in mind the conditions of their country which are entirely different from those of Yugoslavia. Besides this, they consider it necessary, also, to borrow many of the capitalist forms and methods, which, according to them, have proved their «effectiveness» in the United States of America, West Germany, Japan and other bourgeois countries. Apparently, the capitalist system which is being built and developed in China will be a hybrid of various revisionist, capitalist and traditional Chinese forms and methods.

To become a big capitalist power, Chinese revisionism needs a period of peace. The slogan of the «great order», issued by the 11th Congress of the Chinese party, (2) is linked with this necessity. To ensure such «order» requires a capitalist order of the fascist dictatorial type,

2 Held in August 1977.

on the one hand, while, on the other hand, peace and compromise among the rival groups, which have always existed in the Chinese party and state, must be maintained without fail. Time will tell to what extent this order and peace will be ensured.

In their policy of turning China into a superpower, the Chinese leaders aim to make economic and military gains from US imperialism, as well as from the developed capitalist countries which are allies of the United States of America.

This policy pursued by China has aroused keen interest in the capitalist world, especially on the part of US imperialism, which sees in this policy of China a great support for its strategy of maintaining capitalism and imperialism, strengthening neo-colonialism, putting down revolutions and strangling socialism, as well as of weakening its rival, the Soviet Union.

As Carter has declared, US imperialism wants «to collaborate closely with the Chinese». He has stressed: «We consider the US-Chinese relations a central element of our global policy and we look upon China as a key force for peace». China is for the closest possible peaceful coexistence with the United States of America.

With these views and stands, China is lining itself up with those bourgeois-capitalist states which base their existence as states on US imperialism. This turn of China towards imperialism, like that of the Soviet Union and others before it, is becoming more and more a reality with each passing day. This is seen even by the imperialists themselves, who, rejoicing at this «new reality», declare that «the ideological conflicts which divided the United States of America, the Soviet Union and China in the '50s are less apparent today and there is an ever increasing need for collaboration among the super-powers...»

The US imperialists, together with President Carter, are ready to provide China with assistance to strengthen its economy and army, of course, to the degree that interests them. They are patting the backs of the Chinese revisionist leaders because the strategy of China constitutes an important aid for the hegemonic aims of US imperialism.

China applauds the American views and actions against the revisionist Soviet Union because it wants to show that they allegedly serve the revolution and the weakening of the most dangerous great power in the world, Soviet social-imperialism. For its part, US imperialism applauds China's views and actions against the revisionist Soviet Union, because, as one of Carter's closest collaborators has put it, «the Sino-Soviet conflict creates a more pluralist kind of global structure», which US imperialism prefers and considers compatible with its notion of «how the world should be organized», or, in other words, how the others should be incited to bump each other off in order to make it easier for the United States of America to dominate the world.

China's pragmatic and venal policy has led it to become an ally of US imperialism and proclaim Soviet social-imperialism as the main enemy and threat. Tomorrow, when China sees that it has achieved its objective of weakening Soviet social-imperialism, when, in its logic, it sees that US imperialism is becoming stronger, since it relies on one imperialism to fight the other, it may continue the fight on the other flank. In this case US imperialism could become the more dangerous and then China must automatically reverse its previous stand.

This is a real possibility. At their 8th Congress in 1956, the Chinese revisionists considered US imperialism the main threat. Later, at their 9th Congress, in April 1969, they proclaimed that the two superpowers, US im-

perialism and Soviet social-imperialism, comprised the main danger. Later, following the 10th Congress which was held in August 1973, and at the 11th Congress, they proclaimed Soviet social-imperialism alone as the main enemy. With such waverings, with such a pragmatic policy, it is not impossible that the 12th or the 13th Congress could come out in support of Soviet social-imperialism and proclaim US imperialism as the main enemy, and this will go on until China, too, attains its goal of becoming a great capitalist world power. This being the case, what role will China play on the international arena? Its role will never be revolutionary, but regressive and counter-revolutionary.

An important aspect of the Chinese foreign policy is the alliance with Japan. As we pointed out above, this racist alliance between these two states, which was recently sealed with the Sino-Japanese Treaty, is intended to realize the strategic plans of China and Japan for their joint domination of Asia, the ASEAN countries and Oceania. The Chinese revisionists need this treaty and the friendship with Japan, so that, together with the Japanese militarists, they can threaten Soviet social-imperialism and possibly liquidate it and its influence in Asia.

But China also wants to take advantage of its links with Japan to get credits, to import equipment, technology and armaments from Japan, in order to realize its own great-power ambitions. China attaches such importance to its all-round economic collaboration with Japan that more than half its foreign trade is with that country.

In order to implement its expansionist policy, social-imperialist China is working to extend its influence in Asia as much as possible. At present it has no influence at all in India, where both the United States of America and the Soviet Union have their separate and common interests within the context of the changes and alliances

which the future may bring. China now wishes to start somewhat better diplomatic relations with India. But India has great pretensions towards Tibet. India will try to liquidate even that little influence China may have in Pakistan, because Pakistan is situated in a strategic position flanking Iran and Afghanistan. The rivalries over the great oil basin of the Middle East, in which US imperialism is dominant, begin there. It is very difficult for China to penetrate there. It will follow a policy against the interests of the Arab peoples and in support of American interests until such time as it becomes strong. At the same time, China will help the United States of America to set up, jointly with such countries as Iran, Saudi Arabia, etc., a powerful barrier to Soviet political, economic and military penetration into this area vital to American and European imperialisms.

To achieve their aims, the Chinese social-imperialists are devoting special attention to Western Europe. Their objective is to pit it against Soviet social-imperialism. That is why they support NATO and the alliance of the European countries with the United States of America, the European Common Market and the «United Europe», in every way.

In its strategic plan, social-imperialist China aims to extend its influence and hegemony to the countries of what it calls the «third world». The theory of the «third world» has great importance for China. Mao Zedong did not proclaim this «theory» as a dreamer, but with definite hegemonic aims that China should dominate the world. His successors are following this same strategy of Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai.

The Chinese strategic ambitions also extend to what is called the «non-aligned world», which the Titoites advocate. There is no difference between these «worlds», one overlaps the other. It is hard to distinguish which

states belong to the «third world» and what distinguishes them from the «non-aligned countries», which states belong to the «non-aligned» and what distinguishes them from those of the «third world». Thus, whatever they are called, they are the same states.

This is one of the reasons why the Chinese leadership gives so much importance to maintaining very friendly state and party relations with Tito and Yugoslavia in all fields, ideological, political, economic, or military.

The community of views of the Chinese revisionists and the Yugoslav revisionists does not prevent either of them from exploiting this cordial friendship for their own particular purposes.

Tito is trying to exploit Hua Guofeng's declarations about his and the Yugoslav party's loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, about the socialist character of «self-administration», and the «Marxist-Leninist» internal and external policy which the Titoites are allegedly pursuing, in order to show that the condemnation of Tito for his anti-Marxist deviations, his chauvinist, reactionary and pro-imperialist policy and his revisionism, is nothing but a slander by the Stalinists, and, on this basis, he is seeking to build up his own reputation on the international level.

For his part, Hua Guofeng is exploiting relations with Yugoslavia for what is called China's opening to Europe. The Chinese revisionists are also trying to exploit their friendship with the Titoites, who pose as champions of «non-alignment», as an important channel through which to penetrate into the «non-aligned countries» and establish their domination there. It was not without an ulterior motive that during his visit to Yugoslavia,⁽³⁾ Hua Guofeng praised the «non-aligned» movement to the skies as the «very important force in the struggle of the peo-

3 In August 1978.

ples of the world against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism». He sang the praises of this movement and Tito because he dreams of taking control of this movement and making Beijing its centre.

In all its aspects, the policy of Chinese social-imperialism is the policy of a great imperialist power, a counter-revolutionary and war-mongering policy, and therefore the peoples will come to hate it, oppose it, and fight it more and more fiercely.

*
* *
*

The imperialist superpowers, of which we spoke above, will remain imperialist and war-mongering, and, if not today, tomorrow they will plunge the world into a great nuclear war.

American imperialism is striving to get its hooks ever more deeply implanted into the economies of other peoples, while Soviet social-imperialism, which has just begun to spread its claws, is trying to drive them into various countries of the world in order to create and to consolidate its own neo-colonialist and imperialist positions. But there is also the «United Europe», linked with the United States of America through NATO, which has individual, not concentrated, imperialist tendencies. On the other hand, China, too, has joined in the dance in its endeavours to become a superpower, as well as Japanese militarism which has risen to its feet. These two imperialisms are linking themselves in an alliance in order to form an imperialist power opposed to the others. In these conditions, the great danger of a world war is increased. The present alliances exist but will tend to shift in the sense that they will change their directions, but not their

The beautiful words poured out about disarmament at the UNO and the various international conferences organized by the imperialists are demagogy. They have created and are guarding their monopoly of strategic weapons and are trafficking in arms on a large scale, not to guarantee the peace and security of nations, but to draw superprofits and to suppress the revolution and the peoples, to unleash aggressive wars. Stalin has said:

*«The bourgeois states are arming and rearming themselves with a vengeance. What for? Of course, not for talks, but for war. And the imperialists need war, because it is the only means for the redivision of the world, for the redivision of markets, sources of primary materials and spheres for the investment of capital».**

In their rivalry, which is driving them towards war, the superpowers will certainly cause many local wars which they will incite between various states of the «third world», the «non-aligned», or the «developing countries».

President Carter has expressed the opinion that war can occur at only two points of the globe, in the Middle East and in Africa. And it is obvious why: because it is precisely in these two regions of the world that the United States of America has greatest interests at the present time. There is the oil in the Middle East, and in rich Africa there is a clash of great neo-colonialist economic and strategic interests over the division of markets and spheres of influence among the superpowers, which are trying to preserve and strengthen their positions and to gain new ones.

* J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 12, pp. 242-243, Alb. ed.

However, there are other such areas, apart from the Middle East and Africa, where the interests of the superpowers clash, as for example in Southeast Asia. The United States of America and the Soviet Union, plus China, are striving to establish their spheres of influence and divide the markets. This also gives rise to conflicts, which from time to time turn into local wars which are in no way intended to liberate the peoples, but to set up or replace ruling cliques representing local capital, cliques which are sometimes with one superpower and sometimes with the other. Soviet social-imperialism and US imperialism are two monsters which the peoples do not trust. Likewise, the peoples do not trust China, either.

When the superpowers fail to achieve their predatory interests through economic, ideological and diplomatic means, when the contradictions become exacerbated to the most acute level, when the agreements and «reforms» prove unable to resolve these contradictions, then the war between them begins. Therefore, the peoples, whose blood will be shed in this war, must strive with might and main not to be caught unawares, to sabotage the predatory inter-imperialist war so that it does not assume world-wide proportions, and if they are unable to achieve this, to turn it into a liberation war and win.

The Role of Titoism and Other Revisionist Trends in the Global Strategy of Imperialism and Social-imperialism

In the savage fight which imperialism and social-imperialism, world capitalism and reaction are waging against the revolution, socialism and the peoples, they have the support of the modern revisionists of all trends. These renegades and traitors assist imperialism in the

implementation of its global strategy by undermining from within, splitting and sabotaging the efforts of the proletariat and the struggle of the peoples to get rid of social and national bondage. The modern revisionists have taken it upon themselves to denigrate and distort Marxism-Leninism, to confuse people's minds and to alienate them from the revolutionary struggle, to assist capital, to preserve and perpetuate its system of oppression and exploitation.

Along with the Soviet and Chinese revisionists, whom we mentioned above, **the Yugoslav Titoite revisionists play a role of first-rate importance in this great and dangerous counter-revolutionary game.**

Titoism is an old agency of capital, a favourite weapon of the imperialist bourgeoisie in its fight against socialism and the liberation movements.

The peoples of Yugoslavia fought self-sacrificingly against the nazi-fascist occupiers for freedom, democracy and socialism. They succeeded in liberating their country, but were not allowed to continue the revolution on the road to socialism. The Yugoslav revisionist leadership, with Tito at the head, which had long been worked on secretly by the Intelligence Service and which, during the period of the war, posed as preserving the features of a party of the Third International, in fact, had other aims, which were contrary to Marxism-Leninism and the aspirations of the peoples of Yugoslavia for the construction of a true socialist society in Yugoslavia.

The Communist Party of Yugoslavia, which came to power, had inherited many mistakes of a deviationist nature. After the Second World War, it displayed pronounced national-chauvinist features which had shown up as early as the time of the war. These features were apparent in its departure from the Marxist-Leninist ide-

ology, in its attitude towards the Soviet Union and Stalin, in its chauvinist stands and actions towards Albania, etc.

The system of people's democracy, which was established in Yugoslavia, was temporary. It did not suit the clique in power, though this clique continued to call itself «Marxist». The Titoites were not for the construction of socialism, or for the Communist Party of Yugoslavia to be guided by the Marxist-Leninist theory, and they did not accept the dictatorship of the proletariat. This was the source of the conflict that broke out between the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties and the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. This was an ideological conflict between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism, and not a conflict between persons over «domination», as the revisionists try to make out. Stalin defended the purity of the Marxist-Leninist theory, Tito defended the deviationist, revisionist, anti-Marxist trend of modern revisionism, following in the footsteps of Browder and the other opportunists, who emerged on the eve of and during the Second World War.

In the early post-liberation years, the Yugoslav leadership pretended that it was taking the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union as an example and proclaimed that it was allegedly building socialism in Yugoslavia. This was done to deceive the peoples of Yugoslavia who had shed their blood and aspired to genuine socialism.

In fact, the Titoites were not and could not be for the socialist social order or the form of organization of the Soviet state, because Tito was for the capitalist system and for an essentially bourgeois-democratic state, in which his clique would hold power. This state was to serve to create the idea that socialism was being built in Yugoslavia, a «specific» socialism of a «more humane type», that is, precisely the kind of «socialism» which

would serve as a fifth column in the other socialist countries. Everything was well calculated and co-ordinated by the Anglo-American imperialists and the group around Tito. Thus, by playing the game of imperialism and world capitalism and coming to terms with them, the Yugoslav revisionists placed themselves in opposition to the Soviet Union.

From the time of the anti-fascist national liberation war, in pursuit of their old plans, British and, subsequently, US imperialism helped Tito not only to break away from the Soviet Union, but also to carry out acts of sabotage against it and, especially, to work to detach other countries of people's democracy from the socialist camp, in order to isolate the Soviet Union from all these countries and unite them with the West. This was the policy of world capitalism and its agency, Titoism.

The rabid anti-communist, Churchill, took a direct and personal part in ensuring that Tito and his group were placed in the service of capitalism. During the war he sent «his most trusted friends», as the British leader put it, and later his own son, to Tito's staff. Eventually, he himself met Tito in Naples of Italy in August 1944, in order to make quite sure that Tito would play no tricks. In his memoirs, Churchill wrote that, in his talks with Tito, the latter expressed his readiness to make a public statement later that «communism would not be established in Yugoslavia after the war».

Tito worked with such great energy to serve his masters that Churchill, appraising his great services, told him: «Now I understand that you were right, therefore I am with you, I like you even more than I did previously.» A lover could make no warmer declarations to his love.

Almost before Yugoslavia had broken completely with the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy,

the imperialists, the American imperialists, in particular, sent it great economic, political, ideological and military aid, which became more frequent and constant later on.

This aid was supplied only on condition that the country would develop on the capitalist road. The imperialist bourgeoisie was not against Yugoslavia maintaining its outward socialist forms. On the contrary, it was greatly in its interest that Yugoslavia should keep its outward socialist colour, because in this way it would serve as a more effective weapon in the struggle against socialism and the liberation movements. Not only would this kind of «socialism» be radically different from the socialism envisaged and realized by Lenin and Stalin, but it would even come out against it.

Within a relatively short time Yugoslavia became the «socialist» mouthpiece of US imperialism, a diversionist agency to assist world capital. From 1948 to this day, Titoism has been characterized by feverish activity against Marxism-Leninism to organize a propaganda campaign everywhere in the world to present the Yugoslav system as the form of a «genuine socialist» order, a «new society», a «non-aligned socialism», which is no longer like the socialism Lenin and Stalin built in the Soviet Union, but a socialist order «with a human face» which is being tried for the first time in the world and which is yielding «brilliant results». The aim of the propaganda has always been to lead the peoples and progressive forces fighting for freedom and independence everywhere in the world up a blind alley.

The Yugoslav revisionists adopted those forms of running their country that the Trotskyites and the other anarchist elements, encouraged by the capitalist bourgeoisie, tried to adopt in the Soviet Union in the time of Lenin, in order to sabotage the construction of socialism there. While he talked about building socialism, by

adopting these forms, Tito completely distorted the Marxist-Leninist principles on building up industry, agriculture, etc.

The Republics of Yugoslavia assumed such features of administration and organizational political leadership that democratic centralism was liquidated and the role of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia faded into insignificance. The Communist Party of Yugoslavia changed its name. It was transformed into the «League of Communists of Yugoslavia», which looks like a Marxist name, while in its content, norms, competences and aims it is anti-Marxist. The League became a spineless front, was stripped of the distinguishing features of a Marxist-Leninist party, preserved the old form, but no longer played the role of the vanguard of the working class, was no longer the political force which led the Federative Republic of Yugoslavia, but, according to the Titoite revisionists, allegedly performed only general «educational» functions.

The Titoite leadership placed the party under the control of the UDB, to which it was subordinated, turned it into a fascist organization, and the state into a fascist dictatorship. We know full well the great danger of these activities, for Koçi Xoxe, an agent in the pay of the Titoites, tried to achieve the same thing in Albania.

Tito, Ranković and their agency entirely liquidated anything which might have had the true colour of socialism. Titoism waged a fierce fight against the attempts of those internal elements who sought to blow up this agency and this capitalist-revisionist organization, as well as against all the Marxist-Leninist propaganda which was conducted abroad to unmask this regime which posed as socialist.

The Titoite leadership quickly abandoned the collectivization of agriculture which had begun in the early years, set up the capitalist state farms, encouraged the

development of private property in the countryside, allowed land to be bought and sold freely, rehabilitated the kulaks, left the field free for the private market to flourish in town and country, and carried out the first reforms which strengthened the capitalist direction of the economy.

Meanwhile, the Titoite bourgeoisie was searching for a «new» form to camouflage the Yugoslav capitalist order, and this form was found. They called it Yugoslav «self-administration». They dressed it up in a «Marxist-Leninist» cloak, claiming that this system was the most authentic socialism.

At first, «self-administration» emerged as an economic system, then it was extended to the field of state organization and all the other fields of life in that country.

The theory and practice of Yugoslav «self-administration» are an open negation of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the universal laws of the construction of socialism. The economic and political system of «self-administration» is an anarcho-syndicalist form of the bourgeois dictatorship, which is ruling a Yugoslavia dependent on international capital.

The system of «self-administration», with all its characteristic features, such as the elimination of democratic centralism, the role of unified management by the state, anarchist federalism, the anti-state ideology, in general, has brought about permanent economic, political and ideological chaos and confusion in Yugoslavia, weak and unequal development of its republics and regions, great social-class differentiations, national feuds and oppression, and the degeneration of spiritual life. It has brought about great fragmentation of the working class, by putting one detachment of it in competition with another, while fostering the bourgeois sectional, localist and individualist spirit. The working class in Yugoslavia not only does not

play the hegemonic role in the state and society, but the system of «self-administration» places it in such conditions that it is unable even to defend its own general interests and to act as a unified and compact class.

From the capitalist world, particularly from US imperialism, large amounts of capital have poured into Yugoslavia in the form of investments, credits and loans. It is precisely this capital which constitutes the material basis of the «development» of Yugoslav capitalist «self-administrative socialism». Its indebtedness alone amounts to over 11 billion dollars. Yugoslavia has received over 7 billion dollars in credits from the United States of America.

Despite the numerous credits the Titoite leadership receives from abroad, the peoples of Yugoslavia have not enjoyed, nor are they enjoying, the «brilliant results» of this specific «socialism». On the contrary, there is political and ideological chaos in Yugoslavia. A system which engenders large-scale unemployment at home and mass emigration of labour abroad prevails there and this makes Yugoslavia completely dependent on the imperialist powers. The Yugoslav peoples are being exploited to the bone in the interests of the class in power and of all the imperialist powers which have made investments in that country.

The Yugoslav state is not concerned that prices go up every day, that the poverty of the working masses is steadily increasing and that the country is not only up to its neck in debt, but is also deeply involved in the great crisis of the capitalist world. Yugoslavia has only limited independence and sovereignty, because, apart from anything else, it has no economic potential completely its own. The greater part of it exists in joint ownership with various foreign capitalist firms and states, therefore it is bound to suffer the destructive effects of the crisis and foreign exploitation.

But it is not accidental that world capitalism gives

Yugoslav «self-administration» such great political and financial support and sings in harmony with the Titoite propaganda to pass this system off as «a new tested form of the construction of socialism» for all countries.

It does this because the form of Yugoslav «self-administration» provides a way of ideological and political subversion and sabotage against the revolutionary liberation movements of the proletariat and the peoples, a way to open the road to the political and economic penetration of imperialism into the various countries of the world. Imperialism and the bourgeoisie want to keep «self-administration» as a reserve system for various circumstances and different countries, in order to prolong the life of capitalism, which does not give up the ghost easily, but is striving to find various forms of government at the expense of the peoples.

The Yugoslav theories and practices of «non-alignment» render a great service to various imperialists, for they help them hoodwink the peoples. This is in the interest of the imperialists and social-imperialists alike, because it helps them to establish and strengthen their influence in the «non-aligned countries», to divert the freedom-loving peoples from the road of national liberation and proletarian revolution. Therefore, both Carter and Brezhnev, as well as Hua Guofeng, lavish praise on the Titoite policy of «non-alignment» and try to exploit it for their own purposes.

Titoism has always been a weapon of the imperialist bourgeoisie, a fire-extinguisher to quell the flames of the revolution. It is of the same line and has the same aims as modern revisionism, in general, and its different variants, with which it is in ideological unity. The ways, forms and tactics they use in the struggle against Marxism-Leninism, the revolution and socialism may be different, but their counter-revolutionary aims are identical.

In the efforts which the bourgeoisie and reaction are making to put down the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and the peoples, **the revisionist parties of Europe, in the first place, and those of all countries on the other continents render them a great service.**

The revisionist parties of the countries of Western Europe are making efforts to concoct a theory about a «new society», allegedly socialist,(4) which will be achieved through «structural reforms» and in close coalition with the social-democratic parties, and even with the right-wing parties. This society, according to them, will be built on new foundations, through «social reforms», «social peace», «the parliamentary road» and the «historic compromise» with the bourgeois parties.

The revisionist parties of Europe, such as those of Italy, France and Spain, and following them, all the other revisionist parties of the West, deny Leninism, the class struggle, the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. All of them have embarked on the road of compromise with the capitalist bourgeoisie. They have named this anti-Marxist line «Eurocommunism». «Eurocommunism» is a new pseudo-communist trend which is and is not in opposition to the Soviet revisionist bloc. This wavering stand is explained by their aim to have a coexistence of ideas with European social-democracy, and the whole welter of views seething in the cauldron of Europe. The «Eurocommunists» can unite with anybody at all except those who fight for the triumph of the revolution and the purity of the Marxist-Leninist ideology.

All the revisionist, opportunist and social-democratic trends are going the whole length to assist the superpowers in their diabolical activities to suppress the revolution and the peoples. The support of all these trends

4 See pp. 789-1005 of this volume.

for the allegedly new organisms of the bourgeoisie has a single aim: to smother the revolution by raising a thousand and one material, political and ideological obstacles to it. They are working to disorientate and split the proletariat and its allies, because they know that, divided and split by factional struggles, the latter will be unable to create, either at home or on an international plane, that ideological, political and militant unity which is essential to cope with the attacks of world capitalism in decay.

The coalition of modern revisionism with social-democracy is afraid of the advent of fascism, especially in certain countries which are threatened by the extreme right. To avoid the fascist dictatorship, the revisionists and social-democrats make efforts «to mitigate» the contradictions and «tone down» the class struggle between the masses of the people and the proletariat, on the one hand, and the capitalist bourgeoisie, on the other. Thus, in order to secure «social peace», these subjects of the coalition have to make concessions to one another and to reach a compromise with the capitalist bourgeoisie, come to agreement with it over some sort of regime suitable to both sides. Thus, while the capitalist bourgeoisie and its parties openly continue their fight against communism, the revisionist parties endeavour to distort Marxism-Leninism, the guiding ideology of the revolution.

The trade-unions, which are reformist and are especially educated and trained in compromises with the owning class and only for economic claims and not for strikes with political demands and aims of the seizure of state power by the proletariat, have become the mainstay of the revisionist parties of Europe. Naturally, their bargaining is aimed at striking a balance between the demand and the offer — one side begs alms and the other side determines the size of this alms. The two sides, both the

reformist trade-unions and the revisionist parties, and the owning class with its parties, state power and trade-unions, are threatened by the revolution, by the proletariat and its genuine Marxist-Leninist parties. Therefore, they are in search of a reactionary compromise, a solution that cannot be the same in all the capitalist countries, because of the differences in the strength of capital, the depth of the crisis and the extent of the contradictions eroding them from within.

**The Revolution — the Only Weapon to Defeat the
Strategy of the Enemies of the Proletariat
and the Peoples**

All the enemies, the imperialists, social-imperialists and various revisionists, together or separately, are fighting to mislead progressive people, to discredit Marxism-Leninism, and especially to distort the Leninist theory of the revolution, to suppress the revolution and any kind of popular resistance and national liberation struggle.

The arsenal of the enemies of Marxism-Leninism is large, but the forces of the revolution are also colossal. These are the forces which are stirring, clashing and fighting with the enemies of the revolution and which have ruined the peace of mind of the capitalist world and world reaction and are making life impossible for them.

*«A spectre is haunting Europe — the spectre of communism. All the Powers of old Europe... have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre.»**

* K. Marx and F. Engels, *The Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Tirana, 1974, p. 13, Alb. ed.

This observation of Marx and Engels is still valid today. Imperialism, social-imperialism and modern revisionism think that the danger to them from communism has been eliminated, because, thinking that the heavy blow which the revolution has suffered from the revisionist betrayal is irreparable, they are underestimating the strength of Marxism-Leninism, and overestimating the material, suppressive military and economic potential they have at their disposal. This is only an illusion of theirs.

The world proletariat is gathering its forces. From their own experience, the proletariat and the freedom-loving peoples are gaining a clearer understanding, day by day, of the treachery of the Titoite, Khrushchevite, Chinese, «Eurocommunist» and other modern revisionists. Time is working for the revolution, for socialism, and not for the bourgeoisie and imperialism, not for modern revisionism and world reaction. The fire of the revolution is burning everywhere in the hearts of the oppressed peoples who want to gain their genuine freedom, democracy and sovereignty, to take power into their own hands and to set out on the road of socialism, destroying imperialism and its flunkies.

That phenomenon of the time of Lenin, when the break-away from the Second International was followed by the creation of new Marxist-Leninist parties, is taking place today. The revisionist betrayal has brought about the setting up and strengthening of genuine communist parties, as it is bound to do, everywhere, and these parties have taken up and raised high the banner of Marxism-Leninism and the revolution, which the revisionists have rejected and trampled in the mud. On them devolves the burden of opposing the glorious Leninist strategy of the revolution, the great theory of Marxism-Leninism to the global strategy of world imperialism and

revisionism. On them devolves the burden of making the masses fully conscious of the objectives and the right road of the struggle and the sacrifices it demands, of uniting, organizing, guiding and leading them to victory.

We Marxist-Leninists, who are in the forefront of the titanic struggle which is being waged today between the proletariat and the oppressed peoples who aspire to freedom, on the one hand, and the savage rapacious imperialists, on the other, must thoroughly understand the aims, tactics, methods and forms which the common enemies and the individual enemies of each country employ in the fight. We cannot see this thing properly if we do not base ourselves firmly on the Marxist-Leninist theory of the revolution, if we do not see that in the present situation there are a series of weak links in the capitalist world chain, as there will be in the future, at which the revolutionaries and the peoples must carry out ceaseless activity, an unrelenting and courageous organized struggle to break these links one after another. This, of course, requires work, struggle, sacrifices and self-denial. Led by the interests of the revolution, the courageous people and individuals can and will face up to the large forces of imperialism, social-imperialism and reaction, which are linking up with one another, setting up new alliances and seeking a way out of the difficult situations created for them. It is the revolutionaries, the Marxist-Leninists, the struggle of the peoples on all continents, in all countries, that create these difficult situations for the regressive forces.

The communists everywhere in the world have no reason to fear the baseless myths which have predominated in revolutionary thought for some time. The communists must fight to win over those who make mistakes, in order to help them mend their ways, making great efforts to this end without, of course, falling into opportunism

themselves. In the process of the principled struggle, in the beginning there will be some vacillations but the vacillations will occur among the waverers, whereas amongst those who are resolute and apply the Marxist-Leninist theory correctly, who have a proper view of the interests of the proletariat of their own country, of the world proletariat and the revolution, there will be no vacillation. However, when the waverers see that the comrades are standing firm on their revolutionary Marxist-Leninist opinions, they will be further strengthened in their fight.

If the Marxist-Leninists apply the Marxist-Leninist theory correctly and with determination, on the basis of the present international conditions and the national conditions of each country, if they ceaselessly strengthen proletarian internationalist unity in merciless struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism of all trends, they will certainly overcome all the difficulties they will encounter on their road, however great they may be. Properly applied, Marxism-Leninism and its immortal principles will inevitably bring about the destruction of world capitalism and the triumph of the dictatorship of the proletariat, by means of which the working class will build socialism and march towards communism.

II

THE LENINIST THEORY ON IMPERIALISM RETAINS ITS FULL VALIDITY

In the present conditions, when the Khrushchevite, Titoite, «Eurocommunist» and Chinese revisionists and the other anti-Marxist trends are attacking the cause of the revolution and peoples' liberation on the pretext that the situation has changed, a thorough study of Lenin's works on imperialism assumes first-rate importance.

We must return to these works and make an especially thorough and detailed study of Lenin's work of genius *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. From a careful study of this work, we shall see how the revisionists, and the Chinese leaders among them, distort the Leninist thought on imperialism, how they understand the aims, strategy and tactics of imperialism. Their writings, declarations, stands and actions show that their view of the nature of imperialism is completely wrong, they see it from counter-revolutionary and anti-Marxist positions, as did all the parties of the Second International and their ideologists, Kautsky and company, whom Lenin ruthlessly exposed.

If we study this work of Lenin's carefully and faithfully adhere to his analyses and conclusions of genius, we shall see that imperialism in our days fully retains those same characteristics that Lenin described, that the Leninist definition of our epoch as the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution remains unshaken, and that the triumph of the revolution is inevitable.

As is known, Lenin begins his analysis of imperialism with the **concentration of production and capital and the monopolies**. Today, too, the phenomena of the concentration and centralization of production and capital can be analysed correctly and scientifically only on the basis of the Leninist analysis of imperialism.

A characteristic of present-day capitalism is the ever increasing concentration of production and capital, which has led to the merging or absorption of small enterprises by the powerful ones. A consequence of this is the mass concentration of the work force in big trusts and concerns. These enterprises have also concentrated in their hands huge productive capacities and resources of energy and raw materials of incalculable proportions. At present the big capitalist enterprises are also utilizing nuclear energy and the newest technology, which belong to these enterprises exclusively.

Such gigantic organisms have a national and an international character. Within their own country, they have ruined most of the small proprietors or industrialists, while on the international plane they have grown into colossal concerns, which include whole branches of the industry, agriculture, construction, transport, etc. of many countries. Wherever these concerns have extended their tentacles, wherever the concentration of production has been achieved by a tiny handful of multimillionaire capitalists, the tendency to the liquidation of the small owners

and industrialists is becoming more widespread and pronounced. This has led to the further strengthening of monopolies.

«This transformation of competition into monopoly,» said Lenin, *«is one of the most important phenomena, — if not the most important, in the economy of present-day capitalism...»**

Speaking of this feature of imperialism, he adds,

*«... the rise of monopolies as the result of concentration of production in general is a universal and fundamental law of the present stage of development of capitalism.»***

The development of capitalism in today's conditions fully confirms the above conclusion of Lenin's. Nowadays, the monopolies have become the most typical and common phenomenon, which determines the physiognomy of imperialism, its economic essence. In the imperialist countries, like the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany, Britain, Japan, France, etc., the concentration of production has assumed unprecedented proportions.

For example, in 1976, there were nearly 17 million people, representing over 20 per cent of the active work force, employed in the 500 biggest US corporations. Sixty-six per cent of all the goods sold came from these corporations. At the time when Lenin wrote his book *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*; there was only one big American company in the capitalist world, the United States Steel Corporation with share capital of

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 32, p. 237, Alb. ed.

** *Ibidem*, p. 241, Alb. ed.

over one billion dollars, whereas in 1976 the number of billionaire companies was about 350. In 1975, the General Motors Corporation automobile trust, this supermonopoly, had a total capital in excess of 22 billion dollars and exploited an army of nearly 800,000 workers. Next comes the monopoly Standard Oil of New Jersey, which dominates the oil industry of the United States of America and other countries and which exploits over 700,000 workers. In the automobile industry there are three big monopolies which account for more than 90 per cent of production in this branch; in both the aviation and the steel industries, four very big companies account for 65 and 47 per cent of production respectively.

The same process has occurred and is occurring in the other imperialist countries, too. In the Federal Republic of Germany, 13 per cent of the total number of enterprises have concentrated about 50 per cent of the production and 40 per cent of the labour power of the country. In Britain, 50 big monopolies dominate everything. The British Steel Corporation accounts for over 90 per cent of the steel production of the country. In France, two companies have concentrated three fourths of the steel production in their hands, four monopolies own the whole production of automobiles, whereas four others control the entire output of oil products. In Japan, ten big black metallurgy companies produce all the pig-iron and over three fourths of the steel, while eight companies operate in non-ferrous metallurgy. The same applies to the other branches and sectors. (5)

The small and middle-sized enterprises, which still exist in these countries, are directly dependent on mono-

5 Information from *Monthly Bulletin of Statistics*, United Nations, 1977; *Statistical Yearbook*; the US journal *Fortune*, 1976. etc.

polies. They receive orders from the monopolies and work for them; get credits and raw materials, technology, etc. from them. In practice, they have become appendages of the monopolies.

The concentration and centralization of production and capital, creating giant monopolies which have no technological unity, is widespread today. Enterprises and entire branches of industrial production, construction, transport, trade, services, of the infrastructure, etc., operate within these gigantic «conglomerate» monopolies. They turn out everything, from children's toys to intercontinental missiles.

The economic power of the monopolies and the concentration of capital, which has increased and is constantly increasing, creates a situation in which the victims of the competition are not just «the small babies», that is, the unmonopolized enterprises, which were typical in the past, but even big financial enterprises and groups. As a result of the insatiable appetite of the monopolies for high monopoly profits and the extreme sharpening of the competition, this process has assumed colossal proportions during the last two decades. The mergers and takeovers in the capitalist world today are 7 to 10 times greater than in the years prior to the Second World War.

The mergers and combinations of industrial, trading, farming and banking enterprises have led to the creation of new forms of monopolies, to the creation of big industrial-commercial or industrial-agrarian corporations, forms which are finding wide application not only in the capitalist countries of the West, but also in the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and other revisionist countries. In the past the monopoly combines carried on the transport and selling of goods with the help of other independent firms, whereas today, the monopolies control production, transport and marketing.

The monopolies not only try to eliminate competition between the enterprises under their control, but have also extended their clutches to monopolize all the resources of raw materials, all the regions rich in important minerals, like iron, coal, copper, uranium, etc. This process is going on on the national and the international plane.

The concentration of production and capital assumed colossal proportions especially after the Second World War, with the expansion and development of the sector of state monopoly capitalism.

State monopoly capitalism means the subordination of the state apparatus to monopolies, the establishment of their complete domination in the economic, political and social life of the country. In this way the state intervenes directly in the economy in the interest of the financial oligarchy, in order to ensure the maximum profit for the class in power through the exploitation of all the working people, as well as to strangle the revolution and the peoples' liberation struggles.

State monopoly property, as the most characteristic basic element of state monopoly capitalism, does not represent the property of one individual capitalist or group of capitalists, but the property of the capitalist state, the property of the bourgeois class in power. In various imperialist countries the state monopoly capitalist sector accounts for 20 to 30 per cent of the total production.

State monopoly capitalism, which represents the highest stage of concentration of production and capital, is the main form of property prevailing today in the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries. This state monopoly capitalism is in the service of the new bourgeois class in power.

In China, too, through a number of reforms, such as the establishment of profit as the main aim of the activity

of the enterprises, the application of capitalist practices in organization, management and remuneration, the creation of economic regions, trusts and combines very similar to the Soviet, Yugoslav and Japanese ones, the opening of doors to foreign capital, the direct links of enterprises with foreign monopolies, etc., the economy is assuming forms typical of state monopoly capitalism.

At present, in the capitalist and revisionist world the concentration and centralization of production and capital have reached an inter-state level. The European Common Market, Comecon, etc., which represent the union of monopolies of various imperialist powers, also encourage and realize this tendency in practice.

Analysing the forms of international monopolies, in his time Lenin spoke of the cartels and syndicates. In today's conditions, when the concentration of production and capital has reached very large proportions, the monopoly bourgeoisie has also found other forms for the exploitation of working people. These are the multinational companies.

In their outward appearance, these companies seek to give the impression that they are under the joint ownership of capitalists of many countries. In fact, in regard to their capital and control, the multinational companies belong mainly to one country, although they carry out their activities in many countries. They are expanding more and more through the absorption of local companies and firms, big and small, which cannot cope with the savage competition.

The multinational companies open up subsidiaries and extend their enterprises to those countries where the prospects for maximum profits seem most secure. The US multinational company «Ford», for example, has set up 20 big plants in other countries, in which 100 thousand workers of various nationalities are employed.

Between the multinational companies and the bourgeois state there are close links and reciprocal dependence, which are based on their exploiting class character. The capitalist state is used as a tool in their service for their aims of domination and expansion on both the national and the international planes.

In regard to their major economic role and the great weight they carry in the whole life of the country, some multinational companies, individually, constitute a mighty economic force which, in many instances, is equal to or even exceeds the budgets or production of several developed capitalist countries taken together. The production of one of the powerful multinational companies of the United States of America, General Motors Corporation, is greater than the industrial production of Holland, Belgium and Switzerland taken together. They intervene to secure special favours and privileges for themselves in the countries in which they operate. For example, in 1975, the owners of the electronics industry of the United States of America demanded that the Mexican Government change its Labour Code which envisaged some safety measures, otherwise they would transfer their industry to Costa-Rica, and, in order to bring pressure to bear, closed down many factories in which nearly 12,000 Mexican workers were employed.

The multinational companies are levers of imperialism and one of the main forms of its expansion. They are pillars of neo-colonialism and infringe the national sovereignty and independence of the countries in which they operate. In order to open the way to their domination, these companies do not hesitate to commit any crime, from the organization of plots and the dislocation of the economy, down to the outright buying of top officials, political and trade-union leaders, etc. The Lockheed scandal provided ample proof of this.

Many multinational companies have established themselves and are operating in the revisionist countries, too. (6) They have begun to penetrate China, also.

The concentration and centralization of production and capital, which characterize the capitalist world today and have led to extensive socialization of production, have not in any way altered the exploiting nature of imperialism. On the contrary, they have increased and intensified the oppression and impoverishment of the working people. These phenomena prove to the hilt Lenin's thesis that under conditions of the concentration of production and capital in imperialism,

*«the result is immense progress in the socialization of production,» but, nevertheless, «... appropriation remains private. The social means of production remain the private property of a few.»**

The monopolies and multinational companies remain great enemies of the proletariat and the peoples.

The intensification of the process of concentration of production and capital, which is taking place in our time, has further exacerbated the basic contradiction of capital-

6 Seventeen US, 18 Japanese, 13 West-German, 20 French, and 7 Italian and other multinational companies have established themselves in the Soviet Union or have opened offices there. Over 30 multinational companies have established themselves in Poland. Of them, 10 are American, 6 West-German, 6 British, 3 Japanese, etc. There are 32 such companies operating in Rumania, 31 in Hungary, 30 in Czechoslovakia. The picture is the same in the other revisionist countries. (Information from the book *Vodka-Cola*, by Karl Levinson, 1977, pp. 79-82.)

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 22, p. 247, Alb. ed.

ism, the contradiction between the social character of production and the private character of appropriation, along with all the other contradictions. Today, just as in the past, the colossal income and superprofits realized from the savage exploitation of workers are appropriated by a handful of capitalist magnates. Likewise, the means of production, with which the united branches of industry have been equipped, are the private property of capitalists, while the working class remains enslaved to the owners of the means of production and its labour power remains a market commodity. Nowadays the big capitalist enterprises no longer exploit tens or hundreds of workers but hundreds of thousands of them. As a result of the ruthless capitalist exploitation of this great army of workers, the surplus value seized by the US corporations in 1976 alone, is estimated at over 100 billion dollars, as against 44 billion in 1960.

Lenin exposed the opportunists of the Second International, who preached the possibility of liquidating the antagonistic contradictions of capitalism as a result of the emergence and development of monopolies. He proved with scientific argument that the monopolies, as vehicles of the oppression and exploitation of labour and the private appropriation of the results of labour, make the contradictions of capitalism even more severe. The superstructure of the capitalist order is built on the basis of the domination of monopolies. This superstructure defends and represents the predatory interests of the monopolies, on both the national and the international planes. The monopolies dictate the internal and external policy, the economic, social, military, and other policies.

The present-day reality of the concentration of production and capital also exposes the preachings of the reactionary chiefs of social-democracy, the modern revision-

ists and opportunists of every hue, that the trusts, the property of state monopoly capitalism, etc., can allegedly be «transformed» in a peaceful way into socialist economies, that allegedly present-day monopoly capitalism will be «integrated» gradually into socialism.

The concentration of production and capital, Lenin teaches us, also serve as a basis for increased concentration of money capital, its concentration in the hands of big banks, and the birth and development of finance capital. In the course of the development of capitalism, together with the monopolies, the banks, too, assume great development, absorbing the money capital of the monopolies and concerns as well as of small producers and investors. In this way, the banks, which are in the hands of the capitalists and serve them, become the owners of the main financial means.

The same process, which was carried out for the elimination of the small enterprises by the big ones, by the cartels and monopolies, has also taken place in the liquidation, one after the other, of small banks. Thus, just as the big enterprises created the monopolies, the big banks, too, created their banking concerns. In the last two decades this phenomenon has assumed colossal proportions and it is still going on very rapidly today. A distinctive feature of today's mergers and takeovers is the fact that not only the small banks but also the middle-sized and the relatively big ones are involved. This phenomenon is accounted for by the increasing severity of the contradictions of capitalist reproduction, the extension of the struggle of competition and the grave crisis of the financial and monetary system of the capitalist world.

Twenty-six big financial groups dominate in the United States of America. The biggest of them is the

Morgan group, with 20 big banks, insurance companies, etc., and with share capital of 90 billion dollars.

The level of the concentration and centralization of banking capital is also very high in the other main capitalist countries. In West Germany, three out of seventy big banks own over 58 per cent of all banking assets. In Britain, all banking activity is controlled by four banks known as the «Big Four». The level of concentration of banking capital is also high in Japan and France, too.

Lenin has proved that banking capital is interlocked with industrial capital. At first, the banks are interested in the fate of the credits they advance to the industrialists. They mediate to ensure that the industrialists who receive the credits reach agreement among themselves to avoid competition with one another because the banks, themselves, would also suffer from this. This was the first step of the banks in their interlocking with industrial capital. With the development of the concentration of production and money capital, the banks become direct investors in the production enterprises, setting up joint-stock companies. In this way, banking capital penetrates into industry, construction, agriculture, transport, the sphere of circulation and all other fields. For their part, the enterprises buy large holdings of shares and become participants in banks. Today the directors of banks and monopoly enterprises are members of one another's boards of management, thus creating what Lenin called their «personal union». The finance capital which emerges from this process includes all forms of capital: industrial capital, money capital and commodity capital. Characterizing this process, Lenin said:

«The concentration of production; the monopolies arising therefrom; the merging or coalescence of banks with industry — such is the

*history of the rise of finance capital and such is the content of that concept.»**

Although since the Second World War finance capital has increased and undergone structural changes, it still has precisely those same aims it has always had, the making of maximum profits through the exploitation of the broad masses of working people inside and outside the country. The insurance companies, which have greatly increased over recent years in the main capitalist countries and have become serious competitors of the banks, have the the same role. In the United States of America, for example, in 1970, as against 1950, banking assets had increased 3.5 fold, whereas those of insurance companies had increased 6.5 fold, over the same period.

With the capital they accumulate through plundering the people, these companies have been able to advance the monopolies large sums amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars. In this way, the insurance companies are merged and interlocked with the industrial and banking monopolies, becoming an organic constituent part of finance capital.

Driven by its insatiable thirst for profits, the monopoly bourgeoisie turns every source of temporarily available monetary means, such as the workers' pension funds, the people's savings, etc., into capital.

Concentrated finance capital draws exceptionally large amounts of income not only from the profit accruing to it from the money absorbed from the concerns, small industrialists, etc., etc., but also from the issue of securities and provision of loans. Just as in the case of savings' deposits, in the latter, too, only a small share of the profit goes to the lenders, while the bank itself makes colossal

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 22, p. 273, Alb. ed.

profits from these activities, through which it increases its own capital and investments, which, of course, create a continuous flow of additional profits for finance capital. Finance capital invests mostly in industry, but it has extended its network of speculation to other assets, too, such as land, railways, and other branches and sectors.

The banks have real possibilities of providing considerable sums in credits, which are required by the high level of concentration of production and the domination of monopolies. In this manner, favourable conditions are created for the big monopoly combines to step up their savage exploitation of the working masses both at home and abroad, in order to ensure maximum profits.

With the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries, the banks there assumed all the features characteristic of monopolies. In these countries, the banks serve the exploitation of the broad masses of the working people, both at home and abroad, in the same way as in all other capitalist countries.

In recent years, trade on time payment, under which customers buy consumer goods, especially durable consumer items, has increased rapidly in the capitalist and revisionist countries. The provision of such credits ensures the bourgeoisie markets for the sale of goods, the capitalists make colossal profits from the high interest rates charged, while the debtors are bound hand and foot to the creditors and the capitalist firms.

The debts and other obligations of the working people to the banks and money-lending institutions have greatly increased at the present time. In the United States of America alone, in 1976 the indebtedness of the population from such credits had reached the sum of 167 billion dollars, as against 6 billion in 1945, while in the Federal Republic of Germany the indebtedness of the population had amounted to more than 46 billion marks.

The increased concentration and centralization of banking capital has led to increased economic and political domination by the financial oligarchy and the use of a series of forms and methods to increase the economic bondage, the impoverishment and misery of the broad masses of working people.

The development of finance capital enabled a small group of powerful industrial capitalists and bankers not only to accumulate great wealth, but also to concentrate real economic and political power, which makes itself felt in the entire life of the country, in their hands. These all-powerful people are those who head the monopolies and banks and constitute what is called the financial oligarchy. Proceeding from the fact that the large companies, in which even some worker may have a few token shares, the apologists of capitalism labour to prove that capital has now allegedly lost the private character which it had in the time when Marx wrote *Capital*, or when Lenin analysed imperialism, that it has supposedly become people's capital. But this is a fable. Today as in the past, powerful private industrial-financial groups dominate the imperialist countries: the Rockefellers, Morgans, Duponts, Mellons, Fords, the Chicago, Texas, California and other groups in the United States of America; the financial groups of the Rothschilds, Behrings, Samuels, etc., in Britain; Krupp, Siemens, Mannesmann, Thyssen, Gerling, etc., in West Germany; Fiat, Alfa-Romeo, Montedison, Olivetti, etc., in Italy; the 200 families in France, and so on.

As the possessor of industrial and finance capital, the financial oligarchy has established its economic and political domination over the entire life of the country. It has even subordinated the state apparatus, which has been transformed into a tool in the hands of the financial plutocracy, to its own interests. The financial oligarchy

dismisses and appoints governments, dictates the internal and foreign policy. In internal life, it is linked with the reactionary forces, with all those political, ideological, educational, and cultural institutions which defend its political and economic power, while in foreign policy it defends and backs up all the conservative and reactionary forces which support and open the road for its monopoly expansion, and fight for the preservation and consolidation of capitalism.

The financial oligarchy does not hesitate to use any means to secure its own domination, establishing political reaction in all fields.

«... finance capital,» said Lenin, *«strives for domination, not for freedom.»**

The situation today proves that oppression by the monopoly bourgeoisie has been intensified everywhere. On this basis, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is becoming deeper. At the same time, the economic and financial expansion, accompanied with political and military expansion, has further exacerbated the contradictions between the peoples and imperialism, as well as the contradictions among the imperialist powers themselves. The present-day propaganda of the Chinese revisionists ignores this undeniable objective reality.

The concentration and centralization of banking capital now takes place, not just in the context of one country, but in the context of several capitalist, or capitalist and revisionist countries. The joint banks of the European Common Market, or the «International Bank

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 23, p. 124, Alb. ed.

for Economic Co-operation» as well as the «Investment Bank» of Comecon, are of this character. Similarly, the combinations of the West German-Polish or the Anglo-Rumanian, Franco-Rumanian or Anglo-Hungarian banks, or the American-Yugoslav, Anglo-Yugoslav or other banking corporations are banking unions of the capitalist type. The Soviet Union has opened up many banks in a number of capitalist countries and these have become competitors and partners of capitalist banks wherever they have been established, in Zurich, London, Paris, Africa, Latin America, and elsewhere.

China, too, is being sucked deeper and deeper into the whirlpool of this process of the capitalist integration of banks. Apart from the banks it has in Hong Kong Macao and Singapore, tomorrow China will be setting up banks in Japan, America, and elsewhere. At the same time, it is permitting the banks of imperialist powers to penetrate China.(7)

Lenin emphasized that present-day capitalism is characterized by the export of capital. Today this economic feature of imperialism has been further developed and strengthened. The biggest exporters of capital in the world today are the United States of America, Japan, the Soviet Union, the Federal Republic of Germany, Britain and France.

For a certain period, capital was exported by the United States of America, Britain, France and Germany, countries with developed industry, which sucked from colonies the riches of the land and those that lay below its surface. Later, as a consequence of the war and

7 According to the Chinese press, the World Bank will grant China a loan of 2.4 billion US dollars for the 1984-1985 financial year (see *Beijing Review*, no. 24, June 13, 1983, p. 15).

crises, some imperialist powers such as Britain, France, Germany, were weakened economically, while American imperialism enriched itself and became a superpower. In the situation created after the Second World War the torrent of exports of American capital was very detrimental to the other capitalist powers.

Today, American capital is exported to all countries, even to the industrialized ones, in the form of investments, credits, loans, in the form of co-operation in joint companies or through the setting up of large industrial companies. American imperialism, monopoly capital, invests in the undeveloped and poor countries, because there production costs are low, while the level of exploitation of working people is high. It invests in order to secure raw materials, to monopolize markets, to sell its industrial products.

It is known that the development of capitalist countries takes place unevenly, therefore the big monopolies and companies of the United States of America and the other countries export capital precisely to those countries in which economic development requires investments and technology.

The capital invested brings fabulous profits to the financial concerns and monopolies, because in the poor, undeveloped countries, land is very cheap and large tracts of it, together with its riches, can be purchased with little money. Labour power is cheap, too, because people on the verge of starvation are forced to work for a very low pay. It has been calculated that for every dollar invested in these countries, the imperialist powers make a profit of 5 dollars.

According to American official data, during the 1971-1975 period alone, direct investments from the United States of America in the new states totalled 6.5 billion dollars, while the profits it made in these countries over

the same period amounted to nearly 30 billion dollars. (8)

In order to disguise the export of capital, the imperialist powers also resort to the practice of according credits. Through these so-called credits or aid, the big capitalist concerns and the states to which they belong bring great pressure to bear on the recipient states and peoples, and keep them under control. The aid or credits to the undeveloped countries originate from the plunder of the wealth of these countries as well as from the exploitation of the working masses of the developed countries and are given to the wealthy of the undeveloped countries. In other words, this means that the big US monopolies, for example, fatten on the sweat of both the American people and the other peoples, and when they export capital and accord credits, these represent precisely, the sweat and blood of these peoples. On the other hand, these credits, which the big monopolies provide for the countries of the so-called third world, in fact, serve the feudal-bourgeois classes which rule these countries.

The credits the new states receive are links of the imperialist chain around the necks of their own peoples. As the statistical data show, the debts of these countries double every five years. From nearly 8.5 billion dollars in 1955, the debts of the undeveloped countries to the imperialist powers had risen to over 150 billion dollars in 1977.

World capitalism has developed technology and expertise in its own interests, in order to multiply its profits from the discovery of underground resources, the intensification of agriculture, etc. All this technology, the

8 The American review *Survey of Business*, p. 44, August 1976.

technical-scientific revolution itself, and the new methods of economic exploitation serve imperialism, the capitalist monopolies, but not the peoples. Capitalism never makes investments, provides loans, or exports capital to other countries without first calculating the profits it will realize for itself. The big monopolies and banks, which have spread their spider's web all over the capitalist and revisionist world, never accord credits unless they are presented with concrete data about the income to be made from the exploitation of a mine, the land, the extraction of oil or water from a desert, etc.

There are also other forms of according credits, like those practised with those pseudo-socialist states which are trying to disguise the capitalist course on which they are proceeding. These are large credits provided in the form of trade credits which, of course, must be repaid within a short time. These are provided jointly by many capitalist countries, which have calculated in advance the economic as well as political profits they will draw from the recipient state, taking into account both its economic potential and ability to pay. In no case do the capitalists provide their credits for the construction of socialism. They provide them to destroy socialism. Therefore, a genuine socialist country never accepts credits, in any form, from a capitalist, bourgeois, or revisionist country.

Like the Khrushchevite Soviet revisionists, the Chinese revisionists, also, employ many slogans, many quotations, build many phrases which sound «Leninist», «revolutionary», but their real activity is reactionary, counter-revolutionary. The Chinese leaders try to present even their opportunist stands towards, and relations with, the imperialist countries as if they are in the interest of socialism. These revisionists use this camouflage with the intention of keeping the masses of the proletariat and the people in the dark, so that they will not be able to

transform their discontent into a powerful means to carry out the revolution.

Let us take, for example, the question of the economic construction of the country, the development of the socialist economy relying on one's own forces. This principle is correct. Every independent, sovereign socialist state must mobilize the entire people, and define its economic policy correctly, must take all measures for the proper and most rational exploitation of all the wealth of the country, and administer this wealth thriftily, must increase it in the interest of its own people and must not allow it to be plundered by others. This is a main, basic orientation for every socialist country, while aid from abroad, aid from other socialist countries, is supplementary.

The credits two socialist countries accord each other have quite a different character. These credits constitute disinterested internationalist aid. Internationalist aid never engenders capitalism, never impoverishes the masses of the people, on the contrary, it helps develop industry and agriculture, serves their harmonization, leads to the improvement of the well-being of the working masses, to the strengthening of socialism.

In the first place, the economically developed socialist states ought to assist the other socialist countries. This does not mean that a socialist country should not develop relations also with the other non-socialist countries. But these must be economic relations on the basis of mutual interest and must not in any way make the economy of a socialist, or any other non-socialist country, dependent on the more powerful countries. If these relations among states are based on the exploitation of small, economically weak states by big and powerful states, then such «aid» must be rejected, for it is enslaving.

Lenin says that finance capital has cast, in the literal meaning of the word, its nets over all the countries of the world. The capitalists' monopolies, cartels and syndicates work systematically, first they seize the internal market of their own country, get industry, agriculture, under their control, enslave the working class and other working people, make superprofits, and then create great possibilities to monopolize markets all over the world. Finance capital plays a direct role in this.

We see today, and this completely tallies with Lenin's teachings on imperialism as the final stage of capitalism, that the two superpowers, American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, are contending over the division of the world, to capture markets. The problem of oil, for instance, which has become acute throughout the world, is, first of all, the domain of the big American monopoly companies, but British, Dutch, and other oil companies are also involved in them. The Americans are manoeuvring on the problem of oil in order to have a complete monopoly of it. They have invested big capital and established large-scale equipment in the oil producing countries, such as Saudi Arabia, Iran, etc., and have got the ruling cliques of these countries into their clutches, by corrupting kings, sheiks, and imams with large sums of dollars. The rulers of the oil producing countries are allowed by the financial plutocracy of these countries to invest in the United States of America, Britain and elsewhere, even to buy shares in various monopoly companies, as well as luxury hotels, factories, etc.

Saudi Arabia, for instance, is a semi-feudal country where poverty and obscurantism reign, although it extracts 420 million tons of oil a year. While the working masses live in poverty, the king and the big landowner class have deposited over 40 billion dollars in the Wall Street banks alone. The situation is the same in Kuwait,

the United Arab Emirates, and elsewhere. These cliques make all sorts of concessions to the imperialist powers to plunder the assets of the peoples of the countries where they rule, with the aim of getting a share of the profits for themselves.

The investments made by the oil producing countries, and which are the property of the ruling cliques, constitute a union, of course, on a very small scale, of the capital of these cliques with American or British capital. On the face of it, it seems as if the ruling cliques of the oil producing countries have a sort of partnership of investments with American, British, or French imperialism, and allegedly influence the economies of the latter. In reality, quite the opposite is the case. The profits of American imperialists and the other imperialists are enormously big in comparison with the profits allocated to these cliques. This is a characteristic of present-day neo-colonialism, which, in order to be able to exploit the riches of some countries to the maximum, makes some cautious concessions in favour of the bourgeois-capitalist, or feudal ruling groups, of course, not to its own detriment. This example confirms the correctness of Lenin's thesis, that the interests of the bourgeoisie of various countries can very easily become interlocked, just as the interests of private monopolies can be interlocked with those of state monopolies. The big monopolies may also combine with the monopolies which are less powerful but which control great assets, especially underground resources, such as iron, chromium, copper, uranium, and other mines.

Government loans, credits and aid have become one of the most widespread forms of the export of capital today. This kind of export is practised by the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries, in particular.

Apart from the extraction of capitalist profits, these

credits, this «aid» and loans also have political objectives. The states which accord the credits aim to support and consolidate the political and economic power of particular cliques, which defended the economic, political and military interests of the creditor country. As the agreements on such credits are concluded between governments, they make the economic and political dependence of the debtor on the creditor even greater. A classical example of this form of capital export is the «Marshall Plan», which after the Second World War became the economic basis for the political and military expansion of the United States of America in the countries of Western Europe. The so-called aid which the Soviet revisionists provide allegedly for the development of the economy and the setting up of the state sector of industry in such countries as India, Iraq, and elsewhere, is of the same nature.

At present, American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, and the capitalism of the industrialized countries have reached such a stage of development that the profit they realize from the accumulation of capital has increased enormously. The accumulation of capital creates large profits which go into the pockets of the monopolists, the financial oligarchy, who do not put this income at the service of the poverty-stricken working people, but export it to those countries from which other, greater profits may accrue to them. These are the countries which China calls the «third world». However, they make investments of this kind in the developed capitalist countries, too.

Many books have been written about the process of penetration of American capital into Europe and its political and economic aims. A clear picture of this is given in the book by the American author Geoffrey Owen. At the beginning of the chapter «The International Companies», he says that the development of American in-

vestments abroad has been made according to the concept that the American firms represent not companies with overseas interests, but international companies. The headquarters of these companies are in the United States of America. This means that the various big American firms think not only of covering their own country and the needs of industry and clients within the United States of America, but also of extending their networks to foreign countries. These companies invest their «surplus capital» in other countries in order to make bigger profits. Such giant corporations as Socony Mobil, Standard Oil of New Jersey, etc., make nearly half their profits from the plunder and exploitation of foreign countries. About 500 companies secure profits of about 10 billion dollars outside the country every year. There are more than 3,000 such enterprises with investments in foreign countries. This is how such formulas and terms as «multinational companies», or «international capitalism», etc., have come into daily use in journalism and banking operations.

Geoffrey Owen says that in 1929 over 1,300 European companies were owned or controlled by American firms. This was the first stage of the American offensive on European industry. The pressure of the Second World War, which was being prepared, temporarily halted the invasion of American capital. From 1929 up till 1946, the amount of direct investments by American companies in other countries of the world fell from 7,500 million to 7,200 million dollars. However, after the Second World War, in 1950, the amount of American investments abroad had risen to 11,200 million, half of it concentrated in the Latin-American countries and Canada. The investments in Latin America were made to exploit the raw materials: oil, copper, iron ore, bauxites, as well as bananas and other agricultural products. In Canada they were mainly in mining and oil and developed on a wide scale because

of its proximity and other conditions facilitating penetration.

The Europe of the 1950's also became another important target for American investments. Investments on this continent were extended rapidly in communications, mass production goods and complex equipment. Together with investments, American goods and products poured in.

The author in question points out that the situation created after the Second World War in the capitalist market gave an even greater impulse to American investments. Here are the figures on the increase of these investments abroad: in 1946 they totalled 7,200 million and then they began to rise to 11,200 million in 1950, 44,300 million in 1964 and over 60,000 million dollars today.

By incessantly extending their operations on a world-wide scale, the American companies have made the competition with the local firms much fiercer and increased the fear of domination by the American giants. This problem is even more acute in the undeveloped countries where the American firms dominate the key branches of industry and exercise a preponderant influence in the national economy of these countries. In other words, these giant American companies control the local economies and governments and in fact they run them.

The prolonged struggle which went on between the American oil companies and the Mexican government and which ended in 1938 with the collapse of the Mexican government's policy of opposition, is well known. There was a similar outcome to the struggle between the British oil monopoly and the Iranian government, which resulted in the toppling of Mossadeq. Such ruinous conflicts are going on all the time and they end with the triumph of the big American trusts.

The big oil companies operate world-wide. For them

it has become normal and necessary to completely control all the capital and production of this branch, to control governments, etc., in the countries where they have invested, because, if they lacked these possibilities, then difficulties would arise in the co-ordination of their activity on a world scale. This is why the big foreign companies oppose the efforts of the local capitalists to get a bigger share in the profits than that the American investors or those of other imperialist countries allow them.

The American companies in Europe, Canada, Asia, Africa, and elsewhere, have created such a situation that in practice they control the economies of many countries. The governments of these countries stand in great fear of the United States of America, which has made itself the leadership of the European economy, just as it has done in military matters. Therefore, the industrialized capitalist countries of Europe try to hinder the invasion of American capital which has been and is pouring in ever greater amounts into them.

The Chinese leadership claims that the European states, industrialized since the 19th century, are making more investments in the United States of America. But it is known that while the investments of European capital in the United States are made mainly in the form of securities, shares, bonds, deposits, etc., the American investments in Europe have dominant positions in the most important branches of the European economy.

Endeavouring to justify the increase of American investments, Geoffrey Owen claims that the European countries want and are making efforts to develop their industries on scientific bases, as, for instance, the electronics and computer industries. These industries contribute to a certain extent to the technical progress, the rise of exports and the overall economic growth of these countries. But the American companies are more advan-

ced in this field than their European rivals and they control this technical progress in their own interests.

In computer manufacturing, for instance, the respective European companies have established close links to protect themselves against competition from the American International Business Machines (IBM) corporation which controls more than 70 per cent of the American market and an even greater proportion of the world market.

Likewise, the big American companies have the tendency to embark on joint ventures with the local enterprises. In order to camouflage their exploitation, many firms avoid having one hundred per cent ownership of subsidiaries, and set up companies on a 49-51 per cent or 50-50 joint investment basis. That is how the Americans have gone about it in Japan, and that is how they have gone about it in Yugoslavia, too, which tries to create the impression that it is building socialism, relying on its own forces, whereas in reality the Titoites have divided Yugoslavia economically among the United States of America and the big firms of the developed industrial countries. By doing so, the Titoites have also restricted the freedom and independence of Yugoslavia.

There is a tendency among many of these big American companies, like General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, General Electric, etc., to have, in fact, 100 per cent ownership of their subsidiaries in foreign countries. However, these subsidiaries, according to Owen, never forget the problem of nationalization, and their answer to this is that «it is not a question of setting up companies with local investors, but of encouraging international ownership of the shares in the mother companies». This is the concept of the «international» of capitalism, of which General Motors, in particular, is the ardent champion.

These orientations of imperialist American capital

or of the American industrial establishment which invests outside the United States of America in order to create its colonies and empire, are just a few facts which clearly illustrate the thesis that US imperialism has not been weakened in the least, despite what the Chinese revisionists pretend. On the contrary, it has grown stronger, has gained large concessions in foreign countries and is running many important branches of their economy. It has also caused the governments of other countries innumerable difficulties, frequently makes the law in these countries, and has many governments under its control and direction. Of course, this process has its ups and downs, but the general trend does not indicate the weakening of US imperialism.

We are now living at a time when another superpower, Soviet social-imperialism, is exporting its capital and is bent on exploiting the different peoples. The capital exported by this superpower results from the surplus value realized in the Soviet Union, which has been transformed into a capitalist country.

The restoration of capitalism has led to a polarization of the present-day Soviet society, in which a small section rules and exploits the overwhelming majority of the people. Now, the stratum consisting of the bureaucrats, the technocrats and the upper creative intelligentsia has been created and assumed the form of a separate bourgeois, exploiting class which appropriates and divides up the surplus value extracted from the savage exploitation of the working class and the broad working masses. Unlike the countries of classical capitalism, where this surplus value is appropriated in proportion to the amount of capital of each capitalist, in the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries it is distributed according to the position people of the higher bourgeois stratum occupy in the state, economic, scientific, and cultural hierar-

chy, etc.(9)The high salaries, routine and special bonuses, prizes and stimuli, privileges, etc., have been built up into a whole institution for the appropriation of the surplus value extracted from the toil and sweat of the working people. The stratum which represents the «collective capitalist» protects this plunder through a host of laws and norms, which guarantee the capitalist oppression and exploitation.

The Soviet economy has now become integrated into the system of world capitalism. While American, German, Japanese and other capital has penetrated deeply into the Soviet Union, Soviet capital is being exported to other countries, and, in various forms, is merging with local capital.

It is common knowledge that the Soviet Union economically exploits the satellite countries, in the first place. But now it is competing and contesting with the other capitalist states for markets, spheres of investment, for the plunder of raw materials, the preservation of neo-colonialist laws in world trade, etc.

Bent on extending its hegemony, the new Soviet bourgeoisie exports capital, but here it comes up against competition not only from US imperialism, which is very powerful, but also from the other developed capitalist states, such as Japan, Britain, West Germany, France, etc. In their quest for superprofits, these states export capital not only to Africa, Asia and Latin America, but also to the East European countries which are under the tutelage of the revisionist Soviet Union, and export capital even to the Soviet Union itself.

9 In the Soviet Union the ratio between the wages of workers and the salaries of managers of enterprises and members of the caste of the new Soviet bourgeoisie is one to ten, excluding what the latter appropriate for themselves in various other ways and forms.

The ruling cliques of the so-called socialist countries, like the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Poland, etc., and now China, too, allow foreign capital to flow into their countries, because this capital serves the ruling cliques, while it is a heavy burden on the peoples. The Comecon countries are up to their necks in debt. They are in debt to the Western countries to the tune of 50 billion dollars.

Yugoslavia was one of the first revisionist countries to allow the penetration of foreign capital into its economy. First it received credits, then bought licences, and later went over to setting up joint enterprises. In Yugoslavia a law was adopted in 1967, which permitted the creation of joint enterprises, in which 49 per cent of capital was owned by foreign companies. In 1977. there were 170 such enterprises in Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia has ensured the most favourable conditions for the capitalist firms to carry out their activity and ensure maximum profits.

The Yugoslav phenomenon proves that the foreign capital invested in Yugoslavia is one of the decisive factors which has turned it into a capitalist country. The United States of America and the other wealthy capitalist states have lost nothing by these investments. On the contrary, they have made huge profits, while increasing the misery of the working class and the peasantry of Yugoslavia. Lenin said that the exporting of capital is a solid basis for the exploitation of the majority of the nations and countries of the world, for the capitalist parasitism of a handful of very rich states.

The capitalist states will make huge profits in China, too. We see that US, Japanese, West-German and other capital is now pouring in there in billions of dollars. Agreements have been signed with the Japanese for the joint exploitation of oil-fields and the power resources of the Yangtze River. An agreement has been concluded with

the Germans for the building of coal mines, etc. The investments which are being and will be made in China will certainly bring the foreign capitalists handsome profits, but at the same time they will strengthen the bases of capitalism in China.

The exporting of capital from one capitalist country to another capitalist or revisionist country, no matter whether the state which gives or receives it is big or small, is always one of the forms of exploitation of the peoples by capital. This exploitation brings about the economic and political dependence of the recipient country.

Lenin pointed out that, **after capturing the home market, the monopolies engage in economic struggle to redivide and capture the world market for industrialized goods and raw materials.** Competition and their greed for profits impel the monopolists of different countries to reach temporary agreements, to enter into alliances and combinations with one another in order to divide the international markets for the sale of finished goods and the purchase of raw materials. Even when they possess reserves of raw materials and energy, the developed capitalist states turn their attack on other countries, since production costs in these countries are lower than in their own countries and workers' wages, especially, are several times lower.

The struggle that has been waged and is still going on to capture oil resources and markets is notorious. As a result of this struggle scores and hundreds of private enterprises and companies have been ruined and the international oil cartel, which comprises 7 big monopolies (5 American, 1 British, and 1 British-Dutch, the notorious Esso, Texaco, Shell, etc.), have managed to gain control over 60 per cent of the oil extraction and oil sales in the

capitalist countries of the Western world, and about 54 per cent of its processing.

A similar division of resources and markets exists today for copper and tin minerals, for uranium and other valuable strategic minerals.

Many of the old colonialist countries like Britain and France have concluded special, so-called preferential agreements of co-operation, etc. with the former colonial countries, which ensure them almost exclusive economic and commercial privileges. The so-called dollar, sterling, franc, or ruble areas indicate an economic division of the world among the monopolies and various imperialist states.

US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and the other imperialist powers ensure maximum profits in different ways, through the discriminatory and unequal trade they carry on with these countries. Today the «developing» countries alone, excluding the OPEC countries, have a debit balance which amounts to about 34 billion dollars.

In the present conditions, especially now in the conditions of the economic crisis, the monopolies conclude direct agreements also with the governments of capitalist countries on production quotas, prices, markets, etc. The existence of such organisms as the European Common Market, Comecon, etc., is also clear evidence of the economic division of the world which exists today.

This economic division of the world, the domination of monopolies, their dictate over the life and economic development of other countries is making the contradiction between labour and capital, as well as the contradictions between the peoples and imperialism, and the inter-imperialist contradictions, much more severe.

The Chinese theory of the «three worlds», which seeks to reconcile the «third world» with the «second

world» and with US imperialism, is out of step with this reality. It does not want to see that the relentless offensive of American, British, German, Japanese, French and other monopolies towards what China calls the «third world» is increasing the resistance of the peoples to all imperialist and hegemony-seeking powers and extending the objective conditions for the irreconcilable struggle among them. On the other hand, the unequal development of imperialist powers, which is an objective law of the development of capitalism, drives them to competition and abrasive frictions with one another, in their quest for economic expansion everywhere in the world.

The Chinese theory of «three worlds», which seeks to reconcile these contradictions and advocates precisely what social-democracy and the revisionists of every hue have long been preaching, is in flagrant opposition to the Leninist strategy, which, far from denying these contradictions, aims to deepen them in order to prepare the proletariat for revolution and the peoples for liberation.

In his analysis of imperialism, Lenin pointed out that, with the transition of pre-monopoly capitalism to its highest and last stage, **the stage of imperialism, the territorial division of the world among the great imperialist powers is completed.**

*«... the characteristic feature of the period under review is the final partition of the globe, final not in the sense that **repartition** is impossible; on the contrary, repartitions are possible and inevitable — but in the sense that the colonial policy of the capitalist countries **has completed** the seizure of unoccupied territories on our planet. For*

*the first time, the world is completely divided up, so that in the future **only** re-division is possible, that is, territories can only pass from one 'owner' to another...»**

Since the Second World War, the old classical colonialism, which exploited most of the peoples of the world physically, economically, politically and ideologically, has been transformed into a new colonialism. This new colonialism comprises an entire system of economic, political, military and ideological measures, which imperialism has built up with the aim of maintaining its domination and ensuring political control and economic exploitation of the former colonies and many other countries, while adapting itself to the new conditions created after the war.

What are these new conditions?

After the war, the imperialist countries — France, Britain, Italy, Germany, Japan and America were not in a position to maintain the situation which existed before the war by force. France, for instance, could no longer keep Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, and other countries of Africa in a colonial status, as it did in the past. The same can be said also of British, Italian, and other imperialism.

The Second World War brought about a radical change in the ratio of forces in the world. It led to the defeat of the major fascist powers, but it also greatly weakened the old colonialist powers and shook them to their foundations. Everywhere, even in the countries which were not involved in the cyclone, the anti-fascist war gave rise to the problem of national liberation. Those peoples of the former colonial countries, which took part

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 22, pp. 308-309, Alb. ed.

in the war together with the countries of the anti-fascist coalition in order to escape the fascist yoke, could not return to colonial bondage or tolerate it any longer. The victory of the Soviet Union over nazism, the creation of the socialist camp, China's liberation, gave a very powerful impulse to the awakening of the peoples' national consciousness and their liberation struggle. The broad masses of the peoples in the colonies came to understand that the former situation had to be changed. Liberation wars broke out in Indochina, North Africa, and elsewhere.

Forced by this situation, many colonialist countries realized that the old method of exploitation and administration of colonies without any sort of freedom and independence was outdated. The colony-owning imperialist powers reached this conclusion not because of their democratic feelings or their desire to give the peoples freedom, but because of the pressure by the colonized peoples and because these powers were militarily, economically, politically, and ideologically too weak to maintain the old colonialism. But French, British, Italian, American and other imperialisms did not want to give up the exploitation of these peoples and countries. In the existing circumstances each imperialist power was obliged to grant autonomy to these peoples or to promise them freedom and independence after a certain time. During this period, which they allowed allegedly for the creation of the consciousness of self-government and the training of local cadres for this, their real aim was to prepare other, new forms of imperialist exploitation, the new colonialism, while creating the false impression among these countries and peoples that allegedly they had won their freedom.

This was a stage after the war when world imperialism suffered a great defeat, when the crisis of the colonial system of imperialism became even more pronounced.

At this period of the decay of capitalism, as a result of the weakening of imperialism by the Second World War, the United States of America seized the opportunity and saddled the colonial peoples, who were allegedly free and independent, with a new, more intensive exploitation. It extended its imperialist power over the former colonies of the other imperialist powers, which had already been weakened in one way or another.

Although they had won recognition of that sort of «independence» and «freedom», which the former colonialist powers granted them, many former colonial peoples were forced to take up arms, because the imperialists were not disposed to give them this «freedom» and this «independence» immediately. The French imperialists, in particular, even after the war, were still trying to preserve the power of France, or its «grandeur». Thus, the peoples of Algeria, Vietnam, and many others started their protracted struggle for liberation and, in the end, they won it. Here we are not going into detail about how they achieved it, which were the social forces that fought, etc. The fact is that the old French and British imperialism was weakened. Thus, Lenin's theses that imperialism was in decay, that the old capitalist-imperialist society was being eroded by the revolutionary movements and the freedom-loving aspirations of the peoples, who had been oppressed and enslaved up till that time, was confirmed.

During this period American imperialism grew fat, expanded the dollar area, placed territories of the franc and sterling areas under its control, and, in order to protect its hegemonic imperialist power founded on the maximum exploitation of the peoples, it set up numerous military bases and established pro-American political cliques in many of those countries of the world which had allegedly gained their freedom and independence. This

exploitation was, of course, associated with a series of changes in the structure and superstructure as well.

Finance capital has also created its own special ideology, which precedes it in its exploitation of the proletariat and the conquest of the world. It completes its domination of the peoples, and justifies this domination by various sugar-coated forms of bogus freedom, independence, as well as by creating some so-called democratic parties, etc.

With the creation of banks and multinational companies, along with US capital investments, the American way of life, with the degeneration inherent in it, is also exported.

The export of capital by the big imperialist powers creates the colonies which, today, are the countries where neo-colonialism reigns. These countries have an alleged independence but it is only formal. In other words, now as in the past, the same process of the export of capital is going on, though in different forms, with «honeyed» explanations and propaganda. The ruthless exploitation of the peoples of these countries remains the same or becomes even more ferocious; and the plunder of natural assets continues.

The biggest neo-colonialist power of our time is the United States of America. In the three years, 1973-1975, the government and private capital investments of the United States of America in the former colonies, dependent or semi-dependent countries, represented about 36 per cent of the total investments of the most developed capitalist and revisionist countries in these regions. (10)

The economic, political and military treaties and agreements between the imperialist powers and the former colonial countries are enslaving, are weapons in the

10 Statistical Yearbook of the FRG, 1977.

hands of imperialism to keep these countries in bondage. The words of Lenin who stressed

*«... the need constantly to explain and expose among the broadest working masses of all countries, and particularly of the backward countries, the deception systematically practised by the imperialist powers, which, under the guise of politically independent states, in fact, set up states that are wholly dependent upon them economically, financially and militarily...»**

are just as valid today as in the past.

In order to keep the peoples under their domination, American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and the other imperialist powers, old or new, incite quarrels wherever they can among neighbour states, or among different social groups within a given country,⁽¹¹⁾ and then, in the role of the judge or the supporter of one side or the other, interfere in the internal affairs of others, and justify their economic, political and military presence there. The facts show that whenever the super-powers have meddled in the internal affairs of other peoples, the problems have remained unsolved or the result has been the consolidation of the position of imperialism and social-imperialism in these countries. The events in the Middle East, the conflict between Somalia and Ethiopia, the war between Cambodia and Vietnam, etc. bear witness to this.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 31, p. 159, Alb. ed.

11 From the end of the Second World War to this day over 16 million people have been killed as a result of these quarrels which often lead to the outbreak of local or civil wars. American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism have been involved directly or indirectly in these conflicts most of which have occurred in the undeveloped countries.

Together with their investments, the United States of America, the Soviet Union and all the other capitalist countries also consolidate their positions in the countries which accept these investments, as they struggle for markets and spheres of influence. This leads to frictions among different capitalist states, and among big concerns which are not linked with or interdependent on one another. These frictions kindle local wars and may even lead to a general war. As Leninism teaches us, a war that breaks out for these reasons, whether local or general, has a predatory and not a liberation character. Only when the peoples rise against foreign invaders, when they rise against the local capitalist bourgeoisie, which is closely linked up with imperialism, social-imperialism and world capital, is this a just, liberation war.

The representatives of big world capital are indulging in a great deal of talk about the alleged need for amendments to the present system of international economic relations and the creation of a «new world economic order», which the Chinese leaders, too, support. According to them, this «new economic order» will serve as a «basis for global stability». For their part, the Soviet revisionists speak about the creation of a so-called new structure of international economic relations.

These are efforts and plans of imperialist and neo-colonialist powers, which want to keep neo-colonialism alive, prolong its existence, and preserve their oppression and plunder of the peoples. But the laws of the development of capitalism and imperialism are subject neither to the wishes nor to the theoretical inventions of the bourgeoisie and the revisionists. As Lenin said, the consistent fight against colonialism and neo-colonialism, the revolution, is the way out of these contradictions.

In analysing the fundamental economic features of imperialism, Lenin also defined its place in history. He

stressed that **imperialism is not only the highest stage but also the final stage of capitalism**, the eve of the proletarian revolution. Lenin pointed out:

*«Imperialism is a specific historical stage of capitalism... is (1) monopoly capitalism; (2) parasitic or decaying capitalism; (3) moribund capitalism.»**

The reality of the present-day capitalist world fully confirms this conclusion.

The economic basis of all the socio-economic ills of imperialism, as Lenin proved, is monopoly. Monopolies are powerless to overcome the contradictions of the capitalist economy. Lenin linked the parasitism and decay of imperialism organically with the tendency of monopoly to inhibit the development of the productive forces in general, to deepen the disproportional development between branches and of the national economy as a whole, to fail to utilize the human and material productive capacities, with the tendency to hinder the application of the new developments of science and technology to the benefit of the masses and the progress of the entire society.

The greed for profits, the competition, force the monopolies to invest in advanced technology in the process of production. But in the entire historical process of the development of imperialism, the dominant tendency is towards disproportional development and restraint on development.

Expenditure on research and the development of science in the field of industry, and especially the war industry, in the United States of America, for instance, has increased from 2 billion dollars in 1950, to almost

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 23, p. 122, Alb. ed.

11 billion in 1965, and about 30 billion in 1972. Frequently the big firms come up against difficulties in scientific research, but once something is discovered, they buy up the patents and hire qualified workers; however, they apply the research only when their own interests require this.

Naturally, the most important sectors, which present more interest for investments in the field of development and the technical revolution, have priority, because they offer greater possibilities for profits. War industry tops the list, as it is here that the rate of profit is highest. For example, in 1964 the United States of America invested 3,565 million dollars in scientific research in the sector of aviation and missiles. In the same year, 1,537 million dollars were invested in the electrical and telecommunications industry, 196 million in the chemical industry, 136 million in the machine-building industry, 174 million in the automobile industry, 172 million in scientific instruments, 38 million in the rubber industry, 8 million in the oil industry, 9 million in the methane industry, etc.

In today's conditions the militarization of the economy, as a manifestation of the decay of imperialism, has become a characteristic feature of all the capitalist and revisionist countries. But the process of the militarization of the economy has assumed unprecedented proportions, especially in the United States of America and the Soviet Union. The direct military spending by both sides has increased to astronomical proportions, reaching a joint total of over 240 billion dollars a year. (12)

In their policy of hegemony and world domination, the United States of America and the Soviet Union are

12 This figure nearly doubled in 1982, rising to over 430 billion dollars. Military expenditure has been rising continually from one year to the other.

also making extensive use of the arms trade, which is another clear expression of the decay of imperialism. Every year they sell more than 20 billion dollars worth of weapons. The other imperialist states, such as Britain, West Germany, France, Italy, etc., also engage in selling arms. The regular customers of this imperialist trade are such reactionary and fascist cliques as those of Chile, Israel, South Korea, Rhodesia, the South Africa Union, etc. Also numbered among these customers are the countries rich in strategic raw materials or oil, to which the imperialists offer their weapons as a bait to induce them to allow the plunder of their wealth.

The ever more frequent outbreak of economic crises of overproduction is clear proof of the decay and parasitism of present-day monopoly capitalism. The outbreak of crises, which have now become very deep, confirms the correctness of the Marxist theory on the anarchic, spontaneous and disproportional character of production and consumption, and refutes the bourgeois «theories» on the development of capitalism «without crises», or the transformation of capitalism into «regulated capitalism».

The general law of capitalist accumulation discovered by Marx, that the impoverishment of working people grows, on the one hand, while the profits of the capitalists increase, on the other hand, is operating with ever greater force in capitalist society today. The process of the polarization of society into proletarians and into bourgeois, who represent a limited number of people, is deepening.

The present-day imperialist system, which has greater economic possibilities to corrupt the upper strata of the proletariat, the worker aristocracy, has increased the latter to very large proportions.

The financial oligarchy is making extensive use of

this aristocracy today, to deceive and confuse the proletariat, to dampen its revolutionary ardour. It is from this worker aristocracy that those whom Lenin calls socialists in words but imperialists in deeds, usually emerge. Social-democracy, the «bourgeois workers' parties», the opportunist leaders of trade-unions, the modern revisionists, etc., all come within this description of Lenin's. Lenin stresses that imperialism is linked with opportunism, that the opportunists assist to preserve and strengthen imperialism. He says:

*«...the most dangerous of all are those who do not wish to understand that the fight against imperialism is a sham and humbug unless it is inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism.»**

The decay of imperialism is clearly seen also in the growth and intensification of reaction in all fields, and especially in the political and social fields. As practice confirms, when the monopoly bourgeoisie sees that the class struggle becoming acute, it casts off all disguise and denies the working masses even those few rights they have won by shedding their blood. The fascist regimes and dictatorships which have been established in many countries of the world are evidence of this.

All this rotten system, which is in a chaotic state, is propped up by a huge praetorian army, by very large numbers of police mobilized and armed to the teeth. All these military and police forces are set in motion to prevent or suppress any kind of resistance which goes beyond the limits defined by a jungle of laws made by the ruling bourgeoisie. The cadres of the armed forces

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 22, p. 367, Alb. ed.

and other instruments of oppression live in affluence and receive fat salaries. In Italy, for instance, you hear nothing but talk about the army, the police, the carabinieri, about security agents who are decorated, but also killed.

In this very confused situation which prevails in the bourgeois states, gangsterism has developed and become widespread, and this is bred by the capitalist order itself. It is an expression of its degeneration, a reflection of the desperation and confusion to which the bourgeois system of oppression and exploitation gives rise. The bourgeoisie tries to prevent those cases of gangsterism which cause it problems and worry the bourgeois state. But it incites and uses gangsterism to terrorize the broad working masses who live in poverty. In many capitalist countries gangsterism has become an industry and has extended from robbing banks and stores to kidnapping people and holding them to ransom for large sums of money. In some countries gangsterism has been organized in different groupings. These groupings often have names with a «revolutionary», or «communist» sound. The bourgeoisie allows them a free hand to operate in order to prepare the situation for, and justify the staging of, a fascist coup d'état. In order to discredit the revolution and socialism, this gangster activity is publicized as though it is carried out by «communist groups» which are allegedly operating against the bourgeois order.

As a conclusion, we can say that in the present situation of imperialism as a whole, of US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, as well as other imperialisms, imperialism of whatever description is at the stage of weakening and decay, and that the old society will be overthrown to its foundations by the revolution and will be replaced by a new society, socialist society. This new socialist society exists and will extend, it will develop, gain ground regardless of the fact that the Soviet revisionists betrayed

socialism in the Soviet Union, regardless of the fact that opportunism prevails in China and a new social-imperialism is rising there, regardless of the fact that capitalism has been restored in the erstwhile countries of people's democracy. Socialism will pursue its own course and will triumph over world imperialism and capitalism through struggle and efforts, but never, in any way, through reforms and peaceful parliamentary roads, as Khrushchev preached and as all the revisionists are preaching. It will triumph by remaining loyal to the Leninist theory on imperialism and the proletarian revolution and never by following the present-day revisionist theories which proclaim state monopoly capitalism to be an allegedly new, special stage of capitalism, to be the «birth of socialist elements in the bosom of capitalism».

Proceeding from Lenin's conclusions on the nature of imperialism and its place in history, as a result of the contradictions eroding it from within and people's liberation and revolutionary struggles, the whole of world imperialism as a social system no longer has that undivided power to dominate it once possessed. This is the dialectics of history and it confirms the Marxist-Leninist thesis that imperialism is on the decline, in decadence and decay.

The trend towards the weakening of capitalism and imperialism is the main trend of world history today. Marx and Lenin argued this on the basis of concrete facts historical events, and materialistic dialectics. The trend towards united efforts by states opposed to imperialism also leads to the weakening of imperialism. But this latter tendency, which China absolutizes without making the necessary differentiations, without studying the particular situations, does not lead to the correct road. While claiming that US imperialism is in decline and less powerful than Soviet social-imperialism, while proclaiming the «third world» as the main motive force of the epoch,

in practice the Chinese leaders are encouraging capitulation and submission to the bourgeoisie.

It is true that the peoples want liberation, but they can gain this liberation only through struggle, through efforts, and headed by a militant leadership. Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin teach us that this leadership is the proletariat of each country. But the proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist parties must make thorough-going political, economic and military analyses, weigh everything in the balance, make decisions and define the appropriate strategy and tactics, always bearing in mind the preparation and carrying out of the revolution. If the revolution is forgotten, as it is by the Chinese, neither the analyses, actions, strategy, nor the tactics can be Marxist-Leninist and revolutionary.

We cannot have any illusions about imperialism of any kind, either powerful or less powerful. Imperialism from its nature creates the conditions for economic and political expansion, for unleashing wars, because its character is essentially exploitative, aggressive. Therefore, to deceive the broad masses of the peoples who want liberation, that they will achieve this if they are guided by such revisionist theories as that of «three worlds», is to perpetrate a crime against the peoples and the revolution.

Our epoch, as Lenin teaches us, is the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. We Marxist-Leninists must understand from this that we have to combat world imperialism, any imperialism, any capitalist power, which exploits the proletariat and the peoples, with the greatest severity. We stress the Leninist thesis that the revolution is now on the order of the day. The world is going to advance towards a new society which will be socialist society. World capitalism, imperialism and social-imperialism will become even more decayed and will come to an end through the revolution.

Lenin teaches us that **we must fight imperialism to the finish, must criticize it in the broad sense of the term and rouse the oppressed classes against the policy of imperialism, against the bourgeoisie.** The Marxist-Leninist analysis of the development of imperialism today clearly shows that nothing in Lenin's analysis and conclusions on the nature and features of imperialism and the revolution can be altered. The attempts of all opportunists, from the social-democrats down to the Khrushchevite and Chinese revisionists, to distort the Leninist theses on imperialism are counter-revolutionary. Their aim is to negate the revolution, to prettify imperialism and to prolong the life of capitalism.

When Lenin exposes imperialism and its apologists like Bernstein, Kautsky, Hilferding and all the other opportunists of the Second International, he points out:

*«Imperialist ideology also penetrates the working class. No Chinese wall separates it from the other classes.»**

Unfortunately, however, even the «Chinese wall» has now been breached and the imperialist propaganda and ideology have penetrated China. The Chinese opportunists are not in the least original. Treading the road of Kautsky and company, they, too, are prettifying imperialism, in general, and American imperialism, in particular, presenting the latter as an imperialism in retreat, on which the peoples should rely in order to defend themselves from the Soviet social-imperialists.

The similarity between the «theories» of the Chinese revisionists and those of Kautsky is all too obvious. In his time, Kautsky tried to defend the colonial policy of

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 22, p. 347, Alb. ed.

imperialism, to cover up its exploitation and expansion, by distorting the Marxist theory on the development of capitalism. This is also being done today by the Chinese leaders who, in an effort to support American imperialism and its neo-colonialist policy, churn out absurd theories allegedly based on Marx or Lenin. However, to speak in the terms Lenin used, the Chinese «theory» is a plunge into the mire of revisionism and opportunism.

Kautsky's theory spread the illusion that allegedly in the conditions of monopoly capitalism, the possibility exists of another, non-annexionist policy. In this connection Lenin stressed:

*«The essence of the matter is that Kautsky detaches the politics of imperialism from its economics, speaks of annexations as being a policy 'preferred' by finance capital, and opposes to it another bourgeois policy which, he alleges, is possible on this very same basis of finance capital. It follows, then, that monopolies in economics are compatible with non-monopolistic, non-violent, non-annexionist methods in politics. It follows, then, that the territorial division of the world, which was completed precisely during the epoch of finance capital, and which constitutes the basis of the present peculiar forms of rivalry between the biggest capitalist states, is compatible with a non-imperialist policy. The result is a slurring-over and a blunting of the most profound contradictions of the latest stage of capitalism, instead of an exposure of their depth; the result is bourgeois reformism instead of Marxism.»**

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 22, p. 328, Alb. ed.

Ignoring the fact that the monopolies, finance capital, dominate the economic field in the United States of America, and that it is precisely they who dictate the home and foreign policy, the Chinese revisionists talk about a peaceful imperialism which no longer seeks expansion and indeed is on the retreat. The Chinese leaders «forget» Stalin's words that the main features and requirements of the fundamental economic law of present-day capitalism are,

*«... the securing of the maximum capitalist profit through the exploitation, ruin and impoverishment of the majority of the population of the given country, through the enslavement and systematic robbery of the peoples of other countries, especially backward countries, and, lastly, through wars and militarization of the national economy, which are utilized for the obtaining of the highest profits.»**

Thus, the «new» theories of the Chinese leaders show that they are singing Kautsky's old song to a new tune.

While exposing the chieftains of the Second International, who wanted to make a distinction between imperialist powers on the basis of which were more aggressive and which less aggressive, Lenin stressed that this stand was anti-Marxist. This attitude impelled the parties of the Second International to the positions of chauvinism, to open betrayal of the cause of the proletariat and the revolution. In our epoch, said Lenin, there can be no question of which of the imperialist states involved in the

* J. V. Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, Tirana 1974, p. 45, Alb.ed.

First World War, on one side or the other, is the «greater evil».

*«Present-day democracy,» says he, «will remain true to itself, only if it joins neither one nor the other imperialist bourgeoisie, only if it says that 'the two sides are equally bad', and if it wishes the defeat of the imperialist bourgeoisie in every country. Any other decision will in reality be national-liberal and have nothing in common with the genuine internationalism.»**

In the present conditions, if the Chinese thesis, according to which Soviet social-imperialism is more aggressive than American imperialism, were to be accepted, this would lead to open betrayal of the revolution, of the historic mission of the working class, to going over to the positions of the Second International. The two imperialist superpowers represent to the same degree the main enemy and danger to socialism, the freedom and independence of the peoples, and the sovereignty of nations. They are the main defenders of world capitalism.

In order to conceal their betrayal of the peoples, the Chinese leaders say that the relations of the big monopolies with some countries which possess great wealth create a situation in which even conflicts between the monopoly powers and the peoples can be avoided. This is a monstrous absurdity, an attempt to present ferocious imperialism as tame, to create a false situation of euphoria that allegedly the investment of capital will create well-being for the people of the country in which the investment is made, and thus, the antagonistic contradic-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 21, pp. 145-146, Alb. ed.

tips between the imperialists and the peoples of these countries will no longer exist. This false theory, which is now being trumpeted by the Chinese leaders, has been concocted by imperialism in order to extend its domination everywhere in the world and to assist the reactionary cliques ruling in the various countries to oppress their own peoples and to sell their countries to the foreigners.

These «theories» are a repetition, in new, refined forms, of the reactionary theories of the opportunists of the Second International. At the time of the First World War, Lenin exposed Kautsky's anti-Marxist theory of «ultra-imperialism». Kautsky alleged that wars could be prevented under imperialism, through an agreement among the capitalists of various countries.

In his polemic with Kautsky, Lenin said:

*«... in the realities of the capitalist system and not in the banal philistine fantasies of English parsons or of the German 'Marxist' Kautsky, 'inter-imperialist' or 'ultra-imperialist' alliances, no matter what form they may assume, whether of one imperialist coalition against another, or a general alliance embracing **all** the imperialist powers, are inevitably nothing more than a 'truce' in periods between wars.»**

These teachings of Lenin's are very relevant in the present conditions when the Chinese revisionists are talking about and making feverish efforts to set up an alliance and a great world front of all the fascist and feudal, capitalist and imperialist states and regimes, in-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 22, pp. 359-360, Alb. ed.

cluding the United States of America, against Soviet social-imperialism.

Alliances between imperialist countries, Lenin stressed, are possible, but they are created for the sole purpose of jointly crushing the revolution and socialism, of jointly plundering the colonies and dependent and semi-dependent countries.

The Chinese revisionists, like the chieftains of the Second International, have substituted the pragmatic slogan, «Let us unite with all those who can be united» against Soviet social-imperialism, for the slogan of the *Communist Manifesto*, «Proletarians of all countries, unite!».

The theory of the «three worlds» invented by the Chinese leaders does not analyse the historical development of imperialism from the Marxist-Leninist class stand-point, but sees it in a distorted light, ignoring the contradictions of our time which Marx and Lenin defined so clearly. Following this «theory», «socialist» China unites with American imperialism and the «second world», that is, with other imperialists who exploit the peoples, and calls on the «third world», the peoples who aspire to fight against world imperialism and capitalism, whether American imperialism or Soviet social-imperialism, to unite against Soviet social-imperialism only.

The Titoite theory, of «non-aligned countries», too, is just as anti-Marxist as the theory of the «three worlds».

These two «theories» are the rails of the one railroad on which the train of American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism is running, a train loaded with the wealth plundered from the peoples of the world. The Titoites and the Chinese revisionists are trying to open some holes in the trucks of this imperialist and social-imperialist train, so that a little oil, sugar, a few dollars, pounds, francs or rubles may leak out. These rails which

have been laid over the backs of the oppressed peoples, and which are intended to keep these peoples in permanent bondage, are two theories just as reactionary as all the other anti-Marxist theories of the Trotskyites, anarchists, Bukharinites, Khrushchevites, of the supporters of Togliatti, Carrillo, Marchais, etc., etc.

Life is constantly confirming Lenin's theses of genius on imperialism. Capitalism has entered the phase of its decay. This situation is arousing the revolt of the peoples and impelling them to revolution. The struggle of the peoples against imperialism and the bourgeois capitalist cliques is building up in various forms, with varying intensities. Quantity will inevitably turn into quality. This will happen first in those countries which constitute the weakest link of the capitalist chain and where the consciousness and organization of the working class have reached high level, where there is a deep political and ideological understanding of the problem.

Imperialism has stepped up its barbarous oppression and exploitation of the peoples. But, at the same time, the peoples of the world are becoming more and more conscious that they cannot go on living in capitalist society, where the working masses are no less oppressed and exploited than in the pre-War period.

Despite all the efforts by imperialism and its hangers-on, it will find no stability, now or in the future, in its struggle to establish its hegemony over the peoples. It cannot find stability because of the awakening consciousness of the working class and the masses of oppressed working people who want liberation, as well as because of the inevitable inter-imperialist contradictions.

The peoples are seeing, and later they will see ever more clearly, that world imperialism and capitalism are not based solely on the economic, military, political and ideological strength of the two superpowers, but are based

also on the wealthy classes which keep the peoples of their own countries in bondage, under exploitation and under fear so they will not rise up to gain their true freedom and independence.

The broad masses of various peoples of the world have also begun to understand that the present-day bourgeois-capitalist society, the exploiting system of world imperialism, must be overthrown. For the peoples this is not just an aspiration, in many countries they have taken up arms.

Therefore, there is no need to concoct theories which divide the world into three or four parts, into «aligned» and «non-aligned», but the great objective historical process must be seen and interpreted correctly, according to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. The world is divided in two, the world of capitalism and the new world of socialism, which are locked in a merciless struggle with each other. In this fight the new, the socialist world, will triumph, while the old capitalist society, the bourgeois and imperialist society, will be overthrown.

III

THE REVOLUTION AND THE PEOPLES

Marx showed with scientific argument the necessity for the destruction of capitalist society and the construction of a more advanced society, socialism, and then communism. Developing Marx's thought, in his book *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* Lenin showed that the present epoch is the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. This is the epoch of the destruction of the old capitalist order, colonialism and imperialism, of the seizure of state power by the proletariat and the liberation of the oppressed peoples, the period of the triumph of socialism on a world scale.

This means that today we are living in the epoch of the replacement of the old exploiting society, which is intolerable for the majority of mankind, for the oppressed and exploited, with a new society in which the exploitation of man by man is done away with once and for all. It was precisely from these fundamental teachings and its Marxist-Leninist analysis of the process of world development today that our Party proceeded when, at its 7th Congress, it put forward the thesis that the world is at a stage in which the question of the revolution and liberation of the peoples is a problem demanding solution.

The struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie is a stern, merciless struggle which goes on con-

tinuously. Confronting each other stand two great social forces. On the one side stands the capitalist-imperialist bourgeoisie, which is the most ferocious, deceitful and bloodthirsty class known to history. On the other side stands the proletariat, the class totally dispossessed of means of production, ruthlessly oppressed and exploited by the bourgeoisie, which is at the same time the most advanced class of society, which thinks, creates, works and produces, but does not enjoy the fruits of its toil.

Each of these classes strives to rally forces around itself and prepare them for its own aims: the proletariat, for social and national liberation, to carry out the revolution; the bourgeoisie, to preserve its domination and suppress the revolution. The bourgeoisie gathers around itself the most ominous, regressive and criminal forces, while the proletariat strives to win all the revolutionary, progressive forces over to its side.

Marxism-Leninism teaches us that the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie builds up continuously and will certainly be crowned with the victory of the proletariat and its allies. But for this struggle to be crowned with success, the proletariat must be organized, must have its own vanguard party, must make the broad masses of the people conscious of the necessity for revolution, and lead them in the fight to seize state power, to establish its own dictatorship, to build socialism and communism, the classless society.

There are many hot-heads in the world, with good or evil intentions, who think that the revolution can be carried out at any time, at any moment, at any place. But such people are mistaken. The revolution cannot be carried out at any time and at any place, according to one's wishes. The revolution breaks out and is carried through at that link of the capitalist chain which is the weakest. For the revolution to break out and triumph, the

appropriate objective and subjective conditions must exist, and the favourable moment must be found for launching into revolution. The main thing is that, when they start the revolution, the broad masses of the people, with the proletariat at the head, must be determined and prepared to carry it through to the end.

Lenin stresses that the revolution is carried out by the people of each country, that it is not exported. This does not mean that the Marxist-Leninists, wherever they are militating, should not feel themselves in solidarity, should not be linked with one another by the purest feelings of proletarian internationalism, and should not assist the struggle of the proletariat and peoples of other countries for their liberation. On the contrary, all communists, all proletarians, all the revolutionary forces in the various countries are duty bound to assist the revolution in each particular country and all over the world, through propaganda, agitation, material aid, the example of their determination and selflessness, and by faithful adherence to Marxism-Leninism. Of course, success in the utilization of this assistance depends, first of all, on the preparation of the proletariat and its party, on the development of the revolutionary struggle in this or that country.

In the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* Marx and Engels show that the interests of the proletariat and the people of one country are inseparable from the interests of the proletariat and peoples of the entire world.

As Lenin teaches us and life has confirmed, the revolution triumphs in each country individually. Therefore, this triumph depends, first of all, on the working class and its revolutionary party of each country, on their ability to implement the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on the revolution in the concrete conditions.

However, a great deal of confusion has been created

around these teachings and especially around the Leninist theory on the revolution, many mines have been laid by the Titoite, Soviet, «Eurocommunist», Chinese, and other modern revisionists, who have taken it upon themselves to mislead people on the issue of the revolution and to prevent its outbreak.

Today, when this question is put forward for solution, it is an imperative duty for the Marxist-Leninists to dispel the fog the revisionists have spread about the revolution, to unmask their manoeuvres and deliberate misrepresentations about this problem, to expose their counter-revolutionary, chauvinist, hegemonic intentions, and to ensure that the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the revolution are understood and applied correctly.

We Must Defend and Implement the Marxist-Leninist Teachings on the Revolution

Marxism-Leninism teaches us and the experience of all revolutions has confirmed that for the revolution to break out and triumph, the objective and subjective factors must exist.

Lenin formulated this teaching in his book *The Collapse of the Second International*, and developed it further in his book «*Left Wing*» *Communism, an Infantile Disorder* and other writings.

Dwelling on the revolutionary situation as the objective factor of the revolution, Lenin describes it as follows:

«1) *When it is impossible for the ruling classes to maintain their rule in an unchanged form*»*

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 21, p. 223, Alb. ed.

due to the deep crisis which has involved these classes, a crisis which causes discontent and indignation among the oppressed classes. «Usually, for the revolution to break out,» he says, «it is not enough for 'the lower strata not to want' to live in the old way; it is necessary also that 'the upper strata should be unable' to live in the old way. 2) When the want and suffering of the oppressed classes have become acute... 3) When, as a consequence of the above causes, there is a considerable increase in the activity of the masses, who... are drawn into... independent actions of historic importance.»*

«In other words, this truth can be expressed in this way: revolution is impossible without a nation-wide crisis (affecting both the exploited and the exploiters).»**

«Without these objective changes,» he emphasizes, «which are independent not only of the will of separate groups or parties, but even of separate classes, a revolution — as a general rule — is impossible.»***

But not every revolutionary situation gives rise to revolution, says Lenin. In many cases, he says, revolutionary situations like those of the years 1860-1870 in Germany, or of the years 1859-1861 and 1879-1880 in Russia, were not transformed into revolutions, because of the absence of the subjective factor, that is, the high level of consciousness and readiness of the masses for the revolution.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 21, p. 223, Alb. ed.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 31, p. 83, Alb. ed.

*** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 21, p. 223, Alb. ed.

«...the ability of the revolutionary **class**,» as Lenin puts it, «to carry out revolutionary mass actions **strong** enough to break (or dislocate) the old government, which, never, not even in a period of crisis, 'falls' if it is not 'dropped'.»*

In preparing the subjective factor, as Lenin wrote in his early works, the revolutionary party of the working class, its leadership, education and mobilization of the revolutionary masses play a decisive role. The party achieves this both by working out a correct political line, which responds to the concrete conditions and the revolutionary desires and demands of the masses, and through a colossal amount of work, involving intensive and politically well-pondered revolutionary actions, which make the proletariat and the working masses conscious of the situation in which they are living, of the oppression and exploitation, of the barbarous laws of the bourgeoisie, and the absolute necessity for the revolution as a means to overthrow the enslaving order.

In this way, the poor strata will react with such intensity that even the wealthy, the bourgeoisie in power, shaken also by other internal and external contradictions, will have difficulty in continuing to rule as before. When these conditions are fulfilled, when the objective and subjective factors, which are linked with each other, exist, then it is possible for the revolution not only to break out but also to triumph.

Revolutionaries always ponder deeply over these theses of genius of Lenin, and not only ponder over them but also make concrete and all-round analyses of the situations. They act to ensure that they will never be taken by surprise by the revolutionary situations, so they

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 21, p. 223, Alb. ed.

will not find themselves disarmed at these decisive moments, but be able to utilize them for the preparation and launching of the revolution.

What does the analysis of the current situation in the world show? Proceeding from the Leninist theory of the revolution, the Party of Labour of Albania draws the conclusion that the situation in the world today is revolutionary in general, that this situation has matured, or is rapidly maturing, in many countries, while in other countries this process is developing.

When we say that the situation today is revolutionary, we mean that the world today is moving towards great outbursts. In general the situation today is like a volcano in eruption, a scorching fire, a fire which will burn precisely the oppressing and exploiting ruling upper classes.

The capitalist and revisionist world is in the grip of a grave, economic and political, financial and military, ideological and moral crisis. The present crisis, which has shaken the entire structure and superstructure of the bourgeois and revisionist order, has made the general crisis of the capitalist system even deeper and more acute.

The consequences of the crisis are clearly very grave and devastating, especially in the field of the economy. The deepening of the most severe economic crisis following the Second World War has been going on since 1974. It has brought about a decline of considerable proportions in industrial production: 20 per cent in Japan, 15 per cent in Great Britain, 14 per cent in the United States of America, 13 per cent in France and Italy, 10 per cent in the Federal Republic of Germany, etc. The crisis has caused a very deep depression. In many capitalist countries unused productive capacities in some key branches of the economy have reached up to 25-40 per cent and

this situation is dragging on for years on end. That is why industrial production continues to stagnate. Colossal stocks of «surplus» goods remain unsold.

Yet, despite all these stocks of unsold goods and even though many productive capacities are not exploited, the monopolies' profits continue to increase because of rising prices. Prices are going up from day to day, while inflation has reached very high figures in certain countries.

Price rises and, in particular, inflation, have become a very convenient means in the hands of the monopolies and the capitalist and revisionist state to saddle the working class and other working people with the heavy burden of the crisis.

Under the pretext of checking inflation, the capitalist and bourgeois-revisionist states increase the taxes on the incomes of the working masses and freeze their wages, and at the same time reduce taxation on the profits of the monopolies, devalue the currency, etc. These measures are directed against the working class and all working people, step up their exploitation and reduce their standard of living.

The long drawn-out economic crisis has worsened the living conditions of the working class and peasant masses and made life very much harder for them. Unemployment has increased to proportions seldom seen before, and has become chronic, a major ulcer of bourgeois and revisionist society. In the capitalist-revisionist world, 110 million people have been thrown out in the streets. In the United States of America alone not less than 7-8 millions are unemployed. Today millions of people are living on the verge of starvation or actually starving. Hundreds of millions of people are tortured with the anxiety over insecurity for the morrow.

The poverty and insecurity for the broad masses of

working people, as well as the reactionary, anti-popular internal and external policies followed by the capitalist and bourgeois-revisionist regimes have added and are continuously adding to the discontent of broad strata of the population. This grave situation has aroused their incontainable anger, which is expressed in strikes, protests, demonstrations, in clashes with the repressive organs of the bourgeois and revisionist order, and in many cases, even in real revolts. The popular masses are growing ever more hostile to the regimes ruling them.

Striving, even in this situation of crisis, to safeguard their maximum profits, the governments of imperialist, capitalist and revisionist countries make all sorts of fraudulent promises and proposals to placate the discontent and anger of the masses and divert their minds from revolution.

Meanwhile, the poor are becoming even poorer, the rich even richer, the gap between poor and rich social strata, between the developed capitalist countries and the undeveloped countries is growing deeper and deeper.

The present crisis has also extended to political life, inciting contradictions among the ruling circles of the capitalist and revisionist states. Clear evidence of this is the great increase in government crises and the frequent replacement of teams in power.

The bourgeoisie and the ruling cliques are compelled to change the horses in their government teams more and more frequently, with the aim of deceiving the working people and bolstering their hopes that the fresh team will be better than the old one, of convincing them that the latter are to blame for the crisis and for failing to get out of it, while the former will improve the situation, and so on. This whole fraud, which is continuously conducted on broad proportions, is camouflaged with false slogans about freedom, democracy, etc., es-

pecially during electoral campaigns. At the same time, the bourgeoisie in the capitalist and revisionist countries is reinforcing its savage weapons of violence, the army, the police, the secret services, the courts, the control by its dictatorship over every movement and effort of the proletariat. In the capitalist and revisionist countries today there is an obvious trend towards increased bourgeois violence and the limitation of democratic rights. The tendency towards the development of fascism in the life of the country and preparations for the establishment of fascism, at the moment when the bourgeoisie considers it impossible to rule by «democratic» methods and means, is becoming ever more evident.

The economic-financial and political crisis has gripped not only the monopolies, the governments, the political parties and forces inside each particular country, but also the international alliances, the economic, political and military blocs, like the European Common Market and Comecon, the European Community, NATO and the Warsaw Treaty. The contradictions, frictions, contests and quarrels between partners of these alliances and blocs are manifesting themselves ever more openly and abrasively.

Another expression of the crisis and attempts to get out of it can be seen in the armaments race, the all-round preparations for war and the instigation of local wars by the superpowers and the other imperialist powers, such as those in the Middle East, the Horn of Africa, the Western Sahara, Indochina and elsewhere. This course serves the hegemonic and expansionist plans of one or the other imperialist power. It keeps alive and develops the war industry and the arms trade, which have assumed unparalleled proportions today.

But all these political and military means are only

palliatives which do not and cannot cure the ills of the gravely ailing capitalist-revisionist system.

To the present economic and political crisis of the capitalist and revisionist world must also be added the unprecedented ideological and moral crisis. At no other time has there been such ideological confusion and moral corruption as that which is being seen today. At no other time have there been so many variants of bourgeois theories, right, middle or «left», decked out in every kind of secular and religious, classical and modern, openly anti-communist and allegedly communist and Marxist cloaks. At no other time has such moral corruption, such a degenerate way of life, or such great spiritual depression been witnessed. The bourgeois and revisionist theories, built up with so much effort and trumpeted so boastfully as «guides to salvation from the evils of the old society», such as the theories of the «final stabilization of capitalism», «people's capitalism», «the consumer society», «post-industrial society», «averting crises», «the technical-scientific revolution», Khrushchevite «peaceful coexistence», «a world without armies, weapons and wars», «socialism with a human face», etc., etc., have now been shaken to their foundations.

All these aspects of the general crisis are to be found not only in Yugoslavia, where the consequences of the crisis are more obvious, but also in the social-imperialist Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries. Oppression and exploitation have been stepped up everywhere in these countries, all of them are suffering from the ills of capitalism, from the quarrels and conflicts over power and privileges in the ranks of the leaders and the upper strata; everywhere the popular masses are seething with dissatisfaction and anger. Thus, great possibilities for the revolution exist in these countries, too. The law of the

revolution operates there the same as in every other bourgeois country.

It is precisely this situation of the present general crisis of capitalism, the trend of which is to become steadily deeper, that makes us draw the conclusion that the revolutionary situation has already enveloped or is in the process of enveloping the majority of capitalist and revisionist countries, and hence, that this situation has placed the revolution on the order of the day.

Under the ever greater pressure of the crisis and the defeats they have suffered in their predictions and their manoeuvres to strangle the revolution, the bourgeoisie and the revisionists are trying to find new expedients and to fabricate other fraudulent theories.

Today, the modern revisionists have unfurled the banner of defence of the capitalist system, of oppression and exploitation of the peoples, of splitting the revolutionary and liberation movement, and in general, of the deception of the masses. But they, too, will suffer the same fate as the social-democrats and all other opportunists of the past, who have turned into simple lackeys of the bourgeoisie.

In the present situation of its grave economic, political and ideological crises, the bourgeoisie is demanding that its revisionist servants come out more openly in its support. This is forcing them more and more to drop their disguise, but also to become more thoroughly discredited. Lenin says:

*«The opportunists are bourgeois enemies of the proletarian revolution, who in peaceful times carry on their bourgeois work in secret, concealing themselves within the workers' parties, while in times of crises they **immediately** prove to be open allies of the **entire** united bourgeoisie from*

*the conservative to the most radical and democratic part of the latter, from the freethinkers to the religious and clerical sections.»**

This scientific conclusion of Lenin's is proved to the hilt by the service the modern revisionists are rendering the crisis-stricken capitalist system today.

Take Italy, for instance, the typical country in which the decay of capitalism, in its base and superstructure, is reflected. From the end of the Second World War up till now the Christian Democrats, the party of the big bourgeoisie, the party of the Vatican, which has gathered all the religious-reactionary bourgeoisie and elements of the right around itself, have been in power in Italy. Their government is ruling a country which is in a state of bankruptcy. Right from 1945 to this day, the top strata of the bourgeoisie have been in the grip of such a grave crisis that, within that period, there has been a succession of about 40 governments, «monocolour» Christian Democrat, socialist-Christian Democrat; tripartite, Christian Democrat-socialist-socialdemocrat, «centro sinistra» governments, «centro destra» governments, etc.

The deep government crisis in Italy reflects that situation of the internal general crisis from which no way out can be found. The quarrels, conflicts, political murders and scandals, such as the removal of President Leone, the murder of the head of the Christian Democrat Party, Moro etc., which are becoming more and more frequent, are consequences of the crisis.

Italy has become a bridgehead of the United States of America. Its bankrupt economy, which has fallen into the clutches of American imperialism, is also linked with

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 21, p. 106, Alb. ed.

the European Common Market, where it is the partner with the least weight.

As a result of this situation, the broad working masses in Italy have been impoverished and are becoming more so. Italy has the highest level of unemployment among the countries of the European Common Market. Italy has the greatest emigration of the labour force and its imports are greater than its exports. By restricting their buying of food products from Italy, the member countries of the European Common Market, especially West Germany and France, have created a difficult situation in Italian agriculture. The export prices of Italian butter, milk, and fruit have fallen sharply while the cost of living in that country has become extremely high. Italy has become a country of big strikes in which workers from heavy and light industry and transport, down to postmen, airline crews and even the police take part.

In such a situation of seething discontent, when the interests of the masses and the revolution require that all this great discontent of the proletariat and the entire people should be channelled into the fight against the reactionary bourgeoisie, against its preparations for the fascist attack it is trying to launch, the Italian revisionists and the reformist trade-unions, the entire worker aristocracy, as well as the supporters of the Chinese theory of the «three worlds», are acting as firemen to extinguish the flames of the revolution and as defenders of the bourgeois order.

This rotten bourgeois order is being defended by all the parties, from the fascist party to Berlinguer's revisionist party. The Italian revisionist party is united with the bourgeoisie precisely to keep this bourgeois order, shaken to its foundations, in power. It is trying to weaken and suppress the revolutionary drive of the Italian proletariat by spreading the lie that it is following and applying

a Marxism applicable to the conditions of its own country.

Not only did Berlinguer enter into negotiations with the Christian Democrats long ago, but he has even reached agreement with them, and indeed, without formally participating in the government, on many problems, he is governing together with them. The government supports this party, but at the same time, for the sake of appearances, makes believe that it disagrees with it. The Italian revisionist party, for its part, is playing the same game.

The Italian revisionists are raising a great clamour about a government program, agreed on by the five parties of the Italian parliamentary majority, which they are boosting as an «important victory», as a «new political phase» in their country. But this political phase that Berlinguer talks about, is the inclusion of the revisionist party in the plans of Italian capital. Berlinguer describes this as a serious, realistic, and undogmatic agreement. He claims that this agreement will bring about a real change, not only in the political relations among parties, but also in the entire economic, social and state life of the country.

Thus, the Italian revisionists are going down precisely the road Lenin predicted for the different opportunists, who seek unity with capital in order to obstruct the revolutionary drive of the masses. With this unity, they think that they have come some way towards achieving their aim of going to socialism through pluralism. Obviously, this is nothing but a dream, and the President of the Italian Senate, Amintore Fanfani, is not at all mistaken when he describes this agreement among the five parties as a collection of dreams. It is a collection of dreams on the part of the Italian revisionists, whereas on the part of the forces of capital, it is by no means a dream, but a well-pondered act designed to liquidate the ideas of communism in Italy, and to block the claims of

the Italian people and proletariat and suppress their revolutionary struggle for the construction of a new society. The Italian revisionists are now receiving a few crumbs, but, claiming that the government needs the participation of the revisionist party, they are trying to have the party brought completely into the government, like a fish in its element. In a word, the Italian revisionist party is trying to become totally involved in the reactionary mess of Italian monopoly capital.

Berlinguer's party is an utterly degenerate party ideologically, with a completely reformist, parliamentarist, social-democratic program. It supports the order established by the pseudo-democratic Constitution in the formation of which the Italian «communists» themselves, headed by Togliatti, took part. It is precisely under this Constitution that the reactionary and clerical bourgeoisie has been making the law in Italy and oppressing the proletariat and the broad masses of the people for the past three decades. The so-called Italian communists find this oppression just and in conformity with the Constitution.

Inside or outside the Italian parliament, through the press organs, television and radio, the Italian revisionist party together with the other parties of the bourgeoisie, with the Christian Democrat Party at the head, is carrying out a policy accompanied with unrestrained demagoguery which stupefy the Italian public, confuse and disorganize it day by day, in order to weaken the revolutionary will of the proletariat and the political consciousness of the working masses.

Italian reaction and the Vatican are in great need of all this activity. The Italian revisionist party is trying to suppress the revolutionary movement of the masses of the people, headed by the proletariat, in order to hinder the revolution, to help the bourgeoisie out of its predicament and avert the overthrow of the existing order.

Take another example, Spain. After the death of Franco, King Juan Carlos came to power in Spain. He is the representative of the Spanish big bourgeoisie, which, seeing that during its long rule the fascist regime had plunged the country into a grave crisis, came to the conclusion that Spain could no longer be governed as in Franco's time. Therefore, certain changes had to be made in the form of government and Franco's discredited Falange could no longer be kept in power. After a series of changes of heads of government, the people most trusted by the new king, the continuers of the reformed Francoism, took power.

Demonstrations and strikes broke out in Spain as never before. Through them the people demanded changes, naturally, not this «change» that took place, but deep-going and radical changes. The strikes, demonstrations and clashes there did not cease and are still going on. The masses are demanding freedoms and rights, and the different nationalities autonomy. In this situation, in order to mislead the masses in revolt, the government of Juan Carlos also legalized the revisionist party of Ibaruri-Carrillo. The heads of this party have become obedient flunkies of the Spanish monarchic regime, have turned into scabs to hold back the great revolutionary drive which has built up in the existing situation and, in conjunction with the bourgeoisie, to suppress all the elements with revolutionary ideas from the Spanish War and admirers of the Republic.

Here, too, we see the fire brigade role of the Spanish revisionist party, identical with the role played by the Italian revisionist party, although it has less power than the latter.

The revisionist parties in France, Japan, the United States of America, Britain, Portugal and all the other capitalist countries are playing a similar role in defending

the bourgeois order, enabling it to overcome the crises and revolutionary situations, to befuddle and paralyze the proletariat and the other oppressed and exploited masses, who are understanding ever more clearly that it is no longer possible to live in the «consumer society» and other exploiting societies, and who are rising in revolt against the capitalist political and economic order.

The revisionist parties are particularly hostile to Leninism. This means that they are hostile to the revolution, because it was Lenin who elaborated the theory on the proletarian revolution to perfection and put it into practice in Russia. On the basis of this theory, the socialist revolution triumphed in Albania and other countries. The Leninist theory, which shows the way to the triumph of the revolution everywhere, reveals the worthlessness of the counter-revolutionary revisionist theories about peaceful transition to socialism through the parliamentary road, without destroying the bourgeois state apparatus, indeed, according to them, even utilizing it for peaceful socialist transformations, with no need for the leadership of the proletariat and its vanguard party or the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Precisely at these very revolutionary moments, when there are great possibilities for the revolution to break out at the weakest links of the capitalist chain, when there is extremely great need to raise the class consciousness of the proletariat, to prepare the subjective factor, to build up confidence in the correctness and universal character of the Marxist-Leninist theory, which shows the true road to the seizure of state power by the proletariat and other oppressed masses, the revisionists are rendering the bourgeoisie an invaluable service in its efforts to cope with and avert the revolution. That is why the bourgeoisie is striving in every way to involve the revisionist parties and the trade-unions under their influence

in the fight against the revolution and communism. This is precisely the objective that the whole line of American imperialism, world capitalism and the bourgeoisie of every country is intended to achieve. The bourgeoisie wants the revisionist parties to place themselves openly and totally in the service of capital by operating under «communist» colours and allegedly fighting to change the situation, to create a new hybrid society in which not only the owning class and wealthy classes, but allegedly the poorer classes, too, will have their say, with the revisionist «communist» parties and the socialist parties passing themselves off as their representatives and champions.

The revisionists in power, in particular, the Yugoslav, Soviet and Chinese revisionists, are rendering world capitalism a very great service in the struggle to hold back and stamp out the revolutions.

The Yugoslav revisionists are declared enemies of Leninism. They are the most ardent propagandists of the negation of the universal character of the laws of the socialist revolution embodied in the October Revolution and reflected in the Leninist theory of the revolution. They preach that allegedly the world today is moving towards socialism spontaneously, therefore, there is no need for revolution, for class struggle, etc. The Yugoslav revisionists present their capitalist system of «self-administration» as a model of true socialism, alleging that it is a panacea both against the «evils» of «Stalinist» socialism and against the evils of capitalism. According to them, the establishment of this system allegedly does not require violent revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, socialist state ownership, or democratic centralism. «Self-administration» can be established quietly and gently by agreement and collaboration between ruling circles, between employers and workers, between the government and property owners!

It is precisely because Yugoslav revisionism is an enemy of Leninism and sabotages the revolution that international capitalism, and especially American imperialism is so «generous» in providing Titoite Yugoslavia with financial, material, political and ideological aid.

In words, the Soviet revisionists do not reject Leninism and the Leninist theory of the revolution, but they fight it in practice with their counter-revolutionary stands and activity. They are no less afraid of the proletarian revolution than the American imperialists or the bourgeoisie of any other country, because in their own country the revolution topples them from the throne, strips them of their power and class privileges, while in the other countries it ruins their strategic plans for world domination.

They try to present themselves as continuators of the October Revolution, as followers of Leninism, in order to deceive the proletariat and the working masses both in the Soviet Union and in other countries. They talk about «developed socialism» and «transition to communism» in order to put out any discontent, revolt, and revolutionary movement of the working masses in their country against the revisionist rule, and to suppress them as «counter-revolutionary», «anti-socialist» acts. Outside their country, they use «Leninism» as a mask to conceal their anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist theories and practices, to open the way for the expansionist and hegemonic plans of social-imperialism.

The Soviet revisionists present the violent revolution in the developed capitalist countries as very dangerous at the present time, when, according to them, any revolutionary outburst could be transformed into a thermonuclear world war which will exterminate mankind. Therefore, they recommend the revolution on the peaceful road, the transformation of parliament «from an

organ of bourgeois democracy into an organ of democracy for the working people» as the most suitable road today. They also present «detente», the so-called easing of tension, which serves the aims of Soviet foreign policy, as «the general trend of world development today», which will allegedly lead to the peaceful triumph of the revolution on a world scale.

For demagogical purposes they do not deny the dictatorship of the proletariat, indeed, in theory they come out in defence of it, saying that in specific instances even violent revolution may be used. But they need these declarations especially to justify the plots and armed putsches which they organize in one country or another to establish pro-Soviet reactionary regimes and cliques there, to divert the national liberation movements from the right road, and to put them under their hegemony, etc.

Now revisionist China, too, has become a zealous extinguisher of the revolution.

The entire internal and external policy of the Chinese revisionists is directed against the revolution, because the revolution upsets their strategy of making China an imperialist superpower.

Within China the revisionist leadership is savagely suppressing any revolutionary outburst of the working class and the other working masses against its bourgeois counter-revolutionary stands and actions. It is striving in every way to cover up the contradictions of the present epoch, especially the contradiction between labour and capital, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The Chinese revisionists say that there is only one contradiction in the world today, the contradiction between the two superpowers, which they present as a contradiction between the United States of America and all other countries of the world, on the one hand, and Soviet social-

imperialism, on the other. Basing themselves on this fabricated thesis, they call on the proletariat and the people of every country to unite with the bourgeoisie of their countries «to defend the homeland and national independence» against the danger which comes only from Soviet social-imperialism. With this the Chinese revisionists preach to the masses the idea of renouncing the revolution and the liberation struggle.

To the Chinese revisionists the problem of the proletarian and national liberation revolution is simply not a current issue, also because, according to them, nowhere in the world is there a revolutionary situation. Therefore, they advise the proletariat to shut itself up in libraries and study «theory», because the time for revolutionary actions has not come. In this context, it is clear how hostile and counter-revolutionary is the policy of the Chinese revisionists, who are splitting the Marxist-Leninist movement and hindering the unity of the working class in the fight against capital.

The Chinese press and propaganda, as well as the speeches of the Chinese leaders, make no mention at all of the big demonstrations and strikes which the entire proletariat is organizing in different capitalist countries today. This is because they do not want to encourage the revolt of the masses, because they do not want the proletariat to utilize these situations in their fight against oppression and exploitation. How hypocritical sound their bombastic and empty slogans that «the countries want independence, the nations want liberation and the peoples want revolution»!

Not only is the claim of the Chinese revisionists that there is no revolutionary situation in the world today contrary to the reality, but they also demand that the proletariat with its Marxist-Leninist party sit with its arms folded and refrain from undertaking any revolu-

tionary action at all, from working to prepare the revolution. Long ago, at the 2nd Congress of the Communist International, Lenin criticized such capitulationist views expressed by the Italian Serrati, according to whom no revolutionary actions should be carried out when there is no revolutionary situation.

«The difference between the socialists and communists,» said Lenin, *«consists in the former refusing to act in the way we act in any situation, i.e., conduct revolutionary work.»**

This criticism by Lenin is a heavy slap in the face also for the Chinese modern revisionists, and all the other revisionists, who, like the social-democrats, are against revolutionary actions by the proletariat and the other working masses.

Lenin called Kautsky a renegade, because

*«...he had completely distorted Marx' doctrine, tailoring it to suit opportunism, and that he had 'repudiated revolution in deeds, while accepting it in words'»***

The Chinese revisionist leaders go a little further than Kautsky. They do not admit the necessity of the revolution even in words.

This reactionary line explains the profoundly counter-revolutionary policy and attitudes of the Chinese revisionist leadership, which is seeking in every way to enter into alliances and collaborate with US imperialism and the other developed capitalist countries, supports the European Common Market and NATO.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 31, p. 277, Alb. ed.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 28, p. 257, Alb. ed.

By entering into alliance and seeking unity with the US imperialists, who, together with the Soviet social-imperialists, are the most ferocious oppressors and exploiters and the arch-enemies of the proletariat and the peoples, as well as with the other imperialist rulers, with the blackest world reaction, while demanding that the proletariat of the European countries and the other developed capitalist countries bend their backs and submit to oppression by the bourgeoisie, the Chinese revisionists themselves are also participating in this oppression and uniting with world capitalism in the fight against the revolution, against socialism, and against the peoples' liberation.

As can be seen, world capitalism, with modern revisionism and all its other tools, is waging a fierce and many-sided fight on all fronts to stop revolutions from breaking out.

They are striving with might and main to overcome the crises, to cool or defuse the revolutionary situations in order to prevent them from being transformed into revolution. However, the crises and revolutionary situations are objective phenomena which do not depend on the will and desires of the capitalists, the revisionists or any one else. Only when the capitalist order of oppression and exploitation, which inevitably gives rise to them, has been wiped out, can they be avoided.

The imperialists, the other capitalists and the revisionists know full well that the revolution does not break out spontaneously in periods of crises and revolutionary situations. Therefore, they direct their attention and their main blows towards the subjective factor. On the one hand, they strive to stupefy and deceive the proletariat, the other working masses and the peoples, to hinder them from becoming conscious of the necessity for the revolution, and from uniting and organizing themselves;

on the other hand, they fight to destroy the international Marxist-Leninist movement, to stop it from building up and gaining strength, so that it will not become a great leading political force of the revolution, so that the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties of each country will not gain the political and ideological capacity to be able to unite, organize, mobilize, and lead the masses in revolution and to victory.

But, however much the imperialists, the capitalists, the revisionists and reactionaries strive and struggle, they cannot stop the wheel of history from rolling onwards. Their strivings and struggle will come up against the revolutionary strivings and struggle of the proletariat and the freedom-loving peoples, while the modern revisionists will suffer the same fate as the social-democrats and all the opportunists of the past, all the lackeys of the bourgeoisie and imperialism.

The Peoples' Liberation Struggle — a Component Part of the World Revolution

When we speak of the revolution we do not mean only the socialist revolution. In the present epoch of the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism, the peoples' liberation struggle, the national-democratic, anti-imperialist revolutions, the national liberation movements, also, are component parts of a single revolutionary process, the world proletarian revolution, as Lenin and Stalin explained.

«Leninism,» says Stalin, «has proved... that the national problem can be solved only in connection with and on the basis of the proletarian revolution, and that the road to victory of the revolu-

*tion in the West lies through the revolutionary alliance with the liberation movement of the colonies and dependent countries against imperialism. The national problem is a part of the general problem of the proletarian revolution, a part of the problem of the dictatorship of the proletariat.»**

This connection has become even clearer and more natural today, when, with the collapse of the old colonial system, most of the peoples have taken a big step forward towards independence by creating their own national states, and when, following this step, they are aspiring to go further. They want the liquidation of the neo-colonialist system, of any imperialist dependence and any exploitation by foreign capital. They want their complete sovereignty and economic and political independence. It has now been proved that such aspirations can be realized, such objectives can be attained only through the elimination of any domination by and dependence on foreigners and the liquidation of oppression and exploitation by local bourgeois and big landowner rulers.

Hence, the linking and interlacing of the national-democratic, anti-imperialist, national liberation revolution with the socialist revolution, because, by striking at imperialism and reaction, which are common enemies of the proletariat and the peoples, these revolutions also pave the way for great social transformations, assist the victory of the socialist revolution. And vice-versa, by striking at the imperialist bourgeoisie, by destroying its economic and political positions, the socialist revolution creates favourable conditions for and facilitates the triumph of liberation movements.

* J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 6, p. 144, Alb. ed.

This is how the Party of Labour of Albania sees the question of the revolution. It sees it from Marxist-Leninist positions, and that is why it gives all-out support and backing to the just struggles of the freedom-loving peoples against US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and the other imperialist powers, against neo-colonialism, because these struggles assist the common cause of the destruction of imperialism, the capitalist system and the triumph of socialism in each country and on a world scale.

Therefore, when we draw the conclusion that the revolution is a question put forward for solution, that it is on the agenda, we have in mind not only the socialist revolution, but also the democratic anti-imperialist revolution.

The level of maturity of the revolutionary situation, the character and the development of the revolution cannot be the same for all countries. These things depend on the concrete historical conditions of each individual country, the stage of its economic and social development, the ratio of classes, the situation and the level of organization of the proletariat and the oppressed masses, the scale of the interference of foreign powers in the different countries, etc. Each country and people has many specific problems of the revolution, which are very complicated.

At present, there is a great deal of talk about the situation in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the carrying out of the revolution there. The Chinese leaders see the question of the revolution and the independence and national liberation of these countries in a global way, as if it can be solved by means of the unity of the entire «third world», i.e., of states, classes, governments, etc., ignoring the concrete situations and problems of each individual country and region. This metaphysical view

shows that the Chinese leaders are, in fact, against the revolution and the liberation of the peoples of Africa, Asia, Latin America, that they are for the maintenance of the status quo, for the preservation of the imperialist and neo-colonialist domination in these countries.

We, too, speak about the question of the liberation of the African, Asian, Latin-American, Arab and other peoples. These peoples have many common problems which they must solve, but each of them also has very complicated specific problems.

The general and common task of these peoples is the liquidation of any foreign yoke, imperialist, colonial and neo-colonial, and the oppression by the local bourgeoisie. These peoples in Africa, Latin America, Asia, and elsewhere are seething with anger and hatred against the foreign yoke, as well as against the yoke of the local bourgeois or landowner-bourgeois ruling cliques, sold out to the US imperialists, the Soviet social-imperialists, or the other imperialists. These peoples have now awakened and can no longer tolerate the plunder of their riches, their sweat and blood, can no longer reconcile themselves to the economic, social and cultural backwardness in which they live.

Arising from the struggle against US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, the main enemies of the revolution and the national and social liberation of the peoples, the struggle against the bourgeoisie and reaction, the peoples have many common interests, many common problems, and on this basis they must unite with one another.

The fight against Israel — the most bloodthirsty tool of US imperialism — which has become a great stumbling block to the advance of the Arab peoples, is a common problem for all these peoples. In practice, however, not

all the Arab states are of one mind about the struggle they should wage jointly against Israel and about the character this struggle against their common enemy should have. Frequently, some of them see this struggle from a narrow nationalist angle. We cannot agree with such a stand. We stick to our stand that Israel must withdraw to its own lair and renounce its chauvinist, provocative, offensive and aggressive attitudes and actions against the Arab states. We demand that Israel give up the territories of the Arabs, that the Palestinians gain all their national rights, but we can never accept that the Israeli people should be wiped out.

The efforts of the peoples of the Arab countries for complete liberation from the clutches of imperialism and social-imperialism, for the strengthening of their freedom and sovereignty, are likewise the common problems of all these peoples.

However, each of the Arab peoples has its own characteristics, has specific problems, which are different from those of the others, and which arise from its socio-economic development, its cultural level, its state organization, the level of freedom and sovereignty achieved, the unification of clans and tribes in many of them, etc. To lump all these separate elements together and to demand that the question of freedom, independence, democracy and socialism must be solved for all these countries in the same manner and at the same time, is an impossibility.

In those Arab countries in which the interests of the bourgeoisie have been greatest, the various imperialists have invested considerable sums for the exploitation of natural assets and the peoples. To achieve this, certain working conditions had to be created, both for the colonizers and the colonized. Wherever the natural assets have been most plentiful and the interests of the colonizers

greatest, there the exploitation of the people and their wealth also have been more intensive. Naturally, the exploitation of assets has also brought about a certain development, but this cannot be considered as an overall, harmonious development of the economy of this or that country. The colonizers financed and assisted the chieftains of the principal tribes, who sold their souls and the riches of the peoples to the imperialist occupiers. In return they were given a small percentage from the colossal profits made by the colonizers.

Depending on the circumstances and the power of the state which has enslaved them, with these profits and the aid of their foreign patrons, the tribal chiefs created some sort of allegedly independent state, with the support and under the control of the colonizing country. In this way, with the aid of the colonizers, the tribal chiefs were turned into the wealthy bourgeois stratum of sheiks, who sold their territories, together with their peoples, for next to nothing, putting the peoples under a double bondage, that of the foreign colonizers and their own. Thus, the strata of the big bourgeoisie, the big landowners, mediaeval kings, on the one hand, and the slaves, the proletariat working on the foreign concessions, on the other, were created and confronted one another in the Arab countries. With the money and profits the foreign exploiters granted them, the upper strata adopted the mode of living of the European and American bourgeoisie. Their sons even attended the colonizers' schools, where they acquired some western culture. They passed themselves off as the representatives of their people's culture, but in fact, they were trained to keep the working masses in bondage and to allow the colonizers to continue the ruthless exploitation of the latter.

That Arab state which had greater wealth, developed more rapidly, another which was not so wealthy, dev-

eloped more slowly, while the state which was poor, remained at a very low level of development.

Having an organization suitable for the imposition of radical oppression, and also having the armed forces in their hands, colonialism, the state power of feudal monarchs and the big landowning bourgeoisie nipped in the bud any attempt at revolt, any claim, even for some very limited economic rights, let alone for political demands and the revolution.

In the development of the Arab states at the present day, they are not all faced with solving the same problems. The King of Saudi Arabia, for instance, has different problems, and views the economic, political, organizational and military questions differently from the emirs of the Persian Gulf who see these questions from quite another angle and over a different range. Similarly, Iraq, Syria, Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, Mauritania, etc., all see their own problems from different points of view.

Therefore, when we speak of the Arab peoples, we arrive at the conclusion that, though they have many common interests, their problems are not identical and cannot be solved in the same way in one country as in another. Similarly, we cannot say that an alliance and a single opinion about the solution of common problems exist among these countries. The problems are different for each Arab state, not only because of the differing stands of the governments of one or the other country, but also because of the attitudes of the colonial and neo-colonial states which still continue to make the law in most of them.

What has been said about the Arab peoples also applies to the peoples of the African continent. Africa is a mosaic of peoples with an ancient culture. Each African

people has its own culture, customs, way of life, which, with some variations, are at a very backward stage, for well-known reasons. The awakening of the bulk of these peoples has only recently begun. *De jure*, the African peoples, in general, have won their freedom and independence. But there can be no talk of genuine freedom and independence, since most of them are still in a colonial or neo-colonial state. Many of these countries are governed by the chieftains of the old tribes who have seized power and rely on the old colonialists, or the US imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists. The methods of government in these states at this stage are not and cannot be other than a marked survival of colonialism. The imperialists are ruling most of the African countries again through their concerns, their capital invested in industry, banks, etc. The overwhelming bulk of the wealth of these countries continues to flow to the metropolises.

Some of the African countries have fought for that freedom and independence they enjoy today, while the others have had it granted without fighting. During their colonial rule in Africa, the British, French and other colonizers oppressed the peoples but they also created a local bourgeoisie, more or less educated in the Occidental manner. The leading figures today have also emerged from this bourgeoisie. Among them there are many anti-imperialist elements, fighters for the independence of their own countries, but the majority either remain loyal to the old colonizers, in order to preserve the close relations with them even after the formal abolition of colonialism, or have entered into economic and political dependence on the US imperialists or the Soviet social-imperialists.

The colonizers did not make large investments in the past. This was the case, for instance, with Libya, Tunisia, Egypt, etc. However, the colonizers drained the wealth of all these countries, seized large tracts of land, and dev-

eloped a proletariat, by no means small in number, in some special branches of industry, such as in the extraction and processing of raw materials. They also drew large numbers of workers to the metropolises, such as to France, for instance, but also to Britain, as a cheap labour force which worked in the colonizers' mines and factories.

In the other parts of Africa, especially in Black Africa, industrial development remained more backward. All the countries of this region were divided up, especially between France, Britain, Belgium and Portugal. Great underground riches, like diamonds, iron, copper, gold, tin, etc., were discovered there long ago, and industry to mine and process minerals has been set up there.

In many African countries, large, typically colonial cities were built, where the colonizers lived a fabulous life. Now, on the one hand, the local big bourgeoisie and its wealth is growing and developing there, while on the other hand, the impoverishment of the broad masses of working people is increasing still more. In these countries a certain degree of cultural development has been achieved, but it has more of a European character. The local culture has not developed. It has generally remained at the stage reached by the tribes and is not represented outside them, in the centres with towering sky-scrapers. This has come about because, outside the large centres, where the colonizers lived, stark misery and extreme poverty existed, hunger, disease, ignorance and ruthless exploitation of the people, in the full meaning of the term, reigned supreme.

The African population remained culturally and economically undeveloped and continuously diminished in numbers, declining because of colonial wars, the savage racial persecution, and the traffic in African negroes, who were sent to the metropolises, the United States of

America, and other countries to work like animals in the plantations of cotton and other crops, as well as in the heaviest jobs in industry and construction.

For these reasons, the African peoples still have a great struggle ahead of them. This is and will be a very complicated struggle, differing from one country to another, because of the state of their economic, cultural and educational development, the degree of their political awakening, the great influence which the different religions, such as the Christian and Moslem religions, the old pagan beliefs, etc., exert on the masses of these peoples. This struggle becomes still more difficult since many of these countries are actually under the domination of neo-colonialism combined with that of local bourgeois-capitalist cliques. The law there is made by those powerful capitalist and imperialist states which subsidize or control the ruling cliques, which they set up and remove whenever the interests of the neo-colonialists require or when the balance of these interests is upset.

The policy pursued by the big landowners, the reactionary bourgeoisie, the imperialists and the neo-colonialists is intended to keep the African peoples in permanent bondage, in ignorance, to hinder their social, political and ideological development, and to obstruct their struggle to gain these rights. At present we see that those same imperialists who used to lord it over these peoples in the past, as well as other new imperialists, are trying to penetrate into the African continent, by meddling in every way in the internal affairs of the peoples. As a result of this, the contradictions among imperialists, between the peoples and the bourgeois-capitalist leaderships of most of these countries, and between the peoples and the new colonizers, are becoming more and more severe every day.

These contradictions must be utilized by the peoples,

both to deepen them and to benefit from them. But this can be achieved only through resolute struggle by the proletariat, the poor peasantry, by all the oppressed and the slaves, against imperialism and neo-colonialism, against the local big bourgeoisie, the big landowners and their whole establishment. A special role in this struggle devolves upon progressives and democrats, the revolutionary youth and patriotic intellectuals, who aspire to see their own countries advancing free and independent on the path of development and progress. Only through continuous and organized struggle will life be made difficult for the local and foreign oppressors and exploiters and government by them impossible. This situation will be prepared in the specific circumstances of each African state.

British and US imperialism have not given to the peoples of Africa any freedom. Everybody can see what is happening in South Africa, for instance. The white racists, the British capitalists, the exploiters, are ruling there, savagely oppressing the coloured peoples of that state, where the law of the jungle prevails. Many other countries of Africa are dominated by the concerns and capital of the United States of America, Britain, France, Belgium, and other old colonialists and imperialists, who have become somewhat weaker, but who still hold the keys to the economies of these countries.

The peoples of Asia, too, have traversed a road full of suffering and hardship, ruthless imperialist oppression and exploitation. On the eve of the Second World War, nine tenths of the population of this continent, Soviet Asia excluded, was in a state of colonial and semi-colonial oppression and exploitation by the imperialist powers of Europe, Japan and the United States of America. Great Britain alone, had colonies totalling 5 million

635 thousand square kilometres of territory with more than 420 million inhabitants in Asia. The colonial oppression and exploitation of the overwhelming majority of the countries of Asia had left them in a state of marked socio-economic and cultural backwardness and utter poverty. They served only as sources to supply the imperialist metropolises with raw materials such as oil, coal, chromium, manganese, magnesium, tin, rubber, etc.

After the war, the colonial order was shattered in Asia, too. Separate national states were set up in the colonial countries. Most of these countries won this victory through bloody war waged by the popular masses against the colonialists and the Japanese invaders.

The liberation war of the Chinese people, which led to the liberation of China from Japanese imperialist rule, the routing of the reactionary forces of Chiang Kaishek and the triumph of the democratic revolution, was of special importance for the collapse of colonialism in Asia. For a time, this victory in such a large country as China exerted an extensive influence on the liberation struggle of the Asian peoples and the peoples of other countries dominated by, or dependent on, the imperialist powers. But this influence gradually declined, because of the line followed by the Chinese leadership after the founding of the People's Republic of China.

The Chinese leadership proclaimed that China had set out on the road of socialist development. The revolutionaries and the freedom-loving peoples of the world, who wanted and expected China to become a powerful bastion of socialism and world revolution, ardently welcomed this proclamation. But their desires and hopes were not being fulfilled. Hard though it was for people to believe, the facts and the very troubled and confused situation which prevailed in China showed that it was not marching on the socialist road.

Meanwhile, the struggle of the Asian peoples had not ended with the destruction of colonialism. While being obliged to recognize the independence of the former colonial countries, the British, French, Dutch and other colonialists wanted to preserve their economic and political positions in these countries in order to continue their domination and exploitation in other, neo-colonialist forms. The penetration of the United States of America into Asia, especially the Far East, Southeast Asia and the islands of the Pacific, made the situation particularly serious. This region had and still has great economic and military-strategic importance for American imperialism. It established big military bases and deployed powerful fleets there. Parallel with this, US capital got the economies of the countries of this area firmly into its blood-stained clutches. Meanwhile the US imperialists undertook large-scale military operations, diversionist and espionage activities to put down the national liberation movements of the Asian countries. They succeeded in dividing Korea and Vietnam in two, setting up reactionary, puppet regimes in the southern parts of both these countries. Pro-imperialist landowner-bourgeois regimes were established in many former colonial and semi-colonial countries of Asia. In this way, the mediaeval slavery, the savage rule of maharajas, kings, sheiks, samurais, and «modernized» capitalist gentlemen was preserved there. These regimes sold their countries to the imperialists again, especially to US imperialism, thus immensely hindering the socio-economic and cultural development of these countries.

Under these conditions, the peoples of Asia, who were again languishing under the heavy imperialist and landowner-bourgeois yoke, could not lay down their arms, but had to continue their fight for liberation to get rid of this yoke. Generally, this struggle was led by the

communist parties. Wherever these parties had succeeded in establishing sound links with the masses, making them conscious of the liberation aims of the war, and mobilizing and organizing them in revolutionary armed struggle, positive results were reached. The historic victory which the peoples of Indochina, especially the Vietnamese people, won over the US imperialists and their local landowner-bourgeois stooges, showed the entire world that imperialism, even a superpower like the United States of America, with all its mighty economic and military potential, with all the modern means of war at its disposal, which it uses to put down the liberation movements, is unable to subjugate peoples and countries, whether big or small, when they are determined to make any sacrifice and fight selflessly to the finish for their freedom and independence.

Liberation armed struggles have been waged and are still going on in many other countries of Asia, like Burma, Malaysia, the Philippines, Indonesia and elsewhere. Had it not been for the anti-Marxist and chauvinist interference and stands of the Chinese leadership, which have brought about splits and disorientation among the revolutionary forces and the communist parties leading these forces, these struggles would certainly have scored greater successes and victories. On the one hand, the Chinese leaders proclaimed their support for the liberation wars in these countries, while on the other hand, they supported the reactionary regimes, welcomed and farewelled the chiefs of these regimes with paeans of praise and a thousand honours. They have always followed the strategy and tactic of subordinating the liberation movements of the Asian countries to their pragmatic policy and hegemonic interests. They have always brought pressure to bear upon the revolutionary forces and their leadership in order to impose this policy on

them. They have never been really concerned about the question of peoples' liberation and the revolution in the countries of Asia, but only about the realization of their chauvinist ambitions. They have not helped these peoples but have hindered them.

The question of the revolution and the liberation struggle in Asia has never demanded solution so forcibly and imperatively as it does now, it has never been more complicated and difficult to solve.

This complication and these difficulties have resulted mainly from the aims and activities of the American imperialists, as well as from the anti-Marxist, anti-popular, hegemonic and expansionist aims and activities of the Soviet and Chinese revisionists and social-imperialists.

The United States of America is aiming and striving with might and main to preserve and strengthen its strategic, economic and military positions in Asia, for it considers these positions of vital importance to its imperialist interests.

The Soviet Union, too, is aiming and striving by all means and with all forces to expand the positions it has already occupied in Asia.

China, on its part, has openly displayed its pretension to become the ruler of Asian countries, by forming alliances, to this end, with the United States of America, and especially with Japan, and directly opposing the Soviet Union.

Japan, also, has the ambition to dominate Asia, the old ambition of Japanese imperialism.

That is why the Soviet Union is so greatly afraid of the Sino-Japanese alliance and is opposing it so strongly. But neither does American imperialism want this alliance to become so solid that it goes beyond the limits which might infringe American interests although it encouraged and gave its «blessing» to the signing of the treaty be-

tween China and Japan, from the stand-point that this treaty might contain the Soviet expansion which is to the detriment of American domination.

India, which is a big country, also, has ambitions of becoming a great power with the atomic bomb and great weight in Asia, of playing a special role, in particular concerning the strategic position it has at the nodal point of the expansionist interests of the two imperialist super-powers, American and Soviet, in the Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf and on its northern and eastern borders.

British imperialism has not given up its aim of domination in the Asian countries, either. And certain other capitalist-imperialist states also have similar aims.

That is why Asia has become one of the areas of the fiercest inter-imperialist rivalries today, and consequently, many dangerous hotbeds of world conflagrations, for which the peoples will pay the price, have been created there.

In order to quell the revolutions and the liberation struggle in the countries of Asia and open the way to the realization of their hegemonic and expansionist plans, the Soviet and Chinese revisionists, in feverish competition with each other, have been and are engaged in a very filthy job of splitting and destroying the ranks of the communist parties and the revolutionary and freedom-loving forces of these countries. This activity was one of the main causes of the catastrophe suffered by the Communist Party of Indonesia, and of the splitting and destruction of the Communist Party of India, etc. They advocate the alliance and unity of the proletariat and the broad popular masses with the local reactionary bourgeoisie, while each of them is trying to win the friendship of this ruling bourgeoisie for its own ends.

The interference of the Soviet and Chinese social-imperialists in the various countries of Asia from their

hegemonic and expansionist positions and ambitions has faced the liberation movements of these peoples with great dangers and has even put the victories of the liberation war in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos directly in jeopardy.

The revolutionary and freedom-loving forces of the Asian countries, which are led by the Marxist-Leninist communist parties, have to face up to and eliminate both the danger from local reaction, which is armed by its imperialist patrons, and the dangers from the splitting and disruptive activities, and the hegemonic and expansionist plans of the Soviet and Chinese revisionists. They also have to free themselves from a series of old reactionary, mystical, Buddhist, Brahmanic and other religious ideas and concepts, which hold back the liberation movement. They also have to prevent «new» reactionary ideas and concepts from striking root, such as the revisionist ideas of Khrushchevism, Maoism, and other just as reactionary theories, which disorientate and deceive the masses, deprive them of their militant class spirit, and lead them into wrong and hopeless paths.

The liberation struggle ahead of the peoples of Asia is truly difficult and has many obstacles indeed, but there never has been and never will be an easy liberation struggle or revolution, without great difficulties and obstacles that must be overcome, which do not require bloodshed and many sacrifices to achieve ultimate victory.

The countries of Latin America, in general, have a higher level of capitalist development than the countries of Africa and Asia. But the degree of dependence of the Latin-American countries on foreign capital is not lower than that of the overwhelming majority of African and Asian countries.

Unlike the African and Asian countries, most of the

countries in Latin America proclaimed themselves independent states much earlier, since the first half of the 19th century, as a result of the liberation struggles of the peoples of that continent against the Spanish and Portuguese colonizers. Had these countries not fallen under another yoke, the semi-colonial yoke of British, French, German, American and other foreign capital, right after they shook off the Spanish or Portuguese colonial yoke, they would have made much greater progress. Up to the beginning of this century the British colonialists were the masters of the situation on this continent. They plundered colossal amounts of raw materials from these countries, built ports, railways, power stations in the exclusive service of their concessionary companies, and traded there industrial goods produced in Britain.

This situation changed, but not in favour of the Latin-American peoples, with the penetration of Latin America by the United States of America at the stage of its imperialist development. The imperialism of the United States of America used the slogan «America for Americans», embodied in the «Monroe doctrine»,⁽¹³⁾ in order to establish its undivided domination over the whole Western hemisphere. The economic penetration of the United States of America into this hemisphere was carried out both by means of military force and political blackmail and by dollar diplomacy, by means of the stick

13 It was proclaimed by the American president, James Monroe, in his December 2, 1823 State of the Union message. This doctrine of an expansionist character was intended to cover up the plans of the United States to submit the Latin-American countries to North-American rule.

Imperialism did not renounce this policy after the Second World War, either. In the spirit of this doctrine it has carried out tens of open and disguised interventions: 11 times in Panama, 10 times in Nicaragua, 9 times in the Dominican Republic, 7 times in Honduras, 2 times in Guatemala, etc.

and the carrot. Thus in 1930, investments of American and British capital in Latin America were equal, whereas after the Second World War, the United States of America became the real master of the economy of this region of the globe. Its big monopolies took control of the key branches of the economy in Latin America. The countries of that continent became part of the «invisible» empire of American imperialism, which began to make the law in all of them, to appoint and dismiss the heads of state and the governments, to dictate their internal and external economic and military policies.

The monopoly companies of the United States of America drew fabulous profits from the exploitation of the rich natural resources and the toil, sweat and blood of the Latin-American peoples: for each dollar invested in the various countries of this continent they took 4-5 dollars profit. This situation still prevails to this day.

Although the capital investments by the imperialist states in Latin America led to the setting up of some modern industry, particularly the extracting industry as well as light and food-processing industry, these investments have been a very great hindrance to the general economic development of the Latin-American countries. The foreign monopolies and the neo-colonialist policy of the imperialist states have given the economic development of these countries a distorted, one-sided form, a mono-cultural character, turning them simply into specialized suppliers of raw materials: Venezuela — oil, Bolivia — tin, Chile — copper, Brazil and Colombia — coffee, Cuba, Haiti and the Dominican Republic — sugar, Uruguay and Argentina — livestock products, Ecuador — bananas, and so on.

This one-sided character made the economy of these countries utterly unstable, utterly incapable of rapid and all-round development, completely at the mercy of the

changes and fluctuation of prices on the capitalist world market. Any decline in production and any manifestation of economic crisis in the United States of America and the other capitalist countries was bound to be reflected negatively, indeed even more drastically, in the economies of the countries of Latin America, too.

After the Second World War, the imperialist metropolises began to make direct large-scale investments in the various branches of industry, mining, farming, to buy up national enterprises, etc. They extended their domination over whole sectors of production, and stepped up the plunder of the countries of Latin America to the maximum. At the same time, they encouraged provision of loans and financing at high interest rates, thus binding these countries even more tightly to foreign domination and to the domination of the United States of America, first of all. Brazil alone has debts to the foreign banks amounting to almost 40 billion dollars and Mexico nearly 30 billion dollars. (14)

Capitalist development in Latin America has remained generally backward also because there are still many survivals of the latifundia which have not completely lost their feudal character, that is why in some of the Latin-American countries there is very marked backwardness, as in those of Asia and Africa. In the countries of Latin America an oligarchy, a very powerful monopoly big bourgeoisie, dependent on imperialist economic policy and direct imperialist interference, has been created, which together with the big landowners has state power in its hands and, always with the support of American imperialism and together with it, ruthlessly

14 According to data published in 1984. Brazil's foreign debt has risen to 100 billion dollars, making it the most indebted country in the world.

Mexico had a foreign debt of 85 billion dollars in 1983.

oppresses and exploits the working class, the peasantry and the other strata of working people who live in abject poverty.

This development has also created quite a large industrial proletariat which, together with the agricultural proletariat and the building and services workers, makes up nearly half the population, unlike Africa and Asia where, in most countries, the working class is very small.

Besides this, in Latin America the peasantry and the working class, which has emerged from its ranks, have a rich militant revolutionary tradition gained in the ceaseless struggles for freedom, land, work and bread, a tradition which has been developed further in the battles against the local oligarchy and foreign monopolies, against American imperialism. The peoples of Latin America rank among the peoples who have fought and shed their blood the most against their internal and external oppressors and exploiters. In these battles they have had more than a few victories, and not minor ones either, but the complete victory of democratic freedoms, the wiping out of exploitation, securing national independence and sovereignty, has still not been won in any Latin-American country. The Latin-American peoples cherished many hopes, had many illusions about the victory of the Cuban people, which became an inspiration and encouragement to them in their struggle to shake off the yoke of the local capitalist and landowner rulers and American imperialists. However, these hopes and this inspiration soon faded when they saw that Castriote Cuba was not developing on the road of socialism but on that of revisionist-type capitalism, and faded even more quickly when Cuba became the vassal and mercenary of Soviet social-imperialism.

In Latin America today, as on all continents, the situation is complicated.

In most of these countries the situation is revolution-

ary and puts the revolution for the overthrow of the bourgeois-landowner order and the liquidation of imperialist dependence on the order of the day. Of course, these revolutions cannot have the same character, the same process of development and the same solution everywhere, for the known reasons of the particular conditions and problems of each country or group of countries, the different levels of their socio-economic development, their dependence on imperialism or social-imperialism, the more or less moderate, or more or less fascist, bourgeois regimes, etc. But one thing is obviously essential — the interlinking, more closely than in many countries of Africa and Asia, of the anti-imperialist, democratic and socialist tasks of the revolution.

Latin America also has many advantages in regard to the preparation of the subjective factor of the revolution, because of the relatively high level of consciousness and readiness of the broad popular masses to fight against the internal and foreign oppression and exploitation, for freedom, democracy and socialism. However, it is not just the imperialists, especially the Americans, together with local reaction, but also the local revisionists and the other opportunist stooges of capitalism, as well as the Soviet and Chinese revisionists, who are obstructing, confusing, and fighting with all their strength against the full preparation of this factor.

Sticking to its policy of keeping Latin America as its exclusive domain, from which it extracts colossal superprofits, American imperialism is manoeuvring with all its means — military force, secret agents, demagoguery and deception, to prevent any other imperialism from predominating there, to ensure that the revolution will not break out and triumph in any of these countries. Thus it wants to preserve both the total dependence of the Latin-American countries on the United States of

America and the bourgeois-landowner order in these countries.

An important weapon in the hands of the United States of America to this end is the so-called Organization of American States, which is under the command of the president, the Pentagon and the State Department of the United States. The Constitution of this organization gives the United States the right to intervene in any way and with any means, even military means, to maintain the status quo, both internal and external, of the countries of Latin America.

Meanwhile, the big American monopolies have perfected their method of exploitation in these countries by organizing the multinational monopoly companies which have their centres in and are controlled by the United States of America, and by making large use of state capitalism, by means of which they also secure their control over the local governments and state apparatus in general.

But these and many other means the United States of America employs do not solve the problems arising from the grave economic and political crisis which has the Latin-American countries also in its grip.

Now that the local capitalists and landowners cannot exist without being dependent on, or having the support of American imperialism, the idea of the revolution, as the only and indispensable means to gain national and social liberation, is becoming ever more deeply and widely implanted in the consciousness of the proletariat, the working peasantry, the progressive intelligentsia, and the masses of the youth of these countries.

In order to avert the revolutions, the American imperialists and the local capitalists resort to two main methods. One is to establish military-fascist regimes through a «pronunciamento militar» (military putsch)

when they see that their positions are more immediately threatened. This is what they did in Brazil, Chile, Uruguay, Bolivia and elsewhere. The other method is to organize democratic-bourgeois regimes with marked limitations and large gaps in fundamental freedoms, as in Venezuela, Mexico, or as they are doing now in Brazil, trying, in this manner, to ease the revolutionary tensions and give the impression that the bourgeoisie of these countries and, to an even greater extent, the administration of the United States of America and its president are allegedly concerned about «human rights».

However, such means and manoeuvres cannot solve the problems of the crisis, cannot avert revolutionary situations, cannot wipe the revolution off the agenda.

The proletariat and all the revolutionary forces in the Latin-American countries are faced with very important revolutionary tasks. In order to perform such tasks, that is, to carry out the revolution, to win their complete national independence, to establish democratic freedoms and socialism, they have to fight in many directions against the local bourgeois and latifundist oligarchy, against US imperialism, as well as against various lackeys of capital, imperialism and social-imperialism, such as the pro-Soviet and Castroite revisionists, the pro-Chinese revisionists, the Trotskyites, etc. They must not only cope with the diversionist and splitting activity of various shades of opportunists and revisionists, but also free themselves from petty-bourgeois influences such as expressed by a number of putschist, foquist, adventurist concepts and practices which have become a kind of tradition, but which have nothing in common with the true revolution, and on the contrary, cause it great damage. However, this question requires careful handling.

In regard to the militant tradition of the peoples of Latin America the positive, revolutionary aspect is pre-

dominant. It constitutes a very important factor that must be used to the best advantage and as widely as possible in the preparation and development of the revolution while giving the traditions a new content, free from the negative pistolero and foquist elements.

The Marxist-Leninist parties of the working class will play a decisive role in carrying out these great tasks. Now, not only have such parties been created in almost every country of Latin America, but most of them have taken important steps forward in the work of preparing the proletariat and the masses of the people for revolution. In irreconcilable struggle against the revisionists and other opportunists, against all the lackeys of the bourgeoisie and imperialism, against Castroite, Khrushchevite, Trotskyite, «three worlds», and other such views and practices, they have worked out a correct political line and accumulated sufficient experience in the struggle to put this line into practice, becoming the bearers of all the revolutionary tradition of the past, in order to use it and develop it further to the advantage of the workers' and liberation movement, the preparation and raising of the masses in revolution.

The revolutionary situations existing today make it essential for these parties to maintain the closest possible contacts and consult with one another as frequently as possible, to be able to gain the maximum benefits from one another's experience and co-ordinate their stands and actions on the common problems of the struggle against the reactionary bourgeoisie and imperialism, against Soviet, Chinese and other brands of modern revisionism, and on all the problems of the revolution.

Now that the peoples have awakened and refuse to live any longer under the imperialist and colonial yoke, now that they are demanding freedom, independence, development and progress, and are seething with anger

against foreign and internal oppressors, now that Africa, Latin America and Asia have become a boiling cauldron, the old and new colonialists are finding it difficult, if not impossible, to dominate and exploit the peoples of these countries by means of the previous methods and forms. They are quite unable to do without their plunder and exploitation of the wealth, the toil and the blood of these peoples.

That is why all these efforts are being made to find new methods and forms of deception, plunder and exploitation, to dispense some alms, which, again, do not benefit the masses, but the bourgeois-landowner ruling classes.

Meanwhile the question has been made even more complicated, because Soviet social-imperialism long ago began to penetrate and entrench itself more and more deeply in the former colonies and semi-colonies, and because social-imperialist China has begun to make feverish efforts to get in there, too.

The revisionist Soviet Union carries out its expansionist interference under the guise of its allegedly Leninist policy of aid for the peoples' liberation struggle, posing as the natural ally of these countries and peoples. As a means to penetrate into Africa and elsewhere, the Soviet revisionists employ and spread slogans of a socialist colour in order to deceive the peoples who aspire to liberate themselves, to liquidate oppression and exploitation, and who know that the only road to complete national and social liberation is socialism.

The Soviet Union also involves its allies, or better, its satellites, in its interference. We are seeing this concretely in Africa, where the Soviet social-imperialists and their Cuban mercenaries are intervening on the pretext that they are assisting the revolution. This is a lie. Their intervention is nothing but a colonialist action

aimed at capturing markets and subjugating peoples.

The intervention of the Soviet Union and its Cuban mercenaries in Angola is of this nature. They have never had the slightest intention of assisting the Angolan revolution, but their aim was and is to get their claws into that African country which had won a certain independence after the expulsion of the Portuguese colonialists. The Cuban mercenaries are the colonial army dispatched by the Soviet Union to capture markets and strategic positions in the countries of Black Africa, and to go on from Angola to other states, to enable the Soviet social-imperialists, too, to create a modern colonial empire.

Under the cloak of aid for peoples' liberation the Soviet Union and its mercenary, Cuba, are intervening in other countries with armies equipped with artillery and machine-guns, allegedly to build socialism, which does not exist in either the Soviet Union or Cuba. These two bourgeois-revisionist states intervened in Angola in order to help a capitalist clique seize power, contrary to the aims of the Angolan people who had fought to win their freedom from the Portuguese colonialists. Agostinho Neto is playing the game of the Soviets. In the struggle against the other faction, in order to seize power for himself, he called in the Soviets to help him. The struggle between the two opposing Angolan clans did not have anything of a people's revolutionary character. The fight between them was a struggle of cliques for power. Each of them was supported by different imperialist states. Agostinho Neto emerged the winner from this contest, while socialism did not triumph in Angola. On the contrary, following the intervention from abroad, Soviet neo-colonialism has been established there.

Social-imperialist China, too, is making great efforts to penetrate into the former colonial and semi-colonial countries.

An example of how China intervenes is provided by Zaire, a country ruled by the clique around Mobutu, the wealthiest and most bloodthirsty clique on the African continent. In the fighting which flared up in Zaire recently, the Moroccans of the Sherifian Kingdom of Morocco, the French air force, and China, too, all rushed to the aid of Mobutu, the murderer of Patrice Lumumba. The assistance given by the French is understandable, because with their intervention they were defending their concessions and concerns in Katanga, and at the same time, protecting their men, as well as Mobutu and his clique. But what do the Chinese revisionists want in Katanga? Whom are they assisting there? Are they helping the people of Zaire who are being suppressed by Mobutu and his clique and by the French, Belgian, US and other concession holders? Or are not they, too, assisting the bloodthirsty Mobutu clique? The fact is that the Chinese revisionist leadership is assisting this clique not indirectly, but quite openly. To make this assistance more concrete and more demonstrative, it sent its foreign minister, Huang Hua there, as well as military experts and military and economic aid. Thus, it acted in an anti-Marxist, anti-revolutionary way. China's interference has exactly the same features as that of King Hassan of Morocco and that of France.

The Chinese social-imperialists are interfering in the affairs not only of that country, but also of other peoples and countries of Africa and other continents, especially of those countries into which they are striving to penetrate in every way, in order to establish economic, political and strategic bases there.

Even the United States of America dare not assist Pinochet, the fascist hangman of Chile, so openly as China is doing. Indeed, the Americans do not assist the reactionary rulers of other countries in this way, even

although they have great interests at stake there. This does not mean that the US imperialists are renouncing their own interests. They do defend these interests, defend them very strongly, but in more subtle ways.

With the stand it is maintaining, the so-called socialist China is going against the interests and aspirations of the peoples, the communists, the revolutionary elements, against the aspirations of all the progressive people of Latin America.

China is taking under its protection the various dictators who are ruling the peoples and suppressing the efforts of revolutionaries, the proletariat and the Marxist-Leninist parties that are fighting for national and social liberation, with terror and any other means. With such stands, it has taken the road of counter-revolution. Under the guise of Marxism-Leninism it is trying to show that it is allegedly exporting the idea of the revolution to various countries, but in fact, China is exporting the idea of the counter-revolution. In this way it is helping US imperialism and the fascist cliques in power.

The imperialist or social-imperialist powers are striving to the same extent to prevent the African, Asian, or Latin-American peoples from developing their revolutionary struggle stage by stage, against the oppression and savage exploitation by their leaderships and the imperialists, who are ruling and sucking their blood in agreement with these leaderships.

The duty of revolutionaries, progressives, and patriots in the countries with a low level of socio-economic development and dependent on the imperialist and social-imperialist powers is to make the peoples conscious of this oppression and exploitation, to educate, mobilize and organize them and hurl them into the liberation struggle, always bearing in mind that it is the broad masses, the peoples, that carry out the revolution. To this end it is

necessary to make thorough analyses of the internal and external situation in each country, of its socio-economic development, the ratio of class forces, the antagonisms among classes, and the antagonisms between the people and the reactionary cliques in power, as well as between the people and the imperialist states. On this basis correct conclusions can be drawn about the step which must be taken and the tactics which must be employed. What is required from the revolutionary forces is intensive work, determination and wisdom, and first and foremost, thorough understanding of the fact that the liberation struggle in their countries can achieve true victory only by linking this struggle with the cause of the proletariat, the cause of socialism.

Therefore, the proletariat in each country must create its own revolutionary party, which must be capable of applying the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin faithfully, linking them closely with the conditions of each country, with the situation of each individual people. It is absolutely essential that each of these parties has a profound knowledge of the mentality of the masses and the economic, political, ideological and cultural development of its country, and does not act in a capricious and adventurist way, in a Blanquist way, but fights persistently to rally round itself the allies of the proletariat, the broad masses of the people.

The revolutionaries and the masses of the people need to prepare themselves persistently, bearing in mind the activities of the reactionary bourgeoisie and the big landowners in power, and the foreign oppressors, as well as the intrigues of neo-colonialists. These are important factors, which the revolutionary elements and the peoples must face up to with maturity, with sound organization and revolutionary tactics.

Naturally, not only are ties of co-operation, co-ordina-

tion and exchange of experience not excluded, but it is essential to establish them between the revolutionary forces and elements of various countries. This is made easier because they have many similar conditions, such as oppression and exploitation by neo-colonialism and the reactionary bourgeoisie, and a common culture, as well as the common goal of liberation from this oppression and exploitation. The conditions and interests they have in common impel the revolutionary and progressive elements of all these countries to hold consultations, to develop cooperation and co-ordination in their activities, with which they counter the actions of the enemies who oppress them.

Viewing the situation of the peoples languishing under neo-colonialist domination from the Marxist-Leninist stand-point, the task facing all genuine revolutionaries is to give the revolutionary and liberation struggle of these peoples unreserved support and backing, so that it advances consistently and the revolution builds up ceaselessly, to its complete victory.

**Genuine Revolutionaries Call on the Proletarians
and Peoples to Rise up for the New World, the
Socialist World**

As we explained in the foregoing, the general crisis of capitalism is growing ever deeper. As a result, the proletariat, the oppressed classes and peoples are refusing to endure the exploitation any longer, demanding a change in their lives, demanding the overthrow of the bourgeois order, the abolition of neo-colonialism and imperialism. But these aspirations can be realized only through the revolution. No victory can be achieved without clashing with and attacking the internal and external class enemies.

The genuine Marxist-Leninist parties of the working class, as the leaders of the revolution, make the proletariat, the toiling masses, and the peoples conscious and prepare them politically, ideologically and militarily for these clashes.

The Marxist-Leninist parties, all revolutionaries, however few in numbers, establish themselves among the people, organize the masses systematically, with great care and patience, convince them that they are a great force, that they are able to overthrow capital, to seize state power and wield it in the interest of the proletariat and the people. Such parties do not think that, being small, they cannot stand up to the coalition of the parties of the bourgeoisie and the opinion formed by them. The task of the revolutionaries is to prove to the broad masses of the people that this opinion created by the bourgeoisie is wrong, that it must be demolished and that the true revolutionary opinion, which represents a great transforming force, must be formed.

To carry out their mission successfully, the Marxist-Leninist parties consider that, first of all, they must have a revolutionary strategy and tactics, a correct political line, which must respond to the interests and aspirations of the broad popular masses, and the revolutionary solution to the problems and tasks which the struggle to destroy the bourgeois order and the foreign imperialist domination presents.

Marxism-Leninism is the only science which gives the revolutionary party of the working class the possibility to work out a correct political line, to define the strategic aim and tasks clearly, and apply revolutionary tactics and methods for their realization.

Enlightened by Marxism-Leninism and in conformity with the concrete socio-economic and political conditions

of the country and the international circumstances, the Marxist-Leninist party knows how to orientate itself and stand at the head of the masses at any time and at every stage of the revolution, be it a democratic, national liberation, or socialist revolution. A revolutionary strategy and a correct political line based on Marxism-Leninism, the revolutionary practice of the world proletariat and the class struggle of its own country, makes it possible to clearly define the strategic aim at the given stage, to determine who are the chief internal and external enemies against whom the main blow should be struck, who the internal and external allies of the proletariat are, etc.

The Marxist-Leninist parties have as their aim the overthrow of the capitalist order and the triumph of socialism, whereas, when the revolution in their country is confronted with tasks of a democratic and anti-imperialist character, they aim to develop it unceasingly, to raise it to a socialist revolution, to go over as quickly as possible to the fulfilment of socialist tasks.

Both the strategic aim of the Marxist-Leninist parties and the roads to achieve it are totally different from those of the false communist and workers' parties. The former cannot conceive of achieving this aim except by overturning the capitalist relations of production and destroying the old state apparatus, the whole bourgeois superstructure, to its foundations. They adhere to the teachings of Lenin who says,

*«The essence of the revolution is that the proletariat **destroys** the 'administrative apparatus' and the **entire** state apparatus, replacing it with a new apparatus comprised of the armed workers.»**

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 25, p. 577, Alb. ed.

The latter preach the preservation of the old state apparatus, though in words they claim that they stand for socialism. According to them, socialism can be established through reforms, through the parliamentary road, even by using the old state machine.

A number of so-called communist parties are now proving to be even more zealous than the declared bourgeois parties in their defence of the existing capitalist order. For instance, the revisionist party of Ibarruri-Carrillo brazenly defends the monarchic regime of Juan Carlos, at a time when some Spanish bourgeois parties are demanding its replacement with a republican regime. Likewise, the revisionist party of Berlinguer comes out as a fervent champion of the oppressive laws of the Italian capitalist state, which are aimed against democratic freedoms, at a time when various bourgeois parties are not doing this openly. The Chinese revisionists, for their part, instruct the parties which follow the Chinese line in the capitalist countries that they must fight together with the most militarist circles to strengthen the armies and the bourgeois apparatus of violence, allegedly to defend the homeland, but in reality to suppress the revolution, if it should break out.

In their aims to undermine the revolutionary and liberation movement and to perpetuate capitalism and imperialist domination, the bourgeoisie and its followers, especially the modern revisionists, are trying by all manner of means to confuse and split the revolutionary forces while erasing the distinction between the friends and the enemies of the revolution. Typical of this are the preachings of the Chinese revisionists who present the big monopoly bourgeoisie, the reactionary and fascist regimes, NATO and the European Common Market, and even American imperialism, as allies of the proletariat and the oppressed peoples.

As for the Marxist-Leninist parties, they consider that an absolutely essential condition for building a genuinely revolutionary strategy is the establishment of a clear-cut dividing line between the motive forces of the revolution and its enemies and a clear definition of the main internal and external enemy against whom, as Stalin pointed out, the main blow must be aimed, without underrating and overlooking the fight against the other enemies.

In our time, in the conditions of imperialism, the main internal enemy of the revolution, not only in the developed capitalist countries, but also in the oppressed and dependent countries, is the local big bourgeoisie which stands at the head of the capitalist order and fights with all its means, with violence and oppression, demagoguery and deceit, to preserve its domination and privileges, to smother and extinguish any movement of the working people which jeopardizes its state power and class interests in the slightest degree. On the other hand, in the actual conditions, the main external enemy of the revolution and the peoples is world imperialism, the imperialist superpowers, in particular. To advise and call on the proletariat and the oppressed peoples to rely on one superpower to fight the other, or to enter into alliance with the imperialist powers for the sake of allegedly defending national freedom and independence, as the Chinese revisionists advocate, is nothing but betrayal of the cause of the revolution.

The revisionists have made **the hegemonic role of the working class in revolution, which constitutes one of the fundamental questions of the revolutionary strategy,** their special target.

«The main thing in the doctrine of Marx,»
wrote Lenin, *«is the explanation of the world his-*

*toric role of the proletariat, as the creator of socialist society.»**

Lenin described the negation of the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary movement as the most vulgar expression of reformism.

Among the modern revisionists, some strive to prove that the working class is allegedly being deproletarianized and transformed into «co-manager» of enterprises, hence there is no longer a place for the proletarian revolution, no need for a social order different from the existing one. Others claim that not only the workers, but everybody engaged in work and cultural activities, all wage and salary earners are now proletarians, and that not only the working class, but also other classes and strata of the society are interested in socialism. Therefore, they conclude, the hegemonic role of the working class in the revolutionary movement today has lost its meaning. The Soviet revisionists do not deny the leading role of the working class in words, while they have liquidated it in practice, because they have deprived this class of any possibility to lead. But even in theory they eliminate this role, in as much as they defend the ill-famed theory of «the party and state of the entire people». The Chinese revisionists, as the pragmatists they are, sometimes put the peasantry, sometimes the army, sometimes the pupils and students, etc.. whichever suits the occasion, at the head of the «revolution».

The Party of Labour of Albania resolutely defends the Marxist-Leninist thesis that the working class constitutes the decisive force in the development of society, the leading force for the revolutionary transformation of the world, for the construction of socialist and communist society.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 18, p. 651, Alb. ed.

The working class remains the main productive force of society, the most advanced class, the class more interested than any other in national and social liberation, in socialism, and is the bearer of the finest traditions of revolutionary organization and struggle. It has the only scientific theory for the revolutionary transformation of society and its own militant Marxist-Leninist party which guide it towards this goal. Objectively history has charged it with the mission of leading the entire struggle for the transition from capitalism to communism.

The hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution is decisive for the solution of the fundamental question of the revolution, the question of political power, in its own favour and that of the masses of the people.

The new power may pass through different phases and may be given various names, in keeping with the concrete conditions in which the revolution is carried out and the various stages it may go through, but there can be no development of the revolution towards the triumph of socialism without the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Marxism-Leninism teaches us this, and the experience of all triumphant socialist revolutions also demonstrates it. Therefore, whatever the circumstances in which the revolution may be carried out, the Marxist-Leninist party never renounces its aim of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat.

All the revisionists of various hues and trends without exception, in one way or another, deny the need to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, because they are against the revolution, because they stand for the preservation and perpetuation of the capitalist order.

The proletariat with its Marxist-Leninist party goes into battle together with its allies. This, too, is one of the most important questions of the revolutionary strategy.

The natural and close ally of the proletariat is the poor peasantry, which is linked with it not just by the immediate strategic aim but also by the distant and ultimate strategic aim. Such allies are the poor strata of the urban working people too. The proletariat, together with the poor peasantry and the other oppressed and exploited working people, constitute the main motive forces of the revolution.

The urban petty-bourgeoisie also, which is constantly in the grip of big capital and under threat of total expropriation, can and should become an ally.

The proletariat also tries and struggles to make allies of other strata of the population, such as the progressive section of the intelligentsia, which is exploited by internal and foreign capital. The weight of the intelligentsia has increased in capitalist and revisionist countries. But despite all the changes its position, character and the role of its work have undergone, it does not and never can constitute a class in itself, and neither is it nor can it be merged with the working class, as various revisionists claim. Therefore, as Lenin has shown and history has proved, the intelligentsia cannot be an independent socio-political force. Its role and place in society are determined by its socio-economic position and ideological and political convictions. No matter how much this position and these convictions may change, the intelligentsia can never replace the working class in its role of leading the revolution. The task of the proletariat is to win the progressive section of the intelligentsia over to its side, to convince it of the inevitability of the collapse of the capitalist system and the triumph of socialism, and make it an ally in the revolution.

In the countries of Africa, Latin America, Asia, etc., with little socio-economic development and more dependent on foreign capital, and where the democratic and

anti-imperialist tasks of the revolution have special importance, the middle peasantry and that section of the bourgeoisie which is not linked with foreign capital and which aspires to an independent development of the country, can also be allies of the proletariat.

The uniting of this section of the bourgeoisie with the democratic and anti-imperialist revolution depends on the correct strategy and tactics of the proletariat, the skilful and intelligent manoeuvring of the revolutionary party of the working class. In this way, the proletariat with its party can convince not only the petty-bourgeoisie, but also this bourgeoisie, to place itself under the leadership of the proletariat and rise to abolish the foreign domination and liquidate the savage capitalist big bourgeoisie, a tool of imperialism — which oppresses and exploits the people, demoralizes them and corrupts their pure feelings, and centuries-old culture.

To win over the other classes and strata which are interested in achieving the strategic aim at a given stage of the revolution as its allies, the proletariat has to do battle with the big bourgeoisie and the other reactionaries, as over every other issue.

Foreseeing their defeat, the reactionary bourgeoisie and the big landowners make a thousand attempts and manoeuvres to draw the petty-bourgeoisie, the peasantry and the progressive intelligentsia to their side, and to prevent them from becoming allies of the proletariat. They even try to deceive the working class itself, so that the revolution will not break out and, if it does, to ensure that it will not be carried through to the end, but will become bogged down or make an about-turn.

For their part, the proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist party work for and have all the possibilities to achieve unity of their allies around themselves against the common enemies, such as the big bourgeoisie, the big land-

owners, the imperialists and social-imperialists, and to prevent the strata of the peasantry and the petty-bourgeoisie from becoming a reserve of big capital or the fascist dictatorship, as occurred in the time of Hitler in Germany, Mussolini in Italy, and Franco in the Spanish War.

The Marxist-Leninist party maintains a cautious and flexible attitude, especially towards its wavering, possible, or temporary allies, including the various strata of the middle bourgeoisie, which are linked by numerous threads, various interests, traditions and prejudices with the world of capital and imperialism. The proletariat and its vanguard, the Marxist-Leninist party, without ever budging from their principled positions, are interested in attracting such forces, too, in spite of their waverings and instability, to the side of the revolution or the liberation struggle, or at least in neutralizing them, so that they do not become a reserve of the enemy.

The laws of the revolution operate in the countries where the revisionists are in power also, as everywhere else. What is the position of the new bourgeoisie that is developing in the revisionist countries of Europe? It aspires to free itself from the all-round, savage oppression of the Soviet bourgeoisie, from Soviet social-imperialism, but the two sides have fundamental interests in common. The bourgeoisie of these countries could not exist apart from the Soviet bourgeoisie. And even if it were to detach itself from this savage social-imperialist big bourgeoisie, there is no doubt that it would soon come under the domination of the bourgeoisie of the developed capitalist states of Western Europe and US imperialism.

As well as this, in the revisionist countries which are being economically, politically and militarily integrated into the great Soviet social-imperialist state, other strata of the population, besides the proletariat, are dis-

contented because of the exploitation they are subjected to by the new bourgeoisie and the domination by Soviet social-imperialism. For this reason they hate both their own ruling bourgeoisie and Russian hegemonism and neo-colonialism. The proletariat of these countries needs to be awakened and made conscious of the historical necessity of coming out once again on the battlefield, of hurling itself into the fight to overthrow and rout the traitors in order to carry out the proletarian revolution again, to re-establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. It must create its new Marxist-Leninist parties and unite all the popular masses around itself. (15)

While adhering consistently to the principle that the decisive factor for the triumph of the revolution is the internal one, the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and the people of the country themselves, whereas the external factor is of an auxiliary and secondary nature, the Marxist-Leninist parties do not ignore or underrate in the least the external allies of the revolution. At the same time, they take a principled and flexible stand towards the external allies, just as they do towards the internal allies.

In accordance with the teachings of Lenin and Stalin and basing themselves on the existing conditions, they see the proletariat and its revolutionary movement in other countries, the revolutionary anti-imperialist movement of the oppressed peoples of the world and the genuinely socialist countries as the natural and reliable external allies of the revolutionary movement in each country.

In particular cases, circumstances can also be created in which a socialist country, or a people fighting imperialist or social-imperialist aggression, may find themselves

15 See Enver Hoxha. *Selected Works*, vol. 4, «8 Nëntori» Publishing House, Tirana 1982, pp. 397-429, Eng. ed.

on a common front even with various countries of the capitalist world which also are fighting the same enemy, as occurred in the period of the Second World War.

In such cases, it is of first-rate importance to ensure that the interests of the revolution are always kept in mind, are never forgotten, obscured or sacrificed for the sake of the common front or alliance with these temporary allies, to ensure that this front or alliance is not transformed into an aim in itself. It is especially important not to allow such allies to intervene to sabotage the revolution and to wrest the victory from it. The experience of the Communist Party of Albania in its stand towards the American and British allies in the years of the Anti-fascist National-Liberation War is significant. This stand was salutary for the fate of the revolution in Albania. (16)

The revolutionary strategy is indivisible from the revolutionary tactics employed by the Marxist-Leninist parties to achieve the aim and to fulfil the tasks of the revolution. While being part of strategy and in its service, tactics may change according to the ebb and flow of the revolutionary tide, the concrete circumstances and conditions, but always within the limits of the revolutionary strategy and Marxist-Leninist principles.

*«The task of tactical leadership,» says Stalin, «is to master all forms of struggle and organization of the proletariat and to ensure that they are used properly so as to achieve with the given relation of forces the maximum result necessary to prepare for strategic success.»**

16 See Enver Hoxha, *The Anglo-American Threat to Albania* (Memoirs), «8 Nëntori» Publishing House, Tirana 1982, Eng. ed.

* J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 6, p. 164, Alb. ed.

While adopting skilful tactics and forms of struggle to carry forward the cause of the revolution, the true Marxist-Leninist parties always loyally uphold revolutionary principles. They reject and combat any tendency to abandon principles for the sake of tactics, they are the most resolute opponents of any unprincipled pragmatic policy based on passing circumstances, which characterizes the entire activity of revisionists of all trends.

The revolution is always the deed of the masses led by the revolutionary vanguard. Therefore, the Marxist-Leninist party cannot fail to devote great attention to the revolutionary organization of the masses in appropriate forms, proceeding from the concrete conditions and circumstances, the traditions existing in each country, etc. Without organized links of the party with the masses it is idle even to talk of raising, preparing and mobilizing them in revolutionary struggle.

Precisely for this reason the Marxist-Leninist party attaches great importance to the creation of organizations of the masses under its leadership. Certainly, this is not a question which is solved easily, especially today, when many kinds of trade-union, co-operativist, cultural, scientific, youth, women's and other organizations exist in all the capitalist and revisionist countries. Most of these organizations are under the leadership and influence of the bourgeoisie, revisionists and the church.

However, as Lenin teaches us, the communists must get in and work wherever the masses are. Therefore they cannot fail to work also in the mass organizations led or influenced by the bourgeoisie, social-democrats, revisionists, etc. The Marxist-Leninists work in them to undermine the influence and leadership of the bourgeois and reformist parties, to spread the influence of the revolutionary party of the working class among the masses, to expose the fraudulent character of the programs and

activity of the chiefs of these organizations, and to give the activities of the masses an anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist, anti-revisionist political character. Through the revolutionary work they carry out in the ranks of the masses, revolutionary factions can also be formed within these organizations, indeed the possibilities may be created to take over the leadership of these organizations and to set them on a correct course.

But in any case the Marxist-Leninist party never gives up the aim of setting up revolutionary organizations of the masses under its leadership.

The most important organizations of the masses are the trade-unions. Generally speaking, in the capitalist and revisionist countries today, these organizations serve the bourgeoisie, revisionism, to keep the proletariat and all the working masses in bondage. In his time, Engels said that the trade-unions in Britain had been transformed from organizations which terrified the bourgeoisie into organizations which served capital. The trade-union organizations have bound the worker with a thousand threads, with a thousand coils of the chain of enslavement, so that when the isolated worker revolts, he can easily be suppressed. The opportunist trade-union leaders work so that the revolts of the workers of one or more enterprises, who go on strike or hold demonstrations, are kept under control and assume only an economic character. The worker aristocracy works very hard to manipulate things in this direction. In the capitalist countries, this aristocracy plays a major role in eroding, suppressing, and misleading the revolt of the masses and has long become a fire brigade to quell the flames of the revolution.

In all the capitalist countries today, the main bourgeois and revisionist parties have their own trade-unions.

These trade-unions are now acting in unity and have established close collaboration in order to hold back the revolutionary movement of the proletariat and corrupt the working class politically and morally.

In France and Italy, for instance, the trade-unions of the revisionist parties are large and powerful unions. But what do they do? They try to keep the proletariat in bondage, to lull it to sleep and, when it grows angry and rebellious, to set it on the course of negotiations with the boss class and to shut the mouths of the workers with some very small crumbs from the capitalist super-profits. And what they give them is then taken back by raising prices.

Therefore, to free itself from capitalism, it is essential for the proletariat of every country to shake off the yoke of the trade-unions dominated by the bourgeoisie and opportunists, as well as that of any kind of social-democratic and revisionist organization or party. All these organisms support the owning class in various ways and try to create the illusion that «they are a great force», that «they are a brake», that «they can impose themselves on the big capitalists» allegedly in favour of the proletariat. This is nothing but a big fraud. The proletariat has to smash these organisms. But how? It must destroy them by fighting the leadership of these trade-unions, by rising against their treacherous connections with the bourgeoisie, by breaking up the «calm», the «social peace» which they want to establish, a «peace» which is disguised with the alleged revolts against the owning class which the unions engage in from time to time.

It is possible to work to destroy these trade-unions by getting into them in order to fight and erode them from within and oppose their unjust decisions and actions. This activity must involve the biggest and most powerful groups possible of workers in the factories. In every case

the aim must be to achieve a steel unity of the proletariat in the fight not only against the employers but also against their agents, the trade-union bosses. The forceful exposure of all the traitor elements at the head of trade-unions, of the bourgeois degeneration of the trade-union leadership and the reformist trade-unions in general, frees the workers from many illusions they still have about this leadership and these trade-unions.

While infiltrating the existing trade-unions, the Marxist-Leninists never descend to the trade-unionist, reformist, anarcho-syndicalist, revisionist positions, which characterize the leadership of these trade-unions. They never become partners with the revisionists and the other bourgeois and opportunist parties in the leadership of trade-unions. Their aim is to expose the bourgeois character and reactionary role which the trade-unions, in general, have today in the capitalist and revisionist countries, to undermine these organizations in order to open the way to the setting up of genuine proletarian trade-unions.

The organization of the masses of the youth is of special importance to the Marxist-Leninist parties. The role of the youth in the revolutionary movements has always been great. From its very nature the youth is for the new and against the old, and shows itself ready to fight for the triumph of everything progressive, revolutionary. However, on its own, it is incapable of finding the right road. Only the party of the working class can show it this road. When the inexhaustible revolutionary energies of the youth are united with the energies of the working class and the other working masses to wipe out oppression and exploitation, for national and social liberation, there is no force which can stop the triumph of the revolution.

However, in the capitalist and revisionist countries

today, the majority of the youth expend their energies in wrong directions. They are misled by the bourgeoisie and revisionism and often turn to adventurism and anarchism or fall into Utopia and despair, because they have been disorientated and bemused and take a gloomy view of the future, the prospects for the fulfilment of their political, material and spiritual demands.

The Marxist-Leninists always pay very great attention to the youth, try to enlighten them and convince them that the aspirations and desires of the youth can be fulfilled only on the road Marxism-Leninism shows them, and under the leadership of the working class and its party. They are working to free the youth from the influence of the bourgeoisie and revisionists, from the «leftist», Trotskyite, or anarchist movements, and to mobilize them in revolutionary organizations, to draw them on to the road of the revolution.

The genuine Marxist-Leninist party and the revolutionary communists take part actively in the workers' strikes and demonstrations and fight to turn them into political strikes and demonstrations, so as to make life impossible for capitalism, the employers, cartels, monopolies and the trade-union chiefs. In the course of this broad activity the proletariat will come to grips more often and more openly with the armed forces of the bourgeois order, but from these clashes it will learn to fight better. In the course of the struggle it also finds what forms of organization and revolutionary struggle are possible, correct, and appropriate. «You cannot learn to swim without getting into the water,» goes a popular saying. Without fighting by means of strikes, demonstrations, without active involvement in actions against capitalism in general, the struggle for the final victory cannot be organized and intensified, the bourgeois order cannot be overthrown.

The revolution is not prepared by merely talking, like the various revisionists, or by theorizing about the «three worlds», like the Chinese revisionists are doing. It cannot triumph on the peaceful road. Lenin did speak of this possibility, in specific instances, but he always put the main stress on revolutionary violence, because the bourgeoisie never surrenders its power voluntarily. **The history of the international workers' and communist movement, of the development of revisionists and the victories of the working class in a number of former socialist countries, and in our socialist country, shows that up till now revolutions have triumphed only through armed insurrection.**

Revolutionary armed insurrection has nothing in common with military putsches. The former has as its aim the radical political overthrow of the old regime, smashing it to its very foundations. The latter do not, and cannot, lead to the overthrow of the order of oppression and exploitation, or the liquidation of imperialist domination. The armed insurrection is based on the support of the broad masses of the people, whereas the putsch is an expression of mistrust of the masses, of isolation from the masses. Putschist tendencies in the policy and activity of a party which calls itself a party of the working class are a deviation from Marxism-Leninism.

In accord with the concrete conditions of a country and the situations in general, the armed uprising may be a sudden outburst or a more protracted revolutionary process, but not an endless one without perspective, as advocated by Mao Zedong's «theory of protracted people's war». If you compare the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on the revolutionary armed insurrection with Mao's theory on «people's war», the anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist, anti-scientific character of this theory becomes clearly apparent. The Marxist-Leninist teachings on the armed insurrection are based on the close combina-

tion of the struggle in the city with that in the countryside under the leadership of the working class and its revolutionary party.

Being opposed to the leading role of the proletariat in the revolution, the Maoist theory considers the countryside as the only base of the armed insurrection and neglects the armed struggle of the working masses in the town. It preaches that the countryside must keep the city, which is considered as the stronghold of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, besieged. This is an expression of distrust in the working class, the negation of its hegemonic role.

While adhering unwaveringly to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the violent revolution as a universal law, the revolutionary party of the working class is resolutely opposed to adventurism and never plays with armed insurrection. In all conditions and circumstances, it carries out an unceasing revolutionary struggle and activity in various forms, in order to prepare itself and the masses for the decisive battles in the revolution, for the overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie with revolutionary violence. But only when the revolutionary situation has fully matured does it put armed insurrection directly on the order of the day and take all the political, ideological, organizational and military measures to carry it through to victory.

Propaganda is a powerful means in the hands of a Marxist-Leninist party for the preparation of the masses for the revolution, but it must be fiery, clear and convincing. Revolutionary propaganda is worthless if it is only phrase-mongering. Only an incisive propaganda, closely linked with the problems of life, with the general problems and local questions, a propaganda which creates and encourages the spirit of initiative among the broad

masses, can educate the proletariat and the other working masses politically and ideologically, can get them into action and prepare them for revolution.

Apart from the great means of force it has at its disposal, like the army, the police, etc., the capitalist bourgeoisie in all countries also has wide experience of the struggle against the proletariat and its activity. Likewise, it possesses an entire propaganda network, including the press, radio, television, films, theatres, music, etc. All this propaganda has such power to corrupt that it is capable of temporarily disorientating, preventing and weakening the efforts of the proletariat and its struggle for liberation.

In the states of so-called bourgeois democracy, where a measure of «democratic freedom» also exists, it is not enough to carry on only the normal journalistic propaganda against capitalism in general. The newspapers of various bourgeois and revisionist parties are constantly raising a hue and cry, not against the bourgeois order, of course, but against individuals, those who try to grab more than their share of the cake at the big table where they all sit down together to gorge themselves at the expense of the people.

The propaganda, especially the press of the new Marxist-Leninist parties, is faced with a very great task: to expose the falsity of bourgeois «democracy», to tear the mask from all its manoeuvres, as well as from the demagoguery of the revisionists and other lackeys of capital. The Marxist-Leninist propaganda and press tell the naked truth, show the road to social and national liberation through revolution, while the bourgeois and revisionist propaganda and press deceive people, lull them to sleep and disorientate them, in order to divert the masses from the revolution, to lead them up blind alleys, to keep them enslaved.

But in order to enlighten the masses, to convince them of the correctness of the political line of the party of the working class, to prepare them for the revolution, propaganda alone is not sufficient. Lenin says that to prepare the revolution,

*«... the political experience of these masses themselves is necessary.»**

Propaganda becomes effective, hits the target, only when it is carried on together with revolutionary action. Without action thought withers away. This activity is not and must not be an adventure, but a stern struggle, a fierce clash with the class enemies, which passes from a simpler to a higher form, which overcomes numerous difficulties and accepts all the sacrifices the revolution demands.

The genuine Marxist-Leninist parties stand in the vanguard and not at the tail-end of revolutionary action. The temporarily limited possibilities of the struggle and efforts by means of which they must and do oppose the great force of capitalist reaction, do not discourage them. They teach their members to be courageous and to bear in mind that a correct, well-considered, mature, and determined action on their part has profound repercussions among the masses who see it and hear about it. When the communists act in this way, the masses realize that the aims of this or that revolutionary action are in the interest of the proletariat and the exploited. Courage and maturity in actions are of great importance, because in this way, little by little, ground is gained and progress made in building up the surge of the revolution. Revolutionary action links the parties of the working class

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 31, p. 92, Alb. ed.

with the masses, brings them to the head of the masses, and enables them to triumph over the reformist, revisionist parties.

«Every step taken by a genuine movement,»
says Marx, *«is worth more than a dozen pro-grams.»**

Apart from the revolutionary forces led by the Marxist-Leninist party, in the capitalist countries there are also other forces which fight and clash with the police, the gendarmerie, etc. Many of the actions and attacks by these forces have a terrorist, adventurist, and anarchist character. They are presented under all sorts of colours and labels and are guided by various ideologies. Such actions are often organized at the instigation and with the funds of the secret services of capitalist countries and, among other things, are aimed at discrediting the Marxist-Leninist parties by attributing such actions to these parties. The fascist elements or the secret agents of the bourgeoisie, who frequently organize and lead these actions, try to take advantage of the discontent, the anger and the courage of the proletariat, school pupils and students, the youth in general, in order to involve the various groups and movements emerging from these masses in actions which not only have nothing in common with the genuine revolutionary movements, but also seriously jeopardize them, create the impression that the proletariat is degenerating and has become a lumpen proletariat.

Paying the proper attention to this question, the Marxist-Leninist parties, on the one hand, must convince

* K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, vol. 2, Tirana 1975, p. 6, Alb. ed.

the masses, from their own experience, that revolutionary actions have a completely different character from terrorist and anarchist actions, and on the other hand, must fight to win the revolutionary elements, who have been deceived, away from the ranks of terrorist and anarchist groups and the fascist elements and secret agents of the bourgeoisie operating in these groups.

The Marxist-Leninist parties are parties of revolution. Contrary to the theories and practices of the revisionist parties, which are totally immersed in bourgeois legality and «parliamentary cretinism», they do not reduce their struggle simply to legal work, nor do they see this as their main activity. In the context of efforts to master all forms of struggle, they attach special importance to the **combination of legal with illegal work, giving priority to the latter**, as decisive for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the real guarantee of victory. (17) They educate and teach their cadres, their members and sympathizers to know how to act intelligently, skilfully, and courageously under both legal and illegal conditions. But even when operating in the conditions of profound clandestinity, while trying to avoid exposing their forces to the enemy and to safeguard the revolutionary organization from the enemy's blows, the Marxist-Leninist parties do not shut themselves away, do not weaken or break their links with the masses, never for a moment interrupt their live activity among the masses, and never fail to utilize all the legal possibilities, which the conditions and circumstances permit, to the advantage of the cause of the revolution.

While entertaining no illusions about the possibility of seizing power on the parliamentary road, the Marxist-

17 See Enver Hoxha, *Selected Works*, vol. 4, «8 Nëntori» Publishing House, Tirana 1982, pp. 562-575, Eng. ed.

Leninist party may also consider it in order, in particularly favourable instances, to take part in such legal activities as elections to municipal councils, parliament, etc., with the sole aim of propagating its line among the masses and exposing the bourgeois political order. However, the party does not transform this participation into a general line of its struggle, as the revisionists do, does not make these the main, or even worse, the only forms of its struggle.

While utilizing the legal possibilities, the party seeks, finds and applies forms and methods of a revolutionary character, from the simplest to the most complicated, regardless of the sacrifices, while trying to make these forms and methods as popular and as acceptable as possible to the masses.

In their activity, the Marxist-Leninists are not worried about breaking and violating the bourgeois Constitution, laws, rules, norms, and order with their revolutionary actions. They are fighting to undermine this order, to prepare the revolution. Therefore, the Marxist-Leninist party prepares itself and the masses to cope with the counterblows the bourgeoisie may strike in response to the revolutionary actions of the proletariat and the popular masses.

In the present conditions of development of the revolutionary and liberation movement, as a complicated process with a broad social basis, in which numerous class and political forces take part, the revolutionary party of the proletariat not infrequently comes up against the problem of collaboration and common fronts with other parties and political organizations at this or that stage of the revolution, on these or those problems of common interest. A correct, principled and at the same time flexible stand, far from any opportunism and sectarianism on this problem is of major importance for

drawing in, preparing and mobilizing the masses for the revolution and the liberation struggle. The Marxist-Leninist party is not and in principle cannot be against collaboration or common fronts with other political parties and forces, when the interests of the cause of the revolution require this and the situation makes it necessary. However, the Marxist-Leninist party never sees this as a coalition of chieftains and as an aim in itself, but as a means to unite and arouse the masses in struggle. The important thing is that in these common fronts the proletarian party must never for a moment lose sight of the class interests of the proletariat and the final aim of its struggle, must not merge itself in the front, but must preserve its ideological individuality and its political, organizational, and military independence there, must fight to secure the leading role in the front and to implement a revolutionary policy there.

For the Marxist-Leninist party to be able to work out and apply a revolutionary strategy and tactics, a correct political line, to know how to find its bearings in difficult situations, to be able to cope with the enemies and overcome the obstacles, **it is absolutely essential that it carry out great, wide-ranging work for the study and assimilation of the Marxist-Leninist theory.**

One of the reasons why the former communist parties in the capitalist countries turned into revisionist parties was precisely because they had utterly neglected the study and assimilation of Marxism-Leninism. The Marxist-Leninist doctrine was used only as an adornment, was turned into empty words and slogans, had not been implanted deeply in the consciousness of the party members, had not become part of their flesh and blood, and had not become a weapon for action. That small amount of work which was done for the study of Marxism-Leninism was aimed only at acquainting the party member

with some cut-and-dried formulas, just enough to enable him to call himself a communist, to love communism in a sentimental way, while about how and in what manner this would be achieved he knew nothing, because he was not taught this.

The leaders of those parties, who were not lacking in words but were short on deeds, lived in a bourgeois environment and infected the proletariat of their countries with liberal and reformist ideas.

Thus, the turn of the revisionist parties towards the bourgeoisie is a social-democratic opportunist evolution which had long been prepared by their leaders who are in fact social-democrats, the worker aristocracy, which led these so-called communist parties.

The Marxist-Leninist parties cannot fail to remember this negative experience and draw from it the lesson that they must organize the study and assimilation of Marxism-Leninism on a sound basis, always linking this study with revolutionary action.

The unity and co-operation of the Marxist-Leninist parties of different countries on the basis of the principles of proletarian internationalism is of special importance for the preparation of the revolution.

This unity will be strengthened and this cooperation will be extended in struggle against imperialism and social-imperialism, against the bourgeoisie and modern revisionism of every description, Khrushchevite, Titoite, «Eurocommunist», Chinese, etc.

The revisionists, as enemies of the revolution, fight proletarian internationalism with all their strength and means, in order to wrest this powerful weapon in the struggle against the bourgeoisie and imperialism from the hands of the world proletariat and the proletariat of every country.

It is the duty of the Marxist-Leninist parties to expose the manoeuvres of the Titoite revisionists and the «Eurocommunists» who call proletarian internationalism obsolete and outdated today, as well as those of the Soviet revisionists and Chinese revisionists who have distorted proletarian internationalism and are trying to use it as a weapon to realize their hegemonic, social-imperialist aims.

The Communist Party of China, which does not follow the principles of proletarian internationalism and does not support the revolutionary and liberation struggles of the peoples, has set out on the road of rapprochement and friendship with the social-democratic and bourgeois parties, including the ultra-right and reactionary ones. At the same time, it is trying to create various groups dependent on and directed by it. It needs such groupings precisely in order to sabotage the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties and the progressive elements who have set to work to awaken the people, to rouse them to revolution against the ruling cliques which are linked with the superpowers.

The small groups, which call themselves parties and toe the Chinese line, as the opportunists they are, do nothing but defend and propagate the revisionist theories of the group of Hua Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping and its counter-revolutionary actions. These groups are devoid of any individuality of their own or any determination to fight according to the Marxist-Leninist theory.

The main slogan of these parties, which is also the basic slogan of the Chinese policy, is that, in the present situation, the sole and fundamental task of the proletariat is to defend national independence, which is allegedly threatened only by Soviet social-imperialism. They are repeating, almost word by word, the slogans of the chiefs of the Second International who abandoned the cause

of the revolution and replaced it with the thesis of defence of the capitalist homeland. Lenin exposed this false and anti-Marxist slogan, which does not serve the defence of true independence but serves the instigation of inter-imperialist wars. He clearly defined what the stand of the true revolutionary should be towards the conflicts between imperialist groupings. He wrote:

*«If the war is a reactionary imperialist war, that is, if it is being waged by two world coalitions of the imperialist, violent, predatory, reactionary bourgeoisie then every bourgeoisie (even of the smallest country) becomes a participant in the plunder, and my duty as a representative of the revolutionary proletariat is to prepare for the **world proletarian revolution** as the **only** escape from the horrors of a world slaughter...*

*That is what internationalism means, and that is the duty of the internationalist, the revolutionary worker, the genuine socialist.»**

The parties following the Chinese line have become apologists for the growth and strengthening of bourgeois armies, using the excuse that this is supposedly necessary for the defence of independence. They call on the working people to become obedient soldiers and to come out, together with the bourgeoisie, against all those who are fighting to weaken this main weapon of capitalist rule and exploitation. In a word, they want the proletariat and the working masses to serve as cannon fodder in the predatory wars which imperialism and social-imperialism prepare.

At the same time these hangers-on of the Chinese

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 28, pp. 324-325, Alb. ed.

have become ardent defenders of the bourgeois capitalist state institutions, especially of NATO, the European Common Market, etc., which they consider as the main factors for the «defence of independence». Like the Chinese leaders, they whitewash and prettify these pillars of capitalist domination and expansion. They are assisting precisely those organisms which, in reality, have seriously violated the independence and sovereignty of their countries.

For these pseudo-Marxists, alliance with the big bourgeoisie, defence of the bourgeois army, support for NATO, the European Common Market, etc., is a trouble-free road because it not only does not lead them to clashes with the bourgeoisie but, on the contrary, ensures its favours.

These positions of these groupist elements without a future are leading them towards unification with the parties of «Eurocommunism» and the bourgeoisie, and this is bound to happen, because China itself is calling on the proletariat to unite with the bourgeoisie. Already, there is no difference whatsoever between these pseudo-Marxist-Leninists and Marchais.

The Marxist-Leninists must be very much on guard against the empty phrases which the modern revisionists, the social democrats and the pseudo-Marxist-Leninists use about proletarian internationalism, the unity of proletarians in the defence of peace, etc. Proletarian internationalism is genuine when people work self-sacrificingly to assist and carry out revolutionary actions, to create a real situation of revolutionary struggle, in their own country in the first place. At the same time, as Lenin says, they must support, with propaganda, sympathy and material aid, this struggle and line in all countries without exception. Anything else, he teaches us, is a fraud and Manilovism.

Therefore, we must be very much on our guard against such pseudo-Marxist, pseudo-revolutionary, pseudo-internationalist elements, whether individuals or small groups, or parties which call themselves Marxist-Leninist, but which, in fact, are not so, but are social-chauvinist, centrist and petty-bourgeois. All these parties which are beating their breasts about their proletarian internationalism, about the defence of peace, about reforms, etc., serve capital.

The Chinese revisionists, also, talk about proletarian internationalism at times, but they stand on nationalist and chauvinist positions. The Chinese leaders are among those who beat their breasts and swear «to god» that they are for proletarian internationalism, for peace, for the struggles of the proletariat and its claims, but in practice they stand aside and do nothing but issue deceptive phrases to split the revolutionary forces.

The important task the Marxist-Leninist parties are faced with is to strengthen proletarian internationalism, which must be developed amongst all parties, big or small, old or new. All of them must strengthen the unity between them and co-ordinate their political, ideological and fighting actions.

By stressing this important line, which is a primary task of the Marxist-Leninist parties in order to be able to launch a frontal attack on world capitalism, its enslaving policy, as well as on its intrigues, trickery and alliances with Soviet, Titoite, Chinese, Italian, French, Spanish and other modern revisionisms, these parties will create a powerful front which will become ever more unbreakable day by day. If they act in unity and all strike at the forces of reaction together, if they expose all the intrigues which capitalism and modern revisionism concoct in various ways in order to put down the revolution and quell the class struggle, their triumph is assured.

We Marxist-Leninists must fight and call on the workers, wherever they are, to rise up against their age-old enemies and break their chains, to carry out the revolution, and not submit to monopolies and capitalists, as the modern revisionists advocate. The task of the Marxist-Leninists, of the true revolutionaries is to call on the proletarians and the peoples to rise for the new world, for their world, for the socialist world.

PART TWO

I

THE THEORY OF «THREE WORLDS» — A COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY CHAUVINIST THEORY

Today the Chinese revisionists, also, have come out openly and are fighting on a broad front against the Leninist theory and strategy of the revolution and the liberation struggle of the peoples. They are trying to oppose this glorious scientific theory and strategy with their theory of «three worlds», which is a false, counter-revolutionary, and chauvinist theory.

The theory of «three worlds» is in opposition to the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, or more exactly, is a negation of it. It is of no consequence to know who first invented the term the «third world», who was the first to divide the world in three parts, but it is certain that Lenin did not make such a division, while the Communist Party of China claims paternity to it, asserting that Mao Zedong invented the theory of «three worlds». If he is the author who first formulated this so-called theory, this is further evidence that Mao Zedong is not a Marxist. But even if he only adopted this theory from others, this, too, is proof enough that he is not a Marxist.

The Concept of the «Three Worlds» — a Negation of Marxism-Leninism

The notion of the existence of three worlds, or of the division of the world in three, is based on a racist and metaphysical world outlook, which is an offspring of world capitalism and reaction.

But the racist thesis which places the countries on three levels or in three «worlds», is not based simply on skin colour. It makes a classification based on the level of economic development of the countries and is intended to define the «great master race», on the one hand, and the «race of pariahs and plebs», on the other, to create an unalterable and metaphysical division in the interests of the capitalist bourgeoisie. It considers the various nations and peoples of the world as a flock of sheep, as an amorphous whole.

The Chinese revisionists accept and preach that the «master race» must be preserved and the «race of pariahs and plebs» must serve it meekly and devotedly.

Marxist-Leninist dialectics teaches us that there is no limit to development, that nothing stops changing. In this process of unceasing development towards the future, quantitative and qualitative changes occur. Our epoch, like any other, is characterized by profound contradictions which Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin defined so clearly. It is the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, hence, of great quantitative and qualitative transformations which lead to revolution and the seizure of power by the working class in order to build the new socialist society.

The whole of Marx's theory is founded on the class struggle and dialectical and historical materialism. Marx proved that capitalist society is a society divided into exploiting and exploited classes, that classes will disap-

pear only when the classless society, communism, has been achieved.

Today we are living in the stage of the collapse of imperialism and the triumph of proletarian revolutions. This means that in present-day capitalist society there are two main classes, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, which are in irreconcilable, life-and-death struggle with each other. Which of them will triumph? Marx and Lenin, Marxist-Leninist science, the theory and practice of the revolution, provide us with convincing proof that, in the final analysis, the proletariat will triumph by destroying, overthrowing the power of the bourgeoisie, imperialism and all exploiters, and will build a new society, the socialist society. They teach us also that even in this new society, classes, that is, the working class and working peasantry, which are closely allied to each other, will exist for a very long time, but there will also be remnants of the overthrown and expropriated classes. During this entire period, these remnants, as well as elements which degenerate and oppose the construction of socialism, will try to regain their lost power. Hence, under socialism, too, stern class struggle will exist.

Marxist-Leninists always bear in mind that in all countries, with the exception of those where the revolution has triumphed and socialist order has been established, there are the poor classes with the proletariat at the head, and the wealthy classes with the bourgeoisie at the head.

In every capitalist state, wherever it may be, and however democratic or progressive, there are oppressed and oppressors, there are exploited and exploiters, there are antagonisms, there is merciless class struggle. The varying intensity of this struggle does not alter this reality. This struggle has its ups and downs, but it exists and cannot be quelled, It exists everywhere, it exists in

the United States of America between the proletariat and the imperialist bourgeoisie, it exists, likewise, in the Soviet Union, where Marxism-Leninism has been betrayed and a new bourgeois-capitalist class which oppresses the working people of that country, has been created. Classes and the class struggle exist also in the «second world», as in France, Britain, Italy, West Germany, Japan. They exist also in the «third world», in India, Zaire, Burundi, Pakistan, the Philippines, etc.

Only according to Mao Zedong's theory of «three worlds», classes and the class struggle do not exist in any country. It does not see them, because it judges countries and peoples according to bourgeois geo-political concepts and the level of their economic development.

To see the world as divided in three, into the «first world», «second world» and the «third world», as the Chinese revisionists do and not from the class angle, means to deviate from the Marxist-Leninist theory of the class struggle, means to negate the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie for the transition from a backward society to a new society, socialist society, and later to classless society, communist society. To divide the world in three means failure to recognize the characteristics of the epoch, to impede the advance of the proletariat and the peoples towards the revolution and national liberation, to impede their struggle against American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, capital and reaction in every country and in every corner of the world. The theory of «three worlds» advocates social peace, class conciliation, and tries to create alliances between implacable enemies, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the oppressed and the oppressors, the peoples and imperialism. It is an attempt to prolong the life of the old world, the capitalist world, to keep it on its feet precisely by seeking to extinguish the class struggle.

But the class struggle, the struggle of the proletariat and its allies to take power and the struggle of the bourgeoisie to maintain its power can never be extinguished. This is an irrefutable truth and no amount of empty theorizing about the «worlds», whether the «first world», the «second world», the «third world», the «non-aligned world», or the «umpteenth world», can alter this fact. To accept such a division means to renounce and abandon the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on classes and the class struggle.

After the triumph of the October Revolution, Lenin and Stalin said that in our time there are two worlds: the socialist world and the capitalist world, although at that time socialism had triumphed in only one country. Lenin wrote in 1921:

*«... there are now two worlds: the old world of capitalism, that is in a state of confusion but which will never surrender voluntarily, and the rising new world, which is still very weak, but which will grow, for it is invincible.»**

This class criterion of the division of the world is still valid today, regardless of the fact that socialism has not triumphed in many countries and the new society has not supplanted the old bourgeois-capitalist society. Such a thing is certainly bound to happen tomorrow.

The fact that socialism has been betrayed in the Soviet Union and the other former socialist countries does not in any way alter the Leninist criterion of the division of the world. Now, as before, there are only two worlds, and the struggle between these two worlds, between the two antagonistic classes, between socialism and capitalism,

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 33, pp. 153-154, Alb. ed.

exists not only on a national scale but also on an international scale.

The Chinese revisionists, who do not admit the existence of the socialist world under the pretext that the socialist camp no longer exists as a result of the betrayal by the Soviet Union and the other former socialist countries, deliberately ignore one thing, namely, that the emergence of modern revisionism does not in the least alter the general trend of history towards the revolution, towards the collapse of imperialism, regardless of the fact that capitalism still exists. At the same time, they ignore the fact that the immortal ideas of Marxism-Leninism exist, are developing and triumphing, that the Marxist-Leninist parties exist, socialist Albania exists, the peoples fighting for freedom, independence and national sovereignty exist, and that the world proletariat exists and is fighting.

The Paris Commune did not triumph, it was suppressed, but it gave the world proletariat a great example. Marx said that the experience of the Commune revealed the temporary weakness of the French proletariat, nevertheless it prepared the proletariat of all countries for the world revolution and provided a great lesson as to the conditions necessary to achieve victory. Marx raised this great experience of the communards who «stormed the heavens» to the level of theory and taught the proletariat that it must smash the apparatus of the bourgeois state and its dictatorship with revolutionary violence.

The modern revisionists are cowards. They think that the counter-revolutionary forces are very powerful today. But this is not at all true. They are weaker than the peoples. The peoples, with the proletariat at the head, are stronger. They will crush the counter-revolutionary forces, the forces of reaction, imperialism and social-imperialism. The view is based on the class analysis of the world.

Any other view is wrong, regardless of how revisionists may disguise their activity and fears with revolutionary phrases.

When we Marxist-Leninists say that there are two, and not three or five, worlds, we are on the right road and, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, we must build our struggle against the capitalist bourgeoisie, American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, and against the other imperialisms. This struggle must lead to the destruction of the old bourgeois-capitalist world and the establishment of the new socialist order.

The proletariat is the motive social force of our epoch.

Lenin emphasized that the motive force which drives history forward is represented by that class which stands

*«... at the hub of one epoch or another, determining its main content, the main direction of its development, the main characteristics of the historical situation in that epoch, etc.»**

Contrary to this thesis of Lenin's, however, the Chinese revisionists are trying to present the «third world» as the «great motive force which is driving the wheel of history forward». To make such a declaration means to give a definition of the motive force which is wrong in theory and practice. How is it possible in the present epoch of social development, which has at its hub the most revolutionary class, the proletariat, to call a grouping of states, the overwhelming bulk of which are ruled by the bourgeoisie and the feudal lords, indeed, even open reactionaries and fascists, the motive force? This is a gross distortion of Marx's theory.

* V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, vol. 21, p. 147, Alb. ed.

The Chinese leadership takes no account of the fact that in the «third world» there are oppressed and oppressors, the proletariat and the enslaved, poverty-stricken and destitute peasantry, on the one hand, and the capitalists and landowners, who exploit and fleece the people, on the other. To fail to point out this class situation in the so-called third world, to fail to point out the antagonisms which exist, means to revise Marxism-Leninism and defend capitalism. In the countries of the so-called third world, in general, the capitalist bourgeoisie is in power. This bourgeoisie exploits the country, exploits and oppresses the poor people in its own class interests, to make the largest possible profits for itself and to keep the people in perpetual slavery and misery.

In many countries of the «third world», the governments in power are bourgeois, capitalist governments, of course, with differing political nuances. They are governments of the class hostile to the proletariat, the oppressed and poor peasantry, hostile to the revolution and liberation wars. The bourgeoisie, which has state power in these countries, is protecting precisely that capitalist society which the proletariat in alliance with the poor strata of town and countryside, seeks to overthrow. It constitutes that upper class which, proceeding from its own narrow interests, is ready, at any moment, at any turn of events, to sell the wealth of the land and the underground assets of the country, the freedom, independence and sovereignty of the homeland, to foreign capitalism. This class, wherever it is in power, is opposed to the struggle and aspirations of the proletariat and its allies, the oppressed classes and strata.

Many of the states which the Chinese leadership includes in the «third world» are not opposed to American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. To call such states «the main motive force of the revolution and

the struggle against imperialism», as Mao Zedong advocates, is a glaring mistake that stands out like the Himalayas. There are other pseudo-Marxists, too, but they at least know how to hide and disguise themselves behind their bourgeois theories.

The Chinese revisionists have the same anti-Marxist view not only of the «third world» but also of what they call the «second world», where the big capitalist bourgeoisie and the big imperialists of yesterday, who are still imperialists, are ruling. In the countries of the so-called second world, there is a large and powerful proletariat, which is exploited to the bone, which is kept down by crushing laws, the army, the police, the trade-unions, by all these weapons of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Both in the countries of the «third world» and in those of the «second world», it is the bourgeois capitalist class, the same social forces, which are ruling the proletariat and the peoples and which must be smashed. Here, too, the main motive force is the proletariat.

Just as they do in the «third world» and the «second world», in the United States of America and the Soviet Union, too, the Chinese revisionists ignore the proletariat, which represents the great army of the revolution, negate precisely the main motive force of society, that force which has to attack the monopoly bourgeoisie, its class enemy and the enemy of the world revolution in general.

Mao Zedong's theory of «three worlds» denies this great reality and discounts the proletariat of Europe and the other developed countries. It is true that some degeneration also exists in the ranks of the proletariat, whether of the so-called third, second, or first world, because the bourgeoisie is not sitting idle, but is fighting its enemy, not only with weapons and oppression, but also politically and ideologically, with the way of life it creates, etc. But the fact that some stratum of the prolet-

ariat, such as the labour aristocracy, degenerates, does not mean that Marxism-Leninism should be abandoned and the decisive role of the working class in the world revolutionary process denied. Through correct Marxist-Leninist education, through their daily revolutionary activity, the genuine communists protect the proletariat of every country and every «world» from degeneration and mobilize it to struggle against its oppressors, be they British or French, Italian or German, Portuguese or Spanish, American or Japanese, etc.

In the United States of America, also, which is the head of world imperialism, there is a big proletariat. Being one of the most industrialized countries of the world, it is also the wealthiest, therefore the crumbs that capital gives away to deceive the proletariat are a little bigger than those in the other bourgeois countries. In the United States of America the way of life has a greater influence on the proletariat, but we cannot, in the least, negate the role and contribution of the American proletariat to the revolution in that country. In fact, in the United States of America also, there is a section of opinion opposed to imperialism, predatory wars, oppression by the capitalists, trusts, banks, etc. Even among the strata of the petty bourgeoisie in that country there is a resistance to oppression by big capital.

By negating the class struggle, the Chinese theory of «three worlds» also negates the struggle of the peoples to free themselves from foreign domination, to win democratic rights and freedoms, negates their struggle for socialism. This counter-revolutionary and anti-scientific theory rules out the struggle of the peoples against their enemies — imperialism, social-imperialism and the entire international big bourgeoisie.

To put the peoples into «three compartments» and

preach that only the «third world» aspires to liberation from imperialism, that it alone is supposedly the «main motive force against imperialism», is a deception and a flagrant deviation from Marxism-Leninism. If the imperialists and capitalists are to be included in the «first world» and in the «second world», then the question arises: where are the peoples of these «two worlds», who are also fighting for their liberation against those same oppressors who are oppressing the «third world», to be put? The inventors and supporters of the division of the world in three are quite unable to answer this question, because, according to their anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist concept, they merge the imperialists, the rulers and the peoples into one.

Marxist-Leninists cannot identify the Soviet peoples with the anti-Marxist, social-imperialist, double-dealers and the new capitalists who are ruling them. Likewise, they cannot mix up and confound the American people with US imperialism. If they were to act as the Chinese revisionists are doing, then the revolutionaries would be making a gross theoretical mistake and setting themselves against the revolution; they would be supporting precisely imperialism and social-imperialism, the forces of capital against which the proletariat and the people within the lair of their enemies are also fighting.

What is the sense of the Chinese call that the «third world» should unite in alliance with the «second world» to fight half of the «first world», when such a division of the world confuses the individuality, aspirations and development of the peoples who are opposed to and in struggle against the oligarchy that oppresses them? The level of the peoples' resistance and revolutionary struggle is likewise different, but their ultimate aim, communism, is the same. In these conditions, we Marxist-Leninists

must carry out propaganda work and mobilize ourselves so that, through continuous class struggles against imperialism, social-imperialism, capitalism and their fraudulent ideologies, we achieve the ultimate aim.

The Chinese revisionists not only merge and unite peoples into one with the rulers in the capitalist countries, but they also want to liquidate the identity of socialist countries, when they preach that these countries, too, can be included in the «third world».

How can a socialist country be identified with the «third world» in which antagonist classes, oppression and exploitation exist, and line up with «kings and princes», as the Chinese leaders assert? The Chinese revisionists who call their country socialist, allege that they include themselves in the «third world» in order to assist the peoples of this «world». This is a fraud by means of which they want to conceal their expansionist aim. To assist and support the peoples' struggle, a true socialist country has no need to divide the world in three, or include itself in the «third world».

With our stands, guiding ourselves by class criteria, we Marxist-Leninists help the peoples, the proletariat, genuine democracy, sovereignty and freedom, and not the state where the kings, shahs and the reactionary cliques rule. We help those peoples and democratic states which want to liberate themselves from the yoke of superpowers, but we stress that this cannot be done properly, on the correct road and according to class criteria, unless they also fight the monarchs and the international monopolies that are connected with the superpowers. The Chinese leaders claim to have solved this complicated class problem by «merging» themselves in this imaginary «third world». But this is an anti-Marxist solution. Contrary to what the Chinese leaders claim, most of the states

and governments of the «third world» are not for struggle against the «first world», or against US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, or the «second world».

The trend among the peoples of the world is towards the struggle for liberation, for revolution, for socialism, but the governments of kings, emirs and reactionary cliques of the Mobutu and Pinochet type of the «third world» in which China has included itself, are not included in this trend.

In regard to the states of the so-called third world, the Chinese leadership does not make any class differentiation, according to the principles of proletarian internationalism and the interests of the world revolution. It takes no account of the fact that these national states, most of which are led by the upper strata of the bourgeoisie, are under the influence of, and closely linked by many threads with US imperialism and also with Soviet social-imperialism.

In these states there are deep internal contradictions between the proletariat and the poor and oppressed peasantry, on the one hand, and the bourgeoisie and all enslavers, on the other. The aid which a socialist country gives the peoples of these states should be a great stimulus to their progress towards the creation of a truly democratic state, without obscuring the perspective, without affecting the question of the triumph of the proletarian revolution and seizure of power by the proletariat. The revolution cannot be imported. It will be carried out by the proletariat and people of each country. Of course, the seizure of power will not be done overnight, but as Lenin teaches us, those conditions must be created so that, at each turn of history, the proletariat will be found in the forefront of the struggle to overthrow the degenerate state power of dictators and the reactionary bourgeoisie and to establish the rule of the people.

The division we communists make of the world today, on the basis of the Leninist class criterion, does not hinder us from fighting the superpowers and supporting all the peoples and states that are seeking liberation and have contradictions with the superpowers. Socialist Albania has given wholehearted and powerful support to the struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America, because this struggle is in their own interests and is directed against imperialism and foreign colonial domination. But to conceal and distort the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the ideology and policy of the party of the proletariat, as the Chinese leaders do, this is anti-Marxist, a fraud and a deception. The Party of Labour of Albania has not done and will never do such a thing, because this would be an unpardonable crime against its own people, against other peoples, against the international proletariat and the world revolution.

In its division of the world into three, the Communist Party of China is advocating class conciliation.

The genuine Marxist-Leninists never forget the teachings of Lenin, who stresses that the opportunists and revisionists strive by hook or by crook to tone down the class struggle, to deceive the working class and the oppressed with «revolutionary» clichés, while divesting the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of its revolutionary content. This is what the Chinese revisionist leadership is doing when it preaches conciliation and peaceful coexistence between the working class and the bourgeoisie.

As Engels and Lenin teach us, the contradictions between classes or social forces with opposing fundamental interests cannot be reconciled, but on the contrary, become more and more severe and end up in socio-political conflicts. The very existence of the state proves that the antagonisms between classes are irreconcilable. Therefore, to try to mitigate these class antagonisms which can be

seen in the various bourgeois and revisionist countries of the «third», «second», or the «first world», by preaching unprincipled unity, means to deny the objective character of the existence of contradictions and to treat this problem in an anti-Marxist way.

The Chinese «theoreticians» try to reconcile classes that can never be reconciled, and this means that they are in revisionist, opportunist positions. The distortion of Marx's theory by the Chinese revisionists is quite obvious when they consider the countries which they include in the «third world» countries where class peace prevails, and the state in those countries an organism of class conciliation.

To accept the notion of the «third world», such as the Chinese leaders advertise, means to work to create an opinion which will serve to defend those state organisms which the bourgeoisie needs to oppress the working class and the masses of the people. The thesis of the toning down of the class struggle, as Lenin said when he was attacking the revisionists, justifies and endorses this oppression. To seek unity within the «third world», in fact, means to seek unity of the oppressed class with the oppressor class, that is, to try to tone down the antagonisms between the working masses and the bourgeoisie, between the people and the foreign oppressors. These sermons of the Chinese revisionists run counter to the interests of the national and social liberation of the peoples, to their aspirations for freedom, independence and social justice.

The majority of the states which allegedly make up the «third» or the «non-aligned world» are dependent on foreign finance capital which is so strong and so widespread that it has a decisive weight in every aspect of life there. These states do not enjoy complete independence. On the contrary, they are dependent on this big finance

capital, which develops that policy and spreads that ideology which justify the exploitation of peoples.

The bourgeoisie and imperialism take great pains to conceal this reality, and when exposed, they contrive various «theories» against the independence and sovereignty of states. In order to smother the aspirations of the peoples to freedom, independence and sovereignty, the bourgeois and revisionist theoreticians present these aspirations as «anachronistic», give them various metaphysical interpretations and counter them with the slogan of «world inter-dependence», which allegedly expresses the current trend of development of human society, or with the slogan of «limited sovereignty», which allegedly expresses the supreme interests of the so-called socialist community, etc.

The bourgeois-revisionist reality of the violation of the freedom, independence and sovereignty of nations and states in all forms and directions, shows the decay of the capitalist system. We are living in an epoch when the bourgeoisie is losing ground as a ruling class, while the world proletariat has become a colossal force and has entered into ceaseless, merciless struggle to get that class which exploits it off its back. Under the blows of the peoples and the class struggle of the proletariat, the bourgeoisie was compelled to renounce colonialism *de jure*, and to formally recognize the freedom, independence and sovereignty of many countries, which it had been occupying and exploiting to the bone for a long time.

However, for many countries the freedom, independence and sovereignty, legally recognized by the capitalist states to their former colonies, have remained formal to this day, because the capitalists and imperialists are still ruling there in new forms. To prolong their domination over the former colonies, taking advantage of the economic, political and ideological backwardness of the

peoples and the lack of organization of the revolutionary forces, these regressive forces of our time make extensive use of plots and intrigues to divide and rule, suitable terrain for which can still be found in these countries.

In dealing with this problem, it should not be thought that, since the former colonial countries have not yet won complete independence and sovereignty, their struggle has been useless. By no means. The struggle of the peoples for the emancipation of their small countries from the dictate and tutelage of the mighty — imperialism and social-imperialism — must not be underrated. On the contrary, the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian state have given and will continue to give unreserved support to this just revolutionary and liberation struggle, which they have regarded as a victory of the peoples in strengthening their political independence and breaking free from colonial and neo-colonial domination. But we are against those revisionist theoreticians who preach that now the entire revolutionary struggle should be reduced to a struggle for national independence, to win and to defend this independence against the aggression of imperialist powers, while negating the struggle for social liberation. Only victory in this struggle guarantees genuine and complete national freedom, independence and sovereignty. These advocates of the exploiting order «forget» that the class struggle between the proletariat and its allies, on the one hand, and the local bourgeoisie and its external allies, on the other, is going on fiercely at all times, and some day it will lead to those moments, to those revolutionary situations, as Lenin calls them, when the revolution breaks out. The ever more favourable conditions that are being created in the world for anti-imperialist and democratic revolutions to develop on a large-scale and for their leadership by the proletariat must be

utilized in order to go on from the struggle for national independence to another more advanced phase, to the struggle for socialism. Lenin teaches us that the revolution must be carried through to the end, by liquidating the bourgeoisie and its state power. Only on this basis can there be talk of true freedom, independence and sovereignty.

According to our Marxist-Leninist concept, the people cannot have freedom and sovereignty in a society with antagonistic classes where the feudal or bourgeois class holds sway. Freedom, independence and sovereignty have a concrete socio-political content. Genuine and complete freedom and sovereignty are secured under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, while, where state power is in the hands of the exploiting class, the economic and political relations of inequality between the exploiters and the exploited and between countries lead to loss, or restriction of the freedom and sovereignty of the people. As a result, there can be no talk of real national freedom and sovereignty, and even less of people's sovereignty, in the countries which are included in the «non-aligned» or the «third world». Only from a scientific analysis based on the Marxist-Leninist theory is it possible to determine correctly which people is really free and which is enslaved, which state is independent and sovereign, and which is dependent and oppressed. The Marxist-Leninist theory clearly explains who are the oppressors and exploiters of the peoples, and which is the road for the peoples to become free, independent and sovereign. We Albanian communists understand the freedom, independence and sovereignty of states and peoples only in this way, in the light of Marxism-Leninism.

**The Attitude of the Chinese Revisionists to
Contradictions Is an Idealist, Revisionist
and Capitulationist Attitude**

The implementation of a correct revolutionary strategy based on the teachings of Marxism-Leninism demands not only an all-sided dialectical analysis and appreciation of the motive forces of the world revolutionary and liberation trend, a correct assessment of the enemy forces, with their strong and weak aspects, but also a correct and scientific understanding of the contradictions characteristic of our time.

If we interpret the contradictions in connection with the concrete facts and the real development of the situations, according to the teachings of the Marxist-Leninist theory, then we shall not make mistakes.

In connection with the contradictions, the Chinese leaders «theorize», «interpret», «philosophize», paraphrase and confuse many theses which the classics of Marxism-Leninism formulated so clearly. Interpreting contradictions differently from what they really are, they enter into agreements and compromises not in favour of the liberation struggle, the peoples, the revolution and the construction of socialism, but in favour of the bourgeoisie and imperialism. These leaders, who pose as Marxist-Leninist philosophers, have two masks: one to present themselves as if they are in order with the Marxist-Leninist theory, and the other to distort it in practice.

Their stand in regard to contradictions, alliances and compromises stems from a distorted and pragmatic analysis which they make of the international situation, the contradictions that exist in the world, the contradictions among the imperialist powers, among the various capitalist states, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie,

etc. This stand has its roots in their idealist and revisionist world outlook.

However, the Chinese leaders' laying of the problem of contradictions, alliances and compromises on the table for discussion is not fortuitous. The Chinese leadership has now thrown off its disguise and has come out openly against the revolution. It has become a standard-bearer of right opportunism, revisionism. Like all revisionists, the leaders of the Communist Party of China, also, are trying to «justify» their departure from the Marxist-Leninist theory, their revisionist orientation, by using quotations from Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. Of course, they curtail, cut up and take these quotations out of their context, and thus mutilated, use them to peddle their reactionary stands and theses as Marxist-Leninist. But the Chinese revisionists are neither the first nor the last to make these distortions, tendentious curtailments and interpretations of our correct theory. Long before them, the chiefs of social-democracy, the Titoites, the Soviet, Italian, French and other revisionists did the same thing and they are still at it.

In the first place, by juggling with the contradictions, the Chinese leaders are endeavouring to justify their stand towards US imperialism, to pave the way for their rapprochement and collaboration with it.

The Chinese revisionists claim that there is only one contradiction in the world of today, and that this puts the «third world», the «second world» and half of the «first world» in confrontation with the Soviet Union. Proceeding from this thesis which unites the peoples with a group of imperialists, they advocate that all class contradictions must be set aside and that the only fight must be against Soviet social-imperialism.

But let us analyse how things stand on the question

of the contradictions between the peoples and the superpowers, and the contradictions between the superpowers themselves.

In the present conditions, in defining a consistent revolutionary strategy and tactics, the principled stand towards the two imperialist superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, which constitute the greatest force in defence of the capitalist system of oppression and exploitation, the main bastions of world reaction, assumes first-rate importance. They are sworn enemies, the most dangerous enemies of the revolution, socialism and the peoples of the entire world; they have taken upon themselves the odious role of the international gendarme against every revolutionary and liberation movement, and represent the most aggressive war-mongering powers, which, with their actions are driving the world towards a devastating war.

No one, least of all the Party of Labour of Albania, can deny the existence of profound contradictions between the two greatest imperialist powers of our time — American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. We have continually stressed that the contradictions between the two superpowers not only exist, but are becoming deeper. Parallel with this, the superpowers, on their part, are making efforts to reach agreement over certain questions. Lenin explains this phenomenon with the two tendencies of capital. He said,

*«... two tendencies exist — one which makes the alliance of all imperialists inevitable, and the other which pits some imperialists against others...»**

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 27, p. 418, Alb. ed.

But why are there irreconcilable contradictions and antagonisms between the two superpowers? Because, since they are big imperialist powers, each of them is fighting for world hegemony, to create new spheres of influence, for the enslavement and exploitation of peoples. The appetite and greed which each of them has, is the source of bickering and severe friction between them. This friction may lead to war between them, and even to a bloody world war.

We Marxist-Leninists must exploit the contradictions which exist between the superpowers in the interests of the revolution and the peoples' liberation struggles.

Exploiting the contradictions in the enemy camp is a component part of revolutionary strategy and tactics. Stalin described the exploitation of the contradictions and conflicts in the ranks of the enemies of the working class, within the country or among the imperialist states in the international arena, as an indirect reserve of the proletarian revolution. It is a well-known historical fact that the Soviet socialist state, under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, took into account and exploited inter-imperialist contradictions in the period after the October Revolution, or during the years of the Second World War.

But in every instance, the assessment and exploitation of the contradictions amidst the enemies by the revolutionary forces, the socialist countries, are the result of a concrete Marxist-Leninist analysis of these contradictions and their level of severity, of the ratio of forces at a given period or moment, in order to define in what way, in what form and by what means to exploit them. The principle is that these contradictions must always be exploited in favour of the revolution, the peoples and their freedom, in favour of the cause of socialism. The exploitation of contradictions amidst the enemies should lead to the growth and strengthening of the revolution-

ary and liberation movement, and not to making it weaken and fade, should lead to an ever more active mobilization of the revolutionary forces in the struggle against the enemies, especially the main ones, without allowing any illusions about them to be created among the peoples.

The two superpowers, the United States of America and the revisionist Soviet Union, have the suppression of the revolution and socialism as the first point in their program. Not only do the Chinese leaders not stress this fact, which is an expression of the irreconcilable contradiction between socialism and capitalism, but they even deny it in practice. Of course, it is impermissible for Marxist-Leninists to forget that the superpowers, despite the struggle between them for hegemony, despite the contradictions they have, never lose sight of their common objective of suppressing the peoples who demand freedom, and of sabotaging the revolution, and this, too, leads to general or local wars. On this question, the Chinese revisionists continue to hold their known standpoint of the fight only against Soviet social-imperialism, which, according to them, is the more dangerous, more aggressive and more bellicose. They relegate US imperialism to second place and stress that the United States of America «wants the status quo, that it is in decline». From this the Chinese revisionists arrive at the conclusion that an alliance with American imperialism against Soviet social-imperialism can and should be reached.

US imperialism is not at all weakened or tamed, as the Chinese leaders claim. On the contrary, it is aggressive, savage and powerful, like Soviet social-imperialism. The fact that US imperialism no longer has that dominant position it held in the past, does not alter anything. This is the dialectics of the development of capitalism

and it corroborates Lenin's theses that imperialism is capitalism in decline, decadence. But, proceeding from this, to go so far as to underestimate the actual aggressive economic and military strength of one or the other superpower, is impermissible. It is likewise impermissible, proceeding from a real weakening and decline of the imperialists' power, to say that one imperialism has become less dangerous and that the other is more dangerous. Both imperialist superpowers are dangerous, because neither of them ever forgets the fight against those who want to dig the grave for them, and those who want to dig the grave for the superpowers are the peoples.

To advocate the struggle against Soviet social-imperialism only, and to cease the fight against US imperialism in fact, as the Chinese leaders are doing, means to fail to uphold the fundamental theses of Marxism-Leninism. There is no doubt about the fact that Soviet social-imperialism must be fought to the finish. But to fail to fight just as hard against US imperialism, too, this is unacceptable, this is betrayal of the revolution. If the Chinese course is followed, then it will not be clear what US imperialism is and what Soviet social-imperialism is, why these two superpowers have contradictions and what is the essence of these contradictions, what is the basis of the struggle between them, which we must deepen and what we must do to prevent these two imperialist states from unleashing a world war, etc.

If we understand these questions properly in theory, and if we act correctly on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist theory, then the absolute need for us to assist and support the peoples fighting against the two superpowers and the bourgeois capitalist cliques ruling them will become quite clear. The capitalist world today is going through a grave crisis. But this crisis must be assessed

in all its magnitude, and likewise, the contradictions which exist in the capitalist world must also be assessed in all their gravity.

Their pragmatic and anti-Marxist logic leads the Chinese revisionists to present the Soviet Union as a country developing without contradictions, as an imperialism which is ruling the other revisionist countries, like Poland, East Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Bulgaria, without problems. They present the Soviet bloc as a bloc in ascendancy, and the Soviet Union as the only imperialism left in the world, bent on establishing its hegemony everywhere.

If we speak of the hegemony of the Soviet Union over the revisionist countries of Eastern Europe, this is expressed, in the first place, in the military occupation of these countries by the Soviet armed forces, in the ruthless and unscrupulous plunder of their assets by Soviet social-imperialism, which is trying to integrate them completely into the system of Soviet republics. Naturally, the revisionist Soviet Union is encountering opposition in these efforts. The time will come when this opposition and these contradictions, which exist in latent form within the revisionist pack, will become more acute and will burst out.

We have described Soviet social-imperialism as aggressive because it attacked and occupied Czechoslovakia, because it has intervened in Africa and elsewhere, and has plans and is preparing for other acts of aggression. (18) But can it be said that US imperialism has committed fewer acts of aggression, or is less aggressive than Soviet social-imperialism?

The Chinese leadership has forgotten the aggression

18 In the end of December 1979 the Soviet social-imperialists invaded and occupied Afghanistan (see this volume, p. 752).

of the United States of America against Korea, it has forgotten the prolonged and barbarous war against Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, it has forgotten its war in the Middle East, its intervention in the republics of Central America, etc. It has erased all these things from the ledger and now comes out with the conclusion that US imperialism has allegedly been tamed! It forgets that US imperialism has extended its tentacles all over the world, has set up its military bases everywhere, and is developing and strengthening them. Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai forgot this, the Chinese revisionist leadership forget this when they tell us that US imperialism has allegedly been weakened and tamed and, hence, an alliance can be concluded with it! To act in this way means to seek to extinguish the struggle against imperialism in general and against US imperialism in particular, and indeed even against Soviet social-imperialism, which China claims to be fighting so hard.

It is true that Soviet social-imperialism has a great hunger for expansion. Its intervention in Angola and Ethiopia, its attempts to establish bases in the Mediterranean and several Arab countries, to seize the Red Sea narrows or to establish military bases in the Indian Ocean, all these are blatant imperialist actions. But these positions of Soviet social-imperialism are not consolidated to the same extent that US imperialism has consolidated its neo-colonialist economic, strategic and military positions in other countries. It is precisely this situation that the Chinese leadership appears to underestimate, but in reality it recognizes and supports it.

At the same time, the Chinese revisionists cannot fail to see that, despite the contradictions existing between the capitalist states of Western Europe and US imperialism, they are closely linked with one another, linked through political, military and economic alliances, such

as NATO, the European Common Market, etc. It is impossible for the Chinese leadership not to know that US capital has penetrated deeply into the economies of the countries of Western Europe, and not only there, but also into Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The Chinese leadership knows full well that the United States of America has invested and continues to invest scores of billions of dollars in various countries of the world. Then what is it hoping for? Is it hoping that the western capitalist countries, with all their contradictions with the United States of America, will break away from it in order to weaken their own camp, to renounce that armed might, those economic, social and cultural ties they have with it, and leave themselves naked before Soviet social-imperialism for the sake of China's interests? This is an absurdity of the Chinese foreign policy.

As we have already stressed, there is no doubt that the contradictions existing between the two superpowers and the other imperialist and capitalist-revisionist countries should be exploited by the revolutionary and liberation forces. But it is important that this should be understood correctly, should always be seen from the angle of the interests of the revolution and subordinated to them. The exploitation of contradictions among the imperialist powers and groups, the capitalist-revisionist states, etc., can never be an aim in itself for the working class and the Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries.

To exploit the contradictions between the imperialist countries and the two superpowers means to deepen the rifts between them, to encourage the revolutionary and patriotic forces of these countries to oppose US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, which want to subjugate them economically, politically and militarily, to exploit them and deny them their national identity, etc.

But what is China doing?

The Chinese policy advocates the «holy alliance» of the western capitalist countries with the United States of America. Indeed it goes even further. It advocates the alliance of the proletariat of the countries of Western Europe with the reactionary bourgeoisie of these countries. Where is the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist line here? Where is the line of exploiting contradictions here? Do the Chinese leaders think that they will be able to strengthen this bloc against the Soviets, according to their own desires, with such a policy? This is the utopia they are dreaming of, but it is a metaphysical view on their part.

The United States of America, the western capitalist countries, and along with them, Japan and Canada, too, are not so crazy as the Chinese leaders think, their policy is not so naive as the Chinese policy. For their part, they know very well how to exploit the contradictions existing between China and the Soviet Union. They know how to go about it and act in order to weaken the big aggressive power, the Soviet Union. They have long been fighting in this direction, and one cannot say that they have achieved no results. The United States of America and all the other capitalist states are inciting the contradictions between the revisionist countries of the East and the Kremlin.

Now China, too, has begun to practise this old American policy. Hua Guofeng's visit to Rumania and Yugoslavia was according to this course. But China's opening up to Europe, its fanning up of contradictions and, especially, its attempts to create a favourable field of action for itself in the Balkans, all these things are not done in the interests of the peoples and the revolution. They are part of the Chinese policy of incitement of war, the aim of which is that the peoples of Europe should kill one another and become cannon fodder in an imperialist war.

Pravda has long been engaged in polemics with the United States of America, of course without effect, ac-

cluding it of a rapid build up of armaments. Its concern is not to criticize this action of the United States of America, since the Soviet social-imperialists themselves are doing the same thing. The problem is that the increase of US military potential relatively weakens Soviet fighting strength and forces the Soviet Union to follow the United States of America step by step, in order to balance its military potential and aggressive power. However, keeping up with US imperialism in the armaments race weakens the economy of the Soviet Union, because it means that large material, monetary and human funds are transferred from the economy to the army. This is what is worrying Brezhnev and company.

But the astonishing thing is that, through their newspaper *Renmin Ribao*, the Chinese revisionists unreservedly take the side of the Americans, publishing article after article urging the United States of America not to lose the lead in the armaments race, but to ceaselessly increase its military potential. Thus it turns out, according to *Renmin Ribao*, that it is not the United States of America which is arming, but only the Soviet Union. Such an advocate of the Americans as the Chinese revisionist leadership is becoming, is not to be found in any other country. The bourgeoisie tries at least to preserve a sense of proportion in its criticisms and interpretations of realities, to weigh up the situations which are developing, tendentiously, of course. But to act in the way the Chinese leaders are doing, is something quite unprecedented.

At his meeting with Deng Xiaoping, the Secretary of the American Department of State, Vance, explained to him that the «United States of America has military superiority over the Soviet Union». But Deng Xiaoping told a large group of American journalists who were visiting China at that time, that «Beijing does not believe»

Vance's statement, and that the «Soviet Union is much superior to the United States of America». «None so deaf as he who will not hear», as the saying goes.

The Chinese thesis, presented as an alleged Marxist thesis, which casts doubt on the fact that it is not just the one but both the imperialist superpowers which are seeking the redivision of the world, to create new colonies, to oppress the peoples and extend their markets, cannot be accepted.

The very posing of the question that one imperialism is stronger and the other weaker, one is aggressive and the other tamed, is not Marxist-Leninist. The presentation of the question in this manner is a reflection of a reactionary view which leads the Chinese revisionists into alliance with the United States of America, NATO and the European Common Market, with the King of Spain, the Shah of Iran, Pinochet of Chile and all the fascist dictators. The Chinese policy, which is harmless to US imperialism, which is harmless to the power of the banks and the biggest capital of our time, is an out-and-out bourgeois, reformist, pacifist policy, and very stupid.

The Chinese leaders cannot fail to see that American finance capital, the trusts and monopolies are by no means reducing their investments abroad, that they are not giving up their ambitions to exploit and enslave, but, on the contrary, are becoming stronger and trying to alter the ratio of forces in the world in their own favour.

The Soviet social-imperialists are doing the same thing. The aim of their economic policy, of the big trusts which exist in the Soviet Union, is to suck the blood of satellites and other countries by all manner of means. They have dressed themselves up in a new cloak and present themselves under another name, while they, too, strive to alter the ratio of forces to their own advantage,

at first allegedly through agreements and negotiations, but, when the time comes, also by force, i.e., war.

With their reasoning that the United States of America «wants the status quo», that «it is on the decline», and that Soviet social-imperialism is the «more dangerous, more aggressive, more bellicose», etc., the Chinese revisionists want to prove that the United States of America can and should become the ally of China against the Soviet Union. The various kinds of relations, which they are extending, the open support they give the increase in the war budget and the further arming of the United States of America confirm this.

The Chinese revisionists preach that the situation today is such that the Marxist-Leninists, the revolutionaries and the peoples can make a compromise with and rely on US imperialism. Our Party is against any compromise with ferocious US imperialism, because such a thing is not in the interests of the revolution and the liberation of the peoples. We have been, are and will be in struggle with US imperialism until its complete destruction. Likewise, we are and will be in struggle to the end with Soviet social-imperialism.

The support which China is giving US imperialism is not in the least in favour of the revolution and the peoples, but in favour of the counter-revolution. With its reactionary political and ideological line, the Chinese leadership leaves the peoples of the world in the clutches of US imperialism. It wants them to remain docile, not to revolt, and even to unite with US imperialism against the other superpower, which wants to grab from the United States of America the assets it has built up from the toil and sweat of the peoples. China's leadership recommends to the capitalist countries of Europe, gathered in the European Common Market, that they should unite. It also lines up the peoples in the capitalist union of

Europe. This stand means: keep quiet, no more talk about the revolution, no more talk about the dictatorship of the proletariat, but put yourselves in the service of the trusts, the capitalists and, along with them, create an even greater economic and military force to cope with Soviet social-imperialism.

The European Common Market, which China supports and is strengthening economically, is nothing but a means to preserve the maximum profits of the monopoly trusts of Western Europe and to group together the developed industrial states, in which the wealthy classes, as Lenin says, exact a colossal tribute from Africa, Asia, etc. By supporting these capitalist states, the Chinese leaders, in fact, are supporting the parasitism of a handful of capitalists at the expense of the peoples of these countries, as well as of the peoples who have fallen into their clutches.

The theory of the «three worlds» of the Chinese revisionists, by means of which they try to justify their counterrevolutionary stands, is nothing but a variant of opportunism in the ranks of the workers' movement, which helps imperialism to create markets and exact profits at the expense of other peoples, so that the opportunists, too, will receive some of the crumbs from the capitalists' table.

It is an undeniable fact that the Chinese leadership is defending the capitalist forces and states of Europe, and not supporting the revolutionary forces and proletariat so that they rise and destroy the plans of American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, «United Europe», the European Common Market and Comecon, in a word, all the pillars of the imperialist system, which, like a great monster, sucks the blood of the peoples.

Although it includes the developed capitalist states such as West Germany, Britain, Japan, France, Italy, etc.,

in the «second world», and irrespective of all its talk on the theoretical plane about their «double» character, the Chinese revisionist leadership does not consider these states enemies of the revolution. On the contrary, the Chinese have found it convenient to shut their eyes to this and reach open compromises with them, allegedly in order to use them against Soviet social-imperialism.

The Chinese leadership, whose eyes have been blinded as a result of its pragmatic and anti-Marxist policy, «forgets» that such states as West Germany, Britain, Japan, France, Italy and others like these have been and are imperialist states, that the enslaving and colonialist tendencies, which have been characteristic of them traditionally, have not been and, as such, cannot be eliminated. It is true that after the Second World War these imperialist powers have been weakened, even greatly weakened, and that their former positions have changed to the advantage of American imperialism. Nevertheless, neither France, nor Britain, nor any other of them has given up the struggle to protect its markets or gain other markets in Africa, Asia and the countries of Latin America.

Among all these capitalist and imperialist states which are not so powerful as American imperialism, there are contradictions, but, at the same time, there is also the tendency to come to terms with one another,

After the Second World War, American imperialism helped its old, former allies in Europe to recover and the American monopolies linked themselves with the monopolies of these former allies in a tangle of common interests. But contradictions have always existed among them, as each of them tries to have a free hand in monopolizing markets, importing raw materials and exporting its industrial goods. In this instance, too, the international reality confirms the correctness of Lenin's thesis on the two objective tendencies of capital.

It is likewise true that these capitalist states have contradictions not only with American imperialism but also with Soviet social-imperialism. The question arises: how should these contradictions be exploited? The inter-imperialist contradictions can by no means be exploited in the way the Chinese revisionists advocate. We Marxist-Leninists cannot defend the various reactionaries, for example, in Germany, or the British Conservative or Labourite leaders in England simply because they have contradictions with Soviet social-imperialism. Were we to do so and support the preachings of the Chinese to the effect that «the capitalist states of Europe should unite in the Common Market», that «United Europe» should be strengthened so as be able to face Soviet social-imperialism, that would mean our agreeing to sacrifice the struggle and efforts of the proletariat of these countries to break the chains of enslavement, to sabotage the future of the revolution in those countries.

By making unprincipled compromises with American imperialism, the Chinese revisionists have betrayed Marxism-Leninism and the revolution. **Marxist-Leninists interpret the thesis of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on contradictions and compromises in its true spirit. The Chinese interpret this thesis in a way diametrically opposite to the truth.**

Following the Leninist course, our Party is not against every kind of compromise, but is against treacherous compromises. A compromise can be made when it is necessary and serves the interests of the class and the revolution, but always bearing in mind that it must not be at the expense of the strategy and loyalty to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, must not damage the interests of the class and the revolution.

In regard to the stand towards compromises, among other things, Lenin says:

*«Is it permissible for the partisan of the proletarian revolution to conclude compromises with the capitalists or the capitalist class?... to reply to this general question in a negative way would obviously be absurd. Of course, the partisan of the proletarian revolution can conclude compromises or agreements with the capitalists. Everything depends on **what sort** of agreement and **in what circumstances** it is concluded. It is here and here alone that the difference can and must be sought between that agreement which is legitimate from the viewpoint of the proletarian revolution, and that agreement which is treacherous, perfidious (from the same viewpoint).»**

And Lenin goes on:

*«The conclusion is clear: to completely rule out any agreement or compromise with the robbers is just as absurd as to justify participation in the robbery with the abstract thesis that, speaking in general, sometimes agreements with thieves are permissible and necessary.»***

Lenin also said:

«The task of a truly revolutionary party is not to proclaim that it is impossible to abjure every sort of compromise, but to know how to

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 30, pp. 562-563, Alb. ed.

** Ibid., p. 565.

*maintain, regardless of these compromises, since they are unavoidable, its loyalty to its own principles, to its own class, to its own revolutionary task, towards the work of preparing the revolution and the education of the masses of the people to achieve victory in the revolution.»**

Only proceeding from these teachings of Lenin's can compromises be permissible. But how can a compromise with American imperialism or Soviet social-imperialism be in the interest of socialism and the world revolution, when it is known that these two superpowers are the most ferocious enemies of the peoples and the revolution? Not only is this compromise not necessary, but, on the contrary, it endangers the interests of the revolution. To compromise, or to violate principles on problems of such importance, means to betray Marxism-Leninism.

If Mao Zedong and the other Chinese leaders have had and still have a good deal to say about contradictions «in theory», then they ought to speak not only of exploiting inter-imperialist contradictions and of compromises with the imperialists, but, in the first place, they ought to speak of the fundamental contradictions of our epoch, the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the contradictions between the oppressed peoples and countries, on the one hand, and the two superpowers and the whole of world imperialism, on the other, the contradictions between socialism and capitalism. But the Chinese leaders are silent about these contradictions which exist objectively and cannot be wiped off. They speak of only one contradiction, which, according to them, is that between the entire world and Soviet social-imperialism, in this way, trying to justify their unprincipled

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 25, pp. 359-360, Alb. ed.

compromises with American imperialism and all world capitalism.

Marxist-Leninist class analysis and the facts show that the existence of contradictions and rifts among the imperialist powers and groupings in no way overrides or displaces to a position of secondary importance the contradictions between labour and capital in the capitalist and imperialist countries, or the contradictions between the oppressed peoples and their imperialist oppressors. Precisely these, the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between the oppressed peoples and imperialism, between socialism and capitalism, are the most profound, they are permanent, irreconcilable contradictions. Consequently, the utilization of inter-imperialist contradictions, or contradictions between the capitalist and revisionist states is meaningful only if it serves to create the most favourable conditions for the powerful development of the revolutionary and liberation movement against the bourgeoisie, imperialism and reaction. Therefore, these contradictions must be utilized without creating illusions among the proletariat and the peoples about imperialism and the bourgeoisie. It is essential to make the teachings of Lenin clear to the workers and peoples, to make them conscious that only an irreconcilable stand towards the oppressors and exploiters, only their resolute struggle against imperialism and the bourgeoisie, only the revolution, will ensure them genuine social and national freedom.

The utilization of contradictions among enemies cannot comprise the fundamental task of the revolution and be counterposed to the struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the reactionary and fascist dictatorship, the imperialist oppressors.

The stand of Marxist-Leninists on this question is clear. They address themselves to the peoples, the prolet-

ariat, call on the masses to rise to their feet to smash the hegemonic, oppressive, aggressive and warmongering plans of the American imperialists and Soviet social-imperialists, to overthrow the reactionary bourgeoisie and its dictatorship, both in the West and in the East.

As far as our socialist state is concerned, it has always exploited the contradictions in the enemy camp. In exploiting them, our Party proceeds from a correct assessment of the character of the contradictions existing between a socialist country and the imperialist and bourgeois-revisionist countries, and a correct assessment of inter-imperialist contradictions.

Marxism-Leninism teaches us that the contradictions between a socialist country and capitalist and revisionist countries, which reflect contradictions between two classes with diametrically opposed interests, the working class and the bourgeoisie, are permanent, fundamental, irreconcilable. They run like a red thread through the entire historical epoch of the transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale. On the other hand, the contradictions between the imperialist powers are expressions of contradictions amongst exploiters, amongst classes with common fundamental interests. Therefore, however severe the contradictions and conflicts between the imperialist powers may be, the danger of aggressive actions by world imperialism or various sections of it against the socialist country, remains a permanent real danger at any moment. Rifts between imperialists, inter-imperialist quarrels and conflicts may, at the most, weaken or temporarily postpone the danger of the actions of imperialism against the socialist country, therefore while it is in the interests of this country to utilize these contradictions in the enemy ranks, they cannot eliminate this danger. This has been forcefully stressed by Lenin who said,

*«... the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable.»**

These teachings of Lenin's retain their full validity today. They have been thoroughly vindicated by a sequence of historical events, such as the fascist aggression against the Soviet Union in the years of the Second World War, the aggression of American imperialism in Korea and later in Vietnam, the imperialist and social-imperialist hostile activity and the various plots against Albania, etc. Therefore, our Party has stressed and stresses that any underestimation of the contradictions of a socialist state with the imperialist powers and the capitalist-revisionist countries, any underestimation of the danger of aggressive actions by the latter against socialist Albania, any relaxation of vigilance resulting from the idea that the contradictions between the imperialist powers themselves are very abrasive, and because of this they cannot undertake such actions against our Homeland, would be fraught with very dangerous consequences.

The Party of Labour of Albania also proceeds from the fact that only the revolutionary, liberation, freedom-loving and progressive forces can be true and reliable allies of our country, as the socialist country it is. Our country maintains state relations with different countries of the bourgeois-revisionist world, it utilizes the contradictions between the imperialist, capitalist and revisionist states, and, at the same time, firmly supports the revolutionary and liberation struggle of the working class,

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 29, p. 160, Alb. ed.

the working masses and the peoples of every country where such a struggle is going on, regarding this support as its lofty internationalist duty. The Party of Labour of Albania has always consistently upheld this viewpoint; at its 7th Congress it stressed once again that it will support the proletariat and the peoples, the Marxist-Leninist parties, the revolutionaries and progressives who fight against the superpowers, the capitalist and revisionist bourgeoisie and world reaction, for social and national liberation.

In the past, the Communist Party of China has also quoted well-known Marxist-Leninist principles and theses in regard to the contradictions. For example, in the known document entitled, «A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement», published by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in 1963, the Chinese wrote: «These or those necessary compromises between socialist and imperialist countries do not require that the oppressed peoples and nations also make compromises with imperialism and its stooges.» And they added: «Never should anybody, under the pretext of peaceful coexistence, demand that the oppressed peoples and nations renounce the revolutionary struggle.» The Chinese leadership was talking in this way then, because at that time it was the Khrushchevite leadership who wanted the peoples and the communist parties to agree that American imperialism and its chiefs had become peaceful and to submit to the Soviet policy of rapprochement with American imperialism. Now it is the leadership of the Communist Party of China that is preaching to the peoples, the revolutionaries, the Marxist-Leninist parties and the proletariat of the whole world, that they must enter into alliance with the imperialist or capitalist countries, and unite with the bourgeoisie and all reactionaries against Soviet social-imperialism. And

the Chinese do not express these ideas in disguised phrases, but openly. Such vacillations and 180 degree turns have nothing to do with the principled Marxist-Leninist policy. They are characteristic of the pragmatic policy followed by all revisionists, who subordinate principles to their bourgeois and imperialist interests.

In order to justify their unprincipled compromises with American imperialism and the international bourgeoisie, the Chinese leaders and all the advocates of the theory of «three worlds» deliberately misrepresent the historical truth about the Soviet-German non-aggression pact of 1939 and the Anglo-Soviet-American alliance in the Second World War.

The Soviet-German non-aggression pact was a skilful utilization by Stalin of inter-imperialist contradictions. At that time the Hitlerite aggression against the Soviet Union was imminent. It was the period when nazi Germany had invaded Austria and Czechoslovakia, and fascist Italy had invaded Albania, when the Munich agreement had been concluded and the German juggernaut of war was racing towards the East. The Soviet Union did not conclude an alliance, but a non-aggression pact with Germany, after the Western powers had refused to respond to Stalin's call for joint actions with the Soviet state to contain the nazi-fascist aggressors, and when it had become clear that these powers were urging Hitler to attack the land of the Soviets. The Soviet-German pact foiled their plans and gave the Soviet Union time to make further preparations to face the nazi aggression.

In regard to the Anglo-Soviet-American alliance, it is known that it was concluded when Hitlerite Germany, after having occupied France and being at war with Britain, launched its savage aggression against the Soviet Union, when the war against the Axis powers had as-

sumed a clear and pronounced anti-fascist and liberation character. It must be pointed out that at no time and in no instance did Stalin and the Soviet Union at that time advocate or call on the proletariat and the communist parties to renounce the revolution and unite with the reactionary bourgeoisie. Indeed, when Browder renounced the class struggle and advocated class conciliation, because the interests of the Anglo-Soviet-American alliance allegedly required this, he was stigmatized by Stalin and the communist movement as a revisionist and renegade from therevolution.(19)

As can be seen, nothing justifies the unprincipled compromises and alliances of the Chinese with American imperialism and the various reactionary forces. The historical analogy the Chinese revisionists are trying to make does not hold water.

In their propaganda, the Chinese leaders try to give the impression that we Albanians are allegedly against any compromise and do not strive to utilize the contradictions as we should. Naturally, they know that on these questions we take the stand-point of Marxism-Leninism, but they continue to propagate this crooked line in order to conceal their departure from the scientific Marxist-Leninist theory and the road of revolution. They act in this way in order to denigrate the correct policy and stands of the proletarian party and state. Their accusations are groundless. Let us refer to the facts.

Our Party has always energetically supported the just cause of the Arab peoples, without exception, and will continue to do so to the end. We support the struggle of the Palestinian people against Israel, which has long ago become a blind tool, a gendarme of US imperialism

19 See pp. 807-815 of this volume.

in the Middle East. It has been charged with the task of defending the rich Arab oil fields for the big monopoly companies of the United States of America and maintaining the status quo, as the Chinese revisionists call it.

Despite the fact that President Sadat and his government were formerly in alliance with the Soviet Union, we supported the struggle of the people of Egypt to regain the territories occupied by Israel. However, we exposed the aims of the Soviet Union against Egypt, and its game in the Middle East in general. Not for one moment have we remained silent about the colonialist aims of the Soviet Union towards Egypt. We have done the same thing in supporting the Egyptian people just as consistently in their fight against US imperialism and Israel.

While defending the interests of the Egyptian people and the other Arab peoples, our Party and people also expose the manoeuvres which US imperialism together with Israel is engaged in at present. We cannot approve of any course, any line of compromise with aggressor Israel, under the pretext that this is allegedly in favour of the Egyptian people.

The Chinese leadership, however, does not expose American imperialism. It applauds the Israeli-Egyptian agreements and urges the Arab peoples to come to terms, to make compromises with American imperialism and Israel, which are their main enemies. Such a stand is not Marxist-Leninist. Such a compromise à la the Chinese is not in the interest of the peoples. The Chinese absurdity that breaking with one imperialism to throw yourself into the arms of another imperialism «is acting in the interests of the freedom of the peoples», is totally inadmissible. These typically bourgeois manoeuvres and intrigues cannot be called Marxist-Leninist actions which

help to deepen the contradictions between the two imperialist superpowers.

The Albanian Party and people are against predatory imperialist wars and resolutely support just national liberation wars which are, and must always be, to the advantage of the peoples, in favour of the revolution. They are not against supporting even a bourgeois state, when they see that those who rule this state are progressive persons and fight in the interests of the liberation of their people from imperialist hegemony. But our country cannot make common cause, or a compromise, as the Chinese revisionists call it, with a state ruled by a reactionary clique, which, in the interests of its own class and to the detriment of the interests of the people, enters into an alliance with one or the other superpower.

Likewise, socialist Albania is not against maintaining normal diplomatic relations with the states of the «third world», or the «second world». It is against such relations only with the two superpowers and the fascist states. But in developing our diplomatic relations, just as in our trade, cultural and other relations, we work according to principles, having regard, first of all, for the interests of our country and the revolution, contrary to which we have never acted, and will never do so.

We Marxist-Leninists who have come to power have to establish diplomatic relations with the bourgeois-capitalist states, because these relations are in our interests, and theirs, too. These interests are reciprocal.

Marxist-Leninists should always remember principles. They cannot trample upon principles because of circumstances which are created in one period or another. We must keep in mind that in the countries where the upper strata of the bourgeoisie are ruling, they are permanently in struggle against the people, the proletariat and the

poor peasantry, the urban petty-bourgeoisie. Therefore, both when the socialist country maintains state relations with the bourgeois countries, and when it does not, it must make clear to the peoples that it supports their struggle, that it does not approve the reactionary, anti-popular actions of their rulers.

We Marxist-Leninists must recognize and bear in mind not only the contradictions which exist between the oppressed classes and their oppressors, but also the contradictions which arise between states, that is, between the governments of these countries and American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, the other capitalist countries, etc. We must always pursue such a policy that we do not defend a reactionary government simply because, for its own interests and those of the class in power, it breaks temporarily with American imperialism in order to throw itself into the lap of another imperialism, for example, British, Soviet, or some other imperialism. We must exploit the contradictions which exist among them with the aim that our stand assists the strengthening of the struggle of the proletariat and the oppressed masses of that country against its reactionary government. If contradictions have arisen between the reactionary and oppressive capitalist government of a country of the «second» or the «third world» and the government of a country of the «first world», according to the division made by the Chinese revisionists, it must not be taken for granted that these contradictions are always in favour of the liberation of the people of this country from the yoke of capital, the yoke of the reactionary bourgeoisie ruling there. In this case we have to do mainly with class interests, with the interests of bourgeois governments which represent the exploiting classes, with the question of who gives more and who gives less, who best defends their being in power, and

who wants to kick them out in order to bring in his own men.

In dealing with the struggle of the proletariat, the stand towards the bourgeoisie must not be confused with the diplomatic, trade, cultural and scientific relations between the socialist country and states with another state system. These inter-state relations are necessary and must be developed, but the socialist country should be clear about its aims in establishing them. The ideological, political, moral and material life of the socialist country must be a mirror for the peoples of those states with which it maintains relations, and in which, through the development of these relations, the peoples of the non-socialist states can see the blessings and advantages of the socialist system. Naturally, whether or not they follow the socialist road is their affair, but it is the duty of the socialist country to set the good example.

On all these political, theoretical, and organizational problems not only are the Chinese leaders unclear but, far from clarifying them, they deliberately make them even more obscure, because, as Mao Zedong says, we must stir things up in order to clarify them. This thesis is not correct. On the contrary, we must clarify things and convince people to carry out the revolution, because, as for turmoil, this exists already. If the question is to stir things up, then let us stir things up even more for imperialism, which is giving up the ghost, and not to help it and provide it with crutches to keep it going. We should cut short the existence of capitalism so that the peoples, the proletariat will be liberated and the prospect of socialism and communism will be brought nearer. This is our revolutionary road, the road of Marxism-Leninism. There is no other road.

The Chinese leaders formerly used the expression a

«tit-for-tat» struggle against American imperialism, but they did not apply it then, and are certainly not applying it today. They are not waging a tit-for-tat struggle, since they are drawing closer to American imperialism and are in alliance with the United States of America.

China's diplomatic, commercial and cultural relations with the imperialist states and the other states of the world are on a capitalist basis. China's objective in these relations is to strengthen its economic and military positions through the aid it wants to receive from the powerful imperialist states so that it, too, can compete with the other two superpowers. China's propaganda over the radio and by other means is designed to create the impression in the world not only that China is a big, powerful state with an ancient culture, but also that the present Chinese policy is progressive, indeed Marxist-Leninist. However, this activity of the Chinese revisionists does not and cannot by any means serve as an example which the peoples of the world should follow in their struggle to destroy the capitalist and imperialist power.

The Chinese View about the Unity of the «Third World» Is Reactionary

The Chinese leadership seeks the unity of all the countries of the «third world», which are heterogenous from any point of view: in regard to their economic, social and cultural development, the time needed and the road followed by each of them to win that degree of freedom and independence it enjoys today, etc.

But how does China imagine this unity it preaches? The Chinese leadership does not conceive this unity as achieved in the Marxist-Leninist way and in the interests of the revolution and the liberation of the peoples. It sees

it from the bourgeois point of view, that is, as a unity by means of treaties and agreements concluded and rescinded by the rulers of these countries, who are linked with one imperialist power today, but who tomorrow may denounce the agreements they themselves have concluded in order to link up with another.

The Chinese revisionist leadership forgets that the unity of these national states can be ensured only through the struggle of the proletariat and the working masses of each particular country, in the first place, against the external imperialism which has penetrated into that country, but also against the internal capitalism and reaction. Only on this basis can the unity of these countries be brought about. Only on this basis can the united front against foreign imperialism, as well as against the local monarchs, reactionary bourgeoisie, feudal landlords and dictators, be achieved.

Under capitalism unity is realized only from above, at the top, in order to safeguard the victories of the bourgeoisie and to protect them from the revolution. Whereas genuine unity, a people's unity, must be achieved mainly from below, with the proletariat at the head of this unity.

Of course, the tactics which the proletariat of a country of the so-called third world, or the proletariat of all these countries may employ to unite with other political forces against imperialism cannot be rejected out of hand. The unity of the revolutionary forces even with the bourgeois leadership of a country, at a given moment, when a deep contradiction arises with a foreign imperialism or with a reactionary leadership of one of the countries of the «third world», cannot be neglected, either.

All these opportunities and possibilities must be seen and exploited by the revolutionary forces. That is why Lenin says that the aid of the socialist country and the

international proletariat should be differentiated and conditional.

The Chinese leaders, however, advocate precisely an unconditional alliance among reactionary governments, allegedly to face up to imperialism. And when they talk against imperialism, they do not mean imperialism, in general, but only Soviet social-imperialism.

The weakening of imperialism and capitalism is the main trend of world history today. The efforts of various states to free themselves from the influence of imperialism also constitute another tendency which leads to the weakening of imperialism. But this second tendency, as the Chinese revisionist leadership absolutizes it unconditionally, without making any differentiation among countries, without studying the general and particular situations, does not lead to the correct course of the unity of the peoples in struggle to free themselves from imperialist interference and domination. Likewise, the view of the Chinese revisionists, who consider Europe a continent of «second world» countries, which they put in alliance with the «third world», cannot lead to the correct road, either. This grouping of capitalist states can never be for the general weakening of world capitalism. To say that such a thing can be achieved with the assistance and collaboration of the aristocratic bourgeoisie of Britain, the revanchist bourgeoisie of Western Germany, the cunning French bourgeoisie and the other big capitalist groups, is deplorable naivety.

The supporters of the theory of «three worlds» may claim that, by advocating the unity of these capitalist countries, they intend to weaken imperialism. But which imperialism will this unity weaken? That imperialism with which the theory of «three worlds» calls for the creation of a united front against social-imperialism? That imperialism with which the capitalist countries of Eu-

rope are in alliance, despite their contradictions with it? Obviously, advocating the strengthening of this group of states is advocating strengthening the positions of US imperialism, strengthening the positions of the capitalist states of West Europe.

On the other hand, when the Chinese leadership talks about the creation of the alliance between the states of the «second world» and the states of the so-called third world, it means the alliance among the ruling circles of these countries. But to claim that these alliances will help the liberation of the peoples is an idealist, metaphysical, anti-Marxist view. Therefore, to deceive the broad masses of the peoples, who are seeking liberation, with such revisionist theories is a crime committed against the peoples and the revolution.

The Communist Party of China thinks that imperialism does not know, does not see, does not understand and does not exploit the contradictions which exist among the countries that have only just thrown off the yoke of colonialism and have fallen under the yoke of neo-colonialism. The facts show that imperialism exploits these contradictions continuously, every day, to its own advantage. It urges and incites these countries and their peoples to fight one another, to split, to quarrel and fail to achieve unity even on certain specific problems.

Imperialism, too, is waging a life-and-death struggle, striving to prolong its existence and, when it sees that it cannot achieve this through the usual means, then it throws itself into open war and aggression to regain its superiority and hegemony.

The Chinese leaders want to unite the countries of the «third world» not only with one another, but also with the United States of America, against Soviet social-imperialism. In other words, the Chinese revisionists openly tell the peoples of the «third world» that Soviet

social-imperialism is their main enemy, therefore, at the present time, they must not rise against US imperialism or against its ally, the reactionary bourgeoisie which is ruling in their own countries. According to the Chinese «theory», the states of the «third world» have to fight not to strengthen their freedom, independence and sovereignty, not for the revolution which overthrows the rule of the bourgeoisie, but for the status quo. It is understandable that, by advocating agreement with the United States of America, contrary to the interests of the revolution and the cause of national liberation, the Chinese revisionists are pushing these states into a treacherous compromise.

The genuine Marxist-Leninist parties have the internationalist duty to encourage and inspire the proletariat and the peoples of all these countries to make the revolution, to rise against foreign and local oppression and enslavement, in whatever form they present themselves. Our Party thinks that this is the only way that the conditions can be created for the peoples to fight both imperialism and social-imperialism, with which the capitalist bourgeoisie of most of these countries of the «third world» is linked in all sorts of ways.

But what does China do? China defends Mobutu and the clique around him in Zaire. Through its propaganda China is trying to create the impression that it is allegedly defending the people of that country against an invasion of mercenaries engineered by the Soviet Union, but in reality it is defending the reactionary Mobutu regime. The Mobutu clique is an agency in the service of US imperialism. Through its propaganda and «pro-Zaire» stand, China is defending Mobutu's alliance with US imperialism, with neo-colonialism, and striving to prevent any change in the status quo of that country. The duty of the genuine revolutionaries is not to defend the reactionary rulers, the tools of the imperialists, but to work

to inspire the people of Zaire to fight for their freedom and sovereignty against Mobutu, local capital and US, French, Belgian and other imperialisms.

Just as we are against Mobutu in Zaire, we are also against Neto and his abettors in Angola, because the Soviet Union and Neto are doing the same thing in Angola as the United States of America and Mobutu are doing in Zaire. From examination of the development of the situation in the above two states it is obvious how the rivalry between the superpowers over the division of colonies and markets is raging there. We defend neither Neto nor the Soviet Union, but while fighting them, we cannot support US imperialism and its mercenaries, enemies of the Angolan people. In any situation, under any circumstances and at any time, we must support the revolutionary peoples, and, in the case of Zaire and Angola, we must support only the peoples of these two countries in their efforts to throw off the yoke the superpowers are putting around their necks.

What should be recommended to the revolutionaries of Zaire? To make a compromise with Mobutu so that the people of this country will be even more oppressed by imperialism, as the Chinese revisionists advise? No, Marxist-Leninists cannot recommend this sort of compromise to the people of Zaire, or to any other people.

Let us take as an example China's policy in Pakistan. The Pakistan of the khans, where the rich bourgeoisie and the big latifundists have always ruled, has allegedly been an ally of China. China's aid to this country has not been aid in the revolutionary direction. It has assisted the strengthening of Pakistan's reactionary latifundist bourgeoisie which savagely oppresses the people of that country, just as the clique of Nehru, Gandhi and the other reactionary magnates oppresses the Indian people. The government of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was no exception.

First, East Pakistan broke away from West Pakistan. India knew how to exploit the great contradictions which existed between the people of East Pakistan and the reactionary bourgeoisie ruling in West Pakistan. It fanned up these contradictions to the point of leading the people of East Pakistan into an insurrection against the Pakistan of Ali Bhutto. At that time in East Pakistan, which took the name of Bangladesh, the government of Mujibur Rahman, who allegedly fought for democracy and the interests of the people, was formed. But one morning Mujibur Rahman was murdered by elements closely linked with US imperialism. Now Ali Bhutto, too, has been toppled. Thus, China's friend and ally, Pakistan's greatest landowner and richest man, has been overthrown by other reactionaries in a coup d'état.

But what is this opposition which came to power and who are those who take part in it? This, too, is a reactionary force, made up of the military-men, capitalists and big landowners. Impelled by their class interests and the links they, too, have with the United States of America, the Soviet Union, or China, they are trying to keep the reactionary power firmly in their hands. In these conditions, to speak to the people of Pakistan about close alliance with and support for one or the other bourgeois political force, of replacing one clique of rulers with another, as the Chinese leaders are doing, is not showing them the correct course of the revolution. The correct course is to call on the people, caught between two fires, Bhutto's and his opponents', to kindle the powerful fire of the revolution, to stamp out the two former fires, to overthrow the two cliques of the same mould that exist in Pakistan. In this fight on two flanks the Pakistan people themselves will have to know how to utilize the contradictions.

The same applies to many countries of the so-called third world, or non-aligned world.

Thus the Chinese leadership is having no luck, not only in its alliances and friendship with the Marxist-Leninists, but also in its alliances with the bourgeois-capitalist states. But why is it having no luck? Because its policy is not Marxist-Leninist, because the analyses it makes and the deductions it draws from them are wrong. In these conditions, what trust can the peoples of the «third world» have in China, which is aiming to take these countries under its wing?

Only the dictatorship of the proletariat, only the Marxist-Leninist ideology, only socialism, engender sincere love, close friendship and steel-like unity among the peoples, by eliminating everything which splits and divides them. In order to create unity and friendship among the peoples, to solve problems in the way that is best and most suitable to their interests, aid and concessions should in no way be granted to such degenerate bourgeois as Mobutu, Bhutto, Gandhi and others, allegedly for the sake of establishing a political equilibrium which is an expression of the anti-scientific, anti-popular and opportunist theory of «equilibrium», which serves to maintain the status quo and slavery.

We Marxist-Leninists fight against neo-colonialism, against the oppressive capitalist bourgeoisie of any country, that is, against those who oppress the peoples. This struggle can be waged if the genuine communist parties inspire, organize and lead the proletariat and the working masses. Leadership of the proletariat and the masses by the party is successfully achieved only when the party has a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary inspiration, and not an equivocal inspiration with a hundred meanings, with a hundred flags. In its actions the Marxist-Leninist party

of the genuine socialist country does not proceed only from the interests of its own state, but always takes account of the interest of the world revolution, too.

The Chinese Theory of the «Third World» and the Yugoslav Theory of the «Non-aligned World» Sabotage the Revolutionary Struggle of the Peoples

All the renegades from Marxism-Leninism, the Soviet, Titoite, Chinese and other modern revisionists, are doing their utmost to fight Marxism-Leninism, the triumphant theory of the proletariat. Our Party's exposure of the theory of «three worlds» has put the Chinese revisionists in a difficult position, because they are unable to reply to our opposition and exposure theoretically, and this is not because they are afraid of us, but because they are afraid of their lack of arguments.

Mao Zedong and Deng Xiaoping, who enunciated or adopted the notion of the «third world», did not want to support this theory with theoretical argument, for they could not, and this was not without a purpose. Why did they not do this? This «oversight» of theirs is a trick and its aim is to deceive people, to make them accept an absurd thesis without discussion, simply because Mao Zedong produced it. Mao Zedong could not explain the theoretical basis of this «philosophical» or «political» notion, because there is no way it can be explained. He and his disciples propagate their concept of the division of the world into three simply by proclaiming it, but without defending it, because they themselves know that this thesis is indefensible.

The Chinese «third world» and the Yugoslav «non-aligned world» are almost one and the same thing. The

aim of both of these «worlds» is to provide a theoretical justification for extinguishing the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and to assist the big imperialist and capitalist powers to preserve and perpetuate the bourgeois system of oppression and exploitation.

As a false, anti-Marxist theory, totally devoid of any theoretical basis, the theory of the «third world», the myth the Chinese revisionists have created around it, has no effect at all, either on the broad masses of the proletariat and the suffering peoples in the countries of the «third world», or on the leaders of these countries. These leaders, whom the Chinese leadership is trying to take under its umbrella, have their own deeply implanted views, have their own ideology and definite orientations, therefore the Chinese tales do not go down with them. Deng Xiaoping and company think that China with its vast territory and population can impose itself on these countries. To a certain degree, and as long as it does not jeopardize its plans, the Chinese theory of «three worlds» suits American imperialism. This theory fosters the creation of confused situations in the world of which both American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism take advantage to extend their own hegemony, to link together and enter into more alliances and agreements with the capitalist and bourgeois landowner heads of the countries of the so-called third world and make them even tighter. This situation also serves the social-imperialist aims of the Chinese revisionists.

In regard to the theory of the «non-aligned world», the Yugoslav revisionists raise it to a universal theory which is supposed to replace the Marxist-Leninist theory which, in their view, has become «obsolete», is no longer «relevant», because the peoples and the world have allegedly changed. They do not denounce Marxism-Leninism

openly, as Carrillo does, but they fight it by defending their theory of the «non-aligned world», whereas those who defend Marxism-Leninism, according to the Yugoslav revisionists, always repeat the same «mistake», they do not agree that the principles and norms of this revolutionary doctrine must be corrected, hence they are «recidivists». According to them, the Party of Labour of Albania (which is the target of their attack) is a «recidivist» party because it wants to apply the scientific principles, methods and doctrine of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin to «a world entirely different from that of their time».

The Titoite views are totally anti-Marxist. And the analysis they make of the process of world development today proceeds from these positions. Modern revisionism in general, and Yugoslav and Chinese revisionism in particular, are against the revolution. The Yugoslav and Chinese revisionists consider American imperialism a powerful force which can adopt a more logical course, can «help» the present world which, according to them, is developing and does not want to be aligned. But the Yugoslav theory is unable to make a proper definition of the term «non-aligned» itself. From what point of view are the countries it includes in this world it advocates non-aligned, politically, ideologically, economically or militarily? The Yugoslav pseudo-Marxist theory does not touch on or mention this question, because all these countries, which it is seeking to lead under the guise of a new world, cannot extricate themselves from their many and various forms of dependence on American imperialism or Soviet social-imperialism.

The Yugoslav «theory» makes great play with the fact that now the colonialism of the old type has been abolished, in general, but it does not say that many peoples have fallen into the clutches of the new colonialism.

We Marxist-Leninists do not deny the fact that colonialism in the old forms has been abolished, but we stress that it has been replaced by neo-colonialism. The same colonialists of yesterday are still oppressing the peoples today, through their economic and military potential, and disorganizing them politically and ideologically by introducing their corrupt way of life. The Titoites call such a situation a great transformation of the world and add that neither Marx nor Lenin, let alone Stalin, whom they reject altogether, conceived such a possibility. According to them, the peoples are now free, independent, and aspire only to non-alignment, while the wealth of the world should be divided in a more rational and just manner.

For this «aspiration» to be realized, the Yugoslav «theoreticians» ask the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists and the developed capitalist countries, out of the kindness of their hearts to contribute, through international conferences, debates, and the concessions which the countries will make to one another, to the transformation of the present world, which they say, «has reached such a level of consciousness as to be able to go to socialism».

This is the «socialism» the Titoite revisionists preach, a sermon they encourage to distract the peoples as much as possible from the reality. Being against the revolution, they are for the preservation of social peace so that the bourgeoisie and the proletariat can reach agreement on the «improvement of the living standard of the lower classes». That is, they humbly beg the upper classes to become «generous» and hand out something from their profits to the «wretched of the earth».

Tito wants to turn the theory of the «non-aligned world» into a «universal doctrine», which, as we mentioned above, allegedly suits the «situation in the world

today». The peoples of the world have awakened and want to live free, but according to Tito's theory, this «freedom» is not «complete» now because of the existence of the two blocs, the NATO bloc and the Warsaw bloc.

Tito poses as the leading figure and standard-bearer of the anti-bloc policy. It is true that his country is not a member of NATO or the Warsaw Treaty, but it is linked with these military organizations by many threads. The Yugoslav economy and policy are not independent, they are conditioned by the credits, aid and loans they receive from the capitalist countries and, first of all, from American imperialism. That is why he relies mostly on this imperialism. However, Tito also relies on Soviet imperialism and all other big capitalist powers. So Yugoslavia, which claims to be non-aligned is aligned, *de facto* if not *de jure*, with the aggressive organizations of the super-powers.

There are many leaders in various countries of the world like Tito, whom he wants to gather together in the so-called non-aligned world. These personalities, in general, are bourgeois, capitalist, non-Marxist, many of whom are fighting the revolution. The labels socialist, democrat, social-democrat, republican, independent republican, etc., that some of these personalities assume, in most cases serve to deceive the proletariat and the oppressed people, in order to keep them in bondage, and play politics at their expense.

Anti-Marxist capitalist ideology prevails in the «non-aligned» states. Many of these states have links and entanglements with the superpowers and all the developed capitalist countries of the world in the same way as Titoite Yugoslavia. The only basis for the grouping in the «non-aligned world», under Tito's leadership, which he advocates for all countries of the world, is the aim and activity to quell the revolution, to stop the proletariat and

peoples from rising in insurrection to overthrow the old capitalist society and establish the new society, socialism.

This is the idea and the main principle which guides Tito in bringing these countries together. He pretends that he has managed to group them together and assume the leadership of them, but in fact, no such thing exists, as nobody gives the Titoite theory of the «non-aligned world», or the Chinese theory of «three worlds», the importance which their standard-bearers desire and strive for. Everybody goes his own way on the road that brings him the greatest and most immediate gains.

All the indications show that American imperialism and world capitalism prefer the «non-aligned world» of Tito rather than the «third world» of the Chinese. Although they support the Chinese theory of «three worlds», the developed capitalist countries and American imperialism are, however, a bit wary and hesitant, because the strengthening of China may lead to undesirable situations and eventually become dangerous to the Americans themselves. Whereas the «non-aligned world» of Tito poses no danger at all to the United States of America. That is why, during Tito's last visit to the United States of America, Carter extolled his role in creating the «non-aligned world» and described the movement of the «non-aligned countries» as «a very important factor in solving the major problems of the present-day world».

The «non-aligned countries», most of which are capitalist countries, have cast the dice. They know how to manoeuvre in politics, and they side with those imperialist and capitalist powers which give them most aid. According to the bourgeois and capitalist view, to engage in politics means to deceive, to trick, to outwit the others as heavily and as often as possible. This policy is a policy of prostitution, which, at certain moments and according to passing circumstances, is aimed at getting at least a

little hard cash from a more powerful state in the interest of one's class, in the interest of the bosses of this class.

Titoism, with its theory of the «non-aligned world», preaches precisely this policy. But it does not have the same orientation everywhere, as Tito makes out. The «non-aligned» states do not consult Tito as to what they should do and how they should act. With a few exceptions, the rulers of these states are trying to consolidate their capitalist power, to exploit the people, to be on friendly terms with a big imperialist country, to prevent or suppress the outburst of any people's revolt and insurrection, any revolution. This is the whole policy of the Titoite «non-aligned world».

The Chinese theory of the «third world» is also for the status quo. The purpose of the Titoite «non-aligned world» is to beg credits from American imperialism and the other capitalist countries to enrich the bourgeois class and keep it in power. With its theory of the «third world». China, too, wants to enrich itself? to strengthen itself economically and militarily in order to become a superpower, to dominate the world. The aims of both these «worlds» are anti-Marxist. They are pro-capital, pro-American imperialism.

As Tito's visit to China (20) and Hua Guofeng's visit to Yugoslavia showed, the Yugoslav revisionists are lavishing praises and cunning flattery on China, well-adapted to the character of the Chinese revisionists and intended to lure them to the Yugoslav positions, so that the theory of the «non-aligned countries» will find not only understanding, but also complete acceptance in Beijing. Although they do not renounce their theory of the «third world», the Chinese revisionist leaders, headed by Hua

20 From August 30 to September 8, 1977. See Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China*, vol. 2, «8 Nëntori» Publishing House, Tirana 1979, pp. 517-522, 592-597, 608-617, 636-637, Eng. ed.

Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping, have come out in open support of the Titoite theory of the «non-aligned world». They have demonstrated that they want to work closely with the Yugoslav revisionists along the same lines, on two parallel rails, with the anti-Marxist common aim of deceiving the peoples of the «third world». The Yugoslav leaders are now elaborating these views in defence of China. In defending it, however, they have raised some «arguments» which are offensive to China, as the megalomaniac state it is. The Titoites come out in support of China and defend it against the exposure which our Party makes of the Chinese leadership, by saying that China's present policy is allegedly realistic.

China, say the Yugoslavs, is a big country, which from its very nature has to be developed, as it is still backward, a developing country. The Marxist-Leninist parties, such as the Party of Labour of Albania, are wrong, the Titoites claim, when they attack China over its just aspirations to development and non-alignment, over the aid it gives national liberation wars, etc., etc. Yugoslavia has the ambition to make China one of its satellites. For the Yugoslav revisionists the important thing is that China should adopt their anti-Marxist views without any hesitation.

With the theory of the «non-aligned world», Yugoslavia, with Tito at the head, has always faithfully served American imperialism. Tito and his group are performing this kind of service now, too, by trying to push China towards rapprochement and alliance with the United States of America. This was the main aim of Tito's going to Peking and of his talks there, which resulted in a close friendship, which, with Hua Guofeng's visit to Yugoslavia, has taken the form of wide-ranging collaboration, not only between the two states, but also between the two parties. During Tito's visit to Beijing, the Chinese

leaders half admitted that the League of Communists of Yugoslavia was a Marxist-Leninist party and that genuine socialism was being built in Yugoslavia. When Hua Guofeng went to Belgrade, they stated this completely and officially.

In other words, the Maoists have done just what Mikoyan and Khrushchev did in their time, when they gave Tito full recognition as a «Marxist», and declared that «socialism is being built in Yugoslavia» and that the «Communist Party of Yugoslavia is a Marxist-Leninist party».

The United States of America pulls either the Tito string, or the Hua Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping strings, according to its wishes. This pair are marionettes which do not come out openly on the stages of children's theatres, but remain in disguise and, when their theories are attacked and they find no facts to back their arguments, they declare that «they do not engage in polemics»! Why do they not engage in polemics with socialist Albania, when it and the Marxist-Leninist Party of Labour expose them badly before world opinion? What are they waiting for? They do not engage in polemics because they fear that their treacherous game against Marxism-Leninism and the revolution will be exposed. When the Chinese leaders, through the Yugoslavs and others, say that China will not reply to the Albanian polemics, their purpose is to cover up the truth.

The United States of America, the Soviet Union and other capitalist countries are continually holding various bilateral, or multilateral meetings, all kinds of conferences, congresses, adopting resolutions, making speeches and organizing press conferences, telling many lies and spreading false hopes, making threats and resorting to blackmail. All these things are being done to get out of the crisis in which they are bogged down, to suppress the

feelings of revenge of the suffering oppressed peoples, to outwit the broad working masses and the proletariat, and deceive the progressive democrats. The Yugoslav and Chinese revisionists, too, are playing their cards in all this devious and filthy game.

The theory of the «developing world» is also one of the cards of this game which has the same anti-Marxist aim of befuddling people's minds. This theory makes no mention of political problems because to do so would be in vain. Only the «economic problem» and the «problem of development» in general exist for this theory. But what kind of development the theory of the «developing world» is after, this nobody defines. Naturally, the various countries of the world want to develop in the economic, political, cultural, and all other fields. The peoples of the world, with the proletariat at the head, want to overthrow the old, rotten, bourgeois capitalist world and build the new world, socialism, in its place. But the theories of the «non-aligned world» and the «developing world» make no mention of this world.

When we Marxist-Leninists speak of the various countries, we also give our opinions of them, make assessments of the level of development of one country or the other, of the possibilities of each state to develop in this direction. We say that the people of each country must carry out the revolution and build the new society, relying on their own forces. We say that in order to be free, independent and sovereign, every state must build a new society, must fight and overthrow its oppressors, must fight any imperialism which enslaves it, must gain and defend its political, economic and cultural rights, and build a completely free, completely independent homeland where the working class must rule in alliance with all the working masses. This is what we say and we are resolute

defenders of the Leninist thesis about two worlds. We are members of the new socialist world and we are fighting the old capitalist world to the death.

All other «theories» which divide the world into the «first world», «second world», «third world», «non-aligned world», «developing world», or any other «world» which may be invented in the future, serve capitalism, serve the hegemony of the great powers, serve their aims of keeping the peoples in bondage. This is why we combat these reactionary anti-Marxist theories with all our strength.

The whole world and, especially, the countries of the so-called third world, non-aligned world, or developing world are following the struggle of our Party with sympathy. In our Marxist-Leninist views, in the ideological and political stand of our Party, the peoples of these countries whom the Chinese, Titoite and Soviet revisionist theories, and the theories of American imperialism, etc., are intended to deceive, see a correct stand which corresponds to the correct course for their liberation from oppression and exploitation once and for all.

Precisely because of this the enemies of Marxism-Leninism and our Party try to level the accusation at us that we are sectarian, ultra-leftist, Blanquist, that we do not make a correct analysis of the international situation but stick to some outmoded schemata, etc. It is clear that they are referring to our revolutionary doctrine, which they call «Marxist-Leninist schematism», «Stalinist schematism», etc.

They accuse us of allegedly calling on the countries which have escaped from the form of exploitation by old colonialism and which have entered the form of exploitation of the new colonialism, to go over immediately to socialism, to carry out the proletarian revolution immediately. They think they are striking a blow at us with this,

by presenting us as adventurers. But our Party stands loyal to the Marxist-Leninist theory, the theory which has correctly defined the road of the revolution, the stages this revolution must go through, and the conditions which must be fulfilled for this revolution, either national-democratic and anti-imperialist or socialist, to be carried out successfully. We stood loyal to this theory during our Anti-fascist National Liberation War, we are standing loyal to it now, in the construction of socialism, we stand loyal to it in our ideological struggle and foreign policy. Our analysis is correct, therefore no calumny can shake it.

II

CHINA'S PLAN TO BECOME A SUPERPOWER

In the beginning, while analysing the global strategy of US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism for world domination, while analysing the emergence and development of the different variants of modern revisionism, as well as the struggle of all these enemies against Marxism-Leninism and the revolution, we also dwelt on the place and strategy of Chinese revisionism.

China styles its political line Marxist-Leninist, but the reality shows the opposite. It is precisely the true nature of this line that we Marxist-Leninists must lay bare. We must not allow the Chinese revisionist theories to pass for Marxist theories, we must not allow China, on the course it has adopted, to pose as if it is fighting for the revolution, whereas in reality it is against it.

With the policy China is pursuing, it is becoming even more obvious that it is trying to strengthen the positions of capitalism at home and to establish its hegemony in the world, to become a great imperialist power, so that it, too, occupies, so to say, the «place it deserves».

History shows that every big capitalist country aims to become a great world power, to overtake and surpass the other great powers, and compete with them for world domination. The roads the big bourgeois states have followed to turn into imperialist powers have been various; they have been conditioned by definite historical and geog-

raphical circumstances, by the development of the productive forces, etc. The road of the United States of America is different from that followed by the old European powers like Britain, France and Germany, which were formed as such on the basis of colonial occupations.

After the Second World War, the United States of America was left the greatest capitalist power. On the basis of the great economic and military potential it possessed, and through the development of neo-colonialism, it was transformed into an imperialist superpower. But before long another superpower was added to this, the Soviet Union, which after Stalin's death and after the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism by the Khrushchevite leadership, was transformed into an imperialist superpower. For this purpose it exploited the great economic, technical and military potential built up by socialism.

We are now witnessing the efforts of another big state, today's China, to become a superpower because it, too, is proceeding rapidly on the road of capitalism. But China lacks colonies, lacks a large-scale developed industry, lacks a strong economy in general, and a great thermo-nuclear potential on the same scale as the other two imperialist superpowers.

To become a superpower it is absolutely essential to have a developed economy, an army equipped with atomic bombs, to ensure markets and spheres of influence, investment of capital in foreign countries, etc. China is bent on ensuring these conditions as quickly as possible. This was expressed in Zhou Enlai's speech in the People's Assembly in 1975 and was repeated at the 11th Congress of the Communist Party of China, where it was proclaimed that, before the end of this century, China will become a powerful modern country, with the objective of catching up with the United States of America and

the Soviet Union. Now this whole plan has been extended and set out in precise detail in what is called the policy of the «four modernizations».

But what road has China chosen so that it, too, will become a superpower? At present, the colonies and markets in the world are occupied by others. The creation of an economic and military potential equal to that of the Americans and Soviets, within 20 years, and with their own forces, as the Chinese leaders claim they will do, is impossible.

In these conditions, in order to become a superpower, China will have to go through two main phases: first, it must seek credits and investments from US imperialism and the other developed capitalist countries, to purchase new technology in order to exploit its local wealth, a great part of which will go as dividends for the creditors. Second, it will invest the surplus value extracted at the expense of the Chinese people in states of various continents, just as the US imperialists and Soviet social-imperialists are doing today.

China's efforts to become a superpower are based, in the first place, on its choice of allies and the creation of alliances. Two superpowers exist in the world today, US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. **The Chinese leaders worked out that they must rely on US imperialism, on which they have pinned great hopes of getting assistance in the fields of the economy, finance, technology and organization, as well as in the military field.** In fact, the economic-military potential of the United States of America is greater than that of Soviet social-imperialism. This the Chinese revisionists know well, though they say that America is declining. On the course which they are following, they cannot rely on a weak partner, from which they cannot gain much. Precisely because it is powerful,

they have chosen the United States of America to be their ally.

The alliance with the United States of America and the accommodation of the Chinese policy to the policy of US imperialism also has other aims. It contains in itself the threat against Soviet social-imperialism, which is plain from the deafening propaganda and the feverish activity the Chinese leaders are carrying out against the Soviet Union. With this policy it is pursuing, China is letting the revisionist Soviet Union know that its links with the United States of America constitute a colossal force against it, in case an imperialist war breaks out.

The present-day Chinese policy is also aimed at establishing friendships and alliances with all the other developed capitalist countries, from which it seeks political and economic benefits. China wants and is trying to strengthen the US alliance with these countries of the «second world», as it calls them. It is encouraging their unity with, or more accurately, their subjection to, US imperialism, which it regards as its senior partner.

This is the explanation for all those close links that the Chinese government is bent on establishing with all the wealthy capitalist states, Japan, West Germany, Britain, France, etc., this is the explanation for the frequent visits to China of government economic, cultural and scientific delegations from the United States of America and all the other developed capitalist countries, whether republics or kingdoms, as well as the visits of the Chinese delegations to those countries. This is the explanation for China's systematic actions to demonstrate its stand in favour of the United States of America and the other industrialized capitalist states at every opportunity, by trying to bring to notice everything that is written, said and done in these states against Soviet social-imperialism.

This policy of the Chinese leaders cannot fail to attract

attention and find due support from the United States of America. As is known, at the time of the Second World War in the American State Department there were two lobbies over the Chinese issue: one pro Chiang Kaishek and the other pro Mao Zedong. Of course, at that time the Chiang Kaishek lobby triumphed in the American State Department and Senate, while the Mao Zedong lobby triumphed on the spot, in mainland China. Among the inspirers of this lobby were Marshall and Vandemeyer, Edgar Snow (21) and others, who became friends and advisers of the Chinese, the instigators and inspirers of all kinds of organizations in new China. Today the threads of those old ties are being revived, strengthened, intensified and materialized. Now everybody sees that China and the United States of America are drawing ever closer to each other. Some time ago, one of the best-informed American newspapers, *The Washington Post* wrote: «There is now an American consensus which is supported even by the Right, even by those who have little sympathy for Beijing. According to this consensus, whatever might have happened in the past, there is no longer any reason for China to be considered a threat to the United States of America. Except for Taiwan, there are few things on which the two governments are not in agreement. In fact, both sides have agreed to put aside the Taiwan question with the aim of gaining advantage in other fields».

The issue of Taiwan which is raised in the relations between China and the United States of America, has remained something formal. China is not insisting on this question now. It is not worried about Hong Kong and is not in the least concerned that Macao is still under the domination of the Portuguese. The Chinese government

21 See Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China*, vol. 2, «8 Nëntori» Publishing House, Tirana 1979, pp. 492-497, Eng. ed.

does not accept the offer of the new Portuguese government to restore this colony to China, saying that «a gift is not taken back». The existence of these colonies is an anachronism, but this does not upset the pragmatic policy of the Chinese leaders. So long as Hong Kong and Macao remain colonies, why should Taiwan, too, not be a colony? Apparently China is greatly interested that Taiwan should remain as it is in the future, too. Besides its open relations it carries on in the light of the day, it is interested in developing its disguised trafficking with the American imperialists, the British, Japanese and other imperialists, through these three doors. Therefore, the nonsense Deng Xiaoping and Li Xiannian try to put across that Sino-American relations allegedly depend on the stand of the Americans towards Taiwan, is nothing but a smoke-screen to conceal the course on which China has set out towards rapprochement with the United States of America in order to become a superpower.

Carter has declared that the United States of America will establish diplomatic relations with China(22). As far as Taiwan is concerned, it will adopt Japan's stand, i.e., formally it will break off diplomatic relations with the island, without breaking off economic and cultural relations, and under cover of them, military relations. In fact, China is interested in the military relations of the United States of America with Taiwan. It wants the United States of America to maintain forces in Taiwan, Japan, South Korea and the Indian Ocean, because it thinks that this is to China's advantage, for thus a counter-weight is created against the Soviet Union.

All these stands are connected with the course the Chinese leadership has chosen for China to become a

22 Diplomatic relations between China and the USA were established on January 1, 1979.

superpower, by trying to develop its economy and increase its military potential through credits and investments from the United States of America and other big capitalist countries. It justifies this course by claiming that it is allegedly applying a correct policy, the «Marxist» line of Mao Zedong, according to whom «China ought to benefit from the world's great successes, new patents and technologies, making foreign things serve its internal development» (23), etc. The articles of *Renmin Ribao* and the speeches of the Chinese leaders are full of such slogans. According to the Chinese concept, to benefit from the inventions and industrial achievements of other states means to take credits and accept investments from the United States of America, Japan, West Germany, France, Britain and all the other capitalist countries, for which it is lavish with praise.

The Chinese leaders have adopted the revisionist theories that big countries such as China, which have many assets, can take credits from American imperialism or any powerful capitalist state, trust or bank, because they allegedly have the possibilities to repay the credits. The Yugoslav revisionists have come out in defence of this view. By advertising their experience of the «construction of specific socialism» with aid from the world financial oligarchy and especially US capital, they are providing the example and encouraging China to proceed on this course without hesitation.

The big countries may repay the credits they receive, but the imperialist investments which are made in these

23 This purpose is also served by the Code on joint enterprises with Chinese and foreign capital approved by the People's National Assembly in July, 1979, and which provides that the capital of the foreign partner should not be under 25 per cent of the total (see *Beijing Review*, no. 29, July 23, 1979, pp. 25-27).

big states, such as the revisionist Soviet Union, China, or anywhere else, cannot fail to leave grave neo-colonialist consequences. The wealth and toil of the peoples are exploited also in the interest of the foreign capitalist concerns and monopolies. The American imperialists, as well as the developed capitalist states of Western Europe or Japan, which are making investments in China and in the revisionist countries, intend to dig themselves in there, to interlock the concerns of their countries in close collaboration with the trusts and branches of the main industries in these countries.

The question of capital investment by imperialist states in China is not so simple as the revisionists strive to make out when they call this penetration of capital into their countries harmless because, allegedly, it is not coming in through inter-state relations (although top Chinese leaders have recently declared that they will accept government credits from abroad), but through private banks and companies without political implications and interests. The incurring of heavy debts by any country, big or small, to one imperialism or another, is always fraught with unavoidable dangers to the freedom, independence and sovereignty of the country which embarks on this course, especially of economically poor countries such as China. A true socialist country has no need to incur such debts. It finds the resources for its economic development at home, in its wealth, in its internal accumulation and in the creative force of the people. The example of Albania, a small country, shows very clearly what inexhaustible means, resources and capacities a socialist country has for its development. And the means and resources of a big country are much greater still, if it marches consistently on the road of Marxism-Leninism.

The opening up of the Chinese market to American imperialism and the big American and other Western

companies has been welcomed with unrestrained delight by the imperialists of the United States of America and all the international bourgeoisie. The multinational companies, the industrialists of the United States of America, have a good knowledge of China's economy and its great assets, therefore they are doing their utmost to build up their economic network there, to set up joint companies and extract large profits. Not only the big American companies but also the companies of Japan, Germany and the other developed capitalist countries are operating in China in this way.

China has already concluded a contract with Japan for the delivery of up to 10 million tons of oil per year. A big team of representatives of the Italian ENI went to China to offer licences for oil prospecting instruments there, but they found themselves forestalled by large groups from the American oil companies which had earlier entered into agreements with China on the joint extraction and exploitation of oil. This is what China is doing also in other mining sectors like iron and other minerals, large resources of which are already known or may be discovered there. The German coal magnates are now in China and have concluded contracts worth scores of billions of marks. Chinese ministers are going back and forth to Japan, America and Europe in order to get credits, to sign contracts for modern technological equipment, to buy modern weapons, to conclude technical-scientific agreements, etc. The doors of all Chinese institutions and enterprises have been opened to the businessmen from Tokyo, Wall Street and the European Common Market, who are hurrying to Beijing, vying with one another to secure contracts for the large «modernization» projects the Chinese government is offering them. In this way China, too, is entering the whirlpool of imperialist greed, the great imperialist hunger for minerals and raw

materials, and the exploitation of Chinese labour power.

Everyone knows that the capitalist does not give anyone aid without first considering his own economic, political and ideological interests. It is not simply a question of the percentage of profit he makes. Along with the credit it gives, the capitalist country also introduces its way of life, its capitalist way of thinking, into the country which receives its «aid», it sets up bases and spreads out insidiously, like oil in cabbage, expands its spider's web with the spider always there in the centre, ready to suck the blood of all the flies which become entangled in its web, as has happened with Yugoslavia and is happening now with the Soviet Union. The same will happen with China, too.

Consequently, China will give way, as it is doing already, on political and ideological questions, and the Chinese market will become a very important *debouché** for American imperialism and the other industrialized capitalist powers.

The American, West-German, Japanese and other credits and investments in China cannot fail to affect its independence and sovereignty to one degree or another. Such credits make every recipient state dependent, for the lender imposes his own policy on it. Therefore, any state, big or small, which gets caught up in the mechanism of imperialism suffers curtailment or loss of its political freedom, its independence and sovereignty. Even the Soviet Union has been reduced to this state of curtailed sovereignty, although when it embarked on the course of the restoration of capitalism, it was far more powerful economically and militarily than present-day China, which is setting out on the same course.

Naturally, when they get themselves caught up in the

* French in the original.

mechanism of imperialism, the small countries lose their freedom and independence more quickly than big countries like China and the Soviet Union, which may lose them more gradually, not only because they have greater economic and military potential, but also because, relying on this potential, they struggle to protect their markets and seize new ones, to create and expand their spheres of influence in order to bring pressure to bear upon one another, and even go to war when they find no other way out. But still this does not save them from the chains of the credits and investments which bind them hand and foot. The credits must be repaid with interest. However, when you are unable to pay them, you will incur new debts. Debts pile up and the capitalist demands his payment and when you cannot pay he will put pressure on you. The American monopoly companies, for example, which impose their policy on the government, force it to protect their capital by every means, even to declare war, if need be, to defend them.

Judging by the zeal the Chinese leaders are displaying in their attempts to base themselves on American imperialism, on the capitalists of the United States of America, for the development of the economy of their country, all their deafening clamour about the weakening of this imperialism falls flat. Their allegations about the weakening of American imperialism are only a bluff, like their declaration about relying on their own forces. The Chinese revisionists think the opposite of what they say, as everybody can see from their practice.

The official Chinese newspapers often voice their concern about the credits the social-imperialist Soviet Union receives from the American, West-German, Japanese and other banks. They warn the United States of America and the other developed capitalist countries to be careful because the Soviet Union uses the technological

assistance and credits they provide to develop and strengthen its economic and military potential, and that this aid and these credits increase the danger threatening them from social-imperialism, which, according to the Chinese leaders, today has taken the place of the Third Reich. Therefore, they call for these credits to be cut off as soon as possible.

It is not difficult to deduce the real meaning of the «concern» which the Chinese leaders display about the credits which the Soviet Union receives. Naturally, they are not worried about the capitalist nature of these credits, nor about the danger they pose to the sovereignty of the Soviet state. But they want to tell the magnates of American capital and the government of the United States of America, the capitalists and the governments of the other imperialist countries, that they must give these credits and this aid not to the Soviet Union, but to China, which is no source of danger to them, but a source of profits.

This is one aspect of the Chinese plan to become a superpower. **The other aspect is the attempts to dominate the less developed countries of the world, to become the leader* of what China calls the «third world».**

The group ruling today in China lays great stress on the «third world» in which, not fortuitously and not without a purpose, it includes China, too. The «third world» of the Chinese revisionists has a well-defined political aim. It is part of the strategy which aims at transforming China into a superpower as quickly as possible. China wants to rally round itself all the countries of the «third world» or the «non-aligned countries» or the «developing countries», in order to create a large force, which will

* English in the original.

not only increase the overall Chinese potential but will also help China to counterpose itself to the other two superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, to carry greater weight in the bargaining over the division of markets and spheres of influence, to gain the true status of an imperialist superpower. China is trying to realize its aim of rallying as many states of the world as possible round itself under the slogan that it is allegedly for the liberation of the peoples from neo-colonialism and their transition to socialism through the struggle against imperialism. China speaks about this imperialism somewhat in the abstract but it emphasizes that Soviet imperialism is the most dangerous.

China has launched this demagogic slogan, devoid of any theoretical content, in the hope of using it as a means to realize its hegemonic aims. As a start, it intends to establish Chinese domination over the so-called third world and then to manipulate this «world» for its own imperialist interests. For the time being, China is trying to conceal this with its reputation as a socialist country. It is speculating with the assumption that a socialist country could have no intentions of enslaving or leading others by the nose, of blackmailing, fighting, oppressing and exploiting them. It is using this slogan and backing it up with the reputation that the Communist Party of China, created by the «great» Mao Zedong, is allegedly a Marxist-Leninist party which faithfully adheres to the theory of Marx and Lenin, a theory which is against all the evils of the capitalist system, colonial exploitation, etc.

Disguised as something which it is not, hiding behind the phrase the «third world», and including itself without any criterion or class definition in this «world», China thinks that it will more easily realize its strategic aim of establishing its hegemony over this world. The Soviet Union has practised the same deception on other coun-

tries. All the Khrushchevite revisionists prate night and day that they are «socialists» and that their parties are «genuine Marxist-Leninist parties». The Soviet revisionists, also, are trying to establish their hegemony over the world under this disguise. Consequently, we may say that there is no essential difference between the actions of the Chinese and those of the Soviet social-imperialists.

All this development of the Chinese policy and actions fully confirms the description Marxism-Leninism gives of imperialism as the domination of the financial oligarchy which is bent on capturing markets, dominating the world and establishing its hegemony everywhere. On this road, China too is trying to penetrate and get a «foothold» in the countries of the «third world». But this «foothold» has to be gained through great sacrifices.

To penetrate the «third world», to capture markets, requires capital. The ruling classes in power in the countries of the «third world» want investments, credits and «aid». However, China is not in a position to give them «aid» on a large scale, because it does not have the necessary economic potential. It is precisely this potential that it is now trying to build up with the aid of American imperialism. In these conditions, the bourgeoisie ruling in the countries of the «third world» is well aware that, for the time being, it cannot gain much from China economically, technologically, or militarily. It can gain more from American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism which have great economic, technical and military potential.

However, like every country with imperialist aims, China is fighting and will fight harder still for markets in the world. It is striving and will strive harder still to spread its influence and extend its domination. These plans are apparent even now. China is opening its own banks, not only in Hong Kong, where it has had them

for a long time, but also in Europe and elsewhere. It will strive especially to open banks in and export capital to the countries of the «third world». For the present it is doing very little in this field. China's «aid» amounts to the building of some cement factory, railway, or hospital, for its possibilities are limited. Only when the American, Japanese and other investments in China begin to yield the fruits it desires, that is, when its economy, trade and military technology are developed, will China be able to embark on a venture of real large-scale economic and military expansion. But to achieve this, time is needed.

Until that time it will have to manoeuvre, as it has begun doing already, by means of a policy of «aid» and credits either interest-free or at low rates of interest, at a time when the Soviets and Americans are demanding much higher interest rates. As long as Chinese capital cannot flow out of its country, the revisionist Chinese leadership will focus its attention on the propaganda aspect of the small amount of «aid» and credits it accords the «developing countries», extolling its «internationalist character» and «disinterested aims», accompanying this with the motto of «self-reliance» for the liberation and construction of one's country.

The more China develops economically and militarily, the more it will want to penetrate into and dominate the small and less developed countries by means of its exports of capital, and then it will no longer charge a 1-2 per cent interest for its credits, but will act like all the others.

But all these plans and efforts cannot be carried out easily. The developed imperialist and capitalist countries, which have influence in the countries of the so-called third world, will not allow China to capture the markets they conquered long ago through predatory wars, so easily. Not only are they strongly defending their old

positions but they are also trying in every way to capture new ones, and are not allowing China to lay its hand on these countries.

Imperialism is ruthless towards any of its partners, when it is in difficulties or when it is flourishing. Sometimes, from necessity and in order to make greater profits, it may make some concession, but mostly it tries to reinforce its chains, not only against weak countries, but also against the developed ones, like the industrialized capitalist states. For example, the United States of America has always pursued this policy towards its capitalist allies, when they have found themselves in difficulties in the imperialist wars that have broken out amongst them. But even after these wars, when they have been making efforts to recover, American imperialism has done its utmost to prevent them from penetrating into the other countries of the world, where it had established its domination. Thus, after the Second World War, the United States of America, while pretending to assist Britain and France, which had emerged from the war weakened, penetrated deeply into the markets of the sterling, franc and other areas. The American monopolies and cartels of metallurgy, chemicals, transport and many other branches of vital importance for the development of capitalism, penetrated the monopolies and cartels of Britain, France, etc., in overwhelming proportions, making these countries subservient to American imperialism. This savage and insatiable imperialism, as any other imperialism, cannot act otherwise with China, either.

Taking account of the difficulties of economic and military penetration into the countries of the «third world», China thinks that its hegemony over them may be secured by establishing its political and ideological influence. It thinks that this will be attained by operating

in three directions: to refrain from fighting American imperialism and the ruling cliques in the capitalist countries, to enter into alliance with this imperialism and these cliques instead; to combat Soviet social-imperialism which it has on its borders, in order to weaken and destroy its bases in Asia, Africa and Latin America; to deceive the proletariat and the long-suffering peoples of these continents by means of pseudo-revolutionary and pseudo-socialist demagogy and manoeuvres, while undermining any revolutionary liberation movement.

American imperialism and the other imperialist powers, together with social-imperialism, are well aware of these aims of China's. The countries of the «third world» also understand them, hence they are suspicious of China and see that it is working a bluff with them, that its aim is not to support and assist them, but to become a superpower itself. Most of the leaderships which are ruling in the countries of the so-called third world, have long been linked closely with American imperialism or with the developed capitalist powers, such as Britain, France, West Germany, Belgium, Japan etc. Therefore China's flirtation with the «third world» does not worry the developed imperialist and capitalist states in the least.

China's efforts to join the «third world» through its policy and its ideology, the so-called Mao Zedong thought, cannot succeed, also, because its ideology and political line are chaotic. The political line of China is confused, it is a pragmatic line which wavers and changes according to passing circumstances and momentary interests. The ruling classes in the states of the «third world» are not afraid of this ideology, because they understand that it is not for the revolution and the true national liberation of the peoples. In order to exercise its oppression and exploitation of these peoples more easily, the bourgeoisie in these countries has created its own parties under all sorts of

labels. These parties, which are closely linked with the foreign capital invested in the states of the so-called third world, have no difficulty in combating and exposing the Chinese line. Therefore, the Chinese revisionist leaders have chosen a course of smiles towards the parties of these countries and are trying in every way and in every instance to be «as sweet as honey» with them.

Having its plan to dominate the «third world», China is doing its best to channel the movements of the working masses in that «world» in its own interests. Today, however, the oppressed peoples, with the proletariat at the head, are no longer in the situation they were at the end of the 19th century or the beginning of the 20th century. They oppose any policy of hegemony and subjugation by the big imperialist powers, old or new, whether American, Soviet or Chinese. Today, the broad masses of the peoples of the world, in general, have awakened and, through their struggles, have managed in one way or another to gain a certain consciousness about defending their economic and political rights. The peoples of the so-called third world cannot fail to see that China is working not to carry the ideas of the revolution and national liberation to their countries, but to extinguish the revolution, which hinders the penetration of Chinese influence. The Chinese course of alliance with the United States of America and the other neo-colonialist countries also exposes Chinese social-imperialism in the eyes of the peoples.

China cannot carry on positive revolutionary propaganda in the countries of the «third world», also, because it would come into collision with that superpower from which it is hoping to get investments of capital in China and advanced technology. China cannot conduct such propaganda, also, because the revolution would overthrow precisely those reactionary cliques ruling in a num-

ber of countries of the so-called third world, which China is supporting and helping to stay in power.

The great ambition of the Chinese leaders to transform their country into a superpower as soon as possible and to establish its hegemony everywhere, especially in the so-called third world, has impelled them to make incitement of inter-imperialist war the basis of their strategy and foreign policy. They greatly desire a frontal clash between the United States of America and the Soviet Union in Europe, during which China, from a comfortable distance away, would warm its hands at the atomic holocaust that would destroy its two main rivals and leave it the all-powerful, sole ruler of the world.

Until it feels strong enough to compete with the other superpowers, until it wins the «place it deserves» as a superpower, China will seek peace for itself and war for the others. Connected with their present need for peace are the overt diplomatic manoeuvres of the Chinese revisionists to incite war between the United States of America and the Soviet Union in such a way that they themselves can keep out of it and get on with their «modernizations». Deng Xiaoping's declaration that there will be no war within 20 years, is not fortuitous. With this he wants to tell the superpowers and the other imperialist countries not to be afraid of China during these 20 years. At the same time, the Chinese leaders are inciting war between the superpowers in Europe, far from China and the danger of its involvement in it. To what extent this will be possible is another matter, but the Chinese leaders are working in this direction, because they feel the indispensable need for peace for the period they think they need for the realization of their aims of transforming China into a superpower.

China is loudly advocating the strengthening of «Eu-

ropean unity», «the unity of the developed capitalist countries of Europe». It supports this unity on all questions, presuming to teach the old wolves and foxes how they should strengthen their military and economic unity, their state organizational unity, etc., in face of the great danger from Soviet social-imperialism. But they have no need for these lessons from China because they are in a position to know, and do know very well, where the danger comes from.

The developed countries of the West are not so naive as to apply the Chinese advice and desires *à la lettre** They are strengthening themselves to cope with an eventual danger from the Soviet Union, but at the same time, they are also making considerable efforts not to aggravate their relations with it, not to go too far and anger the «Russian bear». This, naturally, runs contrary to China's desire.

China's incitement of their contradictions with the Soviets is to the liking of the capitalist states of Europe and the United States of America, because it enables them to tell the Soviets indirectly, «Your main enemy is China, whereas we, together with you, want to establish détente, peaceful coexistence, irrespective of what China says.» On the other hand, while making believe that they want peace, these states are arming themselves to strengthen their hegemony and military unity against their main enemy — the revolution. This is the aim of all the meetings, such as those of Helsinki and Belgrade, which drag on and on endlessly, like the Vienna Congress after the defeat of Napoleon, which is known as the congress of balls and soirées.

The Chinese leaders, as Deng Xiaoping declared officially in the interview he gave the director of AFP. are

* To the letter (French in the original).

calling for the creation of a «broad front which will include the third world, the second world and the United States of America», in order to combat Soviet social-imperialism.

The strategy of the revisionist leadership of China of instigating US imperialism, Western Europe, etc., to war against Soviet social-imperialism is fraught with the danger of a war between China and the Soviet Union rather than a war between the Soviet Union and the United States of America and its NATO allies.

What China is doing by inciting the others to war is precisely what US imperialism, the developed capitalist countries and all the other countries, where bourgeois capitalist cliques are in power, are doing, too, in inciting both China and the Soviet Union against each other. Therefore, it is most likely that the policy of the United States of America and the wrong strategy of China itself, may impel the Soviet Union to increase its military strength even further, and as the imperialist power it is, to attack China first.

On its part, China has a marked inclination to attack the Soviet Union when it feels strong enough, because it has great territorial ambitions towards Siberia and other territories in the Far East. It raised these territorial claims long ago, (24) but it will push its claims rather more when

24 In the spirit of great-state chauvinism, Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai raised the question of the revision of the borders of the Soviet Union with China and other countries in the summer of 1964.

Proceeding from the interests of communism, in September 1964 the CC of the PLA addressed a comradely letter to the CC of the CPC. «We think that to raise now territorial questions with the Soviet Union,» the letter reads, «causes great harm to our struggle... We think that ... our struggle must be directed and concentrated only against the great ulcers which are imperialism and modern revisionism, Khrush-

it is ready, when it has built up an army equipped with all kinds of weapons. This is the implication in Hua Guofeng's statement to the former conservative Prime Minister of Britain, Heath, when he said: «We hope that we shall see a united and powerful Europe; we believe that on its part Europe, too, hopes to see a powerful China». In a word, Hua Guofeng says to the big European bourgeoisie: «Build up your strength and attack the Soviet Union from the West, while we, the Chinese, will strengthen ourselves and attack it from the East.»

The Chinese policy opened up a broad and very profitable avenue for the United States of America, an avenue which was initially opened up by Mao Zedong, Zhou Enlai and Nixon. Many bridges were built between the United States of America and China, camouflaged bridges, but effective and fruitful. Nixon preached: «We must build a bridge long enough to link San Francisco with Beijing.» The invitation that Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai extended to Nixon after the Watergate scandal, and Nixon's reception by Mao were not without a reason and without a purpose. This meant that the friendship with the United States of America was not just a temporary friendship between persons, but a friendship between countries, between China and the United States of America, although the president who opened this road has been removed from his post for his corrupt practices.

Now that Carter has come to power, the ties of friendship between China and the United States of America are being consolidated. The United States of America is greatly interested in the present-day stand of China

chev and Tito's traitor groups and all their acolytes.» (See Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China*, vol. 1, pp. 71-78 and *Reflections on China*, vol. 2, pp. 28-29, 173, «8 Nëntori» Publishing House, Tirana 1979, Eng. ed.)

and Carter is encouraging its strategy in many ways.

The United States of America is interested in giving China all-round political, military and economic aid to incite it against the Soviet Union. It has given China atomic secrets. This is now clear. The United States of America has also supplied it with the most up-to-date computers which serve nuclear war. China has received complete data so that it can build its own nuclear submarines. Now there is open official talk in Washington of supplying China with modern weapons. All these «blessings» the United States of America is offering China, naturally, are not given with the purpose of helping it become such a big land and naval power as to endanger even the United States of America, as Japan did during the Second World War. No, US imperialism carefully calculates the so-called aid it gives anywhere in the world, and especially to China.

In this way, the aim and feverish efforts of China to become a superpower which will counterbalance both the United States of America and the Soviet Union, cannot fail to lead to new frictions, conflagrations, wars, which may have a local character or the character of a general war.

The whole theory of the «three worlds», its entire strategy, the alliances and «fronts» it advocates, the objectives it seeks to achieve, are incitement to imperialist world war.

Nikita Khrushchev and the modern revisionists elaborated the ill-famed theory of Khrushchevite «peaceful coexistence», which advocated «social peace», «peaceful competition», «the peaceful road» of the revolution, «a world without arms and without wars». It was intended to weaken the class struggle by concealing and smoothing over the fundamental contradictions of our epoch. In particular, Khrushchev advocated the dying out of con-

traditions between the Soviet Union and American imperialism and the contradictions between the socialist system and the capitalist system in general. He fostered the view that, after the changes that had occurred in the world at that time, the historical contradiction between socialism and capitalism would be resolved through peaceful competition in the economic, ideo-political, cultural, and other fields.

«Let us leave it to time to prove and then we shall see who is right,» said Khrushchev, and in this competition the peoples «in sacred peace» would freely choose the most suitable regime. Nikita Khrushchev advised the peoples to sell their riches to the superpowers and wait to secure their freedom, independence and well-being as a result of this famous «peaceful» competition. Of course this anti-Marxist policy was exposed, and it was our Party that first attacked it.

The Communist Party of China has been following a policy like that of Khrushchev since the time when Mao Zedong was alive. This policy, too, calls on both sides, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the peoples and their rulers, to cease the class struggle, to unite against Soviet social-imperialism only, and forget about American imperialism.

The theory of «three worlds» is a reactionary theory just as Khrushchev's theory of «peaceful coexistence» was. But while Khrushchev and his followers, the champions of modern revisionism, on the face of it seemed to be pacifists, Mao Zedong, Deng Xiaoping, Hua Guofeng, etc., present themselves openly as warmongers. They want to give the imperialist-capitalist coalition, in which China includes itself, the colour and significance of an organism of revolutionary struggle, a struggle for the victory of the proletariat and the liberation of the peoples. In reality, however, the «theory» of Mao Zedong and the

Communist Party of China about the «three worlds» calls not for revolution but for imperialist war.

The exacerbation of contradictions and rivalries among imperialist powers and groupings is fraught with the danger of armed conflicts, of predatory wars of enslavement. This is a well-known thesis of Marxism-Leninism which history has proved to the hilt. Present-day international developments also demonstrate its correctness.

Many a time the Party of Labour of Albania has raised its voice to expose the deafening pacifist propaganda which the superpowers spread in order to lull the peoples and the freedom-loving countries to sleep and blunt their vigilance, in order to bemuse them with illusions and catch them unawares. More than once it has drawn attention to the fact that American imperialism and Russian social-imperialism are leading the world towards a new world war and that the danger of the outbreak of such a war is real and by no means imaginary. This danger cannot fail to be a matter of constant concern to the peoples, the broad working masses, the peace-loving forces and countries, the Marxist-Leninists and the progressive people everywhere in the world, who, in the face of this danger cannot stand by passively and do nothing. But what should be done to stay the hand of the imperialist warmongers?

This cannot be achieved through a course of capitulation and submission to imperialist warmongers, or of toning down the struggle against them. The facts have proved that the unprincipled compromises and concessions of the Khrushchevite revisionists did not make American imperialism any tamer, better behaved, or more peaceful, but on the contrary they made it more arrogant and voracious. But the Marxist-Leninists are not for pitting one imperialist state or grouping against the other,

nor do they call for imperialist wars, for it is the peoples who suffer in them. The great Lenin pointed out that our policy is not aimed at inciting war, but at preventing the imperialists from uniting against the socialist country.

*«...if we were really driving workers and peasants to war,» he said, «that would be a crime. All our politics and propaganda, however, are directed towards putting an end to war and in no way towards driving nations to war. Experience has shown very clearly that the socialist revolution is the only way out of eternal warfare.»**

Hence, the only correct course is to raise the working class, the broad strata of the working people and the peoples in revolutionary actions to stay the hand of the imperialist warmongers in their own countries. Marxist-Leninists have always been and are the most determined opponents of unjust wars.

Lenin taught the communist revolutionaries that their duty is to smash the warmongering plans of imperialism and prevent the outbreak of war. If they cannot achieve this, then they must mobilize the working class, the masses of the people, and transform the imperialist war into a revolutionary liberation war.

The imperialists and social-imperialists have aggressive war in their bloodstream. Their ambitions to enslave the world lead them to war. But although it is the imperialists who unleash imperialist world war, it is the proletariat, the peoples, the revolutionaries and all progressives who pay the price in blood. That is why the Marxist-Leninists, the proletariat and the peoples of the

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 31, p. 540, Alb. ed.

world are against imperialist world war and fight relentlessly to foil the plans of the imperialists so that they do not drive the world to a new slaughter.

Hence imperialist war must not be advocated as the Chinese revisionists are doing, but must be combated. The duty of Marxist-Leninists is to raise the proletariat and the peoples of the world in struggle against oppressors to wrest their power and privileges from them and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. China is not doing this, the Communist Party of China is not working for this. With its revisionist theory, this party is weakening and delaying the revolution, splitting the vanguard forces of the proletariat, the Marxist-Leninist parties which will organize and lead this revolution.

The course which the Chinese leadership advocates is a fraud. It is a course which does not conform to our doctrine, Marxism-Leninism. On the contrary, the Chinese revisionist line weakens, breaks up the proletariat and the peoples, threatens them with bearing the burden of a bloody war, an imperialist, a criminal war, so greatly detested by the proletariat and the peoples.

For this reason, too, Mao Zedong's theory of «three worlds» and the political activity of the Communist Party of China and the Chinese state cannot in any way be called Marxist-Leninist and revolutionary.

When Khrushchev advocated economic, ideological and political competition between socialism and imperialism, the Chinese leaders were allegedly against this thesis and said that for genuine peaceful coexistence to be realized, imperialism must be fought, because «coexistence» cannot destroy imperialism, cannot lead to the triumph of the revolution and liberation of the peoples.

But these declarations remained only words on paper. In reality the leadership of the Communist Party of China, too, has been and is in favour of peaceful coexis-

tence of the Khrushchev type. The document we quoted, *A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement*, reads: «A principled policy is the only correct policy... What does a principled policy mean? It means that in laying down and elaborating any kind of policy, we must take the proletarian standpoint, must proceed from the basic interests of the proletariat and be guided by the theory and the fundamental theses of Marxism-Leninism.» This is what the Communist Party of China stated, but what has it done and what is it doing now? It has done and is doing quite the opposite.

In the above mentioned document and on other occasions, the Communist Party of China has stated, «American imperialism must be exposed as the greatest enemy of the revolution, socialism and the peoples of the entire world.» Among other things it has added, «one must not rely on American imperialism, nor on any other imperialism, one must not rely on reactionaries.» But the Communist Party of China has not implemented these theses. The Party of Labour of Albania, which bases itself firmly on the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, resolutely upholds the struggle against imperialism and social-imperialism. It is precisely over this question that socialist Albania is in opposition to China, and the Party of Labour of Albania is in opposition to the Communist Party of China. The Chinese leaders level the accusation at us Albanians that allegedly we do not make a «Marxist-Leninist analysis of the international situation and contradictions», and as a consequence, do not follow the Chinese line calling on «United Europe», the European Common Market and the proletarians of the world to unite with the Americans against the Soviets. Their conclusion is that since we do not support American imperialism, «United Europe», etc., we allegedly favour Soviet social-imperialism.

Not only is this stand of theirs revisionist, disguised under the cloak of «anti-revisionism», but it is also hostile and slanderous to socialist Albania. American imperialism is aggressive, bellicose and war-mongering. The United States of America does not want just the status quo, as the Chinese claim, it wants expansion. Otherwise there is no reason why it should have contradictions with the Soviet Union. The quotation of Mao, which they refer to, that «America has become like a rat with the whole world chasing it in the street, shouting: 'Kill it! Kill it!'», is intended to prove that only the Soviet Union wants war, while the United States of America does not. This softness towards the United States of America is to discourage any attack on this state, which «has been reduced to a rat» but which has to become China's ally. This is the anti-Marxist strategy of «the Marxist» Mao!

The Chinese «strategy», founded on their analysis based on the theory of the «three worlds», has «definitely» defined that «the rivalry between the two superpowers is centered in Europe». Strange! But why precisely in Europe and not in some other part of the world such as in Asia, Africa, Australia or Latin America, where the Soviet Union is seeking expansion?

The Chinese «theoreticians» do not explain this. This is how they «argue» their case: the chief rival of the United States of America is the Soviet Union. These two superpowers, of which one is for the status quo and the other for expansion, will unleash the war in Europe, as in the time of Hitler. He, too, wanted expansion and domination of the world, but in order to achieve this, he had first to defeat France, Britain and the Soviet Union. For these reasons, Hitler started the war in Europe and not elsewhere. And further, the Chinese revisionists reason that Stalin relied on Britain and the United States of America. Then, the Chinese conclude, why shouldn't we,

too, rely on the United States of America? But as we explained above, they forget that the Soviet Union linked itself with Britain and the United States of America only after Germany had attacked the Soviet Union and not before.

When the Germany of Wilhelm II attacked France and Britain, the heads of the Second International advocated «defence of the bourgeois homeland». Both the German and the French socialists fell into this position. How Lenin condemned this and what he said against imperialist wars is common knowledge. Now when they preach unity of the European peoples with imperialism in the name of defence of national independence, the Chinese revisionists, too, are acting in the same way as the partisans of the Second International. Contrary to the theses of Lenin, they are inciting the future nuclear war which the two superpowers are trying to launch, and issuing «patriotic» calls to the peoples and the proletariat of Western Europe to put aside their «petty» differences with the bourgeoisie (over oppression, hunger, murders, unemployment), to refrain from threatening its state power and unite with NATO, «United Europe», the Common Market of the big bourgeoisie and the European concerns, and fight only against the Soviet Union, and become disciplined soldiers for the bourgeoisie. Even the Second International could not have done better.

But what advice has the Chinese leadership to offer the peoples of the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries of the Warsaw Treaty and Comecon? None at all! It is rather quiet on this subject and takes no account at all of these peoples. From time to time it urges the revisionist cliques ruling in these countries to break away from the Soviet Union and unite with America. In fact it tells these peoples: keep quiet, submit, and become cannon fodder for the blood-thirsty Kremlin clique! This line of

the Chinese revisionist leadership is anti-proletarian and warmongering.

All this shows that the Chinese leaders are deliberately complicating the international situations. They see these situations according to their own interests of making China a superpower and not according to the interests of the revolution. They see them from the angle of their imperialist state and not of the liberation of the peoples, from the angle of extinguishing the revolution in their own country and revolutions in other countries, and not from the angle of the organization and intensification of the struggle of the proletariat and the peoples against the two superpowers, as well as against the bourgeois capitalist oppressors of other countries, they see them from the angle of inciting imperialist world war and not of opposing it.

China's course of becoming a superpower will have grave consequences, first of all for China itself and the Chinese people.

The Marxist-Leninist analysis of the Chinese policy leads to the conclusion that the Chinese leadership is driving China into an impasse. By serving American imperialism and world capitalism it thinks it will draw some profits for itself, but these profits are dubious and will cost China dear. They will bring the country to catastrophe and, of course, will have considerable repercussions in other countries as well.

China's policy of becoming a superpower, which is inspired by an anti-Marxist ideology, is being exposed and will be exposed still more in the eyes of all peoples, but particularly the peoples of the so-called third world. The peoples of the world understand the aims of the policy of each state, whatever it be, socialist, revisionist, capitalist or imperialist. They see and understand that, though China poses as a member of the «third world», it does not

have the same aspirations and aims as these peoples. They see that it is pursuing a social-imperialist policy. Therefore, it is understandable that this unpopular policy, which encourages social and national oppression, is unacceptable to the peoples. It is a policy in the interests only of the reactionary cliques, of those who are dominating and oppressing the peoples.

China supports and supplies arms to Somalia which, at the instigation of the United States of America, is fighting Ethiopia. Meanwhile, Ethiopia is being supported by the Soviet Union to gobble up Somalia. This is what is happening with Eritrea, too. Thus, China takes one side, the Soviet Union takes the other. If anyone in Somalia looks on China with a kindly eye, it is those who are in power, but not the people of that country who are being killed. It is not looked on with a kindly eye either by the leadership of Ethiopia which has the support of the Soviets, or by the Ethiopian people, who are being egged on against the Somalis who allegedly want to occupy Ethiopia. Thus China has no influence at all, either in Ethiopia or in Somalia.

But it is not looked upon with a kindly eye in Algeria, either. The latter supports the POLISARIO front, whereas China takes the side of Mauritania and Morocco, that is, the side of US imperialism.

In its foreign policy China pursues an allegedly pro-Arab course. But this policy consists solely of the issue of uniting the Arab peoples against Soviet social-imperialism. Thus, it is self-evident that China assists every rapprochement of the Arabs with the United States of America, first of all.

In regard to Israel, the Chinese leadership has a great deal to say against it. But, in reality, with its strategy, it is pro-Israeli. The Arab peoples, and particularly the Palestinian people, have taken note of this.

In the countries of Asia, we may say that China has no obvious and lasting influence.

China is not in sincere and close friendship with its neighbour countries, let alone with the other, more distant countries. The policy of China is not and cannot be correct so long as it is not a Marxist-Leninist policy. On the basis of such a policy it cannot be in sincere friendship with Vietnam, Korea, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, etc. China poses as wanting friendship with these countries, but, in fact, disputes over political, territorial and economic questions exist between China and these countries.

With the policy it is following, China has now come into open conflict with Vietnam. Grave incidents are occurring on the border between these two countries. The Chinese social-imperialists have been interfering seriously in the internal affairs of Vietnam, and are fanning up the conflict between Cambodia and Vietnam, etc., for their own expansionist objectives. When the Chinese leadership behaves in such a way towards Vietnam, which until yesterday it considered a fraternal country and close friend, what must the Asian countries think about the Chinese policy? Can they trust it?

It would be a waste of time to speak about China's influence in the countries of Latin America. It has no influence there, either political, ideological or economic. The sum total of China's influence rests on its friendship with a certain Pinochet, who is a rabid fascist hangman. This stand of China has incensed not only the peoples of Latin America, but the whole of world opinion. They see that the Chinese leadership is pro oppressive rulers, pro dictators and generals ruling over the peoples, pro US imperialism which has gripped the peoples of this continent by the throat. Thus we can say that China's influence in the countries of Latin America is insignificant, without strength or substance.

The policy of the Chinese leaders does not enjoy the sympathy and support of the peoples, but on the contrary, will lead China to ever greater isolation from the progressive states and the world proletariat. No people, no proletariat or revolutionaries can support China's policy, when they see former German nazi generals, former Japanese militarist generals and admirals, Portuguese fascist generals, etc., etc., standing beside the Chinese leaders on the Tien An Men tribune, as happened on National Day, October 1, 1977.

China cannot go ahead with its course of transforming itself into a superpower without intensifying the exploitation of the broad working masses at home. The United States of America and the other capitalist states will seek to secure superprofits from the capital they will invest there, they will also press for rapid and radical transformations of the base and superstructure of Chinese society in the capitalist direction. The intensification of the exploitation of the multimillion strong masses to maintain the Chinese bourgeoisie and its gigantic bureaucratic apparatus and to meet the repayment of the credits and interest to the foreign capitalists, will undoubtedly give rise to deep contradictions between the Chinese proletariat and peasantry, on the one hand, and the bourgeois-revisionist rulers, on the other. This will bring the latter into confrontation with the working masses of their own country, a thing which cannot fail to lead to sharp conflicts and revolutionary outbursts in China.

III

«MAO ZEDONG THOUGHT» — AN ANTI-MARXIST THEORY

The present situation in the Communist Party of China, its many zig-zags and wavering, opportunist stands, the frequent changes of its strategy, the policy the Chinese leadership has been and is following to make China a superpower, quite naturally raise the problem of the place and role of Mao Zedong and his ideas, the so-called Mao Zedong thought, in the Chinese revolution.

«Mao Zedong thought» is a «theory» devoid of the features of Marxism-Leninism. All the Chinese leaders, both those who were in power before and those who have seized power today, have always made great play with the «Mao Zedong thought», in their forms of organization and ways of action, their strategic and tactical aims, in order to put their counter-revolutionary plans into practice.

Seeing the dubious activity, wavering and contradictory stands, the lack of principles and the pragmatism of Chinese internal and external policy, its deviation from Marxism-Leninism and the use of left phrases to disguise it, we Albanian communists have gradually formed our opinions and conviction about the danger presented by «Mao Zedong thought». When our Party was founded, during the National Liberation War, as well as after Liberation, our people had very little knowledge about China. But, like all the revolutionaries of the world, we, too,

had formed an opinion that it was progressive: «China is a vast continent. China is fighting, the revolution against foreign imperialism, against concessions is seething in China,» etc., etc. We had some general knowledge about the activity of Sun Yat-sen, about his connections and friendship with the Soviet Union and with Lenin; we knew something about the Kuomintang, about the Chinese people's war against the Japanese and about the existence of the Communist Party of China, which was considered a big party, with a Marxist-Leninist, Mao Zedong, at the head. And that was all.

Our Party had closer contacts with the Chinese only after 1956. The contacts steadily increased due to the struggle our Party was waging against Khrushchevite modern revisionism. At that time our contacts with the Communist Party of China, or more accurately, with its leading cadres, became more frequent and closer, especially when the Communist Party of China, too, entered into open conflict with the Khrushchevite revisionists. But we have to admit that in the meetings we had with the Chinese leaders, although they were good, comradely meetings, in some ways, China, Mao Zedong and the Communist Party of China, remained a great enigma to us.

But why were China, its Communist Party and Mao Zedong an enigma? They were an enigma because many attitudes, whether general ones or the personal attitudes of Chinese leaders, towards a series of major political, ideological, military, and organizational problems vacillated, at times to the right, at times to the left. Sometimes they were resolute and at times irresolute, there were times, too, when they maintained correct stands, but more often it was their opportunist stands that caught the eye. During the entire period that Mao was alive, the Chinese policy, in general, was a vacillating one, a policy changing with the circumstances, lacking a Marxist-Leninist spinal

cord. What they would say about an important political problem today they would contradict tomorrow. In the Chinese policy, one consistent enduring red thread could not be found.

Naturally, all these attitudes attracted our attention and we did not approve them, but nevertheless, from what we knew about the activity of Mao Zedong, we proceeded from the general idea that he was a Marxist-Leninist. On many of Mao Zedong's theses, such as that about the handling of the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as non-antagonistic contradictions, the thesis about the existence of antagonistic classes during the entire period of socialism, **(25)** the thesis that «the countryside should encircle the city», which absolutizes the role of the peasantry in the revolution, etc., we had our reservations and our own Marxist-Leninist views, which, whenever we could, we expressed to the Chinese leaders. Meanwhile, certain other political views and stands of Mao Zedong and the Communist Party of China, which were not compatible with the Marxist-Leninist views and stands of our Party, we considered as temporary tactics of a big state, dictated by specific situations. But, with the passage of time, it became ever more clear that the stands maintained by the Communist Party of China were not just tactics.

By analysing the facts, our Party arrived at some general and specific conclusions, which made it vigilant, but it avoided polemics with the Communist Party of China and Chinese leaders, not because it was afraid to engage in polemics with them, but because the facts, which it had about the erroneous, anti-Marxist course of this party and Mao Zedong himself, were incomplete, and

25 See Enver Hoxha, *Selected Works*, vol. 4, «8 Nëntori» Publishing House, Tirana 1982, pp. 34-75, Eng.ed.

still did not permit the drawing of a final conclusion. On the other hand, for a time, the Communist Party of China did oppose US imperialism and reaction. It also took a stand against Soviet Khrushchevite revisionism, though it is now clear that its struggle against Soviet revisionism was not dictated from correct, principled Marxist-Leninist positions.

Besides this, we did not have full knowledge about the internal political, economic, cultural, social life, etc. in China. The organization of the Chinese party and state have always been a closed book to us. The Communist Party of China gave us no possibility at all to study the forms of organization of the Chinese party and state. We Albanian communists knew only the general outlines of the state organization of China and nothing more; we were given no possibilities to acquaint ourselves with the experience of the party in China, to see how it operated, how it was organized, in what directions things were developing in different sectors and what these directions were concretely.

The Chinese leaders have acted with guile. They have not made public many documents necessary for one to know the activity of their party and state. They were and are very wary of publishing their documents. Even those few published documents at our disposal are fragmentary. The four volumes of Mao's works, which can be considered official, are comprised of materials written no later than 1949, but besides this, they are carefully arranged in such a way that they do not present an exact picture of the real situations that developed in China.

The political and theoretical presentation of problems in the Chinese press, not to speak of literature, which was in utter disarray, had only a propaganda character. The articles were full of typically Chinese stereotyped formulas expressed arithmetically, such as «the Three Goods

and the Five Evils», «the Four Olds and Four News», «the Two Reminders and Five Self-controls», «the Three Truths and Seven Falses», etc., etc. We found it difficult to work out the «theoretical» sense of these arithmetical figures, because we are used to thinking, acting and writing according to the traditional Marxist-Leninist theory and culture.

The Chinese leaders did not invite any delegation from our Party to study their experience. And when some delegation has gone there on our Party's request, the Chinese have engaged in propaganda and taken it here and there for visits to communes and factories rather than give it some explanation or experience about the work of the party. And towards whom did they maintain this strange stand? Towards us Albanians, their friends, who have defended them in the most difficult situations. All these actions were incomprehensible to us, but also a signal that the Communist Party of China did not want to give us a clear picture of its situation.

But what attracted our Party's attention most was the Cultural Revolution, which raised a number of major questions in our minds. During the Cultural Revolution, initiated by Mao Zedong, astonishing political, ideological and organizational ideas and actions came to light in the activity of the Communist Party of China and the Chinese state, which were not based on the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. In judging their previous dubious actions, as well as those observed during the Cultural Revolution, and especially the events following this revolution up till now, the rises and falls of this or that group in the leadership, today the group of Lin Biao, tomorrow that of Deng Xiaoping, a Hua Guofeng, etc., each of which had its own platform opposed to the other's, all these things impelled our Party to delve more deeply into the views and actions of Mao Zedong and the Com-

munist Party of China, to get a more thorough knowledge of «Mao Zedong thought». When we saw that this Cultural Revolution was not being led by the party but was a chaotic outburst following a call issued by Mao Zedong, this did not seem to us to be a revolutionary stand. It was Mao's authority in China that made millions of unorganized youth, students and pupils, rise to their feet and march on Beijing, on party and state committees, which they dispersed. It was said that these young people represented the «proletarian ideology» in China at that time and would show the party and the proletarians the «true» road!

Such a revolution, which had a pronounced political character, was called a cultural revolution. In our Party's opinion, this name was not accurate, since, in fact, the movement that had burst out in China was a political, not a cultural movement. But the main thing was the fact that neither the party nor the proletariat were in the leadership of this «great proletarian revolution». This grave situation stemmed from Mao Zedong's old anti-Marxist concepts of underestimation of the leading role of the proletariat and overestimation of the youth in the revolution. Mao wrote: «What role did the Chinese young people begin to play since the 'May 4th Movement'? In a way they began to play a vanguard role — a fact recognised by everybody in our country except the ultra-reactionaries. What is a vanguard role? It means taking the lead...»*

Thus the working class was left on the sidelines, and there were many instances when it opposed the red guards and even fought them. Our comrades, who were in China at that time, have seen with their own eyes fac-

* Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 3, p. 19, Alb. ed.

tory workers fighting the youth. The party was disintegrated. It was liquidated, and the communists and the proletariat were totally disregarded. This was a very grave situation.

Our Party supported the Cultural Revolution, because the victories of the revolution in China were in danger. Mao Zedong himself told us that power in the party and state there had been usurped by the renegade group of Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping and the victories of the Chinese revolution were in danger. In these conditions, no matter who was to blame that matters had gone so far, our Party supported the Cultural Revolution. Our Party defended the fraternal Chinese people, the cause of the revolution and socialism in China, and not the factional strife of anti-Marxist groups, which were clashing and fighting with one another, even with guns, in order to seize power.

The course of events showed that the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was neither a revolution, nor great, nor cultural, and in particular, not in the least proletarian. (26) It was a palace putsch on an all-China scale for the liquidation of a handful of reactionaries who had seized power.

Of course, this Cultural Revolution was a hoax. It liquidated both the Communist Party of China and the mass organizations and plunged China into new chaos. This revolution was led by non-Marxist elements, who have been liquidated through a military putsch staged by other anti-Marxist and fascist elements.

In our press Mao Zedong has been described as a great Marxist-Leninist, but we never used and never

26 See Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China*, vol. 2, «8 Nëntori» Publishing House, Tirana 1979, pp. 760-798, Eng. ed.

approved the definitions of the Chinese propaganda which described Mao as a classic of Marxism-Leninism, and «Mao Zedong thought» as its third and higher stage. Our Party has considered the inflation of the cult of Mao Zedong in China to be incompatible with Marxism-Leninism.

The chaotic development of the Cultural Revolution and its results further strengthened the opinion, still not fully crystallized, that Marxism-Leninism was not known and was not being applied in China, that in essence, the Communist Party of China and Mao Zedong did not hold Marxist-Leninist views, regardless of the façade and the slogans they used about «the proletariat, its dictatorship, and its alliance with the poor peasantry», and many other such shibboleths.

In the light of these events, our Party began to look more deeply into the causes of the vacillations which had been observed in the stand of the Chinese leadership towards Khrushchevite revisionism, such as the instance in 1962, when it sought reconciliation and unity with the Soviet revisionists, (27) allegedly in the name of a common front against American imperialism, or in 1964, when, continuing the efforts for reconciliation with the Soviets, Zhou Enlai went to Moscow to hail the coming to power of the Brezhnev group. (28) These vacillations were not accidental. They reflected the lack of revolutionary principles and consistency.

When Nixon was invited to China, (29) and the Chinese

27 See Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China*, vol. 1, «8 Nëntori» Publishing House, Tirana 1979, pp. 9-11, 19-20, 23, 28-29, 45, 50-51, Eng. ed., and Enver Hoxha, *The Khrushchevites* (Memoirs), «8 Nëntori» Publishing House, Tirana 1984, pp. 231-256, 2nd Eng. ed.

28 See Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China*, vol. 1, «8 Nëntori» Publishing House, Tirana 1979, pp. 164-167, Eng. ed.

29 Nixon arrived in Beijing for a visit on February 21, 1972.

leadership, with Mao Zedong at the head, proclaimed the policy of rapprochement and unity with American imperialism, it became clear that the Chinese line and policy were in total opposition to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Following this, China's chauvinist and hegemonic ambitions began to become clearer. The Chinese leadership started to oppose the revolutionary and liberation struggle of the peoples, the world proletariat, and the genuine Marxist-Leninist movement more openly. It proclaimed the so-called theory of the three worlds, which it was trying to impose on the entire Marxist-Leninist movement as its general line.

For the sake of the interests of the revolution and socialism, and thinking that the mistakes observed in the line of the Communist Party of China were due to incorrect assessments of situations and to various difficulties, the Party of Labour of Albania has tried, more than once, to help the Chinese leadership correct and overcome them. Our Party has openly expressed its views, in a sincere and comradely way, to Mao Zedong and other Chinese leaders, on many of China's actions which directly affected the general line of the Marxist-Leninist movement, the interests of the peoples and revolution, it has made its remarks and disagreement known to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China officially and in writing. (30)

But the Chinese leadership has never welcomed the correct and principled remarks of our Party. It has never replied to them and has never agreed even to discuss them.

Meanwhile the anti-Marxist actions of the Chinese leadership at home and abroad became more flagrant and

30 See Enver Hoxha, *Selected Works*, vol. 4, «8 Nëntori» Publishing House, Tirana 1982, pp. 665-682, Eng. ed.

more obvious. All this compelled our Party, like all the other Marxist-Leninists, to reappraise the line of the Communist Party of China, the political and ideological concepts by which it has been guided, its concrete activity and its consequences. As a result we saw that «Mao Zedong thought», by which the Communist Party of China has been and is being guided, represents a dangerous variant of modern revisionism, against which an all-round struggle on the theoretical and political plane must be waged.

«Mao Zedong thought» is a variant of revisionism, which began to take shape even before the Second World War, especially after 1935, when Mao Zedong came to power. In this period Mao Zedong and his supporters launched a «theoretical» campaign under the slogan of the struggle against «dogmatism», «ready-made patterns», «foreign stereotypes», etc., and raised the problem of elaborating a national Marxism, negating the universal character of Marxism-Leninism. Instead of Marxism-Leninism he preached the «Chinese way» of treating problems, and the Chinese style «... lively and fresh, pleasant to the ears and eyes of the Chinese people»*, in this way propagating the revisionist thesis that in each country Marxism should have its individual, specific content.

«Mao Zedong thought» was proclaimed as the highest stage of Marxism-Leninism in the present era. The Chinese leaders have declared that «Mao Zedong has achieved more than Marx, Engels, and Lenin...». The Constitution of the Communist Party of China, approved at its 9th Congress, which was held under Mao Zedong's leadership, says that «Mao Zedong thought is the Marxism-Leninism of the era...», that Mao Zedong «... has inherited, defended

* Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 4, p. 84, A1b. ed.

and developed Marxism-Leninism and has raised it to a new higher stage.»*

Basing the activity of the party on «Mao Zedong thought» instead of on the principles and norms of Marxism-Leninism opened the doors even more widely to opportunism and factional struggle within the ranks of the Communist Party of China.

«Mao Zedong thought» is an amalgam of views in which ideas and theses borrowed from Marxism are mixed up with idealist, pragmatic and revisionist principles from other philosophies. It has its roots in ancient Chinese philosophy, and in the political and ideological past, in the state and militarist practice of China.

All the Chinese leaders, those who have taken power at present as well as those who have been in and who have fallen from power, but who have manoeuvred to put their counter-revolutionary plans into practice, have had and have «Mao Zedong thought» as their ideological basis. Mao Zedong himself has admitted that his thoughts can be exploited by all, both by the leftists and the rightists, as he calls the various groups that comprise the Chinese leadership. In the letter he wrote to Chiang Ching on July 8, 1966, Mao Zedong affirms, «the rightists in power might use my words to make themselves powerful for a certain time, but the left can use other words of mine and organize itself to overthrow the rightists.»** This shows that Mao Zedong was not a Marxist-Leninist, that his views are eclectic. This is apparent in all Mao's «theoretical works» which, although camouflaged with «revolutionary» phraseology and slogans, cannot conceal the

* *The 9th Congress of the Communist Party of China*, Documents, pp. 79-80, Tirana 1969, Alb. ed.

** *Le Monde*, December 2, 1972.

fact that «Mao Zedong thought» has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism.

A critical survey of Mao's writings, even of part of them, of the way he treats the fundamental problems concerning the role of the communist party, the questions of the revolution, the construction of socialism, etc., makes the radical difference between «Mao Zedong thought» and Marxism-Leninism completely clear.

Let us first consider the question of the organization of the Party and its leading role. Mao pretended to be for the application of the Leninist principles on the party, but if his ideas on the party and, especially, the practice of the life of the party are analysed concretely, it becomes evident that he has replaced the Leninist principles and norms with revisionist theses.

Mao Zedong has not organized the Communist Party of China on the basis of the principles of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. He has not worked to make it a party of the Leninist type, a Bolshevik party. Mao Zedong was not for a proletarian class party, but for a party without class restrictions. He has used the slogan of giving the party a mass character in order to wipe out the distinction between the party and the class. As a result, anybody could enter or leave this party whenever he liked. On this question «Mao Zedong thought» is identical with the views of the Yugoslav revisionists and the «Eurocommunists».

Besides this, Mao Zedong has always made the building of the party, its principles and norms dependent on his political stands and interests, dependent on his opportunist, sometimes rightist and sometimes leftist, adventurist policy, the struggle among factions, etc.

There has been and there is no true Marxist-Leninist

unity of thought and action in the Communist Party of China. The strife among factions, which has existed since the founding of the Communist Party of China, has meant that a correct Marxist-Leninist line has not been laid down in this party, and it has not been guided by the Marxist-Leninist thought. The various tendencies which manifested themselves among the main leaders of the party were at times leftist, at times right opportunist, sometimes centrist, and going as far as openly anarchist, chauvinist and racist views. During the whole time Mao Zedong and the group around him were at the head of the party, these tendencies were among the distinctive features of the Communist Party of China. Mao Zedong himself has advocated the need for the existence of «two lines» in the party. According to him, the existence and struggle between two lines is something natural, is a manifestation of the unity of the opposites, is a flexible policy which unites in itself both loyalty to principles and compromise. «Thus,» he writes, «we have two hands to deal with a comrade who has made mistakes: one hand to struggle with him and the other to unite with him. The aim of this struggle is to uphold the principles of Marxism, which means being principled; that is one aspect of the problem. The other aspect is to unite with him. The aim of unity is to offer him a way out, to reach a compromise with him.»*

These views are diametrically opposed to the Leninist teachings on the communist party as an organized vanguard detachment which must have a single line and steel unity of thought and action.

The class struggle in the ranks of the party, as a reflection of the class struggle going on outside the party,

* Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 5, p. 560, Beijing 1977 (French ed.).

has nothing in common with Mao Zedong's concepts on the «two lines in the party». The party is not an arena of classes and the struggle between antagonistic classes, it is not a gathering of people with contradictory aims. The genuine Marxist-Leninist party is the party of the working class only and bases itself on the interests of this class. This is the decisive factor for the triumph of the revolution and the construction of socialism. Defending the Leninist principles on the party, which do not permit the existence of many lines, of opposing trends in the communist party, J. V. Stalin emphasized:

*«... the communist party is the **monolithic** party of the proletariat, and not a party of a bloc of elements of different classes.»**

Mao Zedong, however, conceives the party as a union of classes with contradictory interests, as an organization in which two forces, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the «proletarian staff» and the «bourgeois staff», which must have their representatives from the grassroots to the highest leading organs of the party, confront and struggle against each other. Thus, in 1956, he sought the election of the leaders of right and left factions to the Central Committee, presenting to this end, arguments as naive as they were ridiculous. «The entire country,» he says, «the whole world knows well that they have made mistakes in the Une and the fact that they are well known is precisely the reason for electing them. What can you do about it? They are well known, but you who have made no mistakes or have made only small ones don't have as big a reputation as theirs. In a country like ours with its very large petty-bourgeoisie they are two stand-

* J. V. Stalin *Works*, vol. 11, p. 280, Alb. ed.

ards.»* While renouncing principled struggle in the ranks of the party Mao Zedong played the game of factions, sought compromise with some of them to counter some others and thus consolidate his own positions.

With such an organizational platform, the Communist Party of China has never been and never could be a Marxist-Leninist party. The Leninist principles and norms were not respected in it. The congress of the party, its highest collective organ, has not been convened regularly. For instance, 11 years went by between the 7th and the 8th congresses, and after the war, 13 years between the 8th and the 9th congresses. (31) Besides this, the congresses which were held were formal, more parades than working meetings. The delegates to the congresses were not elected in conformity with the Marxist-Leninist principles and norms of the life of the party, but were appointed by the leading organs and acted according to the system of permanent representation.

Recently, *Renmin Ribao* published an article by a so-called theoretical group of the «General Directory» of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. (32) This article says that under the name of the «General Directory», Mao had set up around himself a special apparatus which kept the Political Bureau, the Central Committee of the Party, the cadres of the state, the army, the

* Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 5, p. 348, Beijing 1977 (French ed.).

31 Over a period of more than 40 years, from 1928 to 1969, the Communist Party of China held only 4 congresses: the 6th Congress in 1928, the 7th Congress in 1945, the 8th Congress in 1956 and the 9th Congress in 1969.

32 «Always Keep in Mind the Teachings of Chairman Mao», *Renmin Ribao*, September 8, 1977.

Comrade Enver Hoxha analyses the views expressed in this article in *Reflections on China*, vol. 2, «8 Nëntori» Publishing House, Tirana 1979, pp. 618-634, Eng. ed.

security service, etc., under surveillance and control. Entry to this Directory and knowledge of its work was forbidden to all, including the members of the Central Committee and the Political Bureau. Here plans for the bringing down or elevation of this or that factionalist group were worked out. The men of this Directory were present everywhere, they eavesdropped, watched, and reported independently, outside the control of the party. Apart from them, this Directory had at its disposal entire armed detachments, hidden under the name of the «Guard of Chairman Mao». This praetorian guard more than 50,000 strong went into action whenever the chairman wanted «to act with one blow», as has frequently occurred in the history of the Communist Party of China and as occurred recently with the arrest of «The Four» and their supporters by Hua Guofeng.

Under the pretext of maintaining contacts with the masses, Mao Zedong had also created a special network of informers among the population who were charged with the task of keeping the cadres of the base under surveillance and investigating the conditions and state of mind of the masses, without anybody's knowledge. They reported directly to Mao Zedong alone, who had severed all means of communication with the masses and saw the world only through the reports of his agents of the «General Directory». Mao said, «For myself, I am a person who does not listen to the radio, either foreign or Chinese, but I only transmit.» He also said, «I have stated openly that I shall no longer read the newspaper *Renmin Ribao*. I told its Editor-in-chief, 'I do not read your paper'.»*

The article of *Renmin Ribao* provides new informa-

* From Mao Zedong's conversation with comrades of our Party, Feb. 3, 1967. Central Archives of the Party of Labour of Albania (CAP).

tion which enables one to understand even more clearly the anti-Marxist direction and personal power of Mao Zedong in the Chinese party and state. Mao Zedong did not have the slightest respect for either the Central Committee or the congress of the party, let alone the party as a whole and its committees at the base. The party committees, the leading cadres and the Central Committee itself received orders from the «General Directory», this «special staff», which was responsible to Mao Zedong alone. The party forums, its elected organs, had no authority whatsoever. The article of *Renmin Ribao* says, «no telegram, no letter, no document, no order could be issued by anybody without first going through Mao Zedong's hands and being approved by him». It turns out that as early as 1953, Mao Zedong had issued a clear-cut order: «From now on, all documents and telegrams sent out in the name of the Central Committee can be dispatched only after I have gone over them, *otherwise they are invalid.*»* Under these conditions there can be no talk of collective leadership, democracy within the party, or Leninist norms.

Mao Zedong's unlimited power was so far-reaching that he even appointed his heirs. At one time he had appointed Liu Shaoqi as his successor. Later he declared that his heir to the state and the party after his death would be Lin Biao. This, a thing unprecedented in the practice of Marxist-Leninist parties, was even sanctioned in the Constitution of the party. Again it was Mao Zedong who designated Hua Guofeng to be chairman of the party after his death. Having power in his hands, Mao alone criticized, judged, punished and later rehabilitated top leaders of the party and state. This was the case even with Deng Xiaoping, who, in his so-called self-criticism of October

* Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 5, p. 96, Beijing 1977 (French ed.).

23, 1966, stated: «Liu Shaoqi and I are real monarchists. The essence of my mistakes lies in the fact that I have no faith in the masses, do not support the revolutionary masses, but am opposed to them. I have followed a reactionary line to suppress the revolution. In the class struggle I have been on the side not of the proletariat, but of the bourgeoisie... All this shows that... I am unfit to hold posts of responsibility.»* And despite these crimes which this inveterate revisionist has committed, he was put back in his former seat.

The anti-Marxist essence of «Mao Zedong thought» on the party and its role is also apparent in the way the relations between the party and the army were conceived in theory and applied in practice. Irrespective of the shibboleths of Mao Zedong about the «party being above the army», «politics above the gun», etc. etc., in practice, he left the main political role in the life of the country to the army. At the time of the war, he said, «All the army cadres should be good at leading the workers and organizing trade-unions, good at mobilizing and organizing the youth, good at uniting with and training cadres in the newly liberated areas, good at managing industry and commerce, good at running schools, newspapers, news agencies and broadcasting stations, good at handling foreign affairs, good at handling problems relating to the democratic parties and people's organizations, good at adjusting the relations between the cities and the rural areas and solving the problems of food, coal and other daily necessities and good at handling monetary and financial problems.**

* From the self-criticism of Deng Xiaoping. CAP.

** Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 4, p. 355, Beijing 1962 (French ed.).

So the army was above the party, above the state organs, above everything. From this it emerges that Mao Zedong's words regarding the role of the party, as the decisive factor of the leadership of the revolution and socialist construction, were only slogans. Both at the time of the liberation war and after the creation of the People's Republic of China, in all the never-ending struggles that have been waged there for the seizure of power by one faction or the other, the army has played the decisive role. During the Cultural Revolution, too, the army played the main role; it was Mao's last resort. In 1967, Mao Zedong said, «We rely on the strength of the army... We had only two divisions in Beijing, but we brought in another two in May in order to settle accounts with the former Peking Party Committee.»*

In order to liquidate his ideological opponents, Mao Zedong has always set the army in motion. He raised the army, with Lin Biao at the head, against the Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping group. Later, together with Zhou Enlai, he organized and threw the army against Lin Biao. Inspired by «Mao Zedong thought», the army has played the same role even after the death of Mao. Like all those who have come to power in China, Hua Guofeng, also, relied on and acted through the army. Right after Mao's death, he immediately roused the army, and together with the armymen, Yeh Chien-ying, Wang Dungxin and others, engineered the putsch and arrested his opponents.

Power in China is still in the hands of the army, while the party tails behind it. This is a general characteristic of countries where revisionism prevails. Genuine socialist countries strengthen the army as a powerful weapon of the dictatorship of the proletariat in order to crush the

* From the conversation of Mao Zedong with the Friendship Delegation of the PRA, Dec. 18, 1967, CAP.

enemies of socialism in case they rise up, as well as to defend the country from an eventual attack by the imperialists and foreign reaction. But, as Marxism-Leninism teaches us, for the army to play this role it must always be under the direction of the party and not the party under the direction of the army.

At present the most powerful factions of the army, the most reactionary ones which aim to turn China into a social-imperialist country, are making the law in China.

In the future, along with the transformation of China into an imperialist superpower, the role and the power of the army in the life of the country will steadily increase. It will be strengthened as a praetorian guard, armed to the teeth, for the defence of a capitalist regime and economy. It will be the tool of a bourgeois capitalist dictatorship, a dictatorship which, if the people's resistance is strong, may even assume open fascist forms.

By preaching the need for the existence of many parties in the leadership of the country, the so-called political pluralism, «Mao Zedong thought» falls into complete opposition to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the indivisible role of the communist party in the revolution and socialist construction. As he declared to E. Snow, Mao Zedong considered the leadership of a country by several political parties, after the American model, the most democratic form of government. «Which is better in the final analysis,» Mao Zedong asked, «to have just one party or several?» And he answered, «As we see it now, it's perhaps better to have several parties. This has been true in the past and may well be so for the future; it means long-term coexistence and mutual supervision.»* Mao regarded the participation of bourgeois parties in

* Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 5, p. 319, Beijing 1977 (French ed.).

the state power and the governing of the country with the same rights and prerogatives as the Communist Party of China as necessary. And not only this, but these parties of the bourgeoisie, which according to him «were historical», should wither away only when the Communist Party of China also withers away, that is, they will coexist right up till communism.

According to «Mao Zedong thought», a new democratic regime can exist and socialism can be built only on the basis of the collaboration of all classes and all parties. Such a concept of socialist democracy, of the socialist political system, which is based on «long-term coexistence and mutual supervision» of all parties, and which is very much like the current preachings of the Italian, French, Spanish and other revisionists, is an open denial of the leading and indivisible role of the Marxist-Leninist party in the revolution and the construction of socialism. Historical experience has already proved that the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot exist and socialism cannot be built and defended without the indivisible leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party.

*«...the dictatorship of the proletariat,» said Stalin «can be complete only when it is led by a party, the party of the communists, which does not and should not share the leadership with other parties.»**

The revisionist concepts of Mao Zedong have their basis in the policy of collaboration and alliance with the bourgeoisie, which the Communist Party of China has always applied. This is also the source of the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist course of «letting 100 flowers blossom

* J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 10, p. 97, Alb. ed.

and 100 schools contend», which is a direct expression of the coexistence of opposing ideologies.

According to Mao Zedong, in socialist society, side by side with the proletarian ideology, materialism and atheism, the existence of bourgeois ideology, idealism and religion, the growth of «poisonous weeds» along with «fragrant flowers», etc., must be permitted. Such a course is alleged to be necessary for the development of Marxism, in order to open the way to debate and freedom of thought, while in reality, through this course, he is trying to lay the theoretical basis for the policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie and coexistence with its ideology. Mao Zedong says, «...it is a dangerous policy to prohibit people from coming into contact with the false, the ugly and the hostile to us, with idealism and metaphysics and with the thoughts of Confucius, Lao Ze and Chiang Kai-shek. It would lead to mental deterioration, one-track minds, and unpreparedness to face the world...»* From this Mao Zedong draws the conclusion that idealism, metaphysics and the bourgeois ideology will exist eternally, therefore not only must they not be prohibited, but they must be given the possibility to blossom, to come out in the open and contend. This conciliatory stand towards everything reactionary goes so far as to call disturbances in socialist society inevitable and the prohibition of enemy activity mistaken. «In my opinion,» says he, «whoever wants to provoke trouble may do so for so long as he pleases; and if one month is not enough, he may go on for two, in short, the matter should not be wound up until he feels he has had enough. If you hastily wind it up, sooner or later trouble will resume again.»**

* Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 5, p. 397, Beijing 1977 (French ed.).

** Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 5, pp. 405-406 Beijing, 1977 (French ed.).

All these have not been academic contributions to a «scientific» discussion but a counter-revolutionary opportunist political line which has been set up in opposition to Marxism-Leninism, which has disorganized the Communist Party of China, in the ranks of which a hundred and one views and ideas have been circulating and today there really are 100 schools contending. This has enabled the bourgeois wasps to circulate freely in the garden of 100 flowers and release their venom.

This opportunist stand on ideological questions has its roots, among other things, also in the fact that throughout the whole period from its foundation up till it achieved the liberation of its country and later, the Communist Party of China has made no effort to consolidate itself ideologically, has not worked to inculcate the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin into the minds and hearts of its members, has not struggled to master the fundamental questions of the Marxist-Leninist ideology and apply them consistently, step by step, in the concrete conditions of China.

«Mao Zedong thought» is opposed to the Marxist-Leninist theory of the revolution.

In his writings Mao Zedong makes frequent mention of the role of revolutions in the process of the development of society, but in essence he adheres to a metaphysical, evolutionist concept. Contrary to materialist dialectics, which envisages progressive development in the form of a spiral, Mao Zedong preaches development in the form of a cycle, going round in a circle, as a process of ebb and flow which goes from equilibrium to disequilibrium and back to equilibrium again, from motion to rest and back to motion again, from rise to fall and from fall to rise, from advance to retreat and to advance again, etc. Thus, upholding the concept of ancient philosophy on the

purifying role of fire, Mao Zedong writes: «It is necessary to 'set a fire going' at regular intervals. How often? Once a year or once every three years, which do you prefer? I think we should do it at least twice in the space of every five years, in the same way as the intercalary month in a lunar leap year turns up once in three years or twice in five.»* Thus like the astrologists of old, on the basis of the lunar calendar, he derives the law on the periodical kindling of fire, on the development which goes from «great harmony» to «great disorder» and again to «great harmony», and thus the cycles repeat themselves periodically. In this manner, «Mao Zedong thought» opposes the materialist dialectical concept of development, which, as Lenin says

*«...gives us the key to understand the 'self-movement' of every existing thing;... gives us the key to understand the 'leaps', 'the interruption of graduality', 'the transformation into the opposite', the abolition of the old and the emergence of the new,»***

with the metaphysical concept which «is lifeless, pale and dry».

This becomes even more obvious in the way Mao Zedong handles the problem of contradictions, to which, according to Chinese propaganda, Mao has allegedly made a «special contribution» and developed materialist dialectics further in this field. It is true that in many of his writings, Mao Zedong frequently speaks about opposites, contradictions, the unity of the opposites, and even uses Marxist quotations and phrases, but, nevertheless, he is

* Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 5, p. 499, Beijing 1977 (French ed.).

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 38, p. 396, Alb. ed.

far from the dialectical materialist understanding of these problems. In dealing with contradictions, he does not proceed from the Marxist theses, but from those of ancient Chinese philosophers, sees the opposites in a mechanical way, as external phenomena, and imagines the transformation of the opposites as a simple change of places between them. By operating with some eternal opposites taken from ancient philosophy, such as above and below, backward and forward, right and left, light and heavy, etc., etc., in essence Mao Zedong negates the internal contradictions inherent in things and phenomena and treats development as simple repetition, as a chain of unchangeable states in which the same opposites and the same relationship between them are observed. The mutual transformation of the opposites into each other, understood as a mere exchange of places and not as a resolution of the contradiction and a qualitative change of the very phenomenon which comprises these opposites, is used by Mao Zedong as a formal pattern to which everything is subject. On the basis of this pattern, Mao goes so far as to declare that «When dogmatism is transformed into its opposite, it becomes either Marxism or revisionism,»* «metaphysics is transformed into dialectics, and dialectics into metaphysics,» etc. Behind such absurd assertions and this sophistical playing with opposites, lurk the opportunist and anti-revolutionary concepts of Mao Zedong. Thus, he does not see the socialist revolution as a qualitative change of society in which antagonistic classes and the oppression and exploitation of man by man are abolished, but conceives it as a simple change of places between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. To confirm this «discovery», Mao writes: «If the bourgeoisie and the proletariat

* Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 5, p. 479, Beijing 1977 (French ed.).

cannot transform themselves into each other, how does it come that, through revolution, the proletariat becomes the ruling class and the bourgeoisie the ruled class?... We stand in diametrical opposition to Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang. As a result of the mutual struggle and exclusion of the two contradictory aspects with the Kuomintang we changed places...»* This same logic has also led Mao Zedong to revise the Marxist-Leninist theory on the two phases of communist society. «According to dialectics, as surely as a man must die, the socialist system as a historical phenomenon will come to an end some day, to be negated by the communist system. If it is asserted that the socialist system and the relations of production and superstructure of socialism will not die out, what kind of Marxist thesis would that be? Wouldn't it be the same as a religious creed or theology that preaches an everlasting god?»**

In this way, openly revising the Marxist-Leninist concept of socialism and communism, which, in essence, are two phases of the one type, of the one socio-economic order, and which are distinguished from each other only by the degree of their development and maturity, Mao Zedong presents socialism as something diametrically opposite to communism.

From such metaphysical and anti-Marxist concepts, Mao Zedong treats the question of the revolution in general, which he regards as an endless process which is repeated periodically throughout the whole period of the existence of mankind on earth, as a process which goes from defeat to victory, from victory to defeat, and so on endlessly. Mao Zedong's anti-Marxist concepts, sometimes evolutionist and sometimes anarchist, about the revolu-

* Mao Zedong. *Selected Works*, vol. 5, pp. 399-400, Beijing 1977 (French ed.).

** Ibid., p. 409.

tion are even more apparent when he deals with the problems of the revolution in China.

As emerges from his writings, Mao Zedong did not base himself on the Marxist-Leninist theory in analysing the problems and defining the tasks of the Chinese revolution. In his speech delivered at the enlarged working conference called by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in January 1962, he himself admits: «Our many years of revolutionary work have been carried out blindly, not knowing how the revolution should be carried out, and against whom the spearhead of the revolution should be directed, without a concept of its stages, whom it had to overthrow first and whom later, etc.» This has made the Communist Party of China incapable of ensuring the leadership of the proletariat in the democratic revolution and transforming it into a socialist revolution. The entire development of the Chinese revolution is evidence of the chaotic course of the Communist Party of China which has not been guided by Marxism-Leninism, but by the anti-Marxist concepts of «Mao Zedong thought» on the character of the revolution, its stages, motive forces, etc.

Mao Zedong was never able to understand and explain correctly the close links between the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the proletarian revolution. Contrary to the Marxist-Leninist theory, which has proved scientifically that there is no Chinese wall between the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the socialist revolution, that these two revolutions do not have to be divided from each other by a long period of time, Mao Zedong asserted: «The transformation of our revolution into socialist revolution is a matter of the future... As to when the transition will take place... it may take quite a long time. We should not hold forth about this transition until all the necessary political and economic conditions are

present and until it is advantageous and not detrimental to the overwhelming majority of our people.»*

Mao Zedong adhered to this anti-Marxist concept, which is not for the transformation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into socialist revolution, during the whole period of the revolution, even after liberation. Thus, in 1940, Mao Zedong said: «The Chinese revolution must necessarily pass through... the stage of New Democracy and then the stage of socialism. Of these, the first stage will need a relatively long time...»** In March 1949, at the plenum of the Central Committee of the Party, at which Mao Zedong submitted the program for China's development after liberation, he says: «During this period all the elements of capitalism, of town and countryside, must be permitted to exist.» These views and «theories» brought about that the Communist Party of China and Mao Zedong did not fight for the transformation of the revolution in China into a socialist revolution but left a free field for the development of the bourgeoisie and capitalist social relations.

On the question of the relationship between the democratic revolution and the socialist revolution, Mao Zedong takes the standpoint of the chiefs of the Second International, who were the first to attack and distort the Marxist-Leninist theory about the rise of the revolution and came out with the thesis that between the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the socialist revolution there is a long period, during which the bourgeoisie develops capitalism and creates the conditions for the transition to the proletarian revolution. They regarded the transformation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into socialist revolution, without giving capitalism the possibility

* Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 1, p. 210, Alb. ed.

** Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 3, p. 169, Alb. ed.

to develop further, as something impossible, as skipping stages. Mao Zedong, too, fully endorses this concept, when he says: «It would be a sheer utopia to try to build socialism on the ruins of the colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal order without a united new-democratic state, ...without the development of the private capitalist economy...»*

The anti-Marxist concepts of «Mao Zedong thought» about the revolution are even more obvious in the way Mao has treated the motive forces of the revolution. Mao Zedong did not recognize the hegemonic role of the proletariat. Lenin said that in the period of imperialism, in every revolution, hence, also in the democratic revolution, the anti-imperialist national liberation revolution and the socialist revolution, the leadership must belong to the proletariat. Although he talked about the role of the proletariat, in practice Mao Zedong underestimated its hegemony in the revolution and elevated the role of the peasantry.(33)Mao Zedong has said: «...the resistance to Japanese occupiers now going on is essentially peasant resistance. Essentially, the politics of New Democracy means giving power to the peasants.»**

Mao Zedong expressed this petty-bourgeois theory in his general thesis that the «countryside must encircle the city», «...revolutionary villages,» he wrote, «can encircle the cities... rural work should play the primary role in the Chinese revolutionary movement and urban work a secondary role.»*** Mao expressed this idea also when he

* Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 4, p. 366, Alb. ed.

33 Significant is the fact that while in 1927 the CPC had 64,500 members of whom 65 per cent were workers, 20 per cent intellectuals and 15 per cent peasants, in 1928, when the party had 130,194 members, only 10.9 per cent were workers and 76.6 per cent peasants.

** Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 3, pp. 177-178, Alb. ed.

*** Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 4, pp. 257, 259, Alb. ed.

wrote about the role of the peasantry in the state. He has said that all other political parties and forces must submit to the peasantry and its views. «...Millions of peasants will rise like a mighty storm, a force so swift and violent that no power, however great, will be able to hold it back...» he writes. «They will put to the test every revolutionary party and group, every revolutionary, so that they either accept their views or reject them.»* According to Mao, it turns out that the peasantry and not the working class should play the hegemonic role in the revolution.

Mao Zedong also preached the thesis on the hegemonic role of the peasantry in the revolution as the road of the world revolution. Herein lies the source of the anti-Marxist concept that considers the so-called third world, which in Chinese political literature is also called «the countryside of the world», as the «main motive force for the transformation of present-day society». According to the Chinese views, the proletariat is a second-rate social force, which cannot play that role which Marx and Lenin envisaged in the struggle against capitalism and the triumph of the revolution, in alliance with all the forces oppressed by capital.

The Chinese revolution has been dominated by the petty and middle bourgeoisie. This broad stratum of the petty-bourgeoisie has influenced the whole development of China.

Mao Zedong did not base himself on the Marxist-Leninist theory which teaches us that the peasantry, the petty-bourgeoisie in general, is vacillating. Of course, the poor and middle peasantry play an important role in the revolution and must become the close ally of the proletariat. But the peasant class, the petty-bourgeoisie, cannot

* Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 1, pp. 27-28, Alb. ed.

lead the proletariat in the revolution. To think and preach the opposite means to be against Marxism-Leninism. Herein lies one of the main sources of the anti-Marxist views of Mao Zedong, which have had a negative influence on the whole Chinese revolution.

The Communist Party of China has not been clear in theory about the basic revolutionary guiding principle of the hegemonic role of the proletariat in the revolution, and consequently it did not apply it in practice properly and consistently. Experience shows that the peasantry can play its revolutionary role only if it acts in alliance with the proletariat and under its leadership. This was proved in our country during the National Liberation War. The Albanian peasantry was the main force of our revolution, however it was the working class, despite its very small numbers, which led the peasantry, because the Marxist-Leninist ideology, the ideology of the proletariat, embodied in the Communist Party, today the Party of Labour, the vanguard of the working class, was the leadership of the revolution. That is why we triumphed not only in the National Liberation War, but also in the construction of socialism.

Despite the innumerable difficulties we encountered on our road we scored successes one after another. We achieved these successes, in the first place, because the Party thoroughly mastered the essence of the theory of Marx and Lenin, understood what the revolution was, who was making it and who had to lead it, understood that at the head of the working class, in alliance with the peasantry, there had to be a party of the Leninist type. The communists understood that this party must not be communist only in name but had to be a party which would apply the Marxist-Leninist theory of the revolution and party building in the concrete conditions of our country, which would begin the work for the creation of the new socialist society, following the example of the cons-

truction of socialism in the Soviet Union of the time of Lenin and Stalin. This stand gave our Party the victory, gave the country the great political, economic and military strength it has today. Had we acted differently, had we not consistently applied these principles of our great theory, socialism could not have been built in a small country surrounded by enemies, as ours is. Even if we had succeeded in taking power for a moment, the bourgeoisie would have seized it back again, as happened in Greece, where before the struggle had been won, the Greek Communist Party surrendered its weapons to the local reactionary bourgeoisie and British imperialism. (34)

Therefore, the question of hegemony in the revolution is a very important matter of principle because the course and development of the revolution depend on who is leading it.

*«Renunciation of the idea of the hegemony,» stressed Lenin, «is the most vulgar form of reformism.»**

The negation by «Mao Zedong thought» of the leading role of the proletariat was precisely one of the causes that the Chinese revolution remained a bourgeois-democratic revolution and did not develop into a socialist revolution. In his article «New Democracy», Mao Zedong preached that after the triumph of the revolution in China a regime would be established which would be based on the alliance of the «democratic classes», in which, besides the peasantry and the proletariat, he also included the urban petty-bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. «Just as everyone should share what food there is,» he

34 For further information on this question see Enver Hoxha, *With Stalin* (Memoirs), «8 Nëntori» Publishing House, Tirana 1984, pp. 163-200, 3rd Eng. ed.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 17, p. 252, Alb. ed.

writes, «so there should be no monopoly of power by a single party, group or class.»* This idea has also been reflected in the national flag of the People's Republic of China, with four stars which represent four classes: the working class, the peasantry, the urban petty-bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie.

The revolution in China, which brought about the liberation of the country, the creation of the independent Chinese state, was a great victory for the Chinese people, and for the world anti-imperialist and democratic forces. After the liberation, many positive changes were made in China: the domination by foreign imperialism and big landowners was liquidated, poverty and unemployment were combated, a series of socio-economic reforms in favour of the working masses were carried out, the educational and cultural backwardness was fought against, a series of measures were taken for the reconstruction of the country ravaged by the war, and some transformations of a socialist character were made. In China, where people died by millions in the past, starvation no longer existed, etc. These are undeniable facts, and are important victories for the Chinese people.

From the adoption of these measures and the fact that the Communist Party came to power, it appeared as if China was going to socialism. But things did not turn out that way. Having «Mao Zedong thought» as the basis of its activity, the Communist Party of China, which after the triumph of the bourgeois-democratic revolution ought to have proceeded cautiously without being leftist and without skipping the stages, proved to be «democratic», liberal, opportunist, and did not lead the country consistently on the correct road to socialism.

The non-Marxist, eclectic, bourgeois political and

* Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 3, p. 235, Alb. ed.

ideological views of Mao Zedong gave liberated China an unstable superstructure, a chaotic organization of the state and the economy which never achieved stability. China was in continuous disorder, even anarchic disorder, which was encouraged by Mao Zedong himself with the slogan «things must first be stirred up in order to clarify them».

In the new Chinese state Zhou Enlai played a special role. He was an able economist and organizer, but was never a Marxist-Leninist politician. As the typical pragmatist, he knew how to implement his non-Marxist views and adapt them perfectly to each group that took power in China. He was a *poussah** who always managed to stay on his feet, although he always rocked from the centre to the right, but never to the left.

Zhou Enlai was a past master of unprincipled compromises. He has supported and condemned Chiang Kai-shek, Kao Gang, Liu Shaoqi, Deng Xiaoping, Mao Zedong, Lin Biao, «The Four», but he has never supported Lenin and Stalin, Marxism-Leninism.

After liberation, as a result of the views and stands of Mao Zedong, Zhou Enlai and others, many waverings in all directions were observed in the political Une of the Party. The tendency advocated by «Mao Zedong thought» that the bourgeois-democratic stage of the revolution had to continue for a long time, was kept alive in China. Mao Zedong insisted that in this stage the premises for socialism would be created parallel with the development of capitalism, to which he gave priority. Also linked with this, is his thesis on the coexistence of socialism with the bourgeoisie for a very long time, presenting this as something beneficial both to socialism and to the bourgeoisie. Replying to those who opposed such a policy and who brought up the experience of the October Socialist Rev-

* French in the original (a popular type of Chinese doll).

olution as an argument, Mao Zedong says: «The bourgeoisie in Russia was a counter-revolutionary class, it rejected state capitalism at that time, organized slow-downs and sabotage and even resorted to the gun. The Russian proletariat had no choice but to finish it off. This infuriated the bourgeoisie in other countries, and they became abusive. Here in China we have been relatively moderate with our national bourgeoisie who feel a little more comfortable and believe they can also find some advantage.»* According to Mao Zedong such a policy has allegedly improved China's reputation in the eyes of the international bourgeoisie, but in reality it has done great harm to socialism in China.

Mao Zedong has presented his opportunist stand towards the bourgeoisie as a creative implementation of the teachings of Lenin of the New Economic Policy (NEP). But there is a radical difference between the teachings of Lenin and the concept of Mao Zedong on allowing unrestricted capitalist production and maintaining bourgeois relations in socialism. Lenin admits that the NEP was a step back which allowed the development of elements of capitalism for a certain time, but he stressed:

*«...there is nothing dangerous to the proletarian state in this so long as the proletariat keeps political power firmly in its hands, so long as it keeps transport and big industry firmly in its hands.»***

In fact, neither in 1949 nor in 1956, when Mao Zedong advocated these things, did the proletariat in China have political power or big industry in its own hands.

* Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 5, p. 338, Beijing 1977 (French ed.).

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 32, p. 434, Alb. ed.

Moreover, Lenin considered the NEP as a temporary measure which was imposed by the concrete conditions of Russia of that time, devastated by the long civil war, and not as a universal law of socialist construction. And the fact is that one year after the proclamation of the NEP Lenin stressed that the retreat was over, and launched the slogan to prepare for the offensive against private capital in the economy. Whereas in China, the period of the preservation of capitalist production was envisaged to last almost eternally. According to Mao Zedong's view, the order established after liberation in China had to be a bourgeois-democratic order, while the Communist Party of China had to appear to be in power. Such is «Mao Zedong thought».

The transition from the bourgeois-democratic revolution to the socialist revolution can be realized only when the proletariat resolutely removes the bourgeoisie from power and expropriates it. As long as the working class in China shared power with the bourgeoisie, as long as the bourgeoisie preserved its privileges, the state power that was established in China, could not be the state power of the proletariat, and consequently, the Chinese revolution could not grow into a socialist revolution.

The Communist Party of China has maintained a benevolent opportunist stand towards the exploiting classes, and Mao Zedong has openly advocated the peaceful integration of capitalist elements into socialism. Mao Zedong said: «Actually all ultra-reactionaries of the world are ultra-reactionaries, and they will remain such tomorrow and the day after tomorrow, they will not remain such unto death, and in the end they will change... Essentially, ultra-reactionaries are die-hards but not stable... It may happen that ultra-reactionaries may change for the better... they come to see their mistakes and change

for the better. In short, ultra-reactionaries do change.»*

In his desire to provide a theoretical basis for this opportunist concept, and playing on the «transformation of the opposites», Mao Zedong said that through discussion, criticism and transformation, antagonistic contradictions are transformed into non-antagonistic contradictions, the exploiting classes and the bourgeois intelligentsia can turn into their opposite, that is, become revolutionaries. «However, given the conditions of our country,» Mao Zedong wrote in 1956, «most of the counter-revolutionaries will eventually change to a greater or lesser extent. Thanks to the correct policy we have adopted towards counter-revolutionaries, many have been transformed into persons no longer opposed to the revolution, and a few have even done some good to it.»**

Proceeding from such anti-Marxist concepts, according to which with the lapse of time the class enemies will be corrected, he advocated class conciliation with them and allowed them to continue to enrich themselves, to exploit, to speak, and to act freely against the revolution. To justify this capitulationist stand towards the class enemy, Mao Zedong wrote: «We have a lot to do now. It is impossible to keep on hitting out at them day in day out for the next fifty years. There are people who refuse to correct their mistakes, they can take them into their coffins when they go to see the King of Hell.»*** Acting in practice according to these views of conciliation with the enemies, the state administration in China was left in the hands of the old officials. Chiang Kai-shek's generals even became ministers. Indeed, even Pu Yi, the emperor of Manchuguo, the puppet emperor of the Ja-

* Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 3, p. 239, Alb. ed.

** Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 5, p. 321, Beijing 1977 (French ed.).

*** Ibid., p. 512.

panese occupiers, was protected very carefully and turned into a museum piece so that delegations could go to meet and talk with him and see how such people were re-educated in «socialist» China. Besides other things, the aim of the publicity given to this former puppet emperor was to dispel even the fears of kings, chieftains, and puppets of reaction in other countries, so that they would think that Mao's «socialism» is fine and have no reason to fear it.

Stands which do not smack of class struggle have been adopted in China also towards those feudal lords and capitalists, who have committed innumerable crimes against the Chinese people. Elevating such stands to theory and openly taking counter-revolutionaries under his protection, Mao Zedong stated: «... we should kill none and arrest very few... They are not to be arrested by the public security bureaus, prosecuted by the procuratorial organs or tried by the law courts. Well over ninety out of every hundred of these counter-revolutionaries should be dealt with in this way.»* Reasoning as a sophist, Mao Zedong says that the execution of counter-revolutionaries does no good, that such an action allegedly hinders production, the scientific level of the country, and will give us a bad name in the world, etc., that if one counter-revolutionary is liquidated, «we would have to compare his case with that of a second, of a third, and so on, and then many heads would begin to roll... once a head is chopped off it can't be restored, nor can it grow again as chives do, after being cut.»**

As a result of these anti-Marxist concepts about contradictions, about classes, and their role in revolution that

* Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 5, p. 323, Beijing 1977 (French ed.).

** Ibidem.

«Mao Zedong thought» advocates, China never proceeded on the correct road of socialist construction. It is not just the economic, political, ideological and social remnants of the past that have survived and continue to exist in Chinese society, but the exploiting classes continue to exist there as classes, and still remain in power. Not only does the bourgeoisie still exist, but it also continues to gain income from the property it has had. Capitalist rent has not been abolished by law in China, because the Chinese leadership has adhered to the strategy of the bourgeois-democratic revolution formulated in 1935 by Mao Zedong, who said at that time: «The labour laws of the people's republic... will not prevent the national bourgeoisie from making profits...»* In conformity with the «policy of the equal right to land», the kulak stratum, in the forms which have existed in China, has retained great advantages and profits. Mao Zedong himself gave orders that the kulaks must not be touched, because this might anger the national bourgeoisie with which the Communist Party of China had formed a common united front, politically, economically and organizationally**.

All these things show that «Mao Zedong thought» did not and could not guide China on the genuine road to socialism. Indeed, as Zhou Enlai declared in 1949, when secretly applying to the American government to help China, neither Mao Zedong nor his chief supporters were for the socialist road. «China,» wrote Zhou Enlai, «is not yet a communist country, and if the policy of Mao Zedong is implemented properly, it will not become a communist country for a long time.»***

In a demagogic way, Mao Zedong and the Commun-

* Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 1, p. 209, Alb. ed.

** Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 5, p. 22, Beijing 1977 (French ed.).

*** *International Herald Tribune*, August 14, 1978.

ist Party of China have subordinated all their declarations about the construction of the socialist and communist society to their pragmatic policy. Thus, in the years of the so-called great leap forward, with the aim of throwing dust in the eyes of the masses, who, emerging from the revolution, aspired to socialism, they declared that within 2-3 five-year periods, they would pass directly over to communism. Later, however, in order to cover up their failures, they began to theorize that the construction and triumph of socialism would require ten thousand years.

True, the Communist Party of China called itself communist, but it developed in another direction, on a chaotic liberal course, an opportunist course, and could not be a force capable of leading the country towards socialism. The road it followed, and which was concretized even more clearly after Mao's death, was not the road of socialism, but the road of building a great bourgeois, social-imperialist state.

As an anti-Marxist doctrine, «Mao Zedong thought» has substituted great state chauvinism for proletarian internationalism.

From the very first steps of its activity, the Communist Party of China displayed open nationalist and chauvinist tendencies, which, as the facts show, could not be eradicated during the succeeding periods, either. Li Taqao, one of the founders of the Communist Party of China, said, «The Europeans think that the world belongs exclusively to the whites and that they are the superior class, while the coloured peoples are inferior. The Chinese people,» Li Taqao continues, «must be ready to wage a class struggle against the other races of the world, in which they will once again display their special national qualities.» The Communist Party of China was imbued with such views right from the beginning.

Such racist and nationalist views could not have been eliminated completely from the mentality of Mao Zedong, let alone that of Liu and Teng. In the report which he delivered to the Central Committee of the Party in 1938, Mao Zedong said, «Contemporary China has grown out of the development of the China of the past ... We should sum up our history from Confucius to Sun Yat-sen... and take over this valuable legacy. This is important for guiding the great movement of today.»*

Of course, every Marxist-Leninist party says that it must base itself on the legacy of its own people from the past, but it also bears in mind that it must base itself not on everything inherited but only on what is progressive. Communists reject the reactionary legacy in the field of ideas, as well as in any other field. The Chinese have been very conservative, even xenophobic, in regard to their old forms, content, and ideas. They preserved the old as a treasure of great value. From the talks we held with them, it turns out that the Chinese placed little value on all the revolutionary experience of the world. To them only their own policy, their struggle against Chiang Kai-shek, their long march, the theory of Mao Zedong, were of value. As for the progressive values of other peoples, the Chinese considered them of little or no worth, indeed they did not take the trouble to study them. Mao Zedong proclaimed, «the Chinese should cast aside the formulas created by foreigners». But precisely which of these formulas, he does not define. He has condemned «all the clichés and dogmas borrowed from other countries». Here the question arises: is the theory of scientific socialism, which was not worked out by the Chinese, also included in these «dogmas» and «clichés» alien to China?

The leadership of the Communist Party of China

* Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 2, pp. 250-251, Alb.ed.

considered Marxism-Leninism the monopoly of the Soviet Union, towards which Mao Zedong and company nurtured chauvinist views, great state views, and had, you might say, a sort of bourgeois jealousy. They did not consider the Soviet Union of the time of Lenin and Stalin the great fatherland of the world proletariat, on which proletarians of all the world had to rely in order to carry out the revolution, and which they had to defend with all their strength against the furious onslaught of the bourgeoisie and imperialism.

Decades ago, Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai, the two chief leaders of the Communist Party of China, spoke and acted in opposition to the Soviet Union which was led by Stalin. They even spoke against Stalin himself. Mao Zedong accused Stalin of subjectivism, saying, «he failed to see the connection between the struggle of opposites and the unity of opposites,»* that he allegedly made «a number of mistakes in connection with China. The 'Left adventurism' pursued by Wang Ming in the latter part of the Second Revolutionary Civil War period and his Right opportunism in the early days of the War of Resistance Against Japan can both be traced to Stalin,»** that Stalin's actions towards Yugoslavia and Tito were wrong,(35)etc.

Although for the sake of appearances Mao Zedong would now and then speak in defence of Stalin, saying that he was only 30 percent bad, in fact he mentioned only Stalin's mistakes. Mao's statement at the Moscow Meeting of the communist and workers' parties in 1957, when he said, «in Stalin's presence I felt like the pupil before

* Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 5, p. 400, Beijing 1977 (French ed.).

** Ibid, p. 328.

35 See Enver Hoxha, *The Khrushchevites (Memoirs)*, «8 Nëntori» Publishing House, Tirana 1982, pp. 234-246, 2nd Eng.ed.

his teacher, whereas now that we meet Khrushchev, we are like comrades, we are at ease,» is not fortuitous. With this he publicly hailed and approved Khrushchev's standers against Stalin and defended the Khrushchevite line.

Just as the other revisionists, Mao Zedong used the criticisms against Stalin in order to justify his deviation from the Marxist-Leninist principles which Stalin consistently defended and further enriched. With their attack against Stalin, the Chinese revisionists intended to disparage his work and authority, to raise Mao Zedong's authority to the rank of a world leader, a classic of Marxism-Leninism, who allegedly has always pursued a correct and infallible line! These criticisms also expressed their accumulated discontent against Stalin over the censure and criticisms he and the Comintern made of the leadership of the Communist Party of China and Mao Zedong over their failure to implement the principles of Marxism-Leninism consistently on the leading role of the proletariat in the revolution, proletarian internationalism, the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary struggle, etc. Mao Zedong expressed this discontent openly saying, «Stalin suspected that ours was a victory of the Tito type, and in 1949 and 1950 his pressure on us was very strong indeed.»* Likewise, during his talks with us here in Tirana, Zhou Enlai said, «Stalin suspected us of being pro-American or that we might go the Yugoslav way.» Time has proved that Stalin was completely right. His forebodings about the Chinese revolution and the ideas guiding it turned out to be accurate.

The contradictions between the Communist Party of China, led by Mao Zedong, and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, led by Stalin, as well as those between the Communist Party of China and the Comintern,

* Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 5, p. 328, Beijing 1977 (French ed.).

were contradictions over principles, over fundamental questions of revolutionary Marxist-Leninist strategy and tactics. For instance, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China ignored the thesis of the Comintern on the correct and consistent development of the revolution in China, its orientation about joint action of the working class in the city and the liberation army, the theses of the Comintern on the character and stages of the Chinese revolution, etc. Mao Zedong and the other leaders of the Communist Party of China have always spoken disparagingly of the delegates from the Comintern to China, calling them «stupid», «ignorant» people, who «did not know the Chinese reality», etc. Regarding each country as an «objective reality in itself», «closed to others», Mao Zedong considered the assistance of the delegates from the Comintern unnecessary and simply impossible. In his speech to the Enlarged Working Conference of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in January 1962, Mao Zedong said: «China, as an objective world, was known by the Chinese and not by the comrades from the Comintern who were engaged with the question of China. These comrades from the Comintern knew little or nothing about Chinese society, the Chinese nation and the Chinese revolution. Thus why should these foreign comrades be referred to here?»

When speaking about their successes, Mao Zedong leaves the Comintern out. Whereas for the defeats and deviations of the Communist Party of China, for the failure to understand and draw correct deductions from the situations which developed in China, he casts the blame on the Comintern and its representatives in China. He and other Chinese leaders accuse the Comintern of having allegedly impeded and complicated things for them in the waging of a consistent struggle for the seizure of power and the construction of socialism in China. But the facts of the

past and especially the present Chinese reality confirm that the Comintern's decisions and directives about China were correct in general, and that the Communist Party of China did not act on the basis and in the spirit of the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

The consequences of the narrow nationalism and big state chauvinism which characterize «Mao Zedong thought», that have been and are at the basis of the activity of the Communist Party of China, are also reflected in the stands towards, and activity of that party in, the international communist movement.

This is apparent concretely in the stand of the Communist Party of China towards the new Marxist-Leninist parties which were created after the Khrushchevites' betrayal. From the very start the Chinese leadership had not the least confidence in them. This view has been expressed openly by Keng Biao, the person in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, who makes the decisions on relations with the international communist movement. He has said, «China does not approve the creation of Marxist-Leninist parties and does not want the representatives of these parties to come to China. Their coming is a nuisance to us but,» he stressed, «we can do nothing about them, for we cannot send them away. We accept them just as we accept the representatives of bourgeois parties.»* Such a policy, which had nothing in common with proletarian internationalism, was followed at the time Mao Zedong was alive, when he was fully capable of thinking and directing, hence it had his full approval.

When, contrary to the desires of the Chinese leaders, these new Marxist-Leninist parties began to grow strong,

* From Keng Biao's conversation with comrades of our Party in Beijing, April 16, 1973, CAP.

then they pursued another tactic, the recognition of all new parties and every group without exception and without any distinction, provided only that they called themselves «Marxist parties», «revolutionary parties», «red guards», etc. The Party of Labour of Albania has criticized this stand and tactic of the Communist Party of China. The other genuine Marxist-Leninist parties have done the same thing. Nevertheless, the revisionist Chinese leadership has continued on the same course.

Later, in conformity with their pragmatic policy towards the newly formed parties and groups, the Chinese leaders adopted differentiated attitudes. They called the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties their enemies, whereas the groups and parties which opposed these parties, came to be very dear to them. At present, the Chinese revisionists not only maintain ties with these anti-Marxist parties and groups, which laud «Mao Zedong thought» to the skies, but also invite their representatives one by one to Beijing, where they work on them, give them financial assistance and political and ideological instructions and brief them on how to act against the Party of Labour of Albania and the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties. They require them to propagate «Mao Zedong thought», the theory of «three worlds» and, in general, the foreign policy of China, to create the cult of Hua Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping and condemn «The Four». To the Chinese revisionists, that party which meets these demands is «Marxist-Leninist», while those parties which oppose them are declared anti-Marxist, adventurist, etc.

All this shows that in their relations with the Marxist-Leninist parties, the Chinese revisionist leaders have not implemented the Leninist principles and norms which regulate relations between genuine communist parties. Like the Khrushchevite revisionists, proceeding from the anti-Marxist concept of the «mother party», they have resorted

to dictate, pressure and interference in the internal affairs of the other parties, and have never accepted comradely advice and suggestions from sister parties. They have opposed the multilateral meetings of Marxist-Leninist parties, meetings to discuss the great problems of the preparation and triumph of the revolution, the fight against modern revisionism for the defence of Marxism-Leninism, to exchange experience and co-ordinate actions, etc. The reason for such a stand, among other things, is that they have been afraid to confront the genuine Marxist-Leninists in multilateral meetings, because their anti-Marxist and revisionist theories in the service of world capital and of the strategy intended to transform China into a superpower, would be exposed and unmasked.

Another indication of the anti-Marxist essence of «Mao Zedong thought» is the relations the Communist Party of China has maintained and continues to maintain with many heterogenous fascist, revisionist and other parties and groups. Now it is striving to prepare the ground to infiltrate or build relations also with the old revisionist parties of various countries, as for example those of Italy, France, Spain and the other countries of Europe, Latin America, etc. The Chinese revisionists are attaching ever greater importance to these relations because, ideologically, they are all in line with the Communist Party of China, regardless of the differences they have in tactics, which depend on the nature, strength and power of capitalism in each country.

The ties of the Communist Party of China with these traditionally revisionist parties will gradually be expanded, their actions will be concerted while it will continue to use the small groups, which call themselves «Marxist-Leninist» and follow the Chinese line, to fight and disrupt the existing genuine Marxist-Leninist parties, which remain unwavering in their stand, as well as the other par-

ties which are being born or will be born. With these actions the Chinese revisionists are openly assisting capitalism, the social-democratic and revisionist parties, sabotaging the outbreak and triumph of the revolution and, especially, the preparation of the subjective factor, the strengthening of the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties which will lead this revolution.

The Communist Party of China applied this same tactic in its relations with the so-called League of Communists of Yugoslavia, which has worked with all its might to split the international communist movement and has fought socialism and Marxism-Leninism relentlessly. The present Chinese leaders want to march together with the Yugoslav revisionists and co-ordinate their actions with them in the struggle against Marxism-Leninism and all the Marxist-Leninist parties, against the revolution, socialism and communism.

Mao Zedong and the Communist Party of China have maintained a pragmatic stand towards Yugoslav revisionism and have made a great evolution in their views about Tito and Titoism. At first, Mao Zedong said that Tito was not wrong, but it was Stalin who had been wrong about Tito. Then, the same Mao Zedong ranks Tito with Hitler and Chiang Kaishek and says that «such people... as Tito, Hitler, Chiang Kaishek and the Czar cannot be corrected, they should be killed.» However, he changed his stand again and expressed his great desire to meet Tito. Tito himself declared recently: «I was invited to China when Mao Zedong was alive. During the visit of the Chairman of the Federal Executive Veče, Djemal Bijedić, to China, at that time, Mao Zedong expressed to him his desire that I should visit China. Chairman Hua Guofeng also told me that, five years ago, Mao Zedong said that he should have invited me for a visit, stressing that in 1948, too, Yugoslavia was in the right, a thing

which he (Mao Zedong) had declared even then, to a narrow circle. But, taking into consideration the relations between China and the Soviet Union at that time, this was not said publicly.»*

The revisionist leadership of China is loyally carrying out this «will» of Mao Zedong. Hua Guofeng seized the opportunity of Tito's visit to China, and especially of his own visit to Yugoslavia, to eulogize Tito, to present him as a «distinguished Marxist-Leninist», a «great leader» not only of Yugoslavia, but also of the international communist movement. In this way the Chinese leadership also openly endorsed all the attacks of the Titoites on Stalin and the Bolshevik Party, on the Party of Labour of Albania, the international communist movement and Marxism-Leninism.

The close political and ideological relations of the Chinese revisionists with the Titoites, «Eurocommunists», like Carrillo and company, the backing they give the anti-Marxist, Trotskyite, anarchist and social-democratic parties and groups, show that the Chinese leaders, inspired and guided by «Mao Zedong thought», are setting up a common ideological front with the renegades from Marxism-Leninism, against the revolution, against the interests of the peoples' liberation struggle. That is why all the enemies of communism are rejoicing over the Chinese «theories», because they see that «Mao Zedong thought», the Chinese policy, are directed against the revolution and socialism.

These questions which we have analysed do not cover all the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist content of «Mao Zedong thought». However, they are sufficient to permit the conclusion that Mao Zedong was not a Marx-

* From Tito's speech at the meeting of activists of the SR of Slovenia, September 8, 1978.

ist-Leninist, but a progressive revolutionary democrat, who remained for a long time at the head of the Communist Party of China and played an important role in the triumph of the Chinese democratic anti-imperialist revolution. Within China, in the ranks of the party, among the people and outside China, he built up his reputation as a great Marxist-Leninist and he himself posed as a communist, as a Marxist-Leninist dialectician. But this was not so. He was an eclectic who combined some elements of Marxist dialectics with idealism, with bourgeois and revisionist philosophy, indeed, even with ancient Chinese philosophy. Therefore the views of Mao Zedong must be studied not only in the arranged phrases of some of his published works, but in their entirety, in their practical application, while also considering the practical consequences they have brought about.

In appraising «Mao Zedong thought» it is also important to bear in mind the concrete historical conditions under which it was formed. Mao Zedong's ideas were developed at the time of the decay of capitalism, that is, at the time when proletarian revolutions are on the agenda and when the example of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the great teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin have become an unerring guide for the proletariat and the revolutionary peoples of the world. The theory of Mao Zedong, «Mao Zedong thought», which was born in these new conditions, had to try to deck itself out, as it did, in the garb of the most revolutionary and scientific theory of the time, Marxism-Leninism, but in essence it remained a «theory» opposed to the cause of the proletarian revolution, a theory which comes to the rescue of imperialism in crisis and decay. Therefore, we say that Mao Zedong and «Mao Zedong thought» are anti-Marxist.

When one talks of «Mao Zedong thought» it is difficult to discern a single clear line in it, since, as we said

at the beginning, it is an amalgam of ideologies, from anarchism, Trotskyism, modern revisionism à la Tito, à la Khrushchev, à la «Eurocommunist», and down to the use of some Marxist phrases. In all this amalgam the old ideas of Confucius, Mencius, and the other Chinese philosophers, who have directly influenced the formation of the ideas of Mao Zedong, his cultural and theoretical development, also occupy an honoured place. Even those aspects of Mao Zedong's views which come out in the form of a distorted Marxism-Leninism bear the seal and features of a certain «Asiocommunism» with heavy doses of nationalism, xenophobia and even Buddhist religion, and were bound to come into open opposition with Marxism-Leninism eventually.

The revisionist group of Hua Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping, which is ruling in China today, has «Mao Zedong thought» as the theoretical basis and ideological platform for its reactionary policy and activity.

In order to strengthen its shaky positions, the group around Hua Guofeng and Yeh Chienyi, which came to power, unfurled the banner of Mao Zedong. Under this banner it condemned the Tien An Men demonstration (36) and liquidated Deng Xiaoping, to whom they attached the label of the revisionist, which he deserved. Under this banner this group seized power in a putsch and smashed «The Four». However, the chaos which has always characterized China, continued at an even greater intensity. This troubled situation brought Deng Xiaoping to the fore and imposed his return to power, and he set out again on his course of right extremism with fascist methods.

Deng's objective was to strengthen the positions of his own group, to follow his undisguised course of alliance

36 It took place in April 1976.

with American imperialism and the reactionary world bourgeoisie. Deng Xiaoping brought out the program of the «four modernizations», put an end to the Cultural Revolution, liquidated all that mass of cadres promoted to the organs of state power, the party and the army by this revolution, and replaced them with the men of the blackest reaction, who had been exposed and condemned in the past.

Now we are witnessing a period which is characterized by the big character posters against Mao Zedong with which Deng Xiaoping's followers are decorating the walls of Beijing. It is the period of «revenge» which has two aims: first, to liquidate the «prestige» of Mao and eliminate the obstacle of Hua Guofeng and, second, to make Deng Xiaoping an all-powerful fascist dictator and to rehabilitate Liu Shaoyi.

Against this background of reactionary manoeuvres there are those in China, as well as abroad, who draw a comparison between Deng Xiaoping's struggle against Mao, who was never a Marxist-Leninist, and the crime of Khrushchev, who threw mud at Stalin, who was and remains a great Marxist-Leninist. No one, however little the brain in his head, can accept such an analogy.

The most correct comparison possible is that, just as Brezhnev and the revisionist group around him toppled Khrushchev, now, the Chinese Brezhnev, Deng Xiaoping, is toppling the Chinese Khrushchev, Mao Zedong, from his pedestal.

This whole business is a revisionist game, a struggle for personal power. It has always been so in China. There is nothing Marxist about it. Only the Chinese working class and a true Marxist-Leninist party purged of «Mao Zedong thought», «Deng Xiaoping thought», and all other such anti-Marxist, revisionist, bourgeois thoughts, will

correct this situation. It is the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin which can rescue China from this situation through a genuine proletarian revolution.

But we are confident that one day Marxism-Leninism and the proletarian revolution in China will triumph and the enemies of the Chinese proletariat and people will be defeated. Of course, such a thing will not be attained without a fight and bloodshed, because it will take many efforts to form the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary party in China, the leader indispensable to victory over the traitors and the triumph of socialism.

We are convinced that the fraternal Chinese people, the genuine Chinese revolutionaries will free themselves from illusions and myths. They will come to understand politically and ideologically that in the leadership of the Communist Party of China there are no Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries, but men of the bourgeoisie, of capitalism, who are pursuing a course which has no connection with socialism and communism. But, for the masses and the revolutionaries to understand this, it is necessary that they realize that «Mao Zedong thought» is not Marxism-Leninism, and that Mao Zedong was not a Marxist-Leninist. The criticism we Marxist-Leninists make of «Mao Zedong thought» has nothing in common with the attacks which are aimed at Mao Zedong by the group around Deng Xiaoping in the struggle it is waging for power.

By speaking out openly and frankly about these questions, we Albanian communists are fulfilling our duty in defence of Marxism-Leninism, and at the same time, as internationalists, also helping the Chinese people and revolutionaries to find the correct path in these difficult situations they are going through.

THE DEFENCE OF MARXISM-LENINISM — A MAJOR DUTY FOR ALL GENUINE REVOLUTIONARIES

The present international situation is turbulent, the crisis in the capitalist-revisionist countries is getting worse, the aggressive policy of the superpowers more and more each day is creating new great dangers for the freedom and independence of the peoples and the general peace. The bourgeois and Khrushchevite, Titoite. «Eurocommunist» revisionist theories and, together with them, the Chinese theories, too, are part and parcel of the great strategic plan of imperialism and modern revisionism to destroy socialism and strangle the revolution.

In these conditions, the defence of Marxism-Leninism and the principles of proletarian internationalism, a consistent revolutionary stand towards the major world problems, today constitute a fundamental task for our Party, as well as for all genuine Marxist-Leninists. Our just struggle must build up the confidence of the peoples and progressive mankind in the triumph of the cause of the revolution, socialism and the liberation of the peoples. Our Party is on the correct road and it will triumph because the revolutionaries and the peoples of the world, and the Marxist-Leninist truth are on its side.

The Marxist-Leninists and the revolutionaries throughout the world see that the Party of Labour of Albania defends Marxism-Leninism when others attack it, that it defends the principles of proletarian internationalism when the various revisionists have thrown these principles over-

board. They see that in its stands the Party of Labour of Albania not only proceeds from the interests of its own country, but also expresses and represents very great interests, near and dear to the entire proletariat, the interests of genuine socialism, the interests of all those who base themselves on and are guided by Marxism-Leninism for the revolutionary transformation of the world.

At the same time, we notice that the policy China is following in its relations with US imperialism as well as with Soviet social-imperialism is arousing doubts, discontent and constant criticism everywhere, especially in the countries of the so-called third world. This is natural, because the honest people in these countries see that the Chinese policy is not correct, that it is a policy which supports an imperialism which is oppressing them, that much of what the Chinese leaders preach does not conform to their deeds and the concrete reality. The peoples see that China is following a social-imperialist policy which threatens their interests.

In this direction, too, our Party is also making its modest contribution. The peoples trust it because it speaks the truth, and the truth has its source in the Marxist-Leninist theory which has been concretely applied in Albania. The development of our country, its liberation wars, its social, economic, political and spiritual situation in the past, have much in common with many countries of the world which have suffered or are suffering savage oppression at the hands of internal rulers and foreign imperialist rulers. The experience accumulated by our Party in the seizure of power by the people, in the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the construction of socialism is a concrete example and aid to these peoples. The victories and successes achieved in the People's Socialist Republic of Albania have their basis in the Marxist-Leninist theory, by which it is inspired and

which the Party of Labour of Albania applies in practice.

Apart from lackeys and ultra-reactionaries, no one is directly defending the bankrupt Chinese theory of «three worlds». The policy of rapprochement of the Chinese with US imperialism revives the spectres of imperialist wars which nobody wants to see, deepens the colonial and neo-colonial darkness which nobody can endure, and supports the capitalist exploitation which everyone wants to get rid of.

The Party of Labour of Albania has fought, is fighting and will always fight resolutely in defence of the purity of Marxist-Leninist ideas. It is and will always be against all those who strive to distort them and replace them with bourgeois, revisionist, counter-revolutionary ideas. Our Party is a proletarian party, a Marxist-Leninist party, an active participant in the world revolution, for which it is determined to make any sacrifice, just as it has done up till now. There is no force that can make our Party deviate from this fully internationalist, glorious and honourable course. There is no force which can intimidate or conquer it. Our Party cannot reconcile itself to any kind of opportunism, to any kind of deviation from Marxism-Leninism, to any distortion of it. It will fight with determination against Chinese revisionism, too, just as against revisionism of any other kind.

Ours is a small Marxist-Leninist party, and because we are such a party, we must not be afraid to speak the truth openly. Our Party is small in regard to the number of members in its ranks, but it is a Party toughened in many battles. It has always had the courage to state matters openly in defence of the purity of Marxism-Leninism, the revolution and socialism. The facts show that our fight against Chinese revisionism is correct, that it is essential, therefore it is approved and supported by the genuine Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries.

A true revolutionary party, as our Party is, does not renounce its principled standpoints in any instance. We cannot retreat just because others might consider the courage and virtue of our Party conceit. The Party has not taught its members to be conceited, but it has taught them to be always resolute and just and stern against the class enemy. On these questions there is no room for discussion about whether the party is big or small.

The communists, the genuine revolutionaries, the Marxist-Leninists must thoroughly understand how the situations are developing in the world today. They do not develop in a stereotyped form. If the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, the experience of the revolutionary struggle of the world proletariat and the experience of every genuine Marxist-Leninist party are studied, understood and assimilated properly, then these situations which are developing can be properly understood and the revolution will be given a powerful boost.

We Albanian communists must understand well that it is absolutely necessary to master Marxism-Leninism. The capitalist-revisionist encirclement and the pressure it exerts on us must never be underrated. We must not be foolishly overconfident in our understanding of these questions and in the real fight we must wage against the enemies surrounding us.

The revolution has run into rocks and there are more ahead which must be blown up with explosives. Some must be blown up directly, some must be broken down piecemeal, while some others must be outflanked and then given the finishing blow. This is what understanding the strategy and tactics of the revolution means. In order to create confidence in the victory of the revolution, it is essential to organize the broad masses of the people, to make the proletariat conscious of the unwavering leadership of its genuine Marxist-Leninist party, because other-

wise it may become involved in adventurous actions and compromise the victory of the revolution. The communists and the oppressed masses of the people have to realize that imperialism and world capitalism have great experience in oppressing the masses, in organizing the counter-revolution. Therefore, the tactics and strategy of the enemies, too, must be understood and coped with, because our ideology, our policy, our strategy and tactics are more powerful than any enemy, for they serve a just cause, the cause of communism.

Now for our Party, as well as for all the Marxist-Leninist parties in the world, the struggle against Chinese revisionism should be given the greatest attention. This is an important question, but this does not mean that while dealing with it, we are permitted to forget Soviet revisionism, Titoite revisionism or «Eurocommunism», which are very dangerous variants of modern revisionism. In regard to their tactics and strategy, all these anti-Marxist trends, regardless of the differences in their forms of struggle, are on the one course, have the same objective, and are waging the same struggle.

For all these reasons, we must never divert our attention either from the struggle which must be waged against American imperialism and all the reactionary capitalist bourgeoisie of the world or from the struggle against the Soviet, Yugoslav, Chinese, and other shades of revisionism. Despite all the contradictions they have among themselves, all these enemies are linked by the one cord — the fight against the revolution, against the Marxist-Leninist parties and their unity, against the general organization of the proletariat and the entire working masses in order to launch themselves into revolution.

The struggle against modern revisionism, and especially against Soviet, Titoite and Chinese revisionism, is not an easy matter. On the contrary, this struggle is and

will be stern and protracted. For it to be waged successfully, for victories to be gained step by step, the communists, the cadres, the intelligentsia and all the working masses of our country must be imbued with the ideology of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin and must also study the rich experience of our Party in the struggle against modern revisionism. Only in this way will we be able to overcome the obstacles and emerge unscathed from the great hostile forest with all its thorns.

As always, our Party of Labour must maintain clear, resolute, bold stands on the correct Marxist-Leninist line. This line of our Party, with its clearly defined objectives, will help to expose American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, as well as Chinese social-imperialism, and to wage the merciless struggle against them successfully.

The task of our Party, and of all the genuine communists of the world, is to fight with dedication to defend our Marxist-Leninist theory and cleanse it of all the distortions which the bourgeoisie, the modern revisionists and all opportunists and traitors make of it.

Marxism-Leninism is the triumphant ideology. He who embraces, defends and develops it, is a member of the glorious army of the revolution, of that great and invincible army of genuine communists, who are leading the proletariat and all the oppressed to transform the world, to destroy capitalism and to build the new world, the socialist world.

Published according to the
book «Imperialism and the
Revolution», Second Albanian
edition, Tirana 1978

THE IRANIAN WORKING CLASS CAME OUT ON THE BATTLEFIELD, OVERTHREW THE SHAH AND SHOOK THE CAPITALIST WORLD

Article published in the newspaper «Zëri i popullit»

February 18, 1979

In recent months, the attention of world opinion has been centred on the events in Iran, on the heroic struggle of the Iranian people to overthrow the bloodthirsty regime of the Pahlavi monarchy. Now that this revolution has overthrown the mediaeval feudalism and fascist monarchy of the Shah, revolutionaries, patriots and progressive people throughout the world are expressing warm congratulations and admiration for the outstanding heroism of the men, women and youth of Iran, for the determination and courage of the common people.

The Iranian people achieved a victory of great historic importance. It marks a notable step on their road towards freedom and democracy, a further step towards emancipation and progress. This victory will certainly have profound consequences and will serve as a basis for the coming battles for the realization of the popular ideals of complete national and social liberation.

The popular uprising in Iran constitutes a heavy blow to all the imperialist powers and, in particular, to American imperialism which has practically controlled and directed the regime of the Shah for the last 25 years.

Likewise, it is a heavy blow to world capitalism which, up till now, has taken advantage of the submission of the Shah to plunder the Iranian oil and exploit the Iranian people to the bone.

The fact is that the Iranian revolution has thrown the bourgeois and revisionist world into great confusion. Carter and his administration are rebuking the CIA and the other intelligence organs for failing to foresee these events in time. The Western bourgeoisie is astonished about how a whole people could rise in revolt at the peak of the oil boom. The Chinese social-imperialists are complaining that the Shah allegedly permitted foreign agents to enter the country to stir up the masses.

The imperialists and the revisionists have not understood and never can understand and interpret social phenomena correctly. They judge matters according to rigid schemes created by their own anti-historical, selfish class concepts. Their counter-revolutionary hatred does not permit them to analyse any social phenomenon objectively or to foresee any situation. Events always burst on them like bombshells.

The revolution in Iran is not and could not be the work of agents, as the revisionists from Beijing claim. Nor is it the result of modernization, as the Western politicians claim. It is a result of the outburst of many contradictions in the feudal-bourgeois Iranian society, an explosion of the popular anger and hatred which has been building up for decades against the tyranny of the Shah and imperialist domination, a result of the determination of the people to change the miserable life which the ruling and exploiting upper classes have imposed on them.

Attempts are being made from various directions to give the Iranian revolution a religious colour. Of course, there can be no denying the subjective influence in the events in Iran of the Shia religious sect, which played a

positive role in the overthrow of the feudal regime of the Pahlavi empire. But it was not the religious ideology which guided the broad popular masses in the uprising and struggle against the Shah. The democratic aspirations of the lay majority of the people of Iran, the political slogans which aroused the people to struggle, the concrete objective for which the masses are fighting, cannot be identified with the ethical-theocratic demands of the Islamic doctrine. The people of Iran may appear to be believers, but in action, and precisely in this revolution, they proved themselves very progressive and very objective. They rose in struggle and shed their blood for the overthrow of the monarchy and the establishment of a democratic republic in their country, for the nationalization of the oil and its use in favour of the development of the national economy and the people, for putting an end to dependence on foreign capital and for the cancellation of all enslaving economic, military and political agreements with foreigners, whether American, Soviet, British or Chinese, for the strengthening of a sovereign and independent state, for the freedom of the press and assembly, for the elimination of the feudal corruption and the punishment of oppressors and exploiters, for social equality and justice, etc., etc.

It is clear to the peoples of the world that the inspiration of the Iranian revolution is not religious. It is inspired by a powerful democratic and progressive current of the masses, thirsting for a genuine agrarian revolution, for a truly progressive cultural and educational revolution, as well as for profound transformations to eliminate the backwardness of the people. Those valiant women and girls who shed their blood in battle with SAVAK and the imperial guard came out in the streets not to retain the veil or to defend the domestic prison, but to eliminate them. Hence, the great problem presented in that country

was the liberation of the working people, the peasantry, the women and the youth.

The purpose of this hostile campaign is to create the opinion that the events in Iran do not represent a revolution which can be taken as an example. International capitalism is trying to present this revolution as a reaction of religious leaders and «fanatical» masses of believers against the «industrialization» and «modernization» of the life of the country undertaken by the Shah. It is cynically claiming that such revolutions, which it labels «Islamic», allegedly hinder the progressive development not only of the countries in which they occur, but also of the whole «international community».

World capitalism is putting great stress on the term «Islamic» and distorting the true character of the revolution in Iran, because it wants to set the peoples against one another, to set the Moslem believers against the Christian believers. It is striving to have the Iranian, Arab and other peoples considered as backward and fanatical peoples and to give their anti-imperialist liberation struggles a retrograde colour. However, the Iranian revolution demonstrated clearly that the fundamental issue for the peoples of this zone is the struggle for liberation from the feudal-bourgeois yoke and the domination of the American and Soviet superpowers, and Israel, in which unity is required and formed. It is the imperialist superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, and China who incite division among the Arab and Persian peoples and prevent them from gaining and safeguarding their freedom, independence and sovereignty.

Nevertheless, the biased assessments and base calumnies of those who have plundered and oppressed the countries of the Orient can deceive no one. Whatever they say, the events in Iran are consequences of the social antagonism and not religious antagonism.

Proceeding from the fundamental tendencies of present-day world development, the Party of Labour of Albania has pointed out that the question of the revolution and peoples' liberation is not just an aspiration and desire, but a problem presented for solution. The uprising of the Iranian people is a confirmation of this, but it is neither the first nor the last. The example of Iran will certainly exert an influence on and be followed by other countries. The conditions that have been created in many countries now make revolutionary outbursts inevitable. As our Party has pointed out, the situation in general today is like a volcano in eruption, a searing fire in which the oppressing and exploiting ruling upper classes will be consumed.

The popular uprising in Iran in which the broad masses, the working class, the progressive youth and the women are taking part, has confirmed the Marxist-Leninist theses defended by our Party in connection with the present-day revolutionary situations which are being created uninterruptedly in many countries of the world and the development of the objective and subjective factors of the revolution. First of all, the events in Iran demonstrated the invincible strength of the Iranian proletariat which came out in the streets, shed its blood not only in battle against reaction, against the Shah, but also against foreign imperialism.

The present events in Iran have provided very valuable lessons, not only for the people of that country, but also for the others. Contrary to the claims of the bourgeoisie and the revisionists these events have confirmed the fundamental thesis of Marxism-Leninism, strongly defended during all these years by our Party, that for the revolution to triumph and the people to be liberated from national and social bondage it is categorically indispensable for the working class to come out on the battlefield. The

PLA has pointed out that the working class constitutes the decisive force for the development of society, the leading force for the revolutionary transformation of the world... It remains the main productive force in society, the most advanced class and more interested than any other in national and social liberation and socialism, the bearer of the finest traditions of organization and of the revolutionary struggle.

In Iran it was the working class which faced up to the tanks and machine-guns of the Shah. Above all, it was its general strike, especially the strike by the oil workers, which paralyzed the whole life of the country. Demonstrations and manifestations against the Shah had taken place before this, but it was only when the oil pumps stopped working, when the trains did not run and the power stations stopped generating electric current, only when the earthquake struck the foundations of the feudal ruling class, that the Shah left to visit his friend in Morocco and the Baftjar government was overthrown. The working class showed that it and not the army of the Shah hundreds of thousands strong, the American weapons and the billions of petro dollars at the disposal of the banks of Tehran, was the real strength of the country. Through its struggle, through the decisive role it played in the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist revolution, it showed that the only social force to which the future belongs is the working class.

The events in Iran also confirmed another important thesis of Marxism-Leninism, that the revolution cannot be carried out without violence, that it cannot triumph without bloodshed. The regime of the Shah resisted to the last bullet, while the American imperialists, the Chinese social-imperialists, the big international monopoly bourgeoisie, the monarchs and Shahs all over the world supported the regime to the last second. Had the Iranian

people listened to the sermons about the «peaceful way» preached by the Khrushchevite revisionists, about the structural reforms of the Eurocommunists, the theory of «three worlds» of the Chinese, etc., the clique of the Shah and the imperialists would have been ruling quietly and undisturbed, just as they are ruling still in many countries of the world. However, the people of Iran did not entertain illusions, were not afraid to rise in revolution, to shed their blood and make every sacrifice to gain their freedom and independence, to throw off the heavy yoke they were carrying on their backs. Herein lies the great current importance which the Iranian revolution has for all the other peoples who are languishing under the double oppression of foreign domination and internal reactionary cliques. The revolution in Iran is an illustration and concrete confirmation of the correctness of the theses of the PLA that, in today's conditions, freedom and independence from imperialist domination cannot be won, neo-colonialism cannot be driven out and complete national sovereignty established, if the internal cliques linked with or sold out to foreigners are not fought.

The Iranian people rose in insurrection and faced death in order to escape from the savage oppression and exploitation and to win greater freedom and democracy. How far they will advance in this direction, how radical the reforms will be, depends on the genuine revolutionary forces, on the extent these forces will be able to keep the spirit of the revolution ablaze and raise it from a lower stage to a higher stage.

Lenin pointed out that the revolution is a serious matter which must not be trifled with, that if you begin it, you must carry it through to the end. The revolution in Iran is still developing and it cannot be said that it has achieved all the objectives which were placed before it. The fact is that the forces of internal reaction and the

imperialist forces are striving to carry out a counter-revolution, either through direct violence from within, through external military intervention, or through the peaceful degeneration of the revolution and the gradual transformation of it into its opposite. Therefore, to carry the revolution through to the end means that the people of Iran must enhance their vigilance to the maximum and must not allow themselves to be placed again under the yoke of foreign imperialists, whether American, Soviet or any others, who by means of manoeuvres and intrigues, compromises, corruption and so on, will strive to regain their former concessions and positions, of course, in new forms.

Following the destruction of the Shah's administration, now new organs of state power will be created in Iran. On what course this process will develop has great importance. It could be progressive, but could also be regressive. Both possibilities exist. In order to take progressive positions, the people of Iran will have to destroy all the structures and superstructures of the feudal monarchy of the Shah and replace them with a new structure and superstructure suitable to their country and not borrowed from the so-called bourgeois democracy, which is essentially anti-popular. They will have to make great efforts to prevent the feudal-bourgeoisie from infiltrating into all these institutions and must take complete control of them themselves, while those who are to carry out the major social and economic reforms must be the most trustworthy representatives of the people.

Of course, the transition from one stage of the revolution to the other, carrying the revolution through to the end, is no easy matter. Nevertheless, the progressive forces must win the terrain step by step and take sound democratic and progressive positions against those elements which will resist and which are remnants of the backward feudalism of the past.

The Marxist-Leninist communists and the genuine revolutionaries, the working class, the poor peasantry and the rank-and-file soldiers must take full advantage of the objective and subjective situations created within the country. Thus, the pseudo-communists sold out to the Soviets, the Eurocommunists and the Maoists, as well as the «communist parties» of provocateurs which the secret agencies of American and British imperialism set up, will be combated more effectively.

Today more than ever before, the place of the Marxist-Leninist communists, of the genuine revolutionaries, is in the forefront of the struggle against reaction, the intrigues and interference of American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, etc. At these moments of very great importance through which the revolution is passing, they must be neither sectarian nor opportunist. In no instance must they play the game of those who, regardless of how they disguise themselves, try to deceive the people with a thousand tricks and to serve foreigners, the super-powers.

The working class of Iran, which has proved itself so heroic, courageous and mature, will know that at this stage of the revolution it should form sound alliances with progressive elements and forces who are democratic, revolutionary and anti-imperialist, irrespective that they may also be religious, and who have not failed to fight with determination against the monarchy and the Shah.

Among the radical reforms which are now being demanded by the Iranian people are those which have to do with the social composition, the structures and purpose of the army. The army in Iran was the main prop of the monarchist regime and was maintained to suppress the people and prop up the despotic regime of the Shah. However, the events of recent months showed that this army, armed to the teeth and trained by the Americans,

melted away like snow in the sunshine. In the persistent struggle of the people to win their rights and to overthrow the monarchy, it was seen that the strength of the Pahlavi empire and American imperialism in Iran lay in the top officer caste alone. But it turned out that the officer caste, fattened on American dollars, was unable to preserve the unity of the army, because the sons of the people refused to follow it.

The sons of the people are the main strength of any army, therefore, the new army in Iran must be a democratic popular army. The people cannot and must not be disarmed, because they faced death and shed their blood for those weapons. They must not allow themselves to be disarmed without being certain that the army is a people's army and commanded by men from the people. This is an experience drawn from history which has been confirmed and applied by our people's revolution, too. The army must be headed by progressive individuals who constitute a guarantee that the reactionary officer caste will no longer be able to lead the sons of the people to kill the people.

A similar situation has been seen in many revolutions, indeed as early as the bourgeois-democratic revolution in France in the last century when the *sans culottes* produced outstanding commanders from their ranks and routed the royal army, the army of the French aristocracy and feudalism.

This lesson is still valid for the present time when weapons have become a terror to the world. Nevertheless, it all depends on who has control of these weapons and against whom they are aimed. When the people rise in revolution they are able to win over their sons and convince them to turn their weapons against those who order them to kill their fathers, mothers and sisters. In this direction the example of Iran is very significant.

The people of Iran have many means in their hands to defend the victories of the revolution and to carry them forward. Above all, they have the oil, which continues to make the capitalist world tremble. Politicians and publicists of the West consider the question of Iranian oil more dangerous than the war in Vietnam, Korea and so on. They are greatly concerned, because now Iran has the possibility to use this oil to its own advantage and put an end to the situation where others got it almost for nothing. It is to be expected that the imperialists and capitalists will play all their cards in order to re-establish the former situation in different ways and forms. However, the Iranian people have all the possibilities to resist the interference, intrigues and manoeuvres of imperialists, social-imperialists or anyone else. They will be able to resist them successfully, provided they become fully conscious of the need to keep the oil weapon firmly in their grasp and are determined to defend it to the end, provided they are afraid neither of the Americans, the Soviets nor of other coalitions. By always keeping in mind the interests of their homeland, as well as the interests of other peoples of the world who struggle for freedom, they will be able to exploit the situation wisely, both now and in the future. A country in revolution which possesses such a weapon as oil, which has such a valiant people who overthrew a rotten old world in order to build a new world, is able to resist all enemies.

The struggle of the Iranian people which overthrew the despotic rule of the Shah and struck a heavy blow at American imperialism and the whole capitalist world, also assists the liberation struggle of all peoples and the cause of democracy and progress throughout the world. On account of this, we Albanians have exceptionally great respect for the Iranian people and bow in homage to those who fought heroically in the streets of Iran and gave their

lives for the triumph of the revolution. For this reason we hope that they will realize all their desires and aspirations and live free, independent, and sovereign in their own country.

From the newspaper «Zëri
i popullit», February 18,
1979

THE CHINESE LEADERSHIP HEADED BY DENG XIAOPING HAVE LAUNCHED A MILITARY ATTACK ON VIETNAM

Article published in the newspaper «Zëri i popullit»

February 21, 1979

The attack which the Chinese leadership, headed by Deng Xiaoping, has undertaken against Vietnam, is an event which makes the already complicated and disturbed international situation even more grave. Therefore, what is going on now on the Sino-Vietnamese border should be judged with cool heads, frankly and fairly. This must be done for the sake of the peoples, in the interests of the peoples and not in the interests of those ruling classes who are manoeuvring in these troubled situations behind the backs of the peoples and to their detriment.

Ten years ago the Soviet revisionist leaders ordered their tanks to advance on Prague. Czechoslovakia was subjected to a barbarous aggression which was condemned with great indignation and anger by the whole progressive world. This act of the leaders of the Kremlin demonstrated in practice that the Soviet Union had been transformed completely into an imperialist superpower. With its perfidious and brutal aggression against Vietnam, revisionist China, too, acted in the same way as the Soviet Union did in 1968 against Czechoslovakia. The Chinese revisionists, also, emerged openly before the world as an im-

perialist superpower, seeking spheres of influence and «living space».

The chiefs of Beijing threw off their disguises. They did not wait until the year 2000, until they had completed their «modernizations» and transformed China into a great power equal to the Soviet Union and the United States and capable of competing with them for world domination. Their imperial dreams, their great-power obsession and their war-mongering ideology blinded their eyes and clouded their judgement. By sending their troops to attack Vietnam, the rulers of Beijing showed that their policy is a chauvinist and hegemony-seeking policy. The attack on Vietnam is a logical consequence of the social-imperialist line formulated by the Chinese leadership long ago, when Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai were alive, and put into practice now by Deng Xiaoping and Hua Guofeng.

In order to save face, the Chinese leadership declare that their attack on Vietnam has a «punitive character». This claim is an expression typical of the old imperialist gun-boat policy applied by colonialists and neo-colonialists.

China has attacked an innocent country and a heroic people who have never inflicted any harm on mankind but, on the contrary, have rendered it brilliant service while bearing the burden of extraordinary sacrifices and sufferings. Vietnam resisted and defeated American imperialism, the most ferocious enemy of the peoples and all mankind.

The people of Vietnam have never done any harm to the Chinese people, either, but, on the contrary, have been their friends. Throughout the centuries, however, the Vietnamese people have suffered continually at the hands of the rulers of China. Even in the war against American imperialism, the Chinese leadership, like the Soviet social-imperialist leadership irrespective of some slight aid they provided, hindered and damaged the anti-imperialist war

of the people of Vietnam. At the time when the whole of Vietnam, from south to north, was in flames by the bombs of the giant American «B-52» aircraft, Nixon was welcomed with great honours in Beijing, and Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai made deals with the president of the United States to the detriment of the Vietnamese people.

The Party of Labour of Albania has publicly condemned the dangerous policy pursued by China and has warned of the dangers which it presents for international peace and security. The analysis which our Party has made of the Chinese theory of «three worlds» and its ideological basis — «Mao Zedong thought», of the Chinese plans to transform their country into a big power and of the actions of China in the international arena, made it clear that it would not be long before China launched direct armed attacks on the freedom, independence and sovereignty of peoples. It has pointed out also that the feverish efforts and the aims of China to become a superpower, which would counterbalance both the United States of America and the Soviet Union, could not fail to lead to new frictions, to conflagrations and to wars which might have a local character, but could also have the character of a world war.

With the open aggression which they undertook against Vietnam the Chinese social-imperialist revisionists have exposed themselves even worse. Their political hypocrisy and false slogans have become even more obvious. China has posed and still poses as a socialist state, but it turns out that it is a phoney socialist state like the Soviet Union, a state which maintains a socialist disguise in order to deceive the peoples. It claims that it is a country of the «third world», but it turns out that it puts itself in this «world» in order to extend its domination there. And just like American imperialism and Soviet

social-imperialism, when this cannot be achieved in «peaceful ways», it tries to do it through violence and war. All these years China has claimed through the mouths of its leaders, from Mao Zedong to Deng Xiaoping, that «it will never seek hegemony», that «it will never attack first», that «no Chinese soldier will ever be found on foreign territory», etc. There is no end to the stale Chinese slogans. But what are the Chinese soldiers after now in Vietnam where they are killing the people and destroying the country with fire and sword, just as the American imperialists did only a few years before?

China launched its military attack on Vietnam because it is guided by the aggressive superpower ideology of «filling the vacuums», by the chauvinist concept that the peoples ought to live under its shadow, that they must submit to the dictate of the great power, obey and pay tribute to «the middle empire». It attacked Vietnam because it has joined in the game of superpowers, because it seeks to compete with them for spheres of influence.

The fact that the aggressive attack against Vietnam was undertaken immediately after the return of Deng Xiaoping from the United States of America(1) implies that it enjoys the blessing and support of American imperialism. China's aggression against Vietnam was designed in Beijing and approved in Washington.

In his speeches in the United States, Deng Xiaoping declared openly, in fascist style, that «China was going to teach Vietnam a good lesson». And none of his official hosts disapproved of or denied this. The admiring stand which the American imperialists are taking now towards the Chinese aggression shows that they have given it the

1 Deng Xiaoping returned to China on February 8, 1979, whereas the Chinese aggression against Vietnam was launched on February 17 of the same year.

green light. This is obvious, also, from the fact that now the American government is trying to put China, which has attacked Vietnam, on the same plane as Vietnam because, allegedly, it has attacked Cambodia.

In Cambodia, the Cambodian people, communists and patriots, have risen against the barbarous government of Pol Pot, which was nothing but a group of provocateurs in the service of the imperialist bourgeoisie and of the Chinese revisionists, in particular, which had as its aim to discredit the idea of socialism in the international arena. Even Prince Sihanouk, who was incarcerated for nearly four years in Pnom Pen, has spoken publicly at UNO about the crimes of the Pol Pot government and its extermination of the Cambodian people. The anti-popular line of that regime is confirmed, also, by the fact that the Albanian embassy in the Cambodian capital, the embassy of a country which has given the people of Cambodia every possible aid, was kept isolated, indeed, encircled with barbed wire, as if it were in a concentration camp. The other embassies, too, were in a similar situation. The Albanian diplomats have seen with their own eyes that the Cambodian people were treated inhumanly by the clique of Pol Pot and Yeng Sari. Pnom Pen was turned into a deserted city, empty of people, where food was difficult to secure even for the diplomats, where no doctors or even aspirins could be found. We think that the people and patriots of Cambodia waited too long before overthrowing this clique which was completely linked with Beijing and in its service.

When the first conflicts broke out on the Cambodian-Vietnamese border, the view of socialist Albania was, and the world is witness to this, that disagreements between the two neighbour countries should be resolved through talks and without the interference of the Chinese or Soviet social-imperialists. But this was not done. On the contrary, the

Pol Pot group, incited by Beijing, brought out in Pnom Pen daily communiques in which they announced that thousands of Vietnamese were being killed by its army on Vietnamese territory.

It was quite apparent that this provocative and war-mongering activity was supported and carried out for the expansionist aims of Deng Xiaoping, Hua Guofeng and on their account. And why should Deng Xiaoping not support and back the clique of Pol Pot and Yeng Sari when he has rehabilitated all the scum of Chinese reaction, when he has returned property, money and power over the plants and factories to the big bourgeoisie, the men of the Kuomintang and all the counter-revolutionaries, and has turned China into a social-imperialist capitalist country, as our Party has rightly described it? The bourgeoisie in the party and the bourgeois intellectuals are in power in China. There this scum is considered the élite, while they demand that the working class bend its head and work for the «modernizations». It was precisely these capitalists, the clique of Deng Xiaoping and Co., who kept Pol Pot in power in Cambodia and now, after he has been overthrown, are trying with every means to restore him.

The Chinese leadership are trying to cover up the aggressive act they undertook against Vietnam with the absurd pretext that Vietnam is seeking «small-scale hegemony», thinking that in this way they will be excused for the large-scale hegemony of China.

But the question must be asked: Why do the Chinese imperialists allegedly have the right to defend the barbarous fascist Pol Pot group, and Vietnam does not have the right to support the revolutionaries and the people of Cambodia to build a free, independent and sovereign country? The Vietnamese government has officially and publicly rejected the Chinese allegation that it is aiming to set up a federation of Indochina and has declared

that Vietnam wants the peoples of this zone to live free, in friendship and independence, each in its own country.

We Albanians can make the following criticism of the Vietnamese and we have already made it directly to them: neither in the time of the war against the Americans nor at the present time are an alliance with the social-imperialist Soviet Union or any other imperialist state and their joining Comecon justifiable. They are harmful and dangerous, both to Vietnam itself and to other peoples.

The Chinese aggression against Vietnam has all the hallmarks of fascism. The Chinese justifications for their barbarous aggression undertaken in Vietnam seem to be taken word for word from Hitler who, in his time, claimed that he invaded Czechoslovakia because the Sudeten Germans were being mistreated, and invaded Poland because men sent by the Poles had committed acts of sabotage and murders on German territory. But who can believe the leaders of Beijing that it is Vietnam which has sent its men to ruin «the peaceful life of Chinese border towns and villages», and that China was obliged to retaliate? The Chinese pretexts are pretexts which all the imperialists have used and continue to use to start and justify their aggressions. The aim of subjugating and enslaving the people of Vietnam in order to open the way south to the new Chinese expansion cannot be hidden with a fig leaf.

As a result of the aggressive acts of China and its expansionist aims, a dangerous hotbed of war has been created in Indochina. Its flames are threatening the peoples of other countries.

Our Party has publicly denounced the policy of the Chinese social-imperialists towards Vietnam and has condemned their pressures and interference in its internal affairs and the threat which this policy presents for the peoples of Asia. The Chinese social-imperialists have interfered gravely in the internal affairs of Vietnam; for their

own expansionist ambitions they are fanning up the conflict between Cambodia and Vietnam and so on. When the Chinese leadership behaves in this way with Vietnam, with a country which, up till yesterday, it considered a fraternal country and close friend, what can the other countries of Asia think about the Chinese policy? Can they put any trust in it?

The genuine revolutionaries, patriots and anti-imperialists, honest people everywhere in the world, with great force and indignation condemn the Chinese leadership which has caused new sufferings and hardships for the heroic Vietnamese people, and understand the great danger with which other countries are threatened. The peoples of Asia must be concerned that what China is doing today against Vietnam it might do against them tomorrow.

The aggression which China has undertaken against Vietnam cannot end otherwise than with grave and ignominious defeat for it. We are confident that the Chinese attack will be repelled without the aid of anyone from outside and that the Vietnamese people will be vigilant against the dangers which come not only from Chinese social-imperialism, but also from American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism.

The people of Vietnam have been put to the test and have proved that they are an heroic and invincible people. They are fighting for a just cause and will triumph, just as they triumphed over the United States of America. The fate which the American imperialists suffered in Vietnam awaits the Chinese social-imperialists, too. China will be exposed and even more isolated by world opinion. And those cliques who pose as democratic, even as communist, which for their own immediate interests do not defend the just cause of Vietnam, will suffer for this one day. This is where the policy of empty words about «defence of the peoples» and the allegedly non-aligned

policy leads. He who does not support Vietnam today supports the warmongers.

The aggression against Vietnam must make the Chinese people think, too. They must open their eyes and see to what disasters their revisionist chiefs are leading them. The aggression which they have undertaken against Vietnam is aimed not only against the people of that country, but also against the Chinese people themselves.

Such a great people as the Chinese people have permitted their chauvinist leadership to attack a friendly fraternal people, at a time when they want to heal the grave wounds inflicted by 30 years of war and rebuild their devastated country. We appeal to the fraternal Chinese people to reflect and refuse to permit the adventurers who remain at the head of them, to lead them into imperialist wars against other peoples, to refuse to permit them to incite world war. We are hopeful that the Chinese people will not permit such a thing, that they will not allow themselves to be made answerable to history.

The Albanian people, who have always stood beside the Vietnamese people, who have assisted them wholeheartedly and sincerely wished them well, protest against this criminal act undertaken against them by the Chinese social-imperialists and demand an immediate end to this criminal aggression.

The Albanian people are and will always be with the heroic Vietnamese people and will defend their just cause. We are fully confident that just as the fraternal Vietnamese people have resisted and triumphed over other colonialists and imperialists, they will emerge triumphant again over the perfidious attack by the Chinese social-imperialists.

From the newspaper «Zëri
i popullit», February 21,
1979

**ONLY UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF A GENUINE
MARXIST-LENINIST PARTY CAN THE OBJECTIVES
BE ACHIEVED**

From a talk with Ernst Aust (1)

November 30, 1979

First Comrade Enver Hoxha welcomed the guest who had come to our country to take part in the celebration of the 35th anniversary of the Liberation of Albania. They held a long conversation in the course of which Comrade Enver Hoxha expressed the opinion of the Party of Labour of Albania about a number of the more important political problems. Among other things he said:

First of all, I want to thank you most sincerely for coming to our country and your participation in this important celebration for our people and our Party, the 35th anniversary of the Liberation of socialist Albania. You have been here at other times, too, and know our country and our Party, and know the feelings which we nurture for you.

At this meeting I would like to discuss a number of problems which we think are of interest both for you and for us.

The stronger the Marxist-Leninists are, the more they

1 The then Chairman of the Communist Party of Germany (M-L), today the Communist Party of Germany.

are monolithic, with extensive activity and always with a firm and clear line, the more the day-to-day struggle of the proletariat here in Europe will assume a revolutionary political colour and essence. The strikes, demonstrations and demands of the European proletarians, which are taking place at the moments of the great crisis through which imperialism and world capitalism are passing, will more and more assume a political character.

As you know, the economic strikes and demonstrations which are taking place at present in the countries of the European Common Market frequently end peacefully, in agreements between trade-union bosses or the worker aristocracy and the employers.

We think that work must be done to change this sterile struggle, this *modus vivendi*. We consider this struggle harmful to the proletariat and favourable, undisturbing, and to some degree surmountable for capitalism, because the results of it are temporary and do not harm capitalism much financially, because the concessions it makes as a result of the demands and the struggle of the proletariat are just crumbs from the enormous surplus value which it extracts from the exploitation of the working class and the mechanization of production.

The contradictions between proletarians and capitalists, between the rank-and-file unionists and the worker aristocracy, the union bosses, are becoming more profound and we must strive to make them more and more so. We think that capital and the worker aristocracy are bound together in a knot which must be severed like the Gordian knot. This knot consists of the laws which are nothing but the chains with which the proletariat has been bound to prevent it deviating from the course advantageous to capital. Therefore, the question which presents itself is to study the enslaving character of these laws which constitute the wall with which the present struggle of the

proletariat is colliding, and in this direction you have many possibilities to study the situation to find and attack the weak points, to breach this wall and then to launch a frontal attack on the breach in order, eventually, to bring down the whole wall.

Of course, this is not easy. If systematic actions are not undertaken in this direction, and especially, when a great deal of explanatory work is not done with the army of proletarians, then successes cannot be achieved. Hence, the conditions demand that we should work inside the existing unions, but should also work to establish our own unions, which we must defend and use as a political weapon against capital and the union bosses to defend those economic rights which the working class has won through struggle, but we must also struggle for the true rights of the workers, that is, for their political rights. However, these can be achieved only when the proletariat and its party, in the first place, clearly understand the theory of Marx and Lenin about the character of capital and the role of the proletariat and the proletarian revolution.

West Germany is the most powerful capitalist state of «United Europe», the wealthiest country of this monopoly capitalist union. West-German imperialism is a ferocious imperialism, an ally of the United States of America, an ally in NATO and a member of the European Common Market. Next to the United States of America it is the «ally» which plays the main role in NATO and it dominates the Common Market from every stand-point. The other members are afraid of it, and therefore, there are contradictions between them.

This domination, which is also exerted over the German people themselves, at the same time enables West-German capital to show itself somewhat more «generous» towards the proletariat. And in fact, the standard of living

in West Germany is higher than in the other countries of «United Europe», its currency is stronger, the demagoguery about its pseudo-democracy is greater and the level of German technology is among the highest.

Precisely in this difficult situation, in which it is the merit of your Party to be struggling, the Party must provide complete and factually based explanations about the mechanism of the political-economic oppression which German capital exerts, because you have to do with a proletariat with a high level of education and qualification, with farmers who have sufficient land and work with mechanized means, and you have to do with an intelligentsia with traditions, but imbued with the most varied reactionary ideological views which, as we know, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels combated and exposed over a wide front.

Imperialism is continually inventing new fascist and revanchist counter-revolutionary theories, both open and disguised, which respond to the situations which those who create them are experiencing, and it spreads them not only in Germany, but everywhere in the world, concocting and encouraging new outlooks, new ways of life, which are adapted to the technology, the industrial development and capitalism in decay. Imperialism, especially in your country, combines all these theories and outlooks with the Teutonic spirit, with the old Bismarck Junker outlook and Hitlerite national-socialist savagery.

Our doctrine, Marxism-Leninism, explains and clarifies all these situations which have developed and are developing. It has foreseen everything, while also providing a correct solution for the fundamental problems of each epoch, the problems of the materialist and dialectical development of history. Only a rabid enemy of Marxism-Leninism can act as the Chinese revisionists are doing. Amongst other things, at the Congress of Writers and

Artists of China which ended recently, through the vice-president of the League, they declared that in the 19th century Marx and Engels could not have foreseen the development of productive forces through the wide-scale use of electric power and nuclear energy. Lenin was able to recognize this and that is why he said that communism is Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country, but, say the Chinese, he was not acquainted with electronics, and consequently, his theory, too, is of no help in today's conditions of development.

On the other hand, this Chinese revisionist made himself the apologist of imperialism by stating, to the astonishment of all, that this system is not in decay or in decline, but is advancing, developing production, science, technique and the productive forces, therefore, he concludes, this new situation of the imperialist countries has brought forward new problems to be studied. «Mao Zedong thought» provides this «aid». In other words, according to this revisionist, we must reject Marxism-Leninism.

In these conditions it is our duty to arm ourselves by studying and thoroughly mastering Marxism-Leninism in order to clearly distinguish the false, so-called Marxist-Leninist theories such as «Mao Zedong thought», the theories of the «Eurocommunists» who would be better called Eurorevisionists, and other such theories.

As we see, we are facing many enemies whom we must fight together in Marxist-Leninist unity of revolutionary thought and action.

Our struggle is serious and complicated. It is a stern political, ideological and economic struggle and, in certain conditions, even an armed struggle. On this occasion, I want to stress that for us Marxist-Leninists the revolution has begun, it is a process in development, therefore we must carry it through to the end, The fundamental issue

of this revolution is the seizure of state power by the proletariat by force, by violence, because the capitalist bourgeoisie which holds state power does not relinquish it willingly or through reforms.

Of course, we Marxist-Leninists are realists; we are organizers and know that the revolution is prepared objectively and subjectively. Sacrifices will be required, we and the peoples will shed our blood, we will have to be clear in our thinking, prudent and courageous in actions, fearless on attack and careful in retreat. We must also know when we can make compromises, of course, only when these are advantageous to the revolution. On this question and in everything else, both in strategy and tactics, we are guided by Marxism-Leninism.

We must take full account of the political circumstances, clearly discern the splits in the ranks of the enemies and exploit them in favour of the revolution and erode the material, political and military power of the enemies.

World capitalism, social-democracy and modern revisionism have always fought, distorted and misrepresented proletarian internationalism, the collaboration of communists, and the unity of thought and action of the communist and workers' parties. On us, the Marxist-Leninist parties, devolves the urgent task of putting all these things on the right road.

The so-called joint meetings which social-democracy, modern revisionism hold from time to time are worthless, formal, and are held to feel the pulse of the partners who take part in them. At these meetings each participant aims to benefit himself at the expense of the others. Of course, we Marxist-Leninists need meetings, but we have no need for meetings just for the sake of meetings, fruitless meetings, meetings which allegedly affirm our existence. First of all,

we need meetings to exchange experience, to co-ordinate the cardinal actions for a given situation, we need meetings of a militant character in which unity prevails and not meetings in order to quarrel and split.

The holding of these meetings depends on the seriousness of the parties, on the problems which require joint solutions, as well as on the moments when these solutions should be applied. Therefore, we think that slogans about «general meetings of communist parties (Marxist-Leninist)» should not be issued without first carefully weighing up and deciding the problems which will be discussed in them.

In our opinion, these meetings, whether bilateral, trilateral, multilateral, or general, are determined by the objective needs of the struggle, by the need to exchange experience and for special consultations about related problems which all of us face. Our Party clearly defined this view at its 7th Congress.

Now I come to another question. If we look at the present state of the communist parties (Marxist-Leninist) of Europe, along with the good results achieved in strengthening them, it seems to us that since some of them are new, they are still not properly consolidated politically, ideologically and organizationally.

We, the older parties, with greater experience, must help them. Our opinion is that this assistance cannot be provided properly by a meeting or a communique which might emerge from it, but bilateral and trilateral contacts should take place and these require patience, explanations, and real knowledge of the situations in which each party operates.

Our common problems here, in old Europe, are capital ones, but they are problems not only of Europe, but of the whole world, of all peoples, because no part of the globe, no class, no party, whatever its type and the ideology on which it is based, can isolate itself from the

events which are taking place all round the globe or fail to take part in this complicated struggle. Naturally, the intensity of the struggle may not be the same everywhere and this has its own objective and subjective reasons.

We Marxist-Leninists cannot fail to see and study this revolutionary development in all its complexity, with the positive and negative aspects which it presents, and basing ourselves on this, construct our strategy and tactics.

Capitalist and revisionist Europe looks united, but it is and it is not. The interests of Western capitalism seem harmonized and co-ordinated in NATO, in «United Europe» and the European Common Market, but amongst the states which comprise these organisms there are profound contradictions and rivalries, the law of the jungle, crises, inflation and unemployment, fear of the social-imperialist Soviet Union and, above all, fear of the revolution, prevail there.

The situation in the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries of Eastern Europe, which take part in the Warsaw Treaty and COMECON, is similar.

There are confrontations between the two blocs as well as between states within the blocs, but still without weapons; the rivalries between them are becoming more and more profound. There is fierce economic competition, a frenzied arms race and struggle for the weakening of one bloc by the other.

Hence, in this situation there is unequal economic development, there are capitalist and revisionist states which are wealthy and less wealthy, dependent and less dependent, as well as states which are completely dependent, but which pose as free, independent, sovereign states as Tito's Yugoslavia, Rumania and others describe themselves. The multinational companies dominate their political and economic life. The superstructure of these states responds to this structure. In all the capitalist

countries of Europe disguised fascism has its own forms and forces of organization, social-democracy has its numerous parties and modern revisionism also has its parties.

All these parties are political instruments of capital, imperialism and social-imperialism. They represent and defend the interests of various capitalist groups of one or the other bloc, of one or the other capitalist or revisionist state. Decay, rivalry and ideological and political confusion reign throughout them. All of them, with their structures and superstructures, are fighting jointly in the framework of alliances, but also in disalliance and rivalry, in order to safeguard the regime of oppression and exploitation of capitalism as a world system and of capitalism within each state; they are fighting to suppress and exploit the working class and the peoples, to put down the revolution, whether anti-imperialist or proletarian, anywhere in the world.

These are the situations in which we, the Marxist-Leninist parties, the genuine communist parties, the leadership of the proletariat and the proletariat of all countries, are fighting.

The enemies strive to keep the European proletariat split and disorganized and all we Marxist-Leninists can see this. This is the main aim of all the parties of capital, social-democracy and modern revisionism. Only the doctrine of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin assures the proletariat of unity of its ranks and its allies. That is why the bourgeoisie, capitalism, revisionism and social-democracy pervert, distort, fight and deny Marxism-Leninism.

In these conditions our primary task is to defend Marxism-Leninism, to apply it correctly in revolutionary ways in the conditions of each country, but not in isolation from the struggle of other peoples, to make correct analyses of particular and general situations and to form alliances

while safeguarding the individuality of the Marxist-Leninist party. This is the principle of our struggle from which we must not budge, because only in this way can the struggle which capitalism is waging against us be successfully opposed.

The alliance of the proletariat with the peasantry, the progressive intellectuals, the unemployed of various strata, and the proletarian-worker emigrants who work in each separate capitalist country, is essential. Without this alliance, in this situation our struggle will remain restricted.

In Germany there are many such forces, indeed, there are Albanians who have come mainly from Kosova, who, amongst other problems, have the problem of unemployment. The Kosovars are courageous, they have the tradition that when they give their word they do not go back on it, have many fine characteristics which they preserve and a strong sense of friendship. If they make you their friend they will never forget you and will lay down their lives for you.

In order to achieve such an alliance, first of all, there must be struggle for unity of action of the proletariat, which is not achieved all that easily, because of the obstacles which the parties of the bourgeoisie, such as the social-democrats and the Christian-democrats and the demagogy of renegades from Marxism-Leninism, the modern revisionists, raise and the traditions which they have implanted. Unity is strong when it is established from below, from the base, proceeding from the real problems and needs of the workers, from the needs of the rank-and-file unionists, and in this way, according to the problems and circumstances, forms of organization for unity of action are created and the split with their reactionary union bosses becomes obvious.

The pronounced political content of the demands in

strikes and demonstrations in which the new revolutionary leaders will emerge, will strengthen this unity. In the course of this struggle new forms of organization and leadership will emerge too.

Unity, this is the key problem of our Marxist-Leninist parties, the motto of which has always been and still is: «Workers of all countries unite!» This is achieved when attention is paid also to the slogan: «Workers of one country unite!»

This unity implies ceaseless struggle against those who combat it, hence, against the local capitalists and capitalist superstructure, implies struggle against the organization and ideology of political parties of the bourgeoisie and against capitalist exploitation.

Our struggle, then, is a great and extensive one. It is not easy, on the contrary, it is difficult. Naturally, this all-sided struggle does not discourage us or make us pessimistic, but gives us courage. Nevertheless, it cannot be coped with by the forces of the Marxist-Leninist party alone which, while standing firm on principles, must not be sectarian or opportunist either in thought or in action, otherwise it will withdraw into its own shell or become a revisionist party.

Therefore, our Party thinks that the problem of the unity of the working class and the forming of alliances on sound foundations with other strata and forces for specific issues, for minimum programs, in order to go over eventually to alliances of a broader character and more far-reaching programs, are decisive problems.

We think that a mature Marxist-Leninist party with some experience can and must accomplish these tasks. First of all, of course, it is essential that it should thoroughly understand all these major problems and then solve them correctly from the political, ideological and

organizational stand-points, in conformity with the concrete conditions of its own country, so that the objective and subjective factors operate for the mobilization of the masses in revolts, uprisings and revolution.

Such a thing occurred in Iran, but there the Islamic bourgeois party and not the Marxist-Leninist party led the uprising. Of course, Germany, France, or Italy are not like Iran, which is a weak link of capitalism and imperialism. Nevertheless, the representatives of Islam were able to inspire the masses who overthrew the Shah and not only wiped out his feudal power, maintained by means of modern weapons, but also struck a heavy blow at American and the other imperialisms.

The American imperialists, placed in difficult positions, do not know who to support or how to act, whether or not to intervene in Iran with arms. Armed intervention on their part would be catastrophic, not only for the United States of America, but also for the whole capitalist world.

The Moslem believers in Iran are on the move. Not all the masses believe in Mohammed, but they all want liberation from the yoke of imperialism. Of course, the bourgeoisie, the capitalists, want to use the existing situation for their own interests. What will happen later? That is another problem the development of which we shall watch. Nevertheless, we Marxist-Leninists draw some conclusions, seeing that the people came out in the streets, overthrew the Shah and succeeded in bringing the army, which was armed to its teeth, over to their side.

It is well known that whoever oppresses others also oppresses his own people. If the oppressed people in Iran rose against their oppressor, then why should the other oppressed peoples not rise against their own oppressors and the oppressors of others? Capitalism propagates the impossibility of this, while at the same time it organizes oppression in a thousand visible and invisible forms.

At the present time an exceptionally difficult political and economic situation has been created for imperialism and for American imperialism, in particular. Apart from other things, the problem of the dollar has become one of its weak points, because the German mark, the Japanese yen and the French franc are paying for the dollar. Hence, the countries which use these currencies do not want the dollar, but the franc, the mark, the yen, etc.

The struggle of the proletariat, led by the Marxist-Leninists against imperialism, the local capitalism, the bourgeois state and its political parties, cannot fail to lead to blows between these latter and the proletariat and its allies. Provided our actions are revolutionary there can be no other outcome.

The reformists avoid coming to blows, indeed they vote for and support the strengthening of the armed forces, the police, and other forces protecting the capitalist system. The reformists are only for certain reforms, sufficient to deceive the proletariat and the masses; they are for their own participation in the capitalist state, hence, they are for the capitalist order.

They describe anyone who rises against the bourgeoisie and its lackeys as terrorist and anarchist. We Marxist-Leninists are against terrorism and against anarchism, both in theory and practice. However, we are preparing the revolution, hence we are bound to come to blows with the army of the bourgeoisie. For this reason the bourgeoisie is already preparing the terrain and indoctrinating the masses psychologically to create the impression amongst them that we, the communists and proletarians who rise in insurrection against the system of oppression and exploitation, are allegedly terrorists, anarchists, murderers and bank robbers and label us with other epithets which are perfectly appropriate for terrorist and anarchist gangs, but in no way appropriate for communists. It is the capital-

ist system which creates these gangs, which causes the degeneration of their members and encourages them to operate under pseudo-revolutionary, pseudo-proletarian and pseudo-communist labels. Originally, many members of these gangs were honest people, unemployed and homeless and suffering great hardships, but this miserable life and capitalism itself drive them to commit acts of terror, robbery and murder. In some cases these gangs are an embarrassment to the power of the bourgeoisie, but mostly they serve the bourgeoisie and so it increases them continuously and leaves them free to operate. This is the army of fascism with which the proletariat has clashed and will always clash whenever it rises in revolutionary struggle. Such gangs are the auxiliary aids of the army, the police and all the organs of coercion of the bourgeoisie.

Therefore, it is a primary task of our communist parties (Marxist-Leninist) to educate and train the proletariat and the masses day by day by engaging them in minor actions and then in bigger actions against the bourgeoisie and the various forms of oppression which it employs, especially against the army and the other means of oppression of the capitalist order. This is no easy task. For this reason the Marxist-Leninist party does not separate its revolutionary strategy from its revolutionary tactics. The essence of our struggle is to make the soldier, the son of the people, a political person so that he will not be an automaton, but will consciously sabotage the orders, discipline, and armaments of the army, erode the power of the reactionary officer caste, refuse to open fire on the people and, at the culminating moment, turn his weapons against the system, against his superiors, and join the insurgents, as occurred in Iran. In the countries of Europe this is a thing that cannot be realized immediately, therefore, the communist parties (M-L) here have to do a great deal of work. It is clear

that their subsequent activity will be easier when the genuine parties of the working class have carried out adequate work with the sons of the people before they are recruited to the army.

We must sabotage the imperialist war. This is done by preparing the masses and co-ordinating the struggle against the capitalist structure and superstructure with the struggle to sabotage the army of the bourgeoisie. The Marxist-Leninist party turns imperialist war into civil war. This is what Marxism-Leninism teaches us, therefore, the ways and means must be found for us to develop and concretize this great lesson in practice.

This will be achieved only when we prepare the soldier for such an action, when he understands this action and is conscious of its importance, when he sabotages the munition plants and depots and the infra-structure of the bourgeois army and when, at the same time, the Marxist-Leninist party through struggle and in the course of fighting has organized the army of the armed people and, at the head of the proletariat, launches direct attacks to overthrow the power of the bourgeoisie and place power in the hands of the people, which is the main objective of the revolution.

All this complex struggle of the Marxist-Leninist parties, the proletariat, and the working masses cannot be waged in the same way and with the same intensity, with the same forms and methods in all the countries of Europe and the world. This is understandable and an objective fact. The situations are not the same and cannot be developed in the same way everywhere, but Marxism-Leninism, the ideology which guides us and must guide us, is the same, the objectives which we must achieve are the same, while the forces in movement and in confrontation have been defined by Marxism-Leninism on the basis of the dialectical and historical development of human

society. Hence, it is up to the working class in alliance with the peasantry and other exploited strata, under the leadership of its own Marxist-Leninist communist party, to carry out the revolution and take power into its own hands.

Only a genuine Marxist-Leninist party is able to study and understand these great and important problems correctly, to organize the struggle, the revolution, and achieve the objectives which history has allocated to the proletariat and to the party as the leading and guiding force of the proletariat.

We think that only a party of the Lenin-Stalin type can lead the proletarian revolution to its successful conclusion and build the new society, socialism and communism.

Assimilation by the militants of the ideology of Marx and Lenin and its rigorous application in practice with iron proletarian discipline have great importance.

The proletarian revolution demands iron proletarian discipline. Therefore, the vanguard party of the working class is characterized by unity of revolutionary Marxist-Leninist thought and action.

There must be only one line and not two in a Marxist-Leninist party. In the party there is genuine democracy within the principles and norms established, there is open and constructive discussion in which the opinions which may exist about various problems are thrashed out, there is sound Marxist-Leninist comradeship and sincere communist love for one another. Bureaucracy, liberalism and sectarianism are combated, always within these norms, and the cult of individuals, favouritism and other evils and all sorts of other hangovers inherited from the old bourgeois-capitalist society are combated.

Militancy demands great sacrifices, even up to the ultimate sacrifice, from us communists. Not all communists understand this. There are some who understand it

narrowly, restricting their efforts to superficial propaganda which causes no problems or dangers to «democratic» legality and the adoption of some feeble political stands without militant mobilization and without concrete results.

The revisionist parties are parties of «permanent» paid officials, commercial parties which act in politics in the way they run their capitalist enterprises. For example, the French revisionist party, the Italian revisionist party and others have their own trusts and receive open subsidies from the state and secret subsidies from the capitalist groups. Their «militancy» is a facade which deceives the proletariat and supports the capitalist apparatus and system, hence, does capital no harm.

The period through which we are passing is glorious and revolutionary, but also difficult for our parties. Our struggle must be waged with closed ranks so that we are not infiltrated by the enemy, either through provocateurs or agents, or ideologically, in order to split us. «Mao Zedong thought» is one of these weapons which is being employed at present for this purpose.

The existence and activity of a party in legality and the possibilities which the capitalist bourgeoisie may provide for it to work must not create unhealthy illusions. We must use these possibilities to develop the revolutionary work, but the party through its sound nucleus can act better in illegality by exploiting the various forms of work which the possibilities of bourgeois «legality» permit, but not for a moment forgetting the tooth and nail struggle with the army of the bourgeoisie which will attack us.

We must not understand the problem of illegal work in a sectarian way and shut ourselves away in isolation, neglecting all the forms of the struggle which «legality» permits, although we must not forget that this legality is ephemeral. The legal work of the party is known to the enemy; whereas its illegal work, which is combined with

and guides the legal work, must not be known to the enemy. The legal struggle must, without fail, achieve certain limits, certain results which serve the revolution, create the objective factors for it, prepare the wide-scale mass attacks against the oppressive capitalist system and its state.

The Party of Labour of Albania is in power. Socialist Albania is the only state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. We are encircled by savage enemies who are also your enemies and the enemies of all mankind, but all of us together also have countless friends in the world with whom we are united in struggle for the one aim, for the revolution.

We fight to expose and disarm the external enemies through our correct, principled and courageous policy which arouses respect among the peoples and fear among the enemies, both because of the good opinion which it creates about Albania and because of the recognized fact that the Albanian people know how to fight and defend themselves if they are attacked. So, for the enemy the question presents itself like this: you may well try to enter the war but how will you come out of it?! The enemy may and does have many sophisticated weapons, but Albania is strong. One of the main aims of our struggle in the international arena is to increase our friends, to assist our co-fighters and to disarm and expose the enemies. We never forget the enemies, we do not overestimate them, but neither do we underrate them, we face them without batting an eyelid, because we are determined to fight to the end, to defend ourselves against them whether in the international arena or within our own country, in ceaseless struggle against the influence which they are doing their utmost to impose on us.

Our Party is constantly working to strengthen the situation within the country in every direction. We have

some difficulties, but, of course, we have more successes. The Chinese revisionists caused us serious difficulties in the economy, but we are struggling to overcome them and we shall do so...

We are also encountering some difficulties in trade exchanges with the capitalist states, but we shall surmount these, too, without making even the slightest political concession, without toning down the political struggle even for a moment and without accepting the smallest credit from them. In our payments to them we shall continue to be correct, as we have always been. We shall accomplish everything with our own forces, with prudent and well-considered steps. We will always be opposed to exaggerated optimism.

The continuous strengthening of this sound situation within the country is and will continue to be the main objective of our Party. We are working to ensure that the development of our socialist economy and culture and the strengthening of the defence of the Homeland continue to advance. Above all, we are working to safeguard and strengthen the Marxist-Leninist unity of the Party within its own ranks and the unity of the Party with the people. We are struggling to promote new cadres, that is, to prepare the leading cadres for the future, because the Party must always be young, continually rejuvenated with fresh blood. This unity has been created and tempered and will be further tempered only on the course of Marxism-Leninism.

Our close, sincere, equal relations on the course of Marxism-Leninism are a vital issue. We must defend Marxism-Leninism, must master and apply it even better than hitherto by fighting harder and more effectively in creative ways for the proletarian revolution and for genuine socialism. We must fight together, shoulder to shoulder, with closed ranks and assist each other as much

as we can. We, as Marxist-Leninists in power, will help you in your revolutionary struggle. On the other hand, you help socialist Albania where the Party of Labour is in power, where the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established and the new socialist society is being built successfully, according to the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

Our Party thinks that a stern struggle must be waged against the various kinds of modern revisionism and this struggle must be linked closely with the struggle against American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, capitalism and its parties in each separate state and on a world scale. We emphasize the struggle against the various kinds of modern revisionism, because this is the most recent and least unmasked variant of social-democracy in the period of imperialism, of capitalism in decay, the period of anti-imperialist revolutions and proletarian revolutions.

In essence, the various kinds of modern revisionism have the same ideological views and the same objectives:

- The rejection of the Marxist-Leninist theory as a theory allegedly unsuitable for our times;
- The rejection of the revolution and the seizure of power through violence;
- The integration of capitalism into «socialism» by means of reforms in pluralism and in collaboration, in harmony and coexistence of classes and their ideologies;
- The preservation of the existing capitalist state structures as well as of religious beliefs, while accepting only some minor formal change.

Although Togliatti's polycentrism has been achieved in general, there will be further splits and fragmentation.

Today we see a number of variants of modern revisionism:

1. Soviet modern revisionism which «dominates» in a series of revisionist parties within its sphere of influence

which, in general, are the former communist parties. This revisionist grouping disguises itself with Leninism, but fights it both as a theory and as a revolutionary practice. The parties of this revisionist grouping operating in the capitalist countries are in opposition, but they are also making efforts to participate in the capitalist governments of their own countries. Their demagogy is very dangerous.

2. «Eurocommunism», the banner of which is carried by the Spanish, French and Italian revisionist parties as well as others which have openly rejected the Marxist-Leninist theory and the idea of the revolution, defend parliamentarianism, pluralism, reformism in theory and in structure, reject the class struggle, preach class peace, struggle for participation in the capitalist governments and legal collaboration with capitalism, while integrating themselves into its structure and superstructure.

3. Chinese revisionism with «Mao Zedong thought» as a pseudo-Marxist, eclectic, Bukharinite, revisionist, opportunist theory with tendencies for world hegemony both in ideology and policy. Although not well crystallized, «Mao Zedong thought» is a theory of the developing Chinese bourgeoisie, which has aggressive, war-mongering, social-imperialist tendencies. This pseudo-Marxist theory rejects Marxism-Leninism while disguising itself as a theory of the revolution; likewise, it tries to disguise the struggle which Chinese revisionism is waging for world hegemony and neo-colonialism, rejects the class struggle, has a pronounced Asiatic but also world character and comes out openly against proletarian internationalism.

4. Titoism, a revisionist current which operates without disguise against Marxism-Leninism, places itself openly in the service of world capitalism, is the builder of an anarcho-syndicalist pseudo-socialist structure with all the anti-socialist and anti-Marxist-Leninist features. Tito-

ism is a friend and supporter of the «Eurocommunists» and is trying to become their leader, but without success. This current is also making efforts to influence China, to set it more firmly on the capitalist course, and this influence has begun to have effect in several directions, although China aims to create and is creating its capitalist system in its own way.

5. Various eclectic social-religious, social-bourgeois, anti-Marxist currents which pop up continually like toadstools after the rain.

Our parties must bear in mind that these revisionist variants, which are all on the attack against socialism and the revolution, also have their theories with which they want to manipulate the masses within the country and outside it, on the international plane. The theories of «three worlds», «the non-aligned», «the developing world», or theories like that which claims that «socialism is being built everywhere» are opium for the peoples, are anti-popular theories which are emerging as a reaction to the anti-imperialist situation and serve precisely to protect the capitalist system from the attacks of the masses, to hinder the anti-imperialist movement and struggle of the peoples. These pseudo-liberation theories create illusions and try to paralyse the revolutionary drive of the masses by creating the opinion among them that they are at work, «in struggle», and that what they are doing, or appear to be doing, is sufficient.

Through the pompous conferences, the broad meetings, through the exchanges of government delegations and parties of these countries amongst themselves and the great publicity which accompanies these numerous manifestations, the bourgeois press is striving to confuse and daze world opinion and sometimes even the new, unformed Marxists.

All these things constitute the complexity of our strug-

gle. In our fundamental fight, in our strategy and tactics, in our daily struggle and activity we must always take all these actions of our enemies into account and unmask them openly and without respite. It is for this reason that we must temper our parties every day, must arm them with our Marxist-Leninist theory and must safeguard and strengthen the Marxist-Leninist ideological unity of the party. In this way alone we can and will find our bearings correctly in our complicated, but glorious struggle, because this is the great struggle for the liberation of peoples from capitalist bondage, the struggle for the triumph of the proletarian revolution on all continents.

Published for the first time
according to the minutes taken
at this meeting. Central Archi-
ves of the Party

THE AGGRESSORS MUST GET OUT OF AFGHANISTAN!

Article published in the newspaper «Zëri i popullit»

January 5, 1980

The military occupation of Afghanistan which was accomplished in recent days by the social-imperialist Soviet Union has aroused great anger among the progressive and freedom-loving peoples of the whole world. The Soviet intervention is blatant aggression not only against Afghanistan, but also against the neighbouring peoples, against all the peoples of the Middle-East zone and against international peace and security.

This is a fascist-type aggression like the occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1968, a new edition of it, both from the stand-point of the military action and from the stand-point of the arguments used to justify it. The Soviet social-imperialists are trying to present the occupation of Afghanistan as a «lawful» act carried out allegedly on the basis of the Afghan government's request for assistance and the «treaty of friendship» which exists between the two countries to protect Afghanistan from external interference, and so on.

All these «arguments» are as stale as they are time-worn. They have been used by all aggressors at all times. The reality is that the Soviet social-imperialists had carefully prepared the terrain for this occupation in advance,

by interfering and disturbing the situation within the country in their own favour and by binding Afghanistan with the chains of enslaving treaties which the Soviet social-imperialists use openly as instruments to occupy other countries or to keep these peoples dependent and under their control.

The overthrow of the monarchy and subsequently of Daud was a cynical exploitation by the rulers of Moscow of the liberation desires of the Afghan people, who suffered under the heavy burden of the oppression and exploitation by the monarchy and feudalism and their Soviet allies and who wanted to see their country free and sovereign.

In order to conceal their imperialist aims and to achieve them as quickly as possible the staffs of the Kremlin interfered brutally in Afghanistan, bringing to power their own men whom they beheaded, one after the other, in their efforts to find the most suitable and the most obedient to Moscow.

The Soviet Union is not interested in the freedom and independence of Afghanistan, as it claims, or in the liberation of the long-suffering people of that country. What interests it above all is the strategic position of Afghanistan in the Middle East, its closeness to the sources of oil, its key position in an extensive zone in which there is savage rivalry between the superpowers.

The occupation of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union was carried out at the time when the United States of America is engaged in wide-ranging activity to exert pressure and blackmail against Iran, when it has undertaken real economic and political aggression against that country, accompanied by the demonstration of its strength and threats of military intervention. From this stand-point, the events in Iran and Afghanistan are closely linked and may be followed by other events of this kind in that region. They show how fiercely the rivalry between the United

States of America and the Soviet Union for hegemony in the oil rich region of the Middle East and in the Indian Ocean is raging, and what great dangers the superpowers present for the peoples of those regions. The aim of the superpowers is to attack and suppress the revolutionary movements of the peoples, to prevent their breaking free from the hegemony of imperialism and social-imperialism and to stop the peoples from setting out on the course of independent, democratic national development.

The barbarous aggression of the Soviet social-imperialists against Afghanistan, the continual threats of aggression on the part of the American imperialists, and the intrigues of the Chinese social-imperialists in those regions, are fraught with great dangers for peace and security in the world. These activities refute all that great demagogic clamour which the superpowers make about the alleged preservation of peace and stability, the manoeuvres in which they engage to blunt the vigilance of the peoples and countries that are threatened by their hegemonic and expansionist policies. The events in Iran and Afghanistan prove that precisely at the time when the imperialist and social-imperialist superpowers are calling for peace, reduction of tension, disarmament, etc., they are preparing acts of aggression against the freedom and independence of the peoples.

The occupation of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union is a product of its expansionist and aggressive strategy. It demonstrates quite clearly once again that aggression and the use of military force is the most prominent feature of Soviet foreign policy today. In its rivalry with American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism has been striving with might and main to secure new strategic positions and to extend the sphere of its control and domination in Asia, Africa, Latin America and everywhere else. In these efforts the Soviets do not hesitate to use any means, from

diplomatic political manoeuvres to military violence. Nevertheless, when the peoples take their fate, the defence of their just cause, into their own hands and rise in revolution, as they did in Iran, the superpowers suffer grave and irreparable defeats for their hegemonic positions.

Having occupied Afghanistan and placed it under the iron heel of their military forces, the Soviet social-imperialist aggressors are now trying to «placate» public opinion by claiming that they have dispatched only a few contingents which will stay there «temporarily», «only as long as necessary», but in fact they will stay there indefinitely. They will act in Afghanistan as they did in Czechoslovakia where, even today, 12 years later, their occupation troops are still stationed.

Whatever promises and justifications the Soviet social-imperialists may employ, they cannot cover up the grave crime which they have committed against the freedom, independence and national sovereignty of Afghanistan. No one, under any pretext, has the right to interfere in the internal affairs and life of other peoples and nations. The peoples alone are all-powerful and have the right to decide for themselves about their internal problems without any foreign interference.

On the other hand, the hypocritical demagogy of the American imperialists and Chinese social-imperialists who are trying to present themselves as «defenders» of Afghanistan and shedding crocodile tears over its fate, can deceive no one. The American imperialists are trying to take advantage of these troubled situations for their own benefit, to justify their threats of military measures against Iran and other countries of the Middle East. The peoples do not forget the criminal war of the American imperialists in Indochina and elsewhere, do not forget the criminal fascist-type aggression of the Chinese social-imperialists against Vietnam, just as they can never forget

Czechoslovakia, Afghanistan and so on. It is clear to them that the American imperialists, the Soviet social-imperialists, the Chinese social-imperialists and all other imperialists and reactionaries are equally bloodthirsty aggressors, mortal enemies of the freedom and independence of the peoples, and that they make deals and agreements between themselves to the detriment of the peoples.

The events in Afghanistan and Iran, which affect the whole world, make it essential that the peoples enhance their vigilance against the aggressive activities of imperialism and social-imperialism and unite in struggle against the aggressive, expansionist and hegemonic policy of superpowers.

Now the freedom-fighters of Afghanistan have taken up arms and are fighting courageously in the mountains and in the cities against the domination of the Soviets and their agents. Everywhere they are displaying exemplary bravery and proving their determination to keep the banner of freedom and national sovereignty flying and to fight to the end to drive out the occupiers.

In this just and lawful struggle they have and will continue to have the support of all the freedom-loving peoples and honest and progressive persons everywhere in the world. The Iranian revolution and the Iranian people are providing powerful support for their struggle. The Afghan fighters will certainly be supported by all the freedom-loving Moslem peoples wherever they are. In particular, the Arab and African peoples, who at present are under greater threat from the American imperialists and Soviet social-imperialists, must rise and strongly express their fighting solidarity with the Iranian revolution and the Afghan uprising, because in this way they will be fighting for their own freedom, independence and sovereignty. In these situations through the stands they adopt the leaders of those countries who truly defend the

national interests and the interests of their peoples, will be distinguished from those who sell them out to foreigners.

The Arab peoples, who live in a zone rich in oil, but who are poor, oppressed and exploited, see clearly the atrocities which the imperialists and neo-colonialists are committing against them. But we are convinced that the revolt which has begun in those countries will never be quelled. The modern weapons which the enemies may employ, even the most sophisticated ones, cannot operate without the oil which belongs to peoples who are fighting for freedom and independence.

The Albanian people express their profound conviction that the valiant Afghan people will deal the Soviet social-imperialist aggressors crushing blows and drive them from their country.

From the newspaper «Zëri i popullit», January 5, 1980

THE EVENTS WHICH ARE TAKING PLACE IN THE MOSLEM COUNTRIES MUST BE SEEN IN THE LIGHT OF DIALECTICAL AND HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

January 1980

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 redivision 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 Daud 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 for ever. 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, with revolts, first sporadic then ever better organized, 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 Moslem 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 Moslem peoples in an oversimplified 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 Moslem religion is no different in this regard. Nevertheless, we see that at present the broad masses of the Moslem 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 Moslems 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 Moslem 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 blood-thirsty power through the weapons and support 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 clearly that the Moslem 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 for 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 Moslem 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 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 declared that he had 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 feudal 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 there. 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 Moslem 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 uprising 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 stand-point, 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 Moslem 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 Pakistan 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 avoid the uprising of the Pakistan 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 Moslems 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 Koran 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 Moslem religion has been presented as a liberal progressive religion which serves the interests of the peoples 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 Moslem 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 struggles 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 move-

merits 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 colonialists 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 independence 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 Moslem 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 and a movement 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 Koran and Mohammed, and link the question of the struggle against imperialist 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 Moslem 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 Moslem religion in Albania, but there was no fanaticism. In the Arab or Moslem countries of Central Asia, too, the classical fanaticism of the past cannot exist, especially today. Such fanaticism can exist neither among the Moslems 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 peoples 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 is and 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 its 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, and 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 thralldom of the Soviet Union. That is why the Moslem people of Iran, who have risen in revolution, are not acquainted with Marxism-Leninism either as a revolutionary theory or practice. The students who are studying at Iran's Moslem universities with great traditions and of the Shia Moslem 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 precisely 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 Moslem 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 compradore 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 Moslem 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. That was the last shot of the Shah and the American imperialists against the Iranian anti-imperialist revolution and Khomeini.

In the course of this development, the «Movement for the Liberation of Iran», the «Iran Party», and the «Socialist League of the National Movement of Iran» broke away from the political opposition. The «Movement for the Liberation of Iran», which was headed by Bazar-gan, 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 Moslem 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 oil-fields and refineries.

The Iranian Marxist-Leninists must, in particular, sub-

mit 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 by 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 isolation 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 half-way, 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», 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-Moslem 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 Moslem 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 Islamic 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 possess 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 taken 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 the local rulers with the aim 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 Moslem 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 Moslem 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 Moslem 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 stand-point of economic development the Moslem peoples have been held back; as a consequence of colonialist occupation and colonialist and neo-colonialist exploitation in past decades the Moslem 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 Moslem peoples.

The question presents itself that we should look at the present stage of development of the Moslem religion as compared with past centuries. The development of human society has exerted an influence that has made the Moslem 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 Moslem 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 Moslem 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

1 Town in Central Albania.

countries with Moslem 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 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 Moslem 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 Moslem 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 Moslem 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 sympathy

for the peoples who rise in revolt, but also to unity with them, because they are all Moslems. 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 Moslem 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 Moslem 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 Moslem 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 Moslem peoples; also, as Moslems 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 Moslem 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 Moslem countries, then all the possibilities exist for them to do much work. However, they must work cautiously there. 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, 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, for example, 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, in general, 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 among 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-Moslem» uprising of the Iranian people. The incitement of nationalist 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 Moslem 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 peoples' revolutionary movement.

«Reflections on the
Middle East»

EUROCOMMUNISM
IS
ANTI-COMMUNISM

At the 9th Congress of the Communist Party of Spain, in April 1978, the Carrillo revisionists declared that their party was no longer a Marxist-Leninist party, but a «Marxist-democratic revolutionary party». «To consider Leninism the Marxism of our time is unacceptable,» declared Carrillo.

The French revisionist leaders proposed to their 23rd Congress, held in May 1979, that they should no longer speak of Marxism-Leninism in their documents but use the term «scientific socialism» instead.

The Italian revisionists too, at the 15th Congress of their party in April 1979, removed from their Constitution the requirement that the members of the party should master Marxism-Leninism and apply its teachings. «The formula of 'Marxism-Leninism' does not express the whole wealth of our theoretical and ideological heritage,» said the followers of Togliatti. Now anyone, regardless of the ideology to which he adheres or which he applies, can belong to the Italian revisionist party.

Thus, the Eurocommunist revisionists have formally and publicly sanctioned the final break with Marxism-Leninism, which in practice they had made years ago. Very pleased with this rapid and complete social-democratic transformation of these parties, the bourgeois propaganda called 1979 «the year of Eurocommunism».

In a situation when the European bourgeoisie is in great difficulties because of the grave economic and political crisis, when the revolt of the masses against the consequences of this crisis and capitalist oppression and exploitation is mounting to ever higher levels, nothing could serve it better than the anti-Marxist views and anti-

worker activity of the Eurocommunists. Nothing could give greater assistance to the strategy of imperialism for the suppression of the revolution, the undermining of liberation struggles and domination of the world than the revisionist, pacifist, capitulationist, collaborationist trends, including Eurocommunism.

The Western bourgeoisie does not conceal its enthusiasm over the fact that now the Eurocommunist revisionists have lined themselves up with the social-democrats and the fascists to attack the revolution, Marxism-Leninism and communism jointly, with all their weapons. The capitalists are overjoyed that they are preparing new administrators of their affairs to gradually replace the social-democrats, whose long service in the apparatuses of the bourgeois state and open struggle against the working class and the cause of socialism in many countries, has led them into the ranks of extreme reaction and compromised them deeply in the eyes of the workers. Today the social-democrats have become identified, not only ideologically and politically, but also from the social viewpoint, with the big bourgeoisie. Now the bourgeoisie has great hopes that the Eurocommunist revisionists will become the main guardians of the capitalist order, the banner-bearers of counter-revolution. But the great lords of capital are a little hasty in beating the victory drum.

For more than a century now, communism has been terrifying the capitalist bourgeoisie and land-owners, imperialists and opportunists, and renegades from Marxism-Leninism. For more than a hundred years Marxism-Leninism has been guiding the proletarians in their battles to overthrow capitalism and for the triumph of socialism. Its banner waved triumphant for a long time in many countries, and the workers, peasants, people's intellectuals, women and the youth had savoured the fruits of that human life of freedom, justice and equality for which

Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin had fought. Although socialism has been overthrown in the Soviet Union and other countries where the counter-revolution triumphed, this does not prove that Marxism-Leninism has been defeated and invalidated, as the bourgeoisie and the revisionists claim.

The great leaders of the proletariat, Marx and Lenin, pointed out and stressed that the revolution is not a triumphant march in a straight line. It will have victories but also setbacks; it advances in zigzags and mounts step by step. The history of the development of human society shows that the replacement of one social system by another, higher system, is not done within one day, but covers a whole historical epoch. In many instances and in many countries the bourgeois revolutions, which replaced the feudal system of exploitation with the capitalist system of exploitation, were unable to escape the counter-revolution, either. An example of this is France, where the bourgeois revolution, although it was the most profound and radical revolution of the time, was unable to establish and consolidate the capitalist order immediately. After the initial victory of 1789, the bourgeoisie and the working masses had to rise again in revolution to overthrow the feudal monarchy of the Bourbons and the feudal system in general and finally restore the bourgeois order.

The epoch of proletarian revolutions has just begun. The advent of socialism represents an historical necessity which results from the objective development of society. This is inevitable. The counter-revolutions which have been carried out and the obstacles which emerge can prolong the existence of the old exploiting system to some extent, but they are powerless to halt the march of human society towards its socialist future.

Eurocommunism labours to raise a barrier of thorns and brambles to the revolution, in order to defend the

capitalist system. But the flames of the revolution have swept over and destroyed not only such barriers, but also whole fortresses erected by the bourgeoisie.

The revisionists and the Eurocommunists in particular, are not the first to attack Marxism-Leninism and to pronounce the gravest anathemas against it. Bourgeois reaction and the imperialists have massacred, imprisoned, tortured and killed hundreds of thousands of communists and fighters for the revolution, who had embraced the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and fought for the liberation of the proletariat and the peoples. The fascists have burned the books of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin in the city squares, and in many countries still people are sent to the firing squad when it is discovered that they read their books or whisper their names with hope and admiration, even in secret. No library could hold all the books, magazines, newspapers and other publications which attack Marxism-Leninism, no one can calculate or even imagine the quantity and extent of the anti-communist propaganda of imperialism.

Nevertheless, Marxism-Leninism has not disappeared; it is living and flourishing as an ideology and a reality, materialized in the socialist social system constructed according to its teachings. Exemplifying this are socialist Albania, the Marxist-Leninist parties, and those millions and millions of workers and peasants who are fighting every day for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, for democracy and national liberation. No force, no torture, no intrigue, no deception can eradicate Marxism-Leninism from the minds and hearts of mankind.

The doctrine of Marx and Lenin is not a scheme drafted in the studies of philosophers and politicians. It is a reflection of the objective laws of the development of society. Even without knowing Marxism-Leninism, the working people struggle to escape from oppression and

exploitation, to overthrow the bosses and tyrants, in order to live in freedom and enjoy the fruits of their toil. But by acquainting themselves with the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, they find the right road in the struggle, find the compass which guides them in the capitalist jungle and gain the light which shows them the certain socialist future.

The revisionists want to smash this compass of the workers, want to dim this light so that they lose this perspective.

Until recently the revisionist parties of the West were united in the Khrushchevite-imperialist anti-communist campaign against Stalin. They spoke with great enthusiasm about «liberation from Stalinism», allegedly to return to Leninism, which, according to them, had been distorted by Stalin. Now they preach abandoning Leninism «in order to go back» to the founders of scientific socialism — Marx and Engels.

These renegades are trying to present their rapid descent down the steps of betrayal of Marxism-Leninism as a painful ascent of the mountain to find the source of the communist truth. However, all revisionists, whether Khrushchevite or Eurocommunist, fight with equal ferocity and cunning both against Stalin and against Lenin and Marx.

The initial concentration of their fire against Stalin, leaving Lenin out of it for the time being, was simply tactical. Their class logic told the imperialists and revisionists that at the given moment it was preferable first to destroy socialism in the Soviet Union, first to attack Marxism-Leninism where it had been applied in practice. The bourgeoisie and reaction understood that the capitalist degeneration of the Soviet Union would greatly assist their struggle to bring about the degeneration of communist parties which were not in power.

The name and work of Stalin were linked with the establishment of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union and the construction of socialism in that country. By denigrating Stalin and the social system for which he fought and worked throughout his life, reaction and all the anti-communist scum wanted to destroy not only the greatest and most powerful base of socialism, but also the communist dream of hundreds and hundreds of millions of people throughout the world. With their attack on Stalin and his work, they wanted to create an atmosphere of pessimism among the fighters for the revolution, the bitter disappointment of someone who unwittingly has been guided by a false ideal.

Nevertheless, despite all the great hopes they had pinned on the campaign against Stalin, despite the victory of the counter-revolution in the Soviet Union and other countries, the revolution was not conquered, Marxism-Leninism was not eliminated, and socialism was not snuffed out. The Khrushchevite betrayal was a major one, but it could never pull down the glorious banner of Marxism-Leninism which the genuine revolutionaries, millions of people who believe in its inexhaustible power, always hold high. While Khrushchevism was unmasked as a counterrevolutionary ideology of the restoration of capitalism and as a great power policy for the domination of the world, Marxism-Leninism remained the ideology which leads to the triumph of the revolution and the liberation of the peoples.

Now the revisionists have turned against Leninism. It is natural to ask: why is this attack against Leninism undertaken and why are precisely the Eurocommunists the standard-bearers of this attack?

Like Khrushchev, who with his attack against Stalin wanted to attack the theory and practice of the construction of socialism, the Eurocommunists, with their attack

on Lenin, want to attack the theory and practice of the proletarian revolution. The work of Lenin is very wide-ranging, but it is closely linked precisely with the preparation and carrying out of the revolution. Therefore, like Khrushchev who could not destroy socialism in the Soviet Union without getting rid of Stalin, the Eurocommunists cannot thoroughly undermine and sabotage the revolution without eradicating Lenin from the minds and hearts of the working people.

In the struggle to deny and denigrate Marxism-Leninism, the bourgeoisie has always had the support of opportunists and renegades of every kind and every hue, according to the time. All of them have proclaimed the end of Marxism. They have described it as unsuitable for the new times, while they have advertised their «modern» ideas as the science of the future. But what became of Proudhon, Lassalle, Bakunin, Bernstein, Kautsky, Trotsky and their supporters? History has nothing positive to say about them. Their preachings have served only to hold back and sabotage the revolution, to undermine the struggle of the proletariat and socialism. They were defeated in the struggle with Marxism-Leninism and ended up in the rubbish basket. From time to time new opportunists drag them out of this basket, trying to peddle the bankrupt and discredited formulae and theses of the latter as their own and to oppose Marxism-Leninism. This is what the Eurocommunists are doing today.

The Eurocommunists are not the first and by no means original in their efforts to negate Marxism-Leninism on the grounds that it is «outdated» and that allegedly new theories have been discovered for everyone, proletarians and bourgeois, priests and police, to go over to socialism together, without class struggle, without revolution, without the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Our Party of Labour long ago analysed and unmasked

the anti-Marxist theories and counter-revolutionary actions of the Yugoslav and Soviet revisionists. It has also refuted the opportunist and bourgeois views and stands of the Chinese revisionists. It has not refrained from criticizing the ideological and organizational degeneration of the communist parties of Western Europe, either. In this book, however, we shall deal in greater detail with the examination and criticism of the anti-communist concepts and theses of the revisionist current which is doing great harm to the cause of the revolution and socialism not only in Europe, but throughout the world. Its capitalist godfathers have baptized this trend of modern revisionism Eurocommunism, whereas for us Marxist-Leninists it is anti-communism.

I

THE NEW IMPERIALIST STRATEGY AND THE BIRTH OF MODERN REVISIONISM

Opportunism — a Permanent Ally of the Bourgeoisie

The birth of modern revisionism, like the birth of the old revisionism, is a social phenomenon conditioned by many different historical, economic, political and other causes. Taken as a whole, it is a product of the pressure of the bourgeoisie on the working class and its struggle. From the moment they first appeared to this day, opportunism and revisionism have been closely linked with the struggle of the bourgeoisie and imperialism against Marxism-Leninism, have been a constituent part of the capitalist grand strategy to undermine the revolution and perpetuate the bourgeois order. The more the cause of the revolution has advanced, and the more Marxism-Leninism has been spread among the broad masses of the working people, so much the greater has been the attention which imperialism has devoted to the use of revisionism as its favourite weapon to oppose and undermine the triumphant ideology of the proletariat.

This is what happened at the beginning of the second half of the 19th century, after the publication of the «Communist Manifesto» and other works of Marx and Engels, and the growth of the influence of Marxism among

the working masses of Europe. Precisely at this time reformist trade-unionist currents were spread in Britain, the petty-bourgeois views of Proudhon in France, the petty-bourgeois concepts of Lassalle in Germany, the anarchist ideas of Bakunin in Russia and elsewhere, and so on. This phenomenon appeared again after the heroic events of the Commune of Paris, when the bourgeoisie, mortally afraid of the spread of the great example it set, encouraged the new opportunist trend of Bernstein, who tried to strip Marxism of its revolutionary content and make it harmless to the political domination of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

At the beginning of the 20th century, when the political and economic conditions were becoming more and more ripe for the revolution and the seizure of power by the proletariat, the bourgeoisie gave all-out support to the opportunist trend of the Second International and used it extensively in its manoeuvres for the preparation for and launching of the First World War.

After the historic victory of the October Revolution, when socialism was transformed from a revolutionary theory and movement into a socio-economic system which had triumphed in one sixth of the world, capitalism was forced to alter its strategy and tactics. Internally, it stepped up its violence and terror even further, began to use the most ferocious means to strengthen its rule even by bringing fascism to power. First of all, it further whipped up its demagogy and propaganda in order to denigrate and distort Marxism-Leninism by inventing new, pseudo-Marxist «theories», by slandering the Soviet Union and preparing for war against it. At that time Lenin wrote that imperialism,

«...just because it feels that Bolshevism has become a world force, is trying to throttle us as

*fast as possible in the hope of dealing first with the Russian Bolsheviks, and then with its own.»**

In 1918 the British, American, French and Japanese imperialists began their military intervention in Russia. The struggle against the first state of workers and peasants brought all the reactionary forces into a single camp. The opportunists and renegades from Marxism also hurled themselves into the attack on the October Revolution and the proletarian state power. Kautsky in Germany, Otto Bauer and Karl Renner in Austria, Leon Blum and Paul Boncour in France, rose in fury against the October Revolution and the Leninist strategy and tactics of the revolution. They called the October Revolution unlawful, a diversion from the course of historical development and a deviation from the Marxist theory. They preached the peaceful revolution without violence and bloodshed, the taking of power through the majority in parliament: they were against the transformation of the proletariat into a ruling class. They praised bourgeois democracy to the heavens and attacked the dictatorship of the proletariat.

When the armed intervention against Soviet Russia failed and when social-democracy was unable to stop the creation of new communist parties and the great revolutionary drive of the working masses of Europe, the bourgeoisie pinned all its hopes on breaching the communist front

*«...from within and is looking for champions among the leaders of the RCP (B).»***

The Trotskyites again brought up «the theory of permanent revolution», according to which socialism could

* V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, vol. 28, p. 239, Alb. ed.

** J. V. Stalin. *Works*, vol. 6, p. 278, Alb. ed.

not be built in the Soviet Union without the triumph of the revolution in other countries. They amalgamated in a single front with the struggle of the bourgeoisie against socialism. Stalin very correctly pointed out that a single enemy front had been created, including everybody, from Chamberlain to Trotsky. The rightists, the Bukharinites also went on the attack against socialism. They were for extinguishing the class struggle, and preached the possibility of the integration of capitalism into socialism.

The strategy of imperialism assumed a more marked counterrevolutionary and anti-communist character, especially after the Second World War, as a result of the alteration in the ratio of forces in favour of socialism and the revolution, which shook the whole capitalist system to its foundations. These changes put the question of the revolution and the triumph of socialism on the order of the day, no longer in just one or two countries, but in whole regions and continents. Imperialism, headed by American imperialism, this time based its greatest hope on the militarization of the whole of its life, on military blocs and pacts, on violent intervention and open war against socialism and the revolutionary and liberation movements of the peoples. However, it pinned very great hopes also on the invigoration and activation of all the opportunist forces in order to undermine the socialist countries and communist parties from within and to bring about their degeneration.

The Victory over Fascism and the Counter-offensive of Imperialism

The imperialist powers and the whole of world capitalism encouraged and launched the Second World War with the aim of directing it against the Soviet Union and

socialism. This war, however, not only failed to overthrow the first socialist state, but also dealt imperialism heavy blows, causing it great damage which put its whole system in jeopardy.

Not only were the armies of fascism routed on the battlefield, but the anti-communist ideology of world imperialism and the counterrevolutionary policy of international opportunism were defeated, too. The fascist powers, Germany, Italy, Japan, which comprised the main striking forces of the attack of international capitalism on socialism and communism, were defeated. The British and French empires, which up till that time had been the «big noises» in world politics, declined in power and weight and tailed along behind the policy of the United States of America. The anti-communist front was thoroughly breached and the «cordon sanitaire» set up against the Soviet Union was smashed to smithereens.

The Soviet Union, which carried the main burden of the war and played a decisive role in the victory over fascism and the liberation of enslaved peoples, emerged from the war strong and with an indisputable international prestige. In the great clash with imperialism, the socialist system gave historical proof of its superiority, stability and invincibility. As a result of the conditions which were created and their anti-fascist national liberation war led by the communist parties, a series of other countries broke away from the capitalist system and set out on the road to socialism. The socialist camp was created and this was the greatest event after the October Revolution.

The communist parties of all countries had an unprecedented growth. Standing in the forefront of the fight against fascism, they had proved through the blood of their members and their stands that they were the political forces most consistently loyal to the interests of

the peoples and the nations, the most resolute fighters for freedom, democracy and progress. Marxism-Leninism spread throughout the whole world, the international communist movement extended its authority and influence to all continents.

The great ideas of freedom, independence and national liberation, which inspired the antifascist war, pervaded not only Europe, but also Asia, Africa and the Latin-American continent. The victory over fascism and the creation of the socialist camp awakened the peoples in the colonies. The colonial system of imperialism entered its greatest crisis. The powerful national liberation movement in the colonies, which accounted for almost half of mankind, burst out like a volcano. The rear of the capitalist system, the colonial and semi-colonial regimes began to collapse. Weakened by all these defeats, the imperialist system began to be shaken to its foundations.

All these changes constituted a great victory, not only for the Soviet Union, not only for the countries of people's democracy, not only for the peoples of the world, but also for the immortal theory of Marx. Engels, Lenin and Stalin, the vitality and accuracy of which was confirmed once again with new force in the greatest war which mankind has seen to this day, during which two worlds — the socialist world and the capitalist world, clashed. All the changes which occurred after the Second World War proved in practice the theses of Marx and Lenin that the capitalist world was in decay and heading for collapse, while the revolution and socialism were on the ascent.

It was these great victories of socialism, the peoples, and the Marxist-Leninist theory which compelled world imperialism to draft its new defensive and offensive strategy in order to resist the mounting waves of the revolution and the struggle of the peoples, in order to prop up the shaky foundations of the capitalist system.

The joint line, which the imperialist powers worked out after the war, was characterized by two fundamental directions:

First, they mobilized all their forces, every means at their disposal to restore their economic, political and military potential damaged by the war, to strengthen the capitalist system which was being shaken by the great attack of people's revolutionary liberation struggles. They set to work to consolidate the existing anti-communist alliances and to form new ones, and made great efforts to preserve colonialism by means of neo-colonialism.

After the Second World War, American imperialism found itself in a dominating position from the point of view of economic power, and to some extent from the military viewpoint, in regard to Europe and Asia which were ruined by the war. The militarized American economy was very powerful. The United States of America tried to establish its economic, military and political hegemony over the whole world, with the overriding aim of encircling and weakening the Soviet Union, which emerged triumphant from the Second World War and which certainly would be quickly restored from the economic aspect and would assist in the consolidation and progress of the new states of people's democracy, which had been created in Europe and Asia. To this end, the imperialist tactics of the political-ideological struggle and the economic struggle, as well as the military tactics, were built up. The latter were the further continuation of the American plans worked out during the Second World War, those plans which had made the United States of America a great power for the production of modern weapons, as well as for the discovery and production of the atomic bomb, which was dropped for the first time on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The United States of America became the leadership of the capitalist world and took upon itself the role of its «saviour». Thus the pretensions of American imperialism to world domination were placed on the agenda. «The victory in the Second World War,» declared Harry Truman, who replaced Franklin Roosevelt as president, «faced the American people with the permanent and urgent task of becoming the world leader.» In essence this was a call for struggle against the revolution and socialism, to win new dominant economic and military positions throughout the whole world, to restore its partners and to save the colonial system. In order to realize this strategy, UNRRA was used, the «Marshall Plan» was drafted, NATO was created, and other aggressive blocs of American imperialism were set up.

Second, the fundamental question for capital was to build up the undermining work against the Marxist-Leninist ideology on all fronts, in order to remove the most revolutionary section of the working people from its influence, and to cause the degeneration of socialism.

Along with the unrestrained armaments race, the militarization of the economy and the economic blockades against the socialist countries, imperialism also mobilized many means of propaganda, philosophers, economists, sociologists, writers and historians for the furious campaign against the revolution and socialism, in order to present capitalism and the capitalist state as changed, as «people's capitalism», as «a state of general well-being», etc. The bourgeoisie also exploited the favourable post-war economic circumstances to clamour about the «prosperity of capitalism», to spread illusions among the masses about the elimination of crises, anarchy, unemployment and other ills of capitalism, about the alleged superiority of capitalism over socialism, which was presented as a «totalitarian» order behind the «iron curtain», etc.

In order to hinder the peoples' liberation struggle, to strangle the proletarian revolution, to destroy socialism, and defend and consolidate its own position, the bourgeoisie in the moments of its agony and the general crisis of its capitalist system, incites, encourages and sets in motion the various opportunist and revisionist currents, along with other means. These enemies of the proletariat and the revolution set to work with all their strength, first of all, to attack Marxism-Leninism, the ideology which makes the working class conscious of its social situation and its historic mission, in order to distort this ideology, to make it harmless to the bourgeoisie and worthless to the proletariat. The new trends of revisionism which emerged after the Second World War and which were called for short «modern revisionism» undertook this despicable role of betrayal.

Modern revisionism, which is the continuation of the anti-Marxist theories of the parties of the Second International, of European social-democracy, adapted itself to the times after the Second World War. It has its source in the hegemonic policy of American imperialism. All the variants and currents of modern revisionism have the same base and the same strategy, and differ only in the tactics which they apply and the forms of struggle which they use.

Modern Revisionism in Power — a New Weapon of the Bourgeoisie against the Revolution and Socialism

The first current which preceded the modern revisionism in power was **Browderism**. This current was born in the United States of America and took its name from the former general secretary of the Communist Party of the USA, Earl Browder.

In 1944, when the victory of the peoples over fascism was clearly on the horizon, Browder came out publicly with a program which was reformist from start to finish. He was the first herald of that line of ideological and political capitulation which American imperialism was to strive to impose on the communist parties and the revolutionary movement. Under the pretext of the alleged change in the historical conditions of the development of capitalism and the international situation, Browder proclaimed Marxism-Leninism «outdated» and called it a system of rigid dogmas and schemes. Browder advocated giving up the class struggle and called for class conciliation on a national and international scale. He thought that American capitalism was no longer reactionary, that it could cure the ills of bourgeois society, and could develop in democratic ways for the good of the working people. He no longer saw socialism as an ideal, as an objective to be achieved. American imperialism with its strategy and policy had disappeared completely from his field of vision. For Browder, the big monopolies, the pillars of this imperialism, constituted a progressive force for the democratic, social and economic development of the Country. Browder denied the class character of the capitalist state, and considered American society a unified and harmonious society, without social antagonisms, a society in which understanding and class co-operation prevailed. On the basis of these concepts Browder also denied the need for the existence of the revolutionary party of the working class. He became an initiator of the disbanding of the Communist Party of the United States of America in 1944.

«The Communists,» he wrote, «foresee that the practical political aims they hold will, for a long time, be in agreement on all essential points with the aims of a much larger body of non-Communists, and that, therefore, our political actions will be merged in such larger move-

ments. The existence of a separate political party of communists, therefore, no longer serves a practical purpose but can be, on the contrary, an obstacle to the larger unity. The communists will, therefore, dissolve their separate political party, and find a new and different organizational form and name, corresponding more accurately to the tasks of the day and the political structure through which these tasks must be performed.»*

Browder took the Conference of allied powers which was held in Tehran in 1943 as his starting point and justification for the formulation of his bourgeois liquidatory theory and made a completely distorted and anti-Marxist analysis and interpretation of the results of this conference.

Browder presented the agreement of the anti-fascist allies to carry the war against Hitlerite Germany through to the end as the beginning of a new historical epoch, in which socialism and capitalism had found the way to co-operation within «one and the same world», as he expressed it. Browder presented it as a duty to ensure that the spirit of co-operation and peaceful coexistence between the allied powers, which emerged from Tehran, should be applied not only between the Soviet socialist state and those capitalist states, but also within the capitalist country in relations between antagonistic classes. «Class differences and political groups now no longer have any importance,» said Browder. He considered the achievement of «national unity», without incidents and in an atmosphere of class peace, the sole objective which the communists should set themselves, and he understood this national unity as a bloc uniting the groups of finance capital, the organizations of monopolists, the Republican

* E. Browder, *Tehran, Our Path in War and Peace*, New York 1944, p. 117.

and Democratic parties, and the communists and trade-union movements, all of which, without exception, he considered «democratic and patriotic» forces.

For the sake of this unity Browder declared that communists must be ready to sacrifice even their convictions, their ideology and special interests, that the American communists have applied this rule to themselves first of all. «The political aims which we hold with the majority of the Americans,» says he, «we will attempt to advance through the existing party structure of our country, which in the main is that of the peculiarly American 'two-party system'.»*

Confused by the relatively peaceful development of American capitalism following the well-known reforms which the American President Roosevelt undertook in order to emerge from the economic crisis at the beginning of the 30's, as well as by the rapid growth of production and employment during the war period, Browder drew the conclusion that American capitalism had allegedly been rejuvenated, that now it would develop without crises and would ensure the raising of the general well-being, etc.

He considered the American economic system to be a system capable of resolving all the contradictions and problems of society and fulfilling all the demands of the masses. He equated communism with Americanism and declared that «communism is the Americanism of the 20th century». According to Browder, all the developed capitalist countries could resolve every conflict and go gradually to socialism by using bourgeois democracy, for which American democracy had to be the model.

Therefore, Browder considered that the task of Ameri-

* E. Browder, *Tehran, Our Path in War and Peace*, New York 1944, p. 118.

can communists was to ensure the normal functioning of the capitalist regime, and declared openly that they were ready to co-operate to ensure the efficient functioning of the capitalist regime in the post-war period, in order to «ensure the greatest possible lightening of obligations which are a burden on the people». According to him, this lightening of burdens would be done by the «reasonable» American capitalists, to whom the communists must extend the hand of friendship.

In conformity with his ultra-rightist concepts and submitting to the pressure of the bourgeoisie, after the disbanding of the Communist Party in May 1944, Browder announced the creation, in place of the party, of a cultural and illuminist association called the «Communist Political Association», justifying this with the argument that the American tradition allegedly demanded the existence of only two parties. This association, organized as a network of clubs, was to engage mainly in «activity of political education on a national, regional and local plane».

The Constitution of this association says: «The Communist Political Association is a non-party organization of Americans which, basing itself upon the working class, carries forward the tradition of Washington, Jefferson Paine, Jackson and Lincoln under the changed conditions of modern industrial society,» that this association «...upholds the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights, and the achievements of American democracy against all the enemies of popular liberties.»* Browder wiped out all the objectives of the communist movement. In the program of the Association there is no mention of Marxism-Leninism, the hegemony of the proletariat, the class struggle, the revolution or socialism. National unity, social peace, defence of the

* *The Path to Peace, Progress and Prosperity*, New York 1944, pp. 47, 48.

bourgeois Constitution and the increase of the capitalist production became its only objectives.

In this way, Browder went over from open revision of the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary strategy and tactics to the organizational liquidation of the communist movement in the United States of America. Although the party was re-formed at its 13th Congress in June 1945, and the opportunist line of Browder was formally rejected, his influence was never eliminated in the Communist Party of the USA. Later, especially after 1956, the ideas of Browder flourished again and John Hayes in an article entitled «The Time for Change Has Come»*, once again demanded in the spirit of Browderism the turning of the Communist Party of the USA into a cultural and propaganda association. And in fact, that is what the Communist Party of the USA is today, an organization in which the revisionism of Browder combined with that of Khrushchev prevails.

With his revisionist concepts about the revolution and socialism, Browder gave world capitalism direct aid. According to Browder, socialism arises only from some great cataclysm, from some catastrophe, and not as an inevitable result of historical development. «We do not desire any catastrophe for America, even if such a thing would lead to socialism,» he said. While presenting the prospect of the triumph of socialism as very remote, he advocated class collaboration in American society and throughout the world. According to him, the only alternative was that of development by evolution, through reforms and with the aid of the United States of America.

According to Browder, the United States of America, which possessed colossal economic power and great

* *Political Affairs*, October 1956.

scientific-technical potential, had to assist the peoples of the world, including the Soviet Union, for their «development». This «aid», said Browder, would help America maintain high rates of production after the war, ensure work for all, and preserve the national unity for many years. To this end, Browder advised the magnates of Washington that they should set up a «series of giant industrial development corporations for the various devastated and undeveloped regions of the world, Europe, Africa, Asia, Latin America.»* «If we can face realities without flinching, and revive in modern terms the grand tradition of Jefferson, Paine, and Lincoln, then America can face the world united, assuming a leading part... in the salvation of mankind...»** In this way, Browder became the spokesman and propagandist of the grand strategy of American imperialism, and its expansionist neo-colonialist theories and plans.

Browderism directly assisted the «Marshall Plan» through which the United States of America aimed to establish its economic hegemony in the different war-devastated countries of Europe, Asia, Africa, etc. Browder advocated that the countries of the world, and especially the countries of people's democracy and the Soviet Union, ought to soften their Marxist-Leninist policy and accept the «altruistic» aid of the United States of America, which, according to him, has a colossal economy and huge surpluses which can and should serve all peoples(!).

Browder tried to present his anti-Marxist and counter-revolutionary views as the general line of the international communist movement. Under the pretext of the creative development of Marxism and the struggle against

* *The Path to Peace, Progress and Prosperity*, New York 1944, p. 21.

** E. Browder, *Tehran, Our Path in War and Peace*, New York 1944, p. 128.

dogmatism, he, like all the earlier revisionists, tried to argue that the new epoch after the Second World War required a communist movement which would examine its former ideological convictions and relinquish its «old formulas and prejudices», which, according to him, «cannot help us at all to find our way in the new world». This was a call for rejection of the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

Browder's views encountered the opposition of the communist parties of several countries, as well as of the revolutionary American communists themselves. Browderism was exposed relatively quickly as undisguised revisionism, as an openly liquidationist current, as a direct ideological agency of American imperialism.

Browderism did great damage to the communist and workers' movement of the United States of America and some Latin-American countries. Upsets and splits occurred in some of the old communist parties of Latin America, and these had their source in the activity of opportunist elements who, weary of the revolutionary struggle, grasped at any means with which American imperialism provided them to quell the revolts of the peoples and the revolution and to spread decay in the parties which were working for the education and preparation of the peoples for revolution.

In Europe, Browderism did not have the success it had in South America, although this seed of American imperialism was not left unabsorbed by those disguised anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist reformist elements who were awaiting or preparing the suitable moments to deviate openly from the scientific Marxist-Leninist ideology.

Although in its own time Browderism did not manage to become a revisionist current with broad international proportions, the other modern revisionists who came later revived its views and made them their own. These views,

in various forms, remain the basis of the political and ideological platforms of the Chinese and Yugoslav revisionists, as well as of the Eurocommunist parties of Western Europe.

Not only Browderism, but also **Mao Zedong thought, the theories and line which the Chinese leadership followed**, responded to the American strategy for «restraining communism» and for the establishment of the hegemony of the United States of America over the post-war capitalist world.

At the beginning of 1945, at the time when Browder appeared on the scene and when a new American strategy under Truman was assuming its complete form, the 7th Congress of the Communist Party of China was held in that country. The Constitution which this congress adopted, states: «The Communist Party of China is guided by the ideas of Mao Zedong in all its activity.» Commenting on this decision, in the report which he delivered at the congress, Liu Shaoqi declared that Mao Zedong had allegedly refuted many outdated concepts of the Marxist theory and replaced them with new theses and conclusions. According to Liu Shaoqi, Mao Zedong had managed to give Marxism a «Chinese form». He says: «The ideas of Mao Zedong are Chinese Marxism.»

These «new theses and conclusions», this «Chinese form» of Marxism had nothing at all to do with any creative application of Marxism-Leninism in the concrete conditions of China, but were a denial of its universal fundamental laws. Mao Zedong and his comrades had a bourgeois democratic concept of the development of the revolution in China. They were not for raising it to a socialist revolution. For them the model was the «American democracy» and they reckoned on the support of American capital for the construction of new China.

There were great affinities between the ideas of Mao Zedong and the opportunist ideas of Browder who, it must be said, had studied and thoroughly understood the anti-Marxist concepts of the Chinese leaders. Browder wrote: «What is called the 'communist' camp in China, because it is led by outstanding members of the Chinese Communist Party, is much closer to American concepts of democracy than is the so-called Kuomintang camp; it is closer in every way, including the wider scope given to 'free enterprise' in economic life.»*

Mao Zedong was for the unrestricted free development of capitalism in China in the period of the state of the type of «new democracy», as he called that regime which was to be established after the departure of the Japanese. At the 7th Congress of the CPC he said, «Some think that the communists are against the development of private initiative, against the development of private capital, against the protection of private property. In reality, this is not so... the task of the order of new democracy, which we are striving to establish, is precisely... to ensure the possibility for broad circles of Chinese to freely develop their private initiative in society, to freely develop the private capitalist economy...»** In this way, Mao Zedong took over the anti-Marxist concept of Kautsky, according to which, in the backward countries the transition to socialism cannot be achieved without going through a lengthy period of free development of capitalism which prepares the conditions to go over to socialism later. In fact, the so-called socialist regime which Mao Zedong and his group established in China, was and remained a bourgeois-democratic regime.

* E. Browder, *Tehran, Our Path in War and Peace*, New York 1944, p. 26.

** Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 4, p. 364, Alb. ed.

In practice, the line which the Chinese leadership, headed by Mao Zedong, began to follow for restraining the revolution in China and shutting off its socialist perspective assisted American imperialism, which wanted to extend its domination, and the other imperialist powers, which were seeking to preserve their old domination.

In the post-war years, the anti-colonialist national liberation movements surged ahead on all continents. The British, French, Italian, Dutch, and Belgian colonial empires were collapsing one after the other under the waves of the popular uprisings in the colonies. The revolutions in most of these countries were bourgeois-democratic. However, in some of them, the objective possibilities existed for the revolution to be raised and assume a socialist character. Mao Zedong, with his views and activities, advocated the diversion of the anti-imperialist revolutions from the right course of their development; he wanted them to stop half-way, not to go beyond the bourgeois framework, so that the capitalist system was perpetuated. If we bear in mind the importance of the Chinese revolution and its influence among the colonial countries, the damage which the «theories» of Mao Zedong caused was great.

Mao's line was that China, and following its example, Indochina, Burma, Indonesia, India, etc., had to rely on the United States of America and American capital and aid for their development. In fact this was acceptance of that new strategy which had been formulated in the departments of Washington and which Browder had begun to advocate in his own way.

The American envoys attached to Mao Zedong's staff in the years 1944-1949 have described in detail the views, attitudes, activity and demands of Mao Zedong towards the United States of America. One of these envoys was John Service, political adviser to the commander of

the American forces on the Burma-China front and later secretary of the American Embassy to the Chiang Kaishek government in Chongqing. He was one of the first of the American intelligence agents who made official contact with the leaders of the Communist Party of China, although there were continual unofficial contacts.

Speaking about the Chinese leaders, Service admits: «Their outlook impresses one as *modern*. Their understanding of economics, for instance, is very similar to ours.»* «It is not surprising,» he continues, «that they had favourably impressed most or all of the Americans who have met them during the last seven years: their manners, habits of thought, and direct handling of problems seem more American than Oriental.»**

In essence, the liquidationist views of Browder about the party are found in the theories of Mao Zedong too. Just as Chinese communism was a wash-out, the Communist Party of China, too, was such only in name. Mao Zedong did not work to build a genuine Marxist-Leninist proletarian party. From its class composition, its organizational structure and the way it was built and the ideology which inspired it, the Communist Party of China was not a party of the Leninist type. Moreover, Mao Zedong had no consideration even for this party such as it was. He did whatever he wanted. During the so-called Cultural Revolution, he completely disbanded it, concentrating everything in his own hands and putting the army at the head of affairs.

Like Browder, who presented Americanism as the ideal model of the society of the future, Mao Zedong too, considered American democracy the finest example of state and social organization for China. Mao Zedong

* J. Service, *Lost Chance in China*, New York 1974, p. 195.

** Ibidem, p. 198.

admitted to Service: «After all, we Chinese consider you Americans the ideal of democracy.»*

Along with their acceptance of American democracy, the Chinese leaders sought the establishment of close and direct links with American capital, sought American economic aid. Service writes that Mao Zedong told him, «China must industrialize. This can be done — in China — only by free enterprise and with the aid of foreign capital. Chinese and American interests are correlated and similar...

«The United States would find us more cooperative than the Kuomintang. We will not be afraid of democratic American influence — we will welcome it...

«America does not need to fear that we will not be co-operative. We must co-operate and we must have American help.»**

Today we hear such statements and requests every day from the disciples and collaborators of Mao Zedong, such as Deng Xiaoping, Hua Guofeng, and others who are achieving in practice the all-round links with American imperialism dreamed of and initiated by Mao Zedong. Now the Chinese strategy is orientated completely towards co-operation with the United States of America in particular, and world capitalism in general, and they began to support China politically and to influence it ideologically, so that it would obliterate any shadow of Marxism-Leninism from the minds and hearts of common people and thus carry out thorough-going political and organizational transformations towards the capitalist system, whether in the economic field, in the state organization, or in the organization of the party.

Objectively, the whole line of Mao Zedong for the

* J. Service, *Lost Chance in China*, New York 1974, p. 303.

** Ibidem, p. 307.

construction of China and his concept of the development of the countries which liberated themselves from colonialism has served and gone along with the strategy of American imperialism. If close collaboration between China and the United States of America was not established at the start, this is explained by the fact that in the post-war years the Chiang Kaishek lobby triumphed in America. At that time the «cold war» was at its height and Macarthyism prevailed in America. On the other hand, immediately after the war, the United States of America gave priority to Japan, thinking that first of all, it had to aid Japan or subjugate it from every point of view, to make it a powerful and obedient ally, to reconstruct the Japanese economy, and turn that country into a great bastion against the Soviet Union, and eventually against Mao Zedong's China. Apparently, the USA was not sufficiently powerful to be able to provide aid for all parts of the world and to prepare them against the Soviet Union, against the system of socialism, therefore, it gave preference to preparing Europe and Japan, where the destruction was great and where socialism had become dangerous to world capital.

Without doubt, these were the factors that made the heads of American imperialism refuse to grasp the hand Mao Zedong held out to them immediately. Considerable time had to pass. The Chinese revisionist leaders had to give new proofs of their «love» for America before Nixon could go to Beijing and the Americans and all the others understand that China had nothing at all to do with socialism.

After the Second World War the **Yugoslav revisionists** were included in the great campaign of American imperialism and other reactionary forces that gathered around it, in the struggle against socialism and the rev-

olution. This current, which represented revisionism in power, emerged at a crucial moment of the struggle between socialism and imperialism.

The period after the Second World War could not be a period of tranquility either for imperialism or for socialism. In the new conditions which had been created, imperialism had to cope with situations which were mortally dangerous to it, while socialism had to be consolidated, had to radiate and give its aid in the right way for the liberation and the progress of the peoples of the world. Not only had the wounds of the war to be treated and healed, but the class struggle had to be waged correctly, too, both within the countries where the proletariat had taken power and in the international arena. The victory over fascism had been achieved, but the peace was relative, the war continued with other means.

The socialist countries and their communist parties were faced with the task of working to consolidate their victories on the Marxist-Leninist road and to become examples and mirrors for the peoples and the other communist parties which were not in power. The communist parties of the socialist countries, also, had to temper themselves further with the Marxist-Leninist ideology, taking care that this was not turned into a dogma, but preserved as a revolutionary theory for action, a means to achieve profound social transformations, which is what it is in fact. In particular, after the historic victory over the fascist coalition, the socialist countries and the communist parties had to avoid becoming conceited, thinking that they were infallible, and forgetting or weakening the class struggle. This is the important thing Stalin had in mind when he stressed the need for the continuation of the class struggle in socialism.

Precisely in these circumstances the Titoites came out against Marxism-Leninism. Titoism did not throw off its

disguise and come out openly against the revolution and socialism at the start, but, on the contrary, tried to camouflage itself while continuing to prepare the terrain for taking Yugoslavia back on to the course of capitalism and its transformation into a tool of world imperialism.

It is a recognized fact that Titoism leaned spiritually, politically and ideologically towards the West, towards the United States of America, that right from the start it maintained numerous political contacts and achieved secret combinations with the British and other representatives of world capitalism. The Yugoslav leaders opened all the doors to UNRRA, and by this means and under the pretext of aid with the stockpiles of clothing and food left over from the time of the war, the American-British imperialists tried to infiltrate into many countries of the world, and especially into the countries of people's democracy. The aim of the imperialists was to prepare a more or less suitable terrain for operations of a more wide-ranging plan in the future. The Yugoslavs benefited greatly from the things UNRRA gave them, but for its part, UNRRA was able to exert its influence on the still incompletely built state mechanisms of the newly formed Yugoslav state.

Right from the start, American imperialism and the whole of international reaction gave Titoism all their support because they saw in it the course, the ideology and the policy which led to the degeneration of the countries of the socialist camp, to the splitting and disruption of their unity with the Soviet Union. The activity of Titoism conformed completely to the aim of American imperialism to undermine socialism from within. But Titoism was also to serve the strategy of imperialism of paralysing the liberation struggles and weaning new states, which had just thrown off the colonialist yoke, away from the revolutionary movement.

From the beginning, the Yugoslav revisionists were against the theory and practice of the genuine socialism of Lenin and Stalin on all questions and in all fields. Tito and his group linked the country with the capitalist world and set themselves the task of transforming everything in Yugoslavia, including its policy, ideology, state organization, the organization of the economy and the army, in the direction of the Western capitalist states. Their aim was to transform Yugoslavia into a bourgeois capitalist country as quickly as possible. Browder's ideas, which were the ideas of American capitalism, found a place in the political and ideological platform of Titoism.

First of all, the Titoites revised the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism about the role and mission of the revolutionary state power and the communist party in socialist society. They attacked the Marxist thesis about the leading role of the communist party in all fields of life in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Following the example of Browder in America, they liquidated the party in practice, not just because they changed its name, calling it the League of Communists, but because they also changed the aims, functions, organization and the role which this party was to play in the revolution and the construction of socialism. The Titoites transformed the party into an educational and propaganda association. They eliminated the revolutionary spirit of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and *de facto* went so far as to eliminate the influence of the party and to raise the role of the Popular Front above it. (1)

1 Tito declared in 1947: «Does the Communist Party of Yugoslavia have another program besides that of the Popular Front? No! The Communist Party has no other program. The program of the Popular Front is the program of the party, too.» (J. B. Tito, *Speeches and Articles III*. Rilindja, Prishtina 1962, Alb. ed. p. 145)

On the cardinal question of the party, in connection with the leading factor of the revolution and the construction of socialism, there is a community of political, ideological and organizational views between Browderism and Titoism. Since the policy of Titoism, like that of Browderism, is liquidationist and anti-Marxist on the decisive plan of the vanguard role of the party of the working class in the revolution and the construction of socialism, it is such in all aspects of its platforms.

The similarity of the views of the Titoites and those of Browder is apparent also in their stand towards «American democracy» which the Titoites took as a model for the construction of the political system in Yugoslavia. Kardelj himself has admitted that this system is «...similar to the organization of the executive power in the United States of America».*

Following the liquidation of the party and the break with the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy, Yugoslavia has been writhing in a chaos of economic-organizational operations. The Titoites proclaimed the state property «social» property, and camouflaged the capitalist relations of production under the anarcho-sindicalist slogan of «factories to the workers», and set the detachments of the working class one against the other. The collectivization of small producers was called the «Russian way» and was opposed with the «American way» of the creation of capitalist farms and the encouragement of private peasant economies.

This transformation in the economic, political and ideological fields was bound to bring about the subsequent transformation of the state organization, the organization

* E. Kardelj. *Directions of the Development of the Political System of Socialist Self-administration*, Rilindja, Prishtina 1978, p. 235.

of the army, and the organization of education and culture and so it did. In the fifties they proclaimed their so-called self-governing socialism, which was used to disguise the capitalist order. This «specific socialism», according to them, was to be built by relying not on the socialist state, but directly on the producers. On this basis, they preached the withering away of the state in socialism, denying the fundamental Marxist-Leninist thesis about the need for the existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat during the whole period of the transition from capitalism to communism.

In order to justify their course of betrayal and to throw dust in people's eyes, the Titoites presented themselves as «creative Marxists» who opposed only «Stalinism» but not Marxism-Leninism. Thus, they proved once again that the slogan of «the creative development of Marxism and the struggle against dogmatism» is the favourite slogan common to every variant of revisionism.

The United States of America, Britain, European social-democracy, etc., gave Titoite Yugoslavia all-round political, economic and military aid and kept it alive. The bourgeoisie was not opposed to Yugoslavia's formally retaining its «socialist» appearance, indeed it was interested in this. However, this kind of «socialism» had to be completely different from the socialism envisaged and built by Lenin and Stalin, which the Yugoslav revisionists began to attack, to call a «low form of socialism», «state socialism», «bureaucratic» and «anti-democratic». Yugoslav «socialism» had to be a hybrid capitalist-revisionist society, but essentially bourgeois-capitalist. It had to be a «Trojan horse» which would get into the other socialist countries, in order to divert them from the road of socialism and link them with imperialism.

And in fact Titoism became the inspirer of revisionist and opportunist elements in the former socialist countries.

The Yugoslav revisionists carried out extensive undermining and sabotage work in these countries. Suffice it to mention the events in Hungary in 1956, in which the Yugoslav Titoites played a very active role to open the way to the counter-revolution and take Hungary into the camp of imperialism.

In his well-known speech at Pula in 1956, Tito himself has clearly and openly explained the place which Titoism occupies in the overall strategy of imperialism in undermining the socialist countries from within. At that time he declared that the Yugoslav model of socialism was valid not only for Yugoslavia, but also for other socialist countries, which ought to follow and apply it.

The Titoite concepts and theories about world development and international relations also conformed to the strategy of American imperialism. In his speech delivered in Oslo in October 1954, the main theoretician of Yugoslav revisionism, Kardelj, came out openly against the theory of the revolution, while advertising the «new» solutions which capitalism had allegedly found. Distorting the essence of state monopoly capitalism, which assumed wide proportions in many capitalist countries after the Second World War, he proclaimed it an element of socialism, while he called classical bourgeois democracy «a regulator of social contradictions in the direction of the gradual strengthening of socialist elements». He declared that today «a gradual evolution towards socialism» is taking place, and this he called «an historical fact» in a series of capitalist states. These revisionist concepts, which in essence are identical with those of Browder, were included in the program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and became a means of ideological and political diversion against the revolutionary and liberation movements of the proletariat and peoples.

On this basis, the Yugoslav revisionists elaborated their theories and practices of «non-alignment», which came to the aid of the strategy of American imperialism to restrain the impulse of the anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples of the so-called third world and to undermine their efforts to defend their freedom, independence and sovereignty. The Titoites advised these peoples that their aspirations could be fulfilled by applying the policy of non-alignment, that is, of not opposing imperialism. According to the Titoites, the road to the development of these countries had to be sought in «active cooperation», in «ever more extensive co-operation» with the imperialists and big world capital, in the aid and credits which they should take from the developed capitalist countries.

As to where the course which the revisionists of Belgrade advocate leads, the present-day reality of Yugoslavia makes this very clear. The collaboration with American imperialism, with Soviet social-imperialism and the other big capitalist states, the large amount of aid and credits which they have received from them have turned Yugoslavia into a country which is dependent on world capitalism for everything, into a country with its independence and sovereignty crippled.

The strategy of American imperialism and the whole struggle of the international bourgeoisie against the revolution and socialism received further, extremely great and much desired aid with the emergence on the scene of **Khrushchevite revisionism**. The Khrushchevite betrayal was the heaviest and most dangerous blow which has ever been struck at socialism and the peoples' revolutionary liberation movement. It transformed the first socialist country, the great centre of the world revolution, into an imperialist country and a hotbed of counter-revolution. The repercussions of this betrayal on the national and

international scale have been truly tragic. Not only have the peoples' revolutionary liberation movements suffered from its consequences, and they are still suffering from them, but international peace and security have been placed in great danger.

As an ideological and political current, Khrushchevism has no great difference from the other currents of modern revisionism. It is the result of the same external and internal pressure of the bourgeoisie, of the same deviation from the principles of Marxism-Leninism, and of the same aim of opposing the revolution and socialism and preserving and strengthening the capitalist system.

The difference which does exist has to do only with the level of the danger which it represents. Khrushchevite revisionism always remains the most dangerous, the most fiendish, the most threatening revisionism. This is for two reasons: **first**, because it is a disguised revisionism. It retains its external socialist appearance and in order to deceive people and lure them into its traps, makes extensive use of Marxist terminology, and according to the need and the occasion, even of revolutionary slogans. By means of this demagogy it seeks to spread a thick fog so that the present-day capitalist reality of the Soviet Union will not be seen, and above all, its expansionist aims will be hidden in order to mislead the revolutionary liberation movements, and turn them into instruments of its policy. **Second**, and this is more important, Khrushchevite revisionism has become the ruling ideology in a state which represents a great imperialist power, a thing which gives it many means and possibilities to manoeuvre in broad fields and in large proportions.

Khrushchevism and the other revisionist currents have in common the liquidation of the communist party and its transformation into a political force which serves the bourgeoisie. In the Soviet Union too, the Communist

Party of Lenin and Stalin has been liquidated. It is true that the party there did not change its name, as occurred in Yugoslavia, but it was stripped of its revolutionary essence and spirit. The role of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union altered, and its work for the strengthening of the Marxist-Leninist ideology was replaced with the distortion of the Marxist-Leninist theory, under different disguises, through empty phraseology and demagoguery. The political organization of the party, like the army, the police and the other organs of the dictatorship of the new bourgeoisie, was transformed into an organization to oppress the masses, not to mention the fact that it also became the bearer of the ideology and policy of their oppression and exploitation. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union degraded, was weakened, and became a «party of the entire people», that is, no longer the vanguard party of the working class, which carries forward the revolution and builds socialism, but a party of the new revisionist bourgeoisie, which causes the degeneration of socialism and carries forward the restoration of capitalism.

Like Browder, Tito, Togliatti, etc., who preached the transformation of their parties into «associations», «leagues», «mass parties», allegedly to adapt them to the new social changes which had occurred as a result of the development of capitalism, the growth of the working class and its political and ideological influence, etc., Khrushchev too justified the change in the character of the party as an alleged adaptation to the situation created in the Soviet Union, where allegedly the construction of socialism had been completed and the construction of communism had begun. According to Khrushchev, the composition of the party, its structure, role and place in society and the state had to alter in conformity with this «new epoch».

When Khrushchev began to advocate these theses, the construction of communism in the Soviet Union not only had not begun, but moreover, the construction of socialism was not yet completed. True, the exploiting classes had been eliminated as classes, but there were many remnants of them still existing physically, let alone ideologically. The Second World War had hindered the broad emancipation of relations of production, while the productive forces, which constitute the necessary and indispensable basis for this, had been gravely impaired. The Marxist-Leninist ideology was predominant, but this does not mean that the old ideologies had been completely eradicated from the consciousness of the masses. The Soviet Union had won the war against fascism, but another war, with other means, and no less dangerous, had commenced against it. Imperialism, headed by American imperialism, had proclaimed the «cold war» against communism and all the poisoned arrows of world capitalism were aimed at the Soviet Union first of all. Great pressure was exerted on the Soviet state and the Soviet peoples, with the aim of instilling the fear of war amongst them, diminishing their revolutionary enthusiasm, and restraining their internationalist spirit and opposition to imperialism.

In the face of these internal and external pressures, Khrushchev surrendered and capitulated. He began to present the situation in rosy colours, in order to conceal his own pacifist illusions. His theses about the «construction of communism», the «end of the class struggle», and the «final victory of socialism» looked like something new, but in fact they were reactionary. They were the expression of the concealment of a new reality which was being created, of the birth and development of the new bourgeois stratum and its pretensions to establish its own power in the Soviet Union.

The line and program which Khrushchev presented

at the 20th Congress of the CPSU constituted not only the line of the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, but also the line of undermining the revolution, and of the subjection of the peoples to imperialism and the working class to the bourgeoisie. The Khrushchevites preached that at the present stage, the main road of transition to socialism was the peaceful road. They advised the communist parties to follow the policy of class conciliation and collaboration with social-democracy and other political forces of the bourgeoisie. This line assisted the attainment of those objectives for which imperialism and capital had long been fighting with every means, including arms and ideological diversion. It opened broad roads to bourgeois reformism and gave capital the possibility to manoeuvre in the difficult economic, political and military situation created for it after the Second World War. This is the explanation for all that great publicity which the bourgeoisie gave the 20th Congress of the CPSU all around the world and which called Khrushchev «a man of peace» who «understands the situation», unlike Stalin who was for «communist orthodoxy», «incompatibility with the capitalist world», etc.

With their preachings of the peaceful road to socialism, the Khrushchevites sought to impede the communists and the revolutionaries of the world from preparing for and carrying out the revolution, and wanted them to reduce all their work to propaganda, to debates and electoral manoeuvres, to trade-union demonstrations and day-to-day demands.

This was the typical social-democratic line which Lenin had fought so fiercely and the October Revolution had overthrown. The Khrushchevite views, which were borrowed from the arsenal of the chiefs of the Second International, aroused dangerous illusions and discredited the very idea of the revolution. They did not prepare the

working class and the working masses to be vigilant and to oppose the bourgeois violence, but urged them to remain submissively at the mercy of the bourgeoisie. This was also proved in the events in Indonesia and Chile, etc., with the communists and peoples of those countries paying very dearly for the revisionist illusions about the peaceful road to socialism.

Equally in favour of imperialism and the bourgeoisie and harmful to the revolution was the other thesis of the 20th Congress of the CPSU about «peaceful coexistence», which the Khrushchevites tried to impose on the whole communist movement, extending it even to relations between classes, and between the peoples and their imperialist oppressors. According to the Khrushchevites, who presented the problem as «either peaceful coexistence or devastating war», there was no other solution for the peoples and the world proletariat but to bend their backs, to give up the class struggle, the revolution and any other action which «might anger» imperialism and provoke the outbreak of war.

In fact the Khrushchevite views about «peaceful coexistence», which were closely linked with those about the «changed nature of imperialism», were practically identical with the preachings of Browder that American capitalism and imperialism had allegedly become a factor of progress in post-war world development. The prettifying of American imperialism and the false image created about it slackened peoples' vigilance towards the hegemonic and expansionist policy of the United States of America and sabotaged the peoples' anti-imperialist liberation struggle. Both as an ideology and a practical political line, Khrushchevite «peaceful coexistence» urged the peoples, especially in the new states of Asia, Africa and Latin America, etc., to extinguish the «hotbeds from which the flames of war might burst out», to seek rapproche-

merit and conciliation with imperialism, to take advantage of «international co-operation» for the «peaceful development» of their economy, etc. In its expressions, terms and other formulas, this line was the same as that preached by Browder, that in the conditions of the «peaceful coexistence» between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, wealthy America could assist restoration and advance of the whole world. It was the same line which Tito advocated and applied in Yugoslavia, which had opened the doors of that country to American aid, credit and capital. It was the same desire which Mao Zedong and other Maoist leaders had to build up China with American aid, but which the different circumstances and events had hindered up to that stage.

And the Soviet Union cannot escape American aid and the aid from the other Western countries any more than the Titoites, or today the Maoists can escape it. The integration of the Soviet Union and other revisionist countries linked with it into the world capitalist economy has assumed large proportions. These countries have become some of the biggest importers of Western capital. Their debts, at least those which are made public, amount to tens of billions of dollars. Sometimes because of changing circumstances, such as those caused by the events in Afghanistan at present, this process is slowed down, but it never stops. The capitalist interests of the two sides are so great that in special situations they override all their frictions, rivalries and clashes.

The Soviet revisionists used the thesis about «peaceful coexistence» not only to justify their policy of concessions to and compromises with American imperialism. This line also served and is still serving them as a mask to hide the expansionist policy of Soviet social-imperialism, in order to lower the vigilance and resistance of the peoples to the imperialist plans of the Soviet revisionist

leaders for hegemony. The thesis about «peaceful coexistence» was a call of the Soviet revisionists to the American imperialists to divide up the world and rule it jointly.

The Khrushchevite revisionist line assisted imperialism and reaction to take advantage of the situation in order to launch an all-round attack on communism. Of particular assistance to this new attack on the revolution and socialism were the attacks and the slanders of the Khrushchevite revisionists on Stalin and his work.

The Khrushchevite revisionists started their campaign against Stalin in order to justify the anti-Marxist course which they had begun to follow inside and outside the country. They could not negate the dictatorship of the proletariat and transform the Soviet Union into a bourgeois-capitalist state, could not strike bargains with imperialism, without negating the work of Stalin. This is also the reason why the campaign against him was conducted with the accusations borrowed from the arsenal of imperialist and Trotskyite propaganda which presented the past of the Soviet Union as a period of «mass reprisals», and the socialist system as «suppression of democracy» and a «dictatorship like that of Ivan the Terrible» etc.

But for all the slanders and attacks of imperialists, revisionists and other enemies of the revolution, the name and work of Stalin remain immortal. Stalin was a great revolutionary, an outstanding theoretician, who ranks with Marx, Engels and Lenin.

Life has proved the correctness of the analyses of the Party of Labour of Albania and its stands towards Khrushchevite revisionism and is confirming them every day. In the Soviet Union socialism has been destroyed and capitalism has been restored. Meanwhile, in the international arena, the stands and actions of the Soviet

leadership have more and more revealed the social-imperialist character of the Soviet Union and its reactionary great power ideology. Thus, Khrushchevite revisionism has become not only the ideology of the restoration of capitalism and sabotage of the revolution and the peoples' liberation struggle, but also the ideology of social-imperialist aggression.

II

EUROCOMMUNISM — AN IDEOLOGY OF SUBMISSION TO THE BOURGEOISIE AND IMPERIALISM

As we mentioned above, modern revisionism emerged in the period of the sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism. It became an ally of the bourgeoisie and imperialism and joined in their efforts to contain and divert the great tide of proletarian revolutions, national liberation struggles and the peoples' anti-imperialist democratic movement. As such, the new revisionism could not fail to assume different forms and appearances, to use methods and tactics adapted to the needs of capital in each country. It assumed its greatest development, its extension in the communist and workers' movement after Khrushchevite revisionism emerged on the scene.

The betrayal which took place in the Soviet Union was of incalculable assistance to the bourgeoisie and imperialism at the moments most difficult for them. It gave big capital possibilities to attack the Marxist-Leninist theory and the practice of socialist construction, to create doubts about the revolutionary strategy of the proletariat, and to cause the ideological and political degeneration of the communist parties. Above all, the communist and workers' parties of Western Europe which followed the treacherous line of Tito and Khrushchev, were severely shaken ideologically. In these parties, the terrain had long been prepared for them to embrace the Khrushchevite

revisionist ideas and practice and carry them further. Their organizational and ideological degeneration to different degrees and in various ways had begun earlier. Pseudo-revolutionary theories and practices had long been applied in their ranks.

The Beginnings of Modern Revisionism in the Communist Parties of Western Europe

During the Second World War many positive factors which made the transformation of the anti-fascist war into a profound popular revolution both possible and necessary, had emerged in Europe. Fascism had eliminated not only the national independence of the occupied countries, but also all democratic freedoms, and had even buried bourgeois democracy itself. Therefore, the war against fascism had to be not only a war for national liberation but also a war for the defence and development of democracy. As regards the communist parties, the achievement of these two objectives had to be linked with the struggle for socialism.

In the countries of Central and South-eastern Europe, the communist parties knew how to link the tasks of the war for independence and democracy with the struggle for socialism. They worked out and applied a policy which led to the establishment of the regimes of the new people's democracy. Meanwhile, the communist parties of Western Europe did not prove capable of utilizing the favourable situation created by the Second World War and the victory over fascism. This showed that they had not properly understood and did not apply the directives of the 7th Congress of the Communist International(2). This congress

2 The congress was held from July 25 to August 21, 1935.

instructed that in the course of the opposition and fight against fascism, in certain conditions, the possibilities would be created for the formation of united front governments which would be entirely different from the social-democratic governments. They were to serve the transition from the stage of the fight against fascism to the stage of the fight for democracy and socialism. In France and Italy, however, the war against fascism did not lead to the formation of governments of the type which the Comintern wanted. After the war, governments of the bourgeois type came to power there. The participation of the communists in them did not alter their character. Even the French Communist Party, which up to the end of the Second World War had a correct line in general, was unable to overcome and correct its mistakes, weaknesses and deviations on certain problems, which stemmed among other things from lack of realistic analyses of the internal and external situations.

The French Communist Party played a primary role in the creation of the Popular Front in France. It launched the slogan of the Popular Front at its Congress of Nantes in 1935, a slogan which quickly found an echo among the broad masses of the French people. The Comintern made a high valuation of the efforts and work of the French Communist Party for the creation of the Popular Front. However, it must be said that the party did not know how or was unable to take advantage of the situation and utilize it in favour of the working class.

The Communist Party spoke openly about the danger threatening France from internal and external fascism, denounced this danger and came out in the streets in demonstrations, but it expected the measures against fascism and everything else from the «legal» governments, from the bourgeois governments, formed by combinations

in the bourgeois parliament. This was apparent at the time of the creation of the Popular Front which was a success for the French Communist Party, because in the complicated situation of that time it blocked the way to the setting up of a fascist government in France. Although it took some measures in favour of the working class, the Blum government violated and betrayed the program of the Popular Front in its internal and foreign policy. The Communist Party, which did not take part in the Popular Front government, but supported it in Parliament, was unable to stop this process. The struggle of the masses, strikes, demonstrations and actions were replaced by the weekly meetings which Léon Blum held in his home with Thorez and Duclos.

The leader of the Popular Front government was a socialist, and the socialists made up a large part of the government, but the government apparatus at the centre and the base remained what it was. The army remained *la grande muette**. It was commanded, just as under all former governments, by the reactionary caste of officers trained at the bourgeois military schools for the purpose of suppressing the French people and occupying colonies, but not fighting fascism and reaction.

The French Communist Party did not carry its actions through to the end, it was not organized for real struggle against fascism and reaction. The propaganda and agitation, the demonstrations and strikes it led, were not on the line of the seizure of power from the hands of the bourgeoisie. Irrespective of the fact that the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism were not denied, the activity and struggle of the party unwittingly and unconsciously assumed the nature of the struggle for reforms, for econ-

* French — the great mute; here the meaning is that the army was not supposed to get involved in politics.

omic demands on the trade-union level. Of course, the trade-unions play a revolutionary role when they are under correct leadership and a revolutionary situation is created in them, otherwise the trade-union movement is turned into a routine concocted by the trade-union chiefs through stands which are sometimes correct, sometimes deviationist, sometimes liberal, sometimes opportunist, but which, in the final analysis, end up in fruitless talks and compromises with the employers.

When the war broke out in Spain, the French Communist Party actively assisted the Communist Party of Spain and the Spanish people in the war against Franco with agitation and propaganda and material aid. It called for volunteers to go to Spain, a call to which thousands of members of the party and other French anti-fascists responded, and three thousand of them fell martyrs on Spanish soil. The main leaders of the party took part directly in the war or else went to Spain on various occasions. Most of the volunteers, who set out from many countries to join the International Brigades in Spain, passed through France. It was the French Communist Party which organized their passage.

During the Spanish War the communists and the working class of France gained new experience in battle, and this was added to the old tradition of the revolutionary struggles of the French proletariat. This constituted a great capital, a revolutionary experience gained in organized frontal class battles against the savage Franco reaction, Italian fascists and German nazis, as well as against French and world reaction. This revolutionary capital should have served the party in the critical moments of the Second World War and the occupation of France, but in reality it was not utilized.

The French Communist Party exposed the policy of Munich with which the Daladiers and Bonnets made con-

cessions to Hitler, selling out the interests of the Czechoslovak people with the aim of turning the Hitlerite war machine against the Soviet Union. It unwaveringly defended the Soviet-German non-aggression pact and withstood the slanders and persecutions of the bourgeoisie. It called for resistance and rose boldly in the fight against the German occupiers and their collaborators of Vichy. This struggle, which began with actions, strikes, demonstrations and sabotage, has steadily extended. The FTP (3) created by the Communist Party, were the only formations which fought the occupiers, while the Gaullist *re-seaux*, as the name shows, were nothing but a network of the Secret Service to gather military information useful to the Allies. While the Gaullists advocated waiting for a landing before going into action, the Communist Party fought valiantly for the liberation of the country.

In the liberation war the French Communist Party organized and developed the resistance against the occupiers; and tried to and did achieve something in connection with the anti-fascist front. However, as the events showed, it had not considered and had not planned the seizure of power, or if it had planned this it abandoned the idea.

This is confirmed by the fact that during the war the party created many committees for national liberation, but it did not give any attention to them and did not take any measures to ensure that these committees affirm themselves as the nuclei of the new state power. From beginning to end the partisan formations remained small and without organic links with one another. At no time did the party raise the question of the creation of big formations of a real national liberation army.

The French Communist Party carried on an anti-

3 Francs Tireurs et Partisans — French partisan forces led by the FCP.

fascist liberation war, which it led itself, but did not turn this war into a revolutionary war of the whole people. Moreover, it considered it more appropriate and «revolutionary» to beg De Gaulle to be allowed to send one of its representatives to his «Free France Committee». All this meant, «Please, Mr. De Gaulle, accept me into your Committee, too.» This meant, «Mr. De Gaulle, the French Communist Party and the partisan forces are going under your command and that of the 'Free France Committee'.» This meant, «Mr. De Gaulle, we communists have no intention of carrying out any revolution or of seizing power, all we want is that the old game of parties, the 'democratic' game, will be played in the France of the future and that, on the basis of polling, we too will take part in the future government.»

While the French communists were acting in this way, the bourgeoisie was preparing and organizing its forces to seize power in France, which it would assume when the Anglo-American allies landed there. The National Committee, created and led by the De Gaulle group in London, and turned into a government in Algiers, would be the most suitable force to take over this power. Of course, it would do this together with the internal forces which the bourgeoisie had prepared and set in motion together with the old army commanded by generals who, after having served Petain, had placed themselves into the service of De Gaulle, when it became clear that the German ship was sinking.

This was a dangerous situation, which the French Communist Party did not appreciate and assess correctly, or did not analyse thoroughly. It was afraid of complications with the allied forces which were landing, it was afraid of De Gaulle and the forces gathered around him, hence it was afraid of civil war, and especially of war with the Anglo-Americans.

The Communist Party forgot the example of the heroic communards, who encircled by Bismarck's German armies, rose in revolt against the Versailles, «storming the heavens», as Marx said, and created the Commune of Paris. Theoreticians may try to justify this fatal mistake of the French Communist Party during the Second World War by saying: «The strength of the forces had to be taken into account.» Of course, the strength of the forces had to be taken into account. But since the communards, without a party, without organization, without links with the peasantry and the rest of France, and encircled by foreign occupation troops, launched the attack and seized power, the French working class with its party at the head, tempered in battle, enlightened by Marxism-Leninism, and having such a great and powerful ally as the Soviet Union in its struggle, at the head of the working masses and the genuine patriots, could have carried out the immortal deed of the communards a hundred times more successfully.

When it should have acted boldly and wisely to fulfil the desires and aspirations of the French communist militants and proletariat, who fought with determination and heroism against the Hitlerite occupiers, the leadership of the Communist Party proved hesitant and weak. It did not proceed on the Marxist-Leninist road, on the road of revolutionary struggle. It did not follow in the footsteps of the communards.

The anti-fascist war in Italy had its own characteristics and features, but the objectives which the leadership of the Italian Communist Party had set itself, its vacillations and concessions are similar to those of the French Communist Party.

The start of the Second World War found most of the leading cadres of the Italian Communist Party in France.

Nearly all of them fell into the hands of the police. Amongst them was the general secretary of the party, Palmiro Togliatti, who as soon as he was released from jail, in March 1941, went to the Soviet Union.

Although the Italian Communist Party took a correct stand towards the aggressive war which the fascist powers launched, and condemned it as a predatory imperialist war, its activity remained restricted. All the efforts of this party were centered on the creation of a coalition of the anti-fascist parties in exile, on issuing a number of appeals, resolutions and propaganda publications.

In March 1943, the party, which had begun to develop its activity within the country from the middle of 1942, managed to organize a series of powerful strikes in various zones, which testified to the rise of the anti-fascist people's movement. These strikes accelerated the developments which led to the overthrow of Mussolini.

Fear of the revolution had made the Italian bourgeoisie and the symbol of its rule, the king, summon Mussolini to power in 1922. This same fear made the bourgeoisie and the king remove Mussolini from power in July 1943.

The overthrow of Mussolini was carried out by means of a coup d'état of the ruling caste. The take-over was the work of the king of Badoglio, and other leading figures of fascism. Seeing the inevitability of Italy's defeat, by so doing they wanted to forestall the danger that the working class and the people of Italy would rise in struggle and revolution, which would not only overthrow fascism and the monarchy, but would place the domination of the Italian bourgeoisie as a class in jeopardy.

The resistance movement of the Italian people against fascism assumed great development especially after the capitulation of Italy. In Northern Italy, which was still occupied by the Germans, on the initiative of the party,

the liberation war, which included the broad masses of anti-fascist workers, peasants, intellectuals and others, was organized. Big regular partisan formations were created, the overwhelming majority of them under the leadership of the party.

Likewise on the initiative of the Communist Party, national liberation committees were formed in Northern Italy, along with the partisan units and detachments. The party struggled to make these committees new organs of the democratic power, but in fact they remained coalitions of different parties. This did not permit them to be transformed into genuine organs of the people's power.

Whereas in Northern Italy the struggle of the party in general was developed on the right road, and could have led not only to the liberation of the country but also to the establishment of the people's power, in the South and on a national scale the party did not raise the question of the seizure of power. It sought only the formation of a strong government with authority, and did not fight for the overthrow of the monarchy and Badoglio. At a time when favourable conditions existed in the country to carry forward the revolution, the program of the Communist Party was minimal. The party was for a parliamentary solution within the framework of the laws of the bourgeois order. Its maximum claim was for its participation in the government with two or three ministers.

In this way, the Italian Communist Party involved itself in bourgeois political combinations and made unprincipled concessions one after the other. On the eve of the liberation of the country it had great political and military strength which it did not know how to use or did not want to use, and it voluntarily surrendered its arms to the bourgeoisie. It abandoned the revolutionary road and set out on the parliamentary road, which gradually trans-

formed this party from a party of the revolution into a bourgeois party of the working class for social reforms.

In regard to Spain, it must be said that the directives of the 7th Congress of the Communist International had greater results than in France or Italy. The effect of them was especially apparent during the Civil War. At first the communists did not take part in the Popular Front government, but gave it their support. Nevertheless, the Communist Party criticized the government for its irresolute stand and demanded that it take measures against the fascist danger, against the activity which the fascists carried out, especially the caste of officers, who constituted the immediate danger at that time.

On July 17, 1936 the fascist generals launched their «Pronunciamento». The fascists' plot was well co-ordinated. They had acted under the nose of the leftist government and the authorities established by a government which had emerged from the coalition of the Popular Front. All the anti-fascist forces lined up against this danger. In November the government headed by Largo Caballero was formed with two communist ministers included. Thus a common front was formed to defend the Republic even with arms. The government granted autonomy to the Basques, confiscated the lands of fascists in favour of poor peasants and nationalized all their property.

Right from the start, the Communist Party called on the working class and the people for resistance. The Communist Party did not content itself with appeals, however, but went into action. The members of the party went into the barracks to explain the situation to the soldiers, telling them what the fascists were and what a threat they presented to the workers, the peasants and the people. In Madrid, the capital of Spain, the fascist coup failed.

In other cities, the people, and first of all the working class, attacked the military units which had risen against the Republic and paralysed them. In Asturia the fight of the miners against the fascist troops raged for a month and this province remained in the hands of the people. The fascists could not pass there. The same thing occurred in the Basque region and many parts of Spain.

In the first days of August it seemed that the fascist generals were on the way out and their defeat would have been complete had the troops of fascist Italy and nazi Germany not gone to their assistance immediately, together with the troops recruited in Spanish Morocco and those sent by fascist Portugal.

In a country where the army was led by an old caste of reactionary royalist and fascist officers the fate of the country could not be left to the army, of which a part followed the fascist generals while the rest began to fall apart. Therefore, the Communist Party called for the creation of a new army, an army of the people. The communists set to work to create this army and within a short time managed to set up the Fifth Regiment. On the basis of this regiment, which achieved great fame during the Spanish War, the people's army of the Spanish Republic was built up.

The resolute stand of the Communist Party against the fascist attack, the bold example it set by placing itself at the head of the masses to prevent the advance of fascism, the example set by its members, 60 per cent of whom went to the different fighting fronts of the war, greatly increased the authority and prestige of the party among the masses of the people.

A party grows, wins authority and becomes the leadership of the masses when it has a clear line and hurls itself boldly into struggle to implement it. During the Civil War the Communist Party of Spain became

such a party. Between the beginning of the fascist insurrection in July 1936 and the end of that year, the Communist Party increased the number of its members three fold. And despite the fact that in those days people turned to the party, not to cast votes in elections but to give their lives, at no time has any other party, whether the so-called communist party of Carrillo or the other revisionist parties which have opened all their doors to anyone, with religious beliefs or otherwise, workers or bourgeois, who want to join them, been able to show such a growth of its authority and influence as that which the Communist Party of Spain achieved during the time of the Civil War.

The Spanish War came to an end at the beginning of 1939, with the extension of Franco's rule over the whole country. In that war the Communist Party of Spain did not spare its efforts or forces to defeat fascism. If fascism triumphed, this is due, apart from various internal factors, first of all to the intervention of Italian and German fascism, as well as to the capitulationist policy of «non-intervention» followed by the Western powers towards the fascist aggressors.

Many members of the Communist Party of Spain gave their lives during the Civil War. Others fell victim to the Francoite terror. Thousands and thousands of others were thrown into prison where they languished for many years or died. The terror which prevailed in Spain after the victory of the fascists was extremely ferocious.

The Spanish democrats who managed to escape arrest and internment took part in the French resistance and fought valiantly, while the Spanish democrats who went to the Soviet Union entered the ranks of the Red Army and many of them gave their lives fighting against fascism.

Although in extremely difficult conditions, the communists continued the guerilla war and the organization of resistance within Spain. The majority of them fell into the hands of the Francoite police and were condemned to death.

Franco dealt a heavy blow to the revolutionary vanguard of the working class and the masses of the Spanish people and this had negative consequences for the Communist Party. Losing its soundest, most ideologically prepared, most resolute and courageous element in the armed struggle and during the fascist terror, the Communist Party of Spain came under the negative and destructive influence of the cowardly petty-bourgeois and intellectual element, such as Carrillo and company, who became dominant. They gradually transformed the Communist Party of Spain into an opportunist and revisionist party.

Unity with the Khrushchevite Revisionists in the Struggle against Marxism-Leninism and the Revolution

The economic and political conditions which were created in Western Europe after the Second World War were even more favourable to the consolidation and spread of those mistaken opportunist views which had existed previously in the leaderships of the communist parties of France, Italy and Spain and further encouraged their spirit of concessions to and compromises with the bourgeoisie.

Amongst others, such factors were the abrogation of fascist laws and of other measures of restriction and compulsion which the European bourgeoisie had adopted from the first days after the triumph of the October Revolution and had maintained up to the outbreak of the war, with the aim of restraining the upsurge of the revolutionary

drive of the working class, to hinder its political organization and prevent the spread of the Marxist ideology.

The re-establishment on a more or less extensive scale of bourgeois democracy, by completely legalizing all political parties except the fascist parties; permitting their unhindered participation in the political and ideological life of the country; giving these parties possibilities for active participation in the electoral campaigns, which were now held on the basis of less restrictive laws, for the approval of which the communists and other progressive forces had waged a long struggle, created many reformist illusions among the leaderships of the communist parties. The view began to establish itself among them that fascism was now finished once and for all, that the bourgeoisie was no longer able to restrict the democratic rights of the workers, but on the contrary would be obliged to allow their further development. They began to think that the communists, emerging from the war as the most influential and powerful political, organizing and mobilizing force of the nation, would compel the bourgeoisie to proceed on the course of extending democracy and permitting the ever greater participation of working people in running the country, that through elections and parliament they would have possibilities to take power peacefully and then go on to the socialist transformation of society. These leaderships considered the participation of two or three communist ministers in the post-war governments of France and Italy not as the maximum formal concessions which the bourgeoisie would make, but as the beginning of a process which would develop gradually up to the creation of a cabinet consisting entirely of communists.

The development of the economy in the West after the war also exerted a great influence on the spread of opportunist and revisionist ideas in the communist parties.

True, Western Europe was devastated by the war, but its recovery was carried out relatively quickly. The American capital which poured into Europe through the «Marshall Plan» made it possible to reconstruct the factories, plants, transport and agriculture so that their production extended rapidly. This development opened up many jobs and for a long period, not only absorbed all the free labour force but even created a certain shortage of labour.

This situation, which brought the bourgeoisie great superprofits, allowed it to loosen its purse-strings a little and soften the labour conflicts to some degree. In the social field, in such matters as social insurance, health, education, labour legislation etc., it took some measures for which the working class had fought hard. The obvious improvement of the standard of living of the working people in comparison with that of the time of the war and even before the war, the rapid growth of production, which came as a result of the reconstruction of industry and agriculture and the beginning of the technical and scientific revolution, and the full employment of the work force, opened the way to the flowering amongst the unformed opportunist element of views about the development of capitalism without class conflicts, about its ability to avoid crises, the elimination of the phenomenon of unemployment etc. That major teaching of Marxism-Leninism, that the periods of peaceful development of capitalism become a source for the spread of opportunism, was confirmed once again. The new stratum of the worker aristocracy, which increased considerably during this period, began to exert an ever more negative influence in the ranks of the parties and their leaderships by introducing reformist and opportunist views and ideas.

Under pressure of these circumstances, the programs of communist parties were reduced more and more to democratic and reformist minimum programs, while the idea of

the revolution and socialism became ever more remote. The major strategy of the revolutionary transformation of society gave way to the minor strategy about current problems of the day which was absolutized and became the general political and ideological line.

In this way, after the Second World War, the Italian Communist Party, that of France, of Great Britain and after this, that of Spain, too, gradually began to deviate from Marxism-Leninism, to adopt revisionist views and theses and to take the course of reformism. Then Khrushchevite revisionism emerged on the scene, the terrain was suitable for them to embrace it and unite firmly with it in the struggle against Marxism-Leninism. Apart from the pressure of the bourgeoisie and social-democracy within their own countries, the decisions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU exerted a great influence on these parties to go over completely to anti-Marxist, social-democratic positions.

The first to embrace the line of the 20th Congress of the CPSU were the Italian revisionists who immediately after that congress, loudly proclaimed the so-called Italian road to socialism. As soon as fascism had been overthrown, the Italian Communist Party had come out with an opportunist political and organizational platform. When Palmiro Togliatti landed in Naples on his return from the Soviet Union in March 1944, he imposed on his party the line of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie and its parties. In the plenum of the National Council of the Party which was held at that time, Togliatti declared, «We do not put forward the seizure of power as the objective of our struggle, because of international and national conditions; we want only to destroy fascism completely and to create a 'truly progressive, anti-fascist democracy'. The

ICP 'must view every problem from the angle of the nation, of the Italian state'.»*

In Naples Togliatti put forward for the first time the idea, and indeed the platform, of what he called the «new party of the masses», which differed in class composition, ideology and organizational forms from the communist party of the Leninist type. It was natural that, for a policy of unprincipled alliances and a policy of reforms which Togliatti wanted, he needed a reformist party, a broad unrestricted party which anyone could enter or leave whenever he liked. Many years later a collaborator of Togliatti wrote, «His notion of a mass party which has its roots in the people assumes all its proper value if we link it closely with the national component of the communists' struggle. Their objective, in fact, is to achieve profound changes in society... by means of reforms.»**

With the liberation of the country, the working class of Italy hoped for profound social justice, expected that things would change and that at last it would have its say. But this did not occur. And this was because of the organization and management of the life of the country by the different bourgeois parties, including the Communist Party. To deceive the masses and to give them the impression that their voice was being heard in the governing of the country, they arranged political life with majority and minority parties, with parties in office and parties in opposition, with all the parliamentary games and tricks, will all their lies and humbug.

At first the Italian Communist Party received two unimportant portfolios, which the big bourgeoisie allowed

* P. Spriano, *Storia del Partito Comunista Italiano*, Torino 1975. p. 308.

** G. Ceretti, *A l'ombre des deux T*, Paris 1973, p. 52.

it within the «democratic» game, in order to strengthen its position, restore its army, the police and all the network of suppression, and in order to use the presence of communists in the government to strangle and paralyse any tendency of the working class and the Italian people to settle accounts with those who exploited them, oppressed them and sent them to rob other peoples of their freedom, leaving the bones of their sons in Abyssinia, Spain, Albania and the Soviet Union. Then, in May 1947, when they no longer wanted them, the bourgeoisie threw the communist ministers out of the government. The possible danger on an attack by the workers had been averted. The working class had been «lined up», incorporated in different unions according to party colours, and thus the struggle for votes, the parliamentary struggle, began.

After the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Togliatti and the Italian Communist Party publicly proclaimed their old revisionist stands. Not only did they approve every sign of liberalism which came from Moscow, but they raced ahead so fast that they put the Khrushchevite revisionists in difficulties, and thus the Italian Communist Party began to become a worry to them.

The Togliatti supporters approved the revisionist course of «destalinization», applauded the Khrushchevites' mud slinging at Stalin and bolshevism, applauded the Khrushchevites' course for the destruction of the socialist foundations of the Soviet state, were in favour of revisionist reforms and the policy of opening up to the capitalist states, especially the United States of America. As revisionists, Togliatti and his supporters were fully in agreement with Khrushchevite peaceful coexistence and rapprochement with imperialism. This was their old dream of collaboration with the bourgeoisie on the national and international plane.

On the course on which the Khrushchevite revisionist party had set out in the Soviet Union it needed unity and friendship with the Italian Communist Party, it needed the support, in particular, of the two revisionist parties of the West, of France and Italy, which were two big parties with a certain international authority. This was the reason for the «honours» which the Khrushchevites paid these two parties, and together with the «honours», which were obvious, went big subsidies under the lap.

Just as the Khrushchevites hastened to turn the Soviet Union into a capitalist country, so Togliatti and company hastened to integrate themselves into the Italian capitalist order. In June 1956, in the report submitted to the CC of the Italian Communist Party under the flamboyant title «The Italian Road to Socialism», Palmiro Togliatti launched a series of theses so blatantly anti-communist that Khrushchev was compelled to tell him that he should restrain himself and should not cross his bridges so hastily.

At that time Togliatti put forward the question of the integration of socialism into capitalism, as well as the thesis denying the role of the communist party as the sole and indispensable leader of the struggle of the proletariat for socialism. He said that the impulse towards socialism might come even where there was no communist party. These theses were identical with those of the Yugoslav revisionists.

It is not accidental that the Italian revisionists proved to be ardent supporters of the rehabilitation of the Yugoslav revisionists. Togliatti personally went to Yugoslavia to bend the knee to Tito and to help make him «acceptable» in the international communist movement.

The Italian Communist Party and Togliatti spoke out against Moscow being «the only centre of international communism». They preached «polycentrism», the aim of

which was the creation of a new revisionist bloc, headed by the Italian Communist Party, which by opposing the Soviet revisionist bloc would raise the authority of the Italian Communist Party in the eyes of the Italian and world bourgeoisie. Togliatti thought that he would win the trust of the Italian monopoly capital in this way and be invited to join in its dance. Khrushchev saw the danger of the revisionist parties, both those of the countries which were members of the Warsaw Treaty and those which were outside it, breaking away from the tutelage of Moscow, therefore he tried to preserve «unity». However, Togliatti's «polycentrism» and Khrushchev's «unity» were opposing and unreal things. Revisionism splits and does not unite.

The revisionist party of Togliatti today, under Longo and Berlinguer, has steered an obscure and by no means clear course. Intellectualist and social-democratic views have made deep impressions on its line and stands. The leader of the Italian Communist Party, Palmiro Togliatti, manifested these views with increasing stridency, up to his famous «testament», which he wrote a short time before he died in Yalta. This «testament» represents the code of Italian revisionism on which the views of Eurocommunism in general are based today.

After the 20th Congress of the CPSU modern revisionism found an environment suitable for its spread in the French Communist Party also. The idea of parliamentarianism, the idea of «alliances» with social-democracy and the bourgeoisie, of struggle for reforms, had long been implanted in the leadership of this party. This was not proclaimed openly as it is now, that is, it was not raised to a theory. But the opposition to and struggle against fascism, the struggle for the defence and development of democracy, for the improvement of the situation of the

working people, all of them actions correct in principle and also correct as tactics, were not linked by the French Communist Party with the final aim, with the socialist perspective. For the leadership of the French Communist Party, this perspective was obscure, or something which was accepted in theory but was considered to be unrealizable in the conditions of France.

The French Communist Party, as we said, had avoided changing the war for national liberation into a people's revolution, had turned away from the struggle for the armed seizure of state power. The working class and its party shed their blood, but for whom? In fact, for the French bourgeoisie and the Anglo-American imperialists. How should this course of the French Communist Party be described? Bluntly: betrayal of the revolution. Politely: an opportunist liberal line.

It is true that the French Communist Party was not liquidated either by the German occupiers or by reaction, but the negative phenomenon occurred that, with the liberation of the country, the partisan forces which were led by the party were disarmed by the bourgeoisie, or more precisely, the leadership of the party itself took the decision that «they should be disarmed» since «the Homeland had been liberated».

With the liberation of the country, the bourgeoisie again took power while the communists were left out of the banquet. The victor's carriage was prepared for De Gaulle, who was proclaimed the saviour of the French people. To avoid the resistance and strikes of disillusioned and revolted workers, De Gaulle summoned Maurice Thorez and one or two other communists to the government. The Communist Party paid for this place at the bottom of the table which the bourgeoisie gave it by adopting stands contrary to the interests and will of the French working class.

One mistake inevitably leads to another. Dizzy with the electoral success which they achieved in the elections of November 10, 1946, where the communists and socialists won the absolute majority of seats in the National Assembly, the leaders of the French Communist Party went even further down the road of reformism. Precisely at this time Maurice Thorez gave an interview to the correspondent of the British newspaper *The Times*, in which he said that the development of democratic forces throughout the world and the weakening of the capitalist bourgeoisie after the Second World War induced him to envisage for France «...the transition to socialism on roads other than those which the Russian communists followed thirty years ago... In any case, the road can be different for each country.»*

Perhaps this road to socialism, about which Thorez spoke at that time, was not exactly the Khrushchevite road, the contours of which were laid out later. But in any case «the different road», which Thorez sought then, was not that of the revolution.

The French bourgeoisie and American imperialism did not allow Thorez and the leadership of the French Communist Party to live long with their dreams of the parliamentary road to socialism. Not much later, through a simple decree of the socialist premier of that time. Ramadier, the communists were thrown out of the government.

At its meeting in October 1947, the Central Committee of the French Communist Party was obliged to make self-criticism about its mistaken stands and actions at that period, about its incorrect evaluation of the situation, the ratio of forces, the policy of the Socialist Party etc.

Thus, beginning from the end of 1947, the French

* M. Thorez. *Fils du peuple*, Paris 1960, p. 234.

Communist Party began to see certain questions more correctly. It raised the working class in important class battles and big strikes, which had a pronounced political character, especially those of the years 1947 and 1948, which caused panic among the French bourgeoisie. At that time the French Communist Party fought against the Marshallization of France and the warmongering policy of American imperialism. It opposed the establishment of American bases in France and rose against the new colonial wars of French imperialism. The party called on the working class to oppose the colonial war in Vietnam, not merely with propaganda but also with concrete actions.

In this struggle the French working class produced from its ranks such heroes and heroines as Raymonde Dien, who lay down on the rails to stop a train loaded with arms for Vietnam.

The French Communist Party took an active part in the meeting of the Information Bureau which examined the situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. It condemned and sternly denounced the betrayal by Tito and his group.

However, after the death of Stalin and Khrushchev's advent to power, vacillations and deviations appeared again in the line of the French Communist Party and the stands of its leaders. These vacillations were apparent as early as 1954, in its attitude towards the liberation war of the Algerian people.

What did the French Communist Party do to assist this war? It waged only a propaganda campaign and nothing more. It was its duty to display its internationalism towards the liberation war of the Algerian people in deeds, because in this way it would have fought for the freedom of the French people too. It did not do this because it was guided by opportunist and nationalist stands. The French Communist Party went even further. It stop-

ped the Communist Party of Algeria from taking part in the war. The facts show that when the flames of the national liberation war were sweeping Algeria, the Algerian communists did nothing, while the general secretary of the party, Larbi Buhali, went skiing and broke his leg in the Tatra Mountains of Czechoslovakia.

When Khrushchev and the Khrushchevites began their activity to seize power and bring about the capitalist degeneration of the Soviet Union, when they launched their attack against Stalin at the 20th Congress, it seemed that, in general, the French Communist Party was opposed to Khrushchevite revisionism and the Italian Communist Party. Apparently, Thorez and the leadership of the French Communist Party regarded the changes which were taking place in the Soviet Union with suspicion.

This could be seen in their stand towards the question of Stalin, when they did not associate themselves with Khrushchev's slanders; it was apparent at the time of the events in Poland and Hungary in 1956, when, in general, they maintained correct stands.

However, after Khrushchev and his group liquidated Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovich and others, after he consolidated his position in the party and the state and took the bit between his teeth, it was seen that the leadership of the French Communist Party headed by Thorez was wavering. Little by little and from concession to concession it went over from its anti-Khrushchevite position to the position of Khrushchev. Was this fortuitous? Was it an aberration by Thorez? Was it a retreat on his part or on the part of Duclos and the other leaders in the face of the pressures, praises and blandishments of Khrushchev and his other putschist methods? Of course, those methods were used and had their influence in the transition to, and later, the uninterrupted march of the French Communist Party towards revisionism. But these do not ac-

count for everything. The true causes must be sought within the French Communist Party itself, in its earlier stands, in its internal structure and organization, in its composition and in the external environment which exerted its own pressure on that party.

The process of the descent of the French Communist Party into revisionism did not take place within one day. Quantity was transformed into quality over a relatively long period. The parliamentary reformist road, the Thorez road of «the extended hand», his admiration for and concessions to a series of intellectuals, some of whom were expelled after their betrayal, while others remained in the party, and developed defeatism, spreading all sorts of theories which distorted Marxism-Leninism, brought the French Communist Party to revisionist positions. The French Communist Party lived surrounded by a bourgeois, revisionist, Trotskyite, anarchist, political and ideological environment which beat ceaselessly at its walls, which penetrated them and caused the party great damage.

Major international events also created great upheavals in the French Communist Party. The publication of Khrushchev's secret report against Stalin, which was exploited by all the European and world bourgeoisie, also created a turbulent situation in the French Communist Party. The stand which this party adopted towards events in Hungary and Poland encountered the stern opposition of the big bourgeoisie of France, the middle bourgeoisie, the liberal intellectuals, as well as opportunists outside and also inside the party.

The events which occurred in France in connection with the war in Algeria also brought about that the old opportunist views and stands again came to the surface and became predominant in the French Communist Party.

All these factors taken together transformed the French Communist Party, from one of the parties with

the greatest authority, as it had been known in the past, into a social-democratic reformist revisionist party. In a word, the French Communist Party turned back to the former traditions of the old socialist party from which it had broken away at the Congress of Tours in 1920.

One of the revisionist parties which has come out most fervently with the banner of Eurocommunism is the party of Carrillo. How did it come about that the Communist Party of Spain, a party which distinguished itself for its resolute stand at the time of the Popular Front and the Civil War, became united with the Khrushchevites and reached the state of corruption, degeneration and treachery it is in today? The changes did not and could not come about all at once, without a protracted process of decline and degeneration within the Spanish party and especially in its leadership.

In the early years after the Second World War the leadership of the Communist Party of Spain and the majority of its members were in France, where they lived a more or less legal life. The Spanish Republican government was in exile too. This was the time when the communists were still in the governments of countries like France and Italy. The Spanish communists too, began to act like their French and Italian comrades. In 1946 the Spanish Republican government in exile was re-formed in Paris. The Communist Party of Spain sent Santiago Carrillo as its representative to this government.

When the communist ministers were expelled from the governments in France and Italy in May 1947, the situation began to become difficult for the Communist Party of Spain and its cadres and militants, also. In August of the same year the Spanish communists were expelled from the government in exile. The police searches, arrests and other measures against them began

anew. The infiltration of French and Francoite police into the ranks of the Spanish communists and democrats became more intensive.

It became ever more difficult for the leaders and cadres of the party to stay and work in France, therefore, they went to Prague, East Berlin, and other countries of people's democracy. Their exodus towards these countries more or less coincided with the time when the Khrushchevite revisionist scum began to surface in the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe.

The meetings of the Political Bureau and the Central Committee of the Party began to be held far away from Spain. Those communists, who had known the harsh conditions of the Civil War and illegal life in Spain, the difficulties and privations of life in exile in France, began to get the taste for the luxury and comfort of the castles of Bohemia and Germany, to become acquainted with the blandishments and praise, as well as with the various pressures of the Khrushchevite revisionists, the apparatchiki and their secret agents. As events showed, the leadership of the Communist Party of Spain became one of the most obedient blind tools of Nikita Khrushchev and those of his group.

In 1954 the 5th Congress of the Communist Party of Spain was held. At that congress the first elements of the spirit of pacifism and class conciliation became apparent, that spirit which, a little later, was to become the platform of Spanish revisionism and would find its most complete expression in Carrillo's ultra-revisionist work of betrayal.

Adopting the Khrushchevite road of peaceful transition to socialism, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Spain published a document in June 1956, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the Civil War, in which it formulated its policy of «national reconciliation». The Communist Party of Spain expressed its sup-

port for an agreement between forces which 20 years earlier had fought one another with opposing armies. «A vengeful policy will not help to get the country... out of this situation. Spain needs peace and reconciliation between its sons...»* said this declaration.

The time of the resolute stands of the Spanish communists against the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera⁽⁴⁾ and the generals' «pronunciamento», stands which had increased the influence of the Communist Party among the masses and had strengthened and tempered it, had passed. Now was the time of the line of the most vulgar opportunism, of blandishments and of bending the knee to the bourgeoisie and its parties, to the Catholic Church and the Spanish army, a line which was to rank the party of Dolores Ibarruri and Carrillo among the typically social-democratic parties.

We were unaware of the internal process of retrogression which had occurred in the Communist Party of Spain, but at the Meeting of the communist and workers' parties in Moscow in November 1960, when the Party of Labour of Albania openly exposed modern revisionism and especially Soviet revisionism, headed by the traitor to and renegade from Marxism-Leninism, Khrushchev, the Communist Party of Spain and Ibarruri personally attacked us in the most vicious way.

Thus, when it came to defending Marxism-Leninism, the leaders of the Communist Party of Spain savagely attacked the Party of Labour of Albania and defended Khrushchev and his group of traitors to Marxism-Leninism. Time proved that our Party of Labour was on the right road, on the Marxist-Leninist road, while the Com-

* C. Colombo, *Storia del Partito Comunista Spagnolo*, Milano 1972, pp. 186-187.

⁴ The dictatorial fascist regime of Primo de Rivera ruled in Spain from 1923-1930.

munist Party of Spain, headed by Ibarrruri, had lined up totally with the camp of renegades from and enemies of communism.

After 1960 major quarrels and differences emerged in the Communist Party of Spain which led to its splitting, as a result of which two anti-Marxist revisionist groups were created: the one pro-Soviet, with Lister at the head, and the other, a faction led by Ibarrruri and Carrillo, which sought independence from Moscow in order to adopt the line which later took the name Eurocommunism.

The line of Carrillo became more and more identical with the line of the Italian Communist Party and that of the French Communist Party. Likewise, it conformed with the line of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. Thus a still structureless unity began to crystallize between Titoism, the Italian revisionist party, the French revisionist party, and the Spanish revisionist party of Ibarrruri.

At the time when this grouping of West-European revisionists, including Tito, which wanted to break away from Moscow, was being formed, Mao Zedong's Communist Party of China welcomed Carrillo to Peking and had close and intimate talks with him. What the content of these talks was has not been revealed, but time is showing that the Chinese revisionists and the Spanish revisionists have many things in common. Therefore, open official links between the Chinese revisionist party and the Spanish revisionist party will be established before long.

Carrillo also adopted the political orientations, the aims, strategies and tactics of the Italian and French revisionist parties for the establishment of close collaboration with the reactionary bourgeoisie and the bourgeois capitalist states. However, the Communist Party of Spain still did not have legal status. For this reason, even under Franco, it made great efforts to be legalized within Spain.

Francoism and Franco did not allow such a thing. After the death of Franco, with the coming to power of King Juan Carlos, Carrillo achieved some results in the direction of legalizing the party. However, in return for this legality, he had to make such statements and such colossal concessions in principle that even the French Communist Party and the Italian Communist Party had not permitted themselves to make to the capitalist bourgeoisie of their countries. In order to return to Spain and legalize the party, Carrillo agreed to recognize the regime of King Juan Carlos, indeed he went so far as to praise it and call it «democratic», and accepted the monarchy and its flag. After this submission, the monarchists gave him carte blanche. The Communist Party of Spain was legalized. Carrillo and Ibarruri returned to Spain together with the whole herd of Spanish traitors.

As soon as they returned to Madrid, the revisionist chiefs openly denied the Republic and declared that the Spanish War now belonged to history. Coalition with the other bourgeois parties and the struggle for participation in the government of the country was proclaimed as the foundation of their line. In the various elections which have been held in Spain, Carrillo's party has not won more than 9 per cent of the votes and has a few deputies in parliament. Carrillo has described this a «great democratic victory which will change the face of Spain». But in fact, the Spanish revisionists can never clean up the face of Spain because what Ibarruri, Carrillo and company have in their hands is not soap but tar. They have rejected the red flag of the revolution and have shamelessly trampled underfoot the blood of tens and hundreds of thousands of heroes of the Spanish War.

In the reformist and opportunist transformation of the communist parties of the Western countries, the line

which the Soviet revisionist Leadership established in its relations with them played an important role. The aim of the Khrushchevite revisionists of the Soviet Union was to compel the revisionist parties of the different countries to follow them in the policy of establishing their social-imperialist hegemony over the whole world. They demanded that these parties become their assistants in the fiendish activity they had engaged in.

Naturally, the American imperialists and their allies could not approve the hegemonic and expansionist aims of the Soviet social-imperialists. Nor could the revisionist parties of different countries agree with the Soviet policy. Urged by the bourgeoisie of their own countries, they began ever more openly to carry on separate activities independently of the revisionist party of the Soviet Union.

One after the other, the revisionist parties of Western Europe, Latin America and Asia rose to a greater or lesser extent against the Khrushchevite Soviet hegemony, at the same time bringing out new anti-Marxist theories. The «theories» of the big revisionist parties of Western Europe, which took the name Eurocommunism, very quickly became the most complete and most publicized of these theories. As soon as it emerged on the scene, Eurocommunism, like Titoite and Khrushchevite revisionism, began a frontal struggle against Marxism-Leninism, with the aim of revising and discrediting its fundamental principles in the eyes of the workers.

From Revisionist Opportunism to Bourgeois Anti-Communism

Eurocommunism is a variant of modern revisionism, a hotch-potch of pseudo-theories opposed to Marxism-Leninism. Its aim is to hinder the scientific theory of

Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin from remaining a strong and unerring weapon in the hands of the working class and the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties for the destruction of capitalism, its structure and superstructure, to its foundations, for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the construction of the new socialist society.

The Italian revisionists have defined Eurocommunism as «a third road, different from the experience of the parties of social-democracy and different from those which have been promoted since the October Revolution in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries». As the theses of the 15th Congress of the Italian Communist Party have it, this «third road» is presented as «a solution which is adapted to the national characteristics and the conditions of the present epoch, to the essential features and demands which are common to developed industrial societies, which are based on parliamentary democratic institutions, as the countries of Western Europe are today.»*

Hence, as the Eurocommunists themselves admit, this «third road», this so-called Eurocommunism, has nothing at all to do with the genuine scientific communism elaborated by Marx and Lenin, embodied in the October Revolution and in the other socialist revolutions that followed it, and confirmed by the class struggle of the international proletariat. Eurocommunism can be described accurately and correctly as European revisionism number three.

Now the French Communist Party, the Italian and Spanish parties, have only the name communist, because the three of them are floundering in the stinking waters of the bourgeoisie which they serve. The programs of the

* *La politica e l'organizzazione dei comunisti Italiani*, Roma 1979, pp. 8-9.

revisionist parties of the Western countries are typically reformist programs, which do not differ from the programs of the bourgeois parties, socialist and social-democratic, which sing the same refrain. Indeed, it is the latter which inspire the revisionists. Their objective is not the proletarian revolution and the socialist transformation of society, but the creation of the opinion among the broad masses that they should abandon the revolution, which, they say, has become unnecessary and inappropriate. But what should be done, according to them? «We must transform our life-style», «we must change our way of life», «we must think about the day-to-day problems», «we must not attack present-day capitalist society», «we must carry out a cultural revolution in place of the proletarian revolution», explain these anti-Marxist parties day and night. «We must live better, must protect our wages and not allow them to be reduced, must have paid holidays and guaranteed jobs», «what more can we ask?» they say to the workers. The Italian and French revisionist parties deal with these questions at every meeting and every congress and feed this stuff to the proletariat and the workers in order to win their votes.

The classical revisionism of the social-democratic type has been integrated into modern revisionism. The theories of Bernstein and Kautsky in various forms, sometimes openly and sometimes modified, are found in the revisionist Browder, are found in Khrushchevite revisionism, in Titoite revisionism, in French revisionism and in the Italian revisionism of Togliatti, in the so-called Mao Zedong thought, and all revisionist currents. These innumerable anti-Marxist currents, which are developing in the present-day capitalist and revisionist world, are the fifth column in the ranks of the world revolution to prolong the existence of international capitalism by fighting the revolution from within.

Negation of Marxism-Leninism is the objective which capitalism and imperialism have always wanted and want to achieve. In this direction modern revisionism is helping them with all its means and ways, open and disguised, with all kinds of pseudo-scientific philosophical theories and slogans.

At the 22nd Congress of the French Communist Party, Marchais declared that they would go to socialism without class struggle, and that the dictatorship of the proletariat was no longer needed to build it. He admitted that in his «socialism» there would be not merely different parties, but even parties of reaction. Thus, for Marchais, as for Brezhnev and Tito, socialism has already begun to be built in many countries where capital rules, and all that is necessary is to put the signboard «socialist country» over the gate.

In other words, since all countries are going to socialism spontaneously, as the revisionists preach, no one allegedly has any need for Marxism-Leninism as the science of revolution and socialism, for it now belongs to the past, and therefore should be abandoned.

The various revisionists allege that Marxism-Leninism «is in its dotage», that it is no longer capable of solving the problems which the developed society of the present day raises, that it is no longer suitable to present-day civilization. According to them, modern society has absorbed all that it can absorb from Marxism-Leninism, and this has entered the ranks of outdated philosophies such as Kantism, positivism, Bergsonian irrationalism and other idealist philosophies. The ultra-revisionist Milovan Djilas writes openly that Marxism-Leninism, a philosophy elaborated in the 19th century, can no longer be valid when contemporary science is much more developed than the science and philosophy of the past century.

Proceeding on this road, during the last two or three

years, the Italian, French and Spanish revisionists have made great efforts to formulate in theory their opportunist views and stands, which they call Eurocommunism, and to give them the character of a separate ideological and political doctrine, which allegedly represents «a new development of Marxism». In the recent congresses which these parties have held, and in the programs which were adopted, Eurocommunism assumed a completely defined form. These three parties have officially rejected Marxism-Leninism. The French of Marchais, who consider the theory of Marx a «theory with dry and dogmatic concepts», «a closed system of unalterable rules», say that the new «theory» which they have created, has «its sources in the philosophical and political currents of our nation»*. It is self-evident that the French revisionists are not referring to those revolutionary progressive philosophical contributions which Marx included in a critical way in his work, but precisely to those views which he exposed and refuted and which the revisionists have now made their own.

The revisionists' removal of any reference to Marxism-Leninism in their Constitutions, programs and other documents, is not an act of just a formal character, which sanctions what they had done in practice long before. Likewise this act does not represent only the implementation of the will of the bourgeoisie, its demand that the revisionist parties must no longer mention «the spectre of communism». Neither is it only an act which officially expresses the open transition of modern revisionism to the ideological positions of European social-democracy. The abandonment of any reference to Marxism-Leninism by the revisionist parties, which up till now have used it as a disguise to deceive the working people, shows that they have commenced an open struggle against it

* *Cahiers du communisme*, juin-juillet 1979, p. 392.

from the positions of bourgeois anti-communism. The fact is that on the ideological plane, it is precisely the Eurocommunists who are carrying the banner of struggle against Marxism-Leninism, socialism and the revolution today. The publicity which the big bourgeois press, the publishing trusts, the radio and the television are giving to the articles, books, speeches and congresses of the revisionists is truly astounding. Figures such as Berlinguer, Marchais, and even Carrillo have been transformed by the big propaganda machine into personalities who outstrip not only the film «stars» but even popes and heads of the biggest states. Journalists and writers pursue them at every step and never allow them to drop a word without publishing it in the biggest headlines on the front pages of newspapers.

All this advertisement, all this clamour, is evidence of the great joy of the bourgeoisie, which has found zealous lackeys who are fighting communism from the left, as they say, at a time when its open anti-communist weapons had become rusty and broken. Capital could not find anything better or more effective in the difficult situations it is experiencing than the service which the revisionists offer. Therefore, the praise which the bourgeoisie is heaping on the demagogy and deception, the theoretical speculations and practical activity with which the revisionists are manoeuvring to deceive and disorganize the workers, is completely understandable and justifiable.

The Bourgeois Conception of Bourgeois Society

The Eurocommunists try to paint a distorted picture of the present-day capitalist society and its contradictions, to present it as a society which has evolved so

greatly since the time of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin that their fundamental analyses and teachings about it «are out of date and no longer valid».

They see present-day capitalist society as unified and no longer distinguish its polarization into proletarians and bourgeois, no longer see the contradiction between these two classes as the fundamental contradiction, and consequently do not see the class struggle as the main motive force of this society. For the Eurocommunists, of course, there are certain contradictions, which they call contradictions of «development», of «progress», of «well-being», of «democracy» etc., which have allegedly replaced the old contradictions, especially the contradiction between labour and capital, on which the whole Marxist-Leninist theory about the role and the historic mission of the proletariat, the revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism is based.

Today, they say, the proletariat of the time of Marx and Lenin no longer exists, the classes have changed and they are no longer those which Marx and Lenin knew and about which they spoke. Nowadays, say the Eurocommunists, even the bourgeois class has dissolved as a class, has been transformed into «workers» and all the wealth has been gathered in the hands of a small clique of capitalists who preserve and defend this property. Marchais, for example, has «discovered» that in France today the bourgeoisie «that counts» has been reduced to only 25 financial and industrial groups, while the others are «workers». Consequently, stress the revisionist renegades, the present-day bourgeois capitalist state has changed, because society itself has changed and the classes have changed. Therefore, they reason, Marx and Lenin, who did not know the present-day capitalist state, which is entirely different from that of their time, foresaw another role for the proletariat, which differs from that of the

present day, another method for the seizure of power by the proletariat, another method of struggle to go over to socialism.

For the Eurocommunist revisionists, all the classes and strata of capitalist society today, and especially the intelligentsia, have been identified with the proletariat. With the exception of a small handful of capitalists, in their eyes all the others, without distinction, want to change society from a bourgeois society into a socialist society. And in order to carry out this change, according to the Eurocommunists, the old society has to be reformed and not overthrown.

Hence, they imagine that state power must be taken gradually, through reforms, through the development of culture, and through the close collaboration of all classes without exception, both those who hold and those who do not hold this power.

All the revisionists follow the course of Marcuse, who when he speaks about the American proletariat, tries «to prove» that in the «highly industrialized American society», a proletariat in the Marxist sense does not exist, because, according to him, this proletariat now allegedly belongs to history.

To Marcuse, Garaudy, Berlinguer, Carrillo, Marchais, and their company, this means that the «consumer society», «developed industrial society», has not only changed the form of the old capitalist society but has also levelled out the classes, and as Georges Marchais in particular has declared, now «we can no longer talk about the French proletariat, but about the French working class».

Marx said that

«... our 'proletarian' is economically none other than the wage-labourer who produces and increases 'capital', and is thrown out on the streets as

*soon as he is superfluous for the needs of aggrandisement of 'Monsieur capital'...»**

What has changed in France that Marchais can no longer see proletarians? Are there no longer wage-labourers who produce surplus value and increase capital, are there no longer unemployed whom «Monsieur capital» has thrown out on the streets as unwanted?

In socialist Albania, certainly, the proletariat no longer exists in the sense that this notion has in the capitalist countries, because in our country the working class has the state power in its hands, is the owner of the main means of production, is not oppressed or exploited, and works freely for itself and for the socialist society.

The matter is quite different in the capitalist countries where the working class is deprived of the means of production and, in order to live, is obliged to sell its labour power and submit to capitalist exploitation, which is continuously increasing its intensity. Besides being savagely oppressed and exploited to the bone, the proletariat in those countries also suffers the oppression of the bourgeois army and police. Although the proletariat in the capitalist states may be dressed in the nylon materials which the «consumer society» produces, in fact it remains the proletariat.

It is not without purpose that the modern revisionists change the name of the proletariat. If one speaks of the proletariat, which in capitalism possesses nothing but the strength of its arms, it is self-evident that this proletariat has to fight its exploiters and oppressors. It is precisely this struggle which has the objective of destroying the old state power of capital to its foundations, that terrifies the bourgeoisie and precisely in this context the revisionists

* K. Marx, *Capital*, vol. 1, book 3, p. 74, Alb. ed.

assist the bourgeoisie with all the means they possess.

The denial of the existence of the proletariat as a class in itself, as the most advanced class of society, charged by history with the glorious mission of eliminating the exploitation of man by man and building the new, truly free, equal, just and humane society, is nothing new. The various opportunists were preaching it at the time when Marxism was emerging as a philosophic doctrine and a political movement. Marx and Engels refuted these views and gave the proletariat weapons and arguments to fight not only these, but also the other lackeys of the bourgeoisie, the future apologists of capitalism, such as the modern revisionists today.

One of the greatest merits of Marxism is that it saw in the proletariat not just an oppressed and exploited class, but the most progressive and revolutionary class of the time, the class which history had charged with the mission of the grave-digger of capitalism. Marx and Engels explained that this mission stems from the socio-economic conditions themselves, from the place which the proletariat occupies and the role which it plays in the process of production and socio-political life, from the fact that it is the bearer of the new relations of the future socialist society, that it has its own scientific ideology which illuminates its way, has its own leading staff — the communist party.

Despite the changes which have occurred in the development of the economy and the social composition of capitalist society, the overall conditions of the existence, the work and the life of the proletariat today remain those which Marx analysed. No other class or social stratum can replace the proletariat as the main and leading force of the revolutionary processes for the progressive transformation of society.

The teachings of Marx on this question remain un-

shaken. In the Marxist theory the proletariat finds its own spiritual weapon, just as this theory finds its material weapon in the proletariat. Marx said that the proletariat is the heart of the revolution while philosophy is its head. Marx's *Capital* is the beacon light for the world proletariat, which shows it scientifically in what manner and in what forms the bourgeoisie exploits it. The capitalists chain the proletariat to the factories and machines, but *Capital* teaches the proletariat how to break these chains.

The revisionist theses about the change in the nature of the proletariat and its historic mission have long existed in the communist parties of the Western countries, but the first to come out with them publicly and officially was Roger Garaudy, Garaudy was one of the first revisionist «theoreticians» to develop the theory that one could no longer talk about the impoverishment of the French proletariat and that the various classes and strata of the population were already moving towards blending and unification.

The thesis of Garaudy, now repeated and applied by the other revisionists, is that «in the present situation, there is no longer any need for violent revolution, because the workers are gradually sharing actively in the profits of the big capitalist enterprises, which now are no longer run by the bourgeois owners, but by the technicians who have replaced them». This is a great fraud, because these technicians and specialists are under the thumb of a single management, they are the servants of the big capitalist trusts and monopolies which are the real owners of the means of production.

In the capitalist world, despite the changes which have taken place in the social class structure, nothing has altered in regard to the positions of classes and class relationships. The theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and

Stalin about classes and the class struggle in bourgeois society retains its full freshness and validity.

A series of other «theories» similar to that of Garaudy emerged in the West from both the «new» French pseudo-philosophers and from their German, American, Italian and other counterparts. All these theories carry the brand of revisionism, Trotskyism, anarchism and social-democracy. The moment arrived when all these theories became completely the private property of the French, Italian, Spanish, British and other revisionist parties, which gathered up all this revisionist and opportunist refuse and codified it in a banal way.

Daily life, the struggle of the working class, has exposed these theories and continues to do so. It has revealed their reactionary counterrevolutionary aim. It proves that the working class is impoverished the more the capitalists are enriched, that it properly understands what Marx said, that the more wealth each worker produces the poorer he becomes, that the more commodities the worker makes the more he reduces his own value as a commodity, that the proletariat cannot escape from exploitation without taking over the means of production and without destroying the state power of the bourgeoisie.

Today, the modern revisionists such as Marchais, Berlinguer, Carrillo and company, reject this scientific view of Marx. Today, they say, the process of the relative and absolute impoverishment of the proletariat no longer exists because of the development of the technical-scientific revolution and the gains which the workers have achieved through reforms. They want to tell the proletarians that all their demands and needs are being fulfilled from the hand-outs which capitalism gives them, therefore they have no reason to rise in revolution.

Some other revisionist «theoreticians», faced with the

undeniable facts of life, declare that it is true that Marx spoke about the exploitation of the working class, but what he said is equally valid for both the capitalist and the socialist countries. Consequently, the working class has no reason to rise against capitalist exploitation because allegedly it can never escape it! This is a distortion of the reality and a slander. The position of the working class in capitalism and its position in socialism are diametrically opposite.

In the capitalist and revisionist countries the worker is not free, either in work or in life. He is a slave to the machine, to the capitalist and the technocrat, who squeeze out the last drop of his labour power and from this create surplus value for capital. Only in the genuine socialist order, in which the working class is in power, do the teachings of Marx, properly applied, provide the possibility for the proletariat to become conscious and completely the master of the means of production and, through its dictatorship, to gain all its political, economic and democratic freedoms and rights.

The binding of the working class with economic chains, with which capitalism shackles it, is the main thing in bourgeois society. The whole capitalist system has been built on this bondage. However, the bourgeois and revisionist theoreticians, being quite unable to deny this great truth, try to obscure the question of economic exploitation about which Marx speaks and which is primary, and to interpret it through a series of concocted theses and false views. Being unable to refute the binding of the worker to capital, these «theoreticians» preach that allegedly there is no longer any need to point out how much the owner in the capitalist order squeezes and enslaves men, but what should be pointed out is that his link with capital is allegedly in favour of the worker because it keeps him alive. Their aim is to divert the

proletariat from the class struggle against capitalism by trying to focus its attention on the «blessings» of the «consumer society».

The modern revisionists have invented many deceptive theses to divert attention from economic oppression and exploitation. They give great publicity to their thesis that in the «consumer society» the worker enjoys so many things that he regards the economic problems as coming at the bottom of the list. According to them, almost his only worries are the problems of religion, the family, his wife, his TV-set, his car etc. And as a result the problem of economic exploitation is allegedly no longer the basic problem of the class struggle and revolution. However, they do all these things in order to water down the wine and divert the working masses from the struggle to overthrow the bourgeois order.

In breaking with Marxism-Leninism and wanting to create a new «theory» which is distinct from the doctrine of Marx and Lenin on all fundamental questions, the Eurocommunists have got themselves into a great mess and confusion, into profound incoherence and great contradictions. They are practically unable to explain any contradictions of the present-day capitalist world or to give answers to the problems which arise from them. True, they speak about such phenomena as «crisis», «unemployment», the «degradation and degeneration» of bourgeois society, but they content themselves with general observations which no one, not even the bourgeoisie, denies. However, they consciously try to cover up the cause of these phenomena, the savage capitalist exploitation, and to avoid showing that this exploitation can be eliminated only through the revolution, with the overthrow of all the old relations which keep the system of capitalist oppression on its feet.

With their theses about the «dying out of the class struggle» as a consequence of the «essential changes» which capitalist society has allegedly undergone because of the development of the forces of production, the technical-scientific revolution, the «restructuring of capitalism», etc.; with their preaching of the need to establish extensive class collaboration, because now allegedly it is not only the working class and working masses who are interested in socialism but also nearly all the strata of the bourgeoisie, except for a tiny group of monopolists; with their claim that the transition to socialism can be made through reforms, because present-day capitalist society is allegedly developing on the road of peaceful integration into socialism, etc., the Eurocommunists have identified themselves, not only in theory but also in their practical activity, with old European social-democracy and have amalgamated with it in a single counterrevolutionary current in the service of the bourgeoisie.

Their stand towards the working class and its leading role has been the touchstone for all revolutionaries at all times. Abandonment of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary movement, pointed out Lenin, is the most vulgar form of reformism. But this vulgarity does not worry the Italian revisionists. Indeed they proclaim their reformism so bombastically that they make themselves truly ludicrous. «The leading role of the working class in the process of leaving capitalism behind and building socialism,» they declare, «can and must be achieved through collaboration and agreement between different parties and currents which aspire to socialism, and within the framework of the democratic system in which all constitutional parties enjoy full rights, even those who do not want the socialist transformation of

society and oppose it, of course, while always respecting the democratic constitutional rules.»*

This «original Marxist» vision, add the supporters of Berlinguer, is not a new discovery, but the development of the thinking of Labriola and Togliatti. In this case, they themselves admit the source of their ideas. However, it should be added that Labriola, whom they are now making a classic, was not a consistent Marxist. He remained far removed from the revolutionary activity and problems of the revolution. As for Togliatti, his work already shows that he was a deviator and an opportunist.

By referring to Labriola or Togliatti, the Italian revisionists and their counterparts in France or Spain want to leave in oblivion Lenin's theory about the necessity for the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution and the construction of socialism.

In all his work of genius Lenin defended and developed Marx's theory about the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution, abandoned by the European social-democrats. Now the social-democratic views on this question have been revived by the revisionists. Lenin proved that in the new conditions of imperialism, the hegemony of the proletariat is essential not only for the socialist revolution but also for the democratic revolution. He explained that the establishment of this hegemony is essential because the proletariat is interested more than any other social class in the complete triumph of the revolution, in carrying it through to the end. With the theory of Lenin the proletariat has gone into the revolution and has won, while with the theories that the revisionists preach, it remains oppressed by the bourgeoisie.

The Leninist theory about the undivided hegemony of the working class has found a brilliant confirmation

* *La politica e l'organizzazione dei comunisti italiani*, Roma 1979, pp. 15-16.

and application in the carrying out of the revolution and the triumph of socialism in Albania, too. To the Albanian communists it was clear from the start that only one party, the Communist Party, could lead the National Liberation War through to complete victory, that only one class, the working class, could be the leader in this struggle, that the main ally of this class would be the poor and middle peasantry, that the youth and the students would be the main support of the Party and, together with the Albanian women, would comprise the fighting strata of the people's revolution.

The small number of the working class in Albania did not hinder it in the least from playing its hegemonic role because it had at the head its Communist Party, which was guided by the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. The correct line of our Party, which responded to the situation and the interests of the broad working masses, made it possible to achieve the great unity of the people around the working class in a single front under the sole and undivided leadership of the Communist Party.

The correct line and leadership of our Party led to the extension of the struggle, which gradually built up until it assumed the form of a general uprising, a broad people's armed struggle, up to the liberation of Albania and the establishment of the people's power.

In negating the hegemonic and leading role of the working class in the revolution and the construction of socialism, the Eurocommunists could not but abandon also the role and mission of the communist party, as it is defined by Marxism-Leninism and as it has been confirmed by the long history of the world revolutionary and communist movement.

The theses of the 15th Congress of the Italian Communist Party say that now a «new party» has been built.

What is this «new party»? «The Italian Communist Party,» says its Constitution, «organizes the workers, the working people, the intellectuals and the citizens who fight **within the framework of the Republican Constitution** for the consolidation and development of the anti-fascist democratic regime, for the socialist rejuvenation of society, for the independence of the peoples, for the reduction of tension and for peace, for cooperation among all nations...» The Constitution continues, «the Italian Communist Party is open to all citizens above 18 years of age, who irrespective of race, **philosophical views** and religious belief, accept the political program and undertake to act to carry it out by militating in one of the organizations of the party.»*

We quoted this long clause of the Constitution of the Italian revisionist party, which is almost identical with those of the French and Spanish revisionist parties, in order to show how far the Eurocommunist revisionists have departed from the concepts of the Leninist party and how closely they have approached the models of socialist and social-democratic parties. They speak about a «new party», wanting it to be distinct from the party of the Leninist type, but in fact their party which they call new is an «old party» of the type of the parties of the Second International, against which Lenin fought and on the ruins of which he built the Bolshevik Party which became an example and the model for all other genuine communist parties.

The statement placed at the beginning of the Constitution, that anyone, irrespective of his philosophical views and religious belief, can enter the party, requires no comment to prove that the philosophy of Marx is alien to this party, that its eclecticism is blatant, that the line

* *La politica e l'organizzazione dei comunisti italiani*, Roma 1979, p. 153.

of compromises of every kind is part of its strategy, let alone its tactics, that the Italian Communist Party is a liberal social-democratic party, with its line, policy and stands determined by the changing political circumstances. Its liberal policy ensures that at times it will get votes, but not that it will take and hold power. It makes the bourgeoisie praise it, and the priests in the churches and the monks in the monasteries sympathize with it.

Lenin's fundamental idea about the party is that it must be a conscious vanguard detachment of the working class, a Marxist detachment of it.

*«... the role of vanguard fighter,» Lenin said, «can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by the most advanced theory.»**

This revolutionary vanguard theory, a reliable guide to victory, is Marxism. Not only have the revisionists abandoned the fundamental condition for a communist party to be such, i.e., acceptance of Marxism, but they permit all the bourgeois, opportunist, reactionary or fascist philosophical views to coexist in their party, and this they have sanctioned in their Constitution. The thing that characterizes, that distinguishes the communist parties, is Marxism-Leninism, the sole ideology by which they are guided and to which they loyally adhere in all their activity. Without Marxism-Leninism there cannot be a communist party.

The genuine communist parties are parties to carry out the revolution and build socialism, while the Italian, French and Spanish so-called communist parties and

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 5, pp. 435-436, Alb. ed.

others of this type are parties of bourgeois reforms. The former are parties for the overthrow of the bourgeois order and the construction of the new world, the latter are parties for the defence of the capitalist order and the preservation of the old world.

At the time when Lenin was fighting against the opportunists for the construction of the Bolshevik Party, he said:

*«... give us an organization of revolutionaries, and we will overturn Russia!»**

He built such a party and led the Russian working class to the glorious victory of the October Revolution.

But where do Berlinguer's revisionists want to lead the Italian working class? «We must fight within the framework of the Republican Constitution,» they say. And the bourgeoisie says, «Fight as much as you like within the bars of the cage of my Constitution because this does me no harm.» The bourgeoisie maintains the army, the police, the courts, etc., to defend its Constitution, laws and institutions. Lined up beside them now is the revisionist party which is struggling to keep the working class oppressed and enslaved, to corrupt it ideologically and confuse it politically. It has transformed itself into an institution of the bourgeois state to extinguish the revolutionary spirit of the working class, to obscure the socialist perspective, to prevent it from understanding the miserable condition in which it is living and from rising in resolute struggle to overthrow the bourgeoisie.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 5, p. 555, Alb. ed.

The Eurocommunists' «Socialism» Is the Present Capitalist System

How do the Eurocommunists envisage socialism? Although they are obliged to speak about socialism for demagogy, the «socialism» which they want to build is simply a fraud and deception.

It is known that not only now, but for years, many bourgeois and petty-bourgeois philosophers and ideological trends have speculated greatly with the idea of socialism. Many Utopian schemes and endless misrepresentations have been concocted about socialism. Marx rejected all the old forms of socialism and taught the world proletariat that it should organize and fight to establish the new social order based on genuine scientific socialism.

As early as in the first programmatic document of Marxism, the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels made an all-round criticism of various pseudo-socialist theories, such as «feudal socialism», «petty-bourgeois socialism», German «genuine socialism», «conservative or bourgeois socialism». They revealed their class essence as anti-scientific theories which served the interests of the bourgeoisie. In struggle against bourgeois and petty-bourgeois opportunist and anarchist theories which hindered the emancipation of the proletariat and its struggle, the Manifesto taught the working class that it could escape bourgeois oppression and exploitation only by means of the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat and that it could not liberate itself without, at the same time, liberating the whole of society.

History has proved that since the birth of Marxism, every other ideological trend which has come out with socialist slogans has turned into a reactionary current in the process of the class struggle. Marxism alone provides the accurate idea of the genuine socialist society. No

socialism can be achieved or built without being based on this theory.

The first great confirmation of the Marxist theory formulated in the Communist Manifesto came in the revolutionary events of 1848-1849, which shook the whole of Europe.

Revolutions not only open the way to social progress but they always become the grave of Utopian, revisionist and other false doctrines. This occurred with the doctrines of «bourgeois socialism», «petty-bourgeois socialism», etc., which were buried by the revolutions of 1848-1849.

The main evil of those so-called socialist doctrines was that they completely ignored the revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat and envisaged socialism as the realization of this or that system, invented by this or that «theoretician». This was the source of all those illusions that the creation of associations supported by the state, restriction of inheritance rights, establishment of progressive tax scales would gradually lead to socialism in a peaceful way. Proudhon and Louis Blanc, the German «genuine» socialists and Utopian communists like Waitling, Cabets, Desamis and others had preached and were preaching this «doctrinaire socialism».

The working class leaves this doctrinaire socialism to the petty bourgeoisie, says Marx, while

*«... the **proletariat** rallies more and more round **revolutionary socialism**, round **communism**... This socialism,»* he continues, *«**is the declaration of the permanence of the revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as the necessary transit point to the abolition of class distinctions generally, to the abolition of all the relations of production on which they rest, to the abolition of all the social relations that correspond to these rela-***

*tions of production, to the revolutionizing of all the ideas that result from these social relations.»**

At present the new Proudhonists, such as Georges Marchais, Enrico Berlinguer, Santiago Carrillo and others, are trying to impose on the West-European proletariat these old philosophies which were refuted by Marx, dressed up in different cloaks. All the revisionists want to deceive the masses with their «theories» by eliminating the scientific foundations of Marxism. They are simply telling lies when they say that «they are objective in their recognition of the laws which make society advance»! In reality they have become lackeys of the «consumer society» created by the capitalist and imperialist bourgeoisie to ensure maximum profits from the exploitation of the working class and all the working masses. These revisionists also want to consume something from the surplus value which is extracted from the proletariat of their countries.

The question of what socialism is, what socialist society is, what it represents and achieves at present is not a question of the future, but a concrete reality, a whole historical practice, a tangible social system. Genuine scientific socialism, that advocated by the great geniuses of the revolution, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, was achieved and existed for a long time in the Soviet Union and many other former socialist countries, and it exists and is advancing in socialist Albania. The efforts which the Eurocommunists are making today «to prove» that genuine socialism has allegedly never existed anywhere, that the socialist society built in the Soviet Union by Lenin and Stalin was allegedly a «distortion of socialism», indeed a «failure» of the concepts and ideas which Marx

* K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, vol. 1, Tirana 1975, p. 226, Alb. ed.

and Lenin had of socialism, are nothing but expressions of their hostility to communism, expressions of their desire to keep the existing bourgeois society intact.

The Italian, French and Spanish revisionists have travelled a long road to reach the point of their denial of socialism. At first, they claimed that socialism in the Soviet Union was divided into two parts, a «Leninist socialism» which was good, just, but conditioned by the special historical conditions of czarist Russia, therefore unsuitable for the developed capitalist countries, and a «Stalinist socialism» which was bad, because allegedly it was a distortion of the former, deformed, bureaucratized, and so on. This evolution in judgements is not accidental. If the «Leninist experience» were accepted, even with reservations, if the justice of the use of the revolutionary violence for the seizure of power were accepted, for example, then there would be no place left for the Eurocommunists' «model» of socialism. Lenin's theory on the revolution and the construction of socialism, which is a further development of Marx's teachings, is so much a whole, so coherent, so scientific and logical that it must be accepted as it is or not accepted at all. It cannot be chopped into pieces without falling into irreconcilable contradictions and absurdities of logic.

Thus the Eurocommunists are now no longer opposed only to Stalin, but have abandoned Leninism, too, thinking that with this they have escaped and found the way to preach «Eurocommunist socialism». But if they have abandoned Leninism, the proletariat has not done so. Leninism is a living science, the militant ideology of the proletariat, the banner of the revolution and the construction of socialism. Leninism is that powerful weapon with which all genuine revolutionaries, all those who want communism and are striving for socialism, fight against all enemies, against the bourgeoisie and its collab-

orators. Leninism is the mirror which brings to light the true features of the Eurocommunists and all other revisionists, which reveals the falsity of their opportunist «theories», which shows up their reactionary activity against the proletariat, socialism and the peoples' cause.

In order to avoid the dissatisfaction of the rank and file of their parties, the doubts which the «theories» they propose about «socialism» and their confused, contradictory theses in general arouse, the Eurocommunists declare that their socialism still does not represent a «model», is not yet something clear and defined, but only an expression of the «need to find the way» towards this society which must be discussed. In other words, it is just beating the air, because nothing is being achieved.

The «socialism» envisaged by the Eurocommunists is a society in which socialist and capitalist elements are combined and coexist in the economy and politics, in the base and superstructure. In their «socialism» there will be both «socialist property» and capitalist property, hence there will also be exploiting and exploited classes; alongside the party of the working class there will also be bourgeois parties; the proletarian ideology will coexist with the other ideologies; in this «socialism» the state will be a state in which all parties and classes have power.

The Eurocommunists can dream as much as they like about such a hybrid capitalist-socialist society, but this society which they propose can never be achieved. Socialism and capitalism are two different social systems which are mutually exclusive. Capitalism exists as long as it keeps the proletariat and the working masses oppressed and exploited, while socialism is built and advances only on the ruins of capitalism, after it is completely overthrown.

In order to justify their profoundly opportunist views, the Eurocommunists overrate the role of equipment, of

means of production in the development of society, thus slipping into the so-called theory of productive forces, which was the ideological basis of all the opportunism of the Second International.

According to them, the impulse towards socialism comes automatically and spontaneously from the development of productive forces. Therefore, they claim, for the transition to socialism there is no need for class struggle or proletarian revolution. Moreover, according to the Eurocommunists, even in those countries where the revolution has been carried out and socialist relations of production have been established, if there is a relatively low level of productive forces, there can be no talk of genuine socialism there.

In order to see how far the Eurocommunists have departed from the idea of socialism and what sort of socialist society they pretend that they have to build, one need only examine some of their main theses, about which they beat the big drum so loudly as the «highest development of the progressive thought of present-day human society.»

«An integral nationalization of the means of production is not necessary to achieve a socialist society,» declare the Italian revisionists. «Alongside a public sector... private initiative will operate... Freely united peasant property; crafts; small and middle industry; the private initiative in the tertiary field... will play a special role. In this concept of the transformation of society in the socialist sense, there must be a linking of the economic system in order to ensure an integration between programming and the market, between public and private initiative...»*

The French revisionists also proclaim such a «social-

* *La politica e l'organizzazione dei comunisti italiani*, Roma 1979, pp. 12-13.

ism». This society, they say, «requires a sufficient body of democratic nationalizations, along with other forms of social property and an economic sector based on private property.»*

Carrillo says, «This system, which will have a mixed character in the field of the economy, will be expressed in a political regime in which the owners will be organized not only economically but also in one or more political parties, which represent their interests. This situation will become one of the components of political and ideological pluralism.»**

It requires no special knowledge of social laws to understand that the tableau of the so-called socialist society which the Eurocommunists present is nothing other than the precise and most typical tableau of present-day bourgeois society. The basic element which determines a social system is the ownership of the means of production. If the ownership of the means of production is private, then we have to do with a system in which man exploits man, in which wealth is accumulated in the hands of the minority at one pole, while the overwhelming majority of the people live in poverty and want at the other pole. It has already been proved that socialism cannot exist without the elimination of capitalist property and the smashing of the bourgeois state. There can never be socialism without the establishment of social ownership of the means of production in all sectors without exception, without the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The proletariat has fought with courage, sacrifice and abnegation to overthrow the relations of capitalist owner-

* *The Democratic Road to Socialism for France, L'Humanité*, January 13, 1979.

** S. Carrillo, «Eurocommunisme» et Etat, France 1977, pp. 121-122.

ship of the means of production. To this end, it has elaborated its own ideology, Marxism-Leninism, which must guide it in the revolution and the establishment of social ownership of the means of production, in the elimination of the exploitation which arises from private ownership of these means, and in the elimination of poverty. The proletariat realized this objective in those countries where the revolution triumphed and socialism was established. This experience, which the construction of socialism in Albania is confirming more and more each day, shows that the fundamental condition for the construction of socialist society is precisely the expropriation of the bourgeoisie and the transformation of the whole economy of the country on a socialist basis, the establishment of social ownership of the means of production.

Liberation found Albania a backward country from the socio-economic and cultural viewpoint, mainly an agricultural country, almost without industry, with a very low level of development of the productive forces. Did this constitute an obstacle to the construction of socialist relations of production? Of course it did, indeed a major obstacle, but not an insurmountable one. Our Party could not wait for the productive forces to be developed to a high level, and then commence the establishment of socialist relations.

Among the first and most important measures which our people's state power took were the liquidation of foreign capital and the transformation of its enterprises into socialist state property, the implementation of an extensive and radical land reform, which not only liquidated the large-scale property of the feudal lords and the estate-owners, but also greatly restricted the property of the rich peasants. These measures of a profoundly revolutionary character created important premises for the gradual socialist transformation of the countryside, for

the development of the cooperative movement there.

Having the unerring guide of Marxism-Leninism, as well as the experience of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, the Party of Labour of Albania put forward the liquidation of the economic base of capitalism and the construction of the economic base of socialism in town and countryside as a main objective.

The socialization of the main means of production was carried out relatively quickly, by means of nationalization without compensation. In 1946, two years after Liberation, the banks, industry, the mines, power stations, transport, communications, foreign trade, internal wholesale trade, part of the retail trade, the machine and tractor stations, the forests, waters and underground assets, were socialist state property. Thus the socialist sector of the economy occupied the commanding position.

A major problem for every socialist revolution is the agrarian problem. The development of the whole economy and the stability of the people's state power itself depend on the correct solution of this problem. In Albania, where the peasantry comprised the overwhelming majority of the population and agriculture was the main branch of the economy, the agrarian problem was extremely acute and decisive. The course which our Party followed to resolve this cardinal question was the Leninist course of socialist co-operation.

Adhering strictly to the principle of the free will of the peasantry to unite in cooperatives, the process of the collectivization of agriculture, which began almost immediately after the liberation of the country, and went on for about 15 to 20 years, was carried out without first nationalizing the land. This was done only after collectivization had been completed, with the adoption of the new Constitution in 1976.

With the construction of the economic base of so-

cialism in town and countryside, the exploiting classes were liquidated as classes and the exploitation of man by man was wiped out. Only two friendly classes remained, the working class and the cooperativist peasantry, linked with each other by common ideas, aims and interests along with the stratum of the socialist intelligentsia from the ranks of the working people and created during the years of the people's state power.

The construction of socialism cannot be carried out either through decrees or in a spontaneous way. Socialism is built with multiplied forces, with the participation of all the working people, and with a co-ordinated, centralized, overall plan.

By implementing a correct policy for the industrialization of the country, it was possible to transform Albania quickly from a backward agricultural country into a country with developed industry and agriculture, with advanced education and culture, a country in which the people live in true freedom and happiness.

The Eurocommunists do not accept our experience, or that of the Soviet Union or other countries when they were socialist. They want to invent a «new» socialism. However, you need a crippled logic in order to accept the existence of private ownership of the means of production in society and at the same time think you can avoid the exploitation of man by man, and to speak about «socialist transformations», «equality», «justice», etc., such as the Eurocommunists preach. The preservation of private ownership of the means of production, of «private initiative», that is, the possibility of capitalist accumulation in the society which the Eurocommunists propose, means in fact that the capitalist system will be retained completely intact and inviolate.

In all their philosophical fantasies, as well as in the programs which their parties proclaim, the Eurocommun-

ist revisionists do not touch at all on the question of what will be done with the multinational companies and foreign capital. Since they do not mention it, this means that they will remain integral parts of the «socialist» society which they advocate, this means that big American, West-German, British, French and other capital will no longer think of super-profits, but will serve socialism. This is just day-dreaming. On this question, Carrillo, Berlinguer, Marchais are not as progressive as those circles of the bourgeoisie in many developing countries, which, although they are not for socialism, demand the expulsion of foreign monopoly capital and liberation from the multinational companies.

In regard to the so-called public sector, the existence of which «Eurocommunist socialism» foresees, here we have to do simply with a speculation in terms, with a vulgar attempt to peddle the sector of state capitalism, which exists to this or that degree in all the bourgeois countries, as a socialist sector of the economy.

The state capitalist sector, or the «public sector», as the bourgeoisie calls it, has been created in ways and for reasons that are known.

State capitalism in the industrial countries of Europe existed previously, but it assumed an obvious development, especially after the Second World War. It was created as a result of a number of factors. In Italy, for example, it was set up by the bourgeoisie as a result of the exacerbation of the class struggle and the great pressure of the working masses, who demanded the expropriation of big capital, especially that linked with fascism, which was responsible for the catastrophe which the country suffered. In order to escape the further radicalization of the struggle of the working masses and to avoid revolutionary outbursts, the weak Italian bourgeoisie car-

ried out the nationalization of some big industries, a nationalization which fulfilled the minimum demands of the communist and socialist parties, which emerged from the war strengthened. In Britain, the creation of the «public sector» like that of railways or coal came as a result of big capital's abandoning some backward and unprofitable branches. It handed these over to the state, which subsidized them from the budget, from the taxpayers, while it invested its capital in the sectors of new industries with a high level of technology, in which great super-profits were secured more easily and quickly.

Nationalizations of this kind have been and are still being carried out for this or that reason in other countries, too, but they have not changed and can never change the capitalist nature of the system in power, cannot eliminate capitalist exploitation, unemployment, poverty and the lack of freedoms and democratic rights.

As very lengthy experience has already proved, state capitalism is supported and developed by the bourgeoisie, not to create the foundations of socialist society, as the revisionists think, but to strengthen the foundations of capitalist society, of its bourgeois state, in order to exploit and oppress the working people more. Those who run the «public sector» are not the representatives of the workers, but the men of big capital, those who have the reins of the whole economy and the state in their hands. The social position of the worker in the enterprises of the «public sector» is no different from that of the worker in the private sector; his relationship to the means of production, to the economic management of the enterprise, the policy of investments, pay, etc., is the same. The bourgeois state, i.e., the bourgeoisie, appropriates the profit of these enterprises. Only the revisionists are able to find some distinction between the «socialist» character

of the enterprises of IRI and the «bourgeois» character of FIAT, between the «free» workers of Renault and the «oppressed» workers of Citroën.

The society of «democratic socialism», which the Eurocommunists preach today, is the bourgeois society which exists at present in their countries. They just want to touch it up a bit, so that the old European bourgeoisie, with one foot in the grave, will look like a young bride, full of life and vitality. According to the Eurocommunists, all that is needed is a bit of retouching, retaining the state capitalist sector alongside the private sector, creating some workers' consultative councils attached to the management of enterprises, allowing the trade-union bosses to call for justice and equality in meetings in the squares, giving the revisionists a few seats in the government and... socialism will come of its own accord.

With their unrestrained zeal to fight and deny Marxism-Leninism, the Eurocommunist revisionists, prettify the present-day reality of capitalist society in every way. To them, the existing social system in Italy, France, Spain and elsewhere, the state which rules in these countries, is a kind of supra-class democracy, a democracy for all. In this society and this state they see only a few difficulties, a few mistakes, a few distortions at the most, but nothing more. On this basic concept and premise they build up their schemes of their «democratic socialism», which in essence will be the same present-day bourgeois society, but without the «defects», «restrictions» and «difficulties» which it has today.

The revisionists declare that in their «socialism» more than one party will exist and function, along with the possibility of their alternation in government. It must be said that on this question the Eurocommunists are really coherent. It is natural that in this society, in which there will be antagonistic classes, different strata of the bour-

geoisie, groups of capitalists with separate interests, there also will be different parties, and that the practice which has existed up to now in capitalist society, that the different parties alternate at the head of this state, according to the occasion and the need, will certainly exist. But where the Eurocommunists deliberately misrepresent matters is that they present this «pluralism», that is, the practice of changing the horses in the chariot of the bourgeois state, as the culmination of democracy, as a situation which creates the possibility to solve all social problems. Their aim is to distort the very concept of socialist society and to present bourgeois democracy and its institutions as capable of realizing socialist aims, with no need for the revolution, without the need to smash the old bourgeois state apparatus. In fact, their ideal state is the current American, or more particularly, the German political system, in which two big bourgeois parties, which alternate with one another at the head of the government, rule. They want two big parties in Italy, France, or Spain too: one of them openly bourgeois, democratic or liberal, and the other a workers' party, whether they call it socialist, communist, labour, or what you will, as well as a few other unimportant small parties, just for the sake of variety. And in this way, «Italian socialism», «French socialism», «Spanish socialism» would be created, just as «Swedish socialism», «Norwegian socialism», and so on, have been created.

In «democratic socialism» the state must not be the state of workers and peasants, that is, it must not be like the state advocated by Marx and Lenin, which would bring the workers from the factories and the peasants who work the land into leadership. The Eurocommunists want a state which will be the state of «everybody», and the government of this state likewise will be of «everybody». But a state of «everybody» has never existed and never will exist.

The Eurocommunists' concepts about the state are very close to those of Proudhon and Lassalle which Marx refuted more than a century ago. Lassalle, for example, preached that through reforms, in peaceful ways, through general elections, and with the aid of the bourgeois state and of associations of producers, which would have to be created, the reactionary Prussian state could be transformed into a free popular state. He presented this kind of «state» as a model for the new socialist state for which the workers ought to fight.

The Lassallian concept of the «popular state» denied the class character of the state as a dictatorship of a given class.

Marx, especially in his outstanding work *The Critique of the Gotha Programme*, confronted the Lassallian concept of the «free popular state» with the concept of the state as a class organ, with his concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

«... one does not get a flea-hop nearer to the problem by a thousandfold combination of the word 'people' with the word 'state',» says Marx.

*«Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. Corresponding to this is also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the **revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.**»**

The Marxist theoretical theses and doctrine on the state, proclaimed in the monumental works of Marx and Engels, found brilliant confirmation in the events of the Commune of Paris.

* K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, vol. 2, Tirana 1975, p. 24, Alb. ed.

The Commune of Paris showed that the proletariat cannot retain the old bourgeois state machine and use it for its own purposes, to overthrow the capitalist order. The Commune destroyed that machine and, in place of it, created state organisms and institutions entirely new in content and form. The Commune was the first form of the political organization of the proletarian state power. As Lenin stressed, the Commune of Paris showed the historical limitations

*«... and limited value of the bourgeois parliamentary system and bourgeois democracy...»**

It was proved in practice that the state which the Commune of Paris set up represented the highest type of democracy, that of the overwhelming majority of the people. It put into practice the great democratic rights and freedoms which the bourgeoisie proclaims but never realizes.

Later Lenin, in struggle with the opportunist distortions of the chiefs of the Second International, brilliantly defended Marx's theory on the state. He refuted their concepts that allegedly the state is not an organ of the domination of one class over another, but an organ of class conciliation, that the apparatus of the bourgeois state should not be destroyed, but should be used in the interests of the working people. In his famous book *The State and Revolution*, Lenin showed that the state is a product of contradictions between classes and an expression of the irreconcilability of these contradictions. He proved that the bourgeois state apparatus, an apparatus set up to keep the working class and the working masses oppressed and

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 28, p. 535, Alb. ed.

exploited, could not be used by them for the elimination of oppression and exploitation. The proletariat has to build its own state, new in form and content, in structure and organization, in the people who run it and in their methods of work, a state which will ensure the freedom of the working masses and suppress the efforts of enemies of socialism to restore the capitalist system.

Lenin's book *The State and Revolution* and the Leninist theses on the dictatorship of the proletariat played an important role in the preparation for the October Revolution and the establishment of the Soviet state power in Russia. They remain powerful weapons in the hands of genuine revolutionaries to combat the theorizing of modern revisionists, who are trying to revive the old views of Kautsky and company about the state, which Lenin exposed and defeated.

The theorizing of the Eurocommunists about the state is a consequence of the anti-Marxist line of these renegades who pretend that not class struggle but class peace exists in capitalism, that the army and the police are no longer repressive forces of the bourgeoisie, therefore there is no need for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the genuine democracy which the proletariat establishes. They want only one state, one democracy — the state of bourgeois-revisionist democracy.

The «Democratic» Road to Socialism — a Disguise to Protect the Bourgeois State

The question of state power has always been the fundamental question of the ideology and policy of every party, irrespective of what class interests it represents. Eurocommunism could be no exception to this. It began its struggle precisely in this field, becoming a new weapon

in the hands of the bourgeoisie to protect its power of oppression and exploitation, and to prevent the proletariat from carrying out the revolution, destroying that power and establishing socialism.

In their propaganda against Marxism-Leninism, the Eurocommunists insist that in the conditions of modern society, as they call the present-day capitalist society, the theory of Marx about the overthrow of capitalism by means of violent revolution needs new «interpretations». Among the first who began to attack, to declare invalid and violate the thesis of Marx and Lenin about the necessity for the violent revolution, a thesis which they totally distorted, were the Soviet revisionists, as we mentioned above. In order to make their theory of peaceful transition to socialism «convincing», they went so far as to claim that the October Revolution was a peaceful revolution, although history recognizes that it was the first revolution, which after the violent overthrow of the Russian bourgeoisie, established the dictatorship of the proletariat. At the same time they began to propound the theory that the dictatorship of the proletariat was a temporary phenomenon which gave way to the so-called state of the whole people. With these theories, they aimed to minimize and negate the revolutionary class content of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This deliberate distortion of Marxism-Leninism by the Soviet revisionists became the basis on which the Eurocommunist theories on this question were built up. The Khrushchevite theses that with the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union the class struggle no longer existed, that the triumph of socialism was guaranteed and there was no danger of any reversal, that there was no longer any need for the dictatorship of the proletariat, or for the party of the working class, became an inspiration and encouragement for the other revisionists to go

even further. Misrepresenting the significance of the changes which have taken place in the world and misinterpreting a correct phrase of Lenin's about the special features of the road to socialism, they stress that at the present time it is possible to go to socialism through parliamentarianism and reforms.

The Eurocommunists present the course of transformation of capitalist society into socialist society as the development of bourgeois political democracy through to the end, as they say, as a peaceful course which does not lead to a qualitative change but only to a quantitative change. The Italian revisionists say, «Political democracy presents itself as the highest institutional form of the organization of the state, even of a socialist state.»*

If we analyse this so-called thesis, it turns out that «political democracy» for the working people allegedly exists already in capitalism and that socialism is allegedly reached by extending this democracy and, finally, that the fundamental feature of socialist society allegedly is bourgeois democracy which is identified with socialist democracy.

Meanwhile the Spanish revisionists, for their part, claim that «socio-political democracy is not a third road, either capitalist or socialist, but is a transitional stage between capitalism and socialism.»** «Democracy is simultaneously the aim and the means of transformations,»*** says Marchais.

As can be seen, in order to «justify» their revisionist views Berlinguer, Carrillo, Marchais and others present very confused ideas about democracy and the state. Such

* *La politica e l'organizzazione dei comunisti italiani*, Roma 1979, p. 11.

** *Noveno Congreso del Partido Comunista d'España*, Barcelona 1978, p. 83.

*** *L'Humanité*, February 13, 1979.

reasoning, which is not based on the class relations that exist in bourgeois society, which is outside the connection between the capitalist economic base and superstructure, outside reality and any logic, has the aim of proving allegedly that genuine democracy is not that which the dictatorship of the proletariat establishes, the democracy of the great majority of the exploited masses over the minority of the capitalist exploiters, or their remnants, but democracy à la Marchais and Carrillo, that is, «democracy for all, where everyone lives in peace and class harmony». However, history has proved that there is not and cannot be bourgeois democracy without the bourgeois dictatorship, just as there cannot be socialist democracy without the dictatorship of the proletariat. The rights and duties of citizens are related directly to the domination of the class which is in power. Where the capitalist class rules, there are rights for the bourgeoisie, and restriction of rights, oppression and denigration of the masses, while where the working class rules, there are rights and freedoms for the workers, and restriction and compulsion for the minority of former rulers and exploiters, as well as for the enemies of socialism.

The Eurocommunists are not the first opportunists to deny the need for the revolution as the only basic means for the overthrow of capitalism and the construction of socialism. Before them, a similar thing was done by Proudhon, whom Marx exposed, and by Bernstein and company, who ended up openly defending the capitalist system.

Bernstein, for example, preached that by improving the labour legislation, by increasing the role and activity of trade-unions and cooperatives, by increasing the representation of the working class in parliament, all the economic, political and social problems of the proletariat could be solved peacefully and on the evolutionist course.

He stated explicitly that the working class need only win a simple majority in parliament, get 51 per cent of the votes, and it could achieve all its aims. Since the «will of the majority» rules in democracy, he said, the state loses its class character, is transformed from an organ of the class rule into an organ which stands above classes and represents the interests of the whole society. In such a state, he said, the working class and its party can and must collaborate with all the other classes and parties. Together, they must defend and strengthen this state against «reactionaries».

Bernstein preached that the road of the transformation of society was the road of partial and gradual reforms, the road of evolution, of the gradual integration of capitalism into socialism. Therefore, according to him, the party of the working class must be a party not of social revolution, but of social reforms. Lenin strongly criticized and pointed out the utter falsity of these views of Bernstein, which Kautsky and company took over later. The Great October Revolution gave the historic verdict in the great debate between the Marxists led by Lenin, who defended the idea of the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the revisionist opportunists, who were partisans of the peaceful, reformist road, of «pure» democracy, etc.

This revolution showed the proletariat and peoples of the world that the road to victory over imperialism and capitalism does not run through reforms and agreements with the bourgeoisie, but through violent revolution.

«Arguing» in support of their opposition to the Marxist-Leninist theory on the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Eurocommunists claim that Marx himself allegedly «only once mentioned this term»! However, it is known that the idea of the dictatorship of

the proletariat constitutes the fundamental question of the whole of Marx's doctrine on socialism. In 1852 Marx wrote,

*«What I did that was new was to prove: 1) that the **existence of classes** is bound up with **particular historical phases in the development of production**; 2) that the class struggle necessarily leads to the **dictatorship of the proletariat**; 3) that this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the **abolition of all classes and to a classless society...**»**

Marx did not regard the dictatorship of the proletariat as a simple alternation of some people in the government, but as a qualitatively new state, which is built on the ruins of the old bourgeois state. He considered the smashing of the old bourgeois state machine with violence an essential condition for the triumph not only of the proletarian revolution, but of any genuine people's revolution led by the working class. Lenin called this conclusion, put forward by Marx in his outstanding work *The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, «a gigantic step forward». It is precisely this foundation stone of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine that all the old revisionists have attacked and denied, and which all the new Eurocommunist revisionists attack.

The stand of the Eurocommunists towards the question of the revolution, the state and democracy coincides in essence with that of the Soviet revisionists, who have declared that now the «communist» party in the Soviet Union has allegedly been transformed into a «party of the entire people» and that the dictatorship of the proletariat

* K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, vol. 2, Tirana 1975, p. 486, Alb. ed.

has been replaced with the «state of the entire people». On the basis of these statements of the Soviet revisionists Marchais and Carrillo have the right to reason: «If you can allegedly transform the party and the state of the proletariat into a party and state of the entire people, why shouldn't we in the West have the right to carry out such a thing, but without violent revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat? We are going to proceed in 'pluralism' and understanding with the bourgeoisie, by building up opinion for a 'genuine democracy', which has not been achieved in your country. It is in vain for you to claim the existence of democracy in your country while you are strengthening oppression.»

In regard to the Titoites, they, too, are in difficulties with the Eurocommunists in connection with «democracy» and «pluralism». The Yugoslav revisionists speak about the unity of the «non-aligned world», and with this formula «eliminate» the class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat. They demand from imperialism and world capitalism only that the «non-aligned countries» «should remain within their present status quo and be assisted economically.» In this direction the Titoites are of the same opinion as the Eurocommunists. with the one difference that, while the Yugoslavs speak about alleged «independence from superpowers and blocs», the Eurocommunists do not do this even formally.

Without attacking them directly, but through the ideas they express, the Eurocommunists tell the Yugoslav revisionists that the existence of only one party in Yugoslavia is not the road of genuine democracy, therefore the political system in Yugoslavia, too, must undergo changes.

While directly attacking Lenin and the whole Marxist-Leninist theory on the state and the revolution, Berlinguer, Marchais, Carrillo and company call on the Khrushchevites to carry their betrayal through to the end, telling

them that it is not only the «mistakes» of Stalin which is the problem for their filthy undertaking, but the socialist system itself, which, although it was an appropriate system after the October Revolution, is not right at the present time, because it allegedly denies democracy.

Without doubt, this thesis is not to the advantage of the Khrushchevites who, in order to conceal their betrayal and to pose as Marxist-Leninists, still maintain some allegedly Leninist forms.

In order to retain this disguise, from time to time the Brezhnev group makes some feeble criticism of the disobedient parties and advises them that they must allegedly safeguard the class principles of Lenin on the road and the forms of transition to socialism. However, the revisionist parties of the Western countries do not fail to reply to Brezhnev that they are doing nothing more than what the Soviet revisionists have done, that they are acting according to their conditions, which allegedly dictate the peaceful road, the road of democratic reforms, political and ideological pluralism, etc., etc.

Berlinguer, Marchais and Carrillo, who have gone further than Togliatti, tell the Soviets: «Isn't it you who have spoken about peaceful coexistence? Then, come on, let us create this coexistence and carry it through to the end.» And with whom are we to peacefully coexist? With the opponents of communism, that is, with the capitalist bourgeoisie, American imperialism, etc. However, to achieve peaceful coexistence, they say, first we must revise the «dogmas» in policy, in ideology, in the economy and in art, because the «dogmas» cannot be adapted to present-day society. Since the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on the dictatorship of the proletariat, the class struggle, and the seizure of power with violence are allegedly «dogmas», then they are not suitable, either, therefore power must be taken not through violence, but

in the parliamentary way, through general elections, through the coming to power of the working class and removal of the bourgeoisie from power in democratic ways.

For the sake of demagogy and to throw dust in the eyes of the masses, the Eurocommunists mutter in an undertone that the «third way», or «démocratie socialisme», is not social-democracy, because it «has not carried society beyond the logic of capitalism».* Nevertheless, they add immediately, we must unite with social-democracy and the other political forces, and together with them must exert influence on the state apparatus of the capitalist bourgeoisie, through propaganda, reforms, the church, culture, etc., and not destroy it, as the classics of Marxism-Leninism say, so that gradually this state power will assume a truly democratic form, so that it will serve the whole of the society and create the conditions to build «socialism» in a peaceful way. In other words, they advocate the creation of a bastardized social order which will have nothing in common with scientific socialism.

The theses of Togliatti and his supporters, the line of the Italian Communist Party, have become the ideal of all the Eurocommunist revisionists to such an extent that they have aroused the envy of Carrillo and Marchais. Georges Marchais writes in *l'Humanité*, «In 1956 we were slow to draw lessons from what had occurred in the Soviet Union and work out the French road to socialism,» that is, as Togliatti did. When Marchais or Carrillo say that the police are with the Italian Communist Party, and that in Rome they vote for this party, they are praising the efforts and achievements of Berlinguer in the direction of collaboration with social-democracy, the

* *La politica e l'organizzazione dei comunisti italiani*, Roma 1979, p. 7.

Christian Democrats, and the socialists on public questions, and also in the administration of the affairs of the bourgeoisie.

The «successes» of Berlinguer in these directions, that is, in submission to Italian and world capitalism, serve the other revisionists as practical support for their opportunist political theses. Berlinguer works with great zeal. He does not attack the bourgeois Constitution, does not attack the power of the bourgeoisie, does not even mention overthrowing this power and its apparatus, does not speak about destroying the Italian oppressive army, but on the contrary, signs statements together with the parties of reaction that the army must be strengthened, that the American bases must remain, that the power and funds of the police must be increased, that the police must have the right, outside the law, to check up on anything which is suspicious, even to bug telephone conversations and open private correspondence.

Now the program and activities of the Italian revisionists are ready and tested for the other revisionists, too. In Italy, Spain and France, the integration of revisionism into capitalism, and not of capitalism into socialism, as the Eurocommunists preach in their programs and speeches, is developing and taking concrete form.

The Italian, French and Spanish communist parties say nothing at all about the Chinese revisionists. Their whole struggle is spearheaded against Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, and for their own ends, sometimes against the Soviet revisionists, too. They are in accord with the Chinese revisionists on all fronts. The Chinese revisionists are struggling for an alliance with the United States of America, the developed capitalist countries and the ruling cliques in the neo-colonial countries. Such an alliance is on the course of the Eurocommunist renegades. The fact is that the Chinese foreign policy conforms completely

with the policy which the Eurocommunists preach about the unity of revisionist parties with the bourgeois-capitalist regimes in power. The Chinese revisionists and the Communist Party of China also are for pluralism in socialism. In China the parties of the bourgeoisie not only exist, but they participate in the state power and the leadership, together with the Communist Party, which cannot exist and run things without collaboration with them. On these fundamental questions the Chinese revisionists are in agreement with the European revisionists.

On the other hand, Chinese private enterprises, Chinese-foreign capital joint private; enterprises, purely foreign private enterprises, cooperativist sectors, etc., exist alongside the state capitalist sector in China. This conforms completely with the «third road», with the «socialism» which the Eurocommunists propagate.

Mao Zedong proclaimed his «theory» about the «blossoming of a hundred flowers and contention of a hundred schools». What does this mean? This means that all idealist, social-democratic, republican, religious and other ideas are permitted and develop in China. «Let all the schools contend, this is dialectical,» says Mao Zedong. But since pluralism allegedly becomes dialectical, a thing which the Eurocommunists preach, too, then it must be possible to go to socialism together and in unity with the bourgeoisie and its parties, in peace and peaceful competition.

When bourgeois parties exist and take part in the leadership in China, along with the Communist Party, then the state cannot be the dictatorship of the proletariat, but must be a hybrid organism, which is a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat only in words, while in reality it is a bourgeois democracy.

The Chinese practice responds to the line of the Eurocommunists and serves as a «confirmation» of how the transition to socialism can be carried out without

revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Someone may say: «But China went to socialism through the revolution», «China has a dictatorship of the proletariat» etc. This is not true. The truth is that China fought against the Japanese occupiers and the Kuomintang, but the dictatorship of the proletariat was never established and socialism was never built there. The state power in China was called the dictatorship of the proletariat, but its content was different, and now we are seeing that the disguises which the Communist Party of China and the Chinese state had put on are falling off one after the other. Following the death of Mao Zedong, who was an eclectic, and of Zhou Enlai, who was a bourgeois democrat, we see that China is revealing its true features, emerging as a bourgeois republic and an imperialist state.

In regard to the contradictions the Eurocommunists have with the Soviet revisionists over the character of the state in socialism, these are not in the least of a principled nature. They attack the revisionist Soviet state, presenting it as a distortion which, as they put it, neither Marx nor Engels would approve and indeed even Lenin would not consider many things right. But this is a vulgar speculation. The present Soviet state is not a socialist state. It has been transformed into a dictatorship of the revisionist bourgeoisie which oppresses and exploits the working masses. With this speculation, the Eurocommunists want to prove that their pluralist line is the only «scientific Marxist» line, the only line suitable for the construction of true socialism. According to them, this line is a dialectical consequence of the materialist development of history, which allegedly Marx and Engels «did not foresee» and which allegedly «Lenin did not foresee», either. However, it has been allegedly discovered by Berlinguer, Marchais, Carrillo and the other revisionists

of Western Europe who are beating their breasts and saying: «It is we who envisage the genuine transformation of society and who analyse the phenomena of the present-day world to their roots.» In fact, they are opposed to any kind of revolutionary transformation. They want to preserve the present-day bourgeois «consumer» society, to preserve the domination of capitalism and the exploitation of the working people. This is their ideal and their aim. For this they are working and struggling. All the rest is just propaganda, demagogy, deception, means which the bourgeoisie uses to fight socialism and the revolution.

The Eurocommunists' «Independence» Is Dependence on Capital and the Bourgeoisie

The struggle against imperialism in general and its tools in every country is one of the fundamental questions of the strategy of every communist party, and one of the decisive conditions for the triumph of any revolution, whether people's democratic, anti-imperialist or socialist. At the same time, its attitude to imperialism serves as a touchstone to evaluate the political and ideological position of every political force which operates either within the national framework of each country, or on an international scale. In other words, the stand towards imperialism has always been a line of demarcation which divides the genuine patriotic and democratic revolutionary forces, on the one hand, from the forces of reaction, counter-revolution and national betrayal, on the other hand.

What is the stand of the Eurocommunists on this vital question of such major importance of principle?

Commencing from the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, when Khrushchev came

out with the line of conciliation and rapprochement with American imperialism, and put this forward as a general line for the whole communist movement, the revisionist parties of the Western countries abandoned any anti-imperialist position, on both the theoretical and practical planes. It seemed as if they were liberated from their shackles to rush into conciliation with the big imperialist, colonialist and neo-colonialist bourgeoisie. The new strategy which Khrushchev presented to the communist movement was that which the leaders of the Western communist parties had long desired, which they had begun to apply in practice, but which, you might say, had not yet received the seal of official approval.

Even before the 20th Congress of the CPSU, because of various vacillations and concessions, in France and Italy the struggle against NATO, against the revival and rearmament of German imperialism, against the interference of American capital and its military bases in Europe and so on, had begun to decline. If something was done at that time, it was only in the field of propaganda, without any action. On the Algerian question, the French Communist Party was in almost the same position as the bourgeois parties of the country. But its chauvinism and nationalism on this question more and more softened its stand towards the big ally of the French bourgeoisie — American imperialism and its economic and political expansion. Since «French Algeria» had to be defended, «French Africa» had also to be defended, and a blind eye and a deaf ear turned to «British Asia» and «American America».

The Italian revisionists, who were striving in every way to convince the bourgeoisie of their sincerity and loyalty, tried to give the maximum proofs precisely in not opposing the foreign policy of the Christian Democrat government, which was a policy of unconditional alliance

with American imperialism, total submission to NATO, the opening of doors to American big capital, and the transformation of the country into a big military base of the United States of America.

In regard to the Spanish revisionists, their sole preoccupation at that time was to achieve the legalization of the party and return to Spain. Thinking that the «democratization» of Spain could be done only through the pressure of the United States of America, which, according to them, was interested in removing the «obstacle» — Franco, they did not even see the American policy of expansion and hegemony, let alone fight it.

«The national roads to socialism», which the revisionist parties of the countries of Western Europe adopted in the spirit of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, led to their submission, not only to the national bourgeoisie but also to the international bourgeoisie, first of all, to American imperialism. At the same time, it was natural that their abandonment of Marxism-Leninism, the revolution and socialism could not fail to be accompanied by their abandonment of the principles of proletarian internationalism, of aid to and support for the revolutionary and liberation movements.

Although the French, Italian and Spanish revisionist parties began gradually to keep a certain distance from the Soviet Union, to criticize Moscow over certain aspects of its internal and external policy, to disapprove of some of its actions in international relations, they never reached the point of describing and condemning the present-day Soviet Union as an imperialist country. True, they condemned its aggression in Czechoslovakia, for example, but on the other hand, they approved the Soviet intervention in Africa; true, they demanded the withdrawal of the Soviet fleet from the Mediterranean, but they were silent about the dispatch of Soviet weapons to all parts of

the world. According to the Eurocommunists, the Soviet policy within the country is anti-democratic, but abroad in general it is socialist and anti-imperialist. This stand has led and leads the Eurocommunist parties to support the hegemonic and expansionist policy of the Soviet Union in general, despite some opposition.

In this way, just as the revisionist parties of Western Europe became defenders of the bourgeois order within their own countries, they became no less ardent fighters for the preservation of the imperialist system on an international scale. The Eurocommunists became champions of the bourgeois imperialist status quo on all fronts.

If the Eurocommunists still retain some disguise, try to appear as opponents, though feeble ones, of the bourgeoisie and the capitalist order on internal problems, in relations between the revolution and international capitalism on a world scale, between the oppressed peoples and imperialism, between socialism and capitalism, they are openly against any change.

Today, the revisionist parties of Italy, France, Spain and the other parties of the Eurocommunist trend have been transformed into pro-imperialist political forces which, in their line and activities, are indistinguishable from the bourgeois parties of those countries. Let us take their stand towards NATO and the European Common Market, which represent two of the basic political, economic and military factors on which the domination of the European big bourgeoisie and the hegemony of American imperialism in Europe are founded and realized.

From the time it was created to this day, NATO has changed neither its nature, its aims, nor its objectives. The agreements remain those which were signed in 1949. Everyone knows the purpose for which the Atlantic Pact was created and why it is maintained. Even if some do not know them, the Pentagon and the Head-quarters in

Brussels remind them of it day by day. NATO was and still is a political and military alliance of American and European big capital, first of all to preserve the capitalist system and institutions in Europe, to prevent the revolution from breaking out and to strangle it violently if it begins to advance. On the other hand, this counterrevolutionary organization is an armed guard of neo-colonialism and the spheres of influence of imperialist powers, and a weapon for their political and economic expansion. To hope to achieve the transformation of West European capitalist society and the construction of socialism while having NATO and the American bases in the country, is to day-dream. The attempts of the Eurocommunists to stress only the anti-Soviet function of NATO and to forget its mission of suppressing the revolution in Western Europe have the aim of deceiving the workers and preventing them from seeing the reality.

The Eurocommunists do not want to see the existence of a major national problem, the question of American domination in Western Europe and the need for liberation from it. From the end of the Second World War to this day, American imperialism has bound this part of Europe with all kinds of political, economic, military, cultural and other chains. Without breaking these chains you cannot have socialism, or even that bourgeois democracy which the Eurocommunists praise to the skies. American capital has penetrated so deeply into Europe, is so closely combined with local capital that where one begins and the other finishes can no longer be distinguished. The European armies have been so completely integrated into NATO, in which the Americans dominate, that in practice they no longer exist as independent national forces. An ever greater integration is developing in the financial and monetary field, in technology, culture, etc.

It is true that between the European NATO member

countries and the United States of America there are various contradictions. These are normal and inevitable between big capitalist groups and groupings, but it is a fact that on all the major world political and economic questions the NATO countries have always submitted to Washington. When it comes to choosing between class interests and national interests, the European big bourgeoisie, like the bourgeoisie of all other countries, always tends to sacrifice the latter. This is why the communists have always fought to defend the national interests, seeing them as closely linked with the cause of the revolution and socialism.

The Eurocommunists' denial of the existence of a national problem in their countries, concretely, the need to fight the American domination and dictate and to strengthen the national independence and sovereignty, is further proof of their political and ideological degeneration and their betrayal of the cause of the revolution. Today, the Italian revisionists not only insist that Italy must stay in NATO, but have become even greater supporters of the Atlantic Treaty than the Christian Democrats and the other pro-American bourgeois parties. «Italy must stay in the Atlantic Alliance,» say the Italian revisionists, «because of the need to preserve the balance of power on which the preservation of peace in Europe and the world depends.»*

With this thesis, Berlinguer and company tell the workers: Don't oppose NATO, don't demand the withdrawal of the Americans from Naples and Caserta, don't condemn the stationing of atomic missiles near your homes, say nothing about the American aircraft which stand in the Italian airports ready to fly wherever the

* *La politica e l'organizzazione dei comunisti italiani*, Roma 1979, pp. 39-40.

interests of the American imperialists are affected. Let the national interests of Italy be sacrificed for the sake of the hegemonic American policy, say the Italian revisionists; let Washington dictate who should govern Italy and how they should govern it, let Italy be consumed in an atomic holocaust, as long as the balance between the two superpowers is maintained.

The thesis about the balance between big powers as a factor or means for the preservation of peace is an old imperialist slogan with which the world, and Europe especially, are very well acquainted. It has always been used to justify the hegemonic policy of big imperialist powers and the right which they give themselves to interfere in the internal affairs of others and dominate them.

To accept the need for the existence and strengthening of imperialist blocs, allegedly as a means for the preservation of peace, as the revisionists do, also means to approve their policy. The imperialist military blocs exist not to preserve the peace and to defend the freedom, independence and sovereignty of their member countries, as the Eurocommunist revisionists proclaim, but to rob them of these things, to preserve the domination and hegemony of the superpowers in those countries. It is known that one of the main aims of American imperialism when it created NATO was to defend the interests of capital and of the United States in Europe politically, but also with arms, and to put down any revolution which might break out there with fire and steel. These are the objectives of NATO which the Eurocommunist revisionists support.

The policy of blocs is an aggressive policy of the superpowers. It results from their hegemonic and expansionist strategy, from their ambitions to establish their complete and undivided rule over the whole world. The Eurocommunists do not see or do not want to see this

predatory nature of imperialism, because, according to their «theories», big capital, which is its foundation, is being «democratized», is becoming «people's» capital, because the big bourgeoisie is being «integrated into socialism».

In regard to their loyalty to NATO, the French revisionists are no different from their Italian counterparts, but in order to be in unison with the Giscardians or the Gaullists, they, too, speak about the special position which France should have in these organizations. For its part, Carrillo's party is striving with all the means it possesses to seize the banner of the struggle to get Spain into NATO. In this way Franco's unrealized dream will be achieved.

For the Eurocommunists, the European Common Market and United Europe, this great combine of capitalist monopolies and multinational companies for the exploitation of the peoples and the working masses of Europe and the peoples of the world, are a «reality» which must be accepted. But to accept this «reality» means to accept the elimination of the sovereignty, the cultural and spiritual traditions of each individual country of Europe in favour of the interests of the big monopolies, to accept the elimination of the individuality of the European peoples and their transformation into a mass oppressed by the multinational companies dominated by American big capital.

The Eurocommunists' slogans alleging that their participation in «the Parliament and other organs of the European Community will lead to their democratic transformation», to the creation of a «Europe of working people», are nothing but demagogy and deception. The speeches of the Eurocommunists and the propaganda meetings of the Parliament of United Europe can no more transform Europe into a socialist society than the «demo-

cratic road» can transform the capitalist society of each country into such a society. Therefore, the stand of the Eurocommunists towards the European Common Market and United Europe is a stand of opportunists and scabs, which results from their line of class conciliation and submission to the bourgeoisie. It is intended to bemuse the working masses, to break their militant drive in defence of their own class interests and the interests of the whole nation.

Their reformist ideology, submission to the bourgeoisie and capitulation to the imperialist pressure have transformed the Eurocommunist parties into parties which are not only anti-revolutionary but also anti-national. Even amongst the ranks of the bourgeoisie it is rare to find people who call themselves politicians and who accept the concept of «limited sovereignty», as Carrillo does. «...we are conscious that this independence will always be relative...», he writes. In the «démocratie and socialist» Spain, which he proposes in his program, «...investments of foreign capital and the functioning of multinationals will not be prohibited...». «However,» he adds, «for a very long time to come we must pay a tribute to foreign capital in the form of surplus value... but this will serve the development of those sectors which correspond to the national interest.»*

With their stands in defence of the monopolies and the interests of imperialist powers, the Eurocommunists have set themselves against the anti-imperialist and democratic traditions of the French, Spanish and Italian workers. They have also set themselves against the patriotic traditions of the struggle which the workers and progressive people of these countries have waged against NATO,

* S. Carrillo, «Eurocommunisme» et Etat, France 1977, pp. 157-160.

the American bases in Europe and the interference and pressure of American imperialism. The Eurocommunists have abandoned these positions and gone over to the camp of reaction.

The idea of class conciliation and submission to foreign domination, which pervades the entire political and ideological line of the Eurocommunists, emerges clearly also in the stand which they take towards the anti-imperialist national liberation revolutionary movements. Not being for the revolution in their own countries, they are not for the revolution in other countries, either. They do not want the weakening of their imperialist and neo-colonialist bourgeoisie, therefore they can never see the revolution in the oppressed countries as a direct aid for the overthrow of the capitalist system. For them, the unified process of the revolution, the natural connection between its different currents, the indispensable reciprocal aid, do not exist.

Sometimes they say the odd propaganda word in favour of anti-imperialist movements, just for the sake of appearances. But this is only empty phraseology with no concrete content and, above all, not accompanied with political action. Their «support» is, at most, a slightly «leftist» pose, a way of appearing progressive and democratic.

Taken as a whole, in their stand towards the revolutionary liberation movements the Eurocommunists have embraced the ideology of non-alignment, which is extremely convenient for them in order to justify the subjugation of peoples to the domination of imperialist powers and to proclaim neo-colonialism as a way for the former colonial countries to emerge from poverty and develop. In the theses for their recent congress, the Italian revisionists wrote, «the struggle for the construction of a new international system and order in the economic field

is a moment of more and more fundamental importance in the struggle for peace, for international co-operation and the policy of peaceful coexistence.»* They are consistent in their opportunist line. They think that the exploiting character of the international economic relations of the capitalist system can be changed with some reforms, in the same way as they seek to reform the capitalist order within the country, Carrillo also talks about a new world economic order, or how the Eurocommunists envisage it. Indeed, he puts the matter more clearly: «In any case we must proceed from an objective reality; although imperialism is no longer a unified world system, a world market always exists, regulated by the objective laws of the exchange of commodities, laws which, in the final analysis, are capitalist.»**

According to Carrillo, these objective capitalist «laws» cannot alter or be replaced even in the conditions of socialism. In order to «support» this thesis he quotes the example of the capitalist character of relations between revisionist countries in the economic field. In other words, according to Carrillo, it turns out that it is in vain for the peoples to rise in struggle against national and neo-colonialist oppression, against unequal exchanges between the developed capitalist countries and the undeveloped countries, which are expressed especially in the savage plunder of the raw materials of the latter. This is the international order which Carrillo wants to retain and to which Berlinguer wants to do some retouching, so that it looks shiny and new.

A line which is opposed to the genuine national interests of the country, a line which defends imperialist

* *La politica e l'organizzazione dei comunisti italiani*, Roma 1979, p. 40.

** S. Carrillo, «Eurocommunisme» et Etat, France 1977, p. 159.

hegemony and expansion, which praises neo-colonialism and sanctifies foreign capitalist exploitation is doomed to failure. The objective laws of the development of history cannot alter. The new world order for which the proletariat and the peoples are fighting is not the imperialist order which the Eurocommunists advertise, but the socialist order to which the future belongs.

In recent years, the stand of the Italian, French and Spanish revisionist parties towards the Soviet Union and their relations with it have become a major object of discussion and interpretation by the whole international bourgeoisie. The attempt of the Eurocommunists to describe themselves «independent» of Moscow, «original» and even «opponents» of the Soviet Union appears to be made allegedly to deceive the bourgeoisie of their countries, but in reality it is made to deceive the proletariat of their own countries and the international proletariat. It is by no means impossible that this could be a manoeuvre on the part of the Soviet revisionists to create the impression of the existence of allegedly profound differences and contradictions of «principle» between them and the communist parties of Western Europe, especially with the Italian and French parties, with the aim of facilitating the participation of these parties in the bourgeois governments of the respective countries. If this could be achieved, this would be in the interests of Soviet social-imperialism, in the interests of its world domination, because it weakens its rivals while increasing its influence and hegemony in different countries. The Khrushchevite revisionists need this also to support their anti-Marxist thesis that «state power can be taken in a peaceful way», and thus «prove» what they failed to prove in Chile. Indeed, at the 25th Congress of the CPSU, Brezhnev said that the Chilean experience did not rule out the theory of taking power in parliamentary ways.

On the other hand, Eurocommunism is a kind of idea that suits the European big capitalist bourgeoisie which is encouraging and fanning up the contradictions between the Eurocommunists and Soviet social-imperialists in every way, because it is interested in weakening the revisionist ideological power and influence of the Soviet Union. It tries to present the Italian, Spanish, French and other revisionisms as an ideological bloc which is being created in Europe in opposition to the Soviet revisionist bloc. And since they are talking about an anti-Soviet ideological grouping, it is self-evident that the reactionary bourgeoisie of the industrialized countries of Europe has this Eurocommunism under its influence.

However, the Kremlin would not like Eurocommunism to break away completely from its influence. Therefore, the propaganda being spread in the West about Eurocommunism as an «independent» ideological current annoys Moscow. This annoyance also stems from the fact that in this way the split, which has long existed between the revisionist parties of Western Europe and the revisionist party of the Soviet Union and its satellites in Eastern Europe, is made public.

These parties have never had, do not have and never will have unity. However, it pleases the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to maintain a superficial appearance of unity amongst the revisionist parties not only of Europe, but also of the whole world. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union tries to maintain its ideological hegemony over all the other revisionist parties of the world in disguised ways. It is eager to sign joint declarations and communique with them, in order to give the appearance of the existence of unity and the respect which these parties have for the Soviet leadership.

There have been splits and disagreements between the Italian Communist Party and the French Communist Par-

ty and the Khrushchevite revisionists since the time of Togliatti and Thorez, and these disagreements and differences have steadily increased and extended. However, they did not reach then such a degree of acuteness as they have reached today. Now the worsening of relations has come out openly. *Pravda* attacked Carrillo and condemned Eurocommunism. Carrillo replied just as sharply to Moscow. He dotted the i's of the revisionist ideological and political orientation of his party and broke off the connections of dependence on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Following *Pravda's* criticism and Carrillo's reply, the League of Communists of Yugoslavia came out as an ardent defender of the Communist Party of Spain. The Yugoslav revisionists openly took Carrillo's side, because they have always been for the split, for the breaking away of revisionist parties from Moscow, and they have always struggled to bring this about.

In regard to the French and Italian revisionist parties they are somewhat more cautious in this polemic. Sometimes they raise it, sometimes they lower it and at other times they extinguish it altogether. This is explained not by any particular «moderation», but apparently by the existence of certain material and other links which they want to preserve because they bring them profits. Precisely for the preservation of these threads linked with rubles, which have long existed between them and the Soviets, they want the tempers to be cooled a little so that the polemic with the Khrushchevites does not assume uncontrollable proportions. The visits of Berlinguer, Pajetta, etc., to Moscow were made for this purpose. The Italian revisionist leaders declared that they were going to Moscow to explain to the Soviet leaders that there should not be a bitter polemic and that Moscow did not have the right to meddle or interfere in the line of the

communist party of another country, because each of them had the right to define its own strategy and line on the basis of the situation in the country, and allegedly also bearing in mind the experience of the world communist movement. Moscow is ready to put its signature to these theses, but in return demands recognition of its «socialism» and, above all, approval of the main directions of its foreign policy. When Marchais applauds the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan and acclaims the expansionist policy of the Kremlin as the highest expression of «international solidarity», Brezhnev cannot fail to reward him by approving the «democratic road» so dear to the French revisionists, which is completely in accord with the theses of the Khrushchevites' 20th Congress.

Although they have an identical strategy today, the Italian, French and Spanish revisionist parties differ a little in their tactics, because of the specific features of the bourgeoisie in these three countries. The French bourgeoisie is strong — a bourgeoisie with long experience. It also has great political and ideological power, not to speak of its economic strength and the military and police power which it has at its disposal. The Italian bourgeoisie, however, is not so strong as the French. Although it has power in its hands, it has many weak points. This has made it possible for the Italian revisionist party to enter into negotiations and to establish collaboration in many forms, indeed even in parliamentary forms, with other parties, not to mention their collaboration through the trade-unions with the Italian capitalist bourgeoisie, and first of all with its Christian Democratic Party. This is why Berlinguer's party will try to move closer to the bourgeoisie, but at the same time try and play a policy *de bascule** between Moscow and the bourgeoisie of its

* counterpoise (French in the original).

country, the more so when the Italian bourgeoisie also has its own interests in regard to the Soviet Union. We must not forget the large investments which the Italian bourgeoisie has made there.

The French bourgeoisie also, which knows what the revisionist Soviet Union is, does not proceed blindly in its policy, as the Chinese revisionists would like and advocate when they demand that France should take a hard line in its relations with the Soviet Union. Of course, the relations between these two countries are not all sweetness and honey, but neither are they as tense as the Chinese would like. Meanwhile, the French Communist Party, too, in its policy of agreement with the socialists, has in mind that it must not put itself in open and clear-cut opposition to Moscow, but should maintain a certain status quo with it at a time when it is moving towards lining up and unity with the French bourgeoisie.

With the Spanish bourgeoisie the situation is different. In the post-Francoist period, the Suarez party, which is in power in collaboration with the other parties, is the representative of a bourgeoisie which has its own traditions, but which are mostly the traditions of the fascist dictatorship. It is a bourgeoisie which has experienced many disturbances, which have not allowed it to create that stability which the French bourgeoisie has created, and to a lesser extent, the Italian bourgeoisie. Now it is in the process of revival. Carrillo, with his revisionist ideology, has been included in this process, in the process of consolidation and strengthening of a capitalist regime which is closely linked with American imperialism and which is making efforts to join NATO, United Europe, etc. All these factors restrict the field of manoeuvre for both the Spanish bourgeoisie and revisionist party, which has little room in which to move in its game with Moscow.

The Communist Party of China too, likes Eurocommunism, both as an ideology and as a practical activity. It agrees with the name and with the content of the line of these three parties. China, as a state, and the party which defines the line and strategy of this state, proceed according to the world contingencies which alter every hour and minute. In the grouping called Eurocommunism the Communist Party of China sees an ideological opponent of the Soviet Union which it considers the number one enemy.

Therefore, just as it supports without the slightest hesitation and assists without the slightest reserve every force (with the exception of genuine Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries) which appears to be against the Soviet Union, China supports and approves Eurocommunism, too. The Communist Party of China long ago established relations with Carrillo, as it is doing now with Berlinguer, too. It took a step by sending the Chinese ambassador in Rome to attend the recent congress of the Italian Communist Party as the official representative of the Communist Party of China. Recently it welcomed Berlinguer to Beijing. There is no doubt that it will establish relations with the French revisionist party, too. These links will be gradually increased and strengthened. This cannot fail to happen in as much as they have identical strategies and similar tactics. The delay in establishing close links comes from China, which hesitates to go too far in the direction of the Eurocommunist parties in order to avoid angering the top circles of the bourgeoisie ruling those countries, especially the parties of the right, to which it gives priority and considers its closest allies.

The genuine Marxist-Leninist parties of Europe and of all continents are not misled by the tactics and manoeuvres of the Soviet revisionists who allegedly have entered into polemics and opposition with the so-called Eu-

rocommunism. They do not think that they can find a breach here. In principle, there is no breach among the revisionists. They are divided tactically the better to achieve their strategy, which has the aim of the global domination of modern revisionism over the world proletariat. Therefore, the Marxist-Leninist parties expose and fight Soviet modern revisionism, Yugoslav, Chinese and Eurocommunist revisionism equally. They do not and must not have any illusions on this question.

III

REFORMIST IDEOLOGY AND POLITICAL OPPORTUNISM — FUNDAMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EUROCOMMUNIST PARTIES

As we saw, modern revisionism is expressed in various currents and assumes different appearances according to the concrete political and socio-economic conditions of each country or group of countries. This is the case also with the parties which are now known under the name of Eurocommunist parties. Although they represent a separate current of modern revisionism, a current which conforms more to the interests of the bourgeoisie of the developed capitalist countries, such as the countries of Western Europe, the Italian, French and Spanish revisionist parties also have certain specific features.

The Constitution of the Bourgeois State — the Basis of Togliatti's «Socialism»

Speaking about the «third road», which constitutes the new strategy of Eurocommunist revisionism, in his report entitled «For Socialism in Peace and Democracy...», delivered at the 15th Congress of the ICP, Berlinguer gives a rather more complete explanation of what he and his associates mean by this third road. «I'm referring,»

he says, «to a fortunate expression... which we have accepted... We have had the experience of the Second International: *the first phase* of the struggle of the workers' movement to emerge from capitalism... But this experience... capitulated in the face of the First World War and various kinds of nationalism.

«*The second phase,*» continues Berlinguer, «opens with the Russian October Revolution...»* But this, too, according to him, should be looked at critically in view of the history and the reality of the Soviet Union, because this experience is not valid, either. And it results that the third phase has begun now with Eurocommunism. The task of the workers' movement in Western Europe, Berlinguer declares, is «to find new roads of advance towards socialism and the construction of socialism.»**

According to the Italian revisionists, the road to achieve this «society» is «the line laid down by the Republican Constitution to set Italy on the road of transformation into a socialist society based on political democracy.»*** Whereas the French revisionists, who cannot present the De Gaulle Constitution as the basis of their socialism, since not only did they not take part in drafting it, but they also voted against it, do not mention it, although in practice they do not negate it.

The Italian revisionists worked out their idea of achieving «socialism» through the bourgeois Constitution a long time ago. In his speeches, as early as 1944, Togliatti declared that allegedly the times had changed, the working class had changed and the ways to the seizure of

* E. Berlinguer, *Per il socialismo nella pace e nella democrazia in Italia e in Europa*, Roma 1979, p. 38.

** Ibidem, p. 39

*** *La politica e l'organizzazione dei comunisti italiani*, Roma 1979, p. 3.

power had also changed. With this he meant that «the time of revolutions was over and the time of evolutions had come», that «power cannot be seized except by way of reforms, on the parliamentary road, through votes».

Later, at the meeting of the CC of the Italian Communist Party on June 28, 1956, immediately after the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Togliatti said: «we must foresee a socialist advance which takes place precisely on the terrain which the Constitution determines and envisages, which is the terrain of democratic freedoms and progressive social transformations... This Constitution is not yet a socialist Constitution. But since it is an expression of a broad unitary movement of rejuvenation, it differs profoundly from the other bourgeois Constitutions, and represents an effective base for the development of Italian society on the road towards socialism.»

That the Italian Constitution differs, for example, from the Constitution of the time of the monarchy and fascism, that a series of democratic principles figure in it, this is understandable, because these principles have been imposed on it by the struggle of the working class and the Italian people against fascism. But the Italian Constitution is not the only one which contains such principles. After the Second World War, the bourgeoisie in all the capitalist countries of Europe tried, to this or that degree, to outflank the working class by giving it certain rights on paper and taking them away in practice.

Those things which the Italian Constitution envisages are formal freedoms and rights which are violated every-day by the bourgeoisie. For example, it envisages a certain restriction of private property. But this has not stopped the FIATs and Montedisons from becoming more and more wealthy and their workers becoming ever more impoverished. The Constitution envisages the right to

work, but this stops neither the capitalist employers, nor their state from throwing about 2 million people out of work. The Constitution guarantees a series of democratic rights but this has not stopped the Italian state, the carabinieri or the police, basing themselves on the rights which the Constitution provides, from acting almost openly to set up that mechanism which is ready for the establishment of a fascist regime. The various fascist commandos, from those of the extreme right to those who call themselves the *Red Brigades* and the terrorists of the Fontana Square, also find their justification in the Italian Constitution.

To think, as the followers of Togliatti do, that the Italian bourgeoisie drafted its well-known Constitution to lead the society towards socialism, is simply absurd. The Italian Constitution, like the other fundamental laws of bourgeois countries, sanctions the undivided political, legislative and executive rule of the bourgeoisie in the country, sanctions the protection of its property and its power to exploit the working masses. It gives a legal basis for the organs of violence to restrict the freedom and democracy of the people, to suppress all and rule over everything. «Beautiful» words such as freedom, equality, fraternity, democracy, justice, etc., may be written in the Constitution for two hundred years, but in practice they will not be realized for another two thousand years if the capitalist bourgeoisie is not overthrown together with its Constitution and laws.

For the Italian revisionists the existing Constitution is their Bible and the bourgeoisie could not find better advocates to defend it or more zealous propagandists to advertise it. The ardent defence which the Italian revisionists make of the Constitution of their capitalist state shows that they cannot conceive any other social system outside the existing bourgeois society, outside its political,

ideological, economic, religious and military institutions. To them socialism and the present-day Italian capitalist state are the same thing. The opportunism in which the leaders of the Italian revisionist party were born and raised, has clouded their eyes and shut off all horizons to them. The Italian revisionists have become the guardians of the capitalist order. They even present this role as a virtue and mention it in their documents. «... in these 30 years,» say the theses for the 15th Congress of the ICP, «the Communist Party has followed a line of the consistent defence of democratic (read: bourgeois) institutions; a line of the organization and development of democratic life amongst the masses of workers and citizens, a line of struggles for individual and collective freedoms, for observance and the application of the Constitution. The ICP has implemented this policy through continually seeking unity with the ISP(5), with the other democratic forces, secular and Catholic, and seeking every possible convergence even with Christian Democracy itself, even from the opposition, **with the aim of avoiding the damage to the democratic constitutional framework**».* It couldn't be stated more openly. A more servile testimony of loyalty to the bourgeoisie could not be given. «Avoiding the damage to the democratic constitutional framework» means to avoid the overthrow of the existing bourgeois order, to avoid the revolution, to avoid socialism. What more could the bourgeoisie ask of the revisionists?

For 35 years on end the Italian bourgeoisie, revisionists, the Church, and so on, have been deceiving the Italian people by telling them that the hard life which they lead, the poverty in which they live, the savage exploitation,

5 Italian Socialist Party.

* *La politica e l'organizzazione dei comunisti italiani*, Roma 1979, p. 11.

corruption, terror, and all the other social evils that characterize Italy are the result of «failure to implement the Constitution consistently». But the situation in Italy has been and still is deplorable, not from failure to implement the Constitution, but because of the system which the Constitution defends. The present situation is the result of the whole development of Italy after the war.

Italy, which suffered the evils of the royal regime of the Savoy dynasty, which experienced the horrors of the fascist regime, which came to know the economic poverty and moral and political degeneration which this regime brought, which suffered the devastation of the Second World War, came out of this war economically ruined and entered a grave political and moral-social crisis which continues to this day.

After the end of the war, Italy was turned into chaos, but also into a circus, in which the role of acrobats and clowns was played by the new hierarchs decked out in the robes of re-constituted parties with «brilliant» titles such as socialist, social-democrat, Christian Democrat, liberal, communist, etc. One posed as the continuer of the party of Gramsci, the other of Don Sturzo, the one of Croce, the other of Mazzini. From a country of silence and closed mouths, which Italy was in the time of fascism, it turned into the country where a deafening clamour is traditional.

If American capital has got one foot in the door in the different countries of Europe, it has both feet firmly planted in Italy. This has occurred because the bourgeoisie of that country is more degenerate, more cosmopolitan, more unpatriotic, and more given to all-round corruption.

The Christian Democrats have always held the reins of Italy in their hands. The other bourgeois parties also want their share in this bargaining, where everything, including Italy itself, is up for sale, wholesale and retail. The innumerable frequent changes of governments are

an expression of the struggle for power, of the competition and rivalry between parties. Changes are made, but the Christian Democrat Party always remains the pivot which takes the lion's share. The Christian Democrats have proved to be skilful tight-rope walkers in the formation of ministerial councils, giving their rivals carefully measured rations of authority and leaving the impression that they are and are not the incontestable rulers of the country. In this way they bring on stage sometimes the *centre-left*, sometimes the *centre-right*, setting up a cabinet sometimes *mono-tone* in colour, sometimes *two-tone*. All these are conjuror's tricks to show that they are allegedly finding a solution to the chaos, poverty, hunger, unemployment, to the terrible all-round crisis the country is in.

At present all sorts of crimes are flourishing in Italy. The new fascism has organized itself in parliamentary parties and possesses countless terrorist squads and groups, which the Italians call the «lambs» of the general secretary of the fascist party, Almirante. The criminal Mafia has its claws deeply implanted everywhere, and crime, thefts, murders, kidnappings have been raised to a modernized industry. No Italian is certain of tomorrow. The army, the carabinieri and the organs of the secret police have become so inflated that the country can hardly breathe. They have been increased allegedly to defend the people and «the democratic order» from the members of the ultra-left and ultra-right «brigades». But the truth is that without these organs the big thieves and murderers who occupy the soft seats in parliament or in the staffs of the army, police etc., could not protect themselves.

At the same time, Italy is up to its ears in debt while its currency is one of the weakest of all the currencies of the countries of Western Europe. Today it is

called the «sick man» of the European Nine. No one trusts this Italy, with this rotten regime it has, this Italy which may take a course dangerous not only for the Italian people but also for its neighbours.

The various Italian governments, not to mention the period of Mussolini fascism, have in general maintained unfriendly stands towards Albania, either openly or in disguise. The treacherous Albanian reaction which fled on board the British ships was gathered together in Italy, was organized and trained by the post-war governments of that country, by the permanent enemy of Albania — the Vatican, as well as by the Anglo-Americans, to operate against the new Albania. In the first years after Liberation, our people had to wage a stern fight against wreckers who landed in our country from Italy. What end they met, is known. However, the end of the others was no better. Some of the fugitive Albanian traitors remained in Italy, the others dispersed to the United States of America, Belgium, Britain, Federal Germany and many other countries where the imperialist espionage services sent them.

Seeing that they could achieve nothing against the new Albania with acts of diversion, the Italian governments began to maintain an «indifferent» political stand towards our country. True, diplomatic relations between the two countries were established, but other relations always remained at a low level. The Italian governments never showed any desire to develop them. No government has ever publicly condemned Mussolini's barbarous acts against Albania. However, these governments did interest themselves in taking the bones of the Italian soldiers killed by our partisans during the National Liberation War from their graves and sent them to Italy to consecrate them as «heroes who had fought for the greatness of Italy», and every year they pay homage to them.

Most of the Italian press rarely publishes any positive article about Albania. It has distinguished itself above all the world press for its stand of denigration and misinformation about our country.

The stand of the Italian revisionists has not been and is not any different from this stand of the government leaders and the press of Italy. In 1939, the leaders of the Italian Communist Party stood back and watched the fascist armies which were going to rob a small neighbouring people of their freedom. They did not prove to be even at the level of the Italian socialists, who condemned the imperialism of their country at the time of the war of Vlora in 1920. Even after the war, the main leaders of the Italian Communist Party did not deign to come to Albania to condemn the crimes of fascism and express their solidarity with the Albanian people who had faced death and destruction and had fought heroically against Italian fascism.

The Italian Communist Party fought and is fighting to eliminate the revolutionary spirit from its members and the Italian proletariat, to foster the idea of class conciliation and wipe out all thought of seizing power from the hands of the capitalists through violence. It is nothing but a social-democratic party like the others, but has been left in opposition and has not been invited to take part in the dance, because it was formerly in the Third International, and because, apparently, the bourgeoisie requires still greater proofs of loyalty from it.

The Italian «democratic» bourgeois state gives billions of lire in subsidies to the Italian Communist Party, as well as to other parliamentary parties. However, the revisionist party also has other large sources of income from trading companies, as well as from various subsidies in the form of commissions. It has its aristocracy and its plebs; the aristocrats are the deputies, senators, chairmen

and councillors of municipalities and the permanent functionaries.

The 10th Congress of the Italian Communist Party, which was held in 1962, codified the ideas of Togliatti, his social-democratic line and open departure from Marxism-Leninism. Togliatti was a reformist intellectual and this is what he remained to the end of his life, up till the «Testament of Yalta» in which he re-emphasized his «polycentrism» and pronounced himself in favour of the «pluralism» of parties allegedly to go to socialism, of the «freedom of religion», «freedom of speech», «human rights», etc. This was the road of the so-called Italian socialism.

The 10th Congress presented the «Italian road to socialism» as an original road, as a new development of Marxism, as a superseding of the teachings of the October Revolution and the experience of all the socialist revolutions up to that time. In reality, it was the road of «structural reforms», the revisionist, opportunist road adopted to suit the needs and the situation of Italian monopoly capital.

According to the «theory» of «structural reforms» the transition to socialism will be made through gradual reforms which will be forced from monopoly capital in a peaceful way. These gradual reforms will be made only by means of parliamentarianism, through power of the vote, regardless of the fact that the capitalist monopolies have in their hands the wealth of the country, the weapons, and the running of parliament and the administration. According to the Italian revisionists, the «reforms of socio-economic structures», which it is allegedly possible to carry out within the framework of the bourgeois state, «will wipe out exploitation and class inequalities and will make it possible... to gradually overcome the gap between those who rule and those who are ruled,

and move towards the complete liberation of man and society.»*

The Italian revisionists have slipped completely into the positions of trade-unionism and social-democracy. They restrict the workers' struggle merely to economic and democratic demands, and think that the consequences of the capitalist order can be avoided while leaving this order intact. However, history has proved this to be Utopian, because the consequences cannot be eliminated without eliminating their causes which lie in the capitalist system itself. Now the Italian revisionist chiefs themselves accept this open transition to the positions of social-democracy, and indeed they even boast that they have been able to take this «historic» step. At the recent congress of the Italian Communist Party, Ingrao, the former chairman of the Italian Parliament and member of the leadership of the party, declared: «We have much to learn from social-democracy.» It is true that the leaders of the Italian revisionist party are still young pupils, compared with the old social-democratic professors, in revising Marxism-Leninism and in the struggle against the revolution. However, they can be considered their equals in their unrestrained zeal to serve the bourgeoisie unconditionally and in a servile manner.

The Italian revisionists can preach night and day, can foam and shout in all the squares and pray in all the churches of Italy, but they will never be able to achieve their reformist dreams of the transition to socialism through parliament, the Constitution and the bourgeois state.

The follow-on from Togliatti's line of «structural reforms» has now become the «historic compromise» with

* *La politica e l'organizzazione dei comunisti italiani*, Roma 1979, p. 11.

the bourgeoisie, proclaimed by Berlinguer. This slogan, with which the Italian revisionist leadership is now comforting itself, was launched precisely at the time when the Italian capitalist bourgeois state was in a very deep crisis. Through the «historic compromise» the Italian Communist Party offered Christian Democracy, the representative of big capital and the top clerical hierarchy, its co-operation in order to get out of this situation and rescue this state.

Berlinguer's «historic compromise» is the continuation of the old orientations of the Italian Communist Party which immediately after the war sought participation in the bourgeois state, and unification with the socialists of Nenni. It is the continuation of its notorious flirtation with the then chairman of the Christian Democrats, Alcide de Gasperi, it is the hand of friendship of Togliatti-Longo offered to the Catholics. Berlinguer turned this orientation from a tactic into a strategy. The «historic compromise» proposed by the Italian Communist Party is the old liberal policy which has always fitted Italy *comme un gant**.

Berlinguer's «historic compromise» was an effort and a hope born under the influence of events in Chile. When the Italian revisionists saw that the socialist Allende was unable to remain in office without the co-operation of the Christian Democratic Party of Frey, they thought that they, too, could neither come to power nor remain in office without the support and collaboration of the Christian Democrats. Fear of the establishment of fascism with the aid of American imperialism led them to major retreats and concessions in principle and practice, to abandoning even that slightly independent position

* like a glove (French in the original).

which they had maintained until that time, when they thought they could win the parliamentary majority and govern jointly with a left coalition. Since that time, in order to avoid the events of Chile in Italy, they accepted to play the secondary and subsidiary role in a coalition, no longer of the left, but of the right, together with the Christian Democrats.

When the Italian Communist Party launched the slogan of the «historic compromise» Italy gave the impression that it was being transformed into a powerful industrialized country. At this period, not only to reaction, but also to the Italian «communists» themselves, the «historic compromise» seemed like a long-term «strategy». However, the crisis came and fascism was revived, became threatening; the bombs began to burst, people were murdered and disappeared. The «historic compromise» began to become more immediate and to seem «reasonable» even to a part of the bourgeoisie and Christian Democrats. Aldo Moro was a representative of this current, but he was liquidated, because the Christian Democrats were not and are not yet ready to enter this compromise, regardless of the losses they have suffered in elections.

In the present crisis situation, the Christian Democrats have found some ways and forms of co-ordinating activities with the «communists» on certain questions, at the trade-union level and the party level, but still they are afraid of even an Italian Communist Party *à l'eau de rose*.*

Will Italian monopoly capital accept the hand which the Italian Communist Party is offering it? It wants the revisionists to support the government in parliament, to vote for its program and laws, to come into the «par-

* with rose water (French in the original).

liamentary majority», into the «government majority», but not into the government, not into power, not into the centres where political decisions for running the country are taken. The United States of America has expressed its opposition to the presence of the European revisionists in the governments of the NATO member countries. The Italian bourgeoisie is carrying out this order of its patrons.

Whenever parliamentary elections are held, the Italian Communist Party is faced with a great dilemma. It does not know how to act in case it wins a greater number of votes than the Christian Democrats. Berlinguer, frightened, adheres to the formula that in any case a broad government should be formed of all the parties of the «democratic arch», which would carry out some reforms, of course, in a «pluralist democracy», and Italy would not leave NATO.

Why does Berlinguer hold out this prospect? Because this is the revisionist line of the Italian Communist Party, which is afraid to accept the responsibility in the face of the crisis and bankruptcy of the bourgeois system which cannot be cured with reforms. On the other hand, the Italian Communist Party is afraid of the masses of the workers and working people of Italy, who, if this party should win, will demand not cooperation with the employers, but the seizure of power. The Italian Communist Party does not want this situation and will never permit it. But neither does the American and the Italian monopoly bourgeoisie want it, and they will do everything in their power to avoid such a situation.

An anti-historic compromise might be made in the beginning if the Italian Communist Party wins on the votes, but this «compromise» will be ephemeral, just to calm public opinion, until the screws can be tightened. Capital never hands over its weapons, if they are not

taken from it by force. The Italian Communist Party is not of those parties which go into revolution. It is not and never has been for the establishment of a socialist society in Italy, either today, tomorrow, or ever.

The Successors of Proudhon in France

Togliatti and his Italian acolytes long ago carried out the theoretical elaboration of the «roads» to the «new socialist society» which the Eurocommunists advocate. At present, however, it is the French revisionists who are making megalomaniacal «philosophical» speeches, who are trying to make up for lost time and emerge as the banner-bearers of Eurocommunism, as those who interpret and state its laws. This role they have undertaken makes them ridiculous and exposes them even more in the eyes of the working class of their own country and the working people of the whole world.

Georges Marchais has become a zealous follower of the theories of Roger Garaudy, who made the law ideologically in the French Communist Party in the time of Thorez and who was expelled from that party later. Garaudy strove to «prove» that in the developed capitalist countries the proletariat allegedly no longer exists, that it has been put on the same level as the working people of the administration, the engineers and technicians, who, according to Garaudy, are all equally exploited. Now Georges Marchais has taken over this theory as his own and has carried it even further. According to him, everyone, not only the working class, not only all the working people, but even the bourgeoisie, and indeed the army and police, are allegedly for the «socialism» which he preaches. In his discourses he says repeatedly. «We want to advance to socialism, but we are hindered

by just 25 families, which comprise the strength of capital in France.» «How is it possible that we, all this force, should not be able to have our say and overcome this caste which remains in power?» wonders Marchais. And he provides his own answer, that to advance to socialism France requires only economic and political reforms. He deals with the question of overthrowing capital as something which can be easily achieved, just with a few words, by puffing out one's cheeks and blowing it over. Whatever else it may be, the road which the French revisionists advocate can be anything, but it has nothing at all to do with the genuine road to socialism.

Marchais compares and equates the present representatives of state power in France with the French aristocracy before the time of the triumph of the bourgeoisie, two centuries ago, and refers to its leaders as «these princes who govern us». However, the French revisionists are not even in the positions of those people who carried out the French bourgeois revolution of 1789. It is known that this revolution cut off the heads of the king and the queen and of all those «princes» who governed France at that time. The progressive bourgeoisie of that period, which overthrew the monarchy and feudalism, did not stop at that, but carried the revolution further by cutting the heads of all the leaders of the reactionary factions of the bourgeoisie which were emerging: the Feuillants, the Vergniauds and Dantons. This revolution reached its culmination in the dictatorship of the Jacobins led by Robespierre whom bourgeois reaction sent to the guillotine.

Marchais describes Prince Pomyatowski, Giscard d'Estaing's former minister of the interior, as a Versailles. However, he forgets the Commune of Paris which fought with arms against Thiers and the Versailles. «The Communards stormed the heavens,» said Marx, while Marchais,

with his revisionist theories, wages against the Pomyatowskis *la guerre en dentelles**.

The leaders of the French revisionist party try to explain «the underlying reasons» for the decline of France. The theses for the 23rd Congress of the French Communist Party say: «Since 1976, inflation practically stands at a high level; unemployment has increased about 30 per cent; the buying power of the working people has declined; economic growth has ceased... Austerity, unemployment and the super-exploitation of the working people are accompanied with an increase in the capitalists' profits... In France, which has a multi-branched industrial economy, whole branches, such as iron-steel, shipbuilding, machine building, textile, footwear, etc., are being ruined today. The number of workers employed in industry has fallen by more than 500,000.»** These things about the situation in France are known. The problem is not to observe the grave situation of the economy and the workers in France, but how to change this situation.

Marx did not restrict himself merely to making his diagnosis of capitalist society, but also defined the road to overthrow it. The modern revisionists have abandoned this scientific road and only prattle to deceive the party and the working class that they are allegedly concerned about its situation.

The French revisionists also speak about the grave crisis which the capitalist world is experiencing today. «The present crisis of the capitalist countries is an international crisis,» says Georges Marchais, «it is in the final analysis a crisis of the system of exploitation, domination and plunder of the workers and the peoples.»*** Very

* a fight with lace handkerchiefs (French in the original).

** *Cahiers du communisme, juin-juillet*, Paris 1979, pp. 361, 363.

*** *Ibidem*, pp. 356, 358.

good, but how does he intend to utilize this key moment, which not only France, but the whole world is experiencing? With what kind of struggle? With class struggle, or with discourses? Does he hope that with his speeches he will liquidate the French monopoly bourgeoisie which oppresses the proletariat and working people of France with all that army and police force which Marchais thinks he has on his side? No, he indulges in demagoguery which is meant, on the one hand, for the «gallery» and on the other, to tranquilize the employers.

Such revisionists base themselves on the pseudo-theories which they have concocted themselves, according to which the situation has now allegedly matured to the point that there is no longer any need for the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat in order to build the new socialist society. Now, according to them, every class in society, indeed every individual, thinks as a socialist. For them, socialism has become so deeply implanted in the consciousness of man that it has become part and parcel of his consciousness. The theses of the 23rd Congress of the French Communist Party say, «Socialism is already being realized, and moreover, being realized in a great diversity of forms.»* The purpose of these pseudo-theories is to tell the workers that what Lenin did through revolution and bloodshed has now been achieved, moreover under the savage oppression of capital, without revolution and without violence.

The revisionist leaders of the French Communist Party are trying to convince the workers that in the existing society of France, Europe and the world, man has managed to understand that industrial society is no longer a society based on capitalist profit. This is an utterly false theory, because monopoly capital which pre-

* *Cahiers du communisme, juin-juillet*, Paris 1979, p. 371.

vails in this society demands not merely profits, but maximum profits. Georges Marchais also speaks about the export of capital, but he does not say that this export is a means of barbarous exploitation, not only of the workers of the metropolises, but also of the workers of the backward or developing countries. Today the export of capital has become a fundamental feature of neo-colonialism.

Georges Marchais goes so far as to claim that in the existing situation, «imperialism is obliged to seek new international solutions which correspond to the needs of the peoples.» How humanitarian this imperialism has become that acts according to the needs of the peoples! However, imperialism remains imperialism and does not change with the words and analyses of sophists. By preaching such stuff the French Eurocommunist revisionists are simply assisting imperialism by prettifying it, by spreading and nurturing the illusion that it desires to remake a new world.

In a long tirade, at the 22nd Congress of the FCP, Marchais goes so far as to say that the accusation of allegedly wanting to eliminate the wealthy, levelled against the French revisionists, is without foundation. Considering it a slander, he declares openly that they want private property to exist, want the middle bourgeoisie to exist with all its property and want the landed peasantry to exist; that they want only to nationalize all the common state assets and to have all these administered by the people. Social-democracy also defends these capitalist structures which Marchais defends. In this instance he has the right to be angry with those who accuse him of not being one hundred per cent loyal to the bourgeoisie like his social-democratic brothers.

At the beginning of 1979, Georges Marchais wrote: «We want a social democracy, an economic democracy, a

political democracy, and we wish to go further, to a radical transformation of social relations so that we can make it possible for the French people to live in a democratic self-administrative socialism.»* Thus, Marchais emerges as a follower of Tito who has implemented in Yugoslavia precisely the anarcho-syndicalist theories of Proudhon and Bakunin on «worker self-administration», which Marx and later Lenin sternly condemned. Now Georges Marchais, under the cloak of «creative» Marxism but never «deigning» to use any of the statements of the great teachers of Marxism, does not dare to defend the anti-Marxist views of Proudhon openly and say that he is his disciple. However, in demanding «self-administration», he simply is changing the terms while he carries on the petty-bourgeois theory of Proudhon.

The leaders of the French Communist Party speak a great deal about wages and raise the problem of the reformist struggle for raising them. The buying power of the workers and their families must be increased by giving more to those who get the least, they say. The measures to minimize the inequalities in incomes as well as in bonuses must be increased. The range of wage differentials must be reduced by raising the lower wages. The revisionists raise these problems because at the present time increased pay is a universal demand of the masses.

Georges Marchais asks in amazement how the phenomenon can exist that workers and the elderly do not have the possibility to live properly, do not have the right to speak on the radio and television. They must win all these things, he says. «My Party has fought and is fighting to increase wages, to reduce taxes, to ensure that parliament will no longer be as it is at present, with intolerable conditions imposed on its functioning and its

* *L'Humanité*, February 13, 1979.

prerogatives restricted,» says he. While restricting the struggle of the working class simply to day-to-day demands, the French revisionists neglect the teachings of Marx who has explained that in a disguised way, wages hide the exploitation of the workers by the capitalists who appropriate a part of the labour, precisely the unpaid labour of the workers, which creates surplus value for the capitalist. They deliberately say nothing about the idea of Marx who explains that the solution to the problem does not lie in raising wages, or in equalizing them, as Proudhon, that classic reformist, believed. Marx said that to restrict the struggle of the working class merely to wages was nothing but an attempt to prolong the existence of wage slavery. The final elimination of the exploitation of wage labourers, says Marx, is the only correct and radical solution to the problem.

The French revisionists leave in obscurity Marx's theory about the social character of production and the capitalist, private character of the means of production in capitalism and the relations of production between classes. They deliberately do not mention the fact that these questions involve the interests of different classes which are constantly in struggle with one another to alter the character of ownership. They deal with these problems in general terms, simply as economic questions, just as the theoreticians of economism did. Their «theory» is not the theory of Marx, but the «theory» of deviators who came after Marx. Marchais reduces the mission and the struggle of the proletariat to a struggle for economic rights and not for the overthrow of the power of capital. In the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* Marx issued the call: «Workers of all countries, unite!» But why? To carry out the revolution. While Marchais says: Workers, peasants, bourgeois, police, soldiers and officers, unite... to carry reforms! The notion «proletariat» is considered by

the French revisionists to be a romantic notion about which to create poetry.

Instead of fighting to ensure that the proletariat is in the forefront of the revolution and in close alliance with the working people of town and countryside, the French revisionists try to unite it in «another historic bloc», in a «union of the left», as the French revisionists call their collaboration with the bourgeois parties, or in the «historic compromise», as the Italian revisionists call such a thing.

The French revisionists promote this theory on alliances on the basis of their view that in the present-day capitalist order, the workers everyday «see that the conditions of life are improving» and that «the proletariat, in the true meaning of the term, is disappearing.» This is the thesis of the revisionist Garaudy whom the French revisionists keep outside the party in vain. Whether he is inside or outside it, it is all the same so long as the revisionist leaders of the French Communist Party agree that the bourgeois parties should join them in the dance in order to go to socialism. That is where Garaudy and company vegetate, too. The French revisionist leadership criticized and expelled Garaudy from the party, not proceeding from principled positions, but because he came out prematurely with and raised the banner of «the new line», something which according to rank, was up to Marchais and other leaders more senior than he. This leadership is acting in the same way today with Ellenstein and Althuser who want to proceed more quickly on the revisionist road. However, there is no doubt at all that the leadership of the French Communist Party will quickly come to terms and unite, not only with Garaudy and Ellenstein. but also with Mitterrand. Rocard and all the social-democrats. Whether they will pass first through a «union of the left». a «joint program» or through some other

form is of no importance. Since they have the same views and aims, everything else will come about automatically.

The revisionists in general and the French ones in particular in their theories are opposed to the management of the economy by the state in socialism. Marchais says: «We are fighting today against authoritarianism and suffocating centralism... On the contrary, we want the state enterprises to be autonomous in their administration... we want the working people — the workers, the clerks, the engineers and the cadres — to take part more and more actively in this administration. We also want the communes, districts and regions to become real centres for decision making and democratic administration.»* These views of revisionists in the French Communist Party are totally in accord with the line of Yugoslav «self-administration» and the federalism of Proudhon who said, «there should be only an industrial democracy, a positive anarchy. Whoever speaks of freedom speaks of federalism, or says nothing, whoever speaks of republic, speaks of federalism, or says nothing, whoever speaks of socialism, speaks of federalism, or says nothing.» Hence, for Proudhon, the federal principle is applied in the economy and in politics. Perhaps Georges Marchais does not describe these questions in the terms which Proudhon used, but when he speaks of his «democratic socialism» he says, «We want a fine society, with justice, freedom, etc.», and asks whether it is reasonable that the workers should be suppressed for these simple aspirations and that these aspirations should remain only a dream.

Proudhon demanded democracy and freedom, and according to him these could be won very easily, could be taken from the hands of the capitalists without any trouble. Marchais does not restrict himself merely to this, but

* *Le socialisme pour la France*, Paris 1976, pp. 84-85.

stresses that the workers in bourgeois democracy had greater freedom two hundred years ago, they took part in the affairs of the state and the factories, and finally, he is «indignant» that they do not have these freedoms today. However, he goes no further than indignation. And Marchais goes no further, because he does not want to do battle with the capitalists, but wants to coexist with them in peace. All this is like a fairy-tale for the *gogos**.

Marchais preaches that even in the conditions of the existence of the capitalist order, by means of reforms it can be brought about that the proletariat takes part in the management of the economy. He dreams and says that within this order there can be a social democracy in which all the workers, without exception, can benefit from wealth, that there can be a political democracy in which every citizen can control, manage, and truly be in the leadership, in other words — «self-administration». Is this not completely the theory of Proudhon?

In connection with the «democratic socialism» he advocates, Marchais also deals with the question of property and the planned running of the economy. He divides property in this society into state and private property, but the property which he leaves to private owners is colossal. With this he wants to tell the ruling bourgeoisie, don't accuse us French revisionists in vain, because we respect private property, we are not for the proletarian revolution, we are no longer for «raising the fist», but for «holding out the hand of friendship». Marchais speaks about municipal, departmental, regional property. He does not use Proudhon's term «federalism», but it amounts to the same thing. When Marchais says, we fight against authoritarianism and suffocating centralism, he implies the struggle against democratic centralism, contrary to

* the innocent (French in the original).

the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. And he stresses, we must build up the plan in a democratic way, ensuring that not only the workers and other working people, but also those who have property will take part.

Marchais knows that the planning of the economy is not a method which can be applied in any social system depending on the good will of those who are in the leadership of the country. Unified central planning becomes possible only where complete social ownership has been established over the means of production, and this is characteristic only of socialism. Private property, in whatever form, has not submitted and never will submit to centralized planning. These are objective truths and they cannot change just because this would please Marchais and other Eurocommunist «theoreticians.»

Modern revisionism, not only in France, but in all capitalist-revisionist countries, is also attacking Marxism-Leninism in the field of literature and the arts, because it wants to use them as means to poison the minds of people and make them degenerate. The revisionist writers, poets and artists have taken the road of bourgeois degeneration. Today it is difficult to distinguish an Aragon from a Beauvoir and an Andre Stil from a Sagan. This is not referring to a similarity in style and form, but to an identity in the content and purpose of their works which are inspired by anti-Marxist philosophical trends, in order to emerge on the same course, to fight the revolution, to tame the spirits, to make them «dead spirits», equally degenerate.

All the revisionist «theoreticians» advocate the thesis that Marx and Engels allegedly gave very little attention, if any at all, to aesthetics. The aesthetes of the French Communist Party go even further. They try to «prove» that Marx was allegedly not interested at all in art or did not understand it. Contrary to the facts, they allege

that Marx «was unable to understand what it was that gave art an everlasting value irrespective of the historical moments, and was unable to understand how Greek art, linked with the infrastructure of that time, continues to arouse emotions». Such a distortion of Marx is not done without a purpose. On the one hand, they want to create the impression that there is no Marxist opinion about art and that allegedly the revisionists are elaborating this, and, on the other hand, they are trying to deny the class character of art and to start discussion about whether art «is part of the superstructure or the structure, whether or not it is an ideology, whether or not it is linked with the class and the revolution, to what degree and to what point», etc.

A series of «theoreticians» of the French Communist Party have had different opinions about literature and art at different periods, and this has brought about confusion and chaos in the ranks of the party and its militants and vacillations in the creative literary and artistic work of communist writers and artists. At one period, the French Communist Party fought for that creative work which was based on the people's art. on revolutionary art, and later, on socialist realism. At a later stage anti-Marxist trends penetrated the creative work of communist artists.

With its decadent art, the bourgeoisie exerted an influence not only on the rank-and-file members of the communist party, but also on the cadres engaged in agitation and propaganda. Influenced by this art. these elements propounded theories, gave distorted and incorrect interpretations of Lenin, who pointed out that the revolution creates its own art and that the communists do not reject the progressive heritage of the people from the past. These individuals also interpreted in bourgeois and revisionist ways the statements of Lenin. Stalin and Zhdanov that in socialist society the writers and artists

should be free in their creative work, should have personal initiative, but always be realist and create works which truly serve the revolution and socialism.

Certain pseudo-Marxist aesthetes went so far as to defend the thesis that Lenin had allegedly advocated absolute freedom in creative work. The anti-Marxist philosopher Garaudy proclaimed «unlimited realism». Others defend the thesis that when ideology and the party prevail in literature and art, there is no freedom and therefore, no creative work.

What else could one expect in the field of aesthetics, when such people as André Gide, Malraux or Paul Nizan had influence in the French Communist Party and posed as communists. Together with Aragon, they took part in the First Congress of the Soviet writers in Moscow, but in the end betrayed and became open anti-communists. Such «theoreticians» in France, inside and outside the Communist Party, could have no idea of the value of art based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism. The purpose of these elements was to separate art and literature from politics and ideology, of course, from proletarian politics and the Marxist ideology. They struggled to clear the way for the spread of bourgeois ideology and politics, for the development of decadent art, psycho-analyst, sexual, crime and pornographic novels, so that the markets, bookshops, show-cases, theatres and cinemas would be filled with such works.

Let us take Picasso. He was a member of the French Communist Party till he died, but he never became a Marxist. This is reflected in his works, while the French Communist Party boasted of him and the only criticism which they made of him was for a scrawl which was called «Portrait of Stalin», and which his friend and comrade Aragon published in the newspaper *Les lettres françaises*, of which he was director.

Socialist realism was not supported by the French Communist Party strongly and with conviction. Some of the writers, philosophers and critics who were party members, such as Marguerite Duras and Claude Roys, deserted. After Khrushchev's slanders against Stalin, the French Communist Party was shaken and such intellectuals were the first to capitulate. It launched the slogan of «complete freedom in art and culture», and such former defenders of socialist realism as Aragon, André Stil, and André Wurmser not only changed their coats but even sold their souls and their hides to revisionism. Thus, the French pseudo-communist literary figures began to fall in love with the Lukacses, the Kafkas and the Sartres. Critical discussions began throughout the whole party on the platform which the bourgeoisie desired, such as, «what is the relation between literature and ideology?», «what form should be accepted in art, 'sectarianism in interpretation' or 'opportunist eclecticism'?». Speaking as an «authority», Roland Leroys pronounced the conclusion that «there cannot be a specific form of proletarian art or art which is completely revolutionary».

Wallowing in opportunism and revisionism, the French Communist Party allowed these anti-revolutionary theses to ooze like stagnant waters and become predominant amongst its creative artists.

As a conclusion, we can say that the line of the French Communist Party in literature and art has had its ups and downs. But it has always been wobbly. Its vacillation has been caused by its «orthodoxy» in the preservation of principles, on the one hand, and by the direct and indirect influence of bourgeois ideology in literature and art amongst its intellectuals, on the other.

In general, the intellectuals who worked in the field of artistic creativeness have played a role more negative than positive for the French Communist Party. Irrespec-

tive of their class origin, they completed their schooling and sought «fame». The party never influenced and guided them with the proletarian ideology and culture. To these intellectuals of the party it was their free, subjective, individual, creative work, and never the true interests of the proletariat and the revolution, that were important. These elements lived and worked far removed from the working class and isolated from it. For them, the class was the «economy», while the intellectuals were the «god-head» that had to guide the «economic factor». The intellectuals of the French party had been raised and inspired in the Bohemia of Montparnasse, in *Closerie des Lilas*, *Pavillon de Flore*, *Bateau-Lavoir* and in other clubs in which all kinds of decadent trends came together, trends from which emerged the Aragons, the Picassos, the Elsa Triolets and many other friends of the Lazareffs, the Tristan Zaras, the dadaists, cubists, and a thousand and one decadent schools of literature and art. This tradition and this road continued uninterruptedly within the French Communist Party until it arrived at its 22nd Congress at which the revisionist Georges Marchais flaunted all the anti-Marxist corruption which had long been festering in the French Communist Party.

At this congress, the French revisionists came out officially against the leading role of the party of the working class in the field of art and against the method of socialist realism. Under the pretext of the struggle against «uniformity», they claimed that socialist culture should be open to all currents, to all kinds of experiments and creations.

In the book which contains his report to the 22nd Congress, the pseudo-Marxist Georges Marchais published a poem by Aragon taken from his book *Elsa's Madman*. Elsa was Aragon's wife. Here is what Aragon, a member of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party,

says in this verse: «Will there always be fighting and feuds/ Regal behaviour and bowed heads/ Children born of mothers unwanted/ Wheat destroyed by the locusts?/ Will there always be prisons and torture/ Always massacres in the name of idols (the idols are Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin)/ A mantel of words cast over the corpses/ A gag in the mouth and nailed hands?/ But a day will come with orange colours...» This is Aragon's way of saying that he and his party have abandoned the red colour, communism.

In this way, the French revisionists threw overboard the principles of the immortal theory of Marxism-Leninism. Now their party is floundering in a revisionism which is a mixture of the old utopian theories of Bernstein, Proudhon, Kautsky, and anarchism. Uniting with the ideology of other bourgeois parties, it is fighting to create the idea in France and elsewhere that Marxism has become obsolete, and Eurocommunism must come to the fore instead.

In 1968 the students in Paris clashed with «the forces of law and order.» The Trotskyites, Sartre, the theoretician of existentialism, Simone de Beauvoir, Cohn-Bendit and others seized on to these clashes to give them an anarchist colour. And in fact they took place in great disorder. The French Communist Party did not participate. Why did it not participate? Was it that in principle it was opposed to anarchism? I think this is not the reason. The reason is that it did not want to unite with the student youth, which was attacking the De Gaulle government. In fact, it was this movement which forced De Gaulle to hold the referendum, and when he did not win in the way he wanted, he retired to Colombay-Les-Deux-Eglises, where he died.

The French Communist Party stopped the working class from going into action and taking over the leader-

ship of the uprising. The party had the strength to ensure that the flames were spread throughout France, and if not to seize power, at least to shake the power of «princes», or the power of «barons», as they called it at that time. It did not do this, because it was for that road and for those methods which the petty-bourgeois revisionist Georges Marchais advocates.

The French Communist Party has great hopes in a «coalition of the left», which it tried to create with the socialist party of Mitterrand in the elections for the president of France and in the parliamentary elections. The French Communist Party and the French Socialist Party reached a certain agreement, but this was temporary. Not only did they not win in the voting, but after the elections and the triumph of Giscard d'Estaing, it was seen that the love between the communists and the socialists was cooling, and indeed they began to attack one another. Neither the big bourgeoisie, nor its parties, nor even the Socialist Party of Mitterrand will ever want a communist party, even one of an orange colour, such as Aragon describes it, to take part in the government of France. This did not take place with the Popular Front, when Léon Blum was at the head of the Socialist Party, is not taking place today, when Mitterrand is at the head of the Socialist Party, and neither will it take place when someone else emerges at the head of it.

The interests of the French capitalist bourgeoisie and of the two hundred families, which Marchais has reduced to 25 in order to give the impression that today they are dealing with a small reactionary force, are closely linked together to protect their privileges, to protect their great possessions and capital, to increase their profits at the expense of the proletariat and all the working people of France. Of course, the socialists have contradictions with the other parties of the bourgeoisie, but when it comes

to the issue that the bourgeois power is threatened by the proletariat, then unity is achieved, not between the communists and the socialists, however, but between the socialists and the bourgeoisie. This is occurring in Italy with the Socialist Party which is uniting with the Christian Democrats, the Liberal Party and the Social-Democratic Party, and is not making a common front even with Togliatti's «communists».

However, assuming for a moment that a cartel of the «left» in France could manage to take power, for the French communists, even with their orange colour, this would be ephemeral and would change nothing. Why is this? Because this is what happened when De Gaulle, in order to get out of his difficulties, accepted a few communists headed by Thorez in the government, and threw them out again after he had used them as firemen. And when did he do this? He did this at a time when the French Communist Party had emerged from the Second World War with no small authority, as the only party which had fought the occupier consistently. Therefore, Marchais' pretensions that he «is going to take power and build socialism» now, with the Eurocommunist strategy, with the revisionist ideology of Proudhon and Bernstein, will never be realized. The most that the heads of the French Communist Party might achieve is to become shareholders in plundering the sweat and toil of the French proletariat and people, to strengthen the fire brigades of the counter-revolution, but nothing more.

Revisionism with the Gloves off

The line of the Spanish revisionists is worthy of special attention, not because these revisionists are different from the Italian and French variety, but because

of the special role they have undertaken, as spokesmen and kite-fliers for all revisionists. Carrillo and company speak with the gloves off, speak openly, and whether or not the other revisionists headed by the Soviet revisionists like it, they express the true opinion of modern revisionism. If the Soviet revisionists sometimes «criticize» Carrillo, they do this not because of his treacherous revisionist ideas, but because he blurts out the opinions and aims of all revisionists.

Carrillo is a product of the corrupt bourgeois capitalist society in decay, a product of lumpen intellectuals in the service of the capitalist bourgeoisie.

He has lived in France, and apparently, while there, was profoundly influenced by Sartrist, anarchist, Trotskyite, and all sorts of other corrupt anti-Marxist theories. Now he is developing these theories in the speeches and interviews with which he fills the pages of the bourgeois press, and especially in his much advertised book *Eurocommunism and the State*. In this utterly anti-Marxist «work», the general secretary of the Communist Party of Spain has summarized and systematized the opportunist theses and views of Togliatti, Berlinguer, Marchais, Khrushchev, Tito and other chiefs of modern revisionism. His main aim is to justify his deviation from Marxism-Leninism, to attack the idea of the revolution and socialism, and legitimize revisionism.

Carrillo called his book *Eurocommunism and the State*, as a counter to Lenin's famous and brilliant work *The State and Revolution*, in which he put forward the strategy of the socialist revolution and the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This megalomaniac, Carrillo, pretends that with a mishmash of phrases gathered from all the renegades from communism, he can knock down one of the mightiest monuments of the Marxist thinking such as *The State and Revolution*, which life and

revolutionary practice have stamped with the great seal of history, making it immortal.

According to the renegade Carrillo, who propagates the theses of petty-bourgeois intellectuals, the proletariat today is allegedly no longer the most revolutionary class of society which leads the struggle for socialism, but all classes to some extent and, first of all, the intelligentsia, lead this struggle. He claims that in Lenin's time the proletariat was allegedly a backward class, while today, this renegade says, the working class is very advanced and the intelligentsia has grown up alongside it. In other words, he, too, associates himself with the theses of the revisionist philosopher Roger Garaudy. According to Carrillo, the communists must take power today, not through violence, not by destroying the bourgeois power and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, but by using other forms, appropriate to the changes which the capitalist system has undergone. Allegedly, present-day bourgeois society contains within itself the kernel of socialism, therefore the proletariat is not the only class interested in the establishment of socialism.

We must understand, says Carrillo, that the capitalist state has changed today, and he goes on to claim that the others do not see this change in the capitalist state, but his mind reveals it. And what it reveals is an imaginary reality on which he proceeds to build up his whole worthless «theory». According to him, the capitalist state has nationalized a series of enterprises which have assumed other forms which differ from those of the old concerns of capitalism or imperialism. The state administers these enterprises more or less correctly, through functionaries who have a bourgeois mentality. Now, according to Carrillo, all that has to be done is to change this mentality and everything will be in order. This bourgeois mentality of the functionaries, says Carrillo, has under-

gone radical changes, but more must be done to reach the stage at which the bearers of this mentality understand the need for further reforms to advance to socialism.

Carrillo tries «to prove» that the present-day state in the capitalist countries allegedly does not represent the power of the bourgeoisie, its apparatus of violence to protect its property and rule, but is a supra-class power belonging to all classes. Being unable to make black entirely white, he admits only that there is a certain superiority of the bourgeoisie in this state, which he regards as something left over from the historical conditions in which this state was created, but which now can be set right.

But how is this change to be made? How is this superiority to be eliminated and the state of «democratic socialism» to be created? Obviously, according to him, the Leninist theory, which allegedly was valid for the past periods, cannot be applied, because the economic, social and other conditions have changed. Now another theory is needed, and Carrillo has it ready.

The ownership of the means of production, he says, is now not only that of the bourgeoisie. Along with it exists state ownership, which Carrillo considers «socialist», cooperativist ownership, etc. The proletariat no longer exists, because it has merged with all the intelligentsia, the office workers, the priests, the judges, the gendarmes, etc. Meanwhile, the capitalists remain a small group of stubborn bourgeois who still cling to the old. In these conditions, according to Carrillo, the institutions of the bourgeois superstructure must be democratized through reforms and education, and this process has already commenced. Thus, the only task left for the communists to carry out is to accelerate this process.

According to the renegade Carrillo, the conflict between the working masses and the bourgeois state today

has radically changed. This conflict is no longer what it was before, because now allegedly the state is an employer which no longer defends the interests of the bourgeoisie as a whole, but only of a fraction of it, that fraction which controls the big monopoly groups. Therefore, he says, now the state is no longer in opposition only to the advanced proletarians, but also directly to the broadest social classes and strata, including a big section of the bourgeoisie itself. The element of different classes, which is in opposition to the big financial oligarchy and the employing state, is not only able to penetrate the state apparatus, he declares, but has already done so. Through this «progressive element» it is possible to take power by means of reforms.

«To confirm» these dreams, Carrillo quotes the example of Italy, where as he says, even the police in Rome vote for the Italian Communist Party. With this he wants to arrive at the conclusion that the forces of compulsion and oppression of the capitalist bourgeoisie have undergone changes also. True, he says, they frequently act according to the desire of capital, but they do this allegedly contrary to their conscious will, because, when the occasion arises to express this consciousness without exposure to the capitalist state, they act in opposition to the will of this state.

The position is similar in regard to the law courts. The courts, says Carrillo, naturally carry out the laws of the bourgeoisie, but there, too, the consciousness of the courts has begun to undergo a metamorphosis.

He deals with the problem of religion and the church in the same spirit. The church, he says, has changed and is no longer that dogmatic church of the past. Today the clergy themselves are for amendment of the dogmas, are no longer opposed to science but in favour of it. This being the case, they are in favour of a life entirely dif-

ferent from that which the Bible and the Vatican formerly preached, and the Vatican has allegedly made an evolution towards a more progressive and more humane society, towards a society in which there will be a greater and more complete democracy.

According to Carrillo, even the church makes its contribution to the social transformations towards socialism! Basing himself on this fantasy, he arrives at the conclusion that the top clerical hierarchy, without as yet going so far as to accept socialism and Marxism, has allegedly begun to raise doubts about the possibilities of capitalism as a way to solve the problems for the future. He declares that he takes his hat off to the clergy since they have made an evolution in their dogmas, therefore the Eurocommunists must reject their own «dogmas», i.e., Marxism-Leninism, in order to be more «progressive» than the church and the Vatican.

Education, one of the most consistent ideological apparatuses of the bourgeoisie, does not present any problem to Carrillo, because it has just about been transformed already. He claims that education today, while having become available to the masses, has also changed its ideological content.

As to the family, according to Carrillo, it has completely changed its way of life and thinking, Present-day children not only do not listen to their parents, but they are opposed to their ideas. Mentally, they are virtually living in socialism already.

In other words, for Carrillo, the whole of capitalist society has been transformed, is no longer that society of the time of Marx and the time of Lenin, is no longer in that decayed state of 1917, when the Great October Socialist Revolution overthrew czarism. Carrillo links both the October Revolution in the Soviet Union and the revolutions which triumphed in other countries with the

world wars, thus perpetrating a monstrous slander against genuine revolutionaries, who, according to him, are in favour of war in order to ensure the triumph of the revolution. It is true that by exacerbating the social contradictions to the maximum, and by increasing the sufferings of the masses to an unprecedented level, world wars hasten and accelerate the outburst of revolutions, as the only way to escape wars and the order which gives birth to them. But world wars and local wars are not the cause of social revolutions. The underlying cause of the revolution is the contradictions of the capitalist system itself, especially the conflict between old relations of production and new productive forces, a conflict which can be solved even without being associated with interstate wars, as history has proved.

Socialism, declares Carrillo, cannot be linked with world war, because such a war in our time would lead to the total destruction of human society. Thus, Carrillo does not fail to make himself a propagandist of imperialism's atomic blackmail. Following in the footsteps of Khrushchev, he says that it is not necessary to carry out revolutions or liberation wars in the conditions when the atomic bomb exists, because they might become the cause for nuclear wars in which neither side will win. If we speak about «a world without weapons, without wars,» says Carrillo, then we must carry this idea through to the end. Since we want to build a world without wars, as was said at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, let us work in this direction, not only by demanding disarmament and making speeches in favour of peace, but also by undermining and sabotaging the revolution everywhere.

On the other hand, to Carrillo violent revolution is a closed road because allegedly American imperialism will not permit such a thing. Carrillo wants to raise his

own petty-bourgeois fear to the level of theory and to transform his capitulation to imperialism and the bourgeoisie into a norm. The threat of intervention to suppress any revolution on the part of imperialism, and not only American imperialism, but the whole of world reaction, has existed for a long time and this is part of the aggressive strategy of the American and other imperialists. However, history has proved that the peoples have risen in revolution, have clashed with the American intervention, and have triumphed. Let us take the Iranian revolution as a recent example. American imperialism used all its threats, but does not dare to intervene directly with arms, because it senses that, faced with the determination of the Iranian people, it will suffer a bigger defeat than that which it and the gendarme Shah, whom it had armed to the teeth with the most modern means, suffered.

What is new in Carrillo's sermons is that he has become the spokesman for and champion of the imperialist policy, a spreader of panic and a tool of reaction to sow the seed of demoralization and capitulation among the masses. And whom does he warn that they should fear foreigners? He is addressing the heroic Spanish people, who fought so boldly and valiantly not only against Franco, but also against the armed intervention of Hitler and Mussolini, and against the socialists like Blum, who sabotaged the revolution in Spain, and whose pupil Carrillo has now become.

To Carrillo it seems unnecessary for the bourgeoisie to maintain a large police force and apparatus of oppression. Why does it need this when public opinion does not want such a thing? asks Carrillo. The state power of the financial oligarchy and capital ought to come to terms with the workers, preaches this new Christian priest. According to him, strikes can continue to be

held, but should be done in co-ordination with and organized by the employers and the representatives of the workers, that is, by the worker aristocracy. It is very easy, says Carrillo, for the managers to reach agreement with the workers and put aside their arrogance and not impose their dictate. According to him, this can be achieved simply and without difficulty. But he is reckoning without his host. He is speaking without those who have power and are holding on to it, who have the apparatus of oppression, the propaganda machine, the church, etc., in their hands. They do not swallow these tales of Carrillo's, but they support him so that he will create such concepts and spread them in the ranks of the working class and the strata of working people so that the latter will live with the dreams of Carrillo.

In regard to the army, the problem is quite simple to Carrillo. The present-day army must be transformed on the basis of a democratic policy, he writes in his book. This does not mean to give it another political colour, he says, let it retain the colour it has (i.e., reactionary), but it must never think about military plots, or about a present-day repetition of the history of the 19th century and part of the 20th century. To Carrillo, insurrections and civil wars must be avoided. Likewise to be eliminated is the historical binomial: the oligarchy plus the armed forces equals conservatism and reaction; an identification of the army and civilian society must be achieved, an identification which will allegedly facilitate the advance of the progressive forces towards democracy, a society of equality and justice.

According to him, no pretext must be given for the army to be set in motion by one side or the other, but work must be carried out for a «democratic transformation» of the military mentality, so that the army will understand that war should no longer exist in society, be-

cause otherwise it will be suicide. The doors of this army of capital should not be opened only to the cadres of the bourgeoisie, but also to the broad strata of the people, so that the ideology of the masses, the socialist ideology, etc. can penetrate it, and it will no longer be a reserve of the police, but simply a weapon in the service of public order. How this is to be done is another matter. However, Carrillo thinks that, since he preaches it, the bourgeoisie should accept his «wise» council, should peacefully relinquish the main weapon of its power, and one fine day, after it has been convinced that «this is what justice requires», will say to Carrillo, «come and take power, we are withdrawing, lead all of us towards socialism!»

In support of his thesis about the possibility of the democratization of the army and its transformation into an army which serves the people, Carrillo produces a number of arguments which are as naive as they are ridiculous. The French army, he says, was democratized after the war in Algeria, because its regulations were redrafted and new ones were established «which have created a democratic spirit in it». To claim that the French bourgeois army has changed its world outlook and is no longer a weapon in the hands of the big bourgeoisie, but a weapon in the hands of public opinion, is betrayal.

According to this revisionist, the military doctrine and the army itself in the capitalist states are in crisis, because in its ranks, in the ranks of the military cadres there are both hawks and doves. Hence, says Carrillo, we must work in a peaceful way to turn the hawks, too. into doves. To this end, Carrillo thinks that the communist parties should have a separate military policy, but should never consider carrying politics into the army. He says that efforts should be made to draw the military theme into the field of the policy of the left, so that it will be

a monopoly of neither the right nor the left. According to Carrillo, such a policy on the part of the communist parties would draw the army away from the policy of the right, and the army would go over more to the side of the nation. Thus, both the left and the right together should struggle against and control each other and, in the traditional way, should control the state, too, not the bourgeois state, but Carrillo's state, which «is to be created» through reforms.

As a conclusion of these «analyses» of present-day capitalist society and the bourgeois state, Carrillo, who poses as the ideologist and theoretician of Eurocommunism, also builds up his strategy to go over to socialism. The strategy of revolutionaries today, says Carrillo, is not to overthrow the state power of the bourgeoisie, because state power no longer belongs to the bourgeoisie, neither is it to overthrow the bourgeois relations of production, since they have changed already. The only thing which should be done is to gradually transform the existing political and ideological institutions through reforms, in order to bring them into conformity with the social reality and turn them in favour of the people.

The head of the Spanish revisionists preaches that now it is completely possible to gradually transform the capitalist superstructure into a socialist superstructure, without altering its base. This is anti-dialectical and contrary to simple logic. However, Carrillo is not interested in science, but in the schemes he has concocted. This is because his aim is not to indicate the solution of problems, but to obscure their solution, to set the proletariat on a wrong road, to lead it up a blind alley and turn it away from the revolution.

As we said, Carrillo has been inspired by all the «theories» of the Khrushchevites, the Trotskyites, Browder and a thousand and one other traitors to the working

class. However, he demands that things should be said openly, that the i's should be dotted, in other words, that the revisionists' actions should be unified with capitalism and world imperialism. First of all, allegedly with theoretical arguments, he calls on all the revisionists and pseudo-communists of the world to rise against Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. He distorts and interprets as he pleases Marx's writings on the events of 1848, on the June Uprising in France, on the Paris Commune and goes so far as to admit openly that he is taking his treacherous theses from Trotsky or Kautsky. By mentioning these notorious renegades and discredited opponents of Marxism, he shows from which stable he comes and where the sources of his «theoretical» discoveries lie.

Total denial of the class struggle is the foundation of all Carrillo's ideas. In his view, all classes are together at the head of the bourgeois state today. But to Carrillo the stratum of intellectuals is everything, is the cleverest, the most knowledgeable, the most capable and the best administrator. If one had said these things in the time when Marx, Engels and Lenin were alive, declares Carrillo himself, they would have called them Utopian ideas. Our classics would not just have called these counterrevolutionary ideas Utopian, but would have described them as betrayal, just as they described the predecessors of Carrillo as traitors.

Carrillo is a revisionist whose betrayal knows no bounds. All revisionists are traitors, but in one way or another they have tried to disguise their betrayal. They have hesitated to attack Marx, Engels and Lenin so openly as all of them have attacked Stalin.

But Carrillo goes further than Khrushchev and many others. Although he tried, Khrushchev did not dare to publicly rehabilitate Trotsky. By calling Stalin a criminal, by rejecting all the revolutionary trials which were held

in the time of the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union, in practice Khrushchev rehabilitated Kamenev and Zinoviev. He also rehabilitated many other traitors such as Rajk and so on. However, Carrillo was not satisfied with Khrushchev. In his book, he rebukes him as if to say: «When you have rehabilitated all these fine people whom Stalin had shot, when you have betrayed Marx, Engels and Lenin, why have you not rehabilitated your father Trotsky?» Therefore, Carrillo calls for Trotsky to be rehabilitated and for a campaign to do justice to the «merits» of Trotsky.

In other words, Carrillo is one of the dirtiest, one of the most bare-faced agents of world capitalism. However, his «theories» will not do capitalism much good because, as Carrillo presents them, they are a real exposure of the pseudo-Marxism of the modern revisionists. On the one hand, Carrillo serves imperialism and world capitalism, because he opposes the revolution, and denies the Marxist-Leninist ideas which inspire the proletariat and the peoples throughout the world, but on the other hand, he tears the mask from the other modern revisionists and exposes them, discloses their true aims to the proletariat and the peoples.

Santiago Carrillo, the general secretary of the Communist Party of Spain, is a bastard of revisionist bastardy. He took all the vilest and most counter-revolutionary things from modern revisionism and made himself the apologist of utter betrayal and capitulation.

IV

ONLY THE MARXIST-LENINISTS HOLD HIGH THE BANNER OF THE REVOLUTION AND CARRY IT FORWARD

Present-day capitalist society, both bourgeois and revisionist, is pregnant with revolution and the revolution always has been and always will be guided only by the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. All the different ideas which seek to revise our great theory will end up in the rubbish bin of history, just as they have always done. They will be smashed, together with capitalism, imperialism and social-imperialism, by the great power of the world proletariat which leads the revolution and is inspired by the immortal doctrine of Marxism-Leninism.

The tactics and manoeuvres of the Eurocommunists cannot overshadow our great doctrine and they will never get established. Only those who are imbued with the Marxist-Leninist doctrine and remain loyal to it see what dangerous and cunning opportunists they are confronted with in their gigantic struggle for the triumph of the new world, the socialist world, without oppressors, exploiters, war-mongering imperialists and social-imperialists, without revisionists, demagogues and traitors, either old or new.

In France, Italy, Spain and the other capitalist countries, it depends greatly on the proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist parties to ensure that the anti-class, anti-

revolutionary, anti-Marxist theories of the revisionists are defeated. Without a genuine Marxist-Leninist party to lead the proletariat in class battles and revolution, these anti-Marxist theories which have been spread by the revisionist parties cannot be combated and the power of the bourgeoisie cannot be liquidated.

Conscious of the great loss which the birth and spread of modern revisionism, especially Khrushchevite modern revisionism, brought the cause of the revolution and communism, the Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries knew how and were able to resist this great counter-revolutionary tide and to organize themselves and fight resolutely against it.

With a lofty sense of responsibility to the proletariat of their own countries and the world, they placed themselves in the forefront of the stern, principled struggle for the exposure of the revisionists' betrayal and set to work to create new Marxist-Leninist organizations and parties.

The Marxist-Leninist movement was born and developed in this great process of differentiation from modern revisionism and the struggle for the cause of communism, and took upon itself to raise and carry forward the banner of the revolution and socialism, betrayed and rejected by the former communist parties which the revisionist degeneration had transformed into firemen to quell the flames of the revolution and the peoples' liberation wars. The formation of new Marxist-Leninist parties was a victory of historic importance for the working class of each country, as well as for the cause of the revolution on a world scale.

The parties in which Browderite, Khrushchevite, Titoite, Eurocommunist, Maoist modern revisionism became established were liquidated as communist parties. Revisionism stripped them of the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary spirit, transformed them from organized detachments

of the working class to carry out the revolution into weapons for «extinguishing» the class struggle, for establishing class «peace», for sabotaging the revolution and destroying socialism.

Bearing in mind the struggle which the modern revisionists wage against the Leninist theory and practice on the party, the genuine communist revolutionaries fight for the defence, strengthening and development of proletarian parties built on the basis of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. They are conscious that without such a party, without an organized vanguard detachment of the working class, the revolution cannot be carried out, the national liberation struggle cannot be waged correctly through to the end and the bourgeois-democratic revolution cannot be deepened and go over to the proletarian revolution.

The Marxist-Leninist party does not emerge and is not created accidentally or for no purpose. It emerges and is created as a result of certain very important objective and subjective factors. The Marxist-Leninist party emerges from the ranks of the working class, represents its highest aspirations, its revolutionary aims, and wages and carries forward the class struggle. Without the working class, without its revolutionary objectives, without the Marxist-Leninist theory, which is the theory of the working class, there can never be a Marxist-Leninist party.

A party of the working class becomes its truly organized detachment, its supreme staff, when it is educated with and masters the Marxist-Leninist theory and when it uses this powerful and irreplaceable weapon competently, in a creative way, in the class struggle for the triumph of the revolution, for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the construction of socialism.

That party which assimilates this theory but does not

apply it, or applies it incorrectly and continues to fail to correct the mistakes it is making, will not advance on the right road, but will deviate from Marxism-Leninism.

The genuine Marxist-Leninist party is characterized by the clear-cut and resolute stand which it maintains towards modern revisionism, towards Khrushchevism, Titoism, Mao Zedong thought, Eurocommunism, etc. The establishment of a clear line of demarcation over this question is of major principled importance.

If a party permits illusions to be created in its ranks, for example, that «irrespective of the Khrushchevite ideology, socialism is being built in the Soviet Union», that there are «bureaucrats» in the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union but there are «revolutionaries and Marxist-Leninists» as well, then willy-nilly such a party is no longer in a Marxist-Leninist position, but has deviated from the revolutionary strategy and tactics, and if not openly at least indirectly, has been transformed into a pro-Soviet party, irrespective of the fact that in words it might be against the theses of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Khrushchevism. Revolutionary experience has proved that you cannot fight against Khrushchevism if you do not also fight against the chauvinist and social-imperialist hegemonic policy which the leaders of the present-day capitalist and imperialist Soviet Union, Brezhnev, Suslov and company, follow.

The views of those who divide the reactionary line and the pro-imperialist policy of the current Chinese leaders from Mao Zedong and Mao Zedong thought are of the same nature and equally harmful. The counter-revolutionary stands of Deng Xiaoping and Hua Guofeng cannot be opposed and unmasked if the ideological basis of their actions, which is Mao Zedong thought, is not fought and unmasked.

The Party of Labour of Albania has reached this conclusion after making a profound analysis of Mao Zedong thought and the line which the Communist Party of China has followed. To defend Mao Zedong and his ideas without going deeply into and seriously analysing the events and facts means to fall into a revisionist deviation. As long as you do not clear up this position you cannot be in a genuine Marxist-Leninist position.

The Marxist-Leninist parties and the proletariat of each country never underestimate the pressure of the bourgeoisie and its ideology, the oppressive force of capitalism, imperialism, social-imperialism and deceptive revisionist ideologies. This pressure and these negative influences become harmful, very dangerous, if the party of the proletariat does not wage a resolute struggle against them and does not have a strong organization and iron proletarian discipline, and if it is not characterized by a steel unity of thought and action, which excludes any spirit of factionalism and groups.

This is why, along with raising their ideological level and waging the struggle against revisionism and the influences of the bourgeois ideology, the Marxist-Leninist parties devote the greatest care to their internal organizational strengthening on the basis of the Leninist norms and principles. The party is and becomes revolutionary when tested, active, dedicated, revolutionary elements militate in its ranks. They resolutely combat the sectarian intellectualist concepts which frequently, hiding behind the requirement to admit «trained elements», close the doors of the party to the workers and sound elements from the other strata of the working masses who, by militating in the ranks of the party, can gain all those qualities which must characterize the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat.

Sentimentality, liberalism, the tendency to seek num-

bers in order to give the impression that the ranks of the party are increasing with new members, are harmful and have grave consequences. Such admissions without strictly applying the Marxist-Leninist norms not only do not hinder the influence and pressure of the bourgeoisie from attacking the party from outside but allow the party to be infiltrated by various elements which divide and liquidate it.

The Marxist-Leninist parties in the capitalist countries are working and fighting in difficult conditions and encounter many dangers which come from various directions. These dangers are not imaginary. They are real, are encountered every day, in every step and in every action. They cannot be withstood if the communists do not understand that the program of action and struggle of the party is founded on the need for sacrifice for the great ideals of the cause of the proletariat and communism, if these sacrifices are not consciously accepted and made unhesitatingly at any moment, in any situation or circumstances which the major interests of the proletariat and the people require.

In the capitalist countries, the existence of many parties causes great confusion in people's minds. These parties are parties for votes; they are in the service of local and world capital. This united capital rules with the aid of state power and money, with the organized force of the army, the police and other organs of violence. The parties, which are linked with capital, with the various multinational concerns and companies, play the game of «democracy» with the aim of diverting the masses from the main objective of their struggle — throwing off the yoke of capital and seizing state power, that is, carrying out the revolution.

It is not without purpose that the bourgeois parties apply certain organizational and political orientations and

forms. For example, they allow anyone to enter or leave their ranks whenever he wants. All are «free» to talk and shout, to deliver discourses at meetings and rallies, but no one is allowed to act, to go beyond the bounds of the so-called freedom of speech. The transition from freedom of speech to concrete actions is classified and treated as an act of anarchists, criminals and terrorists.

The Marxist-Leninist party can never be such a party. It is not a party of words, but a party of revolutionary action. If its members are not engaged in concrete actions and struggle it will not be a genuine Marxist-Leninist Party, but a Marxist-Leninist party only in name. At given moments such a party will certainly be split into different factions, will have many lines which will coexist, and it will be turned into a liberal, opportunist and revisionist party. Such a party is neither suited to or needed by the working class.

A revolutionary Marxist-Leninist party cannot reconcile itself either to reformism or to anarchism and terrorism. It is against all these counter-revolutionary trends in whatever form they present themselves. The party must always bear in mind that it is impossible for the bourgeoisie not to attack it, that it is impossible that it will not call its actions the actions of anarchists and terrorists. However, this does not make the party tail behind events and the movement of the masses, give up actions and enter the vicious circle of revisionist and reformist parties.

It is the complex actions of the political, ideological and economic struggle of the Marxist-Leninist parties at the head of the working class against the bourgeoisie, social-democracy, revisionism and the bourgeois state, which enable the masses to determine whether or not these activities are truly revolutionary in character. The masses know how to distinguish genuine revolutionary

actions which are in their interests from terrorism and anarchism. Therefore, they join in the revolutionary actions which the Marxist-Leninist parties lead and rise against the power of the bourgeoisie regardless of the blows and the harsh oppression of the capitalist bourgeoisie, which goes as far as undertaking bloody actions against the working class and genuine communists.

The Marxist-Leninist communist party is not afraid of civil war, which the savage oppression and violence of the bourgeoisie lead to. It is known that civil war is not waged between the working class and honest working people, but is waged by the working masses against the ruling capitalist bourgeoisie and its organs of oppression. The revolutionary struggle of the proletariat must lead to the violent seizure of power. It is precisely this development of which the capitalists, the bourgeois and the revisionists are afraid. That is why social-democracy and the modern revisionists strive to prevent the working class from gaining revolutionary consciousness, from understanding the significance of economic, political and ideological problems, and reaching that revolutionary maturity and sound organization which help in the creation of the subjective conditions for the struggle for the seizure of power.

The strategy and tactics of the bourgeoisie, which the Eurocommunists have made their own, aim to split the working class so that they will not be faced with a unified striking force. The Marxist-Leninist parties, however, fight for the opposite, for the unity of the working class.

The bourgeoisie fears the revolutionary organization and unity of the proletariat, which, contrary to the preachings of the Eurocommunists and other revisionists, remains the main revolutionary motive force of our time. Therefore, it tries to maintain continuous control over trade-union organizations, over trade-union centres, which

can be numerous in the capitalist parties, with names and programs which appear different, but which have no essential differences between them. Through the bourgeois and revisionist parties and its own state structures, the bourgeoisie has encouraged as never before the diversionist role of the trade-unions which are openly manipulated by them.

As the facts show, trade-unions of this kind in many countries have become completely integrated into and appendages of the economic and state organization of capitalism. The ever more open collaboration of the trade-union centres with the owning class, with finance capital and the bourgeois governments is a notorious fact. As it is now, the trade-union movement does not challenge capitalism, but works for it, tries to subjugate the proletariat and to restrict and undermine its struggle against capitalism. Some of them are more like big capitalist concerns than trade-union organizations.

It is a fact that, as a result of this undermining activity carried out by the revisionists and social-democracy, by the bourgeois-reformist trade-union centres, the European proletariat remains split, and an important section of the workers is manipulated by these centres. The control of revisionists and social-democrats over the trade-union movement is a major obstacle to the development of the class struggle and the formation and tempering of the revolutionary consciousness of the working people. Therefore, the only road for the Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries, a road which is imposed on them, is to expose the activity of revisionists, to disintegrate their positions in the trade-union movement and to create revolutionary trade-unions. Obviously, these new trade-unions cannot but have the objective of achieving the unity of the working class against the power of capital,

against its demagogy and that of the bourgeois and revisionist parties.

To fight against the so-called traditional trade-unions does not mean that you are opposed in principle to the existence of unions as organizations of the masses with a broad character, as centres of the organization and resistance of the working class, historically inevitable and essential in the conditions of capitalism for uniting the working class and throwing it into the class struggle against the bourgeoisie.

While putting forward the task of creating revolutionary unions, the Marxist-Leninists in no way abandon their work in the existing unions in which there are large masses of workers, because, otherwise, they would leave the trade-union bosses a free hand to manipulate the working class and to use it in their own interests and the interests of capital. Participation of communists in the existing unions is not determined by contingency and is not a «tactic», as the Trotskyites try to present it, but a stand of principle which stems from the Leninist teachings on the need for unity of the working class, which cannot be achieved without working among the masses and without freeing them from the influences of the bourgeoisie and various opportunists.

Of course, the struggle of the Marxist-Leninist party within the reformist and revisionist trade-union centres does not have the aim of correcting or educating the trade-union bosses, or improving and reforming them. Such a stand would be a new reformism. The Marxist-Leninists work with the masses of trade-unionists in order to educate and prepare them for anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist and anti-revisionist revolutionary actions. The unity and cohesion of the proletariat is brought about in the process of work and struggle.

However, as Marxism-Leninism teaches us, the unity

of the working class is achieved, first of all, in the field of practice, through political actions and economic claims properly harmonized with one another, giving priority to political actions. Taking a firm revolutionary class stand, the Marxist-Leninists fight to link economic claims with political claims, and in this terrain denounce and expose the treacherous activity of the trade-union bosses who, through various trade-union manoeuvres, sacrifice the major fundamental interests of the proletariat.

At present, there are millions who come out on strikes, in demonstrations for economic claims, which also have a political character, because they are fighting capitalism which refuses to recognize the rights of workers. However, all these end up in an agreement between trade-union bosses and capitalists, who make the strikers some minor concession, just to give them a certain satisfaction. However, if these claims are given a real political character, the tools of capital in the trade-unions and capital itself are placed in great difficulties.

The worker aristocracy and the capitalist bourgeoisie are very much afraid of the linking of the economic struggle with the political struggle. They fear the political struggle, because it leads the working class a long way, and even leads it to clashes and battles. Political actions, properly carried out, weaken the leadership of the capitalist bourgeoisie in the trade-unions, break the rules, the laws, and everything else it has established in order to enslave the working class, and opens the eyes of the class.

The working class is the leading class, and as such, it must break its links with the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois psychology. In order to do this, it is necessary to fight both against liberal-opportunist views, which lead to rightist trade-unionist deviations, and against sectarian views which isolate the genuine Marxist party from

vigorous concrete work with the masses. Both these types of views have extremely harmful consequences for the cause of the revolution. Just as the reduction of the trade-union movement merely to struggle for economic demands must be combated, hesitation to fight for economic demands, for fear of going over to opportunism and the simple trade-union struggle, must also be avoided.

While fighting for the unity of the working class, the Marxist-Leninist parties see this as the basis for the unity of all the masses of the people, which is quite the opposite to those unprincipled, counter-revolutionary combinations and alliances which the Eurocommunists advocate.

The deepening of the crisis, which the capitalist-revisionist world is experiencing, is extending the social and class basis of the revolution. Apart from the working class, other strata of society exploited by capitalism, such as the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia and the students, the youth and the masses of women, are taking part ever more actively in the revolutionary movement. Therefore, the question of linking up with these masses and leading them becomes a task of first-rate importance for the Marxist-Leninist parties.

Direct work by the Marxist-Leninist party and its members in the ranks of the masses is indispensable and of great value, but it is insufficient to extend the influence of the party among the broad working masses, if the levers of the party, the organizations of the masses, such as those of the youth, women, etc., are not organized and set into action. The Marxist-Leninist party works wherever the masses are, even in the organizations which are run and manipulated by the bourgeois and revisionist parties, in order to wean away them from the influence of the reactionary and opportunist ideology of these parties, just as it works also to create the revolutionary organizations of the masses which militate on the line of

the party and act with conscious conviction under its leadership.

In the countries where capital rules, the youth, the women and other working masses are a major reserve of the revolution. Today there are millions of youth and women unemployed, abandoned and left without hope by the bourgeoisie, therefore they are seething with revolt and the elements of revolutionary outbursts are accumulating. Regarding the movements of the youth, students, intelligentsia and progressive women as important component parts of the broad democratic and liberation revolutionary movements in general, the Marxist-Leninists try to unite the drive and revolutionary aspirations of these broad masses with the drive and aspirations of the working class, in order to organize, educate and lead them on the right road. When the inexhaustible energies of the youth, the women and the other masses are united with the energies of the working class under the leadership of the proletarian party, there is no force which can stop the triumph of the revolution and socialism.

The hegemony of the proletariat will not be complete and effective if it is not extended over all the strata of the population interested in the revolution, especially over the peasantry which in the overwhelming majority of countries, represents the main and most powerful ally of the working class. At the same time, the alliance of the working class with the peasantry is the basis for uniting in a broad front all the working masses, all those who in one way or another are fighting against capitalism and imperialism, against oppression and exploitation by monopolies and multinational companies.

At the present time, many rallies and demonstrations are being held in the streets of cities and villages of the capitalist countries. Naturally, these are organized by the bourgeois, social-democratic and revisionist parties, which

have certain aims when they bring the masses out in the streets. Above all, they want to keep the revolted masses of working people under their control and to confine their demands within the economic framework permitted by the bourgeoisie. The task of the communists is not to stand apart from these demonstrations because the bourgeois and revisionist parties organize them, but to take part in these mass movements and turn them into political demonstrations and clashes with the bourgeoisie and its lackeys.

Inactivity, apathy and fruitless discussions are lethal to a Marxist-Leninist party. If a Marxist-Leninist party is not continually active, in movement with agitation and propaganda, if it does not take part in the different manifestations of the working class and the other working masses, irrespective that they may be under the influence of reformist parties, it will not be possible to alter the direction which the reformist parties give the movement of the masses.

The correct line of the Marxist-Leninist party cannot be carried among the masses by means of its press alone, which is usually very restricted. The communists, sympathizers, and members of the mass organizations carry the line of the party among the masses precisely during the activities and actions of the working class and the other working masses when they are in movement, in struggle and battle for their economic rights, and even more for their political rights.

Such vigorous revolutionary action ensures two important objectives: on the one hand, it tempers the party itself in action together with the masses and raises its authority and influence, and on the other hand, it creates possibilities for the party to see the most politically and ideologically sound and advanced elements of the working class in action, those who will be the best and the most

resolute militants of the party in the future. From these elements, the Marxist-Leninist parties secure the new blood for their ranks, and not from a few discontented intellectual elements, or some unemployed workers who demand justice, who are revolted, but are not so stable and do not accept the iron discipline of a Marxist-Leninist proletarian party.

The leaders of revisionist parties think that the whole work of the party consists of endless discussions, fruitless theorizing and empty contests over one question or another. Nothing comes out of such sterile work. The revisionist parties work on the masses through their press which, it must be admitted, is extensive. These parties themselves are big capitalist trusts, and they have paid workers especially to turn out their propaganda. They have become very skilful at preaching to the working masses what they should and what they should not do. With their demagoguery they obscure the final aim of the working masses, which is the overthrow of the capitalist system, and make them believe that what is achieved with a normal strike is everything. This big lie is in favour of the capitalist bourgeoisie. That is why the bourgeoisie is not worried by the words, the articles and the discourses of the salaried revisionist propagandists, or by the strikes which are held under the leadership of their parties.

The Marxist-Leninist parties never descend to these forms of the stale propaganda of the revisionist parties. They know that the uprising and the revolution do not come about automatically. They must be prepared. The best preparation is through actions. But together with action, the theory which guides these actions is necessary. Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin teach us that without revolutionary action there is no revolutionary theory and without revolutionary theory there is no revolutionary action.

The work of the Marxist-Leninist party among the masses, uniting them around concrete political objectives, is an important task, because the revolution is not carried out by the working class alone, and even less so by its vanguard, the communist party alone. To carry out the revolution, the working class enters into alliance with other social forces, with progressive parties and factions of them, with progressive individuals, with whom it has interests in common on various problems and at different periods. Broad popular fronts with definite political programs are created with these forces. The party of the working class is not dissolved in these fronts, but always retains its organizational and political independence.

The question of alliances is a very acute and delicate problem. The Marxist-Leninist party must follow, study and define the tendencies, demands and contradictions which exist within the movement of the masses, in other words, the dialectics of the class struggle. On this basis the communists choose the right road to achieve various alliances. The maturity of the Marxist-Leninist party is expressed in its sound analysis and assessment of the situation which exists in the ranks of the masses and amongst different political groupings for the creation of necessary alliances. Only with a correct policy and an accurate foresight of how events will develop will the party of the working class be able to maintain its individuality in these alliances and increase its influence among the masses which it wants to rally and throw into revolution.

The creation of different alliances and, on this basis, the creation of broad popular fronts becomes an imperative duty, especially in the conditions when in many countries the danger of fascism is great and immediate, and the pressure and interference of the superpowers against all countries have increased. The fact that the na-

tional issue is assuming a special and steadily increasing importance in the revolutionary process today favours the achievement of this unity and these alliances.

This is linked with the intensification of the expansionist hegemonic and aggressive policy of the imperialist powers. But the occupation of a country is not always done through military aggression. This enslavement, colonization, oppression and exploitation is also carried out in other «new», «modern», economic, cultural, political forms, which disguise savage imperialist domination.

That is why, when we say that the revolution is on the order of the day, this is also linked with the national issue, that is, with the occupation of one or some countries by the big capitalist and imperialist powers, either through direct military occupation or through indirect means and ways. In this sense, countries like Italy, Spain, Portugal, etc., although they are not occupied by the armed force of foreign armies, still suffer from foreign domination and interference.

The Eurocommunists can prattle as much as they like that their countries are free and sovereign, but in fact the Spanish, Italian, Portuguese and other peoples are oppressed and exploited. A bourgeois democracy exists in each of their countries, but the state there is bound hand and foot to foreign capital. The people, the working class do not enjoy genuine democracy and sovereignty, they are not free because everything is controlled by foreign capital.

During the Second World War, at the time when many countries were occupied by the German nazi or the Italian fascist armies, the quislings and collaborators united with the occupiers. Today, too, other quislings and collaborators, with different disguises and slogans, are in power and are bound to the new modern occupiers, the neocolonialists and their capital, with a thousand threads,

Very important for the preparation and carrying out of the revolution is the revolutionary work in the ranks of the bourgeois armies, which Lenin called

*«...the chief instruments of state power».**

Lenin has provided the answer to many theoretical and practical problems linked with the necessity of revolutionary work in the ranks of the bourgeois armies and has defined the ways to attack, demoralize and disintegrate them. This question assumes special importance in the present conditions when the revolutionary situations in many countries are maturing rapidly. In general, the bourgeois army is the bourgeoisie armed to the teeth which confronts the proletariat and the popular masses.

The large armies of the capitalist countries create the impression that in such circumstances the revolution and the smashing of the state of oppression and exploitation become impossible. These views are spread and propagated, especially, by the Eurocommunists who do not attack the bourgeois army even with feathers. In regard to the number of troops in the army, this does not make any great difference to the revolution, while it creates worrying problems for the bourgeoisie. The extension of the army with many elements from various strata of the population creates more favourable conditions for demoralizing the army and turning it against the bourgeoisie.

In this way the revolution encounters two major problems. On the one hand, it must win over the working class and the working masses, without whom it is impossible to go into the revolution and, on the other hand, it must demoralize and disintegrate the bourgeois army

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 25, p. 459, Alb. ed.

which suppresses the revolution. In the trade-unions, the bourgeoisie uses the worker aristocracy for its own ends, while in the army it uses the caste of officers who carry out the same functions there as the trade-union bosses in the trade-unions.

The principles, laws and organizational structures in the bourgeois armies are such that they allow the bourgeoisie to exert control over the army, to maintain and train it as a means to suppress the revolution and the peoples. This shows the markedly reactionary class character of the bourgeois army and exposes the efforts to present it as «above classes», «national», «outside politics», «respecting democracy», etc. Regardless of the «democratic traditions», the bourgeois army in any country is anti-popular and destined to defend the rule of the bourgeoisie and to carry out its expansionist aims.

However, the bourgeois army does not constitute a compact mass; there is not and cannot be unity in it. The antagonistic contradictions between the bourgeoisie, either capitalist or revisionist, on the one hand, and the proletariat and the working masses, on the other, are reflected in the armies of these countries, too. The masses of soldiers, made up of the sons of workers and peasants, have interests diametrically opposed to the character of the army and the mission the bourgeoisie charges it with. Like the workers and other working people, the masses of soldiers are interested in the overthrow of the exploiting order, and that is why the bourgeoisie shuts it up in barracks and isolates it from the people, turning the army, as Lenin pointed out, into a «prison» for millions of soldiers.

This is the basis of the conflict which grows constantly deeper between the soldiers, who are the sons of the people, and the commanding body, the officers, who are the executive hand of the capitalist bourgeoisie, trained

and educated to serve the interests of capital zealously. The work of the Marxist-Leninist party aims to make the soldier revolt against the officer, so that he does not carry out the orders, does not observe the discipline and the laws of the bourgeoisie, and sabotages the weapons in order to prevent them from being used against the people. Lenin said,

*«Not a single great revolution has ever taken place, or ever can take place, without the 'disorganization' of the army. For the army is the most ossified instrument for supporting the old regime, the most hardened bulwark of bourgeois discipline, buttressing up the rule of capital, and preserving and fostering among the working people the servile spirit of submission and subjection to capital.»**

Of course, the methods, forms and tactics to bring about the disorganization and disintegration of the army are many and varied, depending on the concrete conditions. The conditions are not identical in every country today and, therefore, the tactics of the Marxist-Leninists differ from one country to another. There are countries where fascist dictatorships and terror have been established openly, and there are others where those few legal forms of bourgeois democracy can and must be utilized. In general, however, personal work with individual soldiers, both inside and outside the barracks, the stern struggle of the workers, the continual strikes, demonstrations, rallies, protests, etc., play an important role, both for the mobilization of the masses and for the disorganization of the bourgeois army.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 28, p. 321, Alb. ed.

*«...all these, so to say, test battles and clashes,» pointed out Lenin, «are inexorably drawing the army into political life and consequently into the sphere of revolutionary problems. Experience in the struggle enlightens more rapidly and more profoundly than years of propaganda under other circumstances.»**

Work must be done with the soldier, the son of the people, before he joins the army, and later, when he is carrying out his military service, which is the most decisive phase, and finally, when he completes his service and becomes a reservist. Work with the lower ranking officers, in order to separate them from the caste of senior officers and to convince them not to raise their hand against the people, must not be excluded, either.

Of course, political work in the army is as dangerous as it is important. Whereas the worst that can happen to you for political activity and propaganda in the ranks of the trade-unions is to be dismissed from your job, in the army where political work and propaganda are sternly prohibited, the punishment could be to face the firing squad. However, revolutionary communists have never lacked the spirit of sacrifice, or the conviction that without working in this sector the way to the revolution cannot be opened.

At the same time, the disorganization of the bourgeois army is a component part of the strategy aimed to ruin the war-mongering plans of the capitalist bourgeoisie, to sabotage its predatory wars and transform them into revolutionary wars. This is how the bolsheviks acted with the czarist army in the time of Lenin. The

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 9, pp. 402-403, Alb. ed.

overthrow of Kerensky and his government which wanted to continue the imperialist war, Lenin's policy on peace, on the agrarian question and the distribution of the land among the poor peasants, etc., brought the soldiers over to the side of the revolution, while the officer caste remained with the White Guards, on the side of the counter-revolution. The Leninist strategy and tactics of struggle against the bourgeois army make it easier to encourage and mobilize the working class and the peoples for the revolution, for the anti-imperialist and the national liberation wars.

The world revolutionary movement has rich experience of work in the ranks of the bourgeois armies. In the czarist army in Russia in 1905, revolutionary committees of soldiers were created under the leadership of the Russian Social-democratic Party, of which Lenin was the leader. In the February Revolution of 1917, and especially in the October Revolution, party cells and Soviets of soldiers and sailors were formed in the detachments and units of the czarist armed forces, and these played the decisive role in taking the bulk of the bourgeois army over to the side of the revolution.

During the Anti-fascist National Liberation War in Albania, the Communist Party of Albania worked in deep illegality within the ranks of the army, and even in the gendarmerie, police, etc., in order to paralyse those tools and to bring about disorder in and desertions from their ranks. This compelled the enemy to distrust, and in some cases, to intern whole detachments of the old Albanian army which was in the service of the occupier. At the same time, many militarymen from the old army went over to our National Liberation Army.

Let us take another more recent example, that of the army of the Shah of Iran and his caste of officers, which notwithstanding that it was armed to the teeth

with the most sophisticated weapons was incapable of operating effectively and suppressing the anti-imperialist and anti-monarchist uprising of the Iranian people.

The Pahlavi regime was one of the most barbarous, blood-thirsty and corrupt regimes of exploiters of the modern world. The savage Pahlavi dictatorship was based on the feudal lords and the very wealthy stratum which the regime created, on the reactionary army and its officer caste, and on SAVAK which, as the Shah himself described it, was a «state within the state». The Pahlavis who ruled through terror were partners with and sold out to the American and British imperialists, the most heavily armed gendarmes of the Persian Gulf under the orders of the American CIA.

Nevertheless, the great terror, the army, SAVAK and all the rest were unable to quell the revolt of the Iranian people, which in different forms and intensities continued until it was raised to quality and overcame the stage of fearing violence. In this process the army and SAVAK, the shields of the bloodthirsty regime of the Shah, disintegrated, part of the army went over to the side of the people who seized the weapons and are holding on to them. This is an experience which proves that the army and the police, however numerous and well armed, cannot stop the revolution when the people rise in a united block, when careful work is done for the demoralization and disintegration of the bourgeois army and police.

It has now become fashionable in the capitalist countries for all sorts of people to speak about the «revolution» and to carry out allegedly revolutionary activities. The so-called «leftists» scream for «revolutionary measures», but then immediately set a limit to them. They «explain» that revolutionary measures should not be undertaken everywhere and in every field, but only some «alterations» should be made. Hence, an illusion should

be created to deceive the masses that are seeking radical revolutionary changes.

Like the bourgeoisie, the «leftists» see the army as an «impregnable fortress» and never even raise the task of disintegrating, demoralizing and destroying it. The Marxist-Leninist parties, however, without neglecting the other directions of the struggle, regard the struggle for the unity of the working class and the disintegration of the bourgeois army as two directions of decisive importance for the triumph of the revolution.

*«Of course,» said Lenin, «unless the revolution assumes a mass character and affects the troops, there can be no question of serious struggle.»**

The purpose of the work of the Marxist-Leninists in the ranks of the bourgeois and revisionist armies is to draw the militarymen into conscious revolutionary activity, and not simply to organize coups d'état. Marxist-Leninists have never regarded the overthrow of the capitalist order as a question of putsches and military plots, but as a result of the conscious activity and active participation of the masses in the revolution.

Coups d'état, plots organized by the officer caste have become fashionable in many countries of the world. By these means the monopoly groups bring down one government and replace it with another in their service. By means of military coups, the American imperialists and Soviet social-imperialists have placed reactionary cliques in their service at the head of the state in many countries of the world. In these cases, the mass of soldiers has frequently blindly served the interests of the local ruling classes and imperialist superpowers.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 11, p. 183, Alb. ed.

In such instances, the genuine revolutionaries make things clear to the masses of soldiers, so that they will not be deceived by the reactionary propaganda which presents the military coups as actions «in the interests of the nation», «in the interests of the people and defence of the nation», etc. They make clear also that anarchism, terrorism and gangsterism, which are assuming extensive proportions in the capitalist and revisionist countries, have nothing in common with the revolution, either. Daily facts prove that the groups of anarchists, terrorists, and gangsters are used by reaction as an excuse and a weapon for the preparation and the establishment of the fascist dictatorship, to intimidate the petty bourgeoisie and to make it a tool and a hotbed of fascism, to put pressure on the working class and keep it bound with the chains of capitalism under the threat that it will lose those few crumbs which the bourgeoisie «has given it».

All these currents and groups are disguised behind alluring names, such as «proletarian», «communist», «red brigades», and other labels which sow total confusion. The activities of these groups have nothing to do with Marxism-Leninism, with communism.

In its propaganda, the bourgeoisie accuses the communists, those who are genuinely for revolution and socialism, for the overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie, of being terrorists, anarchists and gangsters, and tries to build up opinion against the genuine revolutionary organizations of the proletariat and its vanguard. This is one of the main purposes for which it incites terrorism and gangsterism, which in such countries as Italy is assuming major proportions.

The Marxist-Leninists always take account of these manoeuvres and tricks of the bourgeoisie and struggle to expose and defeat them. They reject the attacks, accusations and slanders of the bourgeoisie and its lackeys who

call the illegal activity of the Marxist-Leninist parties terrorism and gangsterism.

Whether the Marxist-Leninist party is illegal, either partly or completely, depends on the concrete conditions of a particular country. Irrespective of these conditions, however, the organization of illegal work is the greatest guarantee that the victory will be secured. Without this organization the great striking force of the bourgeois dictatorship wreaks havoc and gravely damages the proletariat and its vanguard at the moments the dictatorship finds it suitable to do so.

A party of the working class, which does not foresee moments of fierce attacks and clashes with the forces of the capitalist bourgeoisie, is not a genuine revolutionary party. For such a party, the theoretical principle that power cannot be seized from the bourgeoisie except by violence, by fighting and making sacrifices, remains an empty phrase, a mere slogan. Moments of fierce struggle are inevitable and in these moments of fierce struggle legal propaganda bases alone are not sufficient. At these moments, the communist party must have its fighting bases, must have created its striking forces, must have its rear secure and equip them with the necessary political, ideological and material means. The coming actions will require sacrifices, there will be people who are hurt, who are killed or imprisoned. Therefore, work must be done to build up around the party a great mass of dedicated people, resolute revolutionaries who listen to the party and will hurl themselves into revolutionary action together with it.

Meanwhile, the Marxist-Leninist parties know they must also take advantage of bourgeois «democracy» and the possibilities which legal work and struggle provide for the preparation of the revolution. Even when they operate legally, they make efforts to ensure that their

activities serve to fulfil the requirements and tasks of the revolution, the ideo-political, organizational and military preparation of the party and the masses for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, regardless of what the bourgeois laws permit or do not permit.

On all occasions and under all conditions, the genuine revolutionary parties know that they must combine the organization and development of illegal and legal struggle correctly, using only those revolutionary forms of work and tactics which do not obscure their strategy with illusions about bourgeois legality and democracy.

*«In all countries, even in those that are freest, most 'legal', and most 'peaceful' in the sense that the class struggle is least acute there,» said Lenin, «it is now absolutely indispensable for every Communist Party to systematically combine legal and illegal work, legal and illegal organizations.»**

At first sight, it seems that the working class in Western Europe is bound tight in the chains which social-democracy and the revisionists called Eurocommunists have rivetted on to it, and that the workers' movement is strongly under the influence of bourgeois and revisionist ideology. However, this appearance does not reflect the reality. Moreover, it does not indicate the tendencies of social development, the processes which are seething in the ranks of the working masses, the historical necessity and imperative demands of the time.

The bourgeoisie, the revisionists and all the other opportunists are trying to restrain the revolution and to extinguish the communist ideal. At given stages and in special historical conditions, they even manage to be-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 31, p. 211, Alb. ed.

use and confuse the proletariat and working masses, and to obscure the prospects of the socialist future to some degree. But this is a temporary and passing phenomenon. The revolution and socialism as a theory and practical activity cannot be imposed on the masses from outside by isolated individuals or groups of people. The revolution and socialism represent the only key which the proletariat and the masses need to solve the irreconcilable contradictions of capitalist society, to put an end to their exploitation and oppression and establish genuine freedom and equality. As long as there is oppression and exploitation, as long as capitalism exists, the thinking and struggle of the masses will always be directed towards the revolution and socialism.

The Eurocommunists have rejected the banner of Marxism-Leninism, the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. They preach class peace and sing hymns to bourgeois democracy. However, the ills of bourgeois society are not cured and its contradictions are not resolved with sermons and hymns. History has already proved this and its lessons cannot be set aside. The proletariat, the oppressed and the exploited are moving naturally towards the revolution, towards the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism. Just as naturally they are seeking the road which leads to the fulfilment of these historical aspirations, the road which the immortal theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin shows them. It is the duty of the new Marxist-Leninist communist parties to take over the leadership of class battles which the Eurocommunists have abandoned, to provide the proletariat and the masses with that militant fighting vanguard which they are seeking and accept as their leadership.

The situation is not easy, but let us recall the optimistic words of Stalin, that «there is no fortress which

the communists cannot take». This revolutionary optimism stems from the objective laws of the development of society. Capitalism is an order condemned by history to liquidation. Nothing, neither the frenzied resistance of the bourgeoisie nor the treachery of modern revisionists can save it from its inevitable doom. The future belongs to socialism and communism.

Published according to the book
«Eurocommunism Is Anticommunism». Albanian edition,
Tirana 1978.

THE PROGRESS OF THE COUNTRY IS INSEPARABLE FROM THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCIENCE AND TECHNIQUE

*From the closing speech at the 8th Plenum of the CC
of the PLA (1)*

June 25, 1980

The analysis and discussion of the problems of science at this Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party were necessary and useful.

Our country has now reached an advanced stage of socio-economic development at which creative and transforming scientific-research activity has its own very important role and place, but work must be done to raise it to an even higher quantitative and qualitative level, with the aim that it should make a greater and more effective contribution to all this development.

Our Homeland is the only country which is successfully building genuine socialist society and it is doing so in peculiar historical circumstances, encircled by the capitalist-revisionist world and without accepting any econ-

1 On June 24-25, 1980, the 8th Plenum of the CC of the PLA held its proceedings in which it analysed the report of the Political Bureau, «We must raise the level of the scientific-research work and raise its efficiency for the present and perspective development of the country», delivered by member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the CC of the PLA, Comrade Ramiz Alia.

omic aid or credit from abroad. This is not the case with other states, not only the small states but also the big ones which, being capitalist or revisionist, use science and technique to oppress and exploit the broad working masses and to realize their predatory, imperialist ambitions.

As well as this, today our country is facing the majestic tasks set in the 7th Five-year Plan which we are drafting and which we shall accomplish entirely with our own forces. These are the main circumstances which impelled the Political Bureau to decide to hold a special discussion on the problems of science and scientific-research work at this meeting of the Central Committee, with the aim **of placing science and technical progress more thoroughly in the service of the present and future development of the country, for the development of the economy, the education of the new man and the strengthening of the defence of the Homeland.**

...

Our Party has given great importance to science and scientific and technical progress in our country and it will continue to do so, because their development is inseparable from the needs of our socialist social life. At no time have science and scientific and technical progress been an aim in themselves for our Party and State. **Science and technique have advanced and developed directly serving the needs for production and social life, just as the latter, for their part, have been and are permanent factors impelling the development of science and technique.**

The sciences, both technical and natural, like literature, art, and so on, are a form of the social consciousness. Science acts upon the general development of the civilization, of the society, just as the arts, literature,

technique, etc., do. It is not an isolated epiphenomenon, but, on the contrary, is linked by strong and deep roots with the social, ideological, economic and political terrain. Science is linked with the epochs and develops in different epochs. Science, or scientific thinking, cannot and must not be divorced from the social context in which it evolves. Thus, it is inseparable from the general history of mankind, from the progress of society.

The practice of the society is the source of the development of sciences and the criterion which proves the correctness of their theses. Today the connection between the development of science, technique and the productive forces has become closer. Under the influence of science and technical and scientific progress the material and intellectual potential of society increases and this, for its part, gives a new impulse to the development of science. Its development always follows a materialist-dialectical course. As our great classics teach us, the progress of chemistry led to materialism, the development of mathematics to determinism and atheism. Through the introduction of geometry Archimedes overthrew the theories of Aristotle about the universe and the properties of bodies, and so on.

Naturally, proper knowledge of the sciences today is not so simple even for the experts themselves, but on the contrary, is very complicated. The sciences have now extended so greatly that even the most capable scientist loses his bearings, as they say, and finds it difficult to present the idea of the extent of this or that science in a brief summary. **Every science is divided into separate branches and each branch is a speciality. The development and multiplication of knowledge leads to specialization, and specialization demands the closest possible co-operation between various scientific disciplines and all kinds of different research methods and techniques.** As a

result of specialization and the intensive cooperation between specialities it is becoming ever more difficult to distinguish the dividing line between scientific disciplines and to understand one without the other.

What, for example, are physics and chemistry? These are two sciences that are so closely related that you could call them «cousins». Their objects and methods are very similar to one another, indeed, we can say they are interlinked. However, both of them serve the study of the universe and have been differentiated as have the other natural sciences.

In the harmonious explanation of the world, sciences would have left many similar things and phenomena in obscurity, had the links between them not been disclosed. Therefore, no science can be learned, applied and further developed without linking its problems and methods with those of other sciences. Physics or chemistry, electronics or atomic studies, could not have made progress without using the language of mathematics. A close, dialectical connection exists also between the technical and natural sciences and the economic and social sciences.

This results from the complex nature of various problems and phenomena in life, in which the material, technical and technological aspects are not separated from the political, economic and social aspects. This requires that in our practice we must overcome incorrect manifestations which are seen in both directions. In many cases the problems in the technical and natural sciences are considered over as soon as the technical and technological aspects are solved, without taking proper account of their socio-economic aspect. On the other hand, the economic and social sciences must have their say more clearly and in a more complex way about the directions in which achievements of the technical and natural sciences are used, about the possibilities of putting them into practice,

the order in which this should be done and their economic benefit.

If we look at the question in this way we will understand how closely the sciences are linked with one another, both in the aspect of fundamental research and, even more so, in regard to research for application. Hence, it emerges that concern about the collaboration, cooperation and synthesis amongst workers of different scientific disciplines must not be abandoned or even weakened. Otherwise, science does not advance, but stagnates, progress gets stuck at the artisan forms and prospects for further advance are not opened.

The development of applied sciences is based, to a large degree, on the fundamental sciences. Frequently, the benefit of a scientific discovery is not seen immediately, but what seems at the moment like an unusable result of «pure» science the coming generations will appreciate and apply for great works. The history of the development of science provides countless examples of this. Let us take, for instance, the discovery of mathematical analysis by Newton and Leibniz. Their contemporaries considered it valuable, but could it have been imagined at that time that the engineer of the future would use it so extensively for the construction of bridges and skyscrapers and to fire artillery shells over a range of more than 120 kilometres? No, this could not have been imagined. Similar things have occurred, also, with the scientific theories of outstanding astronomers like Tycho Brahe and Kepler, and the theories of great scientists and physicists such as Einstein and others.

In the conditions of our country we have to insist firmly on application and this is where we must concentrate the main forces for scientific-research work. This does not mean that pure studies in the field of fundamental sciences should not be done, too. In this direction

we must struggle harder to assimilate the theory of natural and technical sciences **with the aim of understanding and successfully applying the applicable achievements of these sciences on a broad scale and must put them into practice.** This is the way to make the transition from theory to practice, and also to combat empiricism and academicalism in scientific activity. Our people of science must consider routine harmful and non-creative in the study of science and its practical application, must consider it a serious obstacle which must be resolutely combated. But, at the same time, they must also combat spurious reasoning and speculation in any kind of science, because this not only makes their knowledge sterile, but also causes the degeneration of science.

In this context, too, the logic of the linking of theory and practice must be developed, both among the people of science and among those of production, both by the university and by the base, both by the specialist who works at the base and by the specialist who works in the central institutions. The people of science must proceed from the principle that the theoretical and experimental data can be elevated to science when they are linked together in a logical way.

Even from such a general view of these major problems of science we can come to the conclusion that we have to do a great deal of work now and in the future in order to apply the achievements of science and follow its advance.

The society exerts an influence on the development of science, but science also exerts an influence on the development of society. The socialist revolution, in particular, gives a great impulse to science. The development that science assumed with the French bourgeois-democratic revolution is well known, but the Great October Socialist Revolution, led by Lenin and Stalin, gave science a colossal forward impulse.

With the triumph of the people's revolution and the construction of socialism in our country science has assumed a great impetus. It is an undeniable fact that by applying the line and the policy of the Party our social sciences have made their valuable contribution to the clarification and scientific elucidation of the laws of development of socialist society, to the defence of the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism and the exposure of bourgeois and revisionist views and practices and to the scientific elaboration of the ancient and glorious history of our people. They have played and are playing a major role in the communist education of the working people and the perfection of relations of production and the superstructure of our socialist society.

Important studies and research work have been done for the rapid development of the productive forces, for the building of an independent, complex economy and the construction of the material-technical base of socialism. The workers, cooperativists and specialists are forging ahead with their ideas, making proposals for improvements, in order to replace the old with the new.

Despite the great work which is going on everywhere, however, we cannot say that a correct concept and appreciation of research work and study have been achieved...

On these matters a major change must be made by the leaders of all ranks, by the workers, cooperativists and specialists, by the higher and middle cadres, wherever they work and run things. Efforts must be made to forge ahead more boldly, more confidently and in methodical ways in the assimilation and the application of science. Otherwise, the advance will be small and not in proportion with the tasks and the great and growing needs of the country.

Our people, whether in the leading apparatus or in

production, at the centre or the base, must always bear in mind the lesson on which Lenin insisted:

*«...we must learn and then see to it that learning shall not remain a dead letter or a fashionable catch-phrase (and we should admit in all frankness that this happens very often with us), that learning shall really become part of our being, that it shall actually and fully become a constituent element of our social life. In short, we must not make the demands that are made by bourgeois Western Europe, but demands that are fit and proper for a country which has set out to develop into a socialist country.»**

I think that the tasks included in the report on the development of scientific-research work which was presented to the Plenum should be considered as integral parts of the five-year plan that we are preparing. Science must assist the planning of production, precede production, and open perspectives for the development of the economy and culture. The plan which is being drafted is being discussed at the base and coming back to the central organs. But the decisions of this Plenum must not be conceived as separate from the 7th Five-year Plan and we must not proceed from the mistaken idea that «it is over and done with», and leave the scientific studies and research work which have to do with the drafting and improvement of the five-year plan to spontaneity. In no way must this occur.

Of course, on certain issues this Plenum also sets tasks for a term somewhat longer than the objectives of the 7th Five-year Plan. By including the main tasks for

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 33, p. 550, Alb. ed.

the development of science and technique in the framework of the five-year plan, however, they will help us to define more accurately the needs for cadres, funds, and the material base and for the improvement of the organization of scientific work from the base to the centre and other matters.

The aim of all this work is to make the development of science and technical progress a powerful support for the accomplishment of the major objectives and tasks ahead of us. In connection with this it should be borne in mind that the 7th Plenum of the Central Committee called on the **working people of science to devote all their physical and mental energies to the new five-year plan we are drafting**. Everything envisaged during the five-year period for the development of productive forces and the improvement of relations of production, which are linked with science and scientific studies, must be absolutely guaranteed from all stand-points.

Here the problem must be seen from two aspects: the drafting of this plan on the soundest possible scientific basis, especially, in regard to its practical application, as well as the opening of perspectives for the future. Of course, this also presupposes verification and more complete elucidation in the process of carrying out the tasks of the plan. Scientific and technical progress is a major reserve which must be used to improve and overfulfil our plans.

The main links and directions of scientific-research work and technical progress have been defined in the fundamental orientations which the Central Committee has issued for the future development of the economy and culture. For the 7th Five-year Plan they include the development in breadth and depth of heavy industry for the extraction, enrichment and processing of minerals; the development and strengthening of the energy base

of the country, mainly of the oil industry; the completion and exploitation at full capacity of the projects which the Chinese revisionists sabotaged and left half-finished, a task in which the engineering industry has a special role; the development of agriculture and livestock farming; the fulfilment of the needs for the defence of the country, as well as the development of other branches and sectors of the economy and culture.

The successful accomplishment of these objectives in the existing situation and at the present stage demands **an absolutely correct concept of scientific work and of the development and deepening of the technical-scientific revolution as a whole.** The rationalizations and innovations which are made by the workers and specialists and which bring advances in technique are undoubtedly based on an advanced empirical element. Included in them, also, are isolated notions and elements of scientific knowledge. These rationalizations and innovations must be made, indeed should be increased, both in quantity and quality. This requires large-scale involvement of the masses in this work, which solves important problems of production and must be encouraged and organized better so that it responds properly to the existing conditions and the great tasks which we face.

However, we must not confound what you could call minor scientific work for the improvement of a process, the carrying out of a rationalization in a factory, or an improvement in agriculture, which is very useful and certainly must be encouraged in every way, with scientific work in the broader and purer sense of the term. **What we require from scientific work is a generalization, a whole positive improvement and transformation of practice and theory, a qualitative upsurge, you might say, a revolution in production, technique, technology or orga-**

nization in the whole factory, in all the factories of the same or similar type, in various fields of our development, providing solutions to the current problems which arise in life as well as opening up prospects for the future.

These demands for scientific-research work should be seen in unity, both by the workers and by those engaged in studies at the base and in the centre. They have to do with the active role of science itself, with the quality and effectiveness of scientific-research work. Departure from them has negative consequences for the present and future development of the country and for science itself.

Let us look at the field of technology and construction from this stand-point. The setting up of a series of production lines, departments and plants with our own forces, and likewise the production of tractors and drilling-rigs, the building of ships and other means of transport are successes. A good part of them have been built or produced mainly at the level of the existing technology, following known and possible models.

We have a planned and frugal economy which stems from the nature of our socio-economic order, but we are a small country. This impels us to use the material and technical base we have created as long as we possibly can by being very careful about its maintenance, and we shall go on doing this. Likewise, we shall continue to produce machinery and equipment on the basis of the existing level. But now the time has come and the possibilities have been created when we should think and work more for the perspective in order to design and produce machinery and equipment of new types, with technical-economic qualities and parametres which respond to the level of the technique and technology of the present day and should not proceed only from the idea of producing that type which can be accomplished and built more

easily, but which is not always the best or most suitable. Thus, we can develop the productive forces in extensive and intensive ways.

In this field, however, the scientists, the specialists, the innovators and others who are engaged in creative scientific work must speak out loudly and continually ask the question: Is what we are doing the best, the most effective and suitable to the needs and the economic and social possibilities of our country? If this is not done in practice we will not keep up with the times, we will talk about the necessity for the development and intensification of the economy, but will not really do as much as we should in comparison with the possibilities which exist and which will be even greater in the future. I make this suggestion, also, for the working groups which are being set up for the designing of the technologies and the production of machinery for the reconstructions and the new projects of the 7th Five-year Plan.

Of course, these problems are not simple or easily solved. They require many studies, comparisons and experiments, because here we have to do, in the first place, with technology which, as is known, is a whole complex of interconnected methods and processes which are used in the processing of primary and other materials during the process of production in order to transform them into finished products. Here we also run up against the monopoly of technology which the capitalists and revisionists try to use as a means of pressure for the subjugation of the peoples, a thing we must bear well in mind in our work.

The major improvements which need to be made in technology in all branches and sectors of our economy as well as the tasks which we have and which will increase in the future, to design and build many new projects

with our own forces, make the training of cadres in this field an imperative need. The programs and the level of teaching and the training of cadres for the technological aspects of production in our higher and secondary schools must be re-examined and there should be studies on how to overcome the shortage of cadres in certain specialities by training them within the country, or, if need be, by sending some caches abroad for specialization.

At present the engineering industry in our country is entering a new stage, that of machine building, on a more extensive scale. According to the draft of the 7th Five-year Plan, production of machinery and equipment is to increase about 80 per cent in comparison with the 6th Five-year Plan, a thing which has not occurred in any other five-year period...

We do not have experience of such a thing on this scale, but we must and certainly will gain it. Our needs will impel us to forge ahead, just as we have done hitherto in all fields of life and science. We are well aware of what Engels wrote in analysing the dialectical connection between science and the needs of practice:

*«If... technique depends to a great degree on the state of science, science depends to an even greater degree on the **state** and the **needs** of technique. When society is faced with a technical need, it carries science forward more than tens of universities.»**

...

The studies, designs and experimental work on the problems of thermal energy must be raised to a higher

* K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, vol. 2, Tirana 1975, p. 545, Alb. ed.

scientific and organizational level. They must cover important problems such as the scientific study of the energy balance of projects with large consumption, of industrial regions and the whole national economy. Studies must be carried out on the more efficient combustion of solid fuels, by adapting the heat generating equipment to the different types of coal, as well as on raising the level of concentration of sources generating thermal energy for electric power with the aim that this energy should be used in a more complex way in industry, in agriculture, for heating, etc.

On the basis of the Marxist-Leninist agrarian policy of the Party our agriculture has advanced and is forging ahead in original ways which are correct and with clear perspectives. Today about two thirds of our population live and work in the countryside and we shall continue to maintain this situation for most of them. We are doing this by developing agriculture both intensively and extensively as well as by the more extensive introduction of industry and the activity of other branches and sectors of the economy in rural areas. Nevertheless, agriculture will always take pride of place in the countryside. We are proceeding on the course of the intensification of agricultural production in conditions when we continue to increase the labour force in agriculture from the population of the countryside and partly from the city. Likewise, we are successfully applying the policy of continually reducing the distinctions between countryside and city.

The progress on this course is a great success in the interests of our whole society and a thing which is not occurring anywhere else in the world, where the countryside is being abandoned and agriculture degraded. On the one hand, the capitalists and revisionists talk about turning their countries into industrial and superindustrial countries, but on the other hand, they are facing irre-

futable facts of the stagnation and decline of agricultural production, of profound agrarian crises, gloomy prospects and the panic which has seized them. Openly or reluctantly all of them are obliged to admit these phenomena from the positions of neo-Malthusianism.

The further development of achievements in the field of the agrarian policy, the development of agriculture and the progress of the countryside, bringing life there closer to that of the city and ensuring its advance parallel with that of the city, presents the agricultural, economic and social sciences with major problems which require them to thoroughly study the problems of the intensive and extensive development of agriculture, those of the harmonization and efficiency of branches of agricultural production, of the perfection of relations of distribution and exchange and the educational, cultural and social progress of our socialist countryside.

Our Party plays a militant, vanguard role in defence of Marxism-Leninism. Life has compelled us to build socialism in our country in special conditions and circumstances, encircled by savage imperialist and revisionist enemies, and to advance on untrodden paths and achieve success. Looking at the matter from this stand-point, our social sciences face major problems both to sum up the experience of our revolution and socialist construction and to indicate the prospects of our development on the most thoroughly scientific basis.

The bourgeoisie and the revisionists, all the hired propagandists of capital: philosophers, politicians, economists, sociologists and their other lackeys, are making feverish efforts to prettify and defend the rotten order of capitalist oppression, to hinder the revolution and the peoples' liberation struggle, to combat and revise the Marxist-Leninist theory on the revolution, the party of the working class and the dictatorship of the prolet-

ariat, the construction of socialism, the class struggle, and its other cardinal problems. Amongst this mess which the international bourgeoisie has cooked up in the context of the counter-revolutionary global aims of its imperialist strategy, it is an imperative duty for the social sciences, under the leadership of the Party, to play a greater role in defence of Marxism-Leninism, to open up the perspectives and to bring out more clearly the experience of our socialist revolution.

The Great October Socialist Revolution, led by Lenin and Stalin on the basis of the doctrine of Marx and Engels, is known to the whole world, therefore everybody speaks about it, either for or against, while our revolution is relatively less known. A great many people in the world know that there is a socialist Albania which remains unwavering and which has its own line, but this astonishes them and they say: «How can this be, how can Albania stand like this?» It is the duty of our social sciences, through scientific generalizations and studies, to explain the objective and subjective factors of our revolution and socialist construction, to explain that the situation which was created in our country was utilized by the Party by faithfully adhering to the Marxist-Leninist theory in the concrete conditions of our country. This theory teaches us the revolutionary road through which the others, too, absolutely have to pass, destroying imperialism and revisionism.

Regardless of all the pressures, blackmail, deception and corruption, what our great classics, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin predicted scientifically is occurring in the present epoch: the antagonistic contradiction between the productive forces and the capitalist relations of oppression and exploitation in production is on the way to being resolved. The proletariat which is oppressed and exploited, the starving millions in Asia, Africa, Latin America

and all over the world will reach a point when they can no longer endure their situation and will certainly erupt in revolution.

Our socialist country is and must become even more an example of inspiration and encouragement for the proletariat and the oppressed peoples of the world. From this, too, emerges once again the necessity that our social sciences: political-philosophical, economic, historical, linguistic, ethnographic, and so on, must carry out complex studies and generalizations about the ancient history of the Albanian people, about their genesis and heroic past, about the history of the language and the formation of our nation, about the glorious epic of the National Liberation War, about the course we have pursued for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the creation and development of our socialist economy and culture, and a series of other problems which emerge from life and our revolutionary development. The social sciences should direct their attention, first of all, to current themes and those problems which demand solution...

The social sciences, our school, art and culture must militate better for the revolutionary tempering and education of our new man imbued with the Marxist-Leninist world outlook so that he can understand and consistently apply the correct line and policy of our Party.

An advanced country which is building genuine socialism ought to be outstanding, also, for the material and spiritual culture of its people, for the socialist way of their life, beginning from the new man and the cultural enlightenment of the people, the concern which is displayed for the health of the people, the problems of town-planning and architecture, down to the level of culture displayed in trade and other services, in short, it ought to be outstanding in every field of life. These things require scientific study work with broad horizons and

perspectives, just as more effective measures are required on the part of the state organs and all the other levers of the Party.

Likewise, the organizations of the masses, which are in daily contact with the broad masses of the working people of town and countryside, can and must undertake more studies in the political, ideological, sociological and other fields with their own internal forces and activists in order to place their work on more scientific foundations

Science and scientific-research work today have achieved a stage of development and are confronted with tasks and requirements such that dictate the need for more perfect management and organization from the centre to the base. Since we say that the revolution in science and technique is carried out by the masses, a thing which is an indisputable reality in our country, then we must respond to the raising of this revolution to new levels with more effective management and organization. This becomes more imperative if we bear in mind the nature, difficulties and complexity of scientific-research activity, from the simplest work of innovation and creation to the more complicated scientific activity.

Here there are a series of questions, things which we have considered correct in their own time, but which, in the new conditions and with the new tasks, must be re-evaluated and solved better. To what extent are all these people and links of science, of scientific activity and innovation, engaged in their proper jobs, to what extent does the organization we have help in carrying the work forward and how can it be improved? How adequately do the human, material, financial and currency resources support the objectives which we put forward, because they could seem to us fine and sufficient when they may not be and are not so? However, this could jeopardize

many of those tasks which we lay down in the field of development of science and technique.

Political and economic leadership must exist **in the leading unity of every state institution at the centre and the base**. These occupy first place. In second place, and auxiliaries of the former, come the scientific organisms, followed by the administration, which has its own role and function in every institution. There is no doubt that all our state activity is guided by specific scientific work harmonized in every particular direction. The inhibitive and bureaucratic character which is sometimes displayed in management and organization should not be accepted by the political and economic leadership but should be fought. It is essential that manifestations of bureaucracy and liberalism must be resolutely combated, because they hinder the application of the new achievements of science in a thousand ways.

The political and operational leadership must not get bogged down in trifling details, but should have initiative and not try to dodge nerve-racking problems. Scientific opinion and ideas on innovations must be listened to and people encouraged to make useful proposals in order to give an impulse to production and all other activities, both short-term and long-term. These must be applied and not be left to get covered with dust. Application proves both the scientific worth of the step which is taken and the result which it brings in the development of production and in the social field.

It is an immediate need, also, to examine how effective are the work and co-ordination of **the various scientific institutes and organisms of the central departments and the Academy of Sciences**. The departmental institutes must engage themselves in the scientific and technical problems which are closely linked with the advance of production, education and culture and must not be turned

into organs of administrative activity as they frequently are today. In the next steps which will be taken the need may arise for the creation of some new specialized scientific organisms, but it is essential that this should be done after very careful consideration and with an eye to economizing, because while we want to advance in science we must combat the institute mania.

We have considered the institutes nuclei which must carry out scientific work, but they are required to base themselves firmly on those thousands and thousands of higher and middle cadres and vanguard workers and cooperativists **who constitute the greatest reserve**. Only in this way can a new, further impulse be given to the work of innovation and scientific research.

The technical and technological bureaus and the scientific councils in the enterprises and cooperatives have a special role as links in the whole of scientific work. In this direction the manifestations of the simplification of their work must be combated because in many cases they have been turned more into groups which solve problems of current processes of production or make some minor technological improvement which, in fact, should be done by the worker who performs and controls the production. In some cases they will do such work, too, but this should not become their normal duty. The tasks of the technical and technological bureaus and scientific councils should be clearly defined and their work put on a sound basis by activating around them tens of higher specialists and hundreds of workers and cooperativists with experience and schooling, who exist in every enterprise and cooperative.

The work of innovation and scientific research in the enterprises and agricultural cooperatives is and must be much more extensive than the direct work which the technical and technological bureaus and the scientific

councils do. This daily activity must be guided better and must be supported and encouraged in every way. It continually gives rise to valuable initiatives, both planned and unplanned. The thing is that these initiatives should be evaluated, sorted out, as they say, and then measures taken to apply them. Gradually further steps should be taken towards the mass adoption, specialization and centralization of these innovations, and bureaucratic obstacles should not be raised, as they sometimes are in practice, on the pretext that «the main thing is the accomplishment of the plan», that «this or that innovation is not related to the profile of the enterprise», etc., etc.

In scientific-research work, as in every other activity, man, with political and ideological education and scientific training, is the decisive factor for carrying the work ahead. Now the Party has trained a whole army of higher and middle cadres whose numbers are increasing every year. They have brought about a great development of science and knowledge, and the results in this field, as in every other field, are obvious and tangible. **Nevertheless, I think they should have done and should do still more.** Wherever we have created the conditions the work proceeds more boldly, but there are also many objective and subjective obstacles which emerge to prevent the men of science from contributing their maximum. Among them there are some who lack the will for creative scientific work, who forget that every scientific discipline has and requires its own method of research, development, application and conception, **the basis on which that science is applied.**

...

There is also another question which must be made very clear. If the number of higher cadres in production or other sectors is increased, then the Party expects of

them and demands that, in collaboration with the working collectives, they make progressive changes and improvements, otherwise their work will not give the desired effect. Naturally, the cadres in production are responsible and must be responsible, first of all, for the drafting and application of the plan on the basis of the requirements of science and technique, but they are also required to make their valuable contribution to the work of scientific and technical research.

Therefore, the engineers, agronomists, economists and all the other specialists must be charged with carrying out concrete tasks and plans, requiring, for example, that within this or that period the technological parameters, mechanization, savings, yields of agricultural crops, etc., should achieve this or that level. This will also assist the participation of the masses in the application of science. The Party is seeking efficiency of production, but this cannot be achieved without effective scientific-research work.

The nurseries for the training of capable cadres, our scientists, are the University and other higher schools. Their main task is to turn out cadres and scientists capable in every direction, in every subject and discipline.

To achieve this objective, quality must be demanded, first of all, in the teachers. Therefore, it is essential that their selection should be done properly. Not only must they be capable in their respective subjects, but they must also demand high standards from themselves and from their students, must be capable of developing the theory and well acquainted with the application of science. They must be outstanding for their scientific methods, style and discipline, they must have a passion for the development of science which should become their second nature and they should not consider their function as teachers simply as a means to earn a living. If there are

incompetent teachers in our higher schools or incompetent cadres in the scientific-research institutes, they should be replaced immediately with more capable cadres.

For fruitful scientific work in any discipline of science, very careful consideration must be given to the time allowed for studies, the work-load of teachers and students, including theoretical, laboratory and teaching work and, on the other hand, practical and military work as well as the necessary holidays.

What has been gained from our experience to date must also be studied. Is the time which we have allocated for studies in the various scientific disciplines sufficient? To this end **there should be close collaboration between the faculties of the University and other higher schools in regard to their various disciplines** precisely to study them individually and as a whole and changes and improvements should be made on the basis of concrete analyses and new orientations.

Undoubtedly, the University and the higher schools must be equipped with laboratories, libraries, and all the other necessary means, but, naturally, not immediately with means so sophisticated that they do not know how to use them.

The dependence of the University and the higher schools on the Ministry of Education and Culture does not mean that the other departments must wash their hands of their responsibility to give the necessary attention and assistance to those institutions. On the contrary, they must carefully co-ordinate their work with the Ministry of Education and Culture or with the state organ which, it is proposed, should be considered for running the higher schools.

Likewise, the connection of the University and the higher schools with the base must be further strengthened, just as the Academy of Sciences and other scientific-

research institutes also must strengthen and deepen their connections. This should not be conceived as a connection between the administration of the university and the ministry, but as the linking of the higher specialists with the base and its leadership. But the leadership too, should have the kindness and logic to listen attentively to the specialists. **It must follow science, learn it and apply it. This is how this matter should be understood.**

We present this task because still we do not see that necessary and possible integration between the teachers and the scientific workers of the University, the higher schools and the scientific institutions and production, so that the working people of all these institutions, who have scientific degrees, have their say with greater authority and bear responsibility before the state about the various problems which worry production. We do not need what you might call merely «voluntary advisers» who toss in some opinion when it is sought or who study some problem when they need it themselves in order to gain a scientific degree or title, but their opinions and studies must serve mainly to increase production or advance science

In this field, perhaps, there should be study of the experience of the way the work is organized in the Faculty of Medicine, where the teachers are also doctors in the respective clinics while the chiefs of chairs who are the most qualified workers of medicine, also run and lead clinics. They are responsible not only for the adequate training of the cadres, but also for the scientific treatment of the patients in the clinics which they run.

... **Science is learned in school but it is also learnt outside it, after leaving school.** Therefore, the Party must develop, organize and guide a great thirst for scientific knowledge among the masses, not only inside institutions

but also outside them. Such a desire, such an interest, especially on the part of the youth, but also among the older people, is not apparent to the necessary degree. There are some who are satisfied with the knowledge they have gained at school, which may be quite good, and who proceed from the idea that the diploma they put in their pocket is sufficient, because with this every door can be opened to them. It is true that the diploma, which represents efforts devoted to study for a considerable part of one's life, opens the door, but there are many turns, many roads, illuminated and dark, which must be clarified, discovered and illuminated. This cannot be done without extensive knowledge, without learning continuously, without drawing conclusions which give an impulse to creative thinking.

The higher cadres will engage more effectively in scientific work when the whole system of post-graduate qualification is placed on sounder scientific foundations.

Their training at the University or the other higher schools lasts from four to five years. However, life is ahead of those who complete their school studies, and the tasks with which they are charged increase and knowledge increases and extends in proportion. In these conditions continuous qualification is essential for all cadres and specialists, employing all the practical and possible ways to this end individually and in an organized way, by arousing scientific debates and criticism. Hence, it turns out that post-graduate qualification, too, must be placed on more solid scientific foundations, because today it includes a small number of cadres and only in certain specialities. It needs to be linked closely with life and serve the solution of problems.

The cadres and working people in general want to learn and acquaint themselves with the major discoveries in individual sciences, especially their application. How-

ever, we must be realists, to gain a profound understanding of science is not easy. The more it develops the more complicated it becomes. With the methods employed hitherto it is quite impossible to follow the development and progress of science and to assimilate all that great volume of knowledge or to avoid parallel work. This requires profound study and passion for science from our scholars and serious support from the Party and state organs for the opening up of perspectives and their concretization and activation.

At the same time, this requires the organization of the best possible system of scientific information. For this we must utilize the existing forms and try to improve them, but we must also study and think, as the report points out, about the organization of this information on sounder foundations, by creating a sector or centre of technical-scientific information and documentation. The requirements and tasks facing this centre dictate the need that it should be at a high technical and scientific level. This is necessary both for the people who will be employed there and for the technical apparatus with which it will be equipped. In this direction the libraries, especially the central ones, must play their role better. For the specialists to increase their knowledge, to acquaint themselves with the new developments of science and technique, more technical and scientific books and magazines must be available to them.

Apart from this, bearing in mind the role that the sciences play in our country at the present stage, their popularization should not be neglected either, because this enables a more or less cultured public to understand their scientific meaning and application in practice. The objective of this popularization of science must not be for sensation, but the most realistic and coherent theoretical and experimental presentation of the problems dealt with.

Good leadership and organization of scientific work have their beginning in sound and complete planning of it.

We say that the plan of scientific-research work and the technical-scientific revolution as a whole is part of the unified state plan. But is it so, in fact, from the base to the centre? The plan of scientific work is not just the list of themes and studies divided according to what organ is responsible, the people who are to be engaged in them and the times for their completion. The plan must include the aims of scientific works and studies, the results which they are expected to achieve, what new articles will be obtained and produced, where mechanization and automation will be carried out, where new technological processes will be introduced or the existing ones improved, how centralization, specialization and co-operation will be developed, what the innovation movement must achieve, and so on.

The state budget funds for the development of science should be carefully calculated and included in the plan and must be employed for this purpose alone. Both the ministries and the Academy of Sciences must have their own budgets, investments and the funds necessary not only for the fulfilment of the tasks foreseen in the plan for scientific studies and research and technical progress, but also some essential reserve in order to open the way to unforeseen new advances of science which emerge in the course of work and life.

Planning of scientific-research work is required to precede the development of the economy and culture, hence, there is a need for prognostic studies over longer terms on the development of different disciplines and branches of science and technique.

If we understand this necessary development properly there will be positive results. In the course of application the need will arise for funds, materials, people, etc.,

which have not been foreseen. Are we going to open the road to this development or close it? **The road must be opened.** The plan cannot be rigid.

Greater concern and seriousness must be shown for the planning and organized application of scientific-research work because **the accomplishment of the plan for production, culture and defence depends on this to an appreciable degree.**

With the new impulse being given to scientific-research work from the base to the centre, better, more correctly orientated and centralized guidance of it is required. This raises the need for the central departments and the Academy of Sciences and the executive committees of the district people's councils to pay much closer attention to scientific-research work, to give it guidance and direction.

The setting up of a Higher Committee of Sciences, as proposed in the report of the Political Bureau, would serve the progress of our science. **It should be at the rank of a ministry,** but not constructed like the other ministries. I think this Higher Committee of Sciences should not have an administration in the sense of the administration of ministries, nor have laboratories and institutes directly dependent on it, as the central departments or the Academy of Sciences have. This Committee, which will guide the sciences in our country, should be comprised only of the best scientists of various disciplines. It should have the whole country, wherever study, work and production is carried on, as its laboratory. The Higher Committee of Sciences must have full knowledge of the level of science and its application in this or that category or process of work, should consider whether this or that study should be carried further, what studies the enterprise or departments can carry out. It can and must conduct various studies about the future development of

science and technology in the fields and directions most important for the present and the future and the branches to which priority must be given, should determine the relative development of different branches of science, the needs for the training of cadres, etc., etc.

The Higher Committee of Sciences will have to coordinate the most important scientific work on a national scale and assist in the major problems of inter-departmental co-operation, check up on the practical application of the more important scientific works, set the work for the qualification and specialization of cadres more firmly on the road to progress, etc. In brief, it will be an organ which will take decisions and act under the direction of the Council of Ministers and will be responsible to it. This Committee, like the other state organs, will present various materials, studies and proposals in the field of the development of science and technique to the government and the leadership of the Party.

The Committee must not take over the competences of any department, any institution, the Academy, the University and other higher schools and institutions. On the contrary, it will assist them and check up on their carrying out of studies and the application of decisions. The Committee will administer the state fund allocated for the development of science in our country and while checking up on the scientific work of the departments, institutions and the base, will also see whether the funds are used well or badly and will examine the nature of the «scientific work», to see whether it is truly at the high level required (a thing which must yield fruit), or is only a simple innovation, a day-to-day improvement of the work.

Not only will the Committee analyse major scientific problems, but it can also study and analyse innovations which have importance and can be used generally over

the whole country. **Who is going to do such studies for the government and the Central Committee? The Committee which I mentioned and which should be set up**, which, according to the occasion, activates, sets tasks for and guides working groups, study commissions and various specialists. The departments, too, must carry out and apply scientific studies, while the government, for its part, must make more profound studies about the departments, without showing partiality towards them and compel them to comply with its decisions.

All our development on the road of the revolution, the all-sided process of the construction of socialism in our country, are based firmly on the Marxist-Leninist science, on the policy and ideology of the Party, which is built on the basis of a profound knowledge of objective laws which determine the political, economic, social and cultural development of the country. The proceedings of this Plenum must serve to ensure that **the organs and organizations of the Party, wherever they work and militate, take continuous care to place all their work of leadership, organization and education on sounder scientific foundations**. Hence, the task devolves on the Party in the centre, the districts and at the base, to pay greater attention to science and scientific-research work, to the development and deepening of the scientific and technical revolution. At the same time, the organs of the Party themselves must engage more in scientific studies, must make studies and generalizations of their activity in leadership, organization, education and application.

Besides this, the Party must take care and demand that the organs of the state, the economy and all the other levers also raise the scientific level of their work in all fields, in the base and in the superstructure.

It is essential that the proceedings of this Plenum

should be followed by profound serious analyses of the achievements to date, of the shortcomings and the tasks which emerge at every link of the productive, educational, cultural and defence activity in each institution and cell of the work of scientific research and innovation, accompanying this with concrete measures and actions in favour of the construction of socialism, the defence of the Homeland, for the improvement of the living conditions of the people and the further tempering of our new man.

«Reports and Speeches, 1980-1981»

CONTENTS

FOREWORD.	VII
-------------------	-----

1976

ON THE ACTIVITY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA (Ex- tracts from the Report submitted to the 7th Congress of the PLA) (November 1, 1976).	1
---	---

I

The new constitution — a great historic victory of the party and the people.	1
---	---

II

The economic development of the country and the tasks of the party.	17
1. — The further development of industry — the main factor for the strengthening of the economy.	20
2. — Agriculture, the basic branch of the eco- nomy, must be raised to a higher level	27

CONTENTS

4. — The people's well-being must be increased and improved. 35
6. — The principle of self-reliance must be understood and implemented correctly 40

IV

THE STRUGGLE OF THE PARTY ON THE IDEOLOGICAL FRONT.	44
1. — We must wage the class struggle correctly and with determination.	44
2. — The leading role of the working class and the education of the working masses	61
4. — Education, culture and science must be raised to the level of the tasks of the time	76

V

THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE PRA	87
BRATISLAVA 1968 (Article published in the newspaper «Zëri i popullit») (November 16, 1976).	138
THE PARTY STANDING AT THE HEAD OF THE MASSES INSPIRES AND MOBILIZES THEM TO CARRY OUT THE TASKS (From the talk with the First Secretary of the CC of the Communist Party of Brasil, Joao Amazonas) (November 25, 1976) . . .	143
SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT THE BALLIST «DECALOGUE» OF MAO ZEDONG (December 28, 1976)	163

CONTENTS

1039

1977

THE JUST CAUSE OF THE ARAB PEOPLES IS INVINCIBLE (Article published in the newspaper «Zëri i popullit») (November 24, 1977).	186
--	-----

1978

WHEN THE PRESENT STANDS ON STEEL FOUNDATIONS THE FUTURE IS SECURE (From the speech delivered to the cadres of the district of Gjirokastra) (March 18, 1978).	195
--	-----

The peoples throughout the world are advancing towards the revolution	196
---	-----

The problems of each stage must be solved with prudence and maturity, never forgetting the future.	213
--	-----

No situation must catch us off guard	227
--	-----

PROLETARIAN DEMOCRACY IS GENUINE DEMOCRACY (Speech delivered at the meeting of the General Council of the Democratic Front of Albania) (September 20, 1978).	233
--	-----

YUGOSLAV «SELF-ADMINISTRATION» — A CAPITALIST THEORY AND PRACTICE	265
--	------------

1. — A brief glance at the history of the Titoite revisionists	268
--	-----

CONTENTS

2. — The system of «self-administration» in the economy.	283
3. — «Self-administration» and the anarchist views on the state. The national question in Yugoslavia.	303
4. — The system of «self-administration» and the negation of the leading role of the party.	323
5. — Ideo-political pluralism, «democracy» and «socialist» construction in Yugoslavia . . .	335
IMPERIALISM AND THE REVOLUTION.	358
Foreword to the first edition.	359
Note to the second edition.	362

PART ONE

I

THE STRATEGY OF IMPERIALISM AND MODERN REVISIONISM.	363
The strategy of world imperialism	372
The strategy of Soviet social-imperialism	380
The strategy of Chinese social-imperialism	385
The role of Titoism and other revisionist	

CONTENTS 1041

trends in the global strategy of imperialism
and social-imperialism 394

The revolution — the only weapon to defeat
the strategy of the enemies of the proletariat
and the peoples. 405

II

THE LENINIST THEORY ON IMPERIALISM RETAINS
ITS FULL VALIDITY. 409

III

THE REVOLUTION AND THE PEOPLES 464

We must defend and implement the Marx-
ist-Leninist teachings on the revolution . . . 467

The peoples' liberation struggle — a com-
ponent part of the world revolution . . . 488

Genuine revolutionaries call on the proleta-
rians and peoples to rise up for the new
world, the socialist world. 518

PART TWO

I

THE THEORY OF «THREE WORLDS» — A COUN-
TERREVOLUTIONARY CHAUVINIST THEORY . . . 549

CONTENTS

The concept of the «Three Worlds» — a negation of Marxism-Leninism	550
The attitude of the Chinese revisionists to contradictions is an idealist, revisionist and capitulationist attitude.	567
The Chinese view about the unity of the «Third World» is reactionary.	595
The Chinese theory of the «Third World» and the Yugoslav theory of the «Non-aligned World» sabotage the revolutionary struggle of the peoples	603

II

CHINA'S PLAN TO BECOME A SUPERPOWER	615
---	-----

III

«MAO ZEDONG THOUGHT» — AN ANTI-MARXIST THEORY.	649
THE DEFENCE OF MARXISM-LENINISM — A MAJOR DUTY FOR ALL GENUINE REVOLUTIONARIES	702

1979

THE IRANIAN WORKING CLASS CAME OUT ON THE BATTLEFIELD, OVERTHREW THE SHAH AND SHOOK THE CAPITALIST WORLD (Article published in the newspaper «Zëri i popullit») (February 18, 1979).	708
THE CHINESE LEADERSHIP HEADED BY DENG	

CONTENTS

1043

XIAOPING HAVE LAUNCHED A MILITARY ATTACK ON VIETNAM (Article published in the newspaper «Zëri i popullit») (February 21, 1979) . . .	720
ONLY UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF A GENUINE MARXIST-LENINIST PARTY CAN THE OBJECTI- VES BE ACHIEVED (From a talk with Ernst Aust) (November 30, 1979).	729

1980

THE AGGRESSORS MUST GET OUT OF AFGHANI- STAN! (Article published in the newspaper «Zëri i popullit») (January 5, 1980)	752
THE EVENTS WHICH ARE TAKING PLACE IN THE MOSLEM COUNTRIES MUST BE SEEN IN THE LIGHT OF DIALECTICAL AND HISTORICAL MATERIALISM (January 1980).	758
EUROCOMMUNISM IS ANTI-COMMUNISM	789

I

THE NEW IMPERIALIST STRATEGY AND THE BIRTH OF MODERN REVISIONISM.	799
Opportunism — a permanent ally of the bourgeoisie	799
The victory over fascism and the counter- offensive of imperialism.	802
Modern revisionism in power — a new	

weapon of the bourgeoisie against the revolution and socialism	807
---	-----

II

EUROCOMMUNISM — AN IDEOLOGY OF SUBMIS- SION TO THE BOURGEOISIE AND IMPERIALISM	836
---	-----

The beginnings of modern revisionism in the communist parties of Western Europe . . .	837
--	-----

Unity with the Khrushchevite revisionists in the struggle against Marxism-Leninism and the r e v o l u t i o n	849
--	-----

From revisionist opportunism to bourgeois anti-communism	867
---	-----

The bourgeois conception of bourgeois society	872
---	-----

The Eurocommunists' «socialism» is the pre- sent capitalist system	887
---	-----

The «democratic» road to socialism — a dis- guise to protect the bourgeois state	903
---	-----

The Eurocommunists' «independence» is dependence on capital and the bourgeoisie	915
--	-----

III

REFORMIST IDEOLOGY AND POLITICAL OPPOR- TUNISM — FUNDAMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EUROCOMMUNIST PARTIES	933
---	-----

The Constitution of the bourgeois state — the basis of Togliatti's «socialism»	933
---	-----

CONTENTS

1045

The successors of Proudhon in France . . . 947
Revisionism with the gloves off.964

IV

ONLY THE MARXIST-LENINISTS HOLD HIGH THE
BANNER OF THE REVOLUTION AND CARRY IT
FORWARD. 977

THE PROGRESS OF THE COUNTRY IS INSEPARA-
BLE FROM THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCIENCE AND
TECHNIQUE (From the closing speech at the 8th
Plenum of the CO of the PLA) (June 25, 1980) . . 1006

