

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

ENVER HOXHA

**CONGRESS
OF BETRAYAL**

ISBN: 978-1-6780-4255-4

Cover: N.S. Khrushchev delivering the report at the 20th Congress of the CPSU (top), Comrade Enver Hoxha delivering his historic speech at the Communist and Workers' Parties meeting in November 1960 (bottom).

THE NOVEMBER 8TH PUBLISHING HOUSE
TORONTO 2022



ENVER HOXHA

CONTENTS

KHRUSHCHEV ANNULS THE INFORMBUREAU DECISION (<i>May 23, 1955</i>).....	1
WE ARE ALONE AGAINST TITO (<i>May 25, 1955</i>)	3
DITYRAMBS FROM TITO TO KHRUSHCHEV (<i>February 18, 1956</i>).....	5
ON KHRUSHCHEV'S SECRET SPEECH (<i>February 26, 1956</i>).....	6
THE AMERICAN IMPERIALISTS CAN NEVER CHANGE THEIR ESSENCE (<i>March 8, 1956</i>).....	7
THE "ITALIAN WAY TOWARDS SOCIALISM" (<i>March 18, 1956</i>).....	8
THE TRAITORS REHABILITATED UNDER THE PRETEXT OF THE "CULT OF THE INDIVIDUAL" (<i>March 30, 1956</i>).....	9
A REVISIONIST PLOT AGAINST THE PARTY (<i>April 16, 1956</i>).....	10
THE LESSONS WE SHOULD DRAW FROM THE PARTY CONFERENCE OF THE CITY OF TIRANA (<i>April 21, 1956</i>).....	14
THE 20th CONGRESS DID NOT PUT MATTERS RIGHT (<i>May 26, 1956</i>).....	20
MOLOTOV HAS BEEN SACRIFICED FOR TITO (<i>June 4, 1956</i>).....	21
KHRUSHCHEV SUGGESTS TO USE THE EXPERIENCE OF HITLER (<i>June 23, 1956</i>)	22
ANOTHER SLANDER LAID ON STALIN (<i>July 2, 1956</i>)	23
THE FOREIGN PRESS SALIVATES OVER THE	

MANOEUVRE OF KHRUSHCHEV (<i>July 3, 1956</i>).....	24
THE CHINESE ARE FOLLOWING THE ROAD OF THE SOVIETS (<i>September 17, 1956</i>).....	25
IN NO WAY WILL WE MAKE CONCESSIONS ON PRINCIPLES (<i>November 13, 1956</i>).....	26
TITO ATTACKS SOCIALISM, KHRUSHCHEV APPEASES (<i>November 22, 1956</i>).....	40
TO KEEP OUR UNITY STRONG FOR IT IS VITAL (<i>January 3, 1957</i>)	41
WHAT ARE RAKOSI'S MISTAKES? (<i>January 8, 1957</i>)	63
THE THESES OF THE 20th CONGRESS HAVE CREATED A DANGEROUS SITUATION (<i>February 13,</i> <i>1957</i>)	65
ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND THE TASKS OF THE PARTY (<i>February 13, 1957</i>)	66
EPITHETS AGAINST OUR PARTY AND PEOPLE (<i>April</i> <i>11, 1957</i>)	77
ECONOMIC COOPERATION WITH THE AMERICAN IMPERIALISTS (<i>May 28, 1957</i>)	79
AN "ANTI-PARTY GROUP"? (<i>July 4, 1957</i>)	80
THE YUGOSLAV AGENT PANAJOT PLAKU SENDS A LETTER TO KHRUSHCHEV (<i>July 22, 1957</i>)	81
KHRUSCHEV "DEFENDS" US BEAUTIFULLY (<i>August 5,</i> <i>1957</i>)	82
ZHUKOV DOES NOT AGREE WITH KHRUSHCHEV (<i>October 17, 1957</i>)	84
ZHUKOV DISMISSED FROM ABROAD (<i>October 25,</i>	

1957).....	85
A DECLARATION THE ULTRA-REVISIONISTS OPPOSE (November 16, 1957)	86
TOGLIATTI'S "POLYCENTRISM" IN EMBRYO (November 19, 1957)	88
THE MORE THE SOVIETS CONCEED, THE MORE THE SITUATIONS WORSEN (January 9, 1958)	89
KHRUSHCHEV'S "COEXISTENCE" (March 12, 1958)	90
KHRUSHCHEV MEETS WITH ALL THE BOURGEOIS (March 24, 1958).....	91
THE SOVIETS DO NOT UNDERSTAND THE BETRAYAL OF THE TITOITES (April 9, 1958).....	92
COMECON CONSULTATION WORK STARTED (May 20, 1958).....	93
MEETING OF THE POLITICAL CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL OF THE WARSAW PACT (May 24, 1958).....	94
MODERN REVISIONISM MUST BE FOUGHT MERCILESSLY UNTIL ITS COMPLETE THEORETICAL AND POLITICAL DESTRUCTION (June 22, 1958).....	95
LENIN'S BOOK ON THE STRUGGLE AGAINST REVISIONISM CAME OUT (July 4, 1958)	96
KHRUSHCHEV SETS CONDITIONS FOR HIS ARRIVAL IN ALBANIA (May 19, 1959).....	97
THE VISIT THROUGH OUR COUNTRY BEGAN (May 27, 1959).....	98
KHRUSHCHEV CONTINUES HIS VISIT TO THE SOUTH (June 2, 1959).....	99

FROM KHRUSHCHEV'S STAY IN ALBANIA (<i>June 3, 1959</i>)	100
SOME MATTERS FROM THE TALKS WITH KHRUSHCHEV WHICH AROUSE DOUBT (<i>June 6, 1959</i>)	101
POLICY OF SOFTNESS, COMPROMISES AND CONCESSIONS TOWARDS AMERICAN IMPERIALISM (<i>March 25, 1960</i>)	103
OUR SUSPICIONS ABOUT THE IMPROPER WORK OF THE SOVIET GEOLOGISTS ARE CONFIRMED (<i>March 30, 1960</i>)	104
OPPOSING VIEWS WITH THE SOVIET AMBASSADOR (<i>May 16, 1960</i>)	105
KHRUSHCHEV'S SECOND LETTER — WHAT IS HIDDEN BEHIND HIS ACTIONS (<i>June 8, 1960</i>)	106
A MEETING WHICH IS TURNING INTO A PLOT (<i>June 21, 1960</i>)	108
KHRUSHCHEV WILL NEVER DECEIVE THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA (<i>June 22, 1960</i>)	109
WE SHOULD NOT SUBMIT TO ANY PRESSURE (<i>June 24, 1960</i>)	110
OUR STRUGGLE AGAINST THE NEW, DISGUISED REVISIONISTS HAS BEGUN (<i>July 27, 1960</i>)	113
THEY SUMMON US TO MOSCOW TO FORCE US TO CAPITULATE (<i>August 16, 1960</i>)	114
KHRUSHCHEV AND HIS COLLEAGUES INCREASE THE PRESSURE ON US (<i>September 10, 1960</i>)	115
RADIOGRAM TO COMRADE HYSNI KAPO IN	

MOSCOW (<i>October 1, 1960</i>)	116
WE ARE NOT FOR SERENADE NOCTURNE (<i>October 7, 1960</i>).....	120
A DISHONOURABLE AND ANTI-MARXIST ACT BY KHRUSHCHEV (<i>November 8, 1960</i>).....	121
SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE MEETING OF 81 COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES IN MOSCOW ON BEHALF OF THE CC OF THE PLA (<i>November 16, 1960</i>)	122
WE HAVE DONE OUR SACRED DUTY TO MARXISM-LENINISM (<i>November 16, 1960</i>)	190
RADIOGRAM TO COMRADE HYSNI KAPO IN MOSCOW (<i>November 30, 1960</i>).....	191
ON THE MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES WHICH WAS HELD IN MOSCOW IN NOVEMBER 1960 (<i>December 19, 1960</i>).....	192
THE PRINCIPLED AND CONSISTENT STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM AND REVISIONISM HAS BEEN AND REMAINS THE ROAD OF OUR PARTY (<i>December 20, 1960</i>).....	238
SLANDERS AND PRESSURE DO NOT FRIGHTEN US — WE DO NOT FALL ON OUR KNEES (<i>February 20, 1961</i>).....	259
FLAGRANT TROTSKYITE VIOLATION OF EVERY NORM OF MARXISM AND EQUALITY (<i>August 4, 1961</i>).....	275
THE POLITICAL BUREAU APPROVES THE STATEMENT AGAINST THE MODERN REVISIONISTS' ATTACKS (<i>October 20, 1961</i>).....	277

TWENTY YEARS OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA (<i>November 7, 1961</i>)	278
THEY TRY TO INTIMIDATE US, WE TERRIFY THEM (<i>November 25, 1961</i>).....	326
THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT HAS BROKEN OFF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH US (<i>December 3, 1961</i>)	328
PANORAMA OF THE YEAR 1961 (<i>December 31, 1961</i>).....	329
WHY HAS GROMYKO GONE TO VISIT TITO? (<i>April 17, 1962</i>)	335
A NEW AGREEMENT WHICH WILL SERVE THE ARMING AND THE WARMONGERING PLOTS OF THE USA AND THE USSR (<i>May 25, 1962</i>)	339
THE KHRUSHCHEVITES ARE COWARDS, COMPROMISERS AND TRAITORS (<i>October 23, 1962</i>)..	340
KENNEDY REVEALS KHRUSHCHEV'S COURSE OF BETRAYAL (<i>June 12, 1963</i>).....	341
MODERN REVISIONISM IN THE SERVICE OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM (<i>June 14, 1963</i>)	343
THE MODERN REVISIONISTS ON THE WAY TO DEGENERATING INTO SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS AND TO FUSING WITH SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY (<i>April 7, 1964</i>)	351
AN OPEN LETTER (<i>October 5, 1964</i>).....	394
THE FALL OF THE TRAITOR NIKITA KHRUSHCHEV (<i>October 17, 1964</i>)	426
THE FALL OF KHRUSHCHEV DOES NOT PUT AN END TO KHRUSHCHEVITE REVISIONISM (<i>November 1,</i>	

1964).....	439
THE CHINESE WANT TO IMPOSE THEIR OPINIONS ON US (<i>November 3, 1964</i>)	447
BREZHNEV IS TRYING TO FOOL THE CHINESE FIRST OF ALL (<i>November 7, 1964</i>)	454
TOGLIATTI'S "TESTAMENT," THE CRISIS OF MODERN REVISIONISM AND THE STRUGGLE OF THE MARXIST-LENINISTS (<i>November 13, 1964</i>).....	460
TWENTY YEARS OF SOCIALIST ALBANIA (<i>November 28, 1964</i>)	480
MODERN REVISIONISM — THE MAIN DANGER AND ENEMY IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' MOVEMENT (<i>October 6, 1965</i>)	489
ON BREZHNEV'S REPORT TO THE 23rd CONGRESS OF THE CPSU (<i>March 30, 1966</i>)	521
THE OFFICIAL PROCLAMATION OF REVISIONISM	525

KHRUSHCHEV ANNULS THE INFORMBUREAU DECISION

May 23, 1955

We waited for the letter to come to us,¹ but I never thought its contents would revolt and shock me so much. It is known that Soviet leaders have recently begun to call the traitor Tito “Comrade Tito,” but I would never have believed, if I had not seen with my own eyes, as I saw today, that they have decided to reject the Informbureau decision of November 1949 as unfair and to completely rehabilitate this enemy.

We never liked and did not agree with the attitudes, opinions and recent actions of the Soviet leaders to approach Tito, but, for this, as well as for going to Belgrade, they can decide for themselves. Everyone knows what they are doing, but no one has the right, even the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, to unilaterally annul a collegial decision. Belgrade’s Trotskyist leadership has been condemned by the communist and workers’ parties, the members of the Informbureau, and it is up to them to decide whether to revise the November 1949 decision.

This decision of the Soviet leadership, which in my opinion is completely illegitimate, worries me, because it is related not only to the attitude to be taken towards a very dangerous enemy such as Tito, but also to the relations between our parties. To ask a party, three days before the meeting with Tito in Belgrade, to reconsider and decide to overturn the decision of the Informbureau means to ask him to wash his mouth.

I do not know for certain, but the leadership of the other parties may agree with this decision of the Soviets. They will proceed how

¹ On May 23, 1955, a letter was received by the leadership of the PLA from N.S. Khrushchev.

ENVER HOXHA

they want, and we, who know the renegade of Belgrade well, will never give our consent for the whitewashing of the untouchable renegade Tito.

I also gave the letter to the comrades to study. We will meet and decide together on our response, which must be returned as soon as possible.

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987,
pp. 63-64, Alb. ed.

WE ARE ALONE AGAINST TITO

May 25, 1955

Our resolute opposition to the unilateral annulment by the Soviets of the Informbureau's decision to condemn the Yugoslav leadership has fallen on deaf ears. As early as yesterday, as soon as he set foot in Belgrade airport, N.S. Khrushchev hastened to publicly declare and resolutely reject the Resolution of November 1949. The "arguments" were found, this resolution was based on documents fabricated by the enemies; Beria, Abakumov and "other agents of imperialism in the ranks of the CPSU" deceived us and pushed the Information Bureau to condemn the Yugoslav leadership. Beautiful logic: "the communist Tito and his comrades were unjustly slapped on the neck." This conclusion, even if it is said simply for conjuncture, which again is absolutely impermissible, is too dangerous, it creates illusions. The enemy remains the enemy and you are weakening your vigilance towards him, he will stab you.

My conviction is growing that we were the only ones opposed to this decision of the Soviets. Had the members of the Information Bureau acted like us, N.S. Khrushchev would have found it very difficult and completely unjustifiable to rehabilitate Tito in this way. This was done, of course, with the consent of others, so now it is not worth asking for the meeting of the Informbureau on this issue. I will share this opinion with the comrades of the Politburo, and, after discussing and agreeing with it, we can also communicate it to the Soviets, of course, reiterating our unwavering stance towards the Titoites.

The comrades of the Political Bureau agreed with my views. I called Levichkin, who these days has been asking for meetings, informed him of what we had decided with our comrades and asked him to inform the Soviet leadership about this.

The problem is still evolving, and we are confident that the Soviet

ENVER HOXHA

leadership will know and decide everything right. However, vigilance should be sharpened and our eyes should be opened wider.

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987,
pp. 67-68, Alb. ed.

DITYRAMBS FROM TITO TO KHRUSHCHEV

February 18, 1956

In the morning session, on behalf of the Party of Labour of Albania and all the Albanian people, I greeted the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

In my greeting speech I expressed the feelings of love of the communists and our people for the first socialist country in the world, love and loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, feelings of proletarian internationalism and the belief that peoples have in the prestige and good name of the CPSU.

The greeting that Tito sends to the 20th Congress was read, where, among other things, dithyrambs are woven into the visit of Khrushchev, Bulganin and Mikoyan last year to Yugoslavia, as well as the “adoption of the Belgrade declaration” which, as Tito emphasizes, marked a period of new in the relations between the two countries and in the attitude of other countries towards Belgrade’s policy.

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987, p.
123, Alb. ed.

ON KHRUSHCHEV'S SECRET SPEECH

February 26, 1956

All night I read the secret report by N. Khrushchev that was given to us the same as all the other foreign delegations. The report rejects the figure and work of the great Stalin.

I understood the positions of Khrushchev and the others towards Stalin and his glorious work during the Congress proceedings where his name was not once mentioned for good, but I did not think they could get to this point.

I shudder to think how the bourgeoisie and the reactionaries will rejoice when they get their hands on this report, what slander campaign they will launch and how long it will last. Then let Tito rejoice and be proud, as surely, he has read it.

What incalculable damage to the Soviet Union and the socialist camp! What a shameful responsibility before history!

I cannot write anything else. It is too little to say: "I am shocked!"

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987, p.
125, Alb. ed.

THE AMERICAN IMPERIALISTS CAN NEVER CHANGE THEIR ESSENCE

March 8, 1956

The exchange of messages between Eisenhower and Bulganin continues, regarding the disarmament problems. We heard this line in Moscow, “we really want the world to be saved from guns and massacres.” Are you saying that the imperialists will change their essence? Our experience shows quite the opposite. We do not harbour any illusions about the hostile attitude of American imperialism towards the peoples, towards their freedom and especially towards the socialist countries.

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987, p.
129, Alb. ed.

THE “ITALIAN WAY TOWARDS SOCIALISM”

March 18, 1956

I read some materials of the last plenum¹ of the Central Committee of the Italian CP. In this plenum Togliatti spoke about the world importance of the 20th Congress of the CPSU. In his speech Togliatti, among others, pays special attention to N. Khrushchev's thesis on the transition to socialism in different ways. In this regard, wanting not to be left behind, he says, or rather brags, stating that the Italian party had walked boldly on this path and that the “Italian communists” had found their way, the Italian way towards socialism...!

The world needed this “Italian socialism” too, after Tito's “specific socialism”!

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987, p.
134, Alb. ed.

¹ Held on March 16, 1956.

THE TRAITORS REHABILITATED UNDER THE PRETEXT OF THE “CULT OF THE INDIVIDUAL”

March 30, 1956

Great noise about the cult of the individual. The Soviet press, the Yugoslav press, the Hungarian press, etc., are publishing articles where, in the spirit of Khrushchev's secret report at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, the cult of the individual is condemned. According to reports from Hungary, in a recent speech, Matyas Rakosi¹ announced that at the initiative of the Hungarian party, the high court of the country has reviewed the Rajk case and, after concluding that the whole “case” was based on a provocation, overturned the previous decision and rehabilitated Lazlo Rajk.

Is this why noise is being made about the cult of the individual, to rehabilitate elements like Lazlo Rajk?

This would be the same as us making an unforgivable mistake in rehabilitate Koçi Xoxe and others! No, never!

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987, p.
138, Alb. ed.

¹ At that time First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Workers' Party.

A REVISIONIST PLOT AGAINST THE PARTY

April 16, 1956

The comrades informed me that at the Party Conference in the city of Tirana, some sick, opportunistic, careerist and strongly anti-party elements, abusing the trust of grassroots organizations where delegates were elected, rose up against the Party line and leadership. They, spouting the hostile propaganda of Radio London, “Voice of America,” etc., cynically attacked the correct line of our Party in its internal and external application, demanded the revision of this line in terms of the class struggle, the relations with Yugoslavia, etc., going so far as, “in the name of democracy and the spirit of the 20th Congress of the CPSU” to seek the rehabilitation of the enemies: Koçi Xoxe, Tuk Jakova, Bedri Spahiu and others! What was happening at the Tirana Conference had never happened in our Party before.

I was very concerned about the efforts of these degenerate elements, who wanted to distort the capital’s Party Conference and put it in opposition to the Party and its Central Committee. I was convinced that their ominous goals would not work, because at that conference the vast majority of delegates were mature, determined communists who would not allow themselves to fall victim to enemies plotting to lay mines. Nevertheless, I deemed it appropriate to interrupt my vacation¹ and give my assistance as First Secretary of the Central Committee to clarify the situation and to unmask this handful of anti-party elements, who, by making the wrong calculations, thought it was time to withdraw their knife and gun to hit the Party in the heart.

After being well informed about what was happening, I went to the conference yesterday. I started my speech² calmly, emphasizing

¹ Comrade Enver Hoxha was on vacation in Vlora.

² See: Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 13, p. 202, Alb. ed.

A REVISIONIST PLOT AGAINST THE PARTY

some issues of principle, that a communist has the right to ask questions, seek clarification and express his views on constructive problem solving. I spoke about the true meaning of democracy in the party, about respecting the Leninist norms of party reconstruction, but I stressed that democracy cannot be used as a mask to slander and deceive to the detriment of the party, which the enemy would very much want. The Party must be very vigilant towards these acts and not allow certain elements to attribute to the communists, various cadres and leaders faults that do not belong to them.

I spoke about the cult of the individual as an anti-Marxist practice, about the fair analysis of this problem in our Party and clarified the ongoing tasks that arise for the Party in this regard.

As for the attitude of our Party towards the enemy and deviationist elements, who had committed crimes against the state and the people, I clarified that we had no reason to review the measures taken against them, that they had been tried and punished, with composure and prudence, on the basis of Leninist norms and irrefutable evidence. Serious crimes were committed by them to the detriment of the interests of the Party and the people.

As for our relations with Yugoslavia, I said that it is universally known that they did not break down because of our fault. Their perspective depends not only on us, but also on the Yugoslavs, who have their own views, plans and desires. We want to have good neighbourly relations with Yugoslavia, but we will put the interests of the homeland and Marxism-Leninism above all.

Regarding the economic problems, I noted the policy pursued by the Party and its plans for the future. Of course, in this area the situation in our country cannot be claimed to be excellent, but it is not “miserable” as some malicious speakers at the conference have said.

I raised the problem of the Party caring for the cadres, who work tirelessly to build socialism. The Party’s interest in creating a cadre of

working conditions should not be interpreted as creating a caste or a layer of the rich here, which the Party has not allowed and will never allow, neither today nor tomorrow. The criticism of the enemies in this regard is intended to push us to go to the extreme and give up caring for the cadres of the Party and the state.

The class struggle, I told the comrades, should not be conceived as being extinguished and it should not be imagined that the overthrown enemies will voluntarily give up the struggle against us. Life has proven that enemies have not dropped their weapons willingly, so it would be unforgivable for us if we slept on our laurels.

It was late, so I interrupted my discussion to continue this morning. I did not sleep all night. After the evening, I thought about the reasons that pushed some anti-party elements and some communists to rise up against the Party at such moments. These, again, had come to the conference with a sword in hand. I decided to severely expose Vehip Demi, Nesti Zoton, Iljaz Ahmeti and others who had asked provocative and tendentious questions in order to shake the communists' confidence in the leadership and lay mines on the just cause of the Party and socialism in our country. I asked them questions and discovered the intentions behind the answers they provided.

Vehip Demi was pushed against the wall as one of the most active against the leadership and as the anti-party man who wanted the rehabilitation of Tuk Jakova, Bedri Spahiu, etc.; Iljaz Ahmeti with his extremely hostile attitude was unmasked as an element against the political line of the Party and its leadership; Nesti Zoto was hit as one of the most ardent supporters of revisionist ideas and anti-party elements; Vandush Vinçani stayed in the same waters, demanding the rehabilitation of Tuk Jakova and other enemies.

I also criticized the Party Committee of the City of Tirana, which had not been vigilant, had fallen into a deep sleep and had not seen

A REVISIONIST PLOT AGAINST THE PARTY

before the conference how these elements were manoeuvring to the detriment of the interests of the Party.

In the end, I called on our comrades to keep the unity of the Party as the apple of our eye, to work constantly to fulfil the plan of the state and to improve the lives of the people. I expressed the conviction of the Central Committee that the organization of the Party of Tirana, like the whole Party, will understand the situation correctly and will fight against the enemies so that the great cause of the Party and the people can move forward.

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987,
pp. 144-148, Alb. ed.

THE LESSONS WE SHOULD DRAW FROM THE PARTY CONFERENCE OF THE CITY OF TIRANA

Letter to all party organizations

April 21, 1956

TO ALL PARTY ORGANIZATIONS

At the 3rd Conference of the PLA for the city of Tirana, which was held from the 14th to the 19th of April 1956, it was discovered that certain unhealthy elements with an accentuated anti-party attitude¹, like Vehip Demi, Nesti Zoto, Iljaz Ahmeti, Ihsan Budo, and

¹ At the 20th Congress of the CPSU held in February 1956, the Khrushchev group launched a fierce attack against the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and put forward a series of revisionist theses which caused deep ideological confusion in the international communist and workers' movement. This Congress encouraged and set moving the anti-party and hostile elements in Albania, too. It aroused in them great hopes that "the time had come" for the Marxist-Leninist course of the PLA to be changed, and for them to regain their lost positions, that is, to start the same process that was developing in the Soviet Union and in some other countries of people's democracy. Direct aid was given these elements by the Yugoslav legation in Tirana, under whose direction a secret counter-revolutionary movement was organized to change the situation and seize the reins of the Party and of the people's power. Participating in this movement were a number of party members criticized for grave faults, or disguised agents of the imperialists and revisionists. More than anybody else, these hostile elements publicized the 20th Congress and tried to create in the Party a favourable atmosphere for the revision of its Marxist-Leninist line and the rehabilitation of the enemies of the Party and the people. The revisionists made use of the Party Conference of the city of Tirana to start their onslaught against the Marxist-Leninist line and the leadership of the Party. There, through the representatives they had managed to have elected as delegates to the Conference, they put forward their anti-Marxist platform. The CC of the PLA considered the situation to be serious and sent to the Conference Comrade Enver Hoxha who exposed the aims of the revisionists and defined the resolute stand of

LESSONS FROM THE TIRANA PARTY CONFERENCE

certain others, were striving to mislead the Conference and attack the unity of the Party, its general line and its leadership. They tried to make the Conference totally neglect the most important tasks of the fulfilment of the state plan.

As was fully confirmed at the Conference, and as some of these elements admitted, this hostile work was prepared behind the back of the Party and was inspired by anti-party elements who have always opposed the line of the Party and have adopted markedly hostile attitudes, like Pëllumb Dishnica, Hulusi Spahiu, Pajo Islami, Peço Fidhi.

Misusing the inner party democracy for hostile, career-seeking aims, these anti-party elements strove to denigrate the policy of the Party, to negate the successes achieved by the Party and our people under the leadership of the Central Committee, to revise the correct decisions adopted by the Party against the various hostile and anti-party elements and groups, to revise the economic policy of our Party, to attack the party cadres, to weaken the party discipline and vigilance, and to sow confusion among its ranks.

As it turned out from the proceedings of the Conference, the preparation of this hostile activity was begun by anti-party elements, unhealthy intellectuals of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois extraction, who, violating the most elementary rules of the Party, spread rumours high and low against the line of the Party, against its leadership and decisions. On the eve of the Conference, they urged the unhealthy elements to put forward their anti-party views at the Conference allegedly as instructions from the basic organizations of which they were members.

The Provisional Bureau of the Party Committee for the city of Tirana was fast asleep, totally oblivious to all this hostile activity going

the PLA to defend the purity of the Party and of its revolutionary policy. The delegates fully supported this stand and condemned the endeavours of the enemy. The revisionist plot was foiled.

on behind its back. This happened because its work had been characterized by pronounced bureaucratism, by the feeling of self-satisfaction, by the spirit of justification, cronyism, and the lack of Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism.

This situation in the activity of the Provisional Bureau of the Party Committee for the city of Tirana undoubtedly created favourable conditions for the hostile activity that was being prepared by these anti-party elements. The Provisional Bureau of the Party Committee for the city of Tirana showed that it was not up to its task. Some other party organizations such as that of the Ministry of Industry, that of Radio Tirana, of the Film Studio, which did not hit hard at the anti-party hostile views expressed by the above-mentioned elements, did not evaluate them properly, nor take the proper measures, also failed to carry out their task.

This hostile activity was possible because certain basic organizations, and especially the Provisional Bureau of the Party Committee for the city of Tirana, allowed violations of the Leninist norms of the life of the Party and the secrecy and discipline of the Party, and misuse of inner party democracy.

The 3rd Party Conference of the city of Tirana, aided by the Central Committee, resolutely condemned this profoundly hostile activity and loyally defended the Marxist-Leninist line of our Party, the correctness of its decisions, and its unity. It expressed the solidarity of the party organization of the city of Tirana around the Central Committee, the Leninist leadership of our Party. The Conference decided that the basic organizations of which these elements are members, as well as the other organizations where such manifestations exist, should make a profound analysis of their mistakes and adopt the stand proper to the occasion. The Conference, having in mind the great responsibility of the Provisional Bureau of the Party Committee for the city of Tirana, and in particular of its secretaries, discharged the First

LESSONS FROM THE TIRANA PARTY CONFERENCE

Secretary of the Party Committee and elected him Second Secretary, whereas the other secretaries of the Party Committee were not elected to the new Party Committee for the city of Tirana.

The main lessons the whole Party should draw from the analysis of this question are:

1. — It should always be borne in mind that even in situations of tranquillity the class enemies and enemies of the Party will strive with every means to fight the Party in every way. Therefore, it is impermissible to let vigilance relax in the slightest; we must not allow our selves to be overwhelmed by the feeling of self-satisfaction and allow enemy activity free rein.

2. — Any violation of the Leninist norms in the life of the Party should be resolutely combatted. The organizational rules of the Party must be observed and implemented with the greatest strictness. The iron discipline of the Party should be strengthened. Issues must be discussed in the party way and in a healthy party spirit. Unhealthy manifestations of discussing internal party matters in public must be sternly condemned. Inner party democracy, criticism, self-criticism, especially criticism from below, must be further strengthened. The party organizations should be vigilant and resolutely attack any misuse of inner democracy endangering the interests of the Party.

3. — Work for the ideological education of the party members, for their communist development, should be stepped up, and unhealthy symptoms of bourgeois liberalism, petty-bourgeois hangovers, manifestations of conceit, and so on, must be combatted.

4. — Active work among the people, close and frequent contact with them, and not only in official forms, should be strengthened. The party organs and their apparatuses should put an end, once and for all, to bureaucratic methods of leadership, to frequent and prolonged meetings, to red-tape methods of management. It is important to keep closer to the grassroots, to listen to the voice of the masses,

and clear up their demands. More concrete work is necessary to explain the decisions of the Party and state in greater detail to the masses. In particular the comrades with responsibility in the Party and the state apparatus should be used in this work.

5. — There should be greater concern for the advancement and promotion to posts of responsibility of worker elements. The activity for the education of the workers and for the increase of the ranks of the Party with new members from the ranks of the working class should be increased. In the districts where we have more or less developed industry, the overwhelming percentage of those to be admitted to the Party must be workers.

6. — Work for the education and distribution of cadres should be improved. Cadres must be carefully looked after and given help on the spot in order to carry out the tasks assigned to them.

* * *

Once again, on the occasion of the study of this letter, the basic organizations of the Party are instructed that they must be wide awake and vigilant to protect the Party, its general line, its unity, from anyone who might try to violate them in any way at all. Day by day we must safeguard and strengthen the ties of the Party with the people. We must always be guided in everything by the immortal teachings of Marxism-Leninism.

The 3rd Congress of the Party is only a short time away. The entire party must mobilize all its forces for the successful fulfilment and over-fulfilment of the important tasks which the state plan for 1956, the first year of the 2nd five-year plan, puts before us, in order to go to the 3rd Congress with splendid achievements. The successful realization of the targets in the field of the economy should be considered by all the party organizations as their principal task.

LESSONS FROM THE TIRANA PARTY CONFERENCE

For the Central Committee of the PLA
First Secretary

Enver Hoxha

Selected Works, vol. 2, Tirana
1975, pp. 456-461, Eng. ed.

THE 20th CONGRESS DID NOT PUT MATTERS RIGHT

May 26, 1956

Discussions began on the report on the activity of the Central Committee of the Party.¹

In the afternoon session, the Congress was greeted by the head of the delegation of the CPSU, Pospelov. Among other things, he spoke about the 20th Congress, which he called “an important contribution to the treasury of Marxism-Leninism,” especially on peaceful coexistence between the two systems, about the possibility of stopping wars today and about the various forms of transition to socialism. These are really big theoretical and practical problems, but I have my reservations about the way the 20th Congress treated them.

The Congress showed high political maturity and applauded en masse.

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987, p.
160, Alb. ed.

¹ The 3rd Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania, held in May 1956.

MOLOTOV HAS BEEN SACRIFICED FOR TITO

June 4, 1956

Today I read the newspaper “Pravda” dated June 2nd. On the front page, where Tito is congratulated on his arrival in Moscow, it publishes a large photograph of him. On the fourth page, in the “Chronicles” section, somewhere in the corner of the page, the removal of Molotov from the post of Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union is announced “at his request”! So says the newspaper!

Astonishment! Say if you want that it is not a sacrifice that Khrushchev makes to the wolf Tito on the eve of his visit to Moscow!

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987, p.
168, Alb. ed.

KHRUSHCHEV SUGGESTS TO USE THE EXPERIENCE OF HITLER

June 23, 1956

At the consultation of COMECON countries, Ochab¹ informed us about the non-realization of the plans from the coal mines in Poland, about the low living standard of the workers of these mines and about the strikes that have broken out!

An honourable situation was created, but what impressed and shocked me the most was Khrushchev's surprising remark² when on one occasion he said that for certain industrial products (it was about the production of weapons) one should act as Hitler did!

Shocking! How can Hitler's experience be taken and, moreover, be suggested to others?!

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987, p.
176, Alb. ed.

¹ Edward Ochab, then First Secretary of the Polish United Workers' Party.

² See: Enver Hoxha, "The Khrushchevites" - Memoirs, 2nd. ed., Tirana 1982, p. 88, Alb. ed.

ANOTHER SLANDER LAID ON STALIN

July 2, 1956

Today, the government delegation of the DPR of Korea, headed by Comrade Kim Il Sung, left our country. To accompany them, I also went to Tirana Airport together with other comrades of the Party and state leadership. Before parting with the Korean comrades, we exchanged greetings.

The Soviet comrades took another step in the direction of Stalin. The decision of the Central Committee of the CPSU “on overcoming the cult of the individual and its consequences” was published in the newspaper “Pravda.” In the decision, of course, attempts are made to “argue” the accusations against Stalin and his mistakes, including those “in the field of building socialism in the USSR.” But nothing convinced me of what was written. The successes achieved in building socialism in the USSR, as in all other areas, under Stalin’s leadership cannot be denied.

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987, p.
181, Alb. ed.

THE FOREIGN PRESS SALIVATES OVER THE MANOEUVRE OF KHRUSHCHEV

July 3, 1956

The foreign bourgeois press writes and comments with appetite on the decision of the Central Committee of the CPSU on the cult of the individual. They found their “certificate of authenticity”!

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987, p.
182, Alb. ed.

THE CHINESE ARE FOLLOWING THE ROAD OF THE SOVIETS

September 17, 1956

The 8th Congress of the Communist Party of China continues. Today afternoon the plenary session began discussions about the reports by Liu Shaoqi, Zhou Enlai and Deng Xiaoping.

The platform of this congress is based on the theses of the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

Mikoyan, head of the CPSU delegation, delivered a speech at the 8th CPC Congress. Then he read the greeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union...

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987, p.
212, Alb. ed.

IN NO WAY WILL WE MAKE CONCESSIONS ON PRINCIPLES

Discussion at the meeting of the Political Bureau of the CC of the PLA

November 13, 1956

Today we have received two other letters which have been exchanged between Tito and Comrade Khrushchev¹. At this meeting of the Political Bureau I think we should read these letters, and at the same time I should also report to you the conversation I have had with the Soviet Ambassador, Krylov. Then, in conclusion, all of us should contribute to the discussion, to see what is our common opinion, what proposals there are on our part, what stand we should maintain at the present moment and in the future towards these important issues.

I want to say right at the start that the moments we are living through are very serious and critical, therefore, the comrades should do some deep thinking, weighing every word they say, with a view to finding the right Marxist-Leninist solution to the problems, always in the interests of our Party, of our people, of the revolution and of socialism. I think, of course, that we should keep these matters to ourselves, for they involve the protection of the Soviet Union.

Having read the letters exchanged between the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, Comrade Enver Hoxha continues:

Today I talked with Comrade Krylov. I asked Krylov some

¹ This refers to Tito's letter to Khrushchev on November 8, 1956, as well as to Khrushchev's reply to Tito on November 9, 1956, in continuation of their earlier letters, beginning from November 4, which dealt with the Hungarian question, the protection of the traitor Imre Nagy and Co., etc.

questions about certain points of the recent letters which are not clear. One of the questions I asked him was the following: "In the letters, we see no clear-cut stand on the part of the Central Committee of the CPSU, nor any allusion to the words Tito says about 'certain evil persons'. Could you say something about this?" Krylov replied: "No, I have nothing to say," and said nothing more.

The second question I raised with Krylov was this: "In the letter we read that the Central Committee of the CPSU has tried to arrange that Janos Kadar becomes the First Secretary of the Hungarian Workers' Party, but it is not clear to us where the Central Committee of the Hungarian Workers' Party was formed, in the Crimea?" What was Krylov's reply? He replied, saying: "No, but it may be that the Hungarian comrades have gone to Crimea and discussed who should be their leader, while the Central Committee of the CPSU has said that Kadar would be the best choice." Then I told Krylov that this means that the Central Committee of the CPSU is not in favour of Gero but in favour of Kadar. And he answered: "Yes, that's how it turns out from the letter." Then I asked him this other question: "How can it be explained that Gero became First Secretary?" Krylov's reply was: "He was elected by the Plenum of the Hungarian Workers' Party." In winding up this question, I told the Soviet Ambassador that Janos Kadar's government had been formed in close collaboration between the Central Committee of the CPSU and Tito, and he accepted this saying: "So it turns out to be."

In the meantime, I informed him of our misgivings, saying that the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania had considered that an extremely important issue, and that was why it was taking it up for discussion nearly every night. My personal opinion, which was also the unanimous opinion of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of our Party, was at variance with the activity of the leadership of the CPSU and of Tito who, among

other things, also discussed who should make up the Hungarian government. Then Krylov asked me what we thought of Imre Nagy's going to Romania¹, whether we agreed or not.

I answered this question in this way: "We have stated and state again that Imre Nagy is a traitor who has opened the doors to fascism. Tito has stated: 'Imre Nagy is with us', while we, Albanians, say that Imre Nagy and Co. are anti-Soviet. How is it possible that a traitor who has killed Soviet soldiers, who has called on the imperialists to come to the aid of the counter-revolution, should now be sent to Romania, to a friendly country? The Soviet comrades are making a major concession in this matter. Formerly, they told Tito: 'It would have been better had Imre Nagy gone to the U.S. Embassy', while now they say: 'Give him to us to have him sent to Romania'! This seems to us to be quite incorrect. We say that if Nagy goes to Romania, it is just the same as if went to the Soviet Union. Therefore, Comrade Krylov," I continued, "we cannot put ourselves in opposition to our people and our Party who do not agree with the backing given to Imre Nagy. We are of the opinion that we have made the right approach to the events of the present situation before our people and our Party. We are raising this problem in a comradely way, telling the Soviet Union that we are not in agreement with it. Later, we may go still further in sizing up the Hungarian events, for in this way we are consistent in our correct line, but today we are speaking from what information we have and from the inferences we draw from the letters exchanged between the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.

In his letter Tito calls us 'evil people', opposed to socialism. We

¹ After the failure of the counter-revolution in Hungary, the traitor Imre Nagy was taken under the protection of the Yugoslav revisionists. He was sheltered for this purpose in the Yugoslav Embassy in Budapest. Through the intervention of the Khrushchevite Soviet leadership he was later sent to Romania.

reject this categorically. On the contrary, we are good people, Marxist-Leninists, determined to uphold the cause of socialism to the very end. As a matter of fact, Tito is opposed to socialism, and this is borne out by many facts.”

I stressed to Krylov that the Central Committee of the CPSU was well aware of our views because we have repeatedly expressed them. I asked him: “Is this not so?” And I received this answer: “Yes, that’s true.” Then I asked him: “Have you reported our opinion every time we have talked to you?.” “Yes,” he replied, “I have reported everything.”

Comrades, it is clear that the Central Committee of the CPSU knows very well that we say (and we are one hundred per cent certain of this) that, in addition to the intervention of the imperialists, Tito and Co. also had a hand in the organization of the counter-revolution in Hungary. On what do we base this? We base this on facts. We have our own experience, too, which teaches us that during these eight years, Tito and his henchmen have tried and are still trying to destroy our Party and our people’s power. Not only earlier, but even now, when their relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are improving, they are continuing to plot against our Party, our people and our state. The CPSU is well aware of this. It is informed that the Tito clique are brutally interfering in our internal affairs and aim to liquidate our Party and our people’s power.

This will encourage Tito and Co. to continue their struggle against us more vigorously. Therefore we cannot agree with an attitude like this which is being maintained towards Tito. In spite of that, we have waited one year and a half, and even two years, for the Tito clique to cease their hostile activities against our Party and our country, but they have done nothing of the sort. On the contrary, they are continuing their activities against Albania, and we have many facts to prove this. But we refuse to give in. We shall continue to follow the

right Marxist-Leninist course we are on, we shall uphold our principles to the very end.

I also raised with Comrade Krylov the question: "For a whole month we have been telling you every day, that we are absolutely without information and know nothing about the events taking place in a number of countries of our camp. Have you ever come to tell us anything about these matters?" "No!" replied Krylov, "except for these letters I have brought you."

In the course of our conversation, I said, as we had stated also at other times, that we did not consider it proper that all those talks should be conducted with Tito while nothing was explained to us about the events taking place within the ranks of our camp, in which we were deeply interested. Why was this? Was it because ours was a small country? Marxism-Leninism draws no distinction between big and small countries. All of us had the duty to uphold matters of principle. For that reason, in the first place, we considered we should have been kept up to date about those events of principled importance, and, second, because they were very closely connected also with our cause, with the defence of socialism and of the Party of Labour of Albania.

Our principles and the interests of the Albanian people demand that we defend the unity of our Party and Marxism-Leninism, our people, the Soviet Union and its Communist Party. On these issues we think we have made no mistakes and will never do so. I asked Krylov to transmit our views to the comrades of the Central Committee of the CPSU. He replied that he understood our situation very well.

Finally, in passing, Krylov asked me: "What about Dali Ndreu's trial, will you carry on with it?" It seems to me that this was not a casual question but one which might well have been prompted by ulterior motives, for we had told him who Dali Ndreu was and what

documents we had in our hands about this traitor. My reply was this: "Yes, we have prepared Dali Ndreu's trial. We shall conduct it and reach a verdict because he is a traitor and an agent of a foreign power. If Tito continues to act against us, as he is doing, although he tries to camouflage his hostile activity, we shall not hesitate to reveal the truth with many facts on a tape recording. We have put up with enough from the Titoites who not only continue to damage us but also accuse us of being evil people and opposed to socialism!" "I understand your situation," Krylov wound up, thanked me, and left.

Now, comrades of the Bureau, let us weigh up these issues, for they are very serious. I think we should not moderate our principled stand by agreeing on Imre Nagy's going to Romania, as the Central Committee of the CPSU writes. How is it possible to support a man who opened the doors to the counter-revolution in Hungary? In the same way, it seems to me that all the attempts which are being made to hush up the grave mistakes which Tito has made, and continues to make, are not permissible. This is not pursuing a consistent and correct revolutionary line. I emphasize once again that I stated to Krylov that we are not in agreement on these matters. We do not like these things that are taking place because we do not see where they will lead to in the future. And on all matters we are discussing, we have been told nothing to convince us of the advantages of the course we are supposed to take.

We expect to be told something about the events in Poland, too. A month ago we were told that the situation there is very grave for our camp and for the Soviet Union, but from that day to this we have received no further information. In the Soviet magazine "New Times," we have read an article which says, among other things, that the Soviet Union is fully in agreement with what is happening in Poland. Gomulka, too, has stated that the leadership of the Soviet Union is in agreement with him. In the course of my conversation with

Krylov I told him that we learned from the Polish press that Anders' officers, fugitives, similar to those who had fled our country, were returning to Poland, issuing leaflets and distributing propaganda material, people who might eventually drop bombs and kill us. How was it possible to leave us in the dark and tell us nothing about what was happening in Poland? That was not right. We were deeply interested to learn the truth. Krylov replied, "Your request is right." Then I asked him, "Please transmit to the Central Committee of the CPSU the views we hold about these things, too."

It is clear that the way the situation is developing, there may be further consequences, therefore the problem before us is whether to breach our principles, to keep silent, or to march forward, irreconcilable with incorrect attitudes.

What is my opinion about the course we should follow? I insist that we proceed on the basis of the principles we have defined, because we have to deal with very delicate problems. But, regardless of our disagreements on certain questions raised by the Central Committee of the CPSU, we should not publicize these differences of opinion, for this is to the detriment of the Soviet Union and the socialist camp. On the other hand, it is my opinion that we must not make concessions of the kind the leadership of the CPSU wants to make, for this is a markedly opportunist stand. I am of the opinion that an exceptionally big role in this grave situation is being played by the intrigues of the Yugoslav Titoites, one of whose objectives is to create conflicts between our two parties, and among all other communist and workers' parties which uphold Marxism-Leninism, to compromise them and pit them one against the other with a view to developing the situation in their own favour.

Therefore, I repeat once more that we should conduct our discussions well, seriously, and with full sense of responsibility, weigh every step we take, foresee the further development of events properly,

NO CONCESSIONS ON PRINCIPLES

because, whether we like it or not, unexpected things may occur, and we do not know what the circumstances will force us to do.

Krylov tells us nothing. The only word he utters is “Pravilno” (that’s right). And when he has anything to add, his words are: “I understand your situation, but we have no word from Moscow.” Referring to my recent speech¹, he said that it was “silny” (strong), and nothing more.

As regards the question of going or not going to Moscow for the purpose of clearing up these problems, I am still thinking about it. In principle we are entitled to go to the Soviet Union, because we are faced with major problems of extreme importance which involve both us and the socialist camp, problems which are not clear to us. This clarification is necessary, also because we should state our opinion openly to the leadership of the CPSU, just as we did when we objected to Khrushchev’s going to Yugoslavia² and his evaluation of Tito. We expressed our views, which have been transmitted to the Central Committee of the CPSU, therefore let us express them once again now. But, in practice, we must bear in mind that by going to the Soviet Union we may come up against things on which we should make no concession on principles. Things may go so far as to compel us to say to the Soviet leaders: “Look where you are going, comrades! We are opposed to the concessions you are making.” This will happen if we have one- thousandth of a doubt that the Soviet comrades will not understand and correct their concessions.

¹ At the solemn meeting on the 15th anniversary of the founding of the PLA, on November 8, 1956.

² In May 1955, the CC of the PLA sent a letter to the CC of the CPSU in which it expressed its opposition to Khrushchev’s going to Yugoslavia and to the rehabilitation of the Yugoslav leadership, and demanded that these questions should be considered at a meeting of the member parties of the Information Bureau, at which the PLA should be invited to state its views.

But we hope that we can reach agreement. The recent article¹ written by us giving a clear statement of our views on all matters of principle in connection with the Polish and Hungarian events was published in full in "Pravda," without any alteration. This indicates that our Party is on the right road, therefore, these days we may write some other articles on the ideological plane, in the spirit of the recent writings and speeches which have really blistered the Yugoslavs. In this way we shall defend Marxism-Leninism to the end.

We have the right to take a further step in exposing the activity of Tito and of his clique. Regardless of the fact that we are at variance with the Soviet Union, we should make our criticism of the Soviet leadership, saying that we do not agree with its opportunist stand on the Yugoslav issue. But I think we should not make matters worse, we should not publicize our opposition to the Soviet leadership, because we should protect the Soviet Union, for there exists the danger of placing a weapon in the hands of the enemy, especially under the present circumstances when the imperialists and the bourgeoisie have launched an unbridled campaign against the Soviet Union, and when there is no shortage of blatantly anti-socialist slogans in certain other countries of the socialist camp, like Hungary and Poland. I mean that we should weigh the issue up very carefully. We have told the Soviet comrades where we differ from them, and they know the position and attitude we maintain. Under these circumstances, if they do not invite us to talk over and clarify matters, then it is our duty to ask to go to the Soviet Union, for otherwise, if we do not go, there is the probability of our marking time, which would not be right. Therefore, I agree in principle to go to Moscow and say to the leaders of the CPSU: "Until now we have not been in opposition to you, but now we have

¹ The article "The Party of Labour of Albania Completes its 15th Year," written by Comrade Enver Hoxha and published in the newspaper "Pravda," on November 8, 1956.

other opinions on certain issues.”

After all the comrades of the Political Bureau had contributed to the discussion on the above mentioned issues, Comrade Enver Hoxha continued:

There is complete unanimity in the Political Bureau on these issues. This is of decisive importance for our Party and the construction of socialism in Albania. I think this principled stand maintained by the leadership of our Party will be a contribution to other parties, too. Why do I say this? I say it because, as we have always stated, the struggle against Titoism is one of the most important issues of principle. Titoism must be exposed. The stand the Soviet comrades have maintained on this issue following the 20th Congress has been such that the danger of Titoism is minimized, not properly evaluated. A big dark veil is thrown over the Titoite ideology, over the espionage activities and intrigues of the Titoite clique. They tell us this is tactics (we wish it were!), but even if we take it as tactics, it seems dubious and wrong to us. Our Party has not done this. It takes its stand as a Marxist-Leninist party; we are in favour of friendship with Yugoslavia, but we do not trample on principles.

The Soviet comrades have not only underestimated the Titoite danger, but have also disregarded the correct stand of our Party. Our Party has informed them and shown them with facts the basis of its stand, down to the last detail. We have discharged our obligation towards them. If the Soviet comrades have locked our documents away in their files, that is their own responsibility. Suslov has said that the leaders of the CPSU know our problems with Yugoslavia. But, it seems, they have taken our opinions and our attitudes as minor affairs of a local nature, simply saying, “the Albanian comrades are right,” and then adding: “Tito has now made self-criticism,” therefore, according to them, this self-important clown can be on our side.

Let us take the question of the so-called cult of the individual of

Stalin. The imperialists took advantage of this and launched a terrible campaign to defame the Soviet Union and our socialist camp as a whole. Imperialism is the chief organizer of the campaign against the Soviet Union in connection with the “cult of the individual of Stalin,” but we are of the opinion that Tito is its right hand and intends to break up the socialist camp.

There is no lack of facts and documents to show what the imperialists and Tito have done. Time has proven their espionage activity against our socialist countries. Whether Tito has agreements with imperialism over these things, or not, we do not know, but the facts are such that he is their tool, while the Soviet Union is neglecting this matter. Perhaps the Soviet comrades will re-examine their attitude towards Tito, and we wish they would, but the situation the Tитоites have created has become so badly entangled that perhaps they may not know how to get out of it. Such an opportunist attitude towards the Tитоites on the part of the old Bolsheviki is beyond our understanding.

It is good that all the comrades of the Bureau who took the floor said that our Party has maintained a correct stand. In no way will we yield the slightest concession on principles, not even a millimetre. In these very delicate matters we should protect the prestige of the Soviet Union and its Communist Party, but we shall uphold questions of principle even if we remain alone. We shall certainly not remain alone for long if we wage a just struggle in defence of principles.

If for the time being it is necessary not to state openly that Tito and Co. are breaking up the socialist camp, the day will come for us to do so. Because we base ourselves firmly on Marxism-Leninism, our Party and our people are quite clear, for example, why we object to Imre Nagy’s finding refuge in Romania. On this occasion I propose that in our speech¹ we should make an addition referring to Imre

¹ This refers to the report to be submitted to the meeting of the People’s

NO CONCESSIONS ON PRINCIPLES

Nagy saying that our Party and our people are convinced that those who shelter or support this traitor are not assisting the building of socialism. We are telling our people bluntly that he is an enemy and a traitor. If we are asked why Georghiu-Dej agrees to shelter him in Romania, we shall say that is his own business, but we do not agree with it. If more explanation is required of us, then we shall tell our Party that we have raised these problems and discussed them with our friends informing them of our contrary opinion, but, comrades, we should always bear in mind that we must protect the interests of the CPSU. If the party members ask us why we have not told them these things, we can reply that it was not the opportune moment, and the Party will certainly tell us that we have thought and acted correctly.

We earnestly desire that these things may take a turn for the better when we go and discuss them in the Soviet Union, but perhaps our opinions will differ. If this happens, we should in no way violate Leninism. But to be a whole-hearted friend with someone, you cannot fail to point out to him his mistakes, of course in a Marxist-Leninist way. If the leaders of the Soviet Union say to us: "Look here, comrades, everything you Albanians say is correct, we have made a grave mistake, but if we declare we have erred, will this not create a favourable situation for the imperialists?" Of course, if we manage to reach an understanding of this sort, everything between us is in order, and we shall talk about the future, because we know very well that the enemy should not benefit. Yes, this is what we wish. Whether this will happen or not, time will show. We shall wait and see whether the Soviet comrades say what Tito really is. This and other matters will have to

Assembly of the PRA on November 14, 1956, regarding the visit of the government delegation of the PR of Albania to the PR of Mongolia and to the DPR of Korea. This speech refers also to the reception given in the PR of China to the delegation of the Party of Labour of Albania, headed by Comrade Enver Hoxha, which attended the 8th Congress of the Communist Party of China.

be settled, otherwise we can make no headway. To continue this course is catastrophic.

From the information we have, we also know this: the members of the Central Committee of the CPSU who spent their vacation in our country, have expressed themselves against Tito, against the stand maintained in his favour, which they say is not in order. Therefore, comrades, let us stand as we have done, unshaken. This is how we shall stand to the end, making no mistakes. Only we should be very cautious, we should keep our heads cool as always, and when we say a thing we must guarantee that it is so, and not otherwise. These are problems of very great importance. Everyone knows how much we love the Soviet Union, and even there, one, two or three persons are apt to err, but it is not easy for the whole CPSU to make a mistake. We know very well that the Tito clique wishes to isolate us from the Soviet Union, to pit us in open conflict against the CPSU. Therefore, we should explain our differences with the Soviet comrades carefully and fairly. Marxism-Leninism permits the thrashing out of opinions, but never in the way Togliatti thinks and acts¹.

In conclusion, we can say that we are all in agreement on the problems we have discussed as well as on the sending of a delegation to Moscow after waiting a few more days. But there is also the question of who will go to Moscow, taking into account that all the comrades should not go.

Now, do you think it proper to inform the Central Committee of these matters, or should we wait a little longer? I

¹ Reference is made here to the anti-Marxist views which Palmiro Togliatti expressed. He had expressed the view that "the socialist system had degenerated"; he had expressed incorrect views about the international role of the Soviet Union and about the universal importance of the Soviet experience, against the so-called cult of the individual of Stalin, which he considered a consequence of the socialist system itself. He had incorrect views about the leading role of the working class, and did not denounce the anti-Marxist views of the Yugoslav leadership.

NO CONCESSIONS ON PRINCIPLES

say that for the time being we should keep these matters within the Political Bureau, for the reasons I have already pointed out. In general lines, the comrades of the Plenum of the Central Committee are in the current of these matters.

Selected Works, vol. 2, Tirana
1975, pp. 625-630, Eng. ed.

TITO ATTACKS SOCIALISM, KHRUSHCHEV APPEASES

November 22, 1956

It was officially announced in Moscow that Molotov had been removed from the post of First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union and “promoted” to Minister of State Control!

Tomorrow in the newspaper “Zëri i Popullit” we will publish our article that seriously exposes a speech of Tito, held a few days ago¹ on the international situation and, in the first place, on the events in Hungary and Egypt. In the article we give Tito what he deserves.

These days I read an article, a comment by the newspaper “Pravda,” about this speech. It spoke with the gloves on, worried that “Comrade Tito” would not be annoyed, as they called him in the article!

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987, p.
254, Alb. ed.

¹ Held on November 11, 1956 in the city of Pula and published in the newspaper “Borba” on November 16, 1956.

TO KEEP OUR UNITY STRONG FOR IT IS VITAL

From the report at the meeting of the Political Bureau of the CC of the PLA "On the Talks Held in Moscow Between the Delegation of the PLA and the Leaders of the CPSU"¹

January 3, 1957

At this meeting of the Political Bureau we thought we should report on the results of the talks of our delegation with the leadership of the CPSU.

In the first place I wish to stress that, wherever we went, very great love for, and confidence in, our Party were shown.

Our reception began at Odessa where we were met and held intermittent discussions with those who had come to welcome us. But naturally, what is important is the discussions we had with the comrades of the Presidium of the CC of the CPSU in which we expounded the views of our Party at length and in detail, as the Political Bureau had instructed us.

Right at the start of our conversation with the Soviet leaders we asked them, within the margins of possibility, to explain to us the

¹ In line with the discussion and decision taken at a meeting of the Political Bureau of the CC of the PLA held on November 13, 1956, a delegation of the PLA headed by Comrade Enver Hoxha went to Moscow. The delegation of the PLA took up with the Soviet leaders political problems regarding events which took place following the 20th Congress, the question of Yugoslavia, of the counter-revolution in Hungary, and of the situation in Poland. During the discussions the Soviet leaders appeared to be trying to tone down and justify their mistakes and opportunist stand. There was no lack of pressure and arrogance on the part of Khrushchev to suppress the correct criticism by the PLA, but Comrade Enver Hoxha, unruffled, courageously continued to lay before the Soviet leaders the views of the PLA. This upset the Khrushchev clique who tried to win over the delegation of the PLA with flattery and a series of promises of economic aid.

ENVER HOXHA

international situation which has developed recently. In concrete terms, we told them that we wanted to take up three problems, namely, the questions of Yugoslavia, Hungary and Poland. As we agreed in the Bureau, on these three matters we put forward the views of the PLA on how it interprets them, what stand it had maintained, and what stand it intends to maintain towards them in the future. We emphasized that we also had our proposals on these matters.

Before getting down to the essence of the questions for which we had gone to Moscow, we told the Soviet leaders why we had sought explanations from them. We stressed what the USSR is to our people and our Party, and that we are concerned that we do not have views identical with theirs on certain matters of principle. But we could not remain silent, without expressing our opinions. We were not afraid of revealing to our common enemies that fair and frank position of our Party towards the CPSU and the USSR.

While expressing the love which our people and our Party cherish for the Soviet Union, we told them that in our talks with them we would speak like comrades, like Marxists, like internationalists, without diplomatic niceties, and stressed that that was how all who called themselves Marxist-Leninists should regard the Soviet Union. We think that whoever tries to hide his love for the Soviet Union, for fear that the imperialists may accuse him of being its satellite, is wrong, because it is all the same to the imperialists whether you express your ideas openly or in a round-about way towards the USSR — they will still accuse you of being “dependent on the Soviet Union.” Certain people, who are afraid they might be accused of being dependent on the Soviet Union and do not talk frankly of it, do this in order to conceal their anti-Marxism, not their internationalism. Thus, it is worse if one’s true attitude is concealed because that does our cause greater harm.

We think that at all times, but especially now, the USSR must be

TO KEEP OUR UNITY STRONG FOR IT IS VITAL

protected by all and with all their might. We say this, not because the USSR is weak and stands in need of our aid, but because in this situation, reciprocal assistance is as essential as ever, therefore we think that this is a decisive main problem. When we defend the USSR, we consider that we have defended our Party and our people, that we have defended Marxism-Leninism, socialism. Therefore, we pointed out that we would open our hearts to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and speak our mind frankly about everything, for to whom else could we speak of our troubles and worries, our opinions, right or wrong, pleasant or painful, because those things that had been going on were of special importance to our Party and our country. We say this, not because our country plays any great role in international questions, for it is small, but we should take into account the position of Albania, which is very delicate. Therefore, when our Party maintains these attitudes, and if we are in the wrong, we should be told openly about and convinced why.

This said, we got down to the subject of the talks.

We told the Soviet leaders that our Party and our people are interested in all the problems of our camp. We are interested also in the other events taking place in the world, but we want most to talk about matters concerning certain countries of the socialist camp and the problems connected with the Warsaw Treaty.

Of course, our country plays a minor role in the Warsaw Treaty, nevertheless, as members of this Treaty we are entitled to say that we think it necessary that we should be informed about everything. We say this because we want to know how was it that we were not informed at all why these events took place in Hungary and else where, when they are of an important international character and are connected with our socialist camp. We say we have been kept in isolation and without information. The very little information imparted to us is no more than the telegrams exchanged between the Soviets and

Tito. We are of the opinion that it would not have been wrong for us, too, to have been better informed.

In saying this, we also expressed the opinion that under such circumstances a meeting of the Consultative Political Committee of the Warsaw Treaty ought to have been called. We say this because all these political attitudes and the measures taken under such critical and complicated circumstances do not appear to us to be consistent, and it would have been better to hold consultations. If such consultations have taken place between the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other parties, while our Party has been left out, this is not at all correct, and we call it a mistake¹. We base this assertion on the words of Shepilov who said that these matters were discussed at meetings and consultations.

Our Party is of the opinion that in the present circumstances it is imperative that we all maintain the same stand, otherwise mistakes might be made, because some may tear along too fast, others may be more moderate, and still others may not be moving at all. If we do not consult one another on what common stand we should maintain, the enemy might think that there are divisions among us, and thus reality is not presented as it should be, showing that we are strong and united, with identical views, which make us even more united and a great deal stronger. This being the case, why should we not display our strength, why should we not come out with identical views, why should we not consult one another?

With regard to these events we said to them: "Allow us to express

¹ The facts indicated that Khrushchev did not want to consult the PLA because he knew more or less the attitude of the PLA towards the Yugoslav leadership. Meanwhile, he had found a common language with Tito, with whom he collaborated closely and co-ordinated activities which in fact were counter-revolutionary. Thus, for instance, the Soviet leadership was no less responsible than the Tito clique for hatching up the counter-revolution in Hungary, and following its defeat, tried in every way to cover up its serious mistakes and faults.

TO KEEP OUR UNITY STRONG FOR IT IS VITAL

the views of our Party. We wish to begin our discussion with the Yugoslav issue, because this is of major importance to socialism, to the unity of our camp, and especially to our two countries.”

We have pointed out in detail to the Soviet leadership the relations of our Party and our people with Yugoslavia. But we asked them: “Please, bear with us while we go over these matters again. The things we intend to say are well based, real, factual, and not prompted by passion, as some may think. They are not subjective opinions, or regional matters, but are very complex issues of principle which we think concern the socialist camp.”

We spoke to the Soviet comrades about the organization of the faction, which was the result of the work of Velimir Stoinich, Koçi Xoxe and others, about the responsibility of the Titoites in Nako Spiru’s suicide, in the persecution of the comrades at the 8th Plenum, in eliminating other comrades of the leadership by keeping secret files on them, their objective to turn Albania into their colony, their sabotage in the oil fields, agriculture and trade, we revealed to them the true nature of the Albanian-Yugoslav joint companies, the Yugoslav intentions in planning, parity of currencies, removal of customs barriers, prohibiting us from maintaining relations with other countries except Yugoslavia; we told them how the Yugoslavs reacted against us when we concluded an agreement with the USSR and with Bulgaria, and so on. Then we mentioned to them that all those things were intended to annex Albania to Yugoslavia, and showed them Boris Kidrich’s document which speaks about Albania’s being considered as “the 7th Republic.”

We then spoke about our military agreements, about the aims of the Yugoslavs to liquidate our country through the joint command, armaments, the application of the Yugoslav military rules and regulations in our army, through a campaign against me and Hysni Kapo, through deploying Yugoslav divisions in Albania in order to do away

with the Party and the independence of our country. And this was later confirmed: the attack against Albania was carried out by the Greek monarcho-fascists in the August 1949 provocations. Our army faced up to this attack heroically.

We think that the objective of this Yugoslav preparation was not only to liquidate our country but also to launch a major provocation of an international character. This is confirmed by the fact that the Yugoslavs and the Greek government concluded a pact which dug the grave for the Greek democratic army. Hence, we are up against a major international intrigue.

We also linked these things with the words of Goshnjak¹ who admitted with his own mouth that the Yugoslavs had gathered an army on the border with Hungary in order to intervene there; we told the Soviet comrades that our Party considered them major provocateurs on an international level, because an act of that kind meant war since it would violate the Warsaw Treaty, and we would necessarily have been involved in war with them over their intervention in Hungary.

Our Party is of the opinion that our stand and the measures we took regarding this problem were right, and that we should be on our guard, because, since they were prepared for such a provocation on an international scale, a similar provocation could be repeated against our country, and besides this, the Tito clique are keeping a number of Albanian fascists in Yugoslavia. The possibility cannot be ruled out that the Yugoslavs may one day smuggle these traitors into our country and follow them up with intervention by the Yugoslav army under the pretext of saving socialism in Albania.

Goshnjak is seeking armaments from the Soviet Union. We are of the opinion that Yugoslavia should not be provided with any

¹ Secretary of State for Defence of the FPRY, who on November 23, 1956 declared that during the events in Hungary, Yugoslav troops were concentrated on the Hungarian border, ready to intervene.

TO KEEP OUR UNITY STRONG FOR IT IS VITAL

armaments, for it would be really tragic to see the Albanian people killed by Soviet-made tanks and airplanes. Yugoslavia is asking for arms to protect itself, but from whom? They know that our camp will not attack them. They should fear the capitalist countries. Then, if this is so, let them sever their relations completely with them, and our camp will provide them with arms. But our Party is of the opinion that they want these arms to use against us, because Tito is allied to the imperialists through the so-called Balkan Pact. He is in struggle with all our parties, with the CPSU, with our Party, he has been and continues to be against all the communist parties. These facts confirm that the Tito clique is linked with the imperialists, and all these attitudes are bluff, a means to gain time.

We told them why we fully supported the Resolution of the Information Bureau, why we considered all that was said in it about Yugoslavia completely correct; for us the problems raised in the Resolution were well founded, we had experienced their foul play to our cost.

Nevertheless, we told them that we are in favour of improving our relations with Yugoslavia, but only along Marxist-Leninist lines. Our Party, however, is of the opinion that mistakes of principle have been made in this respect. Far from making self-criticism for their grave blunders, the Yugoslavs are carrying on in the same wrong way, and concessions are being made to them.

But what has happened through making these concessions? They have become even more arrogant, under the impression that they have not made mistakes¹. We have extended our hand sincerely to the Yugoslavs but all through this period they have continued to abuse and

¹ In this direction, a great influence was played also by the stand of Khrushchev who, when he went to Yugoslavia in May 1955, without the approval of the other parties, consented to kowtow to Tito, declaring that "grave mistakes had been committed against the CPY and the Yugoslav leaders" (!)

ENVER HOXHA

discredit us. They have written hosts of articles and published cartoons against us, and continue to try to smuggle in their agents as before. They are doing all this, taking advantage of the course of reconciliation with them which is being pursued.

In the course of our conversation, we explained to them how the Yugoslav leadership has exploited the 20th Congress of the CPSU and the question of the cult of the individual of Stalin. We spoke about the 3rd Congress of our Party where the Yugoslav question was raised in accordance with the advice of the Soviet leadership, of course without accepting the rehabilitation of Koçi Xoxe or the Yugoslav activity against us, but accepting the improvement of relations on a state level. In this respect we have shown patience and cool-headedness. In spite of this, the Yugoslavs carried on and organized plots against our state and our Party. Thus, they have the same aims as they used to have prior to 1948 against Albania, that is, its liquidation. On this occasion, we briefly mentioned the Party Conference of the city of Tirana, as well as the group of agents, Dali Ndreu, Liri Gega, and Petro Bullati, Tito's speech at Pula, Vidich's¹ attack, and what the Yugoslavs were after with these attacks. On these matters we took measures, we told the Soviet comrades. We replied to Tito. In our opinion, the reply we sent him was in rather strong terms, but it was right. They deserve such a reply for all they have done to us.

Then we explained what the stand of our Party and our people is under these difficult circumstances. When we told our people frankly about the anti-Marxist attitude maintained by the Yugoslav leaders, they were in complete solidarity with our Party and united around it more tightly. The recent elections to the People's Councils are an

¹ Under-secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the FPRY, who, during the counter-revolution in Hungary, declared to the Bulgarian, Albanian, Czechoslovak and other press correspondents that what was happening in Hungary was bound to occur also in the other socialist countries.

TO KEEP OUR UNITY STRONG FOR IT IS VITAL

example of this unity. They gave a further indication of the close ties existing between our Party and our people, of how they have jointly crushed the anti-Marxist intrigues of the Yugoslavs. These were the first elections conducted with ballot papers.

We spoke to the Soviet leaders also about the question of Kosova. We told them that the Albanian population in Yugoslavia is very large. In connection with this problem, our Party has maintained an internationalist stand with patience and cool-headedness, because the Yugoslav leadership, which is anti-Marxist, nationalist and chauvinist, is pursuing towards the Kosova Albanians a policy even worse than that the Serbian monarchs used to pursue. We showed to them how cruel and bloodthirsty the Yugoslavs have been in Kosova. They have murdered thousands of the Kosova Albanians, even within our borders, labelling them as Ballists. Had our National Liberation Army not gone to Yugoslavia in 1944, even greater bloodshed would have occurred there, but our divisions prevented such a thing. This policy of extermination we call genocide. The Kosova Albanians are not only murdered, imprisoned, or dispersed to other regions of Yugoslavia, but the Tito clique is committing other monstrous crimes against them, deporting them to Turkey, a thing which even Tsaldaris did not do, because when the Greeks persecuted the Albanians of Çamëria in 1945, they drove them across our border, whereas the Yugoslavs are deporting them far away from their homeland. In connection with this problem, we told the Soviet leaders that we had maintained a correct stand, and stressed that that was a very grave matter and it should be stopped.

Towards the end of our speech on the Yugoslav question we told them in conclusion that, on the basis of facts, our Party was of the opinion that Tito and his clique should not be trusted at all, because they were anti-Marxists, Trotskyites, and anti-Leninists. They wanted to liquidate socialism and our camp, they wanted to sabotage the unity

of the international working class in favour of imperialism.

Following this conclusion, we emphasized our stand towards Yugoslavia saying: "We won't break off relations, but shall strive to maintain state and trade relations along correct Marxist-Leninist lines; however, on no account will we have party connections with them, for they are not communists. We will protect ourselves against their provocations, keeping our heads cool; we will defend our Party and our country, and fight any attempts by the Tito clique to weaken the situation in our country, and we shall respond to any provocation they undertake against us through the press."

Now I shall give you some information about what we talked about in connection with *the Hungarian problem*.

We told them that this problem had caused us great concern because Hungary was a friendly allied country, and that apart from other reasons, Yugoslavia bore a large part of the responsibility for the organization of the counter-revolution in Hungary. We also told them the impressions we had about the Hungarian Workers' Party, which we had pointed out to the comrades of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Party as well. We stressed that we were kept completely cut off from information about the events which took place in Hungary.

Then we spoke about the Soviet Army. We agree that the Soviet Army had to intervene in Hungary, and that it would have been better to have done this earlier. Then we told them what we thought about the Hungarian problem, about Rakosi and Gero, but stressing that there were many things we did not know, that we were not sufficiently informed to pass judgement on to what extent they were responsible. But we said it was astonishing to us that Kadar should call Rakosi and Gero a clique of criminals when we knew that they were no such thing, but were internationalists, devoted to the Soviet Union and to communism. We did not know whether they had made mistakes to

the extent that they should be considered criminals. On the other hand, we did not know that, from the economic standpoint, Hungary was in a serious situation (and the Soviet leaders admitted that the economic situation in Hungary was not grave).

We do not agree with Tito's analysis of the Hungarian issue, because we think that the Yugoslavs had a hand in organizing the counter-revolution. How did they go about it? Based on our own experience, we think that first and foremost, the Yugoslavs tried to discredit Rakosi in order to discredit the political and economic line, as well as the system of the people's democracy in Hungary along with him, to detach Hungary from our camp, from the Soviet Union, and to place it in allegedly neutral positions at first, and eventually, in one way or another, to attach it to imperialism. All this was intended to set Hungary and other countries on the Yugoslav course, so that Yugoslavia would become the leader of these countries which would become the granary for Yugoslavia, just as they had aimed to do with Albania. Hence, the tactics of the Yugoslavs has not changed, and this should be considered as a hostile act on their part to undermine the socialist camp. We told them that those things could not happen by accident, but were well prepared and organized beforehand.

We told them also what we thought of Kadar and his government. Our attitude towards him had been cautious. We had spoken our mind about his government, but if it gave proof, we should see what we would do, and maybe we should change our attitude towards it. We told them also what our attitude was towards Imre Nagy, towards the Warsaw Treaty, and so on.

After Hungary we spoke about *the Polish problem*. We told them that, not being well acquainted with the situation there and lacking information, we had maintained a very reserved attitude towards Poland. During last October we received only one telegram and one communique on the complicated situation which had arisen in

ENVER HOXHA

Poland. Then we spoke of our impressions from the meeting of the Economic Council, of Cirankiewicz's speech. We asked the Soviet comrades: "How is it possible for a leadership to be Marxist-Leninist when it comes to power by means of an anti-socialist, pro-imperialist movement with slogans against the Soviet Union, as the Polish leadership headed by Gomulka has done? This seems astonishing to us. Let us see who Gomulka is. We know he has made all those mistakes for which he was imprisoned." We asked them to please tell us how those things came to pass, for we had received no news about them. We told them that in Poland the gates of the jails had been flung open, criminals had been set free, the Polish Church had been given freedom of action, religion was being taught in the schools at a time when it was not taught even in many bourgeois states. We spoke about the anti-socialist trends in Poland, and so on. Finally we told them again who Gomulka was, as far as we knew, and where Poland was heading, and that we suspected that it was taking the road of Tito.

The Soviet comrades listened to all this very attentively. After we had spoken we listened to what they had to say, interrupting them when necessary with our questions or to repeat our own views.

While speaking to Khrushchev in connection with our relations with Yugoslavia, he told us to be careful and keep cool. We replied that we had striven and continued to strive to keep cool, but we would not tolerate the work of Tito's agents. We said this because his clique had never ceased that sort of activity against us. All the agents the Yugoslavs had activated had wanted to do away with our Party and our people's power, or at least, according to them, to oblige us to take harsh administrative measures by putting as many people in jail as possible so that a tense atmosphere would be created in our country. This was a tactic the Yugoslavs pursued.

We have borne, and will continue to bear in mind, the question of administrative measures, and we try to make the necessary

TO KEEP OUR UNITY STRONG FOR IT IS VITAL

differentiation, using persuasions with our people in the first place, and administrative measures with the enemies such as the Yugoslav agents.

Let us take the question of Dali Ndreu and Liri Gega. With these two the cup was filled to overflowing, and I told the Soviet leaders their whole history. They were agents of Tito but failed in their mission, for they were captured at the border and could not get away. If they had crossed over to Yugoslavia, that would have been very dangerous, because Dali Ndreu was also a general of our army and knew a lot of things which would increase the possibilities of the Yugoslavs to organize an attack against us. Hence, how could we fail to take measures against such agents?

We also took up with Khrushchev economic problems, as we had discussed at our Political Bureau, as well as the problem of the abolition of rationing¹ and the question of credit.

Regarding Yugoslavia, when we talked with Suslov, he said: "In connection with the recent stand of the leadership of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, the Central Committee of the CPSU is drafting a letter to be sent to it, which, after approval by the Presidium of the Central Committee, will be sent to you, too, for information."

Then they asked us about a document which a member of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania had allegedly given to the Yugoslavs. This false information was given them by Tito, but we told them that that was a slander and was not true at all. The Soviet comrades were shocked at that and said: "We shall note this in

¹ In October 1957, on the basis of the successes achieved, the ration system was completely abolished, and prices were reduced. The complete abolition of the ration system and the transition to free, unrestricted trade, at unified state prices, became an important factor for a fairer distribution of social production on the basis of the socialist principle of quality and quantity of work.

the letter we will send to Tito.”

Among other things we also asked: “Why are Rakosi and Gero called a clique of criminals, and does this help unite all the Hungarian communists?” In his reply, Suslov said: “The mistakes of Rakosi and Gero had created a serious situation in the Party and among the people in Hungary. These mistakes were so grave that they created great dissatisfaction among the people and the communists.”

However, since these phrases did not seem very convincing, we asked to know concretely what were the mistakes of Rakosi and Gero. Suslov answered this question, saying: “They were not linked with the masses, they were not acquainted with their situation, they had not worked systematically for the consolidation of the Party and for carrying out all its Leninist norms. In spite of the advice we had given them, they had made mistakes in the field of the economy. Then, with regard to the national question, reaction has played an important role in arousing the chauvinist feelings of the people, because there are many Hungarians in Romania, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia, and this has made the chauvinist work of the reactionaries much easier. There were also pronounced weaknesses in political and ideological education as well as serious violations of socialist legality.” Again we asked if it were possible to give an example. Then Suslov gave Rajk as an “example,” saying: “He was called a spy without documents to prove it.”

Then we posed the other question: “Have these things ever been discussed with Rakosi, have they been advised about what you are telling us?” They answered: “Rakosi never accepts advice.”

Another question we asked was this: “Can you tell us what kind of a man Kadar is?” They replied: “Kadar is the most positive man among the Hungarian comrades. He is not Tito’s man, and he now has the backing of the Soviet army, and gradually the situation will be stabilized.” Then they recommended that we write about him in our

TO KEEP OUR UNITY STRONG FOR IT IS VITAL

Albanian press, for we have not written anything about Kadar! We did not accept that idea, and told them that we did not agree with that assessment of Kadar who was connected with the traitor Imre Nagy. As far as we could see, their idea was that Kadar should be supported because, according to them, Tito was against his government.

In conclusion, on the topic of Hungary the Soviet comrades said to us: “The Hungarian events came as a great surprise to us. The problem had to be solved with the greatest speed, consultations with other parties were impossible.” Here I broke in with the question: “How could time be found to consult with Tito? Was it not possible to find time enough to inform us?” They said: “We did not consult Tito about Kadar, we only told him that there was no room for Nagy’s government.” Then we pointed out that in the letter of the Soviet leaders there is mention of their having talked about the Hungarian leadership, and asked them how did they explain this. Ponomaryev replied, saying: “Yes, this is in the letter,” and with this the Hungarian issue was closed.

Likewise, regarding Poland we posed this question: “What can you tell us about Gomulka’s act of dismissing so many good officers, friends of the Soviet Union, who are being persecuted?” In connection with this, Suslov said: “Gomulka relied on the men with whom he was acquainted, and he is not to blame of all the things that happened. Even before Gomulka, as well as now there were bad elements in Poland” (alluding to Cirankiewicz, Morawski and Zambrowski¹).

When we asked how the anti-Soviet views and slogans in Poland can be explained, Suslov said to us: “These things happened spontaneously. The situation was very acute, and Gomulka is now taking steps to stabilize it.” As an example he cited the replacement of bad elements in the leading organs of the party with “old and reliable

¹ Former members of the Political Bureau of the Polish United Workers’ Party, revisionist elements.

comrades,” for instance, the former first secretary of the Party Committee of the city of Warsaw had been reinstated to his post. The same thing had been done also in the other leading organs of the party.

After this we asked another question: “How should we consider Gomulka’s statement about the Church and agriculture?” Suslov replied: “Gomulka came to power when the forces of reaction had won positions, and the leadership had lost control of the press. This attitude maintained by the Polish press has not been inspired by Gomulka. We do not agree with many things which are taking place there, but it is evident that Gomulka is maintaining a correct stand¹, pro the socialist camp, and is trying to promote friendship with the Soviet Union. He offers us his hand, therefore we should not drive him to the Yugoslavs, but should help him take the power into his own hands. As far as the Church is concerned, this is a manoeuvre prior to the elections, therefore, they are allegedly giving importance to the freedom of the clergy.” We told them such a thing was not right and seemed to us highly dangerous.

Finally, Suslov said to us: “It is true that we have not come to Albania, because there is no urgent problem that could not wait in your country, but don’t think you have been forgotten. Khrushchev and Malenkov have gone to all the people’s democracies, and the time will surely come that we shall visit your country.”

I wish to tell you also about certain remarks we made to the Soviet comrades in connection with the wrong attitude of the Soviet Ambassador to Tirana, Krylov.

First, we told them that on the 39th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution a mass rally of fifty to sixty thousand people was organized in Tirana. The staff of the Soviet Embassy had been

¹ Time proved the correctness of the foresight of our Party that Gomulka was a revisionist; after having been squeezed dry like a lemon by the Soviet revisionists he was thrown into the garbage can.

informed in due time about this manifestation. But what happened? The people who took part in this rally waited for more than thirty minutes in front of the Soviet Embassy, but none of its staff came out. It had been a custom, on such occasions, for the former ambassadors, like Chuvakin and Levichkin, to appear on the balcony of the Embassy and wave to the demonstrators, but Krylov did no such thing. Nevertheless, a delegation from the masses went into the Soviet Embassy to express the greetings of the occasion. The delegation was headed by the secretaries of the Party Committee of Tirana and other comrades. Krylov pretended to be ill and did not come out until after the demonstrators had left.

When we referred to this in a comradely way to Krylov, the latter said: "I don't agree to such rallies because there may be enemy elements among the crowd." But we rightly replied that in rallies organized by our Party nothing could happen, because it was the people who took part in our manifestations, and there was no room there for enemies. Yet, the Ambassador stuck to his own erroneous opinion.

Second, we stressed another moment, that which I believe you comrades will recall: On the very day when the People's Assembly was to meet and the Prime Minister was to speak, Krylov had planned to visit Korça in order to "see the sowing campaign." Though he had already been informed, we reminded him again, asking him to honour us with his presence at the proceedings of the People's Assembly. But what did Krylov reply? He said to us: "Well, now that the first secretary of this district who is a representative to the People's Assembly will be in Tirana, I will postpone my trip to Korça." This means that he postponed his trip because the first secretary would not be in Korça, not because the People's Assembly was to hold its meeting.

Third, when a solemn meeting was held at the People's Theatre celebrating November 29, Krylov left the box reserved for the representative of the USSR and went to that of the Chinese Ambassador,

sitting behind him. No one saw the Soviet Ambassador, at a time when all the foreign representatives appeared to be present. We consider this gesture a grave mistake, too.

Next day we attended the banquet organized by the Central Committee in commemoration of the anniversary of liberation and, as usual, we had assigned the place of honour to the Soviet Ambassador, according to the tradition created in our country for the representatives of the Soviet people. In spite of this, Krylov sat at the farthest end of the table. We tried to sit him at the head, and he finally consented, provided the Dean¹ would come with him. We told him again that this was the seat reserved for the Soviet Ambassador, while the Dean would sit like all the other representatives of the diplomatic corps. We had a hard time to persuade him to take his seat, which he did reluctantly, taking the Dean along with him. Usually the Soviet Ambassador proposes a toast at our celebrations, while Krylov proposed no toast whatsoever at this banquet. The toast was proposed by the Dean who spoke about two words.

When Krylov left, he almost commanded the Chinese Ambassador to go with him. The Chinese Ambassador told him not to hurry, for it was still too early, but Krylov insisted. He left too early, and even without shaking hands with the Prime Minister and the other comrades, on the pretext that "he had work the following day." But this was not the reason.

Of course, we regret that Krylov maintains such an attitude. His mistakes have a continuity, constitute a line. We think that such an attitude on the part of a representative of the USSR is very grave.

When we listed all these things, Suslov was astonished and asked why this man should have done all these things. After this Krylov was immediately summoned to Moscow.

¹ On this occasion, dean of the diplomatic corps was the Hungarian Ambassador.

TO KEEP OUR UNITY STRONG FOR IT IS VITAL

Now I will say a few words about the dinner put on in honour of the delegation of our Party at the villa “Gorky,” which was attended by all the comrades of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Khrushchev informed us that we would meet there to talk and at the same time to have our dinner.

When dinner was served, before even proposing a toast, Khrushchev said: “The Mediterranean should be ours, under our control, and every connection will be built through Albania where we shall set up strong submarine bases, because Albania is small but of very great strategic importance. With the installations established in Albania the whole Mediterranean, all the movements of aircraft, and so on will be under surveillance”¹. Khrushchev insisted strongly on this matter and then, proposing his toast, he spoke of the need for a correct assessment of the situation which was developing in the world.

After the toast we spoke of Khrushchev’s visit to Albania. All the comrades of the Soviet leadership took part in this discussion. Many of them said in a jocular way: “Why not call a meeting of the Presidium in Albania”? All replied they had no objection, even to the meeting of the Plenum².

¹ The subsequent development of events confirmed the intentions of the Khrushchevite revisionists to use Albania as a point of strategic importance to their social-imperialist schemes in the Mediterranean.

² All these were ridiculous manoeuvres of the Soviet leadership to gratify the delegation of the PLA which, according to them, would kowtow to, and stop criticizing, the erroneous stand of the Khrushchev clique. Such manoeuvres were continued later, too, by the Khrushchev group towards the PLA. Especially when it saw that it got nowhere with its threats hoping that the PLA would give up “its stubborn attitude” and submit to its dictate, this group started to use other means to achieve its ends, and one of these means, it thought, was the economic aid of the Soviet Union, without which, Khrushchev believed, Albania would be unable to take any step! One of these manoeuvres was the re mission of the credits which the Soviet Union had accorded the PRA from its liberation up to 1955. As was later demonstrated, the Soviet leadership did not do this out of genuine friendship and on the

When Molotov took the floor to propose a toast, among other things, he said: "I belong to that category of people who, prior to the Second World War, attached no importance to Albania. Now our people are proud to have such a militant friend. Albania and our friendship with it are of a symbolic and international importance. The Soviet Union has many friends, but they are not all alike. Albania is the best friend of the Soviet Union. Let us drink this toast that the USSR may have such resolute and loyal friends as Albania!"

I and Hysni also proposed toasts at this dinner.

Our delegation was then invited to the meeting of the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which was held on economic problems¹. The Soviet comrades told us that this was the first time the representatives of a fraternal party had taken part in a meeting of their Plenum.

We may consider the invitation to take part in this Plenum also as a response to our complaint that they had not consulted us on the Hungarian issue.

When Khrushchev spoke in the Plenum about Yugoslavia, everyone turned their eyes towards where we were sitting and smiled. This shows that they knew our correct stand towards Yugoslavia, the struggle we are waging against the Titoites; nevertheless, their concessions and the soft attitude which they continue to maintain towards the Tito clique are not to our liking.

In short, what conclusions can we draw from the visit of the

basis of the principles of proletarian internationalism. On the other hand, the PLA, the government of the PRA, and the entire Albanian people considered this gesture not as charity, but as fraternal and internationalist help from the Soviet people to a fraternal people and a socialist country. But neither the threats nor "the gifts" shook the determination of the Marxist-Leninist leadership of the PLA to defend its revolutionary line to the end.

¹ This Plenum of the CC of the CPSU considered the realization of the 1956 plan and the tasks for 1957.

delegation of our Party to Moscow?

The concern of our Party and its leadership about all these events has not been misplaced. It is important that the leadership of our Party has maintained a correct stand on these problems. Of course, this does not make us swellheaded, but it is a satisfaction for our Party that, all through these very difficult situations, it has been able to take a firm Marxist-Leninist stand for socialism and communism. This is a satisfaction for the work of our Party, with whose stand the Soviet comrades are in agreement.

Another matter of very great importance is the fact that, at these extremely important moments, our unity in the Central Committee and in the Political Bureau is firm, we are on sound positions of principle, we have gone deeply into the problems which the times dictate, have made a correct assessment of their positive and negative aspects, without once wavering. This unity of thought and action is reflected throughout our Party. This is the biggest, most important and decisive victory. Let us keep this unity strong, for it is vital for us.

During the moments we are passing through, our people have linked themselves more closely to their Party, and they have very great confidence in it. Not only the party members, but all the workers approve the decisions of our Marxist-Leninist Party. This has further strengthened the unity of the people round the Party, and has won our Party a well-respected place among the ranks of the other communist and workers' parties of our camp.

But we should not allow ourselves to be carried away with these things and rest on our laurels. This situation calls for struggle against the class enemies, against the Yugoslav Titoites and other elements hostile to Marxism-Leninism. The struggle continues, and it will become more intense. Therefore, we should always be vigilant and well prepared to deal resolute blows at the enemies of communism, especially at the enemies of our country. Let us publish the documents to

ENVER HOXHA

expose all the activity of the enemy and of the Yugoslav leaders, the splitters and saboteurs of Marxism-Leninism. Let us raise the ideology of our Party to a higher level, although under these circumstances it is proving to be of a very high political level, and it understands the development of world events very well.

Selected Works, vol. 2, Tirana
1975, pp. 631-654, Eng. ed.

WHAT ARE RAKOSI'S MISTAKES?

January 8, 1957

I read an official statement of the Hungarian government, transmitted by the Soviet agency TASS. Among other things, the Hungarian comrades emphasize that “we never allow the anti-Leninist methods of Rakosi-Gero, the cult of the individual to be reborn in the conduct of social affairs,” etc., etc. Does this statement, made in the context of the analysis of the counter-revolutionary events of October-November in Hungary, take on a very bitter sound? So it was the “anti-Leninist methods” of leadership, the “cult of the individual,” that led to the outbreak of bloody and tragic events in Hungary! So, what happened there was not contrived by the reaction and international imperialism and the unforgivable revival of the last two or three years of internal reaction, but were a consequence of the “anti-Leninist” methods of Rakosi and his comrade, etc., etc.!

In my opinion, the causes and roots of the counter-revolutionary events in Hungary are much deeper and more complex, not so much as what the Hungarian comrades say, or even as what the Soviet comrades say. Why did the internal reaction of the Mindszenty-Horthyites revive and organize in recent years and not before?! Who opened the way for them and gave imperialism and international reaction the opportunity to penetrate freely into Hungary, to revive old ties, to create a whole counter-revolutionary network, to organize it and to put it into action? These are passed over silently or not said at all. In my opinion, if Comrade Rakosi made mistakes, his biggest mistake is that under the pressure of slogans and calls for “democratization,” for the “eradication of anti-Leninist methods,” he surrendered, let go of the Party’s brakes, weakened the force and the unity of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This was required by imperialism and reaction and they were thrown into action.

ENVER HOXHA

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987, p.
268, Alb. ed.

THE THESES OF THE 20th CONGRESS HAVE CREATED A DANGEROUS SITUATION

February 13, 1957

On the events in Hungary and Poland, our party, although no one informed us about them, made a Marxist-Leninist analysis and showed that it is very politically elevated and understands very well the development of events in the world.

However, in the conditions created now after the 20th Congress of the CPSU, it was necessary to make a deeper analysis with a more critical eye to these events.

The Political Bureau deemed it necessary to acquaint the Party with its judgement on the problems of the international situation which contradict some theses of the 20th Congress of the CPSU. For this purpose, the 3rd Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party convened, where I delivered the report "On the International Situation and the Tasks of the Party." The report provided an in-depth analysis of the bitter events in Hungary and Poland, as well as the aggravated international situation that has arisen as a result of the manoeuvres of imperialism with the American imperialists at the helm and the attitudes and actions of the modern revisionists, whose flag bearers are the Yugoslav revisionists.

The Political Bureau has decided that after the Plenum, the report held at this meeting will be published in the press and on the radio. There will certainly be feedback.

The Soviet comrades and others may not like this, but our Party has judged it that way. However, as always, we will consistently defend Marxism-Leninism.

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987,
pp. 294-295, Alb. ed.

ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND THE TASKS OF THE PARTY

Excerpts from the report to the 3rd Plenum of the CC of the PLA

February 13, 1957

Any assessment of the Hungarian events which is not made from the viewpoint of the class struggle is incorrect, anti-Marxist, and inflicts grave damage on the cause of socialism, aids and abets the enemies of socialism, and is a hostile attitude opposed to the interests of the working class and socialism. The attempts of the leadership of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and all their propaganda to explain the Hungarian events as “a popular revolution of all the working masses,” brought about not by the enemy but by “the bureaucratic political system and by the mistakes of the Rakosi-Gero clique,” not only have no foundation but are a hostile attempt to obscure events, to conceal and negate the class struggle, to deal a blow at the system of people’s democracy, to sow confusion among the ranks of the communist and workers’ parties, to lull to sleep their vigilance against the enemy.

There are many facts which lead to the conclusion that the Yugoslav leaders do not have clean hands in the Hungarian counter-revolution, but on the contrary bear a heavy responsibility for the development of events in Hungary:

a) After the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the opportunists and enemies of Marxism-Leninism in Hungary, under the banner of the struggle against “Stalin’s mistakes” and of spreading the “Yugoslav way” as the “only correct way of building socialism,” launched a big propaganda campaign to discredit the Hungarian Workers’ Party and to split the Hungarian party and state organizations. Parallel with this, a wide campaign was launched for

ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

the rehabilitation of Imre Nagy, placing him at the head of the Hungarian party and state, as a man “unjustly persecuted,” as “the man who should lead Hungary in the new situation.” All this campaign was strongly backed by the Yugoslav press and the Yugoslav leaders. Before the outbreak of the counter revolution, the Yugoslav press was filled with news and articles about the activity of anti-Marxist elements, about the hostile activity going on at the “Petofi Club,” and about all the anti-Soviet, anti-socialist and revisionist work going on at that time in Hungary. The Yugoslav agents in Budapest enjoyed full freedom of action, and together with the various groups of anti-party elements, carried out a wide-ranging campaign about the “specific construction of socialism in Yugoslavia,” thus undermining the position of the Hungarian Workers’ Party and the people’s government...

Recently, in Poland, too, when the hostile activity against the countries of the socialist camp became more intense, unpleasant things have occurred which have created a grave situation, though they did not take the same turn as in Hungary.

Following the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the reactionary forces, Rightist elements, and opportunists launched a rabid offensive in order to denigrate the Soviet Union, the Polish United Workers’ Party itself, and the people’s power in Poland under the demagogic slogans of “fighting the cult of Stalin” and “bureaucratism,” “for the democratization of the socialist system,” “for a new Polish way,” “for equality,” “for non-intervention in internal affairs,” “for sovereignty and independence from the Soviet Union,” and so on. In the Polish press, even up to the organ of the Central Committee “Tribuna Ludu,” more and more space was given to bourgeois nationalist articles and propaganda, to the propaganda of reactionary ideology. After this, the situation became even more grave

ENVER HOXHA

when the reactionaries went over to open hostile activities, armed actions as in Poznan, and to anti-Soviet actions and demonstrations. Bourgeois nationalist elements were given a free hand, and taking advantage of certain mistakes that had been committed in the relations of the Soviet Union with Poland which should have been corrected in the normal way, they launched a frenzied attack against the Soviet Union in order to wreck the friendship of the Polish people with the peoples of the Soviet Union, in order to detach Poland from the socialist camp. The reactionary forces and Rightist elements began to belittle everything that had been achieved in Poland under the people's power, and speculating with and exaggerating certain economic difficulties created in Poland during this period, launched a big campaign for the re-examination of the political system of people's democracy itself, in order to replace it with a new system which would respond to the "new socialism," to the Polish "national," "specific" line. This hostile activity was given free play because there was a lack of party unity, because the leadership was disrupted by the opportunist elements and could not fight the enemies and demagogues with energy and determination...

In addition to their offensive against the socialist camp, imperialism and international reaction launched fierce attacks against the communist and workers' parties in the capitalist countries. The enemy resorted to all possible methods, ranging from the exploitation of the Hungarian events to the organization of fascist assault groups. The communist and workers' parties in the capitalist countries courageously resisted the attacks of the enemy, and continue to resolutely defend the interests of the working class and Marxism-Leninism. But while the frenzied propaganda of reaction against the Soviet Union, against the aid it gave the Hungarian people, and the attacks of fascist bullies were unable to shake the communist and workers' parties, they

did influence and upset certain elements in circles friendly to the party, in the ranks of the Leftist socialists, and even certain communists. Generally these were unstable intellectuals, not closely linked with the cause of the working class, the cause of socialism.

The enemy's attacks were especially savage against the French Communist Party. All French reaction hurled themselves furiously upon it, even organizing attacks by fascist groups, because in the French Communist Party they saw a major obstacle to the achievement of their objectives. Through its stand the French Communist Party repulsed the enemy attack and continues to loyally defend Marxism-Leninism, the cause of the working class, friendship with the Soviet Union, the cause of socialism. This has so enraged the enemy that recently in their attempt to launch a new anti-communist campaign they have gone so far as to propose in the French Parliament the disbanding of the Communist Party and a series of the most reactionary laws that existed in the time of fascism. But the French Communist Party, at the head of the working class, and all the democratic forces will not allow an act of this kind. The French Communist Party will know how to fight with courage and will defeat these new fascist provocations, too. Our Party holds the French Communist Party in high esteem, and has expressed to the French comrades its feelings of solidarity with their heroic struggle.

The anti-Marxist elements, together with the reactionaries and the imperialists, also launched an offensive against the Italian Communist Party. After the 20th Congress, when the imperialists and all the enemies of socialism tried to take advantage of the criticism made of J.V. Stalin in order to attack Marxism-Leninism and the communist parties, there were some wavering elements in the Italian Communist Party who went off the rails and undertook activities against the party, spreading anti-Marxist "theories" and hostile views against the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, popularizing the Yugoslav "specific"

ENVER HOXHA

socialism. Some of the revisionist and hostile elements took part as delegates to the 8th Congress of the Italian Communist Party¹, and there they vent their spleen against Marxism-Leninism, the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. A hesitant attitude was maintained towards these elements, and this, of course, had a damaging effect...

The whole frenzied campaign the imperialists and revisionists have launched against Marxism-Leninism, against communism, is carried on under the guise of the struggle against "Stalinism." Immediately following the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the enemies grossly exaggerated Stalin's "mistakes" and blazened them abroad in order to discredit the socialist states, the communist parties, and their leaders, in order to sow ideological confusion and discord in the international communist movement. Under the pressure of this campaign, the opportunist and wavering elements raised their heads everywhere and set to work zealously against the revolutionary parties under false and anti-Marxist slogans (like "democratization," "de-Stalinization," "independence," "the people's well-being," and so on) in order to fight the Marxist-Leninist leadership of the parties and their correct line. Confronted by this situation, our Party acted correctly. It took steps to fight those elements who, under the banner of the struggle against the "cult of the individual," wanted to throw our Party off its track.

In the light of recent events it has been verified once again how appropriate was the stand of the Central Committee of the Party, which was unanimously approved by the 3rd Congress, in connection with the correct struggle waged against various opportunist,

¹ It was held in Rome from the 8th to the 14th of December 1956. This congress revised the programmatic and tactical principles of the party and made such amendments to the Constitution of the party as to open the way to its further degeneration.

ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

Trotskyite, revisionist, and traitor elements who, in their open and disguised activities, had striven to turn our Party away from the course of Marxism-Leninism, to deal a hard blow at the heart of our Party and the dictatorship of the proletariat, and thus pave the way to the establishment of capitalism and the imperialist yoke.

This was the aim of the enemies of the Party, of Tuk Jakova and Bedri Spahiu, the precursors of the other enemies who pricked up their ears at the Party Conference of the city of Tirana and whose treachery found a source of nourishment in the Yugoslav legation. The regrettable development in Hungary where the counter-revolution broke out fully confirmed the correctness of the line of our Party and its correct and farsighted course of action.

a) We do not agree with any of those who negate all the revolutionary activity of Stalin and see in it only the dark side. We think that Stalin should be appreciated correctly. J.V. Stalin, as we all know, is a great Marxist because, next to Lenin, he defended Marxism-Leninism from all the enemies and revisionists, and rendered a valuable contribution to the further development of this science. He has great merits in the preparation and conduct of the October Revolution, in the building of the first socialist state, in the historic victory over the fascist invaders, in the progress of the international communist and workers' movement. For all these things, Stalin enjoyed great authority, not only in the Soviet Union but throughout the world. On the main issues, in defending the interests of the working class and the Marxist-Leninist theory, in the struggle against imperialism and other enemies of socialism, Stalin made no mistakes, but was and remains an example.

I want to emphasize that the Yugoslav leaders, who are making such hue and cry about the cult of the individual in regard to Stalin, have this cult with beard on in their own country. In an article on the occasion of Tito's birthday, Bakarich, Member of the Executive

ENVER HOXHA

Committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, went so far as to say that the “Marxist” works of Tito are comparable only with best works of Marx, Engels and Lenin; this is to say that Tito ranks higher than Marx, Engels, and Lenin! Therefore we say that the clamour of the Yugoslav leaders and press against Stalin’s “cult of the individual” is not intended to defend Marxist-Leninist principles, but to discredit the socialist system, to discredit the Marxist-Leninist leaders of the communist parties, for the purpose of revising Marxism-Leninism, and paving the way to “Yugoslav socialism.”

b) The correct assessment of Stalin’s activity is important because for 30 years after Lenin he was at the head of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and led the Soviet Union and the international workers’ movement. In blackening Stalin, the enemies are not concerned about him as a person, but their aim is to discredit the Soviet Union, the socialist system, and the international communist movement, consequently, to undermine the workers’ faith in socialism.

In a speech he delivered at Pula in November last year, Tito said, “Right from the start we have said that it is not just a question of the cult of the individual, but of the system which made it possible for the cult of the individual to be created, because here lie its roots, because this is what should be attacked constantly and persistently.”

Thus, according to the Yugoslav leaders, the cult of the individual is the offspring of the Soviet system, therefore, this system should be revised (if not overthrown) and should be replaced by the “democratic Yugoslav” system. It is obvious which mill this is grist to. The ideologists of the bourgeoisie are doing their utmost to prove that Stalin’s “mistakes” are the natural outcome of the Soviet system, that this system is “a mistake,” “an abortive experiment,” therefore the workers should give up socialism and work for “people’s capitalism.” These distorted claims have been refuted by the whole history of the

ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

development of the Soviet system which has ensured colossal successes for the Soviet Union, which has emerged triumphant from the most difficult historical tests and has set a brilliant example for all the workers who are fighting to free themselves and build a better life.

c) The banner of the struggle against “Stalinism” serves the Yugoslav leaders and all the revisionists as a mask to settle accounts with all their opponents. This is the way they go about it: they describe the correct Marxist-Leninist theses as “Stalinist dogmatism,” the communist parties and their leaders, who are loyal to Marxism-Leninism, as “Stalinists,” our state and economic systems as “Stalinist bureaucracy,” and according to them, everything “Stalinist” should be wiped out and replaced by “anti-Stalinist.” The division of parties and communists into “Stalinist” and “anti-Stalinist,” and the declaration of war against the “Stalinists,” as the Yugoslav leaders have done, only serves to split the workers’ movement...

The political events of recent times, especially those of Hungary, marked a sharpening of the class struggle on a national and international scale. It should be realized, therefore, how dangerous it is to confuse the working class and the working people and lull them to sleep at this time with “theories” of the negation of the class struggle. The Yugoslav leaders are doing just this. In his latest speech, “assessing” the counter-revolutionary events in Hungary, Edward Kardelj said, “The concept of the process of socialist development only from the point of view of the socialist revolution, that is, from the conflict between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, is an ideological absurdity and a reactionary concept from the political point of view” (speech at the People’s Skupshtina of the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia, on December 7, 1956). This means the rejection of the theory of the class struggle which teaches us that historical events should always be viewed from the angle of the conflict between

the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, from the angle of the class struggle. In line with their negation of the class struggle, the Yugoslav leaders called the fascist counter-revolution in Hungary, the barbarity and reprisals of the Horthyite bands, “a people’s revolution.” Reading the Yugoslav leaders’ speeches and the Yugoslav press, one gets the impression that imperialism, the American plans for the re-establishment of capitalism in our countries, the class struggle, are in general non-existent and are not a problem which should draw the attention of our parties. Not only this, but in their materials even the most ordinary terminology has undergone a metamorphosis. Thus, for instance, the word “imperialism” is replaced with such terms as “the western policy of blocs” or “the freedom of the western type,” and the like. According to the Yugoslav leaders, the danger does not lie in imperialism at all, but in “the conservative and bureaucratic elements,” as they call all those parties and leaders who do not agree with the anti-Marxist views of the Yugoslav leaders.

Marxism-Leninism teaches us that during the transition period the class struggle is inevitable. This class struggle is an objective reality which is connected with the existence of the exploiting classes or their remnants, with the existence of agents of imperialism, with the existence of the broad sector of small-scale producers, with the capitalist survivals in people’s thinking, and finally, with the very existence of imperialism, hence, of the class struggle on an international scale. Here is what Lenin says in this connection:

“The abolition of classes requires a long, difficult and stubborn struggle, which after the overthrow of capitalist rule, after the destruction of the bourgeois state, after the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, does not disappear... but merely changes its forms,

ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

and in many respects becomes fiercer"¹.

Life has shown that by strengthening socialism, by increasing its strength, both within the country and on an international scale, the economic basis of the remnants of the exploiting classes is weakened, their political influence is reduced day by day, and even their numerical strength decreases, but the class struggle does not die out.

However, after the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the opportunist and liberal elements in certain countries interpreted the problem of the class struggle in a dogmatic and opportunist way. This brought about a relaxation of vigilance, helping the enemies of socialism in those countries which failed to fight these views at the proper time. Our Party has understood and put forward the problem of the class struggle in the correct way. The Central Committee and the organizations of the Party have taken up the cudgels in time against the opportunist manifestations which appeared in some cases among unstable opportunist elements. Our Party put forward correctly that the tendency of the internal enemies of socialism to become weaker and of our own forces to grow stronger has nothing in common with the opportunist views which negate the class struggle, with the hostile views of the type of the Bukharinites who view the period of socialist construction as a period of "peace and harmony" between classes, as a period of "stable equilibrium" in which the class struggle disappears. The Central Committee explained that during this period the class struggle is not always developed in a straight line, it has its turns and zigzags. This is best confirmed by the events of these years, namely, the Berlin provocation in 1953,² that of Poznan in 1956 and, especially, the fascist counter-revolution in Hungary.

¹ V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 29, p. 432, Alb. ed.

² It was carried out by imperialism on June 17, 1953, in order to jeopardize the achievements of socialism and the cause of peace.

ENVER HOXHA

Selected Works, vol. 2, Tirana
1975, pp. 667-669, 670-672,
675-676, 688-692, 705-708,
Eng. ed.

EPITHETS AGAINST OUR PARTY AND PEOPLE

April 11, 1957

Yesterday afternoon we arrived in Kiev, where we were received by Kirichenko,¹ Kalchenko² and others. We had a brief, cordial conversation with them, and left late at night for Moscow.

A friendly atmosphere even warmer than in Odessa and Kiev awaited us today in Moscow. Thousands of Moscow residents had come out to greet our delegation. This is a sincere love, expressed by the Soviet people for the Albanian people, for the Party and its leadership, love long seasoned by its unforgettable and glorious leader, Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin.

Khrushchev, Bulganin, Malenkov, Mikoyan and many others, members of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Party and members of the Soviet government had come out to meet us at the "Kievski" station. A very cordial reception, unlike the last time we were in the Soviet Union; the considerations expressed for our Party were very high.

Khrushchev, Bulganin and Voroshilov received our delegation in the Kremlin today.

In the preamble given by Khrushchev in honour of our delegation, that is, from the very first meeting, after appreciating and raising the line of our Party, he drew our attention to the tactics we should follow against Yugoslavia, and when we opposed it, he called us hot-tempered (as a people of the South that you are, he said) and said that "the Romanian comrades have the right to define you 'Skenteja' as a quarrelsome people." I strongly opposed him for this serious epithet and for the treatment of this problem by the Romanians.

¹ At that time the First Secretary of Ukraine.

² At that time Prime Minister of Ukraine.

ENVER HOXHA

At the end of the meeting, Khrushchev again stressed that in relations with Yugoslavia we should be more restrained, more tactful, not to mention the Yugoslav revisionists by name, but to talk about revisionism as a whole. What do we call this attitude? A warning?! In any case, our attitude towards the Yugoslav revisionists is firm and determined. We will expose them everywhere, anytime. Let others be “reasonable.”

This afternoon we had our first government meeting. On the Soviet side were Khrushchev, Bulganin, Mikoyan, Saburov, Gromyko and Ambassador Ivanov. We were the first to speak. After we presented the problems, commissions were set up that will continue to work.

We visited and laid wreaths at the Mausoleum of Lenin and Stalin. I felt special gratitude and respect for these glorious leaders of the proletariat, but at the same time strong emotions.

In the evening we went to see a beautiful performance at the Balshoi Theatre.

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987,
pp. 309-310, Alb. ed.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION WITH THE AMERICAN IMPERIALISTS

May 28, 1957

I learned on the radio that today Khrushchev received in the Kremlin a group of correspondents and collaborators of an American radio and television company who were given an interview on the foreign and domestic policy of the Soviet Union, the international situation and Soviet-American relations.

Khrushchev says that the Soviet Union has overtaken America in several sectors, and that it will reduce it, especially, in agriculture! Be that as it may! But one thing impresses me: how much propaganda is being made by Comrade Khrushchev about cooperation with America.

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987, p.
341, Alb. ed.

AN “ANTI-PARTY GROUP”?

July 4, 1957

The TASS news agency announced today that on June 22-29, the Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU convened in connection with the activity of the “anti-party and factionalist Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov group.” The Plenum has decided to expel them from the Presidium and the Central Committee of the Party. According to TASS, the persons in question “intended to change the political line of the party; have been opposed to the policy of the party approved at the 20th Congress, have opposed the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, the reduction of tension,” etc., etc.

I could not have imagined that these former comrades of Stalin could end like this (!).

It is reported that the plenum also elected Leonid Brezhnev a member of the Presidium. I remember meeting him at the 20th Congress and he left me with the impression of a gloomy, heavy and arrogant man. This man has risen very high.

These, who are resembling the ranks of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, must serve us to further sharpen revolutionary vigilance, the unity of thought and action of our leadership of the whole Party, a unity based on Marxism-Leninism. The USSR is embarking on a dangerous path.

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987, p.
350, Alb. ed.

THE YUGOSLAV AGENT PANAJOT PLAKU SENDS A LETTER TO KHRUSHCHEV

July 22, 1957

The day before yesterday Andropov came and brought me the letter that the UDB agent, Panajot Plaku, had sent to Khrushchev. He told me that they (the Soviets) did not discuss the letter. Not without purpose I asked them when they received this letter because it was written by the spy Panajot Plaku as early as June 15th. "We got it 10 days ago," Andropov replied. I told him in a stern tone, even emphasizing twice that the letter should be returned to the sender as soon as possible. "This is my opinion," I told Andropov, "let the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union act as it pleases, it has its own job." He replied that he would report my views to Khrushchev.

It is clear that the letter exposes the Yugoslavs themselves and their filthy agent Panajot Plaku, but I can say that it also exposes those to whom it is addressed. Nothing surprises me now.

However, I must be vigilant and keep my cool. We cannot be nervous. We have heard such atrocities frequently and we have enough experience to crush the enemies of the Party and people.

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987,
pp. 357-358, Alb. ed.

KHRUSCHEV “DEFENDS” US BEAUTIFULLY

August 5, 1957

This afternoon at the Central Committee of the CPSU, Kusinen, Suslov and Ponomarov briefed me on the talks between the Soviet and Yugoslav delegations in Bucharest. Llapatiev was the translator. Then Comrade Khrushchev came and talked to me for about an hour.

For the Soviet-Yugoslav talks:

Among other issues, which were agreed upon and published by TASS, they discussed the issue of Yugoslavia’s relations with our Party, with the Czechoslovak one and with the Bulgarian. Khrushchev told me that Tito had said that “we do not have good relations with these three parties, since there are conservative Stalinist leaders there.” “We defended you,” Khrushchev said, “but I could not defend you in every case, and I testified before the Yugoslavs,” he continued, “that the Albanians have been a little hot-tempered, and we have even advised them on this matter.” They protected us beautifully (!).

Our party, my Soviet comrades told me, will continue its efforts to strengthen relations with the Yugoslavs on all issues, including party issues, and will not put ideological differences first. We recommend this for other sister parties as well.

I replied that we too are in favour of good state relations with the Yugoslavs, without making any concessions on matters of principle. But I stressed that we will always be vigilant towards them in defence of our independence and sovereignty and will not allow anyone to interfere in the internal affairs of the Party and our people. Here I spoke about the Yugoslav propaganda against the Party of our country, as well as about their intelligence work against us.

“The Yugoslavs said they were not doing espionage work,” Khrushchev said.

On Zhukov’s arrival in Albania.

KHRUSHCHEV "DEFENDS" US BEAUTIFULLY

Khrushchev told me that Marshal Zhukov, who will be coming to Yugoslavia, will also come to Albania to visit. I rejoiced at the news of Zhukov's visit, which we regard as one with the great Stalin, as a strategist of the heroic war of the Soviet people, as an old cadre of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. But I was impressed by the reaction I expressed that caused Khrushchev the joy in this case. "Look at Enver, how happy he is that Zhukov will come," he told his comrades.

At the end he spoke to me about the letter addressed to Panajot Plaku. I expressed my opinion and that of our Party that Panajot Plaku is a dirty traitor to the cause of the Party and the people and that his escape is not accidental, which is very clear from this letter of his. All that the traitor raises in the letter to Khrushchev are nothing but outdated theses of the Yugoslavs, Tuk Jakova, Bedri Spahiu and those who are against the Soviet Union.

When I spoke to Khrushchev about our attitude, about our internationalism, about the love that our Party has nurtured for the Soviet peoples, Khrushchev told me with a laugh: "Do not take us as agents of the Yugoslavs" (!).

When I return to Albania, I will talk about these problems at length with the comrades.

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987,
pp. 360-362, Alb. ed.

ZHUKOV DOES NOT AGREE WITH KHRUSHCHEV

October 17, 1957

Today, Marshal Zhukov, Minister of Defence of the Soviet Union, old cadre of the Bolshevik Party and Hero of the Red Army came to visit our country. We went out and waited at the airport. Before coming here, Zhukov had been visiting Yugoslavia.

At noon I met him at the Central Committee, where we had a conversation about various problems. Among other things, Zhukov told us that from what he had seen in Yugoslavia, he did not think it was a socialist country. "Tell Comrade Khrushchev," I said with a laugh, "that he does not share your opinion of Yugoslavia."

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987, p.
374, Alb. ed.

ZHUKOV DISMISSED FROM ABROAD

October 25, 1957

We escorted Marshal Zhukov to the airport. But as the plane on which he was flying continued to fly to Moscow, TASS reported that the Supreme Soviet Presidium had dismissed Zhukov from the post of Soviet Minister of Defence and that he had appointed Marshal Malinovski¹ in his place!

I was very surprised that such an important decision for a person who was also a member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU was taken when he was visiting abroad. Regardless of the reasons and motives, this way of dismissal is completely anti-democratic; it smells like a coup.

On Zhukov, we know that he was one of the prominent Soviet generals, old cadre of the Bolshevik Party, Hero of the Soviet Union. He led the forces of the Red Army, which under his command liberated Berlin. As a strategist he was a close associate of Stalin. But we also know that, for his mistakes, Stalin has taken a stand against him.

During his stay in our country, he was friendly. He showed no sign that his position in the USSR was in jeopardy.

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987,
pp. 378-379, Alb. ed.

¹ Zhukov arrived in Moscow on October 26, 1957, and on the same day the decision of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet to dismiss the Minister of Defence of the USSR was announced.

A DECLARATION THE ULTRA-REVISIONISTS OPPOSE

November 16, 1957

The consultation of the representatives of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries, which started two days ago, ended.¹ Representatives of 12 parties participated. The "13th representative," Tito, was absent, despite the many prayers recently made by Soviet leaders, which we have not accepted and will never accept. But even though he was not present, his presence was felt, because when I heard Gomulka and some others speaking at the meeting, it seemed to me as if I was listening to Tito. Gomulka proposed that the term "socialist camp with the Soviet Union at the helm" no longer be used and that modern revisionism be identified as a major threat to the international communist movement. Ochab even went so far as to "argue" this: "This is how we ousted our wonderful Yugoslav comrades. Now you are ostracizing us, the Poles." There was a lot of noise in the hall where the meeting took place from the debates we had in the places where we were sitting, the representatives of the communist and workers' parties with each other.

For us, the Albanian communists, the defence of the Soviet Union is a first-rate issue and an internationalist task, the line of demarcation is the fight against modern revisionism, especially against the Yugoslav one, which today is the main danger for the international communist movement.

In my speech I expressed the opinion of our Party on all the issues raised at the meeting, on the struggle against modern revisionism, on the struggle against American imperialism, as the main danger of

¹ The consultation of the representatives of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries took place from 14-16 November 1957.

A DECLARATION THE ULTRA-REVISIONISTS OPPOSE

peoples, on the Marxist-Leninist unity of the communist and international workers' movement, on the road of the transition to socialism and for the defence of the Soviet Union.

Gomulka remained in the minority because everyone rose up against him.

“Interesting” was Mao Zedong’s argument for defending the Soviet Union. He opposed Gomulka’s proposal with these words: “Our camp must have a head, because a snake also has a head” (!).

At the end of the meeting all the representatives of the communist and workers’ parties of the socialist countries signed the Moscow Declaration, to which we will faithfully adhere. The Yugoslavs did not sign it, although some tried to reassure them by saying that their name was not mentioned anywhere and that revisionism would be discussed without making any determination. But the Yugoslavs still did not change their minds.

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987,
pp. 390-391, Alb. ed.

TOGLIATTI'S "POLYCENTRISM" IN EMBRYO

November 19, 1957

After the consultation of the 12 communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries, on November 16-19, a meeting of 64 representatives of the communist and workers' parties took place, which ended today. Tito's envoys also attended the meeting. Here it was Togliatti who took the torch of Gomulka. He also got tired of speaking out against defining modern revisionism as a major threat to the communist and international workers' movement. He then proposed that we open new avenues and issue new slogans to turn the communist parties into broad mass parties. "Why should we have a single leadership centre," he said, "when that would not be helpful in bringing the masses around the party closer together?" Completely opportunistic and revisionist views. Most of the participants in the meeting stood up against the theses of Togliatti and the others who spoke like him.

In the end we approved the Manifesto of Peace addressed to all the workers of the world.

Diary, vol. 1, Tirana 1987, p.
393, Alb. ed.

THE MORE THE SOVIETS CONCEED, THE MORE THE SITUATIONS WORSEN

January 9, 1958

Soviet Ambassador Ivanov, in the meeting I had with him today, handed me the Soviet project proposals for organizing a high-level meeting. The Soviets propose that the meeting be attended by the member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Warsaw Pact, as well as some countries that are not part of the above-mentioned groups, and all together to talk about “reducing international tension.” But in reality we are seeing the opposite: the more the imperialists are called for “understanding,” the more the tension rises and the international situation worsens.

Diary, vol. 2, Tirana 1987, p.
11, Alb. ed.

KHRUSHCHEV'S "COEXISTENCE"

March 12, 1958

Comrade Khrushchev continues to speak and give successive interviews on a single, very favourite topic of his: "coexistence" and general and atomic disarmament in particular! He did this with two correspondents of the newspaper "Rude Pravo."

I have my questions about much of what he has said and says, especially about the way he treats the problem of "coexistence between opposite systems," how disarmament can be achieved, and so on. Although I have not yet expressed these questions openly and in the press with the force I use in this diary, I have talked to them and I talk to the comrades.

But in our press we are still, as it were, obliged to publish the statements of our comrades, sometimes textually, sometimes abbreviated, even when we do not fully agree with them. Time will clear things up.

Diary, vol. 2, Tirana 1987, p.
48, Alb. ed.

KHRUSHCHEV MEETS WITH ALL THE BOURGEOIS

March 24, 1958

From a TASS news release, I learned that during the day Khrushchev had received and held talks with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Hamarskjold, as well as with an Italian journalist, special correspondent of the newspaper "Tempo."

These days alone, he has hosted two American journalists, a French journalist, two American congressmen and several other personalities of the capitalist world with whom he has had long talks.

It is obvious that Nikita Khrushchev wants to become the epicentre of the political world! The Soviet Union must exercise its weight and will in the international arena, but is this the right way to go? And has imperialism been softened at all by all these conversations, receptions and escorts organized one after the other with the representatives of imperialism by the Soviet comrades?! So far nothing good has been achieved and nothing can be achieved in favour of peace and socialism.

Diary, vol. 2, Tirana 1987, p.
53, Alb. ed.

THE SOVIETS DO NOT UNDERSTAND THE BETRAYAL OF THE TITOITES

April 9, 1958

I met the Soviet ambassador Ivanov. He told me that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union would not lead a delegation to the next Titoite congress.

The Soviets were very reluctant on this issue. This attitude of theirs has caused others to waver, except us who have had, have and will always hold clear the betrayal of the Titoites. The Soviets and some others are not with us at all on this great ideological issue.

Diary, vol. 2, Tirana 1987, p.
72, Alb. ed.

COMECON CONSULTATION WORK STARTED

May 20, 1958

The Consultation of the representatives of the communist and workers' parties of the countries participating in the Mutual Economic Assistance Council began in the Kremlin.

When the agenda was presented the question was whether there would be any item on ideological issues, but it was said that there would not be; as for the Yugoslav issue, it was said that it was clear, therefore nothing would be said.

I spoke in the first session.

Diary on International Issues,
vol. 1, Tirana 1981, p. 58,
Alb. ed.

MEETING OF THE POLITICAL CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL OF THE WARSAW PACT

May 24, 1958

The meeting of the Political Consultative Council of the Warsaw Pact began. Marshal Koniev delivered the report. Mehmet spoke.

After the lunch hosted in the Kremlin for the representatives of the communist and workers' parties, the last session was held where the "Declaration of the states participating in the Warsaw Pact" was signed.

To our surprise, the Kremlin's lunch was also attended by the Yugoslav ambassador to Moscow, Micunovic, and Khrushchev raised a toast to "strengthening the socialist camp, to China, Vietnam and Yugoslavia," and even to "the health of Comrades Tito and Micunovic"! What does that mean?! Let's see (!).

Diary on International Issues,
vol. 1, Tirana 1981, p. 62,
Alb. ed.

MODERN REVISIONISM MUST BE FOUGHT
MERCILESSLY UNTIL ITS COMPLETE
THEORETICAL AND POLITICAL
DESTRUCTION

June 22, 1958

Today the newspaper “Zëri i Popullit” published an article entitled “Modern Revisionism Must Be Fought Mercilessly until Its Complete Theoretical and Political Destruction”¹ in connection with the determined struggle waged by all Marxist-Leninist parties against Yugoslav revisionism.

Diary on International Issues,
vol. 1, Tirana 1981, p. 81,
Alb. ed.

¹ Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 16, p. 40, Alb. ed.

LENIN'S BOOK ON THE STRUGGLE AGAINST REVISIONISM CAME OUT

July 4, 1958

Today a special volume of materials (parts of articles and special works) of V.I. Lenin was published on the struggle against revisionism in the Russian and international movement. The book was prepared under the auspices of the Institute of Party History at the Central Committee of the PLA.

Diary on International Issues,
vol. 1, Tirana 1981, p. 95,
Alb. ed.

KHRUSHCHEV SETS CONDITIONS FOR HIS ARRIVAL IN ALBANIA

May 19, 1959

Meeting with Ivanov. He handed me a radiogram from Khrushchev, where, as a condition for his next visit to Albania, he asks us that neither he nor we during public speeches should touch at all on the issue of Yugoslav revisionism. Here is how far his work has reached! He wants to shut us up too! However, we will discuss the request with the comrades at the Politburo and give an answer to the “guest” we are waiting for.

Diary on International Issues,
vol. 1, Tirana 1981, p. 248,
Alb. ed.

THE VISIT THROUGH OUR COUNTRY BEGAN

May 27, 1959

We left for Shkodra.

We stopped in Thumana to see the reclamations.

We also stopped in Lezha. Great enthusiasm for the Soviet Union. Khrushchev spoke briefly.

Large rally in Shkodra. Khrushchev spoke.

We visited the Shtoit vineyard. He did not like it. "Why waste money," the friend told us.

Diary on International Issues,
vol. 1, Tirana 1981, p. 253,
Alb. ed.

KHRUSHCHEV CONTINUES HIS VISIT TO THE SOUTH

June 2, 1959

We went to see the orange plantation at Stjar. We visited Butrint.¹

While we were looking at the beauties of Butrint, Khrushchev² called Malinovsky to him and I heard his whisper, "What a marvellous place! Here an ideal base for our submarines can be built... From here we could paralyse and attack everything."

I was astonished at how he could make such a calculation "without consulting the owners," as our people say.

We returned to Vlora again by ship. Grotewohl³ was with us, too.

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, p. 9, Eng. ed.

¹ Ancient city in South Albania.

² Khrushchev visited Albania from May 25 to June 4, 1959.

³ Then member of the Political Bureau of the CC of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and prime minister of the German Democratic Republic.

FROM KHRUSHCHEV'S STAY IN ALBANIA

June 3, 1959

When we were looking out to sea from the veranda of the villa at Uji i Ftohtë,¹ where we were resting, Khrushchev in an undertone discussed with Malinovsky, as he did yesterday in Butrint, "What a secure bay at the foot of these mountains! With a powerful fleet stationed here we have the whole Mediterranean from the Bosphorus to Gibraltar in our hands!"

What terrible plans this man, who talks so much about peace, is hatching up!² Let us hope that these are only his usual "jokes." We must see whether he will raise them in the official talks. If he does so, we shall give him our reply.

We returned by plane to Tirana. We stopped at Rinas to visit the "Tu-114" aircraft aboard which the Academician Tupolev, chief constructor of this type of plane, had come.

We laid the foundation stone of the new Palace of Culture in Tirana.

Dinner at the Palace of Brigades for the Soviet delegation.

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, pp. 10-11, Eng. ed.

¹ Tourist spot near the town of Vlora, in South Albania.

² In his book, *The Khrushchevites*, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: "It made my flesh creep to hear them talk like this, as if they were masters of the seas, countries and peoples. 'No, Nikita Khrushchev,' I said to myself, 'we shall never allow you to set out to enslave other countries and shed their peoples' blood from our territory. You will never have Butrint, Vlora, or any inch of the Albanian territory, to use for those evil purposes.'" (Enver Hoxha, *The Khrushchevites (Memoirs)*, 2nd Eng. ed., "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1984, p. 377.)

SOME MATTERS FROM THE TALKS WITH KHRUSHCHEV WHICH AROUSE DOUBT

June 6, 1959

At the meeting of the Political Bureau which we held today to inform the Bureau about the talks which we had with Khrushchev during his stay in our country, I mentioned certain expressions and opinions of his which have aroused my suspicion. Thus, during the discussion of the economic requirements which our side presented; to the Soviet side, he said, as if jokingly, "I've not come here for these things," although, when the question of the development of the oil industry was being discussed, he came out with the claim that our oil "has a high sulphur content" and "advised" us not to make investments where we have no profits.¹ In the field of the development of agriculture, he showed his readiness to cooperate in the planting of the maximum number of orange-trees and bay-trees. "Plant thousands of hectares of them," he told us, "because with these products you could buy all the grain and meat you want in the Soviet Union."

From the military standpoint, Khrushchev saw Albania as a country of great strategic importance for the Mediterranean, which must serve the Soviet Union as a base for the deployment of the Soviet navy and the launching of Soviet missiles. (At Butrint and Vlora, as I have written, he made open allusions to such a thing.)

These heavily camouflaged expressions and opinions, expressed sometimes jokingly and sometimes seriously, do not seem to me to be

¹ This "advice" of Khrushchev's was aimed at darkening the great perspectives which oil extraction had in Albania, Khrushchev did not content himself with this, but also set the Soviet specialists working in our country in action with the aim of sabotaging the sensitive key points of the Albanian economy, especially the oil industry and geology.

ENVER HOXHA

very friendly or internationalist towards our country and people and other peoples. Time will confirm whether or not these impressions of mine are accurate.

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, pp. 12-13, Eng. ed.

POLICY OF SOFTNESS, COMPROMISES AND CONCESSIONS TOWARDS AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

March 25, 1960

Today Soviet ambassador Ivanov informed me about the correspondence which Khrushchev has had during this month with Eisenhower in connection with atomic weapons.

Khrushchev pins great hopes on the American president. The policy of the Soviet Union towards American imperialism is not principled, strong and resolute, but is all concessions, and even “supplication.” Seeing this policy of Khrushchev, the American imperialists, for their part, are proving very demanding.

It is not right to continue with such a fruitless policy of softness and compromise. The struggle which we are waging in defence of peace and for disarmament does not mean that we should ever stand at the mercy of the Americans, tagging along behind them. Events must never be allowed to develop when and how they want. Khrushchev is all talk.

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, p. 15, Eng. ed.

OUR SUSPICIONS ABOUT THE IMPROPER WORK OF THE SOVIET GEOLOGISTS ARE CONFIRMED

March 30, 1960

From the talk about oil geology, which I had with two of our oil geologists from the Ministry of Mines, my suspicions are confirmed that the groups of Soviet geologists are not in order in their work; they operate according to their own ideas, and they do not give satisfactory results. But there is no check-up from our side, either. The fields and points which they present for drilling and prospecting do not yield oil.¹ Their activities are not accidental, therefore we cannot permit such a situation to continue any longer. I discussed this very serious problem with Comrades Spiro Koleka and Adil Çarçani. I also summoned ambassador Ivanov and told him my ideas bluntly. I instructed Spiro to present this problem openly to Kosygin when he goes to Moscow, so that Moscow should exercise control over the work of the Soviet geologists. However, we, too, must step up our control on the activity of the groups of Soviet geologists.

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, pp. 16-17, Eng. ed.

¹ As Comrade Enver Hoxha writes, "These oil 'experts' and 'geologists' made two reports: an accurate one, with exact and positive data on discoveries of different minerals, and a false one, which said that the prospecting had allegedly yielded negative results, i.e., the minerals sought were not discovered. The first report was sent to Moscow and Leningrad through the KGB centre, which was called the Soviet Embassy in Tirana, and the second report was sent to our Ministry of Industry and Mines. This whole vile business was discovered and proved after the Soviets cleared out of Albania." (Enver Hoxha, *The Khrushchevites (Memoirs)*, 2nd Eng. ed., "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana, 1984, p. 379.)

OPPOSING VIEWS WITH THE SOVIET AMBASSADOR

May 16, 1960

Today I received Soviet ambassador Ivanov. I saw that he had come to sound us out on our views about the summit conference which is scheduled to begin in Paris today.

I told him that our stands had been decided at the Moscow Meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty,¹ i.e., we must make the imperialists no concessions. I have no hope that any result will be achieved. Everything there will be sabotaged by the imperialists.

Our views were not in accord, because ambassador Ivanov had hopes that something might emerge from this conference. Let time confirm the correctness of our judgement!

Today, too, I received the Czechoslovak ambassador who, on behalf of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, invited me to spend my holidays in Czechoslovakia. I thanked him but told him that this year I was not going abroad for my holidays.

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, p. 18, Eng. ed.

¹ This meeting was held on February 4, 1960.

KHRUSHCHEV'S SECOND LETTER — WHAT IS HIDDEN BEHIND HIS ACTIONS

June 8, 1960

I talked with Comrade Ramiz Alia about how we should prepare ourselves for the coming meeting in Bucharest.

I received the Soviet ambassador Ivanov who informed me that the proposed Bucharest meeting is postponed, and handed me a second letter from Khrushchev, dated June 7 which explains things. But this second letter requests that the representatives of the sister parties of the socialist camp should meet in Bucharest to decide the place and time when the coming meeting will be held. This business seems very complicated: “let us postpone” the meeting, and let us hold another, likewise, in Bucharest. Can there be some trickery behind this?!¹ In any case, the first thing I will discuss with the comrades of the Bureau is this: since the meeting of parties is being postponed, there is no need for me personally to go to Bucharest at the head of the delegation.² Another comrade should go, perhaps Comrade Hysni

¹ After the savage attack launched at the 20th Congress of the CPSU (February 1956) by the Soviet leadership with Khrushchev at its head against Marxism-Leninism and against the work of Stalin through the ill-famed report against him, the Party of Labour of Albania watched attentively and carefully analysed each step of Khrushchev and his associates, who day by day stepped up their hostile activity against socialism and the international communist and workers' movement.

² Explaining why he did not go to the Meeting of Bucharest, Comrade Enver Hoxha pointed out to the 17th Plenum of the CC of the PLA (July 1960): “But why did the first secretaries of the parties of the socialist countries go to Bucharest, while I did not go? I did very well in not going, for I was carrying out the decision of the Political Bureau to avoid compromising our Party on questions that are not Marxist-Leninist. I would have presented there the opinions of the Political Bureau, which were very well transmitted by Hysni. My failure to go upset the Soviet leaders because everybody else went; only Enver did not go, because there was something

KHRUSHCHEV'S SECOND LETTER

[Kapo].¹ He will take part in the Congress of the Romanian Workers' Party, so let him take part also in the meeting of the representatives of communist parties to decide the place and time of the coming meeting.

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, pp. 20-21, Eng. ed.

fishy going on." (Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 19, Alb. ed., "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1975, p. 57.)

¹ The delegation of the Party of Labour of Albania, headed by Comrade Hysni Kapo, arrived in Bucharest on June 20, 1960.

A MEETING WHICH IS TURNING INTO A PLOT

June 21, 1960

The meeting in Bucharest of representatives of communist and workers' parties who are attending the congress of the Romanian Workers' Party is being transformed, in fact, into a plot against the Communist Party of China. We must smash this dangerous plot.¹

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, p. 22, Eng. ed.

¹ Contrary to the agreement reached, under which this meeting was to serve only as a preliminary gathering to decide the place and date of a meeting of the communist and workers' parties of the world, and in violation of all the Leninist organizational norms which governed the relations between communist parties, Khrushchev demanded that the meeting in Bucharest immediately discuss the disagreements which had arisen between the CPSU and the CP of China. As Comrade Enver Hoxha explains, through this plot hatched up in secret, Khrushchev, thinking that he had the Party of Labour of Albania "in his pocket" and could subjugate it more easily, wanted to condemn the Communist Party of China and expel it from the world communist movement. But he was wrong in his calculations. "At the Bucharest meeting our Party played an important role. It was the only party to oppose what was being done there. And from then on the hostility against us, until then covert, came out in the open." (Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 19, Alb. ed., «8 Nëntori» Publishing House, Tirana 1975, p. 583.)

KHRUSHCHEV WILL NEVER DECEIVE THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA

June 22, 1960

I received a series of radiograms from Hysni, in which he informs me about the development of events in Bucharest.

It is more than clear to us that in order to defend his opportunist-revisionist views Nikita Khrushchev is attacking Marxism-Leninism. He is deceiving all the leaders and representatives of the communist and workers' parties in Bucharest and getting them into the net of the plot which he is hatching up. But Khrushchev will never deceive our Party!

I reported to the Political Bureau, informing it of what Hysni reported to me from Bucharest.¹ After carefully analysing the situation created, we decided what stand Hysni must adopt in the meeting, and communicated this to him urgently.²

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, p. 23, Eng. ed.

¹ Published in: Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 19, Alb. ed., "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1975, p. 2.

² *Ibidem*, p. 8.

WE SHOULD NOT SUBMIT TO ANY PRESSURE

From the contribution to the discussion at the meeting of the Political Bureau of the CC of the PLA

June 24, 1960

We have received a series of radiograms from Comrade Hysni concerning the Bucharest Meeting. These radiograms kept coming until late into the night, or more exactly, until three hours past midnight. I didn't think it necessary to convene the Political Bureau again after midnight, but on the basis of its directives I transmitted the relevant answers to Comrade Hysni.

After reading the radiograms sent by Comrade Hysni and the answers to them, Comrade Enver Hoxha went on:

It is clear that Hysni is in a very difficult position in Bucharest. The agreement was to the effect that the delegations of the communist and workers' parties taking part in the proceedings of the Congress of the Romanian Workers' Party would come together in Bucharest only to fix the date and place of a meeting of the communist and workers' parties of the world. But, in fact, Comrade Hysni is faced with an impromptu international meeting, rigged up by the Khrushchev group.

If this meeting issues a communique which doesn't run counter to the Declaration of the Moscow Meeting of the communist and workers' parties of 1957, I think that Hysni should sign it. However, it could happen that the communique will have other nuances, because it comes from an out-of-order meeting, at which the representatives of the communist and workers' parties have been handed a 65-page report from the Soviet leadership in which the Communist Party of China is condemned. The report of the Soviet delegation against the Communist Party of China will have great worldwide

WE SHOULD NOT SUBMIT TO ANY PRESSURE

repercussions, like Khrushchev's "secret" report to the 20th Congress of the CPSU on the so-called cult of Stalin.¹

Even if we accept a communique without any allusions, we should still consider that it is not in order because it is the result of an impromptu meeting contrary to Marxist-Leninist organizational norms. Therefore the stand of our Party that this meeting should be opposed is correct.

These are a few preliminary ideas, however, with respect to the communique, Hysni has been told not to make statements on his own until he receives new directives. If he is handed a communique with allusions against China, he should state categorically: "I will not sign this communique without consulting the leadership of the Party I represent." And if there is no such allusion, Hysni should rise and tell the meeting, "I am authorized by the Party of Labour of Albania to declare that I agree with this communique, but I must add that this communique is a result of a meeting that is not in order. And since we have not come prepared for such a meeting, we cannot make pronouncements regarding the matters that are raised against the CP of China."

The Chinese comrades have requested that the meeting be postponed, but the representatives of the other communist and workers' parties do not agree. This is not right and puts the Chinese comrades in a difficult situation. A fraternal party of a socialist country asks for time to prepare for the meeting, but this is not granted. It is clear that this is being done with a purpose.

Hysni should state that our Party of Labour disagrees with the procedure proposed for the Bucharest Meeting of the communist and workers' parties, that it agrees that what should be decided now is only the date and place of the forthcoming meeting of the communist and

¹ In this report J.V. Stalin and his great revolutionary work were attacked. The purpose of this attack was to justify the liquidation of the Marxist-Leninist line of the Bolshevik Party and to replace it with a revisionist line.

ENVER HOXHA

workers' parties, on which we have reached agreement in principle; and only after we have received explanatory materials from the other side, the Communist Party of China, shall we be prepared to express our opinion at the forthcoming meeting.

Many things may happen, but we should not submit to any pressure. We should always implement our correct Marxist-Leninist line.

Selected Works, vol. 3, Tirana
1980, pp. 15-17, Eng. ed.

OUR STRUGGLE AGAINST THE NEW, DISGUISED REVISIONISTS HAS BEGUN

July 27, 1960

Soviet ambassador Ivanov, who as always aims to feel our pulse, continues to come to me, but he goes away empty-handed.

Hysni returned from Romania today and reported to us at length on the Meeting in Bucharest. This Meeting is a black stain on the history of the international communist movement. There Khrushchev and company revealed their real faces as renegades.

Thus, our struggle against the new, disguised revisionists has begun. It will be a long and difficult struggle, but we are not afraid of it, and we have the unshakeable conviction that we shall triumph, because we are on the right Marxist-Leninist road.

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, p. 24, Eng. ed.

THEY SUMMON US TO MOSCOW TO FORCE US TO CAPITULATE

August 16, 1960

In a letter sent to us the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union invites a delegation of our Party to go to Moscow to discuss the disagreements which emerged at Bucharest. The Soviet leaders motivate this invitation with the need for “the Party of Labour of Albania and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to go to the coming meeting in November with complete unity of opinions.” This means that they are summoning us to Moscow so that we capitulate to them and set ourselves against Marxism-Leninism, like Khrushchev and company. This is a vile, hostile, Trotskyite manoeuvre on their side.

Everything confirms that the present Soviet leadership, headed by Khrushchev, is galloping down the revisionist road.

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, p. 26, Eng. ed.

KHRUSHCHEV AND HIS COLLEAGUES INCREASE THE PRESSURE ON US

September 10, 1960

More and more each day Khrushchev and his colleagues are displaying the hostility which they have long nurtured towards us. Because of the catastrophic drought this year, some time ago we sought grain from the Soviets, Bulgarians and Romanians. The Soviets have replied that they will supply only one fifth of the quantity we asked for, and even this after November. This stand of theirs means pressure on us.¹ The Bulgarians supplied one third of what we asked for, while the Romanians sent us none at all, although this year they are exporting grain to the West.

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, p. 27, Eng. ed.

¹ “In their efforts to overcome the resistance of the PLA and the Albanian people, the Khrushchevites abandoned every scruple, going so far as to threaten our country with the blockade to starve us. These rabid enemies of socialism and of the Albanian people, in particular, refused to supply us with grain at a time when our bread grain reserves were sufficient for only 15 days... ‘Why worry yourselves about bread grain?’ Khrushchev had said to us. ‘Plant citrus-trees. The mice in our granaries eat as much grain as Albania needs.’ And when the Albanian people were in danger of being left without bread, Khrushchev preferred to feed the mice and not the Albanians. According to him, there were only two roads for us: either submit or die. This was the cynical logic of this traitor.” (Enver Hoxha, *The Khrushchevites (Memoirs)*, 2nd Eng. ed., “8 Nëntori” Publishing House. Tirana 1984, pp. 409, 410.)

RADIOGRAM TO COMRADE HYSNI KAPO IN MOSCOW

October 1, 1960

Comrade Hysni,

1) The problem should be raised like this: Which way should the international communist movement develop in the present situation, and what course has it followed from the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union until now?

2) The Chinese and we think that grave tactical and strategic mistakes of principle have been committed by the Khrushchev group. This group has deviated from Marxist-Leninist principles and violated the Declaration of the Moscow Meeting of 1957. This group not only persisted in its mistakes, but also held the Bucharest Meeting and accused China directly, and us indirectly, of dogmatism, and so on. Thus the Chinese and we will fight so that our correct theses will be confirmed and accepted by all, and the grave mistake committed by the Soviet leadership at the Bucharest Meeting will be condemned by all.

3) The group of Khrushchev and those he has compromised defend the opposite thesis. In Bucharest he lined up almost all those present and made the leaders at least agree that "Khrushchev has not made mistakes, that the Chinese have made mistakes, that the Bucharest (Meeting) was necessary and correct."

4) In our opinion, all problems should be solved at the coming Moscow Meeting (1960), while the Khrushchev group has solved them for its purposes at Bucharest. So the Khrushchev group comes to the Moscow Meeting with the conviction that its road and actions have been correct, and we will have to adopt a Declaration that will say where the international communist movement should go. But as

RADIOGRAM TO COMRADE HYSNI KAPO

to who has deviated, who is guilty, and what the Bucharest Meeting represents, nothing is said, which means that China stays condemned.

5) Now let us suppose that the Declaration of the coming Moscow Meeting may be formulated appropriately and defines the correct road for the international communist movement. Such a Declaration will be, more or less, a copy of that adopted at the Moscow Meeting of 1957. Likewise, let us suppose that the commission that meets there to prepare the Moscow Meeting formulates the Declaration, but without indicating in concrete terms who deviated and why China was condemned in Bucharest. Even if this is the case, our just aim will not be achieved.

6) Our aim and task do not consist in adding to the collection of declarations, but in condemning and correcting mistakes. This is important because only then will there be any assurance that either the Declaration of 1957 or the new one will be implemented correctly and in a Marxist-Leninist way.

7) To the Khrushchev group, Marxism-Leninism, the Declaration of the Moscow Meeting of 1957, and the new one that will emerge from the coming Moscow Meeting, are of no value. Thus, even if we try to make this a good one, it will be worthless without an analysis of the mistakes, and without the admission of these mistakes on their part. Therefore, your meeting should start the fight against the mistakes and not stick simply to the discussion of the Declaration. The Declaration should be discussed by means of the exposure of the mistakes of the Khrushchev group. Possibly, no conclusion will be reached until the conference is held. Thus their manoeuvre fails.

8) The new document has many weaknesses. We shall speak about it later. But the slight concessions by the Khrushchev group are aimed at lulling us to sleep and making us think that, with the amendment of the Declaration, any discussion about the group's mistakes is blocked.

9) At the Moscow Meeting we shall raise the problems just as we said above, since as far as we are concerned the entire problem remains unsolved. We have handed the Khrushchev group and all the parties a correct draft Declaration, on the basis of which we want the proceedings to develop. At the meeting we shall go beyond the limits of the Declaration, since we consider it as the conclusion of the debate that will take place. But the Khrushchev group looks at it differently; it aims at the opposite. The representatives of many other parties at this meeting are compromised in advance in one way or another and to various degrees; and faced with a Declaration well-prepared in advance by the commission, they will be taken aback by our correct contribution, by our severe but just criticism which the Khrushchev group will try to oppose, since they will be unable to stop it; and finally the conclusion will be reached that we disagree with the Khrushchev group and its supporters, but do agree with the draft Declaration prepared beforehand.

10) On the one hand we end up in disagreement, since the Khrushchev group will never admit its mistakes, and on the other hand the Moscow Meeting will confront us with the dilemma of signing this Declaration, which is correct (but which fails to say who has committed the mistakes concerning the line, etc.) — or not to sign it. If we put our signature to a Declaration with such mistakes of principle and do not achieve our aim of having the mistakes of the Khrushchev group clearly brought out, then this group will triumph and China will remain condemned. If we refuse to sign it, we will give the Khrushchev group and its followers a weapon to accuse us of refusing to sign a correct Declaration.

This constitutes a well-thought-out tactic of the Khrushchev group. It must have been worked out by the entire pro-Soviet group with Zhivko¹ and company, who have been informed about this

¹ Refers to T. Zhivkov of Bulgaria. Leaving off the “v” is an expression of

RADIOGRAM TO COMRADE HYSNI KAPO

material beforehand. Therefore, try to amend the Declaration according to our viewpoint. If this is not done, then we will be on the course I mentioned above, which is dangerous.

In the correctly worked — out Declaration, the mistakes of the Khrushchev group should be recognized and its aims at the Bucharest Meeting condemned. The Khrushchev group does not admit its mistakes, the document will remain in the air, and thus everything will be decided after the discussions in the meeting. In conclusion, these are only some preliminary ideas. You should ponder over them and act according to the correct line of our Party, according to the instructions the Political Bureau has given and will give you. Keep us constantly up to date.

We are working on our comments on the material, and we shall do everything we can to help you.

Regards to you, Ramiz, and all the comrades.

Enver

*Albania Challenges Khrushchev
Revisionism*, New York 1976,
pp. 131-133, Eng. ed.

WE ARE NOT FOR SERENADE NOCTURNE

October 7, 1960

Hysni sent me the speech which Deng Xiaoping delivered on October 5, at the meeting of the Commission editing documents for the November meeting. I read it and, in my opinion, although, in general, the problems are presented well, the tone of the speech is conciliatory. As a beginning this speech could be considered a “prelude,” but if it does not burst out with force, like Beethoven’s symphonies, then it will be turned into a “serenade nocturne.”

In fact, if the Soviets are interested in closing things up and putting the lid on their anti-Marxist activities, and they have this interest, they have a good opportunity to grasp at this speech, to make the corrections sought in one way or another, and to pass over the issues under the slogan, “We agree we should not engage in polemics,” and thus dodge the debate and principled discussion.

Four or five days ago, too, after a talk which he had had with the Chinese comrades, Hysni informed me, amongst other things, that “our friend” (alluding to Deng) thinks we should not begin the polemics. These do not seem like good signs to me, however, let us wait and see. I am informing Hysni of my opinions about Deng’s speech in a letter¹ which I am sending him on some matters which he must bear in mind in the proceedings of the Commission.

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, p. 28, Eng. ed.

¹ Published in: Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 19, Alb. ed., “8 Nëntori” Publishing House, Tirana 1975, p. 302.

A DISHONOURABLE AND ANTI-MARXIST ACT BY KHRUSHCHEV

November 8, 1960

Nikita Khrushchev invited me to meet him. In fact, we had decided that I should go to this meeting as Nikita asked, although we knew he would try to carry out the tactic of the split; however, this arch-revisionist cannot breach our unity. Today, however, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union handed to us a long letter which it had sent to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on November 5, 1960 and also distributed to all the delegations participating in the Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' parties. While reading this letter, precisely when I was preparing to go to the meeting, I saw that our country did not figure in the list of socialist countries. I saw, also, that our Central Committee was attacked there and accused of operating with anti-democratic methods against Liri Belishova and Koço Tashko simply because they are "friends" of the Soviet Union, and other slanders. Then I called Andropov and told him I refused to go to meet Nikita Khrushchev, because, in a dishonourable, non-Marxist and slanderous way and without waiting to talk to me first, he had attacked our Party through an official international document in order to discredit our Party in the eyes of the international communist movement. This action of Nikita Khrushchev meant not only that he had attacked us, but, in fact, had created unequal conditions for the talks.¹

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, pp. 29-30, Eng. ed.

¹ Published in: Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 19, Alb. ed., "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1975, p. 355.

SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE MEETING OF 81 COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES IN MOSCOW¹ ON BEHALF OF THE CC OF THE PLA

November 16, 1960

Dear Comrades,

This Meeting of the communist and workers' parties is of historic importance to the international communist movement, for it is making a detailed analysis of the international political situation, drawing up a balance-sheet of the successes and mistakes that may have been observed along our course, helping us see more clearly the line we should pursue henceforth in order to score further successes to the benefit of socialism, communism and peace.

The existence of the socialist camp, headed by the Soviet Union, is already an accomplished fact in the world. The communist movement in general has been enlarged, strengthened and tempered. The communist and workers' parties throughout the world have become a colossal force which is leading mankind forward towards socialism, towards peace.

As the draft-statement which has been prepared emphasizes, our socialist camp is very much stronger than that of imperialism.

¹ The Meeting of 81 communist and workers' parties was held in Moscow from the 10th of November to the 1st of December 1960. It was held in an extremely complicated situation of the international communist movement as a result of the spread of modern revisionism and especially the disruptive anti-Marxist activity of the Soviet leadership with Khrushchev at the head.

The delegation of the PLA was headed by Comrade Enver Hoxha. The speech he delivered at the Moscow Meeting was approved at the 20th Plenum of the CC of the PLA held on November 1, 1960.

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

Socialism is growing stronger and attaining new heights day by day, while imperialism is growing weaker and decaying. We should make use of all our means and forces to speed up this process. This will come about if we remain unwaveringly loyal to Marxism-Leninism and apply it correctly. Otherwise, we will retard this process, for we are faced with a ruthless enemy — imperialism, headed by U.S. imperialism, which we must defeat and destroy.

We want peace, while imperialism does not want peace and is preparing for a third world war. We must fight with all our might to avert a world war and to bring about the triumph of a just and democratic peace in the world. This will be achieved when we have forced imperialism to disarm. Imperialism will not give up its arms of its own free will. To believe anything of the kind is merely to deceive oneself and others. Therefore, we must confront imperialism with the colossal economic, military, moral, political and ideological strength of the socialist camp, as well as with the combined strength of the peoples throughout the world, to sabotage in every way the war which the imperialists are preparing.

The Party of Labour of Albania has never hidden from its people this situation and the threat with which imperialism is menacing peace-loving mankind, nor will it ever do so. We can assure you that the Albanian people, who detest war, have not been intimidated by this correct action of their Party. They have not become pessimistic, nor have they been marking time as far as socialist construction is concerned. They have a clear vision of their future and have set to work with full confidence, always vigilant, keeping the pick in one hand and the rifle in the other.

Our view is that imperialism, headed by U.S. imperialism, should be mercilessly exposed, politically and ideologically, and at no time should we permit flattery, prettification, or coddling of imperialism. No concessions of principle should be made to imperialism. The

tactics and compromises which are permissible on our part should help our cause, not that of the enemy.

Facing a ruthless enemy, the guarantee for the triumph of our cause lies in our complete unity, which will be secured by eliminating the deep ideological differences which have been manifested, and by building this unity on the foundations of Marxism-Leninism, on equality, on brotherhood, on the spirit of comradeship and proletarian internationalism. Our Party believes that not only should we have no ideological split, but we should maintain a unified political stand on all issues. Our tactics and strategy towards the enemy should be worked out by all our parties, based on Marxist-Leninist principles and on correct political criteria in accordance with the concrete existing situations.

All the peoples of the world aspire to and fight for freedom, independence, sovereignty, social justice, culture and peace. These sacred aspirations of theirs have been and are being suppressed by the capitalists, the feudal lords and the imperialists. Hence, it is natural that the struggle of these peoples should be waged with great severity against the capitalists, feudal lords and imperialists. It is also natural for the peoples of the world to seek allies in this battle for life, which they are waging against their executioners.

Therefore, in the struggle for peace, disarmament and social progress in the world, the socialist camp is not alone in facing the imperialist camp, but is in close alliance with all the progressive peoples of the world, while the imperialists are isolated facing the socialist camp.

We are living at a time when we are witnessing the total destruction of colonialism, the elimination of this plague that has wiped peoples from the face of the earth. New states are springing up in Africa and Asia. The countries where capital, the scourge, and the bullet reigned supreme, are putting an end to the yoke of bondage, and the peoples are taking their destiny into their own hands. This has been

and is being achieved thanks to the struggle of these peoples and the moral support given them by the Soviet Union, People's China and the other countries of the socialist camp.

Traitors to Marxism-Leninism, agents of imperialism and intriguers, like Josip Broz Tito, are trying in a thousand ways, by hatching up diabolical schemes, to mislead the peoples and the newly formed states, to detach them from their natural allies, to link them directly with U.S. imperialism. We should exert all our strength to defeat the schemes of these lackeys of imperialism.

We are witnessing the disintegration of imperialism, its decomposition, its final agony. We are living and fighting in the epoch which is characterized by the irresistible transition from capitalism to socialism. All the brilliant teachings of Karl Marx and Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, which have never become outdated, as the revisionists claim, are being confirmed.

World imperialism is being dealt heavy blows which clearly show that it is no longer in its "golden age," when it made the law, as and when it wanted. The initiative has now slipped from its hands, and this was not because of its own wish or desire. This initiative was wrested from it not by words and discourses alone, but after a long process of bloody battles and revolutions which capitalism itself provoked against the proletariat, against the strength of the peoples who were rising to smash the world of hunger and misery, the world of slavery. This glorious page was opened by the Great October Socialist Revolution, by the great Soviet Union, by the great Lenin.

Even now, when it sees its approaching doom, when it has strong and determined opponents such as the socialist camp and its great alliance with all the peoples of the world, world imperialism, headed by U.S. imperialism, is mustering, organizing, and arming its assault forces. It is preparing for war. He who fails to see this is blind. He who sees it, but covers it up, is a traitor in the service of imperialism.

The Party of Labour of Albania is of the opinion that, in spite of the major difficulties we encounter on our way to establish peace in the world, to bring about disarmament and settle the other international problems, there is no reason to be pessimistic. It is only our enemies, who are suffering losses, that are and should be pessimistic. We have won, we are winning and shall continue to win. That is why we have always been optimistic and are convinced that our efforts will be crowned with success.

But we think that exaggerated, unrealistic optimism not only is not good, but is even harmful. He who denies, belittles, who has no faith in our great economic, political, military and moral strength, is a defeatist and does not deserve to be called a communist. On the other hand, he who, intoxicated by our potential, regards the opponents as mere gnats, thinking that the enemy has lost all hope, has become harmless, and is entirely at our mercy — he is not a realist. He bluffs, puts the peoples to sleep in the face of all these complicated and very dangerous situations which demand very great vigilance from us all, which demand the heightening of the revolutionary drive of the masses, not its slackening, its disintegration, decomposition and relaxation. “Waters sleep, but not the enemy,” is a wise saying of our long-suffering people.

Let us look the facts straight in the eye. World imperialism, headed by its most aggressive detachment U.S. imperialism, is directing the course of its economy towards preparations for war. It is arming itself to the teeth. U.S. imperialism is arming Bonn's Germany, Japan, and all its allies and satellites with all kinds of weapons. It has set up and is perfecting aggressive military organizations, it has established and continues to establish military bases all around the socialist camp. It is accumulating stocks of nuclear weapons and refuses to disarm, to stop testing nuclear weapons, and is feverishly engaged in inventing new means of mass extermination. Why is it doing all this?

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

To go to a wedding party? No, to go to war against us, to do away with socialism and communism, to enslave the peoples.

The Party of Labour of Albania is of the opinion that if we were to say and think otherwise, we would be deceiving ourselves and others. We would not call ourselves communists if we were afraid of the vicissitudes of life. We communists detest war. We communists will fight to the end to smash the diabolical plans for war which the U.S. imperialists are preparing, but if they declare war on us, we should deal them a mortal blow that will wipe imperialism from the face of the earth, once and for all.

Faced with the threats of atomic war by the U.S.-led world imperialists, we should be fully prepared economically, politically and morally, as well as militarily, to cope with any eventuality.

We should prevent a world war, it is not absolutely inevitable. But no one will ever excuse us if we live in a dream and let the enemy catch us unawares, for it has never happened that the enemy is or is called *loyal*¹, otherwise he would not be called an enemy. The enemy is and remains an enemy, and a perfidious one at that. He who puts his trust in the enemy will sooner or later lose his case.

The peaceful policy of the countries of the socialist camp has exerted a major influence in exposing the aggressive aims of imperialism, in mobilizing the peoples against the warmongers, in promoting their glorious struggle against the imperialist oppressors and their tools.

But in spite of all this, many concrete problems which have been laid on the table, like the proposals for disarmament, the summit conference,² etc., have not yet been resolved and are being systematically

¹ French in the original.

² In December 1959, Khrushchev, former head of the Soviet Government, who was for the settlement of major international issues with the chiefs of imperialism by means of discussions only, made arrangements through diplomatic channels for the calling of a summit conference with the participation of the heads of the

sabotaged by the U.S. imperialists.

What conclusions should we draw from all this? The Party of Labour of Albania thinks that imperialism, and first and foremost, U.S. imperialism, has not changed its hide, its hair or its nature. It is aggressive, and will remain aggressive as long as it has a single tooth left in its head. And being aggressive, it may plunge the world into a war. Therefore, as we emphasized at the meeting of the Editorial Committee, we insist that it should be brought home clearly to all the peoples that there is no absolute guarantee against world war until socialism has triumphed throughout the world, or at least in the majority of countries. The U.S. imperialists make no secret of their refusal to disarm. They are increasing their armaments, preparing for war, therefore we should be on our guard.

We should make no concessions of principle to the enemy, we should entertain no illusions about imperialism. Believing to improve the situation we would make it infinitely worse. In addition to arming and preparing for war against us, the enemy is carrying on unbridled propaganda to poison the spirit and benumb the minds of the people, spending millions of dollars to recruit agents and spies, millions of dollars to organize acts of espionage, diversion and murder in our countries. U.S. imperialism has given and is giving thousands of millions of dollars to its loyal agents, the treacherous Tito gang. It is doing all this to weaken our internal front, to split us, to weaken and disorganize our rear areas.

A lot is said about peaceful coexistence. Some even go so far as to assert such absurdities as that People's China and Albania are allegedly opposed to peaceful coexistence. Obviously, such harmful and erroneous views should be refuted once and for all. There can be no

governments of the USSR, USA, Britain and France. This conference was to have been held in May 1960, but it could not be held because of the sabotage by the US imperialists and the vacillating adventurist stand of Khrushchev.

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

socialist state, there can be no communist, who is opposed to peaceful coexistence, who is a warmonger. The great Lenin was the first to put forward the principle of peaceful coexistence among states of different social orders as an objective necessity, as long as socialist and capitalist states exist side by side in the world. Standing loyal to this great principle of Lenin's, our Party of Labour has always held, and still holds, that the policy of peaceful coexistence corresponds to the fundamental interests of all the peoples, to the purpose of the further strengthening of the positions of socialism. Therefore this principle of Lenin's is the basis of the foreign policy of our people's state. Peaceful coexistence between two opposing systems does not imply, as the modern revisionists claim, that we should give up the class struggle. On the contrary, the class struggle must continue, the political and ideological struggle against imperialism, against bourgeois and revisionist ideology, should become ever more intense. While struggling consistently to establish Leninist peaceful coexistence, while making no concessions on principles to imperialism, we should further develop the class struggle in the capitalist countries, as well as the national liberation movement of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries.

In our view, the communist and workers' parties in the capitalist countries should strive to establish peaceful coexistence between their countries, which are still under the capitalist system, and our socialist countries. But their task does not end there. In these countries it is necessary to promote, intensify and strengthen the class struggle. The working masses, led by the proletariat of the country headed by the communist party, and in alliance with the proletariat of the whole world, should make life impossible for imperialism, should crush the bases of its military and economic potential, should wrest from its hands its economic and political power, and proceed to the destruction of its old power and the establishment of the new power of the people. Will they do this by violence, or in the peaceful parliamentary

way?

This question has been clear, and it was not necessary for Comrade Khrushchev to confuse it at the 20th Congress, and to do so in such a way as to please the opportunists. Why was it necessary to make all those parodies of Lenin's clear theses and of the lessons of the October Socialist Revolution? The Party of Labour of Albania is quite clear about and does not shift from Lenin's teachings on this matter. So far, no people, no proletariat and no communist or workers' party has assumed power without bloodshed and without violence.

It is incorrect for some comrades to claim that they have assumed power without bloodshed, for they forget that the glorious Soviet Army poured out rivers of blood for them during the Second World War.

Our Party thinks that, in regard to this matter, we should be prepared for both eventualities, and we should be well prepared, especially, for taking power by violence, for if we are well prepared for this, the other possibility has more chance of success. The bourgeoisie may allow you to sing psalms, but then it deals you a fascist blow on the head and crushes you, because you have not trained the necessary cadres to attack, or done illegal work, you have not prepared a place where you can protect yourself and still work, or the means with which to fight. We should forestall this tragic eventuality.

The Party of Labour of Albania has been, is and will be for peace and peaceful coexistence, and will fight for them in a Marxist-Leninist way, as Lenin teaches us, and on the basis of the Moscow Declaration. It has been, is and will be striving actively for general disarmament. On no occasion, not for one moment, will the Party of Labour of Albania cease waging a political and ideological struggle against the activities of the imperialists and capitalists and against bourgeois ideology. It will not cease waging a stern, relentless and uncompromising struggle against modern revisionism, and in particular, against

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

Yugoslav Titoite revisionism. There may be comrades who reproach us Albanians with being stubborn, irascible, hot-headed, sectarian, dogmatic, and whatever you like, but we reject all these false accusations and tell them that we do not deviate from these positions, for they are Marxist-Leninist positions.

They say that we are in favour of war and against coexistence. Comrade Kozlov has even put this alternative to us Albanians: either coexistence, as he conceives it, or an atomic bomb from the imperialists, which would turn Albania to ashes and leave no Albanian alive. Until now no representative of U.S. imperialism has made such an atomic threat against the Albanian people. But here it is, and from a member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and to whom? To a small heroic people who have fought for centuries against countless savage enemies and who have never bent the knee, to a small people who have fought with unprecedented heroism against the Hitlerites and Italian fascists, to a party which stands loyal and consistent to the end to Marxism-Leninism. But Comrade Frol Kozlov, you have the wrong address. You cannot frighten us into submitting to your misguided will, and we never confuse the glorious Party of Lenin with you, who behave so badly, with such shamelessness, towards the Albanian people and the Party of Labour of Albania. The Party of Labour of Albania will strive for and support all the correct and peaceful proposals of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist camp, as well as of other peace-loving countries.

The Party of Labour of Albania will exert all its strength, use all its rights and carry out all its obligations, to strengthen the unity of the socialist camp, a Marxist-Leninist unity. It is absurd to think that small socialist Albania wants to break away and live outside the socialist camp, outside our fraternity of socialist peoples. Albania is indebted to no one for its presence within the ranks of the socialist

camp; the Albanian people themselves and the Party of Labour of Albania have placed it there with their blood and sweat, their work and sacrifices, with the system of government which they have established, and with the Marxist-Leninist line they pursue. But let no one even think that because Albania is a small country, because the Party of Labour of Albania is a small party, it should do what someone else says when it is convinced that this someone is mistaken.

As I said earlier, the Party of Labour of Albania thinks that our socialist camp, which has one common aim and which is guided by Marxism-Leninism, should also have its own strategy and tactics, and these should be worked out jointly by our parties and states of the socialist camp. Within the ranks of our camp we have set up certain forms of organization of work, but it is right to say that these have remained somewhat formal, or to put it better, they do not function in a collective way, for instance, the organs of the Warsaw Treaty and the Council for Mutual Economic Aid.¹ Let me make it quite clear. This is not a question of whether we, too, should be consulted or not. Of course, no one denies us the right to be consulted, but we should hold meetings for consultation. We raise this problem on principle and say that these forms of organization should function at regular intervals, problems should be taken up for discussion, decisions should be adopted, and there should be a check-up on the implementation of these decisions.

The further development and strengthening of the economies of the socialist countries has always been and is the main concern of our parties and governments, and constitutes one of the decisive factors of

¹ Set up in January 1949. At the end of February of the same year the PR of Albania became one of its members. From an institution for reciprocal aid, with the coming to power of the Khrushchev revisionist clique in the Soviet Union the Council for Mutual Economic Aid (Comecon) degenerated, too, becoming an instrument for the achievement of the social-imperialist aims of this clique.

the unconquerable strength of the socialist camp.

The construction of socialism and communism is proceeding at a rapid rate in our countries. This is due to the great efforts of our peoples and to the reciprocal aid they render one another.

So far, the People's Republic of Albania has given economic aid to no one, first, because we are poor, and second, because no one stands in need of our economic aid. But within proper norms, we have made and continue to make every effort to give the countries which are our friends and brothers some little help through our exports. We have been aided by our friends, first and foremost, by the Soviet Union.

The Party of Labour of Albania and the Government of the People's Republic of Albania have utilized this aid of the Soviet Union and the other countries of people's democracy as well as they could to the best advantage of our people. They are forever grateful to the Soviet peoples and those of people's democracies for it. We have always considered and will continue to consider this aid not charity but fraternal, internationalist aid.

Our people, who have been in dire poverty, who have fought with heroism, who have been massacred and burnt out, had a duty to seek the aid of their friends and brothers who are bigger and economically better off than they. And it was and still is the internationalist duty of their friends to give this aid. Therefore it is necessary to reject any sinister and anti-Marxist view that anyone may hold about the nature and purpose of this aid. Economic pressure on the Party of Labour of Albania, on the Albanian Government, and on our people will never be of any avail.

I wish to propose here that the aid of the economically stronger countries for the economically weaker ones, such as ours, should be greater. The Albanian people have no intention of folding their arms and opening their mouths to be fed by others. That is not their

custom. Nor do our people expect the standard of living in our country to be raised at once to the standard of living in many other countries of people's democracy, but greater aid should be given our country to further develop its productive forces. We think that the economically strong countries of the socialist camp should also accord credits to neutral capitalist countries and to peoples recently liberated from colonialism, provided the leaderships of these capitalist countries are opposed to imperialism, support the peaceful policy of the socialist camp, and do not hinder or oppose the legitimate struggle of the revolutionary forces; but first of all, the needs of the countries of the socialist camp should be looked into more carefully and be fulfilled. Of course, India stands in need of iron and steel, but socialist Albania stands in greater and more urgent need of them. Egypt needs irrigation schemes and electric power, but socialist Albania has greater and more urgent need of them.

On many political issues of first-rate importance our socialist camp has held, and continues to hold, identical views. But since collective consultations have not been held regularly, on many occasions it has been noted that states from our socialist camp take political initiatives (not that we are opposed in principle to taking initiatives), which very often affect other states of the socialist camp as well. Some of these initiatives are incorrect, especially when they are not taken collectively by the members of the Warsaw Treaty.

An initiative of this kind is that of the Bulgarian Government which, with total disregard for Albania, informed the Greek Government that the Balkan countries of people's democracy agree to disarm if the Greek Government is prepared to do so, too. From our point of view, this initiative was wrong, for even if the Greek Government had endorsed it, the Albanian Government would not have accepted it. Albania is in agreement with the Soviet proposal made by Nikita

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

Khrushchev in May 1959,¹ but not with the Bulgarian proposal, which wants the Balkan countries to disarm while leaving Italy unaffected. Or have the Bulgarian comrades forgotten that bourgeois and fascist Italy has attacked Albania a number of times during this century?

Besides, can it be permitted that, on another occasion, without any consultation at all with the Albanian Government, with which they are bound by a defence treaty, the Bulgarian comrades should propose a treaty of friendship and non-aggression to the Greek Government, at a time when Greece maintains a state of war with Albania and is making territorial claims against our country? It seems to us that it is dangerous to take such unilateral actions.

From this correct and legitimate opposition of ours, perhaps the Bulgarian comrades may have arrived at the conclusion that we Albanians do not properly understand coexistence, that we want war, and so forth. These views are erroneous.

Similar gestures have also been made by the Polish comrades at the United Nations, when Comrade Gomulka stated in a unilateral way at the General Assembly of the United Nations that Poland proposes that the existing “status quo on the stationing of military forces in the world should be preserved and, concretely, that no more military bases should be created but those that have been set up already should remain, that no more missiles should be installed but the existing ones should remain, that those states that have the secret of the atomic bomb should keep it and not give it to other states.” In our opinion, such a proposal is contrary to the interests of our camp. No more missiles to be installed, but by whom and where? All the NATO

¹ Through this proposal and the notes the Soviet Government addressed to the governments of Albania, Bulgaria, Romania, Yugoslavia, Turkey, Greece, Italy, France, Britain and the USA, on May 25, 1959, it proposed the creation of a zone free of nuclear weapons and missiles in the Balkans and the Adriatic region.

ENVER HOXHA

members, including Italy, West Germany and Greece, have been equipped with missiles. Not to give the secret of the atomic bomb, to whom? Britain, France and West Germany have it. It is clear that a proposal of this kind will oblige us, the countries of people's democracy, or any other country of the socialist camp, except the Soviet Union, not to install missiles, not to have the atomic bomb.

We pose the question: Why should communist China not have the atomic bomb? We think that China should have it, and when it has the bomb and missiles, then we shall see in what terms U.S. imperialism will speak, we shall see whether they will continue to deny China its rights in the international arena, we shall see whether the U.S. imperialists will dare brandish their weapons as they are doing at present.

Someone may pose the question: Will China win its rights, despite opposition by the United States of America, by possessing and dropping the bomb? No, China will never use the bomb unless we are attacked by those who have aggression and war in their very blood. If the Soviet Union did not possess the bomb, the imperialists would have been talking to it in a different tone. We will never attack with the bomb, we are opposed to war, we are ready to destroy the bomb, but we must keep it to defend ourselves. "It is fear that guards the vineyard," our people say. The imperialists should be afraid of us, and terribly afraid at that.

Based on Marxism-Leninism and on the Moscow Declaration and the Manifesto on Peace, the Party of Labour of Albania has pursued a correct Marxist-Leninist line in matters of international policy and in the important problems of socialist construction. In international relations, the line of our Party has been in accord with the policy of the socialist camp.

The major problems of the time have concerned both the Party of Labour of Albania and our small people. Our People's Republic has

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

been and is surrounded geographically by capitalist states and the Yugoslav revisionists. We have had to be highly vigilant and tie down people and considerable funds to defend our borders, to defend the freedom and sovereignty of our country from the innumerable at tempts of the imperialists and their satellites and lackeys.

We are a small country and a small people who have suffered to an extraordinary degree, but who have also fought very hard. We are not indebted to anyone for the freedom we enjoy today, for we have won it with our own blood. We are continually aware, day and night, of our imperialist enemies, of their manoeuvres against the socialist camp and our country in particular. Therefore we have never had and never will have illusions about their changing their nature and their intentions towards the peoples, towards our camp, and towards socialist Albania in particular.

The U.S. and British imperialists have always accused us Albanians of being “savage and warlike.” This is understandable, for the Albanian people have dealt telling blows at their repeated attempts to put us under bondage, and have chopped off the heads of their agents who have conspired against the Party of Labour of Albania and our regime of people’s democracy.

We do not think we need prove at this meeting that war is alien to the socialist countries, to our Marxist-Leninist parties, but the question remains: Why do the imperialists and their agents accuse China and Albania of being warmongers and opposed to peaceful coexistence?

Let us take the question of Albania. Against whom would Albania make war, and why? It would be ridiculous to waste our time in answering this question. But those who accuse us of this are trying to cover up their own aggressive intentions towards Albania.

Ranković wants us to turn our borders into a roadhouse with two gates through which Yugoslav, Italian and Greek agents and weapons

could go in and out freely, “without visas,” in order to bring us their “culture of cut-throats,” so that Tito may realize his dream of turning Albania into the 7th Republic of Yugoslavia, so that the reactionary Italian bourgeoisie may put into action for the third time its predatory intentions towards Albania, or so that the Greek monarcho-fascists may realize their crazy dream of grabbing Southern Albania. Because we have not permitted and never will permit such a thing, we are accused of being “warmongers.” They know very well that if they violate our borders they will have to fight us and the whole socialist camp.

Their aim, therefore, has been and still is to isolate us from the camp and from our friends, to accuse us of being “warmongers and savage” because we do not open our borders for them to graze freely, to accuse us of being opposed to “coexistence.” But the irony of fate is that there are comrades who believe this game of the revisionists and these slanders against the Party of Labour of Albania. Of course, we are opposed to any coexistence for the sake of which we Albanians should make territorial and political concessions to Sophocles Venizelos. No, the time has gone forever when the territory of Albania could be treated as a token to be bartered. We are opposed to such a coexistence with the Yugoslav state, which implies that we should give up our ideological and political struggle against the Yugoslav revisionists, these agents of international imperialism, these traitors to Marxism-Leninism. We are opposed to such coexistence with the British or the Americans for the sake of which we should recognize, as they demand, the old political, diplomatic and trading concessions King Zog’s regime had granted them.

As a general conclusion, the Party of Labour of Albania is absolutely convinced that our great cause, the cause of socialism and peace, will triumph. Through determined action, the combined forces of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union, the international communist and workers’ movement, and all the peace-loving peoples have

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

the possibility of compelling the imperialists to accept peaceful coexistence, of averting a world war. But at the same time we will intensify our revolutionary vigilance more and more so that the enemies can never take us by surprise. We are convinced that victory will be ours in this noble struggle for world peace and socialism. The Albanian people and the Party of Labour of Albania, just as heretofore, will spare nothing to assist the triumph of our common cause with all their might. As always, we shall march forward in steel-like unity with the whole socialist camp, with the Soviet Union, and with the whole international communist and workers' movement.

Dear Comrades,

The unity of the international communist and workers' movement is the decisive factor in realizing the noble aims of the triumph of peace, democracy, national independence and socialism. This question is especially emphasized both in the 1957 Moscow Declaration and in the draft-statement prepared for our present meeting. The 1957 Declaration stresses that,

*“the communist and workers' parties bear an exceptionally serious historic responsibility for the fate of the world socialist system and the international communist movement. The communist and workers' parties taking part in the Meeting declare that they will spare no effort to strengthen their unity and comradely collaboration in the interest of the further unity of the family of socialist states, in the interest of the international workers' movement, in the interest of the cause of peace and socialism.”*¹

¹ “Declaration of the Meeting of the Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist Countries,” Tirana 1958, p. 24, Alb. ed.

It must be said that, especially in recent times, in the international communist movement and in the relations among certain parties, profound ideological and political disagreements have arisen, the deepening of which can bring nothing but damage to our great cause. Therefore the Party of Labour of Albania thinks that in order to go forward together towards fresh victories, it is necessary to condemn the mistakes and negative manifestations which have appeared so far, and to correct them.

We want to dwell here on the question of the Bucharest Meeting at which our Party, as you know, refrained from expressing its opinion concerning the differences which have arisen between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, but reserved since then the right to do so at this meeting of the representatives of the communist and workers' parties. At that time the Party of Labour of Albania was accused by the Soviet comrades and by some comrades of other fraternal parties of everything imaginable, but no one took the trouble to think for a moment why this Party maintained such a stand against all this current, why this Party, which has stood loyal to the end to Marxism-Leninism and the Moscow Declaration, is unexpectedly accused of allegedly "opposing Marxism-Leninism and the Moscow Declaration," why this Party, so closely bound to the Soviet Union and to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, suddenly comes out in opposition to the leadership of the Soviet Union.

Now that all the comrades have in their hands both the Soviet information material, as well as that of the Communist Party of China, let them reflect on it themselves. We have read and studied both the Soviet and the Chinese materials, we have discussed them carefully with the Party activists, and come to this meeting with the unanimous view of our whole Party.

As we all know, on June 24 this year, on the occasion of the 3rd Congress of the Romanian Workers' Party, the Bucharest Meeting

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

was organized unexpectedly and without any previous warning, at least as far as our Party was concerned, on the initiative of the comrades of the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Instead of “exchanging opinions” and setting the date for this meeting we are holding today according to the agreement reached through the letters of June 2 and 7, it took up another topic, namely, the ideological and political accusation directed against the Communist Party of China, on the basis of the “Soviet information” material. On the basis of this material, entirely unknown up to a few hours before the meeting, the delegates of the fraternal communist and workers’ parties were supposed to pronounce themselves in favour of the views of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, at a time when they had come to Bucharest for another purpose and had no mandate (at least as regards the delegation of our Party) from their parties to discuss, let alone decide, such an important issue of international communism. Nor could a serious discussion be thought of about this material, which contained such gross accusations against another fraternal party, when not only the delegates, but especially the leaderships of the communist and workers’ parties, were not allowed to study it from all angles, and without allowing the necessary time for the accused party to submit its views in advance in all the forms which the accusing party had used. The fact is that the overriding concern of the Soviet leadership was to have its accusations against the Communist Party of China passed over quickly and to have the Communist Party of China condemned at all costs.

This was the concern of Comrade Khrushchev and other Soviet comrades in Bucharest, and not at all the international political issues worrying our camp and the world as a whole after the failure of the summit conference in Paris.

Our Party would have been in full agreement with an international meeting of communist and workers’ parties, with whatever

other meeting and whatever agenda that might be set. provided that these meetings were in order, had the approval of all the parties, had a clear agenda set in advance, provided the communist and workers' parties were given the necessary materials and allowed enough time to study these materials so that they could prepare themselves and receive the approval of the political bureaus of their parties and, if necessary, of the plenums of their central committees, regarding the decisions that might eventually be taken at these meetings. The meetings should be conducted according to the Leninist norms governing relations among communist and workers' parties. They should be conducted in complete equality among parties, in a comradely, communist and internationalist spirit, and with lofty communist morality.

The Bucharest Meeting did not comply with these norms; therefore, although it took part in it, our Party denounced and denounces that meeting as out-of-order and in violation of the Leninist norms.

We think that the Bucharest Meeting did a great disservice to the cause of the international communist movement, to the cause of the international solidarity of the workers, to the cause of strengthening the unity of the socialist camp, to the cause of setting a Marxist-Leninist example in settling ideological, political and organizational disputes that may arise within the ranks of the communist and workers' parties and which damage Marxism-Leninism. The blame for this falls on the comrades of the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union who organized that meeting, who conceived those forms, and who applied those non-Marxist norms in this matter.

The aim was to have the Communist Party of China condemned by the international communist movement for faults and mistakes which do not exist and are baseless. The Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania is fully convinced of this on the basis of its study of the facts and the Soviet and Chinese materials, which the Party of Labour of Albania now has at its disposal, on the basis of a

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

detailed analysis which the Party of Labour of Albania has made of the international situation and of the official stands of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China.

The whole Party of Labour of Albania holds the unanimous view that the Soviet comrades made a grave mistake in Bucharest. They unjustly condemned the Communist Party of China for having allegedly deviated from Marxism-Leninism, for having allegedly violated and abandoned the 1957 Moscow Declaration. They have accused the Communist Party of China of being “dogmatic,” “sectarian,” of being “in favour of war,” of being “opposed to peaceful coexistence,” of “wanting a privileged position in the camp and in the international communist movement,” etc.

The Soviet comrades made a grave mistake also when, taking advantage of the great love and trust which the communists have for the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, they tried to impose their incorrect views towards the Communist Party of China on the other communist and workers’ parties.

Right from the start, when the Soviet comrades began their feverish and impermissible work of inveigling the comrades of our delegation in Bucharest, it became clear to the Party of Labour of Albania that the Soviet comrades, resorting to groundless arguments and pressure, wished to lead the delegation of the Party of Labour of Albania into the trap they had prepared, to bring them into line with the distorted views of the Soviet comrades.

What was of importance to Comrade Khrushchev (and Comrade Andropov said as much to Comrade Hysni Kapo) was “whether we would line up with the Soviet side or not.” Comrade Khrushchev expressed this opinion in other ways, also, in his interjections against our Party at the Bucharest Meeting. This was corroborated also by many unjust and unfriendly gestures by the comrades of the Soviet leadership and the employees of the Soviet Embassy in Tirana after

ENVER HOXHA

the Bucharest Meeting, to which I shall refer later. What was important for the comrades of the Soviet leadership was not the views of a Marxist-Leninist party such as ours, but only that we should maintain the same attitude in Bucharest as the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

No warning was given to the Party of Labour of Albania by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which organized the Bucharest Meeting, that, on the occasion of the Congress of the Romanian Workers' Party, accusations would be brought against the Communist Party of China for alleged grave mistakes of line. These charges came as a complete surprise to the Party of Labour of Albania. Yet now we hear that, with the exception of the Party of Labour of Albania, the Communist Party of China, the Korean Workers' Party, and the Vietnam Workers' Party, the other parties of the camp were informed that a conference would be organized in Bucharest to accuse China. If this is so, then it is very clear that the question becomes very much more serious and assumes the form of a faction of an international character.

Nevertheless, our Party was not taken unawares and did not lack vigilance, and this happened because it always observes the Leninist norms in the relations among parties, because it respects the principles of equality among parties, an equality which the other parties should respect towards the Party of Labour of Albania, regardless of its being small in numbers.

Right from the beginning, our Party saw that all these norms were being violated at the Bucharest Meeting, and that is why it took the stand you all know, a stand which it considered and still considers the only correct one to maintain towards the events as they developed.

Some leaders of fraternal parties dubbed us "neutralists," some others reproached us with "departing from the correct Marxist-Leninist line," and these leaders went so far as to try to discredit our Party

before their own parties. We scornfully reject all these things because they are slanders, they are dishonest, and they are incompatible with communist morality.

We pose these questions to those who undertook such despicable acts against the Party of Labour of Albania: Has a party the right to express its opinions freely on matters and how it sees them? What opinion did the Party of Labour of Albania express in Bucharest? We expressed our loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, and this is corroborated by the entire life and struggle of the Party of Labour of Albania; we expressed our loyalty to the decisions of the 1957 Moscow Declaration and Manifesto on Peace, and this is corroborated by the line consistently pursued by the Party of Labour of Albania; we expressed our loyalty to and defended the unity of the socialist camp, and this is corroborated by the whole struggle of the Party of Labour of Albania; we expressed our affection for and loyalty to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and to the Soviet peoples, and this is corroborated by the whole life of the Party of Labour of Albania. We did not agree to pass judgement on the "mistakes" of the Communist Party of China and, even less, "to condemn" the Communist Party of China without taking into account the views of the Communist Party of China on the charges raised against it in such a distorted, hasty and anti-Marxist way. We counselled caution, cool-headedness and a comradely spirit in treating this matter so vital to and exceptionally serious for international communism. This was the whole "crime" for which stones were thrown at us. But we think that the stones which were picked up to strike us fell back on the heads of those who threw them. The passage of time is confirming the correctness of the stand maintained by the Party of Labour of Albania.

Why were Comrade Khrushchev and the other Soviet comrades in such a great hurry to accuse the Communist Party of China groundlessly and without facts? Is it permissible for communists, and

especially for the principal leaders of so great a party as the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to perpetrate such an ugly act? Let them answer this question themselves, but the Party of Labour of Albania also has the full right to express its opinion on the matter.

The Party of Labour of Albania is of the opinion that the Bucharest Meeting was not only a great mistake but also a mistake that was deliberately aggravated. In no way should the Bucharest Meeting be left in oblivion; rather, it should be severely condemned as a black stain on the international communist movement.

There is not the least doubt that the ideological differences have been and are grave, and that these have arisen and have been developed between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China. These should have been settled in due time and in a Marxist-Leninist way between the two parties concerned.

According to the Chinese document, the Communist Party of China says that these differences of principle were raised by the Chinese comrades immediately following the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Some of these matters have been taken into consideration by the Soviet comrades, while others have been rejected.

The Party of Labour of Albania thinks that if these differences could not be settled between the two parties concerned, a meeting should have been sought of the communist and workers' parties at which these matters could be brought up, discussed, and a stand taken towards them. It is not right that these matters should have been left unsettled, and the blame for this must fall on the Soviet comrades who had knowledge of these differences but disregarded them, because they were dead certain of their line and its "inviolability," and this, we think, is an idealist and metaphysical approach.

If the Soviet comrades were convinced of the correctness of their

line and their tactics, why did they not organize such a meeting in due time and have these differences settled? Were the matters raised so trivial — for example, the condemnation of J.V. Stalin, the major question of the Hungarian counter-revolution, that of the ways of taking power, not to speak of many other very important problems that emerged later? No, they were not trivial at all. We all have our own views on these problems, because as communists we are all interested in them, because all our parties are responsible to their peoples, but they are also responsible to international communism as well.

In order to condemn the Communist Party of China, Comrade Khrushchev and the other Soviet leaders were very concerned to present the case as if the differences existed between China and the whole international communist movement, but when it came to problems like those I just mentioned, judgement on them has been passed by Comrade Khrushchev and the comrades around him alone, thinking that there was no need for them to be discussed collectively at a meeting of the representatives of all the parties, although these were major problems of an international character.

The Hungarian counter-revolution occurred, but matters were hushed up. Why this tactic of hushing things up when they are not to their advantage, while for things which are to their advantage the Soviet comrades not only call meetings like that of Bucharest, but do their utmost to force on others the view that China “is opposed in line to all the communist and workers’ parties of the world”?

The Soviet comrades made a similar attempt towards us also. In August this year, the Soviet leadership sent a letter to our Party in which it proposed that, “with a view to preventing the spark of differences from flaring up,” the representatives of our two parties should meet so that our Party would align itself with the Soviet Union against the Communist Party of China, and that our two parties should present a united front at this meeting. Of course, the Central Committee

of our Party refused such a thing, and in its official reply described this as something quite un-Marxist, a factional act directed against a third fraternal party, against the Communist Party of China. Of course, this correct principled stand of our Party was not to the liking of the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

There is no doubt that these matters are of first-rate importance. There is no doubt that they concern us all, but neither is there any doubt for the Party of Labour of Albania that the matters, as they were raised against China in Bucharest, were tendentious and aimed at condemning the Communist Party of China and isolating it from the whole international communist movement.

For the Party of Labour of Albania this was unacceptable, not only because it was not convinced of the truth of these allegations, but also because it rightly suspected that a non-Marxist action was being organized against a great fraternal party like the Communist Party of China, that under the guise of an accusation of dogmatism against China, an attack was being launched against Marxism-Leninism.

At the meeting the Communist Party of China was accused of many faults. This should have figured in the communique. Why was it not done? If the accusations were well founded, why all this hesitation and why issue a communique which did not correspond to the purpose for which the meeting was called? Why was there no reference in it to the "great danger of dogmatism" allegedly threatening international communism?

No, comrades, the Bucharest Meeting cannot be defended. It was not based on principle. It was a biased one to achieve certain objectives, of which the main one, in the opinion of the Party of Labour of Albania, was, by accusing the Communist Party of China of dogmatism, to cover up some grave mistakes of line which the Soviet leading comrades have allowed themselves to make.

The Soviet comrades stood in need of the support of the other

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

parties on this matter. Therefore they blatantly tried to take them by surprise. The Soviet comrades achieved half their aim and won the right to put forward the condemnation of China to these parties as the outcome of an “international conference of communism.” In the communist and workers’ parties, with the exception of the Party of Labour of Albania and certain other communist and workers’ parties, the question was raised of the “grave errors of line committed by the Communist Party of China,” the “unanimous” condemnation of China in Bucharest was reported in an effort to create the opinion in the parties and among the people in this direction. The Party of Labour of Albania also was condemned at some meetings of these parties.

After the Bucharest Meeting the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania decided, and decided rightly, to discuss in the Party only the communique, to tell the Party that there existed divergences of principle between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, which should be taken up and settled at the coming meeting, due to be held in Moscow in November. And this is what was done.

But this stand of our Party did not please the leading comrades of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and we were very soon made aware of this. Immediately following the Bucharest Meeting, an unexpected, unprincipled attack was launched, and brutal intervention and all-round pressure was undertaken against our Party and its Central Committee. The attack was begun by Comrade Khrushchev in Bucharest and was continued by Comrade Kozlov in Moscow. The comrades of our Political Bureau who happened to pass through Moscow were worked upon with a view to turning them against the leadership of our Party, under the pretext that “the leadership of the Party of Labour of Albania has betrayed the friendship with the Soviet Union,” that “the line pursued by the leadership of the Party of Labour

of Albania is characterized by ‘zigzags’,” that “Albania must decide to go either with the 200 million (with the Soviet Union), or with the 600 million (with People’s China),” and finally that “an isolated Albania is in danger, for it would take only one atomic bomb dropped by the Americans to wipe out Albania and all its population completely,” and other threats of the kind. It is absolutely clear that the aim was to sow discord in the leadership of our Party, to remove from the leadership of the Party of Labour of Albania those elements who, the Soviet leaders thought, stood in the way of their crooked and dishonest undertaking.

What came out of this divisive work was that Liri Belishova, ex-member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, capitulated to the cajolery of the Soviet leaders, to their blackmail and intimidation, and took a stand in open opposition to the line of the Party.

The attempt of the Soviet comrades, in their letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, to present this question as if the friends of the Soviet Union in Albania are being persecuted, is a falsehood. The million and a half Albanians and the Party of Labour of Albania, which has forged and steeled this friendship tempered in blood, and not the various capitulators, splitters and deviationists, are the life-long friends of the Soviet peoples.

But attempts to arouse doubts about the correct stand of our Party in Bucharest were not confined just to Moscow. They were made, with even more fervour, in Tirana by the employees of the Soviet Embassy, headed by the Soviet ambassador to Tirana personally.

As I said before, prior to the Bucharest Meeting, one could not imagine closer, more sincere, more fraternal relations than those between us and the Soviet comrades. We kept nothing hidden from the Soviet comrades, neither party nor state secrets. This was the decision of the Central Committee of our Party. These relations reflected the

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

Albanian people's great love for and loyalty to the Soviet peoples, sentiments which our Party had tempered in blood.

Over these sacred sentiments of the Party of Labour of Albania and our people certain sickly elements, with the Soviet ambassador at the head, trampled roughshod. Taking advantage of our friendly relations, taking advantage of the good faith of our cadres, they began feverishly and intensively to attack the Marxist-Leninist line of the Party of Labour of Albania, to split the Party, to create panic and confusion in its ranks, and to alienate the leadership from the Party. The Soviet ambassador to Tirana went so far as to attempt to incite the generals of our army to raise the People's Army of Albania against the leadership of the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian state. But the saw struck a nail because the unity of our Party is steel-like. Our cadres, tempered in the National Liberation War and in the bitter life-and-death struggle with the Yugoslav revisionists, defended their heroic Party in a Marxist way. They know very well how to draw the line between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union of Lenin and the splitters. And in fact they put these denigrators in their place.

Nevertheless, the employees of the Soviet Embassy in Tirana, headed by the ambassador, through impermissible anti-Marxist methods, managed to make the chairman of the Auditing Commission of the Party of Labour of Albania, who 15 days earlier had expressed his solidarity with the line pursued by the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania in Bucharest, fall in for their intrigues, go completely off the rails of Marxism-Leninism and come out in flagrant opposition to the line of the Party. It is clear that these despicable efforts of these Soviet comrades were aimed at splitting the leadership of the Party of Labour of Albania, at alienating it from the mass of the Party. And this as a punishment for the "crime" we had committed in Bucharest, by having the courage to express our views freely, as we saw fit.

The functionaries of the Soviet Embassy in Tirana went even further down this road. They turned to the Albanians who had studied in the Soviet Union with a view to inciting them against the Albanian leadership, thinking that they would be a contingent suitable to their crooked aims. But the Albanians, whether those who had completed their studies in the Soviet Union or those who are still in the course of their studies, know that such base methods as those used by the employees of the Soviet Embassy in Tirana are altogether alien to Marxism-Leninism. The Albanians are the sons and daughters of their own people and of their own Party. They are Marxist-Leninists and internationalists.

We could list many other examples, but so as not to take up much time at this important meeting, I will mention only two other typical cases. The pressure on our Party continued, even during the days when the commission was meeting here in Moscow to edit the draft-statement which has been submitted to us, when the Soviet comrades said that we should look ahead and not back. During those days in Moscow, a member of the Central Committee and minister of the Soviet Union, Marshal Malinovsky, launched an open attack on the Albanian people, on the Party of Labour of Albania, on the Albanian Government, and on our leadership at an enlarged meeting of the chiefs of Staff of the Warsaw Treaty countries. This unfriendly and public attack has much in common with the diversionist attack of the Soviet ambassador to Tirana, who tried to incite our People's Army against the leadership of our Party and state. But like the Soviet ambassador, Marshal Malinovsky, too, is making a grave mistake. No one can achieve this aim, and even less that of breaking up the friendship of our people with the peoples of the Soviet Union. The just struggle of the Party of Labour of Albania against these subversive acts strengthens the sincere friendship of our people with the peoples of the Soviet Union. Nor can this friendship be broken up by the

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

astonishing statements of Marshal Grechko, Commander-in-Chief of the Warsaw Treaty, who not only told our military delegation that it was difficult for him to meet the requirements of our army for some very essential armaments, for the supply of which contracts have been signed, but said bluntly, "You are in the Warsaw Treaty only for the time being," implying that Marshal Grechko seems to have decided to throw us out. But, fortunately, it is not up to the Comrade Marshal to make such a decision.

In October of this year, Comrade Khrushchev declared solemnly to the Chinese comrades: "We shall treat Albania like Yugoslavia." We say this at this meeting of international communism so that all may see how far things have gone and what attitude is being maintained towards a small socialist country. What "crime" has the Party of Labour of Albania committed for our country to be treated like Tito's Yugoslavia? Can it be said that we have betrayed Marxism-Leninism, as the Tito clique has done? Or did we break away from the socialist camp and hitch up with U.S. imperialism, as Yugoslav revisionism has done? No, and all the international communist movement, all the concrete political, ideological and economic activity of our Party and our state during the whole period of the National Liberation War, and during these 16 years since the liberation of the country, bear witness to this. This is borne out also by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union itself, which, in its letter of August 13, 1960 to the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, stresses: "The relations between the Party of Labour of Albania and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, based on the principles of proletarian internationalism, have always been truly fraternal. The friendship between our parties and peoples has never at any time been obscured by any misunderstanding or deviation. The positions of the Party of Labour of Albania and those of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on all the most important issues of the international

ENVER HOXHA

communist and workers' movement and of foreign policy have been identical."

Of what, then, are we guilty? Our only "crime" is that in Bucharest we did not agree that a fraternal communist party like the Communist Party of China should be unjustly condemned; our only "crime" is that we had the courage to oppose openly, at an international communist meeting (and not in the marketplace), the unjust action of Comrade Khrushchev; our only "crime" is that we are a small Party of a small and poor people, which, according to Comrade Khrushchev, should merely applaud and approve, but express no opinion of their own. But this is neither Marxist nor acceptable. Marxism-Leninism has granted us the right to have our say, and no one can take this from us, either by means of political and economic pressure, or by means of threats and the names they might call us. On this occasion we would like to ask Comrade Khrushchev, why he did not make such a statement to us instead of making it to a representative of a third party. Or does Comrade Khrushchev think that the Party of Labour of Albania has no views of its own, but has made common cause with the Communist Party of China in an unprincipled manner, and that therefore, on matters pertaining to our Party, one can talk with the Chinese comrades? No, Comrade Khrushchev, you continue to blunder and hold very wrong opinions about our Party. The Party of Labour of Albania has its own views and will answer for them both to its own people, as well as to the international communist and workers' movement.

We are obliged to inform this meeting that the Soviet leadership has, in fact, passed from threats of treating Albania in the same way as Titoite Yugoslavia, to concrete acts. This year our country has suffered many natural calamities. There was a big earthquake, the flood in October, and especially the drought, which was terrible, with not a drop of rain for 120 days in succession. Nearly all the grain was lost. The

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

people were threatened with starvation. The very limited reserves were consumed. Our Government urgently sought to buy grain from the Soviet Union, explaining the very critical situation we were faced with. This happened after the Bucharest Meeting. We waited 45 days for a reply from the Soviet Government while we had only 15 days' bread for the people. After 45 days and after repeated official requests, instead of 50,000 tons, the Soviet Government accorded us only 10,000 tons, that is, enough to last us 15 days, and this grain was to be delivered during the months of September and October. This was open pressure on our Party to submit to the will of the Soviet comrades.

During those difficult days we got wise to many things. Did the Soviet Union, which sells grain to the whole world, not have 50,000 tons of grain to supply to the Albanian people, who are loyal brothers of the Soviet people, loyal to Marxism-Leninism and to the socialist camp, at a time when, through no fault of their own, they were threatened with starvation? Comrade Khrushchev had once told us, "Don't worry about grain, for all that you consume in a whole year is eaten by mice in our country." The mice in the Soviet Union might eat, but the Albanian people could be left to die of starvation until the leadership of the Party of Labour of Albania submits to the will of the Soviet leaders. This is terrible, comrades, but it is true. If they hear about it, the Soviet people will never forgive them, for it is neither Marxist-Leninist, internationalist, nor comradely. Nor is it a friendly act not to accept our offer to pay with clearing for grain from the Soviet Union, and to oblige us to draw the limited gold reserve from our National Bank in order to buy maize for the people's bread from the Soviet Union.

These acts are linked with one another, they are not just accidental. Particularly in recent days, Comrade Khrushchev's attacks on our Party of Labour have reached their climax. Comrade Khrushchev,

on November 6 you declared, “the Albanians behave towards us just like Tito.” You said to the Chinese comrades, “We lost an Albania and you Chinese won an Albania.” And, finally, you declared, “the Party of Labour of Albania is our weak link.”

What are all these monstrous accusations, this behaving like a “dealer” towards our Party, our people, and a socialist country, which is allegedly lost and won as in a gamble? What appraisal is this of a fraternal party which, according to you, is allegedly the weak link in the international communist movement? For us it is clear, and we understand only too well, that our correct and principled Marxist-Leninist stand, that our courage to disagree with you and condemn those acts of yours which are wrong, impel you to attack our Party, to resort to all kinds of pressure against it, to pronounce the most extreme monstrosities against our Party. There is nothing comradely, nothing communist in this. You liken us to the Yugoslav revisionists. But everybody knows how our Party has fought and continues to fight the Yugoslav revisionists. It is not we who behave like the Yugoslavs but you, Comrade Khrushchev, who are using methods alien to Marxism-Leninism against our Party. You consider Albania a market commodity which can be gained by one or lost by another. There was a time when Albania was considered a commodity to be traded, when others thought it depended on them whether Albania should or should not exist, but that time came to an end with the triumph of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism in our country. You are repeating the same thing when you arrive at the conclusion that you have “lost” Albania, or that someone else has “won” it, or that Albania is no longer a socialist country, as it turns out from the letter you handed us on November 8, in which our country is not mentioned as a socialist country.

The fact that Albania is marching on the road of socialism and that it is a member of the socialist camp is not decided by you, Comrade Khrushchev. It does not depend on your wishes. The Albanian

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

people, led by their Party of Labour, decided this through their struggle, and there is no force capable of turning them from this course.

As regards your claim that our Party of Labour is the weakest link in the socialist camp and the international communist movement, we say that the twenty-year history of our Party, the heroic struggle of our people and our Party against the fascist invaders, and the sixteen years that have elapsed from the liberation of the country to this day, during which our Party and our small people have withstood all the storms, demonstrate the opposite. Surrounded by enemies, like an island amidst the waves, the People's Republic of Albania has courageously withstood all the assaults and provocations of the imperialists and their lackeys. Like a granite rock, it has kept and continues to keep aloft the banner of socialism behind the enemy lines. You, Comrade Khrushchev, raised your hand against our small people and their Party, but we are convinced that the Soviet peoples, who shed their blood for the freedom of our people too, and the great Party of Lenin will not be in agreement with this activity of yours. We have complete faith in Marxism-Leninism. We are certain that the fraternal parties which have sent their representatives to this meeting will examine and pass judgement on this issue with Marxist-Leninist justice.

Our Party has always called the Communist Party of the Soviet Union a mother party, and has said this because it is the oldest party, the glorious party of the Bolsheviks, because of its universal experience, its great maturity. But our Party has never accepted and will never accept that some Soviet leader may impose on it his views, which it considers erroneous.

The Soviet leadership viewed this matter of principled importance utterly incorrectly, in an idealist and metaphysical way. It has become swell-headed over the colossal successes attained by the Soviet peoples and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and is violating Marxist-Leninist principles; it considers itself infallible, considers every

decision, every action, every word and gesture it makes to be infallible and irrevocable. Others may err, others may be condemned, while it is above such reproach. "Our decisions are sacred, they are inviolable," "we can make no concession to and no compromise with the Communist Party of China," the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union told our people. Then why did they call us together in Bucharest? Of course, to vote with our eyes shut for the views of the Soviet leadership. Is this Marxist? Is this normal?

Is it permissible for one party to engage in subversive acts within another country to cause a split, to overthrow the leadership of another party or another state? Never! The Soviet leaders accused Comrade Stalin of interfering in other parties, of imposing the views of the Bolshevik Party upon others. We can testify that at no time did Comrade Stalin do such a thing to us. He always behaved to the Albanian people and the Party of Labour of Albania as a great Marxist, as an outstanding internationalist, as a comrade, brother and sincere friend of the Albanian people. In 1945, when our people were threatened with starvation, Comrade Stalin diverted the ships loaded with grain destined for the Soviet peoples, who were also in a very bad way for food at that time, and sent the grain at once to the Albanian people, while the present Soviet leadership permitted itself these ugly deeds.

Is such economic pressure permissible? Is it permissible to threaten the Albanian people, as the Soviet leaders did after the Bucharest Meeting? In no way!

We know that the aid provided to our small people, who before the war suffered great all-round misery, who during the war suffered death and devastation but never yielded, and who, under the glorious leadership of the Communist Party of Albania, fought with great heroism and liberated themselves, is great internationalist aid.

But why did the Soviet leadership change its attitude towards us after the Bucharest Meeting to the point that it let the Albanian people

suffer from hunger? The Romanian leadership did the same thing too, when it refused to send a single ear of wheat to the Albanian people with clearing, at a time when Romania was trading in grain with the capitalist countries, while we were obliged to buy maize from French farmers, paying in foreign currency.

Some months before the Bucharest Meeting, Comrade Dej¹ invited a delegation of our Party for the specific purpose of conducting talks on the future development of Albania. This was a laudable and Marxist concern on his part. Comrade Dej said to our Party, "We, the other countries of people's democracy, should no longer discuss how much credit should be accorded to Albania, but we should decide to build in Albania such and such factories, to raise the means of production to a higher level, regardless of how many million rubles it will cost, for that is of no importance." Comrade Dej added, "We have talked this over with Comrade Khrushchev, too, and we were in agreement."

But then came the Bucharest Meeting and our Party maintained the stand you all know. The Romanian comrades forgot what they had previously said and chose the course of leaving the Albanian people to suffer from hunger.

We have made these things officially known to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union before. We have not submitted them to public discussion, nor have we whispered them from ear to ear, but we are revealing them for the first time at a party meeting, like this one here today. Why are we raising these matters? We do so proceeding from the desire to put an end to these negative manifestations which do not strengthen, but weaken our unity. We proceed from the desire to strengthen the Marxist-Leninist relations and bonds among communist and workers' parties, among socialist states, rejecting any bad manifestations that have arisen up to now.

¹ At that time First Secretary of the CC of the Romanian Workers' Party.

ENVER HOXHA

We are optimists, and we have full conviction and unshaken faith that the Soviet and other comrades will understand our criticisms in the proper way. They are severe, but frank and sincere, and are intended to strengthen our relations. Notwithstanding these unjust and harmful attitudes which are maintained toward us, but which we believe will be stopped in the future, our Party and our people will consolidate still further their unbounded love for and loyalty to the Soviet peoples, to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, to all the peoples and communist and workers' parties of the socialist camp, always on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist teachings.

To our Party, friendship means justice and mutual respect on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. This is what the 1957 Moscow Declaration says and what is stressed in the draft-statement that has been submitted to us. We declare in all earnestness that the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian people will be, as always, determined fighters for the strengthening of relations and unity in the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

The Albanian people will go through fire for their true friends. And these are not empty words of mine. I am expressing here the sentiments of our people and of our Party, and let no one ever think that we love the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for the sake of someone's beautiful eyes, or to please some individual.

Dear Comrades,

In the 1957 Moscow Declaration, as well as in the draft-statement submitted to us, it is pointed out that revisionism constitutes the main danger in the international communist and workers' movement today. In the 1957 Moscow Declaration it is rightly stressed that the existence of bourgeois influence is the internal source of revisionism,

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

while capitulation to the pressure of imperialism is its external source. Life has fully corroborated that, disguised under pseudo-Marxist and pseudo-revolutionary slogans, modern revisionism has tried with every means to discredit our great doctrine, Marxism-Leninism, which it has dubbed as “outdated” and no longer responding to social development. Hiding behind the slogan of creative Marxism, of new conditions, the revisionists have striven, on the one hand, to deprive Marxism of its revolutionary spirit and to undermine the belief of the working class and the working people in socialism, and on the other hand, to use all the means in their power to prettify imperialism, describing it as moderate and peaceful. During the three years that have elapsed since the Moscow Meeting it has been fully confirmed that the modern revisionists are nothing but splitters of the communist movement and the socialist camp, loyal lackeys of imperialism, avowed enemies of socialism and of the working class.

Life itself has demonstrated that until now the standard-bearers of modern revisionism, its most aggressive and dangerous representatives, are the Yugoslav revisionists, the traitor clique of Tito and Co. At the time when the Moscow Declaration was approved, this hostile group, this agency of U.S. imperialism, was not publicly denounced, although, in our opinion, there were enough facts and information to warrant such a thing. Not only that, but later on, when the danger it presented became more evident, the fight against Yugoslav revisionism, the consistent and ceaseless fight to smash it ideologically and politically, was not conducted with the proper intensity. On the contrary. This has been and continues to be the source of many evils and much damage to our international communist and workers’ movement. In the opinion of our Party, the reason for the failure to carry out the total exposure of the revisionist Tito group, for the raising of false “hopes” about an alleged “improvement” and positive “change” in this group of traitors, is the influence of the trend to conciliation,

the mistaken views, and the incorrect assessment of the dangerous Titoite group on the part of Comrade Khrushchev and certain other Soviet leaders.

It has been said that J.V. Stalin was mistaken in his assessment of the Yugoslav revisionists and in sharpening the attitude towards them. Our Party has never endorsed such a view, because time and experience have proved the contrary. Stalin made a very correct assessment of the danger of the Yugoslav revisionists; he tried to settle this affair at the proper moment and in a Marxist way. The Information Bureau, as a collective organ, was called together at that time, and after the Titoite group was exposed, a merciless struggle was waged against it. Time has proved over and over again that such a thing was necessary and correct.

The Party of Labour of Albania has always held the opinion and is convinced that the Tito group has betrayed Marxism-Leninism, is an agency of imperialism, a dangerous enemy of the socialist camp and of the entire international communist and workers' movement. Therefore a merciless struggle should be waged against it. On our part, we have waged and continue to wage this battle as internationalist communists, because we have felt and continue to feel on our own backs the burden of the hostile activity of the revisionist Tito clique against our Party and our country. But this stand of our Party has never been to the liking of Comrade Khrushchev and certain other comrades.

The Titoite group has been a group of Trotskyites and renegades for a very long time. For the Party of Labour of Albania at least, they have been such since 1942, that is, since 18 years ago.

As far back as 1942, when there was a great upsurge in the Albanian people's war, the Belgrade Trotskyite group, disguising themselves as friends and abusing our trust in them, tried their utmost to hinder the development of our armed struggle, to hamper the creation

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

of powerful Albanian partisan fighting detachments, and since it was impossible to stop them, they sought to take direct political and military control of these detachments. They attempted to make everything dependent on Belgrade, and our Party and our partisan army mere appendages of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav National Liberation Army.

While preserving its friendship with the Yugoslav partisans, our Party successfully resisted these diabolical aims. It was at that time that the Titoite group tried to lay the foundations of the Balkan Federation placed under its own direction, to hitch the communist parties to the chariot of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, to place the partisan armies of the Balkan peoples under the Titoite Yugoslav staff. It was to this end that, in agreement with the British, at that time, they tried to set up the Balkan Staff and to place it, that is to say, to place our armies under the direction of the Anglo-Americans. Our Party successfully resisted these diabolical schemes. And when the banner of liberation was hoisted in Tirana, the Titoite gang in Belgrade issued orders to their agents in Albania to discredit the successes of the Communist Party of Albania and to organize a putsch¹ to overthrow the leadership of our Party, the leadership which had organized the Party, guided the National Liberation War, and led the Albanian people to victory. The first putsch was organized by Tito through his secret agents within our Party. But the Communist Party of Albania smashed this plot of Tito's.

The Belgrade plotters did not lay down their arms, and together

¹ At the 2nd Plenum of the CC of the CPA held in Berat in November 1944, the delegate of the CC of the CPY cooked up a behind-the-scenes plot against the CPA with the participation of the anti-party elements, Koçi Xoxe and Pandi Kristo, as well as Sejfulla Malëshova and some others. The main objective of this conspiracy was to overthrow the leadership of the Party headed by Comrade Enver Hoxha, and replace it with a new leadership in the pay of the Yugoslavs.

ENVER HOXHA

with their chief agent in our Party, the traitor Koçi Xoxe, continued the reorganization of their plot against new Albania in other new forms. Their intention was to turn Albania into the 7th Republic of Yugoslavia.

At a time when our country had been devastated and laid waste and needed to be completely rebuilt, when our people were without food and shelter, but with high morale, when our people and army, weapons in hand, kept vigilant watch against the plots of reaction organized by the Anglo-American missions which were threatening new Albania with new invasions, when a large part of the Albanian partisan army had crossed the border of the Homeland and had gone to the aid of the Yugoslav brothers, fighting shoulder to shoulder with them and together liberating Montenegro, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Kosova and Macedonia, the Belgrade plotters were hatching up schemes to enslave Albania.

But our Party offered heroic resistance to these secret agents who posed as communists. When the Belgrade Trotskyites realized that the game was up, that our Party was smashing their plots, they tried their last card, namely, to invade Albania with their armies, to overwhelm all resistance, to arrest the leaders of the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian state, and to proclaim Albania their 7th Republic. Our Party smashed this diabolic plan of theirs, too. The aid and intervention of J.V. Stalin at these moments were decisive for our Party and for the freedom of the Albanian people.

Precisely at this time the Information Bureau exposed the Tito clique. The Information Bureau brought about the defeat of the conspiracies of the Tito clique, not only in Albania but also in the other people's democracies. Posing as communists, the renegade and agent of imperialism, Tito, and his gang, tried to alienate the countries of people's democracy in the Balkans and Central Europe from friendship and wartime alliance with the Soviet Union, to destroy the

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

communist and workers' parties of our countries, and to turn our states into reserves of Anglo-American imperialism.

Who was there who did not know about and see in action these hostile schemes of imperialism and its loyal servant Tito? Everybody knew, everybody learned, and all unanimously approved the correct decisions of the Information Bureau. Everyone, without exception, approved the Resolutions of the Information Bureau, which, without exception, in our opinion, were and still are correct.

Those who did not want to see and understand these acts of this gang had a second chance in the Hungarian counter-revolution and in the unceasing plots against Albania, to see that the wolf may change his coat, but he remains a wolf. Tito and his gang may resort to trickery, may try to disguise themselves, but still they are traitors and agents of imperialism. They are the murderers of the heroic Yugoslav internationalist communists; and this is what they will be and how they will act until they are wiped out.

The Party of Labour of Albania considers the decisions taken against the renegade Tito group by the Information Bureau not as decisions taken by Comrade Stalin personally, but as decisions taken by all the parties that took part in the Information Bureau. And not only by these parties which participated in the Information Bureau, but also by the communist and workers' parties which did not take part in it. Since this was a matter that concerned all the communist and workers' parties, it also concerned the Party of Labour of Albania, which, having received and studied a copy of the letter Stalin and Molotov had written to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, endorsed in full both the letter and the decisions of the Information Bureau.

Why, then, was the "change" of attitude towards the Yugoslav revisionists, adopted by Comrade Khrushchev and the Central Committee of the CPSU in 1955, not made an issue for consultation in

the normal way with the other communist and workers' parties, but was conceived and carried out in such a hasty and unilateral way? This was a matter that concerned us all. The Yugoslav revisionists had either opposed Marxism-Leninism and the communist and workers' parties of the world, or they had not; either they were wrong, or we all were wrong in regard to them, and not just Stalin. This thing could not be resolved by Comrade Khrushchev at his own discretion, and it is impermissible for him to try to do so. But in fact that is what he did, and he connected this change of attitude in the relations with the Yugoslav revisionists with his visit to Belgrade. This was a bombshell to the Party of Labour of Albania, which immediately opposed it categorically. Before Comrade Khrushchev set out for Belgrade in May 1955 the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania sent a letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union expressing the opposition of our Party, to his going to Belgrade, stressing that the Yugoslav issue could not be settled in a unilateral way, but that a meeting of the Information Bureau should be called, to which we asked that the Party of Labour of Albania also should be invited. It is there that this matter should have been settled after a correct and lengthy discussion.

Of course, formally we had no right to decide whether Comrade Khrushchev should or should not go to Belgrade, and we backed down on this, but in essence we were right, and time has confirmed that the Yugoslav issue should not have been settled in this precipitate way.

The slogan of "accumulations" was launched, the 2nd Resolution of the Information Bureau was speedily revoked, the "epoch of reconciliation" with the "Yugoslav comrades" began. The question of the conspirators was re-examined, and they were rehabilitated. There was talk of the "Yugoslav comrades" here and the "Yugoslav comrades" there, and the "Yugoslav comrades," who came off absolved of any

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

guilt, strutted like fighting cocks, trumpeted abroad that their “just cause” had triumphed, that the “criminal Stalin” had trumped up all these things, and a situation was created in which whoever refused to take this course was dubbed a “Stalinist” who should be done away with.

Our Party refused to take such a conciliatory and opportunist course. It stood fast on the correct Marxist-Leninist ideological position, on the position of the ideological and political struggle against the Yugoslav revisionists. The Party of Labour of Albania remained unshaken in its views that the Titoite group were traitors, renegades, Trotskyites, subversionists, and agents of the Americans, that the Party of Labour of Albania had not been mistaken about them.

The Party of Labour of Albania remained unshaken in its view that Comrade Stalin had made no mistake in this matter, that, with their line of betrayal, the revisionists had attempted to enslave Albania, to destroy the Party of Labour of Albania, and by cooking up a number of international plots with the Anglo-American imperialists, they had tried to embroil Albania in international conflicts.

On the other hand, the Party of Labour of Albania was in favour of establishing good neighbourly state relations, trade and cultural relations with the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia, provided that the norms of peaceful coexistence between states of different regimes were observed, because as far as the Party of Labour of Albania is concerned. Titoite Yugoslavia has not been, is not, and never will be a socialist country as long as it is headed by a group of renegades and agents of imperialism.

No open or disguised attempt will make the Party of Labour of Albania waver from this correct stand. It was futile for the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to try to persuade us, through Comrade Suslov, to omit the question of Koçi Xoxe from the report that we would submit to our 3rd Congress in

ENVER HOXHA

May 1956, which would have meant negating our struggle and our principled stand.

In Albania, the Titoite saw struck a nail, or, as Tito says, Albania was a thorn in his flesh, and, of course, the Titoite traitor group continued their struggle against the Party of Labour of Albania, thinking that they were exposing us by dubbing us “Stalinists.”

The Belgrade group did not confine their fight against us to propaganda alone, but they continued their espionage, subversion, plots, dispatching armed bands into our country, more intensively than before 1948. These are all facts. But the tragedy is that, while the Party of Labour of Albania, on the one hand, was defending itself against the bitter and unceasing attacks by the Yugoslav revisionists, on the other hand, its unwavering, principled, Marxist-Leninist stand was in opposition to the conciliatory stand of the Soviet leaders and certain other communist and workers’ parties towards the Yugoslav revisionists.

At that time it was loudly proclaimed and written that “Yugoslavia is a socialist country, and this is a fact,” that “the Yugoslav communists have great experience and great merits,” that the “Yugoslav experience is worthy of greatest interest and attentive study,” that the “period of disputes and misunderstandings had not been caused by Yugoslavia,” and that “great injustice had been done to it,” and so on and so forth. This, of course, gave heart to the Tito clique, who thought they had won everything, except that there still remained one “thorn in their flesh,” which they intended to isolate and later liquidate. However, not only could our Party not be isolated, much less liquidated, but on the contrary, time proved that the views of our Party were correct.

A great deal of pressure has been exerted on our Party over this stand. The Albanian leaders were considered “hot-blooded” and “stubborn,” “exaggerating” matters with Yugoslavia, “unjustly

harassing” the Yugoslavs, etc. The attack against our Party in this direction has been led by Comrade Khrushchev.

So far I have mentioned in brief what the Yugoslav revisionists have done against our Party and our country during and after the war and after 1948, but I shall also dwell a little on the events prior to the Hungarian counter-revolution, which is the work of Yugoslav agents. The Belgrade traitor group began to organize a counter-revolution in Albania also. Had our Party made the mistake of joining in the “conciliation waltz” with the Yugoslav revisionists, as was preached after 1955, then the people’s democracy in Albania would have gone down the drain. We, Albanians would not have been here in this hall, but would have been still fighting in our mountains.

Firmly united by steel-like bonds, our Party and people remained extremely vigilant, and discovered and unmasked Tito’s spies in our Central Committee, who worked in collusion with the Yugoslav legation in Tirana. Tito sent word to these traitors, saying that they had precipitated things, that they should have waited for his orders. These spies and traitors also wrote to Comrade Khrushchev asking him to intervene against the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania. These are documented facts. Tito’s aim was that the counter-revolution in Albania should be co-ordinated with that of Hungary.

Our 3rd Congress was to be held following the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The Yugoslav agents thought that the time had come to overthrow the “obstinate and Stalinist” Albanian leadership, and organized a plot which was discovered and crushed at the Party Conference of the city of Tirana in April 1956. The plotters received the stern punishment they deserved.

Tito’s other dangerous agents in Albania, Dali Ndreu and Liri Gega, received orders from Tito to flee to Yugoslavia, because “they were in danger” and because activities against our Party “had to be organized from Yugoslav territory.” Our Party was fully aware of

Tito's activity and secret orders. It was wide awake and caught the traitors right on the border when they were trying to flee. The traitors were brought to trial and were executed. All the Yugoslav agents who were preparing the counter-revolution in Albania were detected and wiped out. To our amazement, Comrade Khrushchev came out against us in defence of these traitors and Yugoslav agents. He accused us of having shot the Yugoslav agent, the traitress Liri Gega, allegedly "when she was pregnant, a thing which did not happen even at the time of the Tsar, and this had made a bad impression on world opinion." These were slanders trumped up by the Yugoslavs in whom Comrade Khrushchev had more faith than in us. We, of course, rejected all these insinuations made by Comrade Khrushchev.

But Comrade Khrushchev's incorrect, unprincipled and unfriendly stand towards our Party and its leadership did not stop there. The other Yugoslav agent and traitor to the Party of Labour of Albania and to the Albanian people, Panajot Plaku, fled to Yugoslavia and placed himself in the service of the Yugoslavs. He organized hostile broadcasts from the so-called "Socialist Albania" radio station. This traitor wrote to the renegade Tito and to Comrade Khrushchev, asking the latter to use his authority to eliminate the leadership of Albania, headed by Enver Hoxha, under the pretext that we were "anti-Marxists" and "Stalinists." Far from being indignant at this traitor's letter, Comrade Khrushchev expressed the opinion that Panajot Plaku could return to Albania on condition that we did nothing to him, or he could find political asylum in the Soviet Union. We felt as if the walls of the Kremlin had dropped on our heads, for we could never imagine that the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union could go so far as to support Tito's agents and traitors to our Party against our Party and our people.

But the culmination of our principled opposition over the

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

Yugoslav issue to Comrade Khrushchev was reached when, faced with our principled insistence on the exposure of the Belgrade Titoite agency, he was so enraged that, during the official talks between our two delegations in April 1957, he said to us angrily, "We are breaking off the talks. We cannot come to terms with you. You are seeking to lead us back to the road of Stalin!"

We were revolted at such an unfriendly stand by Comrade Khrushchev, who wanted to break off the talks, which would mean an aggravation of relations with the Albanian Party and state over the question of the betrayers of Marxism-Leninism, the Tito group. We could never have agreed on this matter, but we, who are accused of being hot-blooded, kept cool, for we were convinced that we were in the right, and not Comrade Khrushchev, that the line we were pursuing was the correct one, and not that of Comrade Khrushchev, that our line would be confirmed again by experience, as it has been confirmed many times over.

In our opinion, the counter-revolution in Hungary was mainly the work of the Titoites. In Tito and the Belgrade renegades, in the first place, the U.S. imperialists had their best weapon to destroy the people's democracy in Hungary.

After Comrade Khrushchev's visit to Belgrade in 1955, no more was said about Tito's subversive activity. The counter-revolution in Hungary did not break out unexpectedly. It was prepared, we may say, quite openly, and it would be futile for anyone to try to convince us that this counter-revolution was prepared in the greatest secrecy. This counter-revolution was prepared by the agents of the Tito gang in collusion with the traitor Imre Nagy, in collusion with the Hungarian fascists, and all of them acted openly under the direction of the Americans.

The scheme of the Titoites, who were the leaders, was for Hungary to be detached from our socialist camp, to be turned into a

second Yugoslavia, to be linked with the NATO alliance through Yugoslavia, Greece and Turkey, to receive aid from America and, together with Yugoslavia and under the direction of imperialism, to continue the struggle against the socialist camp.

The counter-revolutionaries worked openly in Hungary. But how is it that their activities attracted no attention? We cannot understand how it was possible for Tito and the Horthyite bands to have worked so freely in a fraternal country of people's democracy like Hungary where the party was in power and the weapons of dictatorship were in its hands, where the Soviet army was present.

We think that the stand taken by Comrade Khrushchev and the other Soviet comrades towards Hungary was not clear, because the greatly mistaken views which they held about the Belgrade gang did not allow them to see these questions correctly.

The Soviet comrades trusted Imre Nagy, Tito's man. We do not say this for nothing or without good grounds. Before the counter-revolution broke out and when things were boiling up at the "Petofi Club," I went to Moscow and, in conversation with Comrade Suslov, told him what I had seen on my way through Budapest. I told him, too, that the revisionist Imre Nagy was raising his head and was organizing the counter-revolution at the "Petofi Club." Comrade Suslov categorically opposed my view, and in order to prove to me that Imre Nagy was a good man, pulled out of his drawer "Imre Nagy's fresh self-criticism." Nevertheless, I told Comrade Suslov that Imre Nagy was a traitor.

We wonder and we pose the legitimate question: Why did Comrade Khrushchev and the Soviet comrades go many times to Brioni to talk with the renegade Tito about the question of Hungary? If the Soviet comrades knew that the Titoites were preparing the counter-revolution in a country of our camp, is it permissible for the leaders of the Soviet Union to go and talk with an enemy who organizes plots

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

and counter-revolutions in the socialist countries?

Is it right that, as a communist party, as a state of people's democracy, as a member of the Warsaw Treaty and the socialist camp, we should ask Comrade Khrushchev and the Soviet comrades to tell us why so many meetings with Tito at Brioni in 1956, with this traitor to Marxism-Leninism, and not a single meeting with our countries, not a single meeting of the members of the Warsaw Treaty?

Whether or not to intervene with arms in Hungary, is, we think, not within the competence of one person alone; since we have set up the Warsaw Treaty, we should decide jointly, because otherwise it is of no use to speak of alliance, of the collective spirit and collaboration among the parties. The Hungarian counter-revolution cost our camp blood, it cost Hungary and the Soviet Union blood.

Why was this bloodshed permitted and no steps were taken to prevent it? We are of the opinion that no preliminary steps could be taken so long as Comrade Khrushchev placed his trust in the organizer of the Hungarian counter-revolution, the traitor Tito, and the Soviet comrades so seriously underestimated the absolutely necessary regular meetings with their friends and allies, so long as they considered their unilateral decisions on matters that concerned us all as the only correct ones, and so long as they attached no importance whatsoever to collective work and decisions.

The Party of Labour of Albania is not at all clear about this matter, how things developed and how decisions were taken. At a time when the Titoites are conducting talks at Brioni with the Soviet comrades, on the one hand, and feverishly organizing counter-revolutions in Hungary and Albania, on the other, the Soviet comrades make not the slightest effort to inform our leadership, at least as a matter of form since we are allies, about what is happening or about what measures they intend to take. But this is not a formal matter. The Soviet comrades know only too well what the Belgrade gang thought of Albania

and what their aims were. This stand of the Soviet comrades is not only reprehensible but also truly incomprehensible.

Hungary was a great lesson for us in regard to what was done and in regard to the drama that was played on the stage and behind the scenes there. We believed that after the Hungarian counter-revolution the betrayal of Tito and his gang was more than clear. We know that many documents, that expose the barbarous activity of the Tito group in the Hungarian events, are kept locked away and are not brought to light. Why this should happen, we do not understand. What interests are hidden behind these documents which are not brought to light, but are kept under lock and key? After the death of Comrade Stalin, the most trifling items were searched out to condemn him, while the documents that expose a vile traitor like Tito are locked away in a drawer.

But even after the Hungarian counter-revolution, the political and ideological fight against the Titoite gang, instead of becoming more intense, as Marxism-Leninism demands, was played down, leading to reconciliation, smiles, contacts, moderation, and almost to kisses. In fact, thanks to this opportunist attitude towards the Titoites, they got out of this predicament, too.

The Party of Labour of Albania was opposed to the line followed by Comrade Khrushchev and the other comrades towards the Yugoslav revisionists. Our Party's battle against the revisionists continued with even more fury. Since it was impossible to attack our correct line, many friends and comrades, particularly the Soviet and Bulgarian comrades, derided us, had an ironical smile on their faces, and in their friendly contacts with the Titoites, isolated our people everywhere.

We had hoped that, after the 7th Titoite Congress, even the blind, let alone the Marxists, would see with whom they were dealing and what they should do. Unfortunately, things did not turn out that way. Not long after the 7th Titoite Congress, the exposure of revisionism

was toned down. The Soviet theoretical publications spoke of every kind of revisionism, even of revisionism in Honolulu, but had very little to say about Yugoslav revisionism. This is like saying, "Don't see the wolf before your eyes but look for its tracks." Slogans were put out: "Don't speak any more of Tito and his group, for that will fan their vanity," "Don't speak any more of Tito and his group, for that would harm the Yugoslav people," "Don't speak about the Titoite renegades, for Tito makes use of what we say to mobilize the Yugoslav people against our camp," etc. Many parties adopted these slogans, but not our Party, and we think we acted correctly.

Such a situation was created that the press of friendly countries accepted articles from Albanians only provided they made no mention of the Yugoslav revisionists. Everywhere in the countries of people's democracy in Europe, except in Czechoslovakia, where in general, the Czechoslovak comrades assessed our activities correctly¹, our ambassadors were isolated in a roundabout way, because the diplomats of friendly countries preferred to converse with the Titoite diplomats, while they hated our diplomats and did not even want to set eyes on them.

And matters went so far that Comrade Khrushchev made his coming to Albania in May 1959, at the head of the Soviet Party and Government delegation, conditional on the Yugoslav issue. The first thing Comrade Khrushchev said at the beginning of talks in Tirana was to inform everybody at the meeting that he would not talk against the Yugoslav revisionists, a thing which no one could compel him to do, but such a statement was intended to show quite openly that he disagreed with the Party of Labour of Albania on this issue.

We respected the wishes of our guest during the whole time he stayed in Albania, regardless of the fact that the Titoite press was highly elated and did not fail to write that Khrushchev had shut the

¹ This stand was maintained only in the beginning.

mouth of the Albanians. This, in fact, corresponded to reality, but Comrade Khrushchev was very far from convincing us on this matter, and the Titoites learned that quite clearly, because after our guest's departure from our country, the Party of Labour of Albania no longer felt bound by the conditions put upon us by our guest and continued on its own Marxist-Leninist course.

In his talks with Vukmanović-Tempo,¹ among other things, Comrade Khrushchev has compared our stand, as far as its tone is concerned, with that of the Yugoslavs, and has said that he did not agree with the tone of the Albanians. We consider that Comrade Khrushchev's statement to Vukmanović-Tempo, to this enemy of Marxism, the socialist camp and Albania, is wrong and should be condemned. We hold that one should get what he deserves, and we, on our part, disagree with Comrade Khrushchev's conciliatory tone toward the revisionists. Our people say that when facing the enemy you raise your voice, when facing your loved one you speak in honeyed tones.

Some comrades have the mistaken idea that we maintain this attitude toward the Titoites because we allegedly want to be the standard-bearers of the fight against revisionism, or because we view this problem from a narrow angle, from a purely national angle. Therefore, they claim, we have embarked, if not on a "chauvinist course," at least on that of "narrow nationalism." The Party of Labour of Albania has always viewed the question of Yugoslav revisionism through the prism of Marxism-Leninism, it has always viewed and fought it as the main danger to the international communist movement, as a danger to the unity of the socialist camp.

But while being internationalists, we are at the same time

¹ One of the Yugoslav revisionist leaders who as early as 1943 interfered in the internal affairs of the CC of the Communist Party of Albania (today the Party of Labour of Albania) and brought despicable accusations against it.

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

communists of a given country, of Albania. We Albanian communists would not be called communists if we failed to defend the freedom of our sacred country consistently and resolutely from the plots and diversionist attacks of the revisionist Tito clique, which are aimed at the invasion of Albania, a fact that is already known to everyone. Could we Albanian communists possibly permit our country to become the prey of Tito, of the Americans, of the Greeks, or of the Italians? No, never!

Some others advise us not to speak against the Yugoslavs, saying, "Why are you afraid? You are defended by the Soviet Union." We have told these comrades, and we tell them again, that we are afraid neither of the Yugoslav Trotskyites, nor of anyone else. We have said, and say it again, that, as Marxist-Leninists, not for one moment should we diminish the struggle against the revisionists and imperialists until we wipe them out. Because if the Soviet Union is to defend you, you must first defend yourself.

The Yugoslavs accuse us of "being chauvinists, interfering in their internal affairs, and demanding a rectification of the Albanian-Yugoslav borders." A number of our friends think and imply that we Albanian communists swim in such waters. We tell these friends, who think in this way, that they are grossly mistaken. We are not chauvinists, we have neither demanded nor demand rectification of borders. But what we demand, and will continually demand from the Titoites — and we will expose them to the end for this — is that they give up perpetrating the crime of genocide against the Albanian population in Kosova, that they give up the white terror against the Albanians of Kosova, that they give up driving the Albanians from their native soil and deporting them en masse to Turkey. We demand that the rights of the Albanian minority in Yugoslavia should be recognized according to the Constitution of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia. Is this demand chauvinist or Marxist?

This is our attitude on these matters. But if the Titoites speak of coexistence, of peace, of good-neighbourly relations, and on the other hand, organize plots, raise an army of mercenaries and fascists in Yugoslavia for the purpose of attacking our borders and chopping up our socialist Albania, together with the monarcho-fascist Greece, then you may be certain that not only the Albanian people in new Albania, but also the one million Albanians living under Titoite bondage, will rise, arms in hand, to stay the hand of the criminals. And this is Marxist, and if anything happens, this is what will be done. The Party of Labour of Albania does not permit anyone to trifle or play at politics, with the rights of the Albanian people.

We do not interfere in the internal affairs of others, but when, as a result of the slackening of the fight against the Yugoslav revisionists, things go so far that in a friendly country like Bulgaria a map of the Balkans is printed in which Albania is included within the boundaries of Federal Yugoslavia, we cannot remain silent. We are told that this happened due to a technical error of an employee, but why had this not happened before?

This is not an isolated case. At a meeting in Sremska Mitrovitsa, the bandit Ranković attacked Albania as usual, calling it “a hell where barbed wire and the boots of the frontier guards reign supreme,” and saying that the democracy of the Italian neo-fascists was more advanced than ours.

Ranković’s words would be of no significance to us except that the Soviet and Bulgarian ambassadors to Belgrade, who attended this meeting, listened to these words with the greatest serenity, without making the slightest protest. We protested about this in a comradely way to the central committees of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Bulgarian Communist Party.

In his letter of reply to the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, Todor Zhivkov dared to reject our protest and

called the speech of the bandit Ranković a positive one. We could never have imagined that the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party could describe as positive the speech of a bandit like Ranković, who so grossly insults socialist Albania, likening it to hell. We not only reject with contempt this impermissible insult by the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, but we are dead certain that the Bulgarian Communist Party and the heroic Bulgarian people would be utterly revolted if they came to hear of this. Things will not go any too well if we allow such gross mistakes towards each other.

We can never, never agree with Comrade Khrushchev, and we protested to him at that time about the talks he had with Sophocles Venizelos in connection with the Greek minority in Albania. Comrade Khrushchev is well aware that the borders of Albania are inviolable and sacred, and that anyone who touches them is an aggressor. There will be bloodshed if anyone touches the borders of Albania. Comrade Khrushchev was gravely mistaken when he told Venizelos that he had seen Greeks and Albanians working together as brothers in Korça. In Korça, there is no Greek minority whatsoever, but for centuries the Greeks have coveted the Korça district, as they do all Albania. There is a very small Greek minority in Gjirokastra. Comrade Khrushchev knows that they enjoy all the rights, use their own language, have their own schools, in addition to all the rights that all the other Albanian citizens enjoy.

The claims of the Greeks, among them, those of Sophocles Venizelos — the son of Eleutherios Venizelos who murdered Albanians and put whole districts of Southern Albania to the torch, the most rabid Greek chauvinist and father of the idea of Greater Greece for the partitioning of Albania and annexation of it under the slogan of autonomy, are very well known. Comrade Khrushchev is well aware of the attitude of the Party of Labour of Albania, the Albanian

ENVER HOXHA

Government and people on this question. Then, to fail to give Sophocles Venizelos the answer he deserves, to leave hopes and illusions, and to say that you will transmit to the Albanian comrades the desires of a British agent, a chauvinist, an enemy of communism and Albania — this is unacceptable to us and deserves condemnation.

Comrade Khrushchev, we have given our reply to Sophocles Venizelos, and we believe you have learned of this through the press. We are not opposed to your politicizing with Sophocles Venizelos, but you must refrain from politicizing at the expense of our borders and our rights, for we have not allowed, nor will we allow, such a thing. And it is not as nationalists but as internationalists that we do this.

Some may consider these things I am telling you out of place, statements inappropriate to the level of this meeting. It would not have been hard for me to have put together a speech in an allegedly theoretical tone, to have spoken in platitudes and quotations, to have submitted a report in general terms in order to please you and pass my turn. But to the Party of Labour of Albania it seems that this is not the occasion. What I have said may appear to some as attacks, but these are criticisms which have followed their proper course, which have been made before, when and where necessary, within Leninist norms. But seeing that one error follows another, it would be a mistake to keep silent, because attitudes, deeds and practice confirm, enrich, and create theory.

How quickly the Bucharest Meeting was organized and how quickly the Communist Party of China was condemned for “dogmatism”! But why has a conference to condemn revisionism not been organized with the same speed?

Has revisionism been totally exposed, as the Soviet comrades claim? No, in no way whatsoever! Revisionism has been, and continues to be, the main danger. Yugoslav revisionism has not been

liquidated, and the way it is being dealt with is leaving it a clear field for all forms of action.

And can it be said that there are no disturbing manifestations of modern revisionism in other parties? Anyone who says no is closing his eyes to this danger, and one fine day we will wake to see that unexpected things have happened to us. We are Marxists, and should analyse our work just as Lenin did and taught us to do. He was not afraid of mistakes, he looked them in the eye and corrected them. This is the way the Bolshevik Party was tempered, and this is the way our parties have been tempered.

But what is happening in the ranks of our parties? What is happening in our camp since the 20th Congress? Comrade Suslov may feel very optimistic, and he expressed this at the meeting of the Commission in October, when he accused the head of the delegation of the Party of Labour of Albania, Comrade Hysni Kapo, of pessimism in his view of events. We Albanian communists have not been pessimistic even at the blackest moments of the history of our Party and people, and never shall be, but we shall always be realists.

Much has been said about our unity. This is essential, and we should fight to strengthen and temper it. But the fact is that on many important issues of principle we have no unity.

The Party of Labour of Albania is of the opinion that things should be re-examined in the light of a Marxist-Leninist analysis and errors should be corrected. Let us take the question of the criticism of Stalin and his work. Our Party, as a Marxist-Leninist one, is fully aware that the cult of the individual is a manifestation alien to and dangerous for the parties and for the communist movement itself. Marxist parties not only should not permit the development of the cult of the individual, which hampers the activity of the masses, negates their role, is contrary to the development of the life of the party itself and the laws that govern it, but should also fight with might and

main to uproot it when it begins to appear or has already appeared in a specific country. Looking at it from this angle, we fully agree that the cult of the individual of Stalin should be criticized as a dangerous manifestation in the life of the party. But in our opinion, the 20th Congress, and especially Comrade Khurshchev's "secret" report, did not put the question of Comrade Stalin correctly, in an objective Marxist-Leninist way.

Stalin was severely and unjustly condemned on this question by Comrade Khrushchev and the 20th Congress. Comrade Stalin and his work do not belong to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and to the Soviet peoples alone, but to all of us. Just as Comrade Khrushchev said in Bucharest that the differences are not between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, but between the Communist Party of China and international communism, just as it pleases him to say that the decisions of the 20th and 21st Congresses were adopted by all the communist and workers' parties of the world, in the same way he should also be just and consistent in passing judgement on Stalin's work so that the communist and workers' parties of the world could adopt it in all conscience.

There cannot be two yardsticks, nor two measures of weight on these matters. Then why was Comrade Stalin condemned at the 20th Congress without prior consultation with the other communist and workers' parties of the world? Why was this "anathema," pronounced upon Stalin, sprung without warning on the communist and workers' parties of the world, and why did many fraternal parties learn of it only when the imperialist press blazoned Comrade Khrushchev's "secret" report far and wide?

The condemnation of Comrade Stalin was imposed on the communist and progressive world by Comrade Khrushchev. What could our parties do under these circumstances, when unexpectedly, using the great authority of the Soviet Union, such a matter was dropped

on them all at once?

The Party of Labour of Albania found itself in a great dilemma. It was not convinced, and will never be convinced, on the question of condemning Comrade Stalin in that way and in those forms that Comrade Khrushchev used. Our Party adopted, in general, the formulations of the 20th Congress on this matter, but nevertheless, it did not stick to the limitations set by this congress, nor did it yield to the blackmail and intimidation from outside our country.

The Party of Labour of Albania maintained a realistic stand on the question of Stalin. It was just and grateful towards this glorious Marxist, whom, no one among us was "brave enough" to come out and criticize while he was alive, but against whom a great deal of mud was thrown when he was dead, thus creating an intolerable situation which negated the leading role of J.V. Stalin in a whole glorious epoch of the Soviet Union, when the first socialist state in the world was set up, when the Soviet Union waxed strong, successfully defeated the imperialist plots, crushed the Trotskyites, Bukharinites, and the kulaks as a class, when the construction of heavy industry and collectivization triumphed, in a word, when the Soviet Union became a colossal power which successfully built socialism, which fought with legendary heroism and defeated fascism in the Second World War, when the powerful socialist camp was set up, and so on and so forth.

The Party of Labour of Albania thinks that it is not correct, normal or Marxist to blot out Stalin's name and great work from all this epoch, as is being done at the present time. We should all defend the good and immortal work of Stalin. He who does not defend it is an opportunist and a coward.

As a person, and as the leader of the Bolshevik Communist Party after Lenin's death, Comrade Stalin was at the same time the most prominent leader of international communism, who helped in a very positive way and with great authority in consolidating and promoting

the victories of communism throughout the world. All of Comrade Stalin's theoretical works are a fiery testimony of his loyalty to his teacher of genius, the great Lenin, and to Leninism.

Stalin fought for the rights of the working class and the working people in the whole world; he fought to the end, with great consistency, for the freedom of the peoples of our countries of people's democracy.

Viewed from this angle alone, Stalin belongs to the entire communist world and not only to the Soviet communists, he belongs to all the workers of the world and not just to the Soviet working people.

Had Comrade Khrushchev and the Soviet comrades viewed this matter in this spirit, the gross mistakes that were made would have been avoided. But they viewed the question of Stalin very simply, and only from the internal aspect of the Soviet Union. However, in the opinion of the Party of Labour of Albania, even from this aspect, they viewed it in a one-sided way, seeing only his mistakes, almost completely overlooking his great activity, his major contribution to the strengthening of the Soviet Union, to the tempering of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, to the building of the economy of the Soviet Union, its industry, its collective agriculture, and the leadership of the Soviet people in their great victory over German fascism.

Did Stalin make mistakes? In so long a period filled with heroism, trials, struggle, triumphs, not only Joseph Stalin personally, but also the leadership as a collective body, could not help making mistakes. Which is the party and who is the leader that can claim to have made no mistakes in their work? When the existing Soviet leadership is criticized, the comrades of the Soviet leadership advise us to look ahead and tell us to avoid polemics. But when it came to Stalin, they not only did not look ahead, but they turned right around, completely backward, in order to track down only the weak spots in Stalin's work.

The cult of the individual of Stalin should, of course, have been

overcome. But can it be said, as has been claimed, that Stalin himself was the sponsor of this cult of the individual? The cult of the individual should have been overcome without fail, but was it necessary and was it right to go to such lengths as to point the finger immediately at anyone who mentioned Stalin's name, to look askance at anyone who used a quotation from Stalin? With speed and zeal, certain persons smashed the statues of Stalin and changed the names of cities that had been named after him. But why should we go any further? At Bucharest, turning to the Chinese comrades, Comrade Khrushchev said, "You are clinging to a dead horse." "Come and get his bones, if you wish." These references were to Stalin.

The Party of Labour of Albania declares solemnly that it is opposed to these acts and to these assessments of the work and person of J.V. Stalin.

Soviet comrades, why were these questions raised in this manner and in such a distorted form, while the possibilities existed for both Stalin's mistakes and those of the leadership to be treated properly, to be corrected, without creating that great shock in the hearts of the communists of all the world, which only the sense of discipline and the authority of the Soviet Union prevented from bursting out?

Comrade Mikoyan has said that they dared not criticize Comrade Stalin when he was alive because he would have cut off their heads. We are sure that Comrade Khrushchev will not cut off our heads if we criticize him correctly.

After the 20th Congress, the events we know took place in Poland, the counter-revolution broke out in Hungary, attacks began on the Soviet system, upheavals occurred in many communist and workers' parties of the world, and finally this, which is going on now.

We pose the question: Why did these things occur within the international communist movement, within our camp after the 20th Congress? Or do these things happen because the leadership of the

Party of Labour of Albania is sectarian, dogmatic and pessimistic?

A matter of this kind should be of extraordinary concern to us, and we should look for the source of the malady and cure it. But certainly this sickness cannot be cured by patting the renegade Tito on the back, nor by putting in the statement that modern revisionism has been completely defeated, as the Soviet comrades claim.

The authority of Leninism has been and is decisive. It should be established in such a way as to clean up erroneous views everywhere, and in a radical way. There is no other way out for us communists. If there are things that can and must be said outright, just as they are, this should be done now, at this meeting, before it is too late. Communists, we think, should sleep with a clear conscience. They should strive to consolidate their Marxist unity, but without holding back their reservations, without nurturing feelings of favouritism and malice. A communist must say openly what he feels in his heart, and the issues must be judged correctly.

There may be people who are not pleased with what our small Party is saying. Our small Party can be isolated, our country may be subjected to economic pressure in order to prove to our people that allegedly their leadership is no good. Our Party may be and is being attacked — Mikhail Suslov equates the Party of Labour of Albania with the bourgeois parties and likens its leaders to Kerensky. But this does not intimidate us. We are hardened to such things. Ranković has not said worse things about the Party of Labour of Albania, Tito has called us Goebbels, but nevertheless we are Leninists, and they are Trotskyites, traitors, lackeys and agents of imperialism.

I wish to emphasize that the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian people have shown in practice how much they love, how much they respect the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and that when the Party of Labour of Albania criticizes the wrong-doings of certain Soviet leaders, that does not mean that

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

our views and our attitude have changed. We Albanians have the Marxist courage to criticize these comrades with Marxist severity, we tell them everything in a comradely way, we open our hearts and tell them frankly what we think. Hypocrites we have never been, nor will we ever be.

In spite of the severity we show, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will still love us, in spite of the fact that we also may make mistakes, but the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the communist and workers' parties of the world will not condemn us for our sincerity, because we do not talk behind their backs or swear allegiance to a hundred banners.

In conclusion, I wish to say a few words about the draft-statement submitted to us by the Editorial Commission. Our delegation acquainted itself with this draft and scrutinized it carefully. In the new draft-statement presented to us many amendments have been made to the first variant submitted by the Soviet delegation, which was taken as a basis for the work of the Editorial Commission. With the amendments made to it, the new draft-statement has been considerably improved, many important ideas have been stressed, a number of these have been formulated more correctly, and the overwhelming majority of the allusions against the Communist Party of China have been deleted.

At the meeting of the Editorial Commission, the delegation of our Party offered many suggestions, some of which were adopted. Although our delegation was not in agreement that certain important matters of principle should remain in the draft, it agreed that this document should be submitted to this meeting, reserving its right to express its views once again on all the issues on which it disagreed. Above all, we think that those five issues which remain uncoordinated should be settled so that we may draw up a document which has the unanimous approval of all.

We think that it is essential to make clear in the statement the idea of Lenin, expressed recently by Comrade Maurice Thorez as well as by Comrade Suslov in his speech at the meeting of the Editorial Commission, that there can be an absolute guarantee of the prohibition of war only when socialism has triumphed throughout the world or, at least, in a number of other major imperialist countries. At the same time, that paragraph which refers to factionist or group activity in the international communist movement should be deleted, because, as we pointed out at the meeting of the Commission, too, this does not help consolidate unity, but on the contrary, undermines it. We are also in favour of deleting the words referring to overcoming the dangerous consequences of the cult of the individual, or else, of adding the phrase "which occurred in a number of parties," a thing which corresponds better to reality.

I do not want to take up the time of this meeting on these questions and on other suggestions which we have on the draft-statement. Our delegation will make our concrete remarks when the draft-statement itself is under discussion.

We shall do well, and it will be salutary, if we have the courage at this conference to look squarely at the mistakes and treat their harmful consequences, wherever they may be, consequences which are threatening to become aggravated and dangerous. We do not consider it an offence when comrades criticize us justly and with facts, but we shall never accept that, without any facts, they call us "dogmatic," "sectarian," "narrow nationalists," simply because we fight with persistence against modern revisionism, and especially against Yugoslav revisionism. If anyone considers our struggle against revisionism dogmatism or sectarianism we say to him, "Take off your revisionist spectacles, and you will see more clearly."

The Party of Labour of Albania thinks that this meeting will remain an historic one, for it is a meeting in the tradition of the Leninist

SPEECH AT THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

meetings and conferences which the Bolshevik Party has organized in order to expose distorted views and root them right out, in order to strengthen and steel the unity of our international communist and workers' movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. Our Party of Labour will continue in the future, too, to strive with determination to steel our unity, our fraternal bonds, the joint activity of our communist and workers' parties, for this is the guarantee of the triumph of the cause of peace and socialism.

Selected Works, vol. 3, Tirana
1980, pp. 93-163, Eng. ed.

WE HAVE DONE OUR SACRED DUTY TO MARXISM-LENINISM

November 16, 1960

This morning I delivered my speech to the meeting of the 81 communist and workers' parties of the world which is being held here in Moscow. The speech which lasted about two hours was heard in silence. No interruption, no interjection from Khrushchev.

So, everything went in order. In this way we have done a sacred duty to our Party, to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and to the entire communist and workers' movement. We are on the correct Marxist-Leninist road. Time will confirm everything we said. We have taken account of everything, every attack and villainy that may be perpetrated against us. Marxism-Leninism must be defended at all costs and our Party is defending it.

In the afternoon I rested.

My comrades informed me that at the afternoon session of the Meeting, Dolores Ibarruri, "la Passionaria," was the first to launch the unprincipled attack against us. She made a disgraceful attack. But it neither hurts nor shakes us. "Let the dogs bark, the caravan goes forward!"

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, p. 34, Eng. ed.

RADIOGRAM TO COMRADE HYSNI KAPO IN MOSCOW

November 30, 1960

Comrade Hysni,

We received your radiogram. If all the things you wrote about in the radiogram are removed from the draft Declaration, if the Chinese proposal is added, and the 20th Congress remains according to the [1957] Moscow Declaration, you may sign the Declaration. Go about this question in full agreement with the Chinese comrades. If a declaration on non-acceptance of the inclusion of the 20th Congress, or on the formulation according to the Moscow Meeting is necessary, make a written statement, hand it in, and sign the Document of the Meeting.

We had a good trip.¹ Last night we were at a dinner given at the Palace of Brigades.² Indescribable enthusiasm. The comrades are well. Regards to Ramiz. We are waiting for you.

Affectionately yours,

Enver

*Albania Challenges Khrushchev
Revisionism*, New York 1976,
p. 233, Eng. ed.

¹ In the afternoon of November 29, 1960, Comrade Enver Hoxha and the Albanian delegation at the Meeting of 81 Communist and Workers' Parties returned to their country.

² On the occasion of the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Albania and the 16th anniversary of the Liberation.

ON THE MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES WHICH WAS HELD IN MOSCOW IN NOVEMBER 1960

Excerpts from the Report at the 21st Plenum of the CC of the PLA

December 19, 1960

In the first section Comrade Enver Hoxha makes a scientific analysis of the fundamental disagreements that existed at that time in the ranks of the international communist and workers' movement concerning the definition of the character of our epoch, the questions of war and peace, peaceful coexistence, the question of the road of transition to socialism, the questions of revisionism and dogmatism, and the question of the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

These questions of such great importance became the subject of a major struggle over principle, first in Bucharest, where as is known the Soviet leaders and those of some other parties wanted to make an accomplished fact of the condemnation of the Communist Party of China, by labelling it "dogmatic" and "sectarian." Our Party did not associate itself with this anti-Marxist conspiracy, because in principle it did not agree either with the methods adopted by the organizers of the Bucharest Meeting, or with the content of the issues they put forward. An even greater struggle was waged on the above-mentioned matters of principle at the meeting of the commission in Moscow during October, and finally, a determined struggle was waged at the Meeting of the representatives of the communist and workers' parties in November in Moscow over the correct Marxist meaning of these questions, for the defence of Leninism in the explanation, comprehension and interpretation of them.

In the course of this struggle, through this long process, the

positions of various parties with respect to these questions were also defined. Thus, from the time of the November Meeting it was clear that the disagreements on these problems were not just between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, and even less, between the Communist Party of China and the whole of international communism, as the Soviet leaders claimed in Bucharest, but these disagreements included many parties, and became disagreements between Marxists and opportunists, between parties which defended the purity of Marxism-Leninism and parties which were distorting a number of its theses and interpreting them in a one-sided manner. If it was only our Party of Labour which rose openly in defence of the Marxist principles at Bucharest, against the trend that was distorting the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the Moscow Declaration [1957], in the October commission seven out of the 26 parties represented took correct positions.

At the Moscow Meeting this ratio of forces underwent a change. Besides the former seven parties, another four to five parties adopted the correct stand regarding all the questions under discussion. But there were a considerable number of parties, which on particular questions such as the problem of the road of transition to socialism, the aggressive nature of imperialism, the necessity of the struggle against revisionism and especially against Yugoslav revisionism, and other questions, supported our theses. Such positions were adopted by almost all the parties of Latin America.

The change in the ratio of forces speaks of the determined struggle waged at the Meeting by the delegation of our Party and others, which, through convincing arguments, refuted the distorted views and made clear to everyone their principled position on the issues under discussion. The fact that a considerable number of parties, completely or partially, adopted the correct positions indicates that Marxist-Leninist right is on our side, that it is being rapidly adopted by others,

ENVER HOXHA

that right will triumph over wrong, that Marxism-Leninism will always triumph over opportunism and revisionism. Absolutely convinced of this, our Party will continue to fight with determination, as it has done until now, for the purity of our Marxist-Leninist ideology, for the triumph of socialism and communism.

II. THE STAND OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA TOWARD THE DISAGREEMENTS WHICH AROSE IN THE RANKS OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Our Party of Labour has always pursued a correct Marxist-Leninist line and has upheld the principles of the Moscow Declaration [1957]. On all the fundamental matters which we mentioned above, that is, in connection with the definition of the epoch, the question of the struggle against imperialism, the problem of war and peace, etc., our Party has defended and implemented the correct Marxist-Leninist view. Our Party has never accepted or said that Leninism has become “outdated.” On the contrary, it has fought incessantly and with determination against the Yugoslav revisionists who, in order to cover up their betrayal, declare Marxism “outdated.” Our Party has never had any illusions about the character of U.S. imperialism and its leaders, but has constantly educated the masses of the people to hate it and be vigilant against it; we have never thought that peace will be donated to us, that without first liquidating imperialism it is possible to create a world without weapons, without armies, and without wars. On the contrary, having a correct view of the problem of war and peace, the danger threatening mankind from imperialism and reaction, our Party has mobilized the people under the slogan, “The pick in one hand and the rifle in the other.” Our Party has fought consistently to unmask imperialism and its lackeys, the Yugoslav revisionists, and has never

approved the “soft” policy, the “big” policy of the Soviet leaders, or even that of the Bulgarian leaders, either toward U.S. imperialism or toward Yugoslav revisionism. Our Party has never thought that for the sake of coexistence the class struggle in the capitalist countries should be extinguished or the political and ideological struggle against imperialism and the bourgeoisie liquidated. On the contrary, our Party has always opposed any such opportunist concept of peaceful coexistence.

Thus, the position of our Party on these matters of principle has been in complete accord with the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, and it has long been in opposition to the position of the Soviet leaders. However, our Party has taken a principled stand in opposition to the views and actions of the present Soviet leaders also on a series of other questions of principle, about which our Central Committee has been informed.

For instance, we have not been in agreement with the Soviet leaders in connection with their stand toward Yugoslav revisionism. This dates back to May 1955, at the time when Khrushchev and Bulganin¹ went to Belgrade and, in a unilateral manner and overriding the Information Bureau, decided to rehabilitate the Tito clique, a thing which, as is known, later brought about many evils in the international communist and workers’ movement. At that time our Party expressed its opposition to this rehabilitation, and since then it has never approved the tactics and the stand of the Soviet leadership toward Tito and his clique, a clique which was coddled, considered to be socialist, and with which they should consult about everything, etc.

Our Party did not agree with the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, especially with the criticism against Stalin and the explanation of the peaceful road of transition to socialism. On the first issue we were not, and are not today, in agreement,

¹ At that time President of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union.

ENVER HOXHA

first, because the criticism against the “cult of Stalin” was made without prior consultation with the other fraternal parties, although Stalin was not only the leader of the Soviet Union but also of the international proletariat, and second, because only the mistakes of Stalin were mentioned without saying a single word about the positive aspects of his activity. On the second issue, the 20th Congress in fact gave the opportunists ideological weapons to propagate only the peaceful road of taking power.

At the 20th Congress, Khrushchev presented the issue of the transition to socialism in a distorted way. He put special stress on taking power in a peaceful way and through the parliamentary road, something which is contrary to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the experience of history so far.

Apart from these questions, our Party did not agree with the Soviet leaders also in regard to the events in Hungary, with their assessment of them, with the hesitation they showed over the liquidation of the counter-revolution there, and over the complete exposure of the Yugoslav revisionists on this issue. The Central Committee has been informed about this matter, therefore it is not necessary to dwell on it at length.

Finally, our Party was not in agreement with the Soviet leaders and has been opposed to them also on many other issues which have to do with the correct Leninist concept of relations among fraternal parties, which are equal and independent from one another. In connection with this, the Central Committee is also informed about the improper interference of the Soviet leaders in the internal affairs of our Party, such as in the case of the enemies of our Party, Liri Gega, Tuk Jakova, Panajot Plaku, and others.

Hence, it is evident that on the fundamental questions of foreign policy, of the tactics and strategy of the communist movement, our Party has always maintained a correct Marxist-Leninist line, a line

which has run counter to that pursued by the Soviet leadership. But while consistently pursuing the above-mentioned line, while resolutely defending the correct Marxist-Leninist principles, without making concessions on them, despite the many pressures exerted on it by the Soviet leaders, the Central Committee of our Party did not express its opposition publicly. Why did the Central Committee do this?

First, because after the 20th Congress, all the attacks of the imperialist and revisionist enemies were concentrated on splitting the unity of our communist movement. Therefore, for the sake of this unity, we had to contain ourselves and consistently apply the Marxist-Leninist line while avoiding open criticism addressed to the Soviet leadership.

Second, because, as is known, as a result of the criticism of Stalin, when reaction and the revisionists began to cast doubts on the entire Soviet system, and in particular, as a result of the events in Poland and in Hungary, the efforts of the whole world reaction to lower the authority of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the prestige of the Soviet Union itself were very great. In these circumstances, it was an internationalist duty to defend the Soviet Union and its Communist Party, to give reaction not a single weapon and to defend the Soviet leadership and, by means of comradely criticism, to put it on the right road. This was what our Party did. We publicly defended the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union itself, but from 1957 on, as the opportunity presented itself, we have also pointed out to the Soviet leaders a number of matters on which we had criticism, especially in connection with their stand toward Yugoslav revisionism, toward the events in Hungary, toward the interference in the internal affairs of our Party.

This stand of our Party is correct, internationalist, Marxist-

Leninist. To have acted differently at that time would have meant to play into the hands of the enemy, to damage the general cause of socialism and the international working class.

But the Soviet leaders plunged more deeply into their errors. Matters went so far that they were not only coddling Tito and his clique, but they were also showering flattery on Eisenhower, thus demonstrating that they were distorting the Marxist-Leninist concept of imperialism and the class struggle. The Communist Party of China and our Party, absolutely correctly, considered it reasonable to dot the i's on the fundamental questions of the international situation and the strategy and tactics of the communist movement, by means of some articles which explained these things on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist teachings. But the Soviet leaders did not pause to reflect. On the contrary, they organized the anti-Marxist behind-the-scenes plot of Bucharest in order to settle accounts with any party which had become an obstacle to their erroneous course.

We shall not dwell on the proceedings of the Bucharest Meeting, because the Plenum of the Central Committee is already informed about this, but I shall briefly mention our stand at this meeting.

As we said before, our Party did not agree with the organizers of the Bucharest Meeting, the Soviet leaders, not only on the anti-Marxist methods which were used there, but in essence it also did not agree with the accusation brought against the Communist Party of China. Therefore, it maintained the correct and principled stand which is known.

How did it come to pass that our Party maintained that stand? Was it accidental? The stand of our Party in Bucharest was not accidental. It was in keeping with the consistent line always pursued by our Party, with the principled positions always defended by our Party on the fundamental questions under discussion. In Bucharest we defended Marxism-Leninism, we defended the line of the Party, and

while waging this principled and courageous struggle, on the one hand, we found ourselves on the same side as the Chinese comrades who defended their Party; and, on the other hand, we ran counter to the Soviet leaders and all the representatives of the other parties who organized the Bucharest Meeting, who defended a wrong course in opposition to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. Here lies the principled importance of our stand in Bucharest, a stand which was the logical and consistent outcome of the entire Marxist-Leninist line pursued by our Party, a stand which has enhanced the authority and prestige of our Party in the eyes of the international communist movement.

Our Party condemned the Bucharest Meeting and described it correctly as a blot on the communist movement. The correctness of our stand in Bucharest and our assessment of the anti-Marxist behind-the-scenes plot hatched up there was demonstrated at the Moscow Meeting and by the documents approved there. Not a single representative of any of the parties there had the courage to defend the Bucharest Meeting, to answer our criticisms and those of the Chinese comrades regarding the factional work which went on there. Not only this, but none dared to propose that a single good word should be put in about the Bucharest Meeting in the Declaration published, which comprised 52 pages. Not the slightest trace remained of the Bucharest Meeting.

On the other hand, however, the Bucharest Meeting marks the beginning of the overt aggravation of relations between our Party and the Soviet leaders, a thing which soon began to express itself in the political and economic relations between our two countries and states. The blame for the situation rests completely on the Soviet side, which was not pleased with the principled stand of our Party in Bucharest. It began to express this displeasure in many wrong actions which began to cause serious harm to the friendship and fraternal ties between

our two parties and countries. This is how the anti-Marxist interference in the internal affairs of our Party by some Soviet persons began. It had the aim of splitting our Party, of arousing discontent with its leadership, of casting doubt on the correctness of the line of our Party, of attacking the leadership of our Party, with the final aim of liquidating it. The staff of the Soviet Embassy to Tirana, headed by the ambassador, worked in this direction; Kozlov in Moscow worked in this direction on our comrades who passed through there; this was the aim of the words of Marshal Malinovsky at the dinner for the chiefs-of-staff of the Warsaw Treaty; this was the objective of the economic pressures which began in regard to bread and the reduction of economic aid; the threats by Marshal Grechko to throw our country out of the Warsaw Treaty, and the provocations at the military base of Vlora, etc., are linked with this.

The objective of these wrong and anti-Marxist actions is clear: *the Soviet leadership aimed either to make us change our stand, that is, to abandon the correct Marxist-Leninist course, the principled stand maintained by our Party, or, as a result of the difficulties which would be created, in the opinion of the Soviet leaders, some division must take place in the Party, dissatisfaction must be increased in its ranks and among the people, and, as a way out, the leadership of the Party must be liquidated to bring to the head of it the "saviours," who would be loyal to the anti-Marxist line of the Soviet leadership.*

But, as is known, in reckoning their accounts they had forgotten the host, and all these intentions were foiled. They did not succeed thanks to the loyalty of our Party to Marxism-Leninism, thanks to its staunch and principled stand, thanks to its steel-like Marxist-Leninist unity with the masses of the people, the unity of the Party with its Central Committee, the unity of the Central Committee with the Political Bureau. This unbreakable unity has been and is the guarantee of all the victories of our people and Party; therefore our primary duty

is to make this unity ever stronger and defend it like the apple of our eye.

The source of the wrong actions of the Soviet leadership toward our Party should be sought in its non-Marxist views on fundamental issues and in the disagreements over matters of principle which exist between our Party and the Soviet leaders on the questions of principle of the international communist and workers' movement. The incorrect actions of the Soviet leaders against our Party also express the anti-Marxist concept they have about the relations between fraternal parties and countries, the concept they have about criticism and the Marxist-Leninist unity of the communist movement and the socialist camp. In Bucharest we expressed our opposition to the stand of the Soviet leaders, we criticized their crooked actions in a correct and principled way.

For Marxists, fair and principled criticism is not contrary to unity. On the contrary, criticism aids the consolidation of unity, it is a motive force, a law of development. The Soviet leaders do not see the problem in this way. They are not used to listening to criticisms, but only to making criticisms. In words they accept the principle of equal rights in the relations among parties, but in fact they recognize only their right to say the final word, while the rest must obey blindly. Therefore, according to them, if some party or other dares to criticize them, that party is in an anti-Soviet position, is factional, against the unity of the communist movement, and so on. This distorted concept impels them to incorrect actions, like those mentioned above. In these concepts and acts Marxist dialectics has been replaced with metaphysics, with idealism.

The acts we mentioned and the erroneous stand maintained by the Soviet leaders toward our Party and our country following the Bucharest Meeting made us more than ever convinced that our Party was in a correct Marxist-Leninist position, that its position on all the

fundamental issues was principled, therefore those positions had to be defended with determination, standing firm against any pressure.

The delegation of our Party in Moscow, at the October meeting of the commission which worked out the draft of the Declaration approved later at the November meeting, maintained this correct and principled stand. At this meeting our delegation openly presented the correct viewpoint of our Party on all matters of principle under discussion, and together with the comrades of those other parties which also took a correct stand, resolutely defended the Marxist-Leninist teachings with sound arguments. A great struggle for principle went on in the commission on every issue, over every paragraph, and every word. This work went on for nearly 25 days.

To give you an idea of the correct struggle waged by our delegation there, as well as by the other delegations which stood on sound positions, suffice it to mention these facts: in compiling the draft Declaration, the draft presented by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was taken as the basis. This draft of 36 pages contained many erroneous views, and in many parts there were hidden attacks against the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania. For instance, it accused us of “national communism,” of being opponents of the policy of peaceful coexistence, compared us with Yugoslavia, accused us of being “factionalists,” and so on. Apart from this, the draft did not properly stress the necessity of the struggle against imperialism and had a soft and frequently opportunist spirit, putting great stress on the peaceful road of transition to socialism; the national bourgeoisie was presented almost as a supporter of socialism, it failed to mention Yugoslav revisionism, dogmatism was presented as more dangerous than revisionism, even though it said that revisionism was the main danger, and so on. One hundred seventy five pages of comments on this draft were presented, of which our delegation presented 20 pages and the Chinese delegation 40. It must be stressed that none

of our comments was refuted by argument as incorrect; but those which were not included in the Declaration were rejected on the pretext of tactics or by the majority of votes. Nevertheless, the basic draft was almost completely changed. It was extended from 36 pages to 52. The hidden attacks against us were thrown out, the section on imperialism was strengthened, the paragraph on Yugoslav revisionism was added, the question of the struggle against revisionism and dogmatism was put in order, and so on. However, some questions remained, such as that of the importance of the 20th and 21st Congresses, that of factions, of the cult of the individual, etc., with which our delegation and the delegations of some other parties did not agree, but which should be taken up again for discussion at the November meeting.

In the meeting of the commission it was very clear how correct and principled our positions were and how distorted were the positions of the Soviet leaders and the parties supporting them. The opportunist spirit which has gripped some parties, such as the Communist Parties of Italy, Syria, Britain, the United States of America and others, showed itself plainly, and this emerged even more clearly at the November meeting. The Soviet leaders tried hard to manoeuvre, resorting to all kinds of methods, ranging from working on individuals among the various delegations to procedural machinations. Here is a typical fact: the commission agreed that a phrase which Maurice Thorez had used in a speech during those days should be put in the Declaration. It was: "There will be an absolute guarantee of the liquidation of all kinds of war only when socialism has triumphed in all countries or in the main capitalist countries." This thesis was put in on the proposal of the French delegation and was supported by our delegation and the Chinese. But before two days had passed the Soviets proposed that it should be re-examined, presumably because their Presidium had not approved it. Despite our resistance, the majority of the meeting decided to omit it, but at the November meeting they

were forced to put it back again in another form.

The proceedings at the preparatory meeting and the views expressed there indicated clearly that the Moscow Meeting in November would become an arena of the struggle between the correct Marxist-Leninist view and the tendency to deviate from the revolutionary positions of our ideology.

Our Party and the delegation appointed by the Central Committee of the Party were prepared for this struggle. The Central Committee of our Party instructed its delegation that at the Moscow Meeting it should put forward the principled view of our Party on all questions under discussion, frankly and sincerely, and with Marxist-Leninist courage, that it should inform the meeting of the erroneous acts of the Soviet leaders against our Party following the Bucharest Meeting, and criticize them severely with the aim of preventing any repetition of such acts in the future. We report to the Central Committee of our Party that the delegation carried out this directive and, as was decided by the Central Committee of the Party, all the matters were put before the meeting of the representatives of the 81 communist and workers' parties that was convened in November this year in Moscow.

Did the Central Committee of the Party act correctly when it decided that all matters should be put forward openly at the November meeting? We answer: Yes, the Central Committee acted correctly, for the following reasons:

1) Because, as a Marxist-Leninist Party, we were duty-bound to defend the principled positions of the Moscow Declaration [1957] that were being violated. If we were to remain silent in the face of the distortions of Marxism-Leninism, in the face of actions contrary to the fundamental principles of our ideology, irrespective of the fact that the violators and deviators were the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, we could not call ourselves communists. In order to defend the purity of Marxism-Leninism, to defend the cause of

socialism and communism, we must always be principled, never sentimental or one-sided.

2) Because, in its violation of the Moscow Declaration [1957] and the principles of Marxism-Leninism, as well as in its concrete actions, the Soviet leadership had gone so far that to have remained silent about these grave errors and offences would have been suicide, a crime against our common cause. The Bucharest Meeting and the anti-Marxist behind-the-scenes plot which was organized there by the Soviet leaders, the pressures and damaging actions against our Party, on the one hand, and against the Communist Party of China, on the other (I mean the withdrawal of the specialists, the cancelling of orders for various machinery, etc.), were the first signs of a very dangerous action which, if not unmasked, would have had even more serious consequences for the communist movement and the socialist camp.

3) Because our sincere and principled criticism had a good purpose: by condemning the wrong views and actions, it aimed at liquidating them, at closing the door to them so that they would never be repeated, at clearing the air of the negative manifestations, and on this basis, at helping to strengthen our communist movement and to reinforce our unity which was endangered. This aim, and this aim alone, was what impelled the Central Committee of the Party to express its view openly, and it was absolutely correct to do so.

4) Finally, we say with absolute conviction that there is another reason why the Central Committee was correct when it decided to put forward these questions at the Moscow Meeting. We saw for ourselves, both before the meeting and during its proceedings that the Soviet leaders, on their part, were determined to continue on the course on which they had embarked against our Party. Because if we had remained silent, they had prepared themselves to cast the blame on us for everything, and for this reason they brought extreme pressure to bear on our delegation in order to make us shut our mouths.

ENVER HOXHA

It is clear that if we had remained silent at the meeting about the wrong actions of the Soviet leaders, this would not only have meant abandoning our whole principled line, but it would also have been fatal to our Party and to the future of socialism in Albania.

III. ON THE ATTITUDE OF THE SOVIET LEADERS TOWARD OUR DELEGATION, AND OUR TALKS WITH THEM

As is known, our delegation went to the Soviet Union as an official delegation, invited by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for the celebrations of the 43rd anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution. This being the case, from the formal angle they did us all the honours of the occasion. But their attitude toward us was cold and the talks unfriendly. Thus, we talked with Kozlov on our arrival in Moscow, with Kosygin and Polyansky at the dinner on the 7th of November, and their position became clear: in everything they sought to cast the blame on our Party. The next day, that is on the 8th of November, everything became even more clear.

On the 8th of November we were handed a copy of the letter which the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union sent to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in reply to the September letter from the Communist Party of China. This fact in itself did not please us, because it was a bad prelude to the holding of the meeting, but we shall speak of this later. What made an impression on us were the following facts: In one paragraph of the letter, speaking of the socialist countries of Europe, they were all listed by name, with the exception of Albania. This meant that the leadership of the Soviet Union had wiped Albania off the books as a socialist country. Further down, although the letter was addressed to the Communist Party of China, there was an open and tendentious

attack against our Party. While claiming that, following the criticism of “the cult of the individual,” all problems were solved in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union allegedly according to the rules of democratic centralism, the letter said:

“Unfortunately, there are other examples. We can bring up such a fresh example as the settlement of such matters by the Albanian comrades. In September this year they expelled Comrade Liri Belishova from the Central Committee and discharged her from the post of Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, while Comrade Koço Tashko was discharged from the post of Chairman of the Central Auditing Commission of the Party of Labour of Albania and expelled from the Party. And for what? Simply because these comrades expressed their beliefs that it is impermissible to slander the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

“We express our suspicions that there is a bad end in store for all those people whose only ‘sin’ is that they are friends of the Soviet Union, have a correct understanding of the situation, and express their sympathy for the Soviet people and for the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.”

From this presentation of things it emerges: *First*, that allegedly the Central Committee of our Party did not carry out the rules of internal democracy of the Party when it expelled Liri Belishova from its ranks and Koço Tashko from the Central Auditing Commission. It seems to me unnecessary to prove here, in the Central Committee of the Party, that this is deliberate slander. *Second*, it emerges that in our Party the friends of the Soviet Union are being condemned and persecuted, that is, the Central Committee of our Party is allegedly in an anti-Soviet position, etc. There is no need to prove that this, too, is another slander. But in these tendentious accusations the aim of the Soviet leadership is clear: to discredit our Party, to present it as though

it has gone off the rails of Leninism, as though it has taken the road of Yugoslavia (therefore, in the same document Albania is not mentioned as a socialist country).

This shows that the Soviet leaders were not interested in resolving the disagreements which had arisen between us. On the contrary, they wanted to deepen them, indeed to use them to discredit our Party. On the other hand, in order to achieve complete success in their actions against our Party they resorted to all means to make us keep our mouths shut.

The first method was that of threats. To this end, Nikita Khrushchev himself twice spoke to the Chinese comrades about Albania. First, on October 25 [1960], he told the delegation of the CP of China, "We shall treat Albania like Yugoslavia." The second time, he told a representative of the CP of China, "The Albanians behave toward us just like Tito used to do," "We lost an Albania and you Chinese won an Albania," "The Party of Labour of Albania is our weak link."

What was their aim?

First, the Soviet leaders intended to intimidate us, to make us re-view our position and to desist from raising all the questions we had in mind. It should be borne in mind that the Soviets were more or less aware of what we would raise at the Moscow Meeting. Koço Tashko had kept them informed about our views.

Second, while speaking against our Party and threatening us, in fact, they were also warning the Chinese; that is, they intended to kill two birds with one stone.

Third, by presenting the case as though we were following the road of Yugoslavia, the Soviet leaders sought to discredit our Party, to distort our stand, to divert the discussion away from the basis of principles to slanders, etc.

Together with the method of indirect threats, the Soviet leaders

also used the method of direct pressure, through meetings and talks with our delegation.

Before speaking of the meetings we had in Moscow, it is necessary to say a few words concerning our view on the method of talks, meetings and consultations. This is essential because the Soviet leaders tried many times to present the question as though we were against talks, and to illustrate this they brought up these examples: our refusal to meet the Soviet leaders on the basis that they proposed in the well-known letter of August 13 [1960]; the fact that Comrade Enver did not go to spend his summer holiday in the Soviet Union, allegedly as if we wanted to avoid any meeting with them, and finally, our refusal of Khrushchev's invitation to meet him on November 9, of which I will speak later.

The Party and its Central Committee have been and are of the opinion that the method of meetings, talks and consultations among the leaders of fraternal parties, the exchange of views on various problems of mutual interest, the more so when differences have arisen between two parties or socialist countries, is the most correct and advisable Marxist-Leninist method. Therefore, in the past our Party and its Central Committee have not refused any meeting and will not do so in the future, especially when the aim of these meetings is to strengthen and consolidate the Marxist-Leninist unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

But at the same time, proceeding from these principled positions, our Party is of the opinion that in these meetings certain other principles of Marxism-Leninism must be respected, among which: First, it is impermissible and contrary to Leninist norms that a third party should become a subject of conversation at a meeting of two other parties, that the general line of the former should be talked about in the absence of this party; and second, any discussion or meeting between two parties, whichever they may be, should be held on a equal

footing, on the basis of consultations and mutual respect, avoiding any manifestation of imposing the will of one side upon the other side, or of any privileged position of one side over the other side, etc. Our Party has respected and will respect these principles. This is the principled position of our Party concerning the question of meetings, talks and consultations; we have maintained such a position in the past, and we shall maintain it in the future, too.

Now let us see in concrete terms whether the Soviet leaders are right when they accuse us of being against meetings, by bringing up the above-mentioned cases. It is true we refused the meeting proposed in the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union dated August 13, 1960. But we refused to meet them, not because we were against meetings in principle or because we wanted to avoid meeting the Soviet leaders, but because such a meeting would have been contrary to Leninist norms, because, as is known, in their letter the Soviet leaders proposed that we should hold discussions in order to put out “the spark of misunderstanding” which had flared up between us in Bucharest “in time,” so that our two parties “could go” to the meeting next November “with complete unity of opinion.” Why did misunderstandings arise at Bucharest? What was the fundamental problem of the Bucharest Meeting? It was the criticism of the Communist Party of China. Therefore, we were supposed to discuss China, to formulate a common view on this issue, and all this was to be done behind the back of the Communist Party of China. Is this principled? Isn’t this the same as factionalism? We explained this to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in our reply, back in August, stressing that a meeting between us for that purpose was not in order. Again we think we acted very correctly.

Let’s take the question of our refusal to meet Nikita Khrushchev on November 9, 1960. We think that our delegation acted correctly

when it refused that meeting, and we explained this to the Soviet leaders. The thing is that, on the one hand, on November 8, 1960, the Soviet leadership handed us a letter addressed to the Communist Party of China, in which, as we said above, Albania was not ranked among the socialist countries, and our Party was accused of anti-Sovietism, of having allegedly violated the principles of democratic centralism, and so on, and this material was distributed to the representatives of 81 parties; while, on the other hand, on the very same day they were inviting us to talks to examine the misunderstanding which had arisen between us! On the one hand, they tell the Chinese comrades, "We shall treat Albania like Yugoslavia," and on the other hand, they want to meet us! Is this talking on equal footing? Has the basis been created for the comradely spirit indispensable for fruitful talks? Is not this a clear expression of the tendency of the Soviet leaders to have a privileged position in talks? It is clear that we could not possibly hold talks under such conditions, because this is contrary to the principles of mutual equality and respect, especially so when we had not whispered a single word to the international communist and workers' movement about the concrete disagreements between us and the Soviet leaders up till that time. This is why we refused that meeting. It is up to the Central Committee of the Party to judge whether our delegation acted correctly or not.

As for the question of "Comrade Enver's failure to go to the Soviet Union for his holiday this year," this is not worth speaking about, because there is nothing political in it. I did not go to the Soviet Union for my vacation last year either, and no scandal was made of it. The nub of the matter is that this year the Soviet leaders "had thought" that when Comrade Enver came there they would talk to him! But neither I nor the Political Bureau had been informed of this. We were supposed to find this out by divination.

In fact, it is not our Party, but the Soviet leaders who have been

against talks, against the solution of disagreements through consultations. As is known, at the beginning of August we sent the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union a letter informing it of the anti-Marxist acts of some members of the staff of the Soviet Embassy headed by Ambassador Ivanov. Why is it that the Soviet leaders, who tell us they are determined that the problems should be solved through discussions, have still not replied to this letter to this day? In Moscow they told us that they had not replied because they did not want to worsen relations, because their answer might be offensive to us. This clearly shows that it had never crossed their minds that the disagreements should be resolved, that it was necessary to discuss them, but they had decided their attitude: to deny everything. Then, why talk at all? Hence, who is actually against talks? It is clearly not us, not the Party of Labour of Albania, but the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union that is against talks.

Regardless of all this, in spite of the unequal conditions for talks, which, as we said above, were created by the Soviet leaders themselves, and despite their uncomradely attitude toward our delegation, an attitude which went so far as to resort to such anti-Marxist and police methods as eavesdropping on our conversations by means of various bugging devices both in our residence and in our embassy, our delegation, seeing their insistence on meeting us, and upholding our Party's principle on the necessity for talks, consultations and exchanges of opinion before the meeting began and during it, consented to, and held, three meetings with the Soviet leaders.

Our delegation understood the real aim of the Soviet leaders from its talks, on November 9, 1960, with Maurice Thorez, who, as the conversation showed clearly, had been charged by them to meet us. Thorez tried to "convince" us of the correctness of the line pursued by the Soviet Union in all directions, on the question of war and peace, on the policy of peaceful coexistence, calling Khrushchev the

ON THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

“Lenin of our time,” and so on. On the other hand, he spoke against China, presenting the Communist Party of China as “dogmatic, factionalist and Trotskyite, as a great danger to the communist movement, a partisan of war, which seeks to discredit the Soviet Union,” and so on. Finally, he told us of the love which the Soviet Union has for Albania, of the aid it has given Albania, as well as that we ought to be grateful to it, and in the end he said that all of us must follow in the wake of the Soviet Union.

We told him of our views, stressing that we had disagreements with the Soviet leaders, which we would put forward at the meeting (we were aware that everything we said would be eavesdropped by the Soviet leaders or would be transmitted to them by Thorez). Thorez tried to “dissuade” us from raising these matters at the meeting, otherwise the whole meeting would be against us and would call us provocateurs, that we should resolve these things by sitting down to talk with the Soviet leaders, and here he mentioned that we had been wrong not to meet Khrushchev. The meeting with Thorez lasted three hours, and in the end we parted with each side maintaining its own viewpoint. This was the first direct pressure to stop us from speaking openly at the meeting, and the first effort to learn what we would put forward there.

Following this meeting, we held two meetings with the Soviet leaders, on November 10-11 and Nov. 12.

At the first meeting the views of each side were put forward and, as you might say, the ground was prepared for the next meeting, which, in fact, was the official meeting.¹

¹ Comrade Enver Hoxha reported to the Plenum how, at the first and the second meeting, the Soviet leaders blamed the Party of Labour of Albania for the deterioration of Albanian-Soviet relations, while they themselves had allegedly done nothing wrong. They accused the PLA of anti-Sovietism because it had expelled from the CC and the Party Liri Belishova and Koço Tashko, who had sided with

ENVER HOXHA

As a conclusion, it can be said that the Soviet leaders did not want to talk or to reach agreement with us on anything. They had made up their minds on their plan and point of view. They had even started to talk with others about this, with the sole aim of discrediting our Party. If they asked us to talks, they did this not because they wanted to resolve the disagreements, but to threaten us, to force us to give up the idea of our speech at the meeting. After these meetings it was clear once again who was for talks and who was not. They also showed that the Soviet leaders had no intention of making a self-criticism over anything they had done against our Party and against our country. On the contrary, as their threat about the Vlora base indicated, they were determined to go further.

Therefore, we can repeat once more than in those conditions the Central Committee of the Party acted very correctly. It did well when it decided to raise, and when it actually did raise, all our contradictions with the Soviet leaders at the Meeting of the representatives of the 81 communist and workers' parties of the world in Moscow.

IV. ON THE DEVELOPMENTS AT THE MOSCOW MEETING

The Moscow Meeting was organized to discuss the current problems of the international situation and the questions of the strategy

the Soviet Union, and because the Albanian officers did not submit to the threats and provocations of the Soviet officers at the Vlora base. With factual arguments our delegation refuted all these slanders and showed that those who were truly responsible for the deterioration of relations were the Soviet leaders, whose aim was to put the PLA under their control, to force it to deviate from its revolutionary road and adopt the revisionist course of the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

At the point when Khrushchev, angry at the refusal of the delegation of the PLA to accept his anti-Marxist and anti-Albanian views, likened these talks to talks with MacMillan, our delegation walked out of the meeting in protest.

and tactics of the international communist movement. The basis for the proceedings of the meeting was the draft Declaration prepared by the commission of 26 parties, which, as we said, was convened in Moscow in October. In discussing these questions, the meeting, in fact, had to pass judgement on the disagreements which had appeared in the ranks of the international communist and workers' movement, to condemn the erroneous views, and to fix the correct Marxist-Leninist view, the united view of the whole communist movement on these questions, in the Declaration which it would approve.

But from the very beginning of the meeting, even prior to it, it was evident that the Soviet leaders and those of some other communist parties of the socialist and capitalist countries of Europe, thought differently. The distribution of the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union addressed to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on the eve of the proceedings of the meeting, and the working on all the delegations with this letter, made the plan of the Soviet leaders even more clear. The tendency was to organize a new Bucharest, to gain approval outside the meeting for all those things that were said in Bucharest against China, to create the opinion among all the parties that the Communist Party of China "is dogmatic and factionalist" that "it has violated the Moscow Declaration and acts in opposition to the entire communist movement, that together with the Communist Party of China, the Party of Labour of Albania too is following the same course," opposition to which is expressed in the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

In order to create this opinion, the Soviet leaders organized intensive preparatory work among the various delegations in the first days before the beginning of the meeting. Working especially actively to this end were the delegation of the Communist Party of France (with the delegations of the capitalist countries of Europe), the delegation

of the Communist Party of Spain, and the People's Party of Cuba (with the delegations of Latin America), the delegation of Syria (with the delegations of the Arab and African countries). On top of this organized work, in which the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union dated November 5 addressed to the Communist Party of China was read and commented on, many bilateral meetings and talks were held with the Soviet delegation and the delegations of the socialist countries of Europe. Of course such work cannot be considered normal; on the contrary, it is incorrect and anti-Marxist. On the other hand, it indicates how weak the positions of the Soviet leaders are, because he who is on the correct course and abides by the teachings of Marx and Lenin has no need to win allies through improper methods, pressure, and working on people in this way.

By doing this preparatory work outside the meeting, the Soviet leaders intended to impart a show-piece character to the very holding of the meeting, in which the speeches made would be in general terms, with eulogies for the successes achieved, without disclosing the existing contradictions, but casting veiled allusions against the Communist Party of China and the correct Marxist-Leninist positions of the Party of Labour of Albania on the fundamental issues. Such a development of the meeting would have been to the advantage of the Soviet leadership and the parties supporting its view, because, on the one hand, they did their work outside the meeting, creating the opinion that the Communist Party of China, too, had allegedly made mistakes, indeed that it was in favour of war, of adventures, against peaceful coexistence, and so on. And on the other hand, by not uncovering the contradictions at the meeting, the Soviet leaders presented themselves as allegedly staunch partisans of the defence of the unity of the communist movement and the socialist camp; hence they displayed their "magnanimity" and avoided discussion of their line, of their mistakes,

and of their deviations from the Moscow Declaration [1957] and from the teachings of Marxism-Leninism.

The Soviet leaders saw clearly that an open discussion of the contradictions at the meeting would discredit them before the movement in many respects: *First*, because they have trampled on the Moscow Declaration and have adopted a conciliatory policy in the struggle against imperialism and revisionism; *second*, because they have broken the Leninist norms regulating the relations among socialist states and communist and workers' parties, as is the case with China and Albania; *third*, because in the eyes of the entire communist movement, of the representatives of 81 communist and workers' parties of the world, the existing opinion of the infallibility of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its leaders would vanish together with the notion that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its leaders are beyond criticism, that everything they say "is law, is correct, is the last word in Marxism, and therefore must be implemented by all," etc., etc.

In keeping with this tactic, Nikita Khrushchev spoke on behalf of the Soviet delegation on the first day of the Moscow Meeting. In fact, his speech was an attempt to set the tone in which matters should be discussed at this meeting.

Khrushchev's speech was cunningly prepared, and differed greatly from the letter which the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union addressed to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on November 5, which was distributed to all the delegations prior to the meeting, in which the Chinese comrades were openly accused of having violated the Moscow Declaration and the principles of Marxism-Leninism. The speech delivered to the meeting was written in such a tone as though no disagreements whatsoever existed between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China. Moreover, throughout that speech of

80 pages the Communist Party of China was never mentioned by name. Khrushchev's speech gave the main "arguments" in defence of the theses of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union concerning the main questions about which there are disagreements, such as the question of war and peace, the theoretical problems of the 20th Congress, the question of the struggle against "factionalism" in the international communist movement, etc. The speakers who followed in support of Khrushchev, such as Zhivkov and others, described Khrushchev's speech as a "creative development of Marxism" and repeated his arguments in other forms.

Although efforts were made to avoid mentioning the disagreements in Khrushchev's speech, to maintain a moderate tone, nevertheless, in a hidden manner, it contained venomous allusions, which were directed first of all against the Chinese and our Party on a series of important problems.

Khrushchev strongly insisted on condemnation of the so-called factionalist activity in the international communist and workers' movement, hypocritically declaring that this thesis was not directed against any party in particular, and he put great stress on the fact that the decisive condition for the achievement of unity in the international communist movement was allegedly respect for, and the implementation of, the decisions taken by the majority on the part of the minority. With this he set the line for all his supporters at the meeting on the key problem and his main aim: the condemnation and subjugation of the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania.

Immediately after Khrushchev's speech, the meeting began its "tranquil" course, as the tactic and purpose of the Soviet leaders required, according to the principle, "Roast your meat but don't burn the spit." Thus, during the first three days of the meeting, 18 representatives of various parties took the floor, among them the

ON THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

representatives of the parties of Bulgaria, Hungary, Canada, Greece, Argentina, Iraq, the Union of South Africa, and others, who, while supporting the stand of the Soviet delegation on all matters raised in Khrushchev's speech and eulogizing him, levelled masked criticism against the Communist Party of China and the correct views of the Party of Labour of Albania. All of them, on Khrushchev's example, insisted that the Declaration which had been prepared should remain unchanged on the questions about which our delegation and those of some other parties had expressed opposition since the meeting of the October commission. As is known, these questions had to do with the evaluation of the 20th and 21st Congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the question of the "cult of the individual," the question of "factions," and that of "national communism."

This is how the meeting began, and this is the "tranquil" appearance it had in the first stage of its proceedings. But if, formally, its appearance was tranquil, in essence the atmosphere was tense because they all had an uneasy feeling, all had something on their chests from which they could not get away unless they brought it out. They were all worried about the question of unity, but the course the meeting had taken was not leading to unity. It covered up the contradictions without eliminating them, so sooner or later they were bound to burst out and would come to the surface, and the later this happened the worse it would be for the fate of our movement. Marxism-Leninism teaches us to look the truth straight in the eye and not to be afraid of it, no matter how unpleasant it may be. The contradictions existed; therefore they had to be discussed courageously. Who was right and who was wrong had to be found out through criticism and self-criticism, through a frank and comradely consultation and discussion, and then, purged of the filth, united in genuine Marxist-Leninist unity, we had to march ahead toward fresh victories. This is how we conceived the proceedings of the Moscow Meeting of the representatives

of the communist and workers' parties.

Therefore, it was essential to change the spirit of the proceedings and the discussions at the meeting; it was necessary to put an end to the stage of relative "tranquility" which was in the interests of the Soviet leaders, but did not serve the genuine strengthening of our unity.

The spirit of the proceedings of the meeting changed after the speech I delivered on behalf of the delegation of the Party of Labour of Albania. The meeting entered its second phase, which is characterized by the open discussion of the disagreements existing in the international communist and workers' movement over fundamental questions. This discussion forced the representatives of every party to take a stand concerning these major issues, and thus the real views of every party came out more clearly...

The Central Committee knows the content of the speech of our delegation; therefore it is unnecessary to dwell on it here. However, we can say that it was listened to with great attention by the participants at the meeting, and despite the attacks heaped upon us later, of which we shall have more to say below, no one, not even the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in its written declaration of December 1, could produce convincing arguments to refute a single one of our theses. On the contrary, its principled character, its correct analysis of the questions and its courageous criticism addressed to the Soviet leaders were welcomed by many delegations of fraternal parties.

As I said above, following our speech, the meeting took another course. This stage of the meeting also can be divided into two parts: the first two to three days after our speeches were dominated by the contributions of the representatives of the communist and workers' parties who defended the thesis of the Soviet leaders and consequently attacked the Communist Party of China and our Party of Labour.

Whereas, during the last two to three days of the meeting there was a predominance of speeches of the delegations of the communist and workers' parties who defended the correct Marxist-Leninist positions, that is, the parties which were of the same opinion as us. Why did this happen? Because even in this matter the Soviet leaders pursued an incorrect procedure: wanting to create the impression that the entire movement was against us, they gave the floor, one after another, to those delegations which they were sure would defend the view of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, while refusing it to others. Thus, for example, they postponed the right of the Indonesian delegation to take the floor for three days on end. But, in this manner, by putting off the demands of all those delegations, it came about that the last speeches delivered were by the parties maintaining a correct Marxist-Leninist stand.

What is characteristic of the speeches of the second stage of the meeting?

First, the attacks against the Communist Party of China and against our Party in particular were organized (to such an extent that they were even furnished with quotations from the documents of our Party which were only at the disposal of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union); and another characteristic is their lack of arguments, the replacement of arguments with offensive language.

Second, at first, following the speech of the Chinese delegate, the attacks were spearheaded only against the Communist Party of China. After our speech the attacks were directed mainly against our Party, and by the end of the meeting, especially during the second contributions, criticism was concentrated against our two parties at the same time, against the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania.

Third, their discussions were tendentious; they condemned

everything Chinese or Albanian, passing over in silence, that means supporting, even the most extreme manifestations of right-opportunism, which tried to take advantage of this situation in order to spread its ideas. For example, in his speech, which gave the impression of being more of a speech of a social-democrat than of a communist, the representative of the Communist Party of Sweden, Hagberg, raised these opportunist theses:

1) He said that within the framework of its collaboration with the Social-Democratic Party, the Communist Party of Sweden had achieved successes precisely thanks to the fact that it was in favour of broad collaboration with all the social-democrats, that they spoke of what united them and not of what divided them. He declared that the leadership of the Communist Party of Sweden was against the creation of a Left-wing within the Social-Democratic Party because the communists should collaborate with all the detachments of the working class.

2) He defended the Yugoslav revisionists and criticized those who spoke in harsh language against them. He declared that the main thing for us was to isolate the principal enemy and not the Yugoslav League of Communists, that we should not maintain a sterner stand toward the Yugoslav leaders than toward the leaders of the social-democrats, because this hurt the feelings of the Yugoslav people. We should not aggravate our relations with the Yugoslav leadership, so that we could have them as fellow-travellers, be it even temporary and not very reliable, in our common struggle for peace, etc.

3) He declared that the term “dictatorship of the proletariat,” which might cause only harm, should not figure in the Declaration which the meeting would adopt. The term “dictatorship of the proletariat” was an old term of the 19th century, which had become outdated and frightened the masses. Although we communists understood the content of this term, we didn’t use it because, from both the

logical and the philological aspects, “dictatorship” meant the opposite of democracy, its negation. The Swedish workers took offence if you spoke to them about the “dictatorship of the proletariat.” This term was not included in the program of the Communist Party of Sweden and “when we spoke to the workers about the socialist state, we stressed that this was the most democratic state,” etc.

Likewise, the representatives of the Communist Party of the United States of America and of the Communist Party of Great Britain, under various pretexts, also demanded that the formulation on the dictatorship of the proletariat should be omitted from the draft Declaration.

The representative of the Communist Party of the United States of America also demanded the omission from the draft Declaration of the phrase which said: “If the crazy imperialists launch their war, the peoples will wipe out and bury capitalism.” Whereas the delegate of the Communist Party of Italy declared in his speech that not a single Italian worker would consent to pay for the victory of socialism in blood, that is, they were for “peace at any price.” The representative of the Communist Party of Italy proposed a new formulation of that part of the draft Declaration which speaks about Yugoslav revisionism. This new formulation left out the thesis that the Yugoslav revisionists have betrayed Marxism-Leninism and have engaged in undermining activity against the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

However, none of the delegates to the meeting, including even the Soviet delegation, stood up to oppose these anti-Marxist and blatantly revisionist theses. Only our delegation, as well as those of some other parties which stand on Marxist-Leninist positions, fought against and refuted these incorrect and opportunist views in the editing commission.

THE SPEECH OF OUR DELEGATION

Immediately after the speech delivered by our delegation at the meeting, the representatives of a number of communist and workers' parties launched heavy attacks full of offensive epithets against the Party of Labour of Albania. Regardless of the facts, or without knowing them at all, they labelled as slanders all criticisms contained in our speech directed at the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The attack was opened by Dolores Ibarruri, who said, among other things, "This morning I heard the most disgraceful speech I have ever heard in my many years in the communist movement; we have not heard such a speech since the time of Trotsky. It was a provocative speech. How can anyone speak such falsehoods against the Soviet Union... We protest against the slanders addressed to Khrushchev. We believe that the entire movement will condemn your speech..." etc.

Most offensive adjectives were employed by Gomulka against our speech and our Party. He called our speech "an irresponsible attack against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, an act of hooliganism, which no one who has any sense of responsibility could permit himself." Further on Gomulka said: "If anyone does not believe that the Chinese are factionalists, let him look at their factionalism with the Albanians..."

Attacking the speech of our delegation, Longo and the representatives of some other parties declared that "it sounds like an insult and vilification, not only of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union but also of the entire international communist movement."

The representative of the Communist Party of Morocco, Ali Yata, also made base attacks against the leadership of our Party.

Georgiu Dej pronounced himself in this manner against our speech: "We listened with indignation to the speech by the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania.

We controlled ourselves, put our patience to the test, for it seemed as if *The Voice of America* or *Free Europe* were speaking from this tribune. No difference whatsoever from the Yugoslav revisionists. With their adventurist policy, the Albanians are creating a difficult situation in the Balkans... Our meeting should resolutely condemn the disruptive speech and action of the Albanian delegate.”

The delegations of some parties which had not yet pronounced themselves before my speech hurried to issue written declarations to condemn the speech of the delegation of the Party of Labour of Albania and its leadership. This is what the delegations of the Bulgarian Communist Party, the French Communist Party, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, and others did.

The declaration distributed by the delegation of the Bulgarian Communist Party, among other things, says: “...What the representatives of the Party of Labour of Albania did was an expression of the blackest ingratitude and cynicism. In return for fraternal help they have brought up the basest falsification and slanders against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The Belgrade revisionists have no reason to be dissatisfied with the struggle waged by the leaders of the Party of Labour of Albania against them. Through this ‘struggle’ they have simply become more valuable on the U.S. market and will receive more generous aid and loans from the United States of America.”

The declaration of the delegation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, in connection with the speech by the delegation of the Party of Labour of Albania, says among other things, “What are the aims of the monstrous slanders of the Albanian delegation which dared to describe the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as almost to blame for the Hungarian counter-revolution? The present words of the Albanian delegation, which levels against the Soviet Union the grave accusation of resorting to almost colonial methods and great-power chauvinism, arouse even greater indignation.

These insults can only be grist to the mill of the bourgeois and revisionist propaganda about the so-called Soviet 'colonialism' and Soviet 'hegemonism'."

A large number of the delegations that spoke against us in connection with our speech expressed themselves only with some phrases, such as "This was not the place to open these discussions," or "The speech by the Albanian comrade was inappropriate and harmful, and contained slanders against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union," or "We agree with the assessment of the speech of the Albanian delegate made by the preceding speakers," etc.

Generally speaking, based on their stand toward the views expressed in our speech, the various delegations may be divided into three groups:

a) The first group includes those parties that defended us openly, or that supported our theses without mentioning us at all, or that merely spoke a few odd words against our speech simply for the sake of appearances.

In this group mention should be made, first of all, of the Chinese delegation that defended our Party.

Besides the Chinese delegation, many delegations of the communist and workers' parties of Asia came out openly in defence of our Party. Some of them, such as those of Burma, Malaya and Indonesia, criticized the un-communist methods and the offensive language used against those parties that speak openly and courageously, whereas some other delegations did not declare themselves openly but told us on the side that they agreed with us.

b) The second group is made up of the delegations which spoke against us, but, as we said above, in very mild terms, such as "improper speech," etc. Most of the delegations from Latin America, the Scandinavian countries, some delegations from Africa and others may be included in this group.

c) The third group is made up of the delegations that rose against us with great heat and unreservedly defended the position of the Soviet leaders. But even among them there are some shades of difference:

— The most aggressive were Gomulka, Ibarri, Ali Yata of Morocco, Zhivkov, and the Czechs (the latter two came out with written declarations), Dej, Longo of Italy, and others who used the most abusive language against us.

— The less aggressive were the French, who issued written declarations, the Tunisians and others who spoke against us, not in the above-mentioned terms, but such as “disgraceful speech,” “impermissible and unacceptable speech,” “aimed at discrediting the Soviet Union,” etc.

— Lastly, the moderates, among whom the Hungarians may be included, for they were very measured in their written declaration.

The fierce attacks against the Chinese delegation and ours came as no surprise. They were an organized outburst of unprincipled passions, an unsuccessful attempt to stifle our principled views and criticism through base attacks and offensive language, to divert the discussion, by means of sentimental phrases, away from the questions of principle on the agenda, etc. But they did not achieve their aims. In fact, most delegations began to waver, and the more passions cooled down and logic prevailed, the more objectively the correct and principled Marxist-Leninist views upheld by our delegation and some other delegations were assessed by a series of delegations.

This is clearly expressed in the shift of the ratio of forces and in the conclusion of the proceedings of the meeting.

As we said at the start of this report, apart from our delegation, the representatives of many other parties, too, took a resolute Marxist-Leninist stand at the November meeting. All stood for the unity of the communist movement, and frankly admitted that without China and its Communist Party there could be no talk of unity, either in the

communist movement or in the socialist camp. This stand was in open opposition to the proposals and theses of the Soviets and their ardent supporters, who wanted to condemn the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania as factionalists, etc.

At the end of the plenary session of the meeting, after 79 representatives of the various parties had made their contributions to the discussion, N.S. Khrushchev took the floor for the second time, and so did the Chinese delegate and 23 other persons. A characteristic of the last speeches of Khrushchev and his supporters was that they assumed a more moderate appearance, their expressions were more controlled, they were more engaged in defending their viewpoints than in attacking those of others.

Nikita Khrushchev's second speech was a reflection of the situation created up to then at the meeting: on the one hand, the speech of our delegation had dealt heavy blows at the arguments of the Soviet leaders concerning the accusations against the Communist Party of China; and on the other hand, it was a fact that besides the parties openly supporting the stand taken by the Soviet delegation against the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania, although without convincing arguments, there was also another group of parties (and not a small one) that supported our viewpoints, and still another group in the centre that were against the split.

In conformity with this, Khrushchev's second speech had two characteristic aspects:

a) Although in its external form it was sharper than his first speech and directly attacked both the Chinese comrades and us, in essence it was a speech from defensive positions. Defending himself against the criticisms by us, Khrushchev tried to justify the viewpoints of the Soviet leadership on a series of questions: war and peace, the stand to be taken toward imperialism, the thesis of the 20th Congress on the road of transition to socialism, the attitude toward the national liberation

movements, the criticism of “Stalin’s cult of the individual,” etc. Concerning all these questions, he did not dare to enter into an analysis of facts, but said only that all “the slanders and attacks against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union” would be answered by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in a special letter. Apart from this, in Khrushchev’s second speech the first signs of a retreat were apparent when he declared that, facing the enemy, the meeting must, without fail, be concluded with a joint document and the elimination of disagreements.

b) Relying on the support of the majority, in his second speech Khrushchev continued his pressure on the Communist Party of China to have it condemned and force it to its knees. In this respect he was very insistent that allegedly the disagreements were between the Party of Labour of Albania, on the one hand, and all the communist and workers’ parties, on the other; that the minority should submit to the majority and respect its opinion; that “factional activity” in the international communist movement should be condemned, etc. He went on with his attacks against the Chinese comrades, accusing them of being unwilling to acknowledge their mistakes simply for the reason that they put their pride above the interests of the international communist movement, etc. Without any arguments, and on false evidence, he then directly attacked the leadership of the Party of Labour of Albania.

Khrushchev’s second speech showed that the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, with Khrushchev at the head, had not renounced its erroneous views and methods in its relations with the fraternal parties.

After Khrushchev’s speech and in reply to it, the delegate of the Communist Party of China took the floor for the second time...

Our delegation decided not to take part in the discussion for the

second time, so it did not ask for the floor, but we issued a brief written declaration which was distributed to all the delegations. In this declaration we emphasized that we stood firm on the positions expressed in our speech and pointed out that the insulting criticism levelled at us was hasty and did not serve the strengthening of the unity of our movement. In this connection we stressed:

“Typical in this respect was the speech of the delegate of the United Workers’ Party of Poland, Vladislav Gomulka, who went so far in his unworthy attempts to distort the truth about the Party of Labour of Albania as to use against it epithets, descriptions and insinuations which are altogether impermissible in the relations among the Marxist parties and which only the imperialists and the Yugoslav revisionists repeatedly fling at us each passing day. From the content and tone of the Polish delegate’s speech it is clear that he is not in the least interested in the elimination of disagreements among parties and in strengthening the unity of the communist and workers’ movement; but on the contrary he is striving with great zeal to deepen them, which is only to the benefit of our enemies. His intention was to lead our meeting into a blind alley and to discredit the Party of Labour of Albania in the eyes of the international communist and workers’ movement. However, this attempt to isolate the Party of Labour of Albania ended in failure and disgrace, as it was bound to do.

“We reject all the slanders and provocations made at this meeting against our delegation, against our Party and people.

“The Party of Labour of Albania regrets that a number of delegates of some other fraternal parties hastened to use an incorrect and uncomradely language toward the Party of Labour of Albania in their speeches or written declarations distributed at this meeting, without going thoroughly into the real facts and without being aware of the truth. However, the Party of Labour of Albania hopes that those comrades will reflect more deeply and will understand the truth about the

content of the speech made by the delegation of the Party of Labour of Albania.”

As you see, apart from Gomulka, we did not name anyone else, nor did we respond to the personal attacks so that we would not deviate from our principled position. Our brief written declaration was well received by the delegations, and none of the 23 second-time speakers, including even Gomulka, said anything against it.

In this manner the first and more important part of the Moscow Meeting came to an end, and the commission for the final editing of the Declaration started its work. The commission met five days in succession. Other delegations met with the same viewpoints as ours, waged a stern and determined struggle there. The change in the situation was clearly apparent in the commission. Not only the shift in the ratio of forces, but also the result of the resolute struggle and the courageous and unflinching stand taken, was even more evident there. Many delegations of parties in a centrist position behaved with respect toward the proposals made by our delegations.

In conclusion, some amendments were made for the improvement of the draft Declaration, whereas all the proposals intended to weaken the Declaration, to give it an opportunist character, like those of the Italians who wanted to water down the paragraph on Yugoslav revisionism, or the proposals of the Swedes, etc., were rejected. The Commission also rejected the thesis about “national communism” but, at the end, four questions remained unresolved: the assessment of the 20th and 21st Congresses, the question of the cult of the individual, the question of factions, and the inclusion in the Declaration of the principle of consultation for the achievement of unity, as proposed by the Chinese delegation.

A break of one day was taken for consultation with the heads of delegations about finding a way out. However, our delegations expressed their determination not to accept the inclusion in the

Declaration of the first three of the above-mentioned four questions. Indeed, through some delegations that had taken a centrist position we had let it be understood that, if the above-mentioned questions remained in the Declaration, we would not put our signature to it.

Only at midday of the last day, as a result of our struggle and clear-cut stand, was complete unanimity reached, after the delegation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was obliged to back down. In fact, the questions under discussion were resolved as follows: the question of factions was removed from the text altogether; the Chinese proposal about consultations was included; the assessment of the 21st Congress was removed completely and only the characterization of the 20th Congress according to the 1957 Declaration remained, with the addition of a phrase on the contribution made by other parties to the enrichment of Marxism-Leninism; the formula about the cult of the individual remained, but no longer as a phenomenon connected with the whole international communist movement. After these amendments the Declaration was unanimously approved by all the delegations.

The fundamental questions about which there were different opinions are presented correctly and interpreted from the Marxist point of view. The characterization of the epoch, the problems of war and peace, the question of peaceful coexistence, the problems of the national liberation movement, of the communist movement in the capitalist countries, of the unity of the socialist camp and of the communist parties, find their correct reflection in the Declaration. The only fundamental question about which we disagreed, but on which, for the sake of unity, we were obliged to make a concession, was the mentioning of the 20th Congress.

But one thing should always be kept in mind. There exists the possibility that each will try to give his own interpretation of the theses of the Declaration. The Moscow Declaration of 1957, too, was

correct, but many disagreements arose concerning its interpretation. Distortions could be made, not by revising the theses of the Declaration and replacing them with new theses, but by stressing its theses in a one-sided manner, by mentioning only one side of the question and leaving out the other. For example, there exists the danger that in the characterization of our epoch only our forces may be emphasized or overestimated; there is the danger that in connection with the problem of war, the danger of war may not be properly stressed and imperialism not exposed; there is the danger that only the policy of the alliance with the social-democrats and the national bourgeoisie may be emphasized, and the struggle against, and criticism of, their reactionary viewpoints and actions may be left aside; there is the danger that the peaceful road of transition to socialism will be the most stressed, and the non-peaceful way not mentioned, as it should be; there is the danger that revisionism may be acknowledged as the main danger only in words, and more stress laid on the struggle against dogmatism and sectarianism. Similar distortions can be made with regard to the other problems taken up in the Declaration, too.

Hence the question arises: How will this Declaration be implemented? Will it be honoured by everyone?

We can answer this question with certainty only as far as our Party is concerned. Not only will our Party of Labour fight with might and main to implement the Declaration approved, but at the same time we feel ourselves duty-bound to fight against anyone who may violate it, or who may attempt to distort its content.

As far as the other parties are concerned, we hope that for the sake of unity, of the common struggle against imperialism and revisionism, for the sake of the camp of socialism and communism, they will all implement the Declaration which was approved. The implementation of this Declaration to the letter will mark a decisive step toward the liquidation of all disagreements in the ranks of the communist

movement, will make a valuable contribution to the tempering of the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement, which is indispensable for victory over the enemy. The Declaration itself and its content represent a real basis on which this unity can be built.

But we cannot fail to inform the Central Committee of the Party about some reservations that are even now becoming apparent in the attitude of the Soviet leaders toward the implementation of the Declaration.

The reservations they have expressed, which in our opinion are unjustified, are these: In a speech he delivered in October, at a banquet in honour of the participants in the editing commission of the Declaration, Nikita Khrushchev himself called the Declaration a "compromise document." "As you know," he went on, "such documents are not long-lived." Later, at the farewell banquet given in honour of the participants of the Moscow Meeting of December 2nd, that is to say, after the Declaration was signed, speaking about Yugoslavia, Nikita Khrushchev stressed that it is not a socialist country but that its economy is developing along socialist lines (!), and that "we (the Russians) would not fight Yugoslav revisionism as the Albanians are doing, for we keep in mind that in case of war Yugoslavia could muster a number of divisions, and we do not want them lined up against us."

On what is hidden behind these declarations, what is their purpose, we shall not attempt to comment. Let us wait and see. We only observed these facts, and now we are informing the Central Committee of the Party about them. Of course, in our opinion, such statements cannot give rise to optimism. They make you think that the Soviet leadership will not fight, as every party should, to implement the pledges stemming from the unanimous approval of the Declaration that was signed.

V. THE TASKS OF THE PARTY IN THE FUTURE

The activity of our delegation, its determined and principled stand, the courageous speech and all the work carried out at the Moscow Meeting, have been very good and, as we said, have given good results. We must emphasize that, as a result, the individuality of our Party has been raised, admiration and respect for its courage, its principled stand, and its determination to defend Marxism-Leninism have increased immeasurably. This rejoices us, but it should not go to our heads and make us boastful. We did nothing but our duty to Marxism-Leninism, to proletarian internationalism, to our Party and our people.

But, at the same time a number of new problems confront us, which we must solve with the wisdom characterizing our Party, with cool-headedness and intelligence.

We should be aware that our courageous and principled stand was not to the liking either of the Soviet leadership or of the representatives of some parties of the socialist and capitalist countries, and this is evident from the attacks they directed against our Party. On the other hand, as a result of the work done by the Soviet leaders with the various delegations, especially after our speech, and the slanderous lies they told the meeting about us, among many delegations there is the impression that we attacked the Soviet Union and its Communist Party.

After having spoken of the attitude toward the Soviet Union, Comrade Enver Hoxha continued:...

ON THE DISCUSSION OF THESE QUESTIONS IN THE PARTY AND AT THE CONGRESS

So far, the Central Committee of the Party has informed the Party, through a special letter, only about the Bucharest Meeting. We

think that now, by means of another letter, we must inform the party organizations of the Moscow Meeting and the contradictions which exist between our Party and the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. We think this letter of the Central Committee should be analysed and discussed at district party conferences (or in actives), and then in the party branches. It would be good if all this work can be completed before the Congress, so that the delegates who come to the Congress will be aware of these problems beforehand.

The party organizations must see to it that our people, in the first place the communists, further enhance their revolutionary political vigilance and devote more attention to the problems of production and the realization of economic plans, in industry, construction, the mines, trade, agriculture, etc. Under present conditions total mobilization is needed — indeed, a tenfold increase of the enthusiasm and the determination of the masses, to cope with the difficulties and obstacles¹ ahead of us, so that both the Party and the people emerge successful.

As to the Party Congress, we think that it is better to postpone it, hold it toward the beginning of February, so that we shall have time to put the questions of which we spoke before the Party, and also to

¹ Time confirmed the predictions of the PLA. The Soviet leadership launched an all-out open attack against the PLA and the PRA. It unilaterally broke off all the agreements, stopped all the credits which were due to be provided for the PRA in the years 1961-1965 on the basis of agreements, broke off all trade, technical-scientific and cultural relations, used the withdrawal of all the Soviet specialists from Albania as a means of pressure, withdrew all the warships from the Vlora naval base before the eyes of the whole world, robbing Albania also of eight submarines and all the Albanian warships that were under repair at Sevastopol in the USSR, cancelled the scholarships of all the Albanian students studying in the Soviet Union and expelled them, and finally, carried out an absolutely unprecedented act in the relations among socialist countries — broke off diplomatic relations. Subsequently, a total economic blockade was organized against the PRA.

ON THE 1960 MOSCOW MEETING

prepare ourselves better for the Congress.

Comrades,

These were the questions we wanted to report to the Plenum. Our Party, as always, will march forward towards new victories under the banner of Marxism-Leninism. We shall achieve ever greater successes, for we are on a correct road, we are fighting for a noble cause, and there is and will be no obstacle or difficulty that can stop our triumphant advance.¹

*Albania Challenges Khrushchev
Revisionism*, New York 1976,
pp. 234-278, Eng. ed.

¹ The Plenum fully and unanimously endorsed the activity of the delegation of the CC of the PLA at the Moscow Meeting.

THE PRINCIPLED AND CONSISTENT STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM AND REVISIONISM HAS BEEN AND REMAINS THE ROAD OF OUR PARTY

Closing Speech at the 21st Plenum of the CC of the PLA

December 20, 1960

I shall try to be brief, since the contributions of the comrades of the Plenum to this great problem, so decisive for the defence of Marxism-Leninism and the line of our Party, were at the proper level and supplemented the report submitted to the Plenum on behalf of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee very well.

First of all I want to emphasize that what we did in Moscow, where we put forward the line of our Party, is not a personal merit of mine or of our delegation only, but it is the merit of our entire Party and, in particular, of its leadership, the Central Committee, which has always led our Party correctly, has always analysed the situations in the light of Marxism-Leninism, has always remained loyal to our glorious theory, has carried out to the letter all the correct decisions that have been adopted, and has also known how to transmit these decisions properly to the Party and to arm it powerfully. For these reasons the whole general line of our Party has achieved great successes. Hence we should be clear that the credit for this belongs to the Central Committee and our entire heroic Party.

The revisionists may think and say that if our Party were to learn about the stand our delegation maintained at the international Meeting in Moscow, it would not tolerate its Central Committee. But none of us has the slightest doubt about the steel-like unity that exists in our leadership, the steel-like unity of our Party around the Central Committee and the Political Bureau. This constitutes the great

STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM AND REVISIONISM

strength of our Party, and this unity has made it possible for our Party to contribute to the defence of Marxism-Leninism on the international level. In this regard, of course, we have done nothing but our duty as a Marxist party, as internationalists. With this correct concept of its duty which is characteristic of our Party, we are firmly convinced that all of us, in solid unity, will pour out all our strength to apply Marxism-Leninism precisely, through to the end, unwaveringly and in all circumstances.

As the comrades said, we are confronted with a great and difficult struggle. We all are aware of the struggle which awaits us, but we are not afraid. We do not say this out of the desire to give one another courage; the whole life of our Party has demonstrated this, and the recent events have especially proven this. In its principled, consistent stand, in defending its correct line, i.e., Marxism-Leninism, our Party did not flinch in the face of either the current difficulties or of those of the future. Thus, difficulties and the struggle do not frighten us. This is a Marxist characteristic. We have not been, nor will we ever be, pessimistic about the future. On the contrary, we will be optimistic for we are convinced that Marxism will always triumph over opportunism and revisionism, as well as over imperialism.

Why is this struggle difficult? Because when we say that we are confronted with modern revisionism, we mean that we are confronted not only with Yugoslav revisionism, which the Moscow Declaration describes as the essence of modern revisionism, but that we are facing even more dangerous revisionists. For the sake of appearances, everyone — even the other revisionists, even Khrushchev and company who are such themselves — admitted this. They did this to camouflage themselves, choosing the lesser of two evils. Otherwise, it would have looked a bit fishy, and what they sought to conceal would have been exposed. They put up a fight and will continue to do so in future too, resorting to all sorts of tricks to camouflage themselves.

These people proposed that nothing should be said about Yugoslav revisionism in the Declaration, and only after a prolonged struggle did they agree to the inclusion of this issue. But revisionism is not concentrated in Yugoslavia alone. It is a dangerous trend in the whole international communist movement. It has become dangerous especially because of the efforts of the opportunists to tranquilize the people by spreading the idea that revisionism exists in Yugoslavia alone; hence they fight to confine the struggle just to Yugoslavia. In this way international revisionism is causing great confusion, which will become even greater in the future; it will try to conceal this serious danger which is threatening the international communist movement, and will continue to confuse and deceive other people in the future. Faced with this danger, one of the Marxist-Leninist parties which must, and will, wage a stern and consistent struggle against revisionism, is our Party.

It is a fact that we are not alone in this struggle. When Khrushchev said to the representatives of the Communist Party of China, "We shall treat Albania the same as Yugoslavia," or "The Albanians behave toward us just like Tito," he was bluffing and could deceive nobody. It is not Tito who is Khrushchev's enemy, but us. But since the Yugoslav revisionists have been condemned, against Khrushchev's will, by the international communist movement as traitors and renegades to Marxism-Leninism, Khrushchev and company, while not defending them directly, strive to smear the positions of the genuine Marxists and to put the "dogmatists" — in reality, those who defend the principles of Marxism-Leninism — on a par with the revisionists, with whom, as Marxism teaches us, one fine day Khrushchev and those who follow him will completely agree on the road they should follow. So Khrushchev says that we Albanians are not revisionists but "dogmatists," and that allegedly we fight the Soviets the same as the Titotes; that is to say, according to him, he and his cronies are allegedly

STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM AND REVISIONISM

Marxists, while we constitute the “left” wing of Marxism. “Therefore,” he says, “both Tito from the right and the Albanians from the left are fighting against us, the Marxists.”

But it is not the revisionists who are the enemies of Khrushchev and his entire group. Life is demonstrating that only the Marxists are the enemies of this group. The Political Bureau emphasizes that, following his advent to power, Khrushchev and his revisionist group had worked out a complete plan: Marxism-Leninism would be negated and all those trends and people that had been unmasked, attacked and defeated as anti-Marxists, or who had been liquidated by Marxist-Leninism in action, were to be rehabilitated; the entire struggle of the Soviet Union and of the CPSU against renegades from Marxism-Leninism, a struggle which was personified in the CPSU(b) led by Lenin and Stalin, was to be negated.

This meant that both Lenin and Stalin had to be attacked. But to attack Lenin was impossible for them; it would have been a great catastrophe for the revisionists, so they confined themselves to Stalin and they dragged out a thousand and one things against him. Today it has become even more apparent that these intriguers, liars, opportunists and revisionists are doing all these things openly, devising all these villainies in the international communist movement, organizing disgraceful behind-the-scenes plots within the fraternal parties.

Seeing all these despicable methods which the revisionists use, our Party is fully convinced that all the monstrous accusations and slanders brought against Stalin were aimed at discrediting both him as a person as well as the work of this great Marxist-Leninist. The revisionist, career-seeking, non-Marxist elements in the Soviet Union have accepted these concoctions. They have accepted the theses of Khrushchev and his group concerning “Stalin’s mistakes,” and so on.

The Political Bureau emphasizes that the Soviet leadership headed by Khrushchev tried to rehabilitate the Tito clique, and this is a fact.

No great weight should be given to the variations and zigzags of Khrushchev, because he has not been able to avoid them, since he was not in a position to change the situation in a single day; there were sound Marxist-Leninist forces in the party who did not allow him to follow his course at the speed he would have desired, so that he and his group could carry out their plans immediately. But it is fact that he has made every effort to completely rehabilitate all the enemies of Marxism-Leninism who had until then been condemned in the Soviet Union. He dug up old accusations against Stalin, such as whether or not Kamenev and Zinoviev, who had betrayed Lenin, should have been executed. Whether or not it was Stalin who shot these traitors, they were shot for the treason they had committed against the Soviet Union and against communism. Now Khrushchev is dragging out all these things and striving to rehabilitate these people. Therefore, in order to rehabilitate the Yugoslav revisionists, too, he had to fabricate all sorts of lies against Stalin. We should have no illusions at all that the line of Khrushchev and his group will change. This line will not change in the least as far as his international policy and his defence of revisionism are concerned. Khrushchev and his group are on a revisionist course. This stand of his has had, and will continue to have, grave repercussions in the international arena.

But will Khrushchev and his group succeed in their plans? We are fully convinced that they will not be successful, although we shall encounter many difficulties in our course. We should keep his policy in mind and deal with it very carefully, for he is no ordinary revisionist, but a wily devil and a skilful acrobat to boot. If we carefully analyse his activity since he came to power, we shall see that he has captured key positions everywhere, has used all sorts of methods to disguise himself, and is continuing to do dangerous work. In the beginning, through his tricks, he managed to create a situation which prevented the emergence of any opposition; he took up a few slogans about

STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM AND REVISIONISM

international political life and the development of the economy, and publicized them far and wide with enough clamour to confuse people for a while.

He followed this tactic in the USSR as well, by preaching a sort of change, right down to the way people live. He trumpeted that, in Stalin's time, the life of the Soviet working people was hell, whereas now Khrushchev has become "the promoter of a new life, democratic and rich from the economic aspect." Then he raised the question of peace in the world, which he was going to "impose" on the imperialists, etc.

This policy was loudly propagated right from the start of his career, when his instructions had not yet yielded their fruit. Words there were aplenty, but nothing came of them. All this was done in order to prepare the ground and create a favourable situation. Khrushchev continues to follow this road.

His course has had grave repercussions in international policy. He has lulled people to sleep and made them shut their eyes to the imperialist danger, the revisionist danger, and all the other opportunist trends menacing international communism.

By means of his views and his opportunist and revisionist policy, Khrushchev has aroused and activated all the revisionist elements, and has therefore become very dangerous. In the other countries the revisionists did not make their presence felt — not because they were terrified of Stalin, not because he would have shot them, for in Bulgaria, Albania and elsewhere, even if Stalin had wanted to, or had really been as Khrushchev is presenting him now, they were out of his reach; they did not make their presence felt because at that time, in all the parties, there was a correct Marxist-Leninist line which did not allow revisionism to become active.

Yugoslav revisionism was exposed and condemned by the CPSU and by Stalin. This line was embraced by all the other parties. When Khrushchev and company came to power, all the revisionists saw that

in them they had powerful support, because these people are at the head of the Soviet Union. Therefore, now it can be seen that within many Marxist-Leninist parties which have had a consistent stand, people of opportunist-revisionist trends have raised their heads and even managed to have themselves elected to the leading organs. For a while Khrushchev thought that he would push through his line smoothly, therefore he was reckless in the propagation of his views, both in the internal economic and organizational measures which were taken in the Soviet Union and in its international policy. Thus, in pursuing his opportunist and revisionist line, he would say whatever came into his head, and he made repeated concessions to imperialism. In words, you may threaten the imperialists as much as you like, but they are no fools; they make their calculations well, they take into account not only your declarations and tactics but also your means and forces. The imperialists also have the assistance of the revisionists who know the concrete reality in our countries.

It is a fact that ever since Nikita Khrushchev and his group came to power, imperialism has made no concessions at all. On the contrary, it has armed itself more powerfully and is preparing for war. We are absolutely right when we say that the camp of socialism and the forces of peace are much more powerful than those of imperialism. But these forces can be weakened if we slacken our vigilance, if we do not defend Marxism-Leninism resolutely, if we do not put a stop to these actions of the revisionists and fail to ceaselessly expose imperialism and revisionism, if we do not educate the people politically and fail to arm them so that they are always ready to cope with any possible danger.

It is clear that the methods used by Nikita Khrushchev and those who assist him result in reduced vigilance toward this danger. Therefore, as the report of the Political Bureau points out, the time came when we could wait no longer, we could go no further by these

STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM AND REVISIONISM

methods. When the Soviet revisionists say, "You started the fight," etc., they are telling lies, trying to cover their tracks. The thing is that they began to follow an opportunist line which has become more and more pronounced since the time they seized power.

Their defence consists only of, "You say this, you say that." But it doesn't hold water. We see that ever since they came to power, they have been following a revisionist line and working to weaken the struggle against imperialism, the vigilance of the peoples, and to help revisionism gain control of the international communist movement.

Now, however, we have said "Stop!" to this whole business. Thus the whole opportunist line headed by Khrushchev was endangered. As an opportunist, he wanted to defeat the Marxist-Leninist resistance to his line. He thought that this resistance in the Soviet Union would be smashed by bringing up the question of Stalin, by condemning the "cult" of the individual around Stalin. He thought, too, that, in the international communist movement, there were enough forces available to strike a decisive blow at the Marxist-Leninist attack on his opportunist line. This was clearly evident at the Bucharest Meeting where efforts were made to condemn the Marxist-Leninists and liquidate the situation which was hindering him; but, as we know, they failed.

Our Party played an important role at the Bucharest Meeting. It was the only party to oppose what was being done there. And from then on the hostility against us, until then covert, came out in the open. From this we can judge how grave and damaging to them was the stand of our Party.

We should have complete confidence that the situation Khrushchev has created in many communist parties of Europe, which he has tried to win over to his side, is a temporary one. We base this conviction on the strength of Marxism-Leninism. However, for the time being, he has created this unhealthy situation by bringing people with

opportunist-revisionist views into the leadership of a number of parties by one means or another. In the face of these favourable conditions which he had created for himself, apart from the Communist Party of China, there was a small Party too which also realized the danger of this line and stood up to say resolutely: "Stop! I am not with you at this point. I do not support the course you are pursuing!"

Up till now, in the interests of the international communist movement, we too have used tactics, but now that Khrushchev seeks to deal blows at the sound part of the international communist movement and compel it to follow his opportunist line, we say to him: "Stop!" Of course, to them, this is a great loss.

But the situation became more complicated for them at the Moscow Meeting. The Moscow Meeting did not proceed as they had envisaged. The proof of this is the Moscow Declaration, which is a good document, approved by all. Naturally, had there been a healthy situation, a more fiery, more militant declaration would have come out of it. However, this document is acceptable and it must be understood correctly, just as it is.

Now the question arises: Can it be said that these people who signed such a document will change? We must say to the Central Committee that they will not change their line. This is implied from the words of Khrushchev, which were mentioned in the report and which should not be forgotten. In connection with the Declaration he said, "It is a compromise document." To Khrushchev this is a compromise because he is entering another phase; but our tactics, too, are entering another phase.

All the Marxist-Leninist communist and workers' parties ardently loved the Soviet Union, the CPSU, and the leadership of the CPSU, with Stalin at the head, and had unshakable confidence in it. This was a well-deserved, correct, Marxist-Leninist confidence. When the Khrushchev group came to power, it no longer found that warmth in

STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM AND REVISIONISM

the hearts of the Albanian communists and those of the other countries as before. We continued to nurture the same feelings of love and confidence as before, with the difference that, basing ourselves on the events taking place there, we said that injustice is being done in the CPSU, that the line is being distorted there. In the beginning there were a number of ill-defined things, but later they were concretized.

Even in this phase, we preserve our love for the Soviet Union, but during this time we saw and understood that the leadership of the CPSU was moving to the right, toward an opportunist, revisionist course. Under these conditions, we adopted the tactic of keeping silent in public, especially before world public opinion. This was a correct tactic of our leadership and was not adopted by accident. Its aim was to defend Marxism-Leninism, to defend the line of our Party.

But what is our line? The struggle against revisionism and any opportunist or dogmatic trend which attacks and aims at the destruction of Marxism-Leninism, the ideological and political exposure of imperialism and Yugoslav revisionism and of every kind of revisionism, the sharpening of vigilance, the arming and permanent readiness to deal with any eventual danger, and unbreakable friendship with all the communist and workers' parties and with the countries of the camp of socialism, regardless of whether Khrushchev, Zhivkov, Gomulka and others like or dislike our line. It means that we have not made political or ideological concessions in our line; it was they who made concessions. We have tried hard to defend our line and our love for the CPSU and the Soviet Union, but with Khrushchev and company we have not been and are not now in agreement. This they have understood and know.

Now a new stage is approaching, one which the Bucharest and Moscow Meetings opened. In this stage too their tactics have taken and will take new forms. But our tactics too will not mark time; they will be adapted to the development of events, but we shall always

continue our resolute defence of Marxism-Leninism, we shall expose all the enemies of Marxism-Leninism.

After the Bucharest Meeting and especially after the Moscow Meeting, the positions of those who thought they had won have been shaken. No one doubts this. Nikita Khrushchev can no longer cut a great figure on the throne he had occupied in the international communist movement, because of the principled struggle waged by our Party, the Communist Party of China, and by many other parties which maintained a Marxist-Leninist stand.

These stands are of great historic importance, for they said "Stop!" to Khrushchev. They shook the very foundations of his positions among the various parties, although he had thought them impregnable.

But we should bear in mind that Khrushchev will try to keep all those who followed him at the Bucharest Meeting on his side, because they are heavily compromised. The Soviet revisionists and their flatterers who were present at the Moscow Meeting were greatly concerned that we should not criticize them; therefore they strove to throw dust in our eyes by cajolery. This was what Mikoyan tried to do before we spoke at the Meeting. "We agree with you," was more or less what he said. "We are for Stalin, too, for the 'condemnation' of Yugoslav revisionism, so tell us, what do you want?"

If we look at the problem from the ideological viewpoint, we shall be convinced of what was of greater importance: whether to speak about those major problems of principle of the communist movement, or about something else — about what Malinovski said, for example. Of course, the defence of questions of principle of the communist movement, first and foremost, was of greater importance than the things the Soviet leaders had done to us, but these too were extremely discrediting to them, therefore they tried to induce us not to mention them in our speech, for this would expose not only their

STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM AND REVISIONISM

opportunist line but also the underhand, fiendish and dirty methods which the revisionists and the Soviet leadership have used against us and many others, which now they want to cover up. But they have left scars and have not been forgotten, and have had their influence on the mistakes made on many major questions of international communism.

Maurice Thorez, for example, may have had other reasons to maintain the stand he took against us at the Moscow Meeting, though, when he was on holiday in Albania, he was in full agreement with as much as I told him. But the speech of our Party in Moscow did not leave him unscathed because as the representative and leader of the Communist Party of France he bears great responsibility since he permitted such a very important matter, as that of the stand toward the Yugoslav revisionists, whom the Information Bureau had condemned, to be settled by N. Khrushchev and his followers, not in the Marxist-Leninist way, but simply by means of a telegram.

For a number of reasons Gomulka got up at the meeting and demanded that the question of Albania should be considered within the Warsaw Treaty, but he said this also because the representative of our Party had opposed his policy and had not agreed with Gomulka's proposals in the UNO. This is a question of great importance, because his proposals amounted to saying to the imperialists: "Keep all the numerous military bases you have set up, keep the atomic bomb, and don't let others have it." It is easily understood that, according to Gomulka, China must not have this weapon, and the imperialists are very interested in this. The stand of our delegation, therefore, was a telling blow to their adventurous and opportunist policy which aims at leading the socialist camp toward the abyss. That is why Gomulka said that Albania should be expelled from the Warsaw Treaty.

The raising of these major questions had very great importance for the fate of socialism. The Soviet leadership would not have been

much concerned if we had only pointed out what Ivanov had done in Albania, etc. The raising of problems in the way we did upset them because this would expose their policy. But by also raising the question of their interference in the internal affairs of our country, the question of their attempts to split our leadership, we touched Zhivkov on a sensitive spot, since it is known that it was Khrushchev who interfered to bring him to power in Bulgaria.

Thus, our speech at the Moscow Meeting was exceptionally harmful to Khrushchev. It is understandable that this exposure would open up very great troubles for him. This is what impelled them to heap unprincipled insults on us, because if the others were to go thoroughly into these things, it would lead to a lot of troubles, not only for those who aimed their insults against us but also for those directing them.

It is known that, subsequent to the 20th Congress of the CPSU, there were changes in the leaderships of many communist and workers' parties. Khrushchev understood that the parties in which the leadership was not changed constituted a great danger to his line, because his efforts and his views could not find a foothold among them. So he was obliged to grin and bear it, and for the sake of appearances, he maintained friendly relations with our Party. But he saw that he was failing to achieve his ends, and if not today, he planned to have another try in the future. This is what he intended for our Party, for the Communist Party of China and for some other parties. In these parties, he was quite unable to undermine the leadership; therefore, seeing a danger in them, he went about achieving his plans in other ways.

At first he tried to strengthen his positions, to create an atmosphere of trust — because he was allegedly the “Lenin” of today — to eliminate all doubts about himself, and in the course of this activity to prepare his loyal cadres who would support him. He saw that good propaganda work about the Soviet Union was being done in Albania and he hoped that the time would come when we too would follow

his course. But it did not turn out that way.

Although they signed the Declaration, it does not mean that they have changed their course. This is only one of their tactics. No one knows how long this will go on, but it is a dangerous tactic. We shall keep our eyes on it, we shall follow it closely. The international situations will become more complicated, despite the propaganda of Khrushchev and his followers about peaceful development. Wherever we look, we see strikes, uprisings, national liberation movements on the part of the peoples, and terror on the part of the imperialists. This refutes the view that Khrushchev has propagated so widely about the peaceful development of events.

Nothing can stop these people in their course except the great force of international communism and the strength of the parties that fight consistently for the defence of Marxism-Leninism.

We must be optimistic. The issues are becoming clearer day by day and the international situation will undoubtedly confirm our theses. But we face a protracted struggle. It should in no way be thought that they will lay down their arms. On the contrary, they will try to manoeuvre in the most brutal and sophisticated ways. The contradictions of the policy they follow toward the imperialists will emerge ever more clearly; whoever is a Marxist will understand them, because the imperialists are preparing for war, and the revisionists want to restrain them with words alone. With the policy they are pursuing they are leaving imperialism a free field of action; therefore, day by day, it is becoming a grave danger to the camp of socialism, the entire communist movement, and peace in the world.

We have had faith in the Soviet Union, because when we experienced difficulties before both she and the countries of people's democracy have helped us. But at no time have we gone to sleep basing our hopes on the aid of friends alone. Khrushchev used to say demagogically, "Why do you need weapons? We are defending you!" Fine, but

what are all these things that are happening? Why have we not met even once to talk over those problems that are so important for the fate of the socialist camp and international communism, to look into these great problems together? Why was our minister of defence appointed deputy commander of the united forces of the Warsaw Treaty? Similarly, why have his colleagues in Poland, Czechoslovakia and others been appointed? Their appointment is entirely formal because nobody invites them to talks; all the measures on behalf of the socialist camp are taken by Khrushchev and company. "You can put your trust in us," says Khrushchev, "we are well armed." But somebody might launch a surprise attack on us, and we may not have the weapons to retaliate. "We shall attack them from Siberia," says he.

But as events are developing, all of us together should be well prepared. We shall go to war together, therefore how we shall defend ourselves should be decided together. We do not seek to know the military secrets of the Soviet Union, but Khrushchev in the Kremlin continues to lay down his grand strategy for all the countries of the camp and doesn't call us even once to tell us at least: "We have these kinds of weapons and in safe places." The representatives of the Warsaw Treaty countries do not meet from time to time to check on armaments, to take joint measures, so that our armies get to know and fraternize with one another. These situations are known only to Khrushchev's friends. I am sure that the others, too, even Gomulka who is keeping quiet now, certainly have reservations about these questions, but now he sees eye to eye with Khrushchev, and, over a criticism that we made, in addition to other threats he demanded our immediate expulsion from the Warsaw Treaty.

Hence, the struggle ahead of us in the existing situation is not an easy one. On the contrary, it will be very difficult. But we should fight with determination, we should follow the situation step by step, being clear in our minds about what these people are and what they want to

STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM AND REVISIONISM

do. If they put themselves on the right road, we shall change our attitude toward them and we shall march together with them as before, but we should not allow ourselves to be lulled to sleep. After all these things which are occurring, we shall not have blind trust, because the views and actions of this man are blatantly anti-Marxist. Khrushchev is committing a great crime against the Soviet people and international communism.

We should take the threats he is making against us seriously. If they do not manage to throw us out of the Warsaw Treaty, if they do not withdraw their men from the Vlora naval base, if they do not cut off their credits, this will not be because they love us, but because their impetus was checked in Moscow, as well as because of international political circumstances. What they did to us in connection with the naval base was not only blackmail, but an entire line mapped out not by Khrushchev alone.

Why did they take a stand against us when we had not yet expressed our viewpoint? They had consulted one another, and the Bucharest Meeting was the alarm signal for them to do this. Later they called on us to march on their road, and since we did not follow them, they had already decided the stand to be adopted toward us.

If their course had not been stopped at the Moscow Meeting, they would have tried to drag us on to their anti-Marxist road, or if they failed to achieve this, to discard us, and if they were unable to expel us, to take the stand they are adopting now.

They could achieve neither the first nor the second objective, and so it came to the situation we know. Of course, they had a different plan for us, but it would not have been easy for them to achieve, because they would have been exposed in the international communist movement, especially in the eyes of the peoples of the Soviet Union. Although their plan toward our Party failed, they will never forget the courageous and correct Marxist-Leninist stand our Party has

maintained and continues to maintain, and they will cook up fresh plans in order to take revenge, if not today, then tomorrow. But we shall not give them weapons to fight us. We are not going to make mistakes, we do not violate the line, nor kowtow to anyone, we shall stand as always, vigilant on the positions of Marxism-Leninism.

The Marxist-Leninist stand we maintain, as well as the stand of some other parties, is of decisive importance for the life of the socialist countries, for peace and socialism throughout the world. One of the main causes of their retreat at the Moscow Meeting is the correct and principled stand of ours.

We think that if Khrushchev and company had not retreated, it would have been a great disaster for them and for all their minions, because their parties would not have allowed such a crime to be committed against international communism. But even if their parties had accepted this temporarily, after a time it would certainly have become clear that they are revisionists and traitors, whereas Albania and others are on the Marxist-Leninist road, fighting against revisionism and building socialism.

That is why they preferred to retreat, in order to gain new strength from the new positions they would withdraw to. For this reason we think that we shall be facing a difficult struggle of great responsibility for the defence of socialism in Albania, the general line of our Party, and the correct principles of the Moscow Declaration.

But the grave situation that has been created in the international communist movement and in our relations with the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and with the leaderships of some other parties sets before us very important tasks, which we must always carry out correctly, with Marxist-Leninist wisdom and courage, as we have done up till now.

First of all, day by day, we must consolidate the unity of the Party. This is a steel-like unity, but we should work continuously to temper

STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM AND REVISIONISM

it, since these moments are important turning points, and at these turning points there are people who waver. Therefore the Party should be close not only to its members but to each individual, close to all the masses of the people, so that the unity of the ranks of the Party and the party-people unity is tempered in a Marxist-Leninist way.

We are of the opinion that the Party should know the hostile and revisionist activities of these traitors, should see who are the individuals who want to dig the grave for our Party as well as for international communism. There are written documents about this, but we should also work by word of mouth in order to make it clear to the Party that a stern struggle must be waged against revisionism, not only theoretically but also in practice and with concrete examples. The Party members should be vigilant, should defend its line, and safeguard the interests of our people, the Party and Marxism-Leninism.

Thus, it is important that we educate the Party well, for in this way it will understand correctly the tactics we have to use in such complicated situations.

Our Party will use tactics; this is necessary, among other things, so that the Soviet people and the other peoples of the countries of people's democracy understand that we are on the Marxist-Leninist road and in friendship with them, but in opposition to those who are their enemies and enemies of Marxism-Leninism.

If the leaderships of these countries continue to act against us, they will receive the proper reply; but we shall try to maintain friendly relations with all the socialist countries, without making concessions on principles, without distorting the line, and always maintaining correct attitudes on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

We should keep in mind that we shall have contacts with Soviet people or people of the countries of people's democracy. We shall not change our attitudes, but of course the relations with them will not be as they used to be, and it is not us who have brought this about, but

they themselves. Mikoyan said to us: "Now it is not necessary to have close Party relations, but only trade relations." We said that we did not agree with such a view, but since that is what they want, that is how we must act too.

When Ivanov or Novikov came to meet us, we were the ones who gave them the information they wanted with the greatest goodwill. We did this not because we had to render account to them, but because this stand was connected with the question of the close and unreserved friendship we nurtured for the Soviet Union. Now that the situation has changed, and this only because of them, when they come again we shall receive them, we shall ask what they want, but we shall give them only what we consider it reasonable for them to know, and nothing more.

With the technicians and specialists who work in our enterprises, our relations should be warm, cordial and friendly. Of course, there may be evil people among them, but even if they are not so some will be instructed to become so. Therefore, we should be careful and vigilant, we must clearly distinguish between those who are honest and sincere toward us, and those who have been sent to carry out the hostile instructions of Khrushchev and company. We should defend our Marxist-Leninist line all the time and with anybody. We should have no hesitation at all in giving them the proper answer when they attack our Party, our leadership and our unity in an improper way. We should be on guard against provocations because there are people who commit provocations, but there are also provocations to which we should reply on the spot and deal the deserved blows at those who hatch them.

We should be careful and vigilant to orient ourselves correctly on the basis of the line of the Party at every instant. Here the capability and intelligence of the communists should show itself. It is easy to say to the other: "Get out!" or "I don't want to talk to you!," but such a

STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM AND REVISIONISM

stand would be neither politic nor Marxist. Therefore we should act with maturity and flexibility.

We should talk to the foreigners residing in Albania about the line of our Party, about our stand. We should try to explain it to them so that they may understand these things correctly, because many of them may be unclear.

The press organs in particular should be very vigilant and mature. Our press must present the line and tactics of our Party properly. This work should be done carefully by the Department for Agitation and Propaganda. It is important to steer a correct course in the press, because a mistake made by us there may be exploited by the foreign imperialist and revisionist enemies, or it may confuse the broad masses of the Party and people.

Therefore we should work carefully to guide the Party correctly through the press. Everything that is on the correct Marxist-Leninist road, in the interests of the Party, the people and socialism should be reflected there, whereas the manoeuvres of the revisionists, which may even seem fine, but which actually are harmful, should not be published in the press, and we shall render account to nobody over this.

We must consider everything deeply, we must carefully weigh both its good and its bad aspects, and choose the best, that which serves our work and our cause.

We shall certainly overcome these difficulties. Therefore, in the first place, the Party should be mobilized, it should be clear about everything and in complete unity, its political and ideological level should be enhanced, its Marxist-Leninist line should be applied consistently, and we should be totally mobilized to realize our plans.

The comrades working in the Party and State organs should keep these situations in mind and pay great attention to the work of convincing and educating the masses, to make them conscious of the need to carry out all the tasks, especially the utilization of internal resources.

ENVER HOXHA

Thus, while working to open up new land, we should not base all our hopes on tractors alone. If possible, we shall bring in tractors too, but we must strengthen our economic potential with all the possibilities we have, in order to keep up regular supplies for the people, to avoid being caught in a crisis, and we must create reserves in all fields through economical use of our resources.

With regard to this, a program of work should be worked out by all the Party and State organs. Many tasks face us in practice in relation to this question.

Our Party and people have been hardened to difficulties; therefore our plans have always been realized. So we shall overcome these new difficulties as well, better days will come for our Party and our people, because right is on our side and because we have many friends in the world—all the peoples and the true communists, to whom the cause of freedom, independence and socialism is sacred.

This is what I had to say. Now let us approve the Communiqué. Besides this, we have the 4th Congress of the Party ahead, which, as we decided, will be held in February next year. During this time, the Party should mobilize all its forces, carry out all-round political, ideological and economic work, in order to go to the Congress in steel-like Marxist-Leninist unity, with tasks realized in all fields, well prepared to discuss problems in a lofty Party spirit, and to shoulder the difficult but glorious tasks we shall be charged with.

*Albania Challenges Khrushchev
Revisionism*, New York 1976,
pp. 279-295, Eng. ed.

SLANDERS AND PRESSURE DO NOT FRIGHTEN US — WE DO NOT FALL ON OUR KNEES

*From the conversation with the delegation of the CPSU which
participated in the 4th Congress of the PLA¹*

February 20, 1961

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: We listened with much attention to your words, Comrade Pospelov. In regard to the love and loyalty of our Party and people towards the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, we have shown this in life with deeds. We desire close friendship with the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the Marxist-Leninist road. Do not think that we believe that this close friendship will be strengthened through the “holy spirit.” We know that this friendship can be realized by implementing the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism correctly and consistently. We have never wished and do not wish ill to the Soviet Union. On the contrary, we have loved the Soviet Union and still do. Let him who wants disbelieve these ardent feelings of our people and Party, we march on the

¹ After the 4th Congress of the PLA, Comrade Enver Hoxha received the delegation of the CPSU, with which he had a conversation at the premises of the Central Committee. The first to speak was P. Pospelov, candidate of the Presidium of the CC of the CPSU and head of the delegation, who said that the purpose of the request by the Soviet delegation for this meeting was “to talk about some issues which have to do with our comradely mutual relations.” After having said, “true, a great deal was said at your congress about strengthening the friendship between the Albanian people and the Soviet peoples,” but that they had information that “the role of the Soviet Union is negated in Albania,” “the Soviet specialists are not treated well,” and that “offensive things are being said about the Soviet leadership,” he committed a series of slanders against the Party of Labour of Albania and its leadership and tried to exert pressure on it.

road which Marxism-Leninism and our Party teach us.

There are people in the world who speak words of love for the Soviet Union and the Soviet peoples. A wise saying of our people goes: "When the basket is full of figs, everybody becomes a friend," whereas we Albanians love our friends both in weal and woe. If anything bad were to happen to the Soviet Union, if a difficult situation is created for it, we shall be among the first to spring to its defence and not the Gomulkas and Co. Nikita Khrushchev has told me that "Gomulka acts like a fascist," while on the other hand Mikoyan has told me that "Comrade Gomulka is an outstanding Marxist-Leninist!" Gomulka uttered all those vile slanders addressed to our Party, our delegation and myself personally who were representing our Party at the Moscow Meeting. He said that we must examine the question of Albania within the Warsaw Treaty. You, yourself, stated here that Gomulka and others like him say many things against the Party of Labour of Albania and its leadership. Information about what he is saying comes to us from many comrades of other parties, but he and everyone else should understand thoroughly that we do not live under the shadow of Gomulka. I say that the words which such people utter, making the accusation that our Party allegedly does not love the Soviet Union, have absolutely no foundation.

It is a fact that we have disagreements with the leadership of the Soviet Union at the present time. This is clear. When the occasion arose we told you our criticism frankly, just as our Party teaches us, just as Lenin has taught us. However the thing is that these criticisms were seen in a distorted way from your side, you took them badly.

At no time has it ever crossed our mind that we are "interfering in the internal affairs of the Soviet leaderships," as you said. This is absolutely untrue. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union are masters in their own house, therefore we have not interfered and do

SLANDERS AND PRESSURE DO NOT FRIGHTEN US

not interfere in the internal affairs of your party. Likewise, we do not allow the Soviet leadership to interfere in the internal affairs of our Party in any way. Every party is master in its own house.

But should these disagreements which exist between our parties be resolved? We think that they absolutely must be resolved, but only in a Marxist-Leninist way. For us there is no other way. This is in the interests of our Party and people, as well as in the interests of the Communist Party and the peoples of the Soviet Union and the whole international communist movement.

We have also held bilateral talks to resolve these disagreements. The last meeting is that held between the representatives of our two parties in Moscow.¹ Mikoyan, Kozlov and Andropov were at this meeting from your side.

The instructions which the Central Committee of our Party has given us are that we should march ahead, on the Marxist-Leninist road. For us there is no other road. You may have your opinion, but we have our opinion, too. Our opinion is that the disagreements which have arisen between our two parties cannot be resolved within one day. It would be deceiving ourselves to think that they can be settled within one day. Therefore we must put our common will to it and resolve the disagreements gradually, in the correct Marxist-Leninist way, in complete equality. This is the way in which they must be overcome.

However, Mikoyan and Kozlov received the comrades of the delegation of the PLA insolently, indeed they went as far as to say to our

¹ This refers to the joint talks which were held in Moscow on November 20, 1960, after Comrade Enver Hoxha's speech at the Meeting of the representatives of the 81 communist and workers' parties. These joint talks were held between the delegation of the PLA, led by Comrade Hysni Kapo, and the delegation of the CPSU. The meeting was held at the request of the Soviet leadership.

ENVER HOXHA

comrades, “You will see what difficulties will occur in your party and among your people with this change you are making in your relations with the Soviet Union!” It seems to us that the attitude of the Soviet leaders towards our hand of friendship was wrong and judgement of the issues on their part was, likewise, very wrong. They should have known our Party and people, the line and the feelings of our people and Party. The relations between our two countries cannot be treated in the way they treated them.

Let us take the economic aid. In the opinion of Kozlov and Mikoyan the whole problem rested on this. This was apparent especially in the attitude maintained towards our economic delegation that went to the Soviet Union. This delegation was kept hanging about in Moscow for whole months. Our people go to Moscow, wander round and round and are unable to conclude anything with you, because of the attitude you maintain towards them. Do you think we do not understand your contemptuous attitude? When the Yugoslavs come, you conclude the talks within ten days! Likewise, the War Minister of Indonesia went to Moscow, and you immediately gave him large credits for armaments, while little Albania, which is looking down the wolf’s mouth, with which you have signed agreements, and which is led by a Marxist party, is neglected.

The Soviet Government also puts in doubt the aid in credits the Soviet Union has granted us for the 3rd Five-year Plan, on which official acts have been signed. Things have reached such a point that the Soviet Government, through an official note, has sought to compel our Party and Government to send a top-level delegation to Moscow to “reconsider” these agreements. Naturally, to our Party and Government, such an attitude on your part is unacceptable, unfriendly, and not right at all.

We have set out all the reasons why we refused to hold this meeting in a very comradely letter to the Central Committee of the

SLANDERS AND PRESSURE DO NOT FRIGHTEN US

Communist Party of the Soviet Union. But it must be pointed out that, immediately after the Bucharest Meeting, the letters which our Central Committee has sent to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union have all remained unanswered. This is neither fair, friendly, nor correct. You said that you have answered our letters, but we say to you: Have a look because perhaps they are tucked away in the drawers of your offices, for we have received no reply whatever. Even the simplest rules of relations between parties require that a letter must be answered by letter¹ but, I repeat, we have received no reply from you.

No answer is being given from your side, likewise, to the letters of our Government about many other problems, particularly about problems of the army, which are linked with the defence of our country and the training of the army, based, of course, on the agreements we have with the Soviet Government. We think that on all these issues, the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government should have replied, either positively or negatively, to our Central Committee and Government. We need one another's assistance and this assistance must have a thoroughly internationalist content.

There are rumours that we Albanians are allegedly not satisfied with the aid the Soviet Union has given us! We have said and continue to say that the Soviet Union has given our people aid. We have never concealed and shall never conceal from our people the assistance the Soviet Union has provided and continues to provide for us. I want to point out also that we consider valuable and very necessary the aid the Soviet Union has granted us for the 3rd Five-year Plan, for the further development of the economy of our country. We need help in the

¹ The Soviet revisionist leadership avoided answering the CC of our Party by letter because it did not want its official replies to remain in the archives of our Party.

future, too, but we do not beg this help. We seek help from anyone only on a Marxist course. I told Nikita Khrushchev to his face that we do not violate principles, that we are even prepared to tighten our belts, but we must live like Marxists. If the Soviet leadership does not want to grant us aid, we cannot force it to do so.

The aid of the Soviet Union to our country is important not only from the economic aspect, but also from the political aspect. We want the Soviet leadership to avoid making such a mistake to the detriment of Albania, it should reconsider this matter. Therefore we ask you once again to transmit our views to Nikita Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders. It is not right that you make it a condition that we must eliminate the political and ideological disagreements first, and then you will provide aid for us. We have jointly signed the agreement on credits, not just in principle, but we have even detailed it for all the objects. On this basis the Soviet specialists came here, the designs were drawn up, etc. While now you are asking us to go to the Soviet Union to reconsider the agreements once more! Why?

At the Moscow Meeting you used the tactic, in contacts, indeed, even in the corridors, of convincing various delegations that the Albanian leaders do not want to talk with you. Now, too, you are continuing this tactic, but this does not hold water. There is no need to repeat ourselves, we have told you clearly why we do not come to you. Tell Nikita Khrushchev that our stand remains the same.

Tell Nikita Khrushchev, also, that we are not opposed to top level meetings on any question whatever, with the approval of both sides. But the Soviet Government demands that a high-level delegation of our Party and Government should go to Moscow to "reconsider" the question of credits. The question arises: what credits? These credits have been accorded us under a protocol signed for both sides by top level leaders. For this purpose our Central Committee and our Government sent me to Moscow. Later the credits were detailed, it is

SLANDERS AND PRESSURE DO NOT FRIGHTEN US

stated there how they will be used, the times at which they will be accorded, as well as the projects to be built. Thus, for us, the problem of credits is considered settled. We have a note of the Soviet Government in writing and there can be no quibble here about what it says. Then why should we go to Moscow? Should we have gone to Moscow before the Congress of the Party just about the credit of 70 million rubles, of which you have notified us officially? This was not reasonable. We informed you officially about this, too. We had no agreement about this, therefore we appointed a deputy prime minister for talks, while from your side the Minister of Foreign Trade, Patolichev, was appointed. As you told us prior to the Moscow Meeting, he was to come to Albania for talks, but he did not come. Then we assigned a deputy prime minister to go to Moscow on these matters, but even today you have not replied to us as yet. We would like to know why have you not given us an answer?

You say many things against us because you base yourselves on the sayings of this one and the other. But if we, too, were to act in this way, then we could bring out whole books. But for the sake of the friendship between our peoples, the gossip to be heard high and low must be checked up carefully and in a friendly spirit, both by us, as well as by your side. What have many Soviet people said about our leadership and about me? What have they not said! Many of these people have highly responsible positions in your country, too. The criticism our Party makes of the Soviet leadership is thoroughly principled. Enver Hoxha and other Albanian leaders never abuse the Soviet Union. Pointing out mistakes and faults of some Soviet leaders does not mean that we are speaking against the Soviet Union. I say this here, we have proved it in practice and we shall prove it whenever it may be necessary. We say without reservation that the Albanians are close and loyal friends of the Soviet Union and for the sake of this friendship we must settle everything in the Marxist-Leninist way, not

in any other way. If there are comrades in the Soviet leadership who continue to speak ill of, to slander our leadership or our Party, they are making a grave mistake.

You say that you have the course set for you by the Moscow Declaration and the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. We, too, base ourselves on the Declaration of the Moscow Meeting of last year, indeed, we implement it consistently, but as far as the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is concerned, we stated frankly at the Moscow Meeting on which matters we are not in agreement. But, instead of accepting the comradely criticism we make of you, you make the accusation that we are ruining the friendship with the Soviet Union! It is unnecessary to say what a great and sincere friendship we have had with the Soviet people. It is the Soviet cadres and leaders who have dynamited the friendship that existed between us. We stated also at the Moscow Meeting that it was the former ambassador of the USSR to Albania, V.I. Ivanov, in the first place, who ruined the situation. It was he who upset things. Let this be known also to the newly appointed ambassador, Josif Shikin, who has the possibility to exert all his efforts so that together we can improve the abnormal situation that has been created between our two countries. For our part we shall do everything possible in this direction. We want to believe that the comrade ambassador, too, will act in this way, because for him, too, it is not only a duty, but also an urgent need, that our relations should constantly improve and the disagreements be gradually eliminated in a Marxist-Leninist way.

Now let us come to some other issues you raised. For our part we do not accept your accusations concerning the Soviet specialists in our country. You are “surprised” because we “checked up on the drawers of the geologists’ desks.” I shall explain to you how things stand in this matter which you have also made the subject of a government note. Our people, who exercised control over the preservation of

SLANDERS AND PRESSURE DO NOT FRIGHTEN US

secrecy, did not do this in a demonstrative way. nor with the purpose of humiliating the Soviet specialists. In our state there is a rule established by the Party, according to which controls must be carried out from time to time. You, too, certainly have such a rule, indeed, we have taken this experience from you. The aim is that the state and party secrets must be protected. We carry out such check-up two or three times a year over all the state and party apparatus. This was a normal control of this type. You know that our people are not angels, but yours are not angels, either. However, it has been observed that there are some among our people, as well as among yours, who leave documents on desks, indeed, there have been Soviet comrades who have even hung documents on walls. We are living in encirclement. We have sworn enemies all round us, the Yugoslav revisionists, the Greek monarcho-fascists, the Italian neo-fascists. We have information that the espionage agents of imperialist states have been activated in Albania. Therefore our Party and state take the strictest care that secrets are protected. From this check-up carried out in the oil enterprises, a report was sent to the Central Committee, by which it was informed that the comrade in charge of the Soviet oil specialists had been notified in advance about this check-up, he had been told the purpose for which it was being carried out and had agreed. If you like, we can give you his name.

We have not made an issue of these things but I can tell you something else which has a very much graver character. The Soviet personnel have a plan of work. However, one Soviet geologist, instead of working on the basis of the plan set by the government, was drawing maps of a scale other than those required of him, and when our comrades and his Soviet comrades asked him about this, he replied: "I am working on this map for a Soviet academician!" What are these things? Some specialists have complained to the comrade ambassador about the check up we carried out, but have they told him the fact that one

of the Soviet geologists has declared to our people, “you are trying in vain to keep these documents secret, for they have them both in Leningrad and in Belgrade!”? How does he know that these documents are also in Belgrade, and how have these secrets reached there? Therefore we shall reply to your note on this question officially.

One day, a Soviet army officer, who is working at our base in Vlora called together our officers and told them that “the statement which Enver Hoxha made about the plot against Albania¹ is a bluff!” We want to take the opportunity to tell you that this plot is not a bluff, but an exceptionally dangerous thing. Albanian and world opinion will learn about the aims and dangers of this plot. The rulers of Greece and Yugoslavia, together with their agents in Albania, civilian and military, and in collaboration with the U.S. 6th Fleet, organized this plot to attack Albania. But our organs uncovered it and all the plotters are in the hands of our organs of justice and will render account. Now the trial is coming to an end and when this affair is over, we shall, without fail, inform the Soviet Ambassador, J.V. Shikin, about it in detail.

As to the question of the naval base in Vlora, I can tell you that for our part there is no problem whatever there now. Indeed, even before there has not been any problem from our side. We wish that it will be like this from your side, too. We fully agree that our comrades of the Ministry of Defence and General Andreyev² should talk about this matter. You ask that these talks be held in my presence. I am

¹ This refers to the counter-revolutionary plot which was being prepared by a secret anti-state organization at the head of which were veteran agents of the Intelligence Service. Their plan was combined also with an armed intervention on the part of the Yugoslav revisionists, the Greek monarcho-fascists and the U.S. 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean. As was proved, the Soviet revisionist leadership also had knowledge of this plot, which it had reckoned to exploit for its own purposes.

² At that time representative of the United Command of the armed forces of the Warsaw Treaty, in Albania.

SLANDERS AND PRESSURE DO NOT FRIGHTEN US

willing to listen not only to a general like Andreyev, Hero of the USSR, but even to a rank-and-file Soviet sailor, for we consider the Soviet people our brothers, friends and comrades, but I think that my presence is not absolutely necessary. We want harmony with and love for the Soviet men to reign at the naval base, because this base is needed for the interests of our entire socialist camp, and not just for us. We told Nikita Khrushchev this, too.

But I can also say something about the question of the base. You are not in order there with the plan of construction work, armament and the handing over of objects. All the plans and decisions that have been taken for the construction work at the base and for the supply of materials have been suspended by your side. It seems to us that such a question should be reconsidered as quickly as possible on the part of the Soviet Government.

The issue raised here by Comrade Pospelov, that one of our people has allegedly spoken to the representatives of the Communist Party of Cuba and the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia against the Soviet leadership, is not true. However, we shall inquire into it. How is such a thing possible when we have been and are in complete agreement with what Nikita Khrushchev said, that if Cuba is attacked, the Soviet Union will launch missiles against the aggressor to defend Cuba? Therefore we think that this is a slander. Why do I say this? I say this because Barak¹ has come to the 4th Congress of the PLA with very bad aims and he behaves with contempt towards our Party and our people. Since he is visiting us, he is our guest and we respect him according to our traditions. You, Comrade Andropov, may tell him these things, because we shall not tell them him here, but when some

¹ Rudolf Barak, ex-member of the Political Bureau of the CC of the CP of Czechoslovakia, first deputy to the chairman of the Council of Ministers and Minister of Internal Affairs of the Socialist Republic of Czechoslovakia, had come to the 4th Congress of the PLA with hostile intentions.

meeting of international communism is held, I shall not fail to tell him. Barak should understand clearly that we are not afraid of him.

We observe that Barak is treating the members of the Political Bureau of our Party with contempt. We had thought that, as the representative of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, he should greet our Congress after the representatives of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China. But, when a comrade of ours begged him to say when his speech of greeting would be ready, not only did Barak not deign to tell him, but he asked him scornfully: "And who might you be?" Our comrade, towards whom Barak behaved in this way, displayed his modesty and said nothing for he was his guest, but when Barak asked him: "And who might you be?," although he knew who he was, he could have replied that "I have 15 decorations on my chest which I won in the war against fascism, and I have wounds on my body," and then could have asked him: "But you, who are you?" However, our comrade did not do this because he had him as a guest in his home and he respected the customs of our people.

Thus, towards these gestures of Barak, our comrades have maintained the greatest composure. Barak kissed the delegate of the Communist Party of Greece when our Party rightfully described him as he was. Whom did the delegate of the Communist Party of Greece call provocateurs — the most glorious generals of our Army, to whom our Party gave the order to defend the southern borders of Albania against the Greek monarcho-fascists and Van Fleet, who had hurled themselves like wild beasts against the Greek partisans! And the representative of the Communist Party of Greece comes to the Congress of our Party not as a friend, but to say that he does not agree with Enver Hoxha concerning the question of Venizelos, this enemy of Albania, who has been and is for the partitioning of our Homeland. It is not

SLANDERS AND PRESSURE DO NOT FRIGHTEN US

for nothing that we say these things; we know only too well who are the Greek monarcho-fascists whom we have for neighbours. Therefore Barak should not be hasty because he was still in his swaddling clothes when we knew them. The father of Sophocles Venizelos, Eleutherios Venizelos, put Southern Albania to the torch, while the representative of the Communist Party of Greece comes to our Congress and defends them. Then, what is this stand, is it not a provocation?

The Central Committee of our Party told your ambassador in Tirana: If you are loyal to your homeland and your party, you must report to them correctly even some thing unpleasant. You must hide nothing from the party and the government, otherwise you have followed a policy destructive to your party and homeland. We considered Ivanov a close friend, but he did not deserve our trust.

We want the disagreements between our parties and countries to be resolved in time and in a Marxist-Leninist way. We shall struggle to the limit of our possibilities to strengthen our unity. We shall never give either occasion or cause for this unity to be damaged, but will work to make it stronger day by day. We shall defend our views on the basis of the Moscow Declaration, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, regardless of whether others may think that we are allegedly ignorant of Marxism-Leninism. That is what the Italian comrades, for example, think. When Nikita Khrushchev was in Albania, he said, making allusions against Tito, that it was not true that the Albanian comrades did not know Marxism, indeed even children were Marxists in Albania. Whereas the Italians have told us: "Read Marx and Lenin!" We tell them that not only do we read our glorious teachers, but we work and fight on the basis of their teachings.

But we are not making an issue of these things. We can play politics, too, but we do not indulge in diplomacy with the Soviet comrades. Whatever we have to say we say it openly. Bear this in mind, comrade ambassador, between us we shall not use diplomacy, but we

ENVER HOXHA

shall speak frankly and in a comradely manner.

I shall tell you one thing. Owing to your stand we shall be compelled to reduce our food rations and the firing practice programs in our Army, but we shall not surrender. You saw what the Congress was like and if we take this measure which is imposed on us by you, our soldiers and officers will ask why has this measure been taken. Then, what must we do — not speak? No, we shall not shut our mouths. We shall tell our men and women that the Soviet leading comrades want to force our Party and Government to their knees, that the Soviet leadership is breaching the signed agreements, acting in a unilateral manner, and refuses to help us, and we shall issue the call: tighten your belts, stand vigilant in defence of the Homeland and the socialist camp, endure it! Our Party and people have a very high level of understanding of these things.

You are gravely mistaken when you say that we deny the role of the Soviet Union. We never have denied and do not deny the role of the Soviet Union and the blood shed by the Soviet Army for the liberation of the countries occupied by the German nazis, including Albania, irrespective of the fact that the Red Army did not come to our country. You know who denies the role of the Soviet Union. We entirely disagree with Barak and his ilk who say that the state power in Czechoslovakia was seized without bloodshed, whereas in reality, the sons of the Soviet people shed rivers of blood for the liberation of Czechoslovakia. Hence, we are in total disagreement with this view of Barak which was expressed in our Congress. If it were not for the Red Army, which was commanded by J.V. Stalin, Czechoslovakia today would not have Karlovy Vary where we chanced to spend our summer holidays.

Who armed the Czechoslovak workers who came out in boulevards in 1948 and took action against the coup d'état, which was being prepared? It pains us deeply when the role of the Soviet Army

SLANDERS AND PRESSURE DO NOT FRIGHTEN US

which saved the peoples is denied and we say this openly. We have said this directly to Nikita Khrushchev and Mikoyan.

There are political and ideological disagreements between us, but we do not interfere in your internal affairs and we likewise allow neither Khrushchev nor anybody else to interfere in our internal affairs. Do not try to split our leadership, as your former ambassador, the representative of the government and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in Albania, has done.

Y. ANDROPOV: At this meeting we are not on equal terms with you. Here you are the leaders of your Party, while we are only a party delegation, thus, people without authority. I say this because Comrade Enver Hoxha spoke to us about a number of questions ranging wider than we had intended. However, we shall report these matters to our leadership.

COMRADE HYSNI KAPO: Do not forget to tell Khrushchev what your men have said about Comrade Enver Hoxha. What friendship are you talking about, when you subject the delegation of our Party to espionage processing, when you have put all sorts of bugging devices in our embassy in Moscow? You should be the first to show us that you want to strengthen our friendship, but when you commit such unfriendly acts, when you reduce economic aid to our country, when you suspend supplies of armaments to our army, how can you expect an approach from our side? How do you consider these actions? Why is it that you have not sent many goods, items of machinery, armaments, etc., which should have arrived in Albania 6 months ago? In our economic or military agreements there are time schedules fixed for the deliveries. Then why have these agreements been violated by your side?

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: If the Soviet leadership understands us correctly and nurtures for our people and our Party that great sincere love which the entire Soviet people and the Communist

ENVER HOXHA

Party of the Soviet Union have, any disagreement between us will be put right. We made the other issues clear at the Moscow Meeting. There we stated things as they are. You say that we blackened Khrushchev at that meeting. I say that I criticized him for his mistakes and faults, whereas you interpreted our criticism wrongly, as though I was slinging mud at the Soviet Union. We say to you: read my Moscow speech once more with greater care.

I believe we have finished. Please transmit our greetings, as well as our views, just as we stated them here, openly and sincerely, to all the comrades of your leadership.

Selected Works, vol. 3, Tirana
1980, pp. 284-300, Eng. ed.

FLAGRANT TROTSKYITE VIOLATION OF EVERY NORM OF MARXISM AND EQUALITY

August 4, 1961

Ramiz returned from Moscow and reported on the meeting of representatives of communist and workers' parties of the member countries of the Warsaw Treaty on the question of the Peace Treaty with Germany. They expelled him from the meeting in the vilest way.¹ They did not give him the floor, did not allow him to speak. The bandit Khrushchev, in a scandalous way, prevented him from speaking, although there was a sharp debate on this between Ramiz and Khrushchev.² Ulbricht proposed our expulsion from the meeting and the sending of a hostile letter to the Central Committee of our Party, a thing which was approved by all the others, with the exception of the Chinese ambassador who did not speak on the first day, because

¹ The delegation of the PLA to this meeting, which was held on August 3-5, 1961 in Moscow, was headed by Comrade Ramiz Alia, at that time member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the CC of the PLA. As they had done at the previous meetings, the Soviet revisionist leaders and their supporters made this base provocation with the aim of humiliating the PLA and denying its incontestable right to have its say about such an important problem as the German problem.

² Even though Khrushchev interrupted him at every word, Comrade Ramiz Alia condemned this action as a hostile anti-Marxist action and stressed that the PLA has never been and is not afraid of anyone... it has been and is determined that the question of the peace treaty with Germany should be concluded as soon as possible. As Comrade Enver Hoxha points out, "...this meeting, like the meetings of Bucharest and Moscow, held in 1960, will be remembered in the history of the international communist and workers' movement, in the history of the socialist camp, not only for the anti-Marxist and revisionist stands of Khrushchev and company, but also for the resolute, principled, Marxist-Leninist stand maintained by a small party, the Party of Labour of Albania..." (Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 21, Alb. ed., Tirana 1976, p. 422).

ENVER HOXHA

he was not given the floor, and neither were the Korean, the Vietnamese or the Mongolian, who were there as observers.

Khrushchev and his supporters are bandits. They trample on every norm of Marxism, every norm of equality. They are fascists in the full sense of the word, but they will suffer the consequences. We shall mercilessly expose these renegades disguised as communists. They are multiplying their mistakes every day and, thus, confirming our correct theses. Through these actions, in practice, they have excluded us from the Warsaw Treaty and the meetings of parties of the countries of the Warsaw Treaty. They have not done this legally and openly as yet, because they are afraid. But they may do it and then they must expect our public attack. They even published a falsified communiqué which we are not publishing¹, but we shall publish the speech which Ramiz was to deliver at the meeting and which we sent to the revisionist plotters in Moscow through diplomatic channels.

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, pp. 54-55, Eng. ed.

¹ The communiqué stated shamelessly and falsely that the meeting was attended by all the first secretaries of the central committees of the communist and workers' parties of the Warsaw Treaty. In view of the fact that this assertion did not respond to the truth, the CC of the PLA decided not to publish this communiqué.

THE POLITICAL BUREAU APPROVES THE STATEMENT AGAINST THE MODERN REVISIONISTS' ATTACKS

October 20, 1961

Today we held the meeting of the Political Bureau. In my contribution¹ I pointed out that, after the open attacks by the Soviet revisionists on our Party and country at their 22nd Congress, for our Party the stage of maintaining our reserve is over and we must reply to their attacks. I proposed that a statement should be made in the name of the Central Committee of the Party and that we publish it in the press.

After expressing their opinions in the discussion, all the comrades unanimously approved the text of the draft-statement.²

At the 22nd Congress of the Soviet revisionists the delegates of foreign parties are continuing their attacks on our Party. The Khrushchevite plot is concocted. The Trotskyites will be unmasked.

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, p. 56, Eng. ed.

¹ Published in: Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 22, Alb. ed., Tirana 1976, p. 55.

² Published in: *Principal Documents of the PLA*, vol. 4, Alb. ed., Tirana 1970, p. 153.

TWENTY YEARS OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA

Speech Delivered at the Tirana Festive Meeting Commemorating the 20th Anniversary of the Founding of the Party of Labour of Albania and the 44th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution

November 7, 1961

The Party of Labour of Albania recognizes and understands the deep changes that have taken place in the world, the new conditions and phenomena that have arisen. But we reject all and every attempt being made by the present-day revisionists who, under the slogans of the “creative interpretation of Marxism in the new conditions,” are spreading their false and opportunistic viewpoints; they are seeking to sell them as a further development of Marxism, and they hasten to stigmatize as dogmatist, sectarian and adventurist anyone who goes on record against such viewpoints. These are known tactics. There is nothing new, nothing original in this. All the revisionists and opportunists, beginning with Bernstein and ending with Tito, under the guise of the “changes in the situation” and of the “new phenomena,” have denied the basic principles of Marxism. As V.I. Lenin used to say, by always masking themselves under the slogan of the fight against dogmatism, using “the catch-word: dogmatist,” they have risen against Marxism.

From the changes that have occurred in the world, there must be drawn correct, revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist conclusions: there must be drawn such conclusions as not to create reformist and pacifist illusions and weaken the struggle against imperialism, but to strengthen ever more this just struggle: there must be drawn such conclusions as not to alienate the peoples from the cause of revolution, but bring them ever closer to it, not divert them from the struggle for

their national liberation, but raise this struggle to an ever higher level.

Let us take the problem of war and peace. Does it mean that the change in the balance of power to the advantage of socialism has brought about also a change in the nature of imperialism, that imperialism has been tied up hands and feet, that it is unable to do anything, to unleash wars and undertake various aggressive actions? Such a conclusion is not only erroneous, but also very harmful. The underestimation of the forces of the enemy and the overestimation of our own forces weakens our vigilance and pushes us into dangerous adventures, just as the underestimation of our own forces and the overestimation of the forces of the enemy leads to unprincipled concessions, to mistakes and opportunist attitudes. Proceeding from the real balance of forces in the world today, our Party has pointed out and continues to point out that in the question of war and peace both eventualities must be considered and we must be prepared for both, for war being prevented, as well as for it being unleashed on the part of the imperialists. Our deep conviction that at the present time a world war and other aggressive wars which imperialism unleashes can be prevented is by no means based on the "good intentions" of the leaders of imperialism, but on the tremendous economic, political and military power of the mighty socialist camp, on the unity and struggle of the international working class, on the resolute efforts of the peoples of the whole world against the imperialist warmongers, on the unity and compactness of all the peace-loving forces.

During all the years of the existence of the people's power, the Government of the People's Republic of Albania has resolutely and consistently pursued a foreign policy which has fully met the interests of our people and country, the interests of freedom and national independence, as well as the interests of the whole camp of socialism and of the cause of peace and progress of human society. The foundation of the foreign policy of the Party of Labour of Albania has always

ENVER HOXHA

been and remains to be: constant strengthening of the relations of friendship, fraternal cooperation and mutual support and assistance with the countries of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union; support for the national-liberation, anti-imperialist and anti-colonial struggle of the oppressed peoples and nations, as well as for the revolutionary struggle of the working people in the capitalist countries; efforts to secure relations of peaceful coexistence of the People's Republic of Albania with the capitalist countries especially with the neighbouring countries; efforts for the preservation and consolidation of peace in the world and in the Balkan and Adriatic area; exposure of the policy of war and aggression pursued by the imperialist powers headed by the United States of America and their partners and tools round our country, such as the Italian imperialists, the Greek monarcho-fascists and the Yugoslav revisionists.

In the foreign policy our Party and Government have always marched hand in hand with the other socialist countries in their efforts for the preservation and strengthening of the world peace. They have always approved and energetically supported the general line of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and all the other socialist countries for the settlement of the most important international problems. And this foreign policy of the People's Republic of Albania has always met with the full approval of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries which have always considered it as a correct policy to the advantage of our common cause.

But of late, N. Khrushchev and company turned their coat and are accusing us at times of being "adventurists and warmongers" and at times of a "rapprochement" with imperialism. Those who are accusing us, besides slanders and inventions, have no argument, not a single fact to prove that the foreign policy of the People's Republic of Albania has changed. Nothing has changed in our foreign policy. Our attitude also has not changed either in regards the questions of war

and peace, or in regards our relations with the other States, and especially with the neighbouring States, or in regards the struggle against imperialism and for the exposure of the Yugoslav revisionists.

Twenty years of life and revolutionary struggle of the Party of Labour of Albania reject all these base slanders and inventions which have caused a profound indignation to and have irritated our people who have heroically fought and continue to fight against imperialism and its henchmen. Those who accuse and slander the Party of Labour of Albania and its leadership are unable to adduce even a single fact that could prove their allegations, while we are in a position to present many documented facts clearly showing their estrangement from the positions of Marxism-Leninism and of the struggle against imperialism. We have never cherished illusions about our enemies, we have not embraced and kissed them, we have not flattered them and we have not caressed them, we have never bowed to them. Our Party and Government have always maintained a firm, principled, Marxist-Leninist stand towards the enemies of peace and socialism; they have sharply and constantly exposed the imperialists, whether U.S. or British, French or Italian, and their policy of war and aggression; they have been irreconcilable with and have energetically and unreservedly supported the just cause of the peoples who have risen in struggle against imperialism. They have rendered all their support to the fraternal Algerian, Cuban, Congolese, Laotian and other peoples in their sacred struggle against imperialism, resolutely condemning all the aggressive attempts of imperialism.

For all this “good” which our Party has done to imperialism during these 20 years, it has been rewarded by it and its tools with a fierce and relentless fight which they have carried out against the People’s Republic of Albania through continuous plot and provocations, through diversion, blackmail and successive slanders.

They accuse us of being afraid of imperialism, of being afraid to

assume responsibility for the settlement of important international questions. By this they mean the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and the settlement of the West Berlin problem. The Party of Labour of Albania and the Government of the People's Republic of Albania have not feared and never fear imperialism; they have not feared and never fear their responsibility as a socialist country and as a member of the Warsaw Treaty and they have honourably and strictly fulfilled their internationalist tasks. The attitude of the Party of Labour of Albania and the Government of the People's Republic of Albania towards the German issue is known to the whole world, it is contained in many publicly known documents. The Party of Labour of Albania and the Government of the People's Republic of Albania have always supported and continue to resolutely support the efforts of the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic for a peaceful settlement of the German problem. The viewpoint of our Party and Government has been and remains that the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and the solution on this basis also of the West Berlin problem are indispensable measures, long since ripe and in the interests of the People's Republic of Albania, of the German Democratic Republic, of the other socialist countries, in the interests of peace and security in Europe. We have stood and stand for the earliest possible settlement of these problems because any procrastination is only to the advantage of our enemies. The declaration of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania concerning the German question publicly stated that "in any situation and at any dangerous moment we shall fight to the end alongside with the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries, irrespective of any sacrifice on every occasion and as always we shall solidarize with them to the end and honourably discharge our duty." Such has been, is and will remain the stand of our Party and our Government.

Then the question arises: Who fears indeed, who is afraid of the

responsibility for the settlement of the German issue, who is dragging it on? We that have stood and continue to stand for its earliest possible solution or our accusers who have backed out on this question and have dragged it out from year to year?

Or let us take the disarmament problem. It is a matter of common knowledge that our Government has supported the Soviet Union's proposal for a total and complete disarmament because as long as the arms exist and the armament race is being conducted, as long as a total and complete disarmament is not effected, there is no security for peace. The Soviet Government, jointly with our Government, have forwarded the proposal to convert the Adriatic and the Balkans into a peace area, without bases for atomic weapons and rockets. But the proposals of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries for a total and complete disarmament and for the creation of peace areas have been rejected by the imperialist powers. In such conditions our Government has supported and fully supports the Soviet Government's decision on the resumption of the nuclear weapon tests as a very important and indispensable measure for the security of the Soviet Union and the whole socialist camp, for bridling the imperialist powers headed by the United States of America and the Bonn revanchists, who have intensified to the maximum the frenzied armaments race and the feverish preparations for a new world war. We are aware that disarmament is a difficult problem. To force its solution upon the imperialists, great efforts must be made as well as resolute struggle must be waged by the socialist countries and all the peace-loving forces. But N. Khrushchev, instead of pursuing such a correct path, is seeking to disarm a socialist country such as the People's Republic of Albania, which is encircled on all parts by enemies. By weakening the defensive might of the People's Republic of Albania, he damages not only the interests of our country, but also those of the entire camp of socialism. And all this is done at a time when the U.S. 6th fleet is

roaming about like a monster in the Mediterranean, when U.S. rocket bases have been established in Greece and Italy, when the NATO forces are feverishly continuing their armaments race, when the imperialists and revanchists of West Germany are sabre-rattling and seriously endangering world peace. The Albanian Government was not guilty of and bore no responsibility for this. But, at any case N. Khrushchev should by no means go to such lengths as to openly incite the imperialists and various reactionaries against a socialist country such as the People's Republic of Albania. However, the defence of the Albanian borders is fully ensured.

In conditions when there exist in the world states with different social systems, the only just principle to govern the relations between them is the principle of peaceful coexistence, a principle outlined by Lenin and implemented also by Stalin. Our Party of Labour has always thought and thinks that the policy of peaceful coexistence meets the vital interests of all the peoples, both of the socialist and capitalist countries; it meets the aim of the further strengthening of the positions of socialism and universal peace. Therefore, this principle underlies the relations of our socialist state with the other non-socialist states.

It is absurd to accuse our Party and socialist State of allegedly standing against peaceful coexistence. This slander is refuted by the entire practical activity of our State in the field of foreign policy. We are not opposed to the principle of peaceful coexistence, but we do not agree with some opportunist viewpoints of N. Khrushchev and his followers who consider the peaceful coexistence as the general line of foreign policy of the socialist countries, as the main road to the victory of socialism on a world scale, who for the sake of peaceful coexistence renounce the struggle for the exposure of imperialism, who negate almost completely the ideological and political struggle against Yugoslav revisionism under the pretext that in some foreign policy

issues Yugoslavia supports the Soviet proposals. Such an interpretation of peaceful coexistence is erroneous and anti-Marxist because it leads to the denial of the class struggle. The correct implementation of the policy of peaceful coexistence, implying also the exposure of imperialism and its policy of war and aggression, must promote the development of the struggle of the working class of the capitalist countries, as well as the national-liberation movement in the colonial and dependent countries. On their part, the successes of the revolutionary class and national-liberation struggle, by narrowing and weakening the positions of imperialism, promote the cause of peace and peaceful coexistence. The communist parties in the capitalist countries, parallel with the struggle to force the policy of peaceful coexistence on the bourgeois governments of their countries, are waging at the same time the class struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeois power, for the transition to socialism according to the specific conditions of every country.

As regards the forms of transition to socialism, N. Khrushchev badly complicated this question, too, at the 20th Congress and later. He almost raised to absolute the peaceful way of the seizure of power by the working class, and thus the illusion was created that allegedly the working class and its communist party would be able to take power in their hands only by securing a parliamentary majority. Such theses were approved only by the revisionists and various opportunists who used them to justify their anti-Marxist viewpoints. We, the Albanian communists, have never been and are not a priori opposed to the peaceful way. But the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, the historical experience and the reality of the present days teach us that, to secure the victory of the cause of socialism, the working class and its party must prepare themselves simultaneously for both eventualities — the peaceful way and the non-peaceful one. To take one's bearings only from one of these eventualities means to embark on an erroneous

path. Only by getting well prepared, especially for the non-peaceful way, the chances grow also for the peaceful way.

This is how we understand the peaceful coexistence and its connection with the class struggle. This is how we understand and implement the policy of peaceful coexistence with the other non-socialist states, and in the first place with our neighbours.

It is strange that Nikita Khrushchev and his followers demand from us that we should put into effect the peaceful coexistence with our Greek neighbours. They accuse us of not marching along the same road with them as regards the proposals for the disarmament of the Balkan countries, they accuse us of not making efforts "for a Balkan understanding"; they join the chorus of Tito and Karamanlis that we are allegedly the "warmongers of the Balkans" at a time when Greece continues to consider herself in a "state of war" with Albania, when she advances territorial claims towards our country and is plotting to attack Albania, when monarcho-fascist Greece has become a fortress armed to the teeth by the American imperialists against our socialist countries. The charges of our critics are groundless, for no reasonable man can think that little Albania, encircled as she is by wolves which for 17 years in succession have sought to swallow her alive, does not stand for peace and disarmament.

How much monarcho-fascist Greece disarmed and to what extent the hopes of those believing in such a thing were realized, this is a matter of common knowledge, it is shown by life, but that we should avoid criticizing Nikita Khrushchev (and this criticism was made by us in a comradely way) when he gives hopes to Sophocles Venizelos for an "autonomy of South Albania," this would be a treason on our part. Nikita Khrushchev did not like our just criticism. This is the least evil. But he turned our criticism into a counter-charge, accusing us of allegedly slandering the Soviet Union, which has liberated us and is defending us. This, of course, is machiavellian. But later the

devil showed again his horns. At the time when the Americans, Greeks and Turks were carrying out their large-scale military manoeuvres around the borders of Albania and Bulgaria, N. Khrushchev, in his statement to the “New York Times” reporter, Sultzberger, on September 10th, 1961, textually said: “You (Americans) have established bases also in Greece and you are threatening from there our ally Bulgaria.” Has not perhaps monarcho-fascist Greece installed rockets also against Albania? How long is it that Nikita Khrushchev has decided that Albania should be no more an ally of the Soviet Union? This is monstrous. Are these unimportant questions? Is it permissible to the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, even if he and socialist Albania were at daggers drawn, to openly tell the Greek reaction that socialist Albania is no more an ally of the Soviet Union and inform president Kennedy that “the relations between the Soviet Union and Albania have deteriorated”?

It is we, therefore, according to some, that view things as “sectarian nationalists,” while others, who speculate on the interests of our people, are Marxists. Tomorrow, these same criticizers may hold us responsible also for the losses in election of the Greek progressive party — EDA. Do perhaps these self-styled Marxists think that we should hand the keys of our country to the Greek monarcho-fascists so that “their line of peaceful coexistence” may win or the seizure of power in Greece “in a peaceful and parliamentary way” may be achieved? No, they should not expect this from us. These self-styled Marxists should not forget that the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian people have shown their great internationalism by saving tens of thousands of heroes of the Greek people and of the Communist Party of Greece who, we are certain, do not spit the horse after having crossed the river.

Such is the foreign policy that has been pursued by our Party and

our Government. Such are our viewpoints about the problems of the present-day world development. It is precisely for these attitudes and these viewpoints that we are criticized, it is for this that N. Khrushchev attacked us at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. In this way, he first, unilaterally, made public our disputes, providing weapons to the enemy and assuming thereby a heavy historic responsibility as a splitter of the unity of the international communist movement and of the socialist camp. Our Party of Labour has never publicly expressed our differences; it has dwelt on them only at party meetings, but now that N. Khrushchev made them public, our Party, too, is obliged to state openly its viewpoints.

N. Khrushchev, accusing our Party in his speeches at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, said that the Albanian-Soviet relations were spoiled for the fault of the Albanian leaders. It is well known that the 20 years of revolutionary activity of our Party are 20 years of a tremendous work for the promotion of friendship between the Albanian people and the Soviet peoples, for the establishment of closer fraternal ties between the People's Republic of Albania and the Soviet Union; they are 20 years of exemplary cooperation between our Party and the glorious Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Twenty years of the activity of our Party are 20 years of sincere faithfulness, of great fraternal love of our Party for Lenin's great Party which has always been, is and will remain for us a source of inspiration and experience, from which we have learned and shall learn how to work and strive for the good of our peoples, for the cause of socialism and communism. Twenty years of the activity of our Party have been years of an unsparing and all-round assistance by the Soviet Union to the Albanian people, of a fraternal internationalist aid, which our Party and Government have rightly utilized for the economic development of our country, for the upbuilding of socialism in Albania, for the improvement of the living standards of the

Albanian people.

In such conditions it is absurd and incredible to everyone to allege that it is the Albanian leaders who “without any reason” and with “an amazing quickness” have changed their attitude towards the Soviet Union, towards the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Incredible is also the monstrous slander that the Albanian leaders have allegedly linked themselves to imperialism and have allegedly sold themselves to it for 30 pieces of silver. Such “discoveries” may be believed by those who are fond of tales and detective novels, but by no serious man, for every honest person who knows somewhat the twenty-year old history of our Party cannot fail to see that such a slander is not justified by any stand of our Party, by any action of its leaders. The Party of Labour of Albania, during its entire revolutionary path, has always fought and continues to fight with determination against imperialism and its agents; never in the past, at present and in the future has it stretched, is stretching or will stretch its hand to anybody for pittance, and less so to imperialism and its allies. It has received and receives from its friends and brothers of the countries of the socialist camp not alms, but only internationalist aids in credit and it will continue to receive in the future, too, only from those socialist countries which will desire to offer to it such an aid. We ask for alms from nobody. If N. Khrushchev and his followers, for one or another reason, do not like to help us, they are expecting us in vain to address ourselves to the imperialists and their allies for “alms.” Our people have friends and comrades in the socialist countries who have not abandoned and will not abandon them. But, regardless of this, we tell N. Khrushchev that the Albanian people and their Party of Labour will live even on grass, if need be, but they will never sell themselves for 30 pieces of silver, for they prefer to die standing and with honour rather than live with shame and knelt down.

Why then did the Soviet-Albanian relations deteriorate? This is

clear and well-known to N. Khrushchev himself and to the international communist movement. Khrushchev knows the cause, for he himself is the culprit. We shall say only this: that the June 1960 Bucharest meeting was the starting point.

Differences had existed between our Party of Labour and the Soviet leadership even prior to June 1960 on some questions of ideological and political nature: however they have not exerted any negative influence on the relations between our two socialist states, between our two Marxist-Leninist parties.

The Party of Labour of Albania has always declared, and declares now, too, that the experience of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the experience of its congresses, have been, are and will always be a great help on our road for the up-building of the socialist and communist society. However, as regards some special theses of principle of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union our Party has not been and is not of the same opinion with the Soviet leadership, just as it is not also at present as regards some special questions of the 22nd Congress or of the new programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union approved by the 22nd Congress. Is not our Party entitled to this? Is this not consistent with the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism? Can this be considered as an anti-Soviet attitude, as they are trying to accuse us?

The Soviet leaders consider as anti-Marxist, dogmatist, sectarian, and opposed to proletarian internationalism, etc., any party that is not of the same opinion with them as regards some theses of principle which were raised at the 20th Congress. Moreover, the former member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union E. Furtseva went to such lengths as to declare from the rostrum of the 22nd Congress that "How can those persons who do not accept the decisions of the 20th Congress of our Party call themselves communists?" That is, according to some Soviet

leaders, the criterion of loyalty towards Marxism-Leninism, towards communism and proletarian internationalism, is allegedly the attitude towards the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Can such a logic be Marxist? If all the communist and workers parties in the world would adopt the new criteria invented by Furtseva, then only the disagreement, let us say, with many revisionist theses of the 8th Congress of the Italian Communist Party would throw into misfortune millions of communists in the world and difficulties would be created for them, for they would not know to what address they should hand their party cards.

According to the Leninist principles governing the relations between Marxist parties, however important the congress of a party may be, however great and authoritative the party of a country may be, the decisions of its congress are binding only for its members. In the international communist movement all the parties — the Moscow Declaration points out — are equal and independent, they work out their policies proceeding from the specific conditions of their countries and guiding themselves by the principles of Marxism-Leninism. The attempt to make the decisions of the congress of a party as international norms binding for all the parties is a crude violation of the principles of equality and independence of the Marxist-Leninist parties; it is in open contrast with proletarian internationalism. Therefore, it is not our Party, but the Soviet leadership, headed by N. Khrushchev, that has deviated from the positions of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, seeking to force its course upon the other parties, demanding from them to renounce their own viewpoints and obey and submit to them.

Whether our Party stands or not on the positions of Marxism-Leninism, this is by no means determined by its critical attitude towards some theses expressed by the leaders of some fraternal parties, nor by the subjective evaluation that may be made of its line and

activity by N. Khrushchev and his followers. The criterion of truth is life, practice; therefore the individuals and the various parties should be judged by the facts, by their practical activity. The path traversed by the Party of Labour of Albania, the line it has pursued right from its founding, its 20-year-old political activity, are the most convincing facts attesting to its firm loyalty towards Marxism-Leninism, towards the great cause of socialism and communism as well as towards the cause of the world peace.

Our Party of Labour has made its special remarks about some theses of principle of the 20th Congress and about some stands of the Soviet leaders, with which it has not agreed, through normal party channels, observing thereby all the jointly established principles governing the relations between the fraternal parties. As regards our remarks relating to the foreign policy and the problems of the present-day world development, we mentioned them above. Let us now see another important problem about which we have held and continue to hold opinions different from those of the Soviet leaders. The question is about the attitude towards J.V. Stalin and his work.

According to the views of our Party, N. Khrushchev had to uncrown first J.V. Stalin and his work in order to forward his opportunist theses to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and spread them later. He did this by his special report delivered at the 20th congress "Concerning the Personality Cult and Its Consequences." Our Party has not agreed and does not agree with the criticism against Stalin, as it was effected at the 20th Congress and later.

N. Khrushchev, slandering our Party at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and crudely interfering with our domestic affairs, said that the Albanian leaders were against the criticism of Stalin's personality cult because the personality cult methods are allegedly thriving in our Party, that terror and injustice are

allegedly reigning in Albania. We shall not stop here to reject these slanders, but the fact that their author has fallen so low as to mobilize the public opinion against our Party using such “arguments” borrowed from the most rabid enemies of socialism and communism shows his dark aims. It is evident that by linking at the 22nd Congress his unsubstantiated attacks on the Party of Labour of Albania with his “fight against Stalin’s cult and the anti-party group,” N. Khrushchev aimed at showing the “analogy” between the alleged “Albanian Stalinism” and the “epoch of the Stalinist crimes” in the Soviet Union, in order to create in this way the “atmosphere” he needed at the Congress and in the world public opinion to make his slanders more credible.

The Party of Labour of Albania has always taken and continues to take account of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism concerning the role of the masses, classes, party and leaders. It has always considered and continues to consider the manifestation of the personality cult as phenomenon alien to Marxism-Leninism, harmful to a communist and workers’ party. Our Party has not hesitated, when the case has been, to criticize while still in embryo the various manifestations of this kind among its ranks, as it did at its Third Congress. Likewise, our Party, when the case has been, has boldly fought and has nipped in the bud any violation of the revolutionary legality, any abuse of the state power by anybody, as it did at its First Congress. Everybody knows what was the fate of the enemy of the Party and people Koçi Xoxe and company, who before the year 1948, incited by the Yugoslav revisionists and abusing the trust given to them by the people and Party, violated the state laws in order to dig the grave to the Party and state cadres.

There does not exist in our Party either the sickness of the personality cult or the violation of the socialist legality. But at the same time, while guarding itself against the manifestations of the personality cult,

ENVER HOXHA

our Party, in a correct Marxist-Leninist way, nourished love and respect for its leaders strictly observing the socialist legality, our Party and our people's power are severe towards the enemies of our People's Republic, towards all those who seek to bury the historic victories of our people.

The Party of Labour of Albania, therefore, has been and is opposed to the criticism done to J.V. Stalin at the 20th Congress and which was repeated also at the 22nd Congress for some other reasons of principle.

According to the viewpoint of our Party, J.V. Stalin, in his entire theoretical and practical activity, has been and remains one of the most distinguished leaders and personalities not only of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, but also of the international communist and worker's movement, one of the most ardent defenders and greatest theoreticians of Marxism-Leninism. His great historic merit lies in the fact that for many years in succession he had been a loyal disciple and determined comrade-in-arms of V.I. Lenin in the struggle for the overthrow of Tzarism and the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution; while following Lenin's death, heading the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, he faithfully defended Leninism against the rabid attacks by the Trotskyites, Bukharinites, Zinovievites and other enemies and routed them ideologically and politically. J.V. Stalin, as the main leader of the Party, made a great contribution to the successful direction of the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union and the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union against fascism; he further developed Marxism-Leninism in a series of important questions of the Soviet socialist society and the construction of socialism and communism; he made a valuable contribution to the consolidation of the socialist camp and the international communist movement, as well as to the exposure of modern revisionism in the person of Tito's revisionist traitorous

group. By thus appraising J.V. Stalin's activity, there is not doubt that the errors he may have committed during the last years of his life were partial and they cannot serve as a criterion to make a general evaluation of J.V. Stalin's person and his activity. In the general evaluation of J.V. Stalin's activity, in the foreground stand his great merits, his fight for the defence of Leninism, his struggle for the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union, his struggle for the creation and consolidation of the socialist camp, for the strengthening of the unity of the international communist and workers' movement; his consistent fight against imperialism; his policy for the defence of peace and peaceful coexistence. They constitute his main characteristic feature as a leader and as a communist. Such has been and remains the firm position of the Party of Labour of Albania relating to the evaluation of J.V. Stalin's work.

N. Khrushchev's wrong position in his criticism against J.V. Stalin lies in the fact that:

a) he unilaterally and tendentiously exaggerated beyond measure J.V. Stalin's mistakes going even to such lengths as to make base slanders against him. Stalin was presented by him almost as an "enemy" of the Soviet Union and communism; he was characterized as "brutal," "capricious," as a "despot," "murderer" "bloodthirsty" and "criminal" towards the Party cadres and the loyal and tested revolutionaries, and as a "dupe" of the imperialists and fascists, as a man who committed great "follies," both in practice and theoretical questions, who did not "understand" of what was being done in the Soviet Union, who manifested a "lack of respect towards Lenin's memory," and many other charges of this kind. The detached statements made at the 20th Congress and after it, to the effect that Stalin remains a distinguished Marxist-Leninist, etc., are entirely formal and were made to mitigate the bad impression and the lawful anger aroused in the communists of the whole world by these accusations against Stalin. In fact,

neither at the 20th Congress nor up today the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its propaganda has made no positive appraisal of J.V. Stalin's theoretical legacy to show his positive sides and his contribution to the defence and further development of Marxism-Leninism. This inhumane attitude reached its climax at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, where not only were repeated the accusations of the 20th Congress, this time publicly, but there was adopted also a special decision to remove J.V. Stalin's embalmed body from the mausoleum. Unable to reject Stalin by arguments of principle in the field of theoretical activity and creativeness, Khrushchev, in order to fight Stalin, introduces the question into the police and espionage field, and he took measures also for the liquidation of Stalin's corpse. How much hypocritically sound, following all these actions, N. Khrushchev's words pronounced in January 1957 to the effect that "when it was the question of the revolution, of the defence of the interests of the class of the proletariat, in the revolutionary struggle against our class enemies, Stalin defended bravely and irreconcilably the cause of Marxism-Leninism," that "in the main and fundamental thing — and the main and fundamental thing for the Marxist-Leninists is the defence of working class interests, of the cause of socialism, the fight against the enemies of Marxism-Leninism — in this main and fundamental thing, as it is said, pray to god every communist be able to fight as Stalin fought."

b) N. Khrushchev, at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and the Soviet propaganda following that congress, unilaterally treated the question of the fight against the personality cult, throwing into oblivion the Leninist doctrine about the relations among the masses, classes, parties and leaders. The great Lenin, especially in his book of genius "Leftism — Infantile Sickness in Communism," forcefully pointed out the indispensability of the creation, in every Marxist party, of a group of leaders, more or less permanent,

composed of the most authoritative, most influential and most experienced persons. Without such a stable leadership the struggle of the working class and its communist party cannot be crowned with success. In contrast with these clear teachings of Lenin, at the 20th Congress, under the pretext of the fight against the personality cult, mass democracy was contraposed to the role of the leaders. It is not bad to recall what V.I. Lenin writes in connection with this:

*“To arrive for this reason at such a point as to oppose in general the dictatorship of the masses to the dictatorship of the leaders is an absurdity and a folly. It is especially ridiculous when you see that the old leaders who had human viewpoints about simple things, are indeed replaced (under the mask of the slogan: “down with the leaders!”) by **young leaders** who say nonsenses which weigh nothing.”*¹

N. Khrushchev and his group used for their own anti-Marxist aims — and this is becoming ever more clear — the alleged “principled criticism” against Stalin’s personality cult. How he used it and for what purposes he is acting in the internal plan (in the Soviet Union and in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union) this is not our business, this may be judged only by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Despite this, we can but note that in fact N. Khrushchev, dealing with the “crimes” that have been committed in Stalin’s epoch, with the “murders of the innocent people,” with the “elimination of thousands of cadres” through “false” court trials, with the regime of “terror,” which is described with an unbridled enthusiasm, in the darkest colours, making all these things known to the international public opinion, is rendering a very bad service to the Soviet Union, pleasing only the imperialists and all the enemies of communism. N. Khrushchev has accused the leadership of our Party of the just

¹ V.I. Lenin, *Works*, vol 31, p. 31, Alb. ed.

criticism, also at party meetings, against some unlawful actions with regard to our country, alleging that the Albanian leaders “throw mud at the Soviet Union.”

But how should we call this same unbridled zeal of his to darken a whole glorious epoch, the epoch of the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union, to discredit before the eyes of the whole world the glory of the Soviet Union, presenting it as the country where terror and murders have allegedly reigned, just as the whole reactionary bourgeois press has propagandized and is propagandizing?

Is it not he himself that, by his actions, is discrediting the Soviet Union? Is he not gravely offending the heroism of the Soviet peoples who, in struggle with internal and external enemies, in struggle with countless difficulties and obstacles, under the leadership of their Communist Party which was led by Stalin, laid the foundations of the socialist and communist society in the Soviet Union, when he proposes that there should be erected in Moscow a memorial to the “victims” of the personality cult? Someone calls such actions a “bold self-criticism.” Let them think more deeply about how much good and how many evils has this kind of “bold self-criticism” brought to the Soviet Union and the communist movement.

N. Khrushchev, speaking of the “iniquities” and “victims of the period of the personality cult,” declaring the various court trials as framed-up, regardless of the fact that in all that struggle there might have been made also some mistakes, appears to be consistent with his anti-Marxist concepts about imperialism and its servitors. Indeed, he rendered a service to imperialism, for he presents it as not dangerous to the countries which are building up socialism; he is weakening the vigilance of the peoples in their struggle against the espionage network of imperialism which has acted and is fiercely acting against the socialist camp. N. Khrushchev adopted his tactics of silence also towards the plot organized by the Yugoslav revisionists, the Greek monarcho-

fascist and the United States 6th fleet, a plot which was exposed in our country a few months ago. Moreover, after having recommended these tactics also to some other fraternal parties, he spread the slogan that the plot was an invention, that the participants in this plot were “patriots and honest fighters,” whom later, at the 22nd congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in his concluding speech, he openly took them under his protection. While not long ago N. Khrushchev formally accused the Albanian leaders of being connected with the imperialist espionage. Therefore, according to his logic, it follows that he who fights against imperialism, he who fights against its agents, he who fights for the defence of the freedom and independence of the socialist homeland, is an agent of imperialism. And conversely, he who rises against the people’s power and the Party, he who places himself at the service of the enemies of socialism, is a “martyr,” a “good patriot,” he is taken under protection by the leader of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, to such persons there will be erected memorials also.

The question of the fight against Stalin’s cult has been used by N. Khrushchev to uncrown Leninism, to prepare the ground to revise Marxism-Leninism and spread his opportunist views in the most important questions of the present-day world development and the international communist movement. This action and the tactics of his are neither new nor original. In fact, in his fight against Leninism Trotsky, too, used the same tactics.

“...Trotsky in his writings,” J.V. Stalin says, “*makes one more (one more!) attempt to prepare the conditions for the substitution of Trotskyism to Leninism. Trotsky has to discredit, at all costs, the Party, its cadres that carried out the uprising with a view to passing from the discredit of the Party to the discredit of Leninism. While he needs the discredit of Leninism to smuggle in Trotskyism as the ‘only’ ‘proletarian’ ideology (don’t take it for a joke). All this is certainly*

(yes, certainly), done under the banner of Leninism, so that the procedure of this smuggling should be carried out ‘without any damage at all.’”¹

N. Khrushchev used Stalin’s question to strike on the healthy Marxist-Leninist elements in the leaderships of the communist and workers’ parties of the different countries, to scare, and in case of resistance, also to liquidate anyone who would dare to object; to reduce to silence the other parties and various leaders who would not support his revisionist views, his course. The question of the personality cult, in short, was used as a bugbear to exercise pressure on the other parties and to liquidate the leaders who were not to the liking of N. Khrushchev. These aims which, but recently, were concealed by him, covering them with a “principled” and “Marxist” phraseology, were openly stated at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Khrushchev said in his speech: “To put an end to the personality cult means for Hoxha and others to renounce in essence the commanding posts in the Party and state.” And added that “such a thing they do not want to do.”

If we take account of the fact that in the same speech he, as we mentioned above, takes under protection and considers as patriots the anti-party elements and agents of imperialism, participants in the plot organized by the imperialists against the People’s Republic of Albania, then clearly follows N. Khrushchev’s “principled” fight against the personality cult in Albania, his great concern! He is seeking to liquidate the present-day leaders of our Party and place in their stead the anti-party elements and any plotter, agent of imperialism.

That N. Khrushchev, under the pretext of the fight against the personality cult, is seeking to uncrown Leninism in order to pave the way to revisionism, is known also by the fact that he is by no means

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 6, p. 361, Alb. ed.

concerned with the just and principled Marxist-Leninist fight against the personality cult. For, if such were the case, irrespective of his demagogical words, he could not have helped noticing that at present in the Soviet Union manifestations of the personality cult are appearing with every passing day, and even in more open and exalting forms for his own person. Thus, one can hardly find an issue of the Soviet illustrated reviews in which one will not find pictures of N. Khrushchev; the pages of the Soviet press are full of quotations from his speeches, he is the only one to speak in all parts and about all questions; a whole film is devoted to his life, and other films to his visits to various countries of the world; numerous praises are made to him in various speeches and writings attributing to him personally the greatest successes of the Soviet people in the field of the development of industry, science and technology. Great, feverish efforts are being exerted to present Khrushchev not only as a “great military strategist,” but also almost as an “architect” of the victory over fascism in the Second World War.

Where does then lie N. Khrushchev’s respect for principles in the fight against the manifestations of the personality cult, which he so noisily advertises in his unprincipled fight against the other fraternal parties and their leaders?

This is why, comrades, our Party has not agreed and does not agree with the Soviet leadership in the question of their criticism towards Stalin.

Our Party of Labour has not agreed and does not agree with the Soviet leadership also as regards the question of the attitude towards the present-day revisionism, and especially towards the traitorous clique of the Yugoslav revisionists. N. Khrushchev and his group used Stalin’s issue and the issue of the personality cult also to prepare the ground for the complete rehabilitation of Tito’s revisionist and traitorous clique, to present it as a “victim” of Stalin’s errors, encouraging

thereby the revisionist renegades, wherever they are, to begin their activity against Marxism-Leninism under the demagogical slogans of “anti-Stalinism,” etc.

It is known that Tito’s revisionist clique was publicly condemned both by the known letters of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of the Soviet Union, signed by J.V. Stalin and V.M. Molotov, and by the June 1948 resolution of the Information Bureau of some communist and workers’ parties “Concerning the Situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia,” which was later supported by all the communist and workers’ parties of the world. Later on, in November 1949, a second resolution of the Information Bureau was issued stating that the Tito clique had finally degenerated into an espionage centre of imperialism, that it had liquidated the gains of the revolution in Yugoslavia, that it had diverted Yugoslavia from the road to socialism and the socialist camp and placed her on the economic and political dependence of imperialism, that the Tito gang waged a broad-scale activity of espionage and plots against the various socialist countries, that it supported in different forms the imperialist policy of war and aggression, etc.

The viewpoint of the Party of Labour of Albania has been and remains that the conclusions of Stalin and the Information Bureau in connection with the renegade revisionist clique of Tito, have been and remain correct. These conclusions have been borne out and are being borne out both by the Yugoslav reality at that time and the later and present-day events. The Yugoslav revisionists became the centre of diversion and plots at the imperialist service against the countries of the socialist camp. Under their direction was working in Albania Koçi Xoxe’s gang, which aimed at destroying the Party of Labour and at liquidating the people’s power. From Tito’s Yugoslavia were illegally smuggled in the socialist countries hundreds and thousands of agents and provocateurs, spies and diversionists, whose duty was terror,

sabotage, hatching up of plots against socialism in these countries. Tito's revisionist clique has more and more openly since 1948 and on, placed itself at the service of the U.S. imperialism, with which it is linked with the millions and billions of dollars in the form of U.S. economic and military credits to Yugoslavia, with which it is linked by the participation in the Balkan Pact, which is nothing else but an appendage to the Atlantic Pact, with which it is linked by the policy of diversion and plots against the socialist countries and the national liberation movement of the newly liberated peoples or of those still suffering under the clutches of colonialism.

Until 1955, all the communist and workers' parties were unanimous in condemning the Yugoslav revisionist leadership and were waging a firm and principled ideological-political struggle against it. However, precisely at that time N. Khrushchev announced that towards Yugoslavia and her leaders had allegedly been done a great injustice, that "under the influence of the agent Beria" groundless charges had been levelled against them, that in the Yugoslav issue, too, J.V. Stalin had allegedly made a serious mistake. And immediately he took the initiative, went to Belgrade, where he called Tito "dear comrade," threw to the basket one-sidedly the resolution of the Information Bureau and loudly announced that Yugoslavia is a socialist country and that the Yugoslav leaders, although they have some waverings, are in general Marxist-Leninists.

What does the experience, what does the life show? The experience and life both before and after 1955 show that in the assessment of the Yugoslav question Stalin and the Information Bureau were right, because their assessment rested on objective facts, on the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. Experience and practical life, on the other hand, show that in their stand towards Tito's revisionist clique N. Khrushchev and those who follow him are not right, because their actions are based on subjective viewpoints and are contrary to the

teachings of Marxism-Leninism, contrary to the objective reality.

Let us refer to facts. What have been the results of the efforts to rehabilitate the Tito clique? The Yugoslav revisionist leaders have given up neither their anti-Marxist viewpoints nor their hostile activity against the socialist camp and the fraternal communist and workers' parties. The most obvious result brought about by N. Khrushchev's efforts was the fact that after 1955, possibilities were created for the gang of Yugoslav renegades to act more freely against the world communist movement and the countries of the socialist camp under the guise of the "persecuted comrade," exploiting in this direction even the patronage of the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The rehabilitation of the Yugoslav revisionists brought with it also the rehabilitation of all their agents and companions in some fraternal parties where, under the mask of "correcting the mistakes," a true campaign started against the sound cadres of the Party and an activation of all the anti-Party elements. This happened in some parties of the socialist countries in Europe, as well as in some parties of the capitalist countries. The most typical in this direction are the events of Hungary, where the activation of the revisionist elements, headed by Imre Nagy, who had the active support and instigation of the Yugoslav revisionists, led up to the outbreak of the counter-revolution, which put in danger the very existence of Hungary as a people's democratic state.

In spite of this, N. Khrushchev continuously, with great confidence in Tito and his companions, pursued insistently the policy of rapprochement, flatteries and caresses with the Yugoslav revisionists. The events of Hungary show still more clearly this stand. When the counter-revolution started in Hungary, it was clear to everybody that in the Hungarian events a base role was being played by the Yugoslav revisionists. This was seen in their influence in the counter-revolutionary discussions of the "Petoefi" club, this was seen during the

counter-revolutionary uprising and the enthusiasm expressed by the Yugoslav revisionists at that time, but it was still more clearly seen also in the fact that the traitor Imre Nagy, after the smashing of the counter-revolution, found asylum at the Yugoslav embassy in Budapest. Instead of mercilessly unmasking the Belgrade renegades as direct inspirers of the counter-revolutionary coup in Hungary, N. Khrushchev tried in every way to mitigate their responsibility, to minimize it and, finally, to eliminate it entirely. The former ambassador of the Soviet Union at that time in Albania, L.I. Krylov, communicated to the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania the letter that N. Khrushchev had sent on November 9th, 1956 to J.B. Tito. In this letter, among other things, Khrushchev wrote to Tito the following: "The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has examined your last letter. We consider it possible to agree with your viewpoints that no special importance should be given now to the question whether the Yugoslav embassy in Budapest has acted correctly or not by giving asylum to Imre Nagy and his companions. We are noting with satisfaction that since the Brioni talks you have been in full agreement with our stand towards Comrade Janos Kadar as a distinguished personality and with revolutionary authority in Hungary, capable in these difficult moments and conditions to head the new revolutionary government... You were fully satisfied with the fact the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, since the summer of this year, in connection with the departure of Rakosi, was trying that Comrade Kadar should become first secretary of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Working Peoples' Party."

Any comment in connection with this letter is superfluous. This letter shows very clearly that the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, trampling under foot any regulation determining the relations between fraternal parties, has gone so far as to interfere even in an issue of so important and

markedly internal party character, as is the appointment in the place of the first secretary of a fraternal party of this or that person. It shows also very clearly that N. Khrushchev has been long since in full agreement with J.B. Tito, that he has deemed it reasonable that for everything, even for the “appointment” of the First Secretary of another Party, to consult J.B. Tito, this enemy of socialism, the very inspirer and organizer of the counter-revolution in Hungary.

From this it is clearly understood and is entirely logical why N. Khrushchev tried to see the question of the Yugoslav intervention in the Hungarian events closed: because two things cannot be done simultaneously, both to consult Tito and to expose Tito.

After Tito’s notorious speech in Pula in November 1956, the struggle of the communist and workers’ parties against the Yugoslav revisionism was enlivened and the Yugoslav leaders were criticized for their stand. But the traitorous Tito group not only did not make any self-criticism or any positive step towards the communist movement, but in 1958 it considered it convenient to formulate and sum up its revisionist ideas in the Program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, which was published as a counterweight to the Moscow Declaration of the Communist and Workers’ Parties of November 1957. It seemed already as if there was no more room even for the least illusion, because Tito and his group had openly written in their program what they were hiding for years under demagogical pseudo-Marxist and pseudo-socialist slogans. But what did happen? At the beginning, N. Khrushchev, who felt himself embarrassed before the public opinion and the international communist movement, although half-heartedly, took a stand concerning the Yugoslav revisionists. But this did not last long. With a wonderful nimbleness and contrary to the most elementary logic, he, at the Fifth Congress of the Socialist United Party of Germany in July 1958, gave the orientation not to speak of the Yugoslav revisionists, by saying: “In our struggle for the common

questions we should not devote to the Yugoslav revisionists more attention than they deserve. They want that their value should be raised, that people should think that they are the centre of the world... We will not help in fanning the passions, in aggravating the relations. Even, in the situation created in our relations with the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, it will be useful to retain a spark of hope, to seek acceptable forms for some questions.”

He stressed this also during his visit in Albania in May 1959. At the same time, again started to circulate more and more often the word on “Comrade Tito,” propaganda started again that “Yugoslavia is a socialist state,” that between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia “there exists mutual understanding on many problems of the foreign policy.”

It is appropriate to recall that V.I. Lenin in his time has waged an irreconcilable fight not only against opportunism, but also against those who preached the “unity” with the opportunists.

The revisionist group of the Yugoslav leadership, being left unmolested in their treacherous, anti-socialist and plotting work, continued with a greater intensity their activity, both to split the communist movement and to undermine the national liberation and anti-imperialist movement of the peoples fighting for freedom, or that have just won their national freedom. With every passing day the Yugoslav revisionists showed themselves enemies of communism and of the peoples freedom. Precisely because Tito’s revisionist gang is such, the representatives of 81 fraternal communist and workers’ parties resolutely condemned in the 1960 Moscow Declaration the Yugoslav revisionist leaders. As it is known the Declaration stresses that the Yugoslav leaders, having betrayed Marxism-Leninism, detached their country from the socialist camp, put it under the dependence of the so-called “aid” of the U.S. and other imperialists and in this way created the danger of losing the revolutionary gains reached with the heroic struggle of

the Yugoslav people; that the Yugoslav revisionists are carrying out an undermining activity against the socialist camp and the international communist movement, that under the pretext of the policy of non alignment they conduct an activity which brings harm to the question of the unity of all the peace-loving forces and states. Finally, the Declaration stresses the need for a continuous struggle to expose fully the group of Yugoslav leaders.

However, after November 1960, in the majority of occasions, these correct theses of the Declaration were thrown into oblivion by the Soviet leadership. More than that, as if to encourage Tito's revisionist clique, to "appease" its resentment, Soviet leaders saw it reasonable to make warm official statements at the address of the Yugoslav "comrades." Thus, only a few days after the issuing of the Declaration of the 81 fraternal parties, the member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union A. Gromyko, at the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, on December 23rd, 1960, stated that in some fundamental things the foreign policy of the Soviet Union is fully compatible with the foreign policy of Yugoslavia. While N. Khrushchev himself, in an interview to the observer of "The New York Times," Sultzberger, published by "Pravda" on September 10th, 1961, stated: "Of course, we consider Yugoslavia a socialist country." Is such a statement not contrary to the Declaration of the 81 fraternal Communist and Worker's Parties? Should it not be thought that the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union with this statement was aiming at "appeasing" the resentment of the Yugoslav revisionist leaders and at making to them publicly known, that what is written in the Moscow Declaration, or also in some other document of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, is formal, while his viewpoints are other?

Why is such a thing happening? Why is with such a persistence

being held such a benevolent stand towards a gang of renegades of Marxism-Leninism, submerged head and feet in the scum of revisionism and of treachery and, at the same time, rabidly attacking the communist and workers' parties which have always stood loyal to the revolutionary teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the cause of socialism?

The Party of Labour of Albania could not and cannot agree with such an opportunistic stand towards the dangerous revisionist gang of Tito, which is an agency of imperialism and an enemy of socialism and communism, of the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian people. In the struggle against modern revisionism especially against Tito's revisionist clique, the Party of Labour of Albania has taken and always takes into consideration the valuable teachings of the great Lenin, who stressed powerfully that opportunism constitutes a serious danger for the very existence of the socialist order.

These important teachings of Lenin were all the more understandable for our party because it had proved on its back what does Yugoslav revisionism mean, not only in theory but also in practice. Because, in fact, Tito's clique has never renounced, either before 1948 or after 1955, the plots and diversion against the People's Republic of Albania and the Party of Labour of Albania, but, on the contrary, has increased them. Therefore, the struggle of the Party of Labour of Albania against the Yugoslav revisionism was an important internationalist task of our party as a Marxist-Leninist party and at the same time its sacred duty to defend our socialist homeland against the aims and the plots of the Yugoslav revisionists. Some of the Soviet leaders did not like this stand of the Party of Labour of Albania, which was contrary to and constituted a hinderance for their schemes of rapprochement and embrace with the Titoite clique. The slogans started circulating that the "Albanians are hot-blooded," "they view things narrowly and conduct the struggle against the Yugoslav leaders from the positions of nationalism," that the "Albanians want to capture the flag of anti-revisionism"

and that “they are increasing the value of Tito’s clique,” etc. etc. But our Party did not waver from its principled positions and continued consistently and uncompromisingly the struggle against the Yugoslav revisionists. This stand of our Party has never been to the liking of N. Khrushchev and is one of the reasons explaining his so fierce a stand against the Party of Labour of Albania and its leadership.

The stand of N. Khrushchev’s group towards the Yugoslav revisionism, in fact, is not a stand different only from that of the Party of Labour of Albania, but from that of all the international communist and workers’ movement, from the stand expressed in the Moscow Declarations of 1957 and 1960, where revisionism is described as the main danger in the international communist and workers’ movement, and the Yugoslav revisionism as underminer of the socialist camp and the forces of peace. Thus, it is obvious that the Soviet leadership is trying to mitigate the struggle against opportunism and revisionism in the communist movement. Here lies also the source of all the attempts to distort the clear thesis of the two Moscow Declarations on revisionism as the main danger in the communist and workers’ movement and to bring to the foreground the struggle against dogmatism. For our party it has become clearer with every passing day that by accepting by words the need of fighting against revisionism and not doing it in fact, N. Khrushchev and those who follow him, under the pretext of the struggle against dogmatism, are fighting against Marxism-Leninism, are making efforts to reject the fundamental theses of the revolutionary doctrine of proletariat precisely as Tito tried to do earlier and as have tried to do in the past the opportunists and revisionists of the various brands.

What were the consequences of the spreading of the various opportunist viewpoints, of the unprincipled struggle against J.V. Stalin and the policy of reconciliation with Tito’s treacherous revisionist clique, persistently pursued by N. Khrushchev and his group?

Although they raise to the skies, with a great noise, “the wonderful consequences” allegedly brought about by the “criticism of the personality cult of J.V. Stalin” and the “normalization of relations with Yugoslavia,” although they present the questions as if with the 20th Congress a new era started in the development and further strengthening of the world communist movement, the facts speak entirely to the contrary. These distorted viewpoints and actions became a banner in the hands of the opportunist and revisionist elements in many countries to launch their revisionist attacks against the Marxist-Leninist parties. This happened in the Communist Parties of the United States of America, Denmark, the Netherlands, Italy, France, Great Britain, etc. Under the influence of the opportunist viewpoints presented by N. Khrushchev to the 20th Congress, revisionism was revived and assumed a large dissemination in many communist and workers’ parties, becoming an extremely serious danger for the entire international communist movement. Precisely under the slogans of the struggle against “Stalinist despotism,” borrowed from the “secret” report “On the Personality Cult and Its Consequences,” which, strange enough, fell into the hands of the reactionary circles of the West and was reproduced by them in tons, the imperialist reaction and the modern revisionists, especially the Belgrade revisionist renegades, enemies of socialism, of the Soviet Union and of the peoples of all the countries of the socialist camp, organized the counter-revolutionary actions against the socialist order in Poland and the counter-revolutionary coup in Hungary.

Precisely under the protection of these opportunist theses, of the attacks against Stalin and the appeasing attitudes of N. Khrushchev with the Yugoslav revisionists, Tito’s renegade gang was enlivened still more, it was given free hand to develop broadly its undermining activity against the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

For us it is clear that such a conclusion is not acceptable either to N. Khrushchev, or to his followers. But it is logical to raise the question: Why precisely after the 20th Congress were immediately enlivened the renegades and the revisionists in the ranks of the communist and workers' parties of the different countries, the Yugoslav revisionist clique raised again its head and all of them together launched a frontal attack against Marxism-Leninism? Why, let us say, the theses of the 19th or the 18th Congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union did not become their banner? There is only one explanation here because the theses which were set at the 20th Congress were of an opportunist nature, therefore they constituted the ideological food for the renegades and the revisionists in their struggle against Marxism-Leninism; because the stand towards Stalin and Tito's clique were anti-Marxist, therefore they were utilized so successfully by the enemies of Marxism and socialism for their aims.

These bitter consequences were felt in Albania, too. In our country, the opportunist elements of the Tuk Jakova and Bedri Spahiu type, as well as many other elements expelled from the party for anti-party activity were activated and with the direct instigation of the Yugoslav revisionists, organized the plot at the Party conference for the city of Tirana in April 1956. It is known that a major role in this plot was played by the traitor Panajot Plaku, an old agent of the Yugoslav espionage, to whom, after he fled from the country, N. Khrushchev proposed ever since 1957 to be given political asylum to him in the Soviet Union. The slogans of these traitors were the demagogical slogans of the "liberalization and democratization of the proletarian dictatorship," "normalization of relations with Yugoslavia," "rehabilitation of Koçi Xoxe and other anti-party elements condemned earlier," etc. It is significant that precisely at that time, in April-May 1956, the Soviet leadership, through M. Suslov and P. Pospyelov tried to persuade our Party to rehabilitate the traitor Koçi Xoxe, an enemy of the

party and the Albanian people, an agent of Tito's clique shot for his hostile activity which was aimed at liquidating the Party and the people's power and at turning Albania into a seventh republic of Titoite Yugoslavia.

N. Khrushchev's anti-Marxist stand on the above-mentioned questions caused thus a great damage to our common cause, socialism and communism.

However, the international communist and worker's movement managed to cope successfully with the onslaught of the revisionist renegades. The ranks of the communist and workers' parties were strengthened and this is due to the strength and firmness of the fraternal communist and workers' parties, to the vitality of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. And thus will always happen. Marxism-Leninism is the banner of victory, therefore its enemies, the revisionists and opportunists, have failed and will always fail shamefully.

From the above said it follows clearly that the nature of our disagreements has been entirely ideological and political, that our Party has not agreed with the opportunist viewpoints and actions of N. Khrushchev as concerns vital questions of the present-day world development and the international communist and workers' movement, viewpoints which are contrary to some of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and constitute a serious violation of the 1957 and 1960 Declarations of the communist and workers' parties. But the existence of these wrong viewpoints among the Soviet leaders is only half of the evil. The greatest evil is that they try to impose at any condition their opportunistic concepts to all the communist and worker's parties, not stopping for this purpose even before the pressure, blackmail and brutal attacks against those fraternal parties and their leaders that do not agree with the revisionist theses of N. Khrushchev, that oppose them and resolutely defend Marxism-Leninism. Here lies the greatest evil, here lies also the cause that relations

between our country and the Soviet leadership have become tense. Seeing that his multifarious attempts to kneel down the Party of Labour of Albania and to impose on it his anti-Marxist viewpoints have failed in face of the firm Marxist-Leninist stand of our Party and wanting to justify before his party and before the international communist movement his impermissible, hostile activity against the Party of Labour of Albania and the People's Republic of Albania, N. Khrushchev has gone over to wild and public slanders like those he and other Soviet leaders made at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The fact that he chose the rostrum of the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to carry out "the trial" against our Party, the fact that he deceived the representatives of some fraternal parties to express themselves uncomradely against our Party in their greetings to the Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, throws light on his putschist methods, on his tactic of surprise, on the one-sided imposing of his desire upon the international communist and workers' movement, on the non-observance of the fundamental principles governing the relations between the fraternal communist and worker's parties, which have been established jointly and have been outlined in the Moscow Declarations.

To examine the activity of a communist and workers' party, to express the viewpoint whether it stands on correct positions or not, can judge only an international forum, an international meeting of the communist and workers' parties, after hearing in detail the arguments of that party. But N. Khrushchev feared to ask the convocation of such a meeting because he was convinced that he would not succeed in condemning our Party of Labour. For this reason he did not invite to the 22nd Congress our Party also, because its word would bring to the fore the truth on the Albanian-Soviet relations, would expose his anti-Marxist viewpoints and activity, would reject all his entirely

unfounded slanders and charges.

The method used by the First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to attack one-sidedly our Party is known in the international communist and workers' movement. He applied these tactics at Bucharest, too, where with false and one-sided charges he tried to kneel down Marxist-Leninist parties and to compromise by means of a quick, unpondered and hasty pronouncement the representatives of the fraternal parties, but that despite his efforts, he did not succeed. On the contrary, N. Khrushchev was forced to agree to the holding of the Moscow meeting in November 1960, where correct debates were conducted, where it was clearly seen that his viewpoints did not meet with the enthusiastic support of the participants, and this is expressed also in the very documents approved by the representatives of 81 parties and which N. Khrushchev is brutally violating in all his activity. Therefore he, in order to attack our Party, since he feared to convene an international conference, resorted to his putschist methods, utilizing for this purpose the 22nd Congress.

In this way, N. Khrushchev has effectively sabotaged any future international meeting also, because by attacking one-sidedly and publicly our Party, he has put the Party of Labour of Albania on conditions of inequality.

At the 22nd Congress, N. Khrushchev, and his followers charged our Party that it allegedly, with its actions, is "disrupting the unity, is splitting the socialist camp and the international communist movement." One must have lost any feeling of responsibility or seriousness to say such a thing. Who is in reality undermining our unity, the Party of Labour of Albania or the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union headed by N. Khrushchev? Our Party, which has always observed the principle that our disagreements should be solved through the party way, on basis of the principles of the Moscow Declarations of 1957 and 1960, or the Soviet leadership, which has

trampled under foot these principles and has embarked upon the anti-Marxist path of pressure, blackmail and is openly calling for counter-revolution in socialist Albania? The Party of Labour of Albania has never spoken publicly about our differences, it has only through the party way and at party meetings, openly and courageously criticized the wrong viewpoints and actions of the Soviet leaders, while N. Khrushchev was the first to speak publicly from the rostrum of the 22nd Congress not only about the existence of our differences but also to vomit gall, to slander at full daylight against our Party and people's power, presenting it as a "regime of terror, where right and left there are prisons and firing squads," using the language of Ranković, who has said that "in Albania there reign the barbed wire and the frontier guard boot." Our Party stands for unity, for its further strengthening, but for a sound, iron unity, not for an anemic and sick unity. Precisely because it stands for the iron unity of the international communist and workers' movement and the socialist camp, it has courageously and through the party way criticized N. Khrushchev's anti-Marxist manifestations and actions, which weaken this unity.

We greatly regret the fact that some leaders of the fraternal parties joined with N. Khrushchev's wrong viewpoints. We don't want to seek the causes which forced them to take this stand (we understand very well the difficult position in which they have found themselves), but can their one-sided position be called correct, a priori, when the majority of the representatives of the fraternal parties have no knowledge of the development of relations between our Party and the Soviet leadership. Is it correct to take this or that stand, when one hears only the arguments of one side, while the other side has been deprived of the right to state its own viewpoint? Or in the communist movement should be established new principles, according to which the big one must be heard, the little one not, the big is right, while the little is always wrong? According to our opinion, such a reasoning

is not at all correct and is not compatible with the Leninist norms of relations between the fraternal parties. Such a stand does not help the strengthening of the unity of the international communist and workers' movement, the strengthening of the socialist camp, but weakens it and will later create great troubles.

In spite of this, at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, N. Khrushchev was not supported by all the representatives of the fraternal communist and workers' parties. Out of the 80 foreign delegations which attended the proceedings of the Congress and spoke or sent by writing their greetings, 34 representatives of the fraternal parties did not join N. Khrushchev's slanders and charges against our Party, they did not speak about the disagreements existing between the Party of Labour of Albania and the Soviet leadership. Surely, many of them may have their remarks as concerns the work of the Party of Labour of Albania, but at the 22nd Congress, which was the congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, of a definite party, they did not consider it appropriate to speak about a question which concerns the entire international communist movement, taking thus a correct Marxist-Leninist stand. We must say also that even the mass of the home delegates to the 22nd Congress did not express themselves about the Soviet-Albanian disagreements, they did not support N. Khrushchev in his attacks and slanders against the Party of Labour of Albania. Out of 88 delegates who took part in discussions in the congress, only 14 spoke against our Party. They all were members of the Soviet leadership.

Our Party of Labour thanks for their principled and correct stand both the representatives of the fraternal communist and workers' parties who did not support N. Khrushchev in his one-sided attacks against our Party and the delegates of the glorious Communist Party of Lenin, who, preserving the Bolshevik traditions and the Leninist principles of objective judgements of any question, did not support

N. Khrushchev in this anti-Marxist act.

From the rostrum of the 22nd Congress, among the numerous slandering charges, the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union spoke also of the allegedly lack of democracy in our Party, of the allegedly violations of the Leninist norms in its inner life. This, of course, is an open interference in the internal affairs of our Party, but despite this we can say to these “defenders” of democracy: Look better at your business, for not in the Party of Labour of Albania, but in your parties there are many scandalous examples of the violation of the most elementary rules of democracy. Dmitri Polyansky, on attacking the anti-party group, and especially Comrade Kliment Voroshilov, surely refrained himself from telling in detail all the backstage plots he and his companions had organized at the time of the plenary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in summer 1957.

Polyansky has hidden this from the congress, but he has told this to their “friend” Liri Belishova, who reported it to our party. Let us take another example. When the Tirana tribunal gave the deserved verdict against the agents of U.S. imperialism, of Yugoslavia and Greece, Teme Sejko and company, out of the whole press of the European people’s democracies, only the newspaper “Trud,” the organ of the Bulgarian working class, reported correctly this trial. But immediately, within the day, by the most “democratic” methods, it was announced that the president and the two secretaries of the Central Council of the Bulgarian Trade Unions had been dismissed from their posts. And this was because the revisionist Tito on the same day lodged a serious protest with the Bulgarian Government in connection with the report given on the Tirana trial by this newspaper. Finally, those who speak of internal democracy and of the observance of the party norms, we are referring here especially to Palmiro Togliatti, does he consider regular, democratic his action at the 22nd Congress

when he spoke and condemned our Party? He did not know before what has happened and how the relations between our Party and the Soviet leadership have been developed. At least our Party has not given the Italian Communist Party any material. His Central Committee had not adopted before any decision by which to denounce our party and thus to authorize its representatives to condemn it. At least we do not know of any such fact. Then of what democracy are speaking these leaders who scandalize themselves without cause for the fate of a person and who when it is the question of the fate of a party, of 50,000 communists and an entire people, make offending statements without any responsibility and in flagrant contradiction with the elementary rules not only of the party democracy, but also of the simple logic and human conscience? Palmiro Togliatti threw at us the Roman anathema, by charging us that we are splitting the unity of the international communist movement. On what did Togliatti rely when he a few years ago attacked publicly the Soviet socialist system and preached polycentrism and the zones of influence in the international communist movement? He has not and will not have any fact against us, but with his own anti-Marxist theses he has greatly served the revisionist Tito. Nevertheless, strangely enough, nobody rose against Togliatti's revisionist viewpoints.

N. Khrushchev, who speak so much of democratic methods, patience and internationalism, has resorted against our party to the most anti-Marxist methods, methods which are entirely alien to the relations between the socialist countries. In order to subdue the Party of Labour of Albania, to prevent it from having its own viewpoint, to impose on it his anti-Marxist viewpoints, he and his followers have not stopped before any measure, not only as concerns the relations between our parties, but also as concerns the relations between our socialist states. Today we do not want to enter into detail and to dwell long on these questions, because there are many facts and countless

documents, which illustrate objectively these, but will mention that as a result of the adoption of anti-Marxist methods by the soviet leadership for the settlement of existing disagreements, as a result of the consecutive pressure both in the economic and the political and military fields, the relations between our country and the Soviet Union have been greatly aggravated. This process has started since the second half of last year, that is after the Bucharest meeting. Since then, N. Khrushchev, instead of agreeing to settle patiently the ideological and political disagreements existing between our Party and the Soviet leadership, made them public and extended them to the state relations also.

Thus in the economic field, all the credits the Soviet Union had accorded to our country for the third five-year plan were suspended and this was done with a view of sabotaging the economic plan of our country, without any reason they one-sidedly withdrew all Soviet specialists from Albania, whom our economy badly needed and we had officially asked to stay, under the pretext of starting from this year with the repayment of the old credits (although according to the existing documents, this would begin after 1970), the Soviet side has almost entirely suspended the trade relations on a clearing basis, scholarships were cut to all the Albanian civilian and military students studying in the Soviet Union, etc., etc. The economic pressures have been accompanied with pressure and restrictive measures in the military field, too.

On the other hand, it is well known by all that the press of the People's Republic of Albania is continuously writing on the life and the successes of the Soviet Union in the building of communism, supports the various moves and proposals the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government concerning various international questions, whereas the Soviet press, to the contrary, since almost one and a half years has established a strict silence blockade

against Albania. While it does not let escape the least chance to write even concerning a single positive word which some British lord has occasionally said, the Soviet press does not write a single line about Albania, let alone the Party of Labour of Albania, as if neither the People's Republic of Albania or the Albanian people, who are building up socialism and struggling for peace in the wolf's mouth, surrounded on all sides by the imperialists and their tools, did not exist at all. The ice of silence was broken only at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union by N. Khrushchev, but it was broken only to slander and vomit gall against the Party of Labour of Albania and the People's Republic of Albania.

In these anti-Marxist and hostile actions towards the Albanian people, N. Khrushchev has been followed also by some leaders of the socialist countries of Europe. They are all together doing their utmost to isolate Albania economically, politically and militarily, by creating around her a "sanitary cordon." N. Khrushchev forgets that in the century of the triumph of Leninism there can be no "cordon" to isolate a people and a party which are firmly fighting for the triumph of socialism and of communism, there can be no "cordon," regardless of how organized and strong it may be, to resist to the Marxist-Leninist truth. Any "cordon" will be smashed and its organizers will shamefully fail.

The First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union did not confine himself to this. Seeing that all his pressure, blockades and blackmail did not bring the result he desired, could not kneel down our Party and people, from the rostrum of the 22nd Congress he made an open call for the overthrowing by means of a counter-revolutionary coup the leadership of the Party of Labour of Albania, for the liquidation of the Party, something which he reserves himself to do even when it is the question of the governments of the capitalist

countries, because he considers it an interference in the internal affairs. He said: "To put an end to the personality cult means for Hoxha and others to give up in essence the commanding posts in the party and the state. But they do not want to do this. However we are convinced that the time will come when the Albanian communists, when the Albanian people, will have their say and then the Albanian leaders will have to give account for the damage they have caused to their country, to their people, to the cause of building of socialism in Albania." The Albanian people and the Albanian communists gave the reply to N. Khrushchev by means of hundreds and thousands of telegrams and letters, a part of which has been published by our press.

Our Party and people have heard continuously for 17 years in succession calls for the overthrow of our People's Power, for the liquidation of our Party and its leadership. They have heard and are hearing them every year from the U.S. State Department, from the U.S., British and other imperialists, from Franco's "Nationalist Spain" radio, from Tito's traitorous revisionist gang, from the Greek monarcho-fascists, etc. These have even hatched up plots to achieve their aims. We have heard now such calls also from Nikita Khrushchev, who in fact is joining them in the hostile activity against the Albanian people and its Party of Labour. On what have the imperialists and their tools relied in their activity against the people's power and the Party in our country? Their army has been the scum of our society, the degenerate and anti-party elements, people sold to the foreign imperialist intelligence services, whom our people recalls only with a feeling of deep hate, contempt and scorn. This will also be the army of Nikita Khrushchev. And it can not be otherwise. Our whole people, old and young, all the honest and patriotic people of our homeland, party and non-party people, have rallied today more than ever around our glorious Party and its correct Marxist-Leninist line, which expresses the vital interests of our people and meets the common interests of our

great cause, socialism and communism. In the face of the iron unity of our Party and people, in the face of this invincible force, all the hostile actions and the brutal inferences of Nikita Khrushchev will shamefully fail, as the entire hostile activity and plots of the imperialists, the Yugoslav revisionists, the Greek monarcho-fascists and other enemies of the Albanian people, its Party of Labour and the People's Republic of Albania, have failed and will always fail.

At the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, N. Khrushchev accused our Party and its leadership of anti-Sovietism, considering any remark and criticism towards his anti-Marxist viewpoints and actions, made in party meetings and according to Leninist rules, an attack against the Soviet Union and the Soviet peoples. This is a monstrous slander and distortion. Our Party and people for 20 years in succession have been educated in the spirit of unbounded love and firm loyalty towards the glorious Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. They have demonstrated this love and loyalty by deeds in their common struggle against fascism, in their joint efforts to built up the socialist and communist society, for peace and the freedom of peoples, they have shown it by their unswerving and principled struggle against our common enemies — the imperialists and the modern revisionists, especially after the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and after the counter-revolution in Hungary, when the enemies of socialism launched wild attacks and slanders against the Soviet order and Soviet soldiers were attacked on the back. The entire 20 year old heroic struggle and untiring activity of our party and people for the continuous tempering and strengthening of the sacred Albanian-Soviet friendship can not be liquidated so easily by means of some unfounded accusations and base slanders. The Albanian-Soviet friendship has deep roots, it will live in centuries, contrary to the desires and attempts of our criticsers.

Who does indeed defend the Soviet Union and its prestige, Nikita

Khrushchev, who with his unprincipled attacks and slanders against J.V. Stalin has discredited the glorious Soviet Union, presenting it like a country where the fiercest terror has reigned, the same as in the Hitlerite Germany, or the Party of Labour of Albania that has defended and is defending the Soviet Union from the fierce attacks of the imperialist and revisionist propaganda, which Nikita Khrushchev has provided with weapons? Who defends the Soviet Union and its prestige, Nikita Khrushchev who with his anti-Marxist actions, attacks, pressures and blockades against the People's Republic of Albania is providing weapons to the imperialists to stain before the world public opinion the Soviet Union and its Communist Party, or the Party of Labour of Albania, which has shown and is showing that his anti-Marxist actions have nothing in common with the principles and internationalist traditions of the glorious Soviet Union and its great Party of Lenin, that they are an unfortunate and temporary sickness in their sound body.

Our Party heard with patience what was said at the 22nd Congress in its address. We, too, are saying our own viewpoint concerning these questions. The Party of Labour of Albania, with calm and pure conscience, appeals to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, appeals to the new Central Committee elected by the 22nd Congress to judge with Leninist equity, with objectivity and calmness, not one-sidedly, on the situation created in the relations between our two parties and our two countries. Our Party has always been ready, for the sake of the unity of the Communist movement and the socialist camp, of the interests of our countries, to settle the existing disagreements. But it has always been and is of the opinion that these questions should be solved correctly and only in a Marxist-Leninist way, in the conditions of equality and not of pressure and dictate. We hope for and are confident in the sense of justice of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

20 YEARS OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA

Our Party and people, regardless of the attacks, slanders and the hostile actions directed against them, will guard untouched in their hearts the pure feelings of friendship with the fraternal peoples of the Soviet Union.

*The Party of Labor of Albania
in Battle with Modern Revi-
sionism*, Tirana 1972, pp.
112-175, Eng. ed.

THEY TRY TO INTIMIDATE US, WE TERRIFY THEM

November 25, 1961

The Soviet government is continuing its hostile acts against our country. It announced that it is withdrawing its ambassador from Albania, allegedly because we do not provide him with conditions in which to work. Base slanders, as usual. In fact, it is about ten months since the ambassador left. The Soviet embassy in Tirana has about 80 people engaged in nothing but espionage and sabotage against our Party and country. They try to frighten us, but we terrify them.

Disguising his activities under the great authority of the Soviet Union, Nikita Khrushchev is making major concessions to the imperialists so that his revisionist counter-revolutionary pacifist line will triumph. He and his cronies are saying almost nothing, have toned down the struggle against imperialism, headed by American imperialism. Khrushchev is making great efforts to let Kennedy and his group know and convince them that they should not be afraid of the Soviet Union and that they could come to terms if Kennedy makes a few concessions in response to Khrushchev's major concessions in order to arrive at a *modus vivendi*. Khrushchev and his henchmen have aimed their propaganda against Bonn and are completely avoiding bringing out the responsibility of the United States of America in arming it. On the other hand, Khrushchev and his group are attacking us, indirectly attacking China, defending India, inciting it against other countries, and making approaches to Tito. All these are bouquets of flowers for Kennedy who is not satisfied with empty words, but is demanding that Khrushchev make still more concrete concessions. Khrushchev is trying to split the alliances by making concessions to imperialists, but the Americans will get their hands on his throat. Time will prove everything. Khrushchev is a traitor to communism.

20 YEARS OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, pp. 57-58, Eng. ed.

THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT HAS BROKEN OFF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH US

December 3, 1961

Through our embassy in Moscow, the Soviet government informed us that it has broken off diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of Albania. This is an unheard-of, unprecedented hostile act, but it comes as no surprise to us. We had foreseen and knew that the enemies would go as far as this and would try to go even further if they could.¹ Although this act gravely damages the friendship between the Albanian people and the Soviet peoples, it is to the detriment of its authors. They are unmasking themselves in the eyes of the whole world by breaking off diplomatic relations with a friendly, allied country of people's democracy, a socialist country, while they maintain relations with and embrace the imperialists, the fascists, the Titoites, and others.

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, p. 59, Eng. ed.

¹ In the discussion of the question of the breaking off of the diplomatic relations between the USSR and the PRA by the Soviet revisionist leadership, held at the meeting of the Political Bureau of the CC of the PLA on December 5, 1961, Comrade Enver Hoxha pointed out: "Now there remains nothing for Khrushchev but to expel Albania from the Warsaw Treaty and to order the Soviet army to attack the People's Republic of Albania. But it is not easy for him to do this,... one thing is quite clear: today at the head of the Soviet government there are fascist elements who are striving in every way to hatch up all kinds of plans against the Albanian people." (Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 22, Alb. ed., Tirana 1976, pp. 401-402).

PANORAMA OF THE YEAR 1961

December 31, 1961

The year 1961 has been a year of struggle and efforts for the strengthening and defence of our Party, for the defence of the People's Republic of Albania, for the defence of Marxism-Leninism, for the fulfilment of the economic plan and the improvement of the life of our people. I can say that we achieved all these objectives successfully.

The Party of Labour of Albania remains as strong as steel. Not the slightest wavering among its members. The correct line and stand of the Central Committee were unanimously endorsed and embraced by all the Party members and non-members alike. The struggle of the Party in defence of the unity of its ranks, in defence of Marxism-Leninism, in defence of the Soviet Union of Lenin-Stalin, and the socialist camp was splendid. The diabolical plans, all the conspiratorial actions to repress, to strangle us, to stir up the counter-revolution in our country, all the attempts at economic, political and military blockades, the law of silence, etc., established by Nikita Khrushchev and the members of his counter-revolutionary group, were unmasked and thwarted. Thus Nikita Khrushchev was unable to achieve his vile purpose. He has been discredited in the communist movement and among world opinion as a traitor to Marxism-Leninism, the Soviet Union and the socialist camp.

Nikita Khrushchev went so far as to break off diplomatic relations with Albania. This discredited him more than anything. For nearly two years the traitor group of Nikita Khrushchev has been fighting us with all its means and power, but the result it has achieved is zero. The Party of Labour of Albania and our People's Republic stand proudly, unbowed and admired by all, because they are on the right road, because they are defending a just cause, because they are defending Marxism-Leninism, socialism, communism, freedom and peace in

the world.

Nikita Khrushchev poses as a pacifist and a pacifist with a communist disguise, but he is a counter-revolutionary, a Trotskyite revisionist who serves imperialism and the bourgeoisie. The plan which he is trying to apply is intended to transform the Soviet Union into a revisionist state, to cause the degeneration of the Soviet state and Communist Party, to corrupt the youth and to demoralize the working class. If this traitor is not stopped on his course, the Soviet Union will be turned into a fascist police state. Khrushchev hides all his hostile activities under the great prestige of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet socialist state. He relies also on the great economic potential which the Soviet Union has created.

Nikita Khrushchev is a revisionist coward. He is trying to reach a revisionist agreement with the American imperialists, wants reconciliation with them. Instead of resisting them with determination, he prefers to make them all sorts of concessions. Through the course on which he has set out he is weakening the economic, political, ideological and military strength of our camp. Khrushchev is preparing for even more open struggle against communism, if he is not stopped on his road.

In his relations with us Nikita Khrushchev revealed his real features as a traitor and an international bandit. He employed all kinds of counter-revolutionary tactics against us, from blandishments to the breaking-off of diplomatic relations. But in the Party of Labour of Albania he found an insurmountable obstacle, his calculations turned out wrong. He thought he would deceive us or he would liquidate us. But he was able to do neither the one nor the other. In this situation, when we were uncovering his betrayal and his aims as a traitor to Marxism-Leninism, he mobilized all his forces, all his cronies and fellow-travellers in order to slander us, allegedly to unmask us. But as a result of the course of betrayal which he is pursuing, his actions and

those of his associates and followers simply unmask him and, contrary to his wishes, confirm the correctness of our line, which has been expressed clearly in all the documents and in the daily struggle of the Party of Labour of Albania and our state.

In the attacks which he made on us at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, Nikita Khrushchev emerged as a splitter of the socialist camp, as a violator of the Moscow Declarations. In fact, a great many other parties did not attack us, or did not speak about us, and by not speaking they defended us. A considerable number of those who danced to the Khrushchevites' tune did this under the pressure and even open blackmail of Khrushchev. At the 22nd Congress their unprincipled attacks on us were among the main issues for the Khrushchevite gang. This exposed the gang. After the congress the Soviet propaganda and Soviet rubles were mobilized totally against us. Many party leaders were compelled to say something, even half a word against our Party. All these things were immediately reproduced in the newspaper *Pravda*, but this exposed them and not us. Now people are asking, why is this happening? Is this Party of Labour of Albania, that all are attacking, so powerful?

This is the first flare-up. All Khrushchev's friends have had their turn, now tempers will cool, people will think and, indeed, they have begun to think seriously, about the things they have done and they are gradually abandoning the sinking ship.

The countries of people's democracy in Europe did not follow Nikita Khrushchev in breaking off diplomatic relations with Albania. Czechoslovakia, Hungary and East Germany withdrew only their ambassadors, but left all the rest of the staff and their chargés d'affaires, while Bulgaria, Romania and Poland have not even withdrawn their ambassadors up till now. Hence, here there is a differentiation, even if only temporary. With the exception of the Soviet Union, all these states are concluding trade contracts with us for the year 1962. That

is another differentiation. We are convinced that time will work for us. Within their parties and states there is great confusion, discontent and splits, there is no unity and there can be no unity in them.

The leaderships of the communist and workers' parties of the countries of people's democracy are in an impasse, they are in opposition to the masses of their party members, and contradictions will increase. Each day and each year that passes the traitor course of Nikita Khrushchev will get them into deeper trouble.

The French Communist Party has taken this course, too, and so has that of Italy, the leadership of which has betrayed completely.

Albania is a bone which has stuck in Nikita Khrushchev's throat and is choking him so that he can hardly breathe, therefore Nikita Khrushchev is fighting us furiously. He thinks that the struggle against us will serve to intimidate his satellites, because he knows or guesses that sooner or later many of his present friends will turn their coats.

Nikita Khrushchev's traitor tactic at the moment consists of compromising his present friends as much as he can against us, to build up hostility against the genuine communists in their parties, to subordinate the economies of those countries to the Soviet economy so that at the first movement "out of line" pressure will be exerted on them either to stay "in line" or leave their place for other Khrushchevites. Of course the process of division will take place and clashes will develop over this. But Nikita Khrushchev and the other revisionists do not take account of the strength of their peoples. They rely on deception and on the strength of the army and the security forces (which they have fought under the mask of the fight against the cult of the individual and allegedly from the positions of the dictatorship of the proletariat which, according to them, is no longer necessary). The lying propaganda and the real application of terror and reprisals, which have begun on a large scale, will undoubtedly bring them terrible and insoluble contradictions. This will be their undoing.

The revisionist line that they are applying can bring them no benefits at all, in either their internal or their external policies. On the contrary, they will suffer defeat both at home and abroad, will be unmasked, isolated and destroyed, and although the struggle will be long, difficult and dangerous, we will triumph. Time is working for us. We are the majority. We have not lost our confidence in the Bolsheviks of the Soviet Union. How is it possible for all those thousands of revolutionaries and fighters imbued with the teachings of Lenin and Stalin to fall asleep? We have hopes in their strength, we like them, and we are sorry for them, because they are experiencing difficult moments. The Party of Labour of Albania will struggle with all its might to show them the disaster to which the revisionist group of Khrushchev is leading them.

The relentless struggle against the Yugoslav and Soviet revisionists, the struggle against the traitor groups of Tito and Khrushchev, will be continued very sternly. We must and will fight the main enemies, the imperialists and modern revisionists, until they are completely destroyed.

We are prepared and armed to accomplish the tasks of the new year 1962. As always, we shall safeguard the Party from any enemy. As always, we shall fight with the greatest severity to expose the traitors — Tito and Khrushchev and their associates. We shall be more vigilant than ever to protect our borders and our dear socialist Homeland, shall fight unflinchingly to defend the purity of Marxism-Leninism and the unity of the socialist camp on the Marxist-Leninist road and not on a revisionist basis, as Khrushchev and his gang of lackeys want.

The American imperialists will strive to damage us, in particular. To this end they will be assisted by the modern revisionists, will incite the Greek monarcho-fascists, the Yugoslav revisionists and others against us, but we shall foil all their diabolical plans. Socialist Albania will live and flourish because the heroic Party of Labour of Albania is

ENVER HOXHA

leading and defending it gloriously.

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, pp. 60-65, Eng. ed.

WHY HAS GROMYKO GONE TO VISIT TITO?

April 17, 1962

Yesterday Andrei Gromyko arrived in Belgrade on an official visit. He will stay there a week. Gromyko is an individual without any personality. This top Soviet functionary and obedient servant of Khrushchev has no backbone and his pants are threadbare at the knees. Gromyko has gone to Belgrade not to hold normal inter-state talks, but to approve Tito's line, to offer him new concessions on a tray, to beg Tito, on Khrushchev's behalf, to become an intermediary with the Americans, to confirm to Tito the split in the socialist camp and to assure him that they will continue to oppose China and Albania. Gromyko has gone to Belgrade to plot with Tito against Albania, according to Khrushchev's directives and in complete conformity with the desires, aims and methods of the Titoite group. The following matters must be the secret aims of his visit to Belgrade. The rest is just a smokescreen.

1) Khrushchev is in complete agreement with Tito's line. They both have the one line. Khrushchev is pursuing the recognized line of Tito in every field, both at home and abroad. Tito succeeded in having his line against Stalin, against Albania, for splitting the socialist camp, for splitting the communist and worker's parties of the world, for toning down the struggle against imperialism and for the development of revisionism, adopted and applied to the letter by the group of Khrushchev and his followers. They are operating "in unity" on all questions. For them the struggle against Titoism is "ancient history." Smoke! When Khrushchev says that he agrees with Tito only on certain questions of foreign policy, that is just demagoguery, because, in fact, the whole Khrushchevite policy conforms with that of Tito. When Khrushchev claims that he is trying to stop Yugoslavia from going over to the imperialist camp, that is just demagoguery, because

Yugoslavia went over to that camp long ago. On the contrary, now Tito is working to get Khrushchev and his gang deeper into his mire in the service of imperialism. Tito's allegedly neutral course has been fully approved by Khrushchev who finds it correct. This course is necessary and essential for Khrushchev, just as it is for the American imperialists, because it is a catalyst of their lines, the most fruitful variant of American imperialism, the ideological variant of the imperialist "comrade" to hinder the development and upsurge of communism in the countries not yet liberated, and the destroyer of the communist movement and the socialist camp.

To defend this line and the promoters of this line means to serve imperialism consciously. Hence, Gromyko has gone to Belgrade to strengthen Tito's belief in this line on behalf of Khrushchev, and Tito in turn, is to assure Kennedy, Nehru, and others that the Soviet revisionist group wants peace at any price, that it has completely given up support for the peoples' national liberation struggle (Algeria, Congo, South Vietnam, etc.), because it never has supported and never will support this struggle (the talk about support is just propaganda).

Tito understands these things very well, therefore, they are begging him to talk to and convince the Americans and the "non-aligned," his partners and Khrushchev's friends, about this. Tito's role as a "neutral" is acceptable and necessary to the "neutral" capitalist bourgeoisie, too, because it has Tito as the Trojan horse to split the communist and workers' parties in the capitalist countries. Tito serves, to some extent, as a kind of disguise to hide from the peoples the true savage features of the bourgeoisie as capitalist exploiters and oppressors and their dependence on American imperialism. Thus, Tito is a bridge for all of them. He plays in all the scenes.

Both the American imperialists and the "non-aligned" have him on their side, both ideologically and materially. They have him as an informer, as a buffer to moderate and restrain Khrushchev, and,

WHY HAS GROMYKO GONE TO SEE TITO?

knowing Khrushchev inside out, they know every plan and secret of his and impose their plans on him. Both sides are interested in the “non-aligned” and try to enhance their value, to make them a third force, to fight jointly with them against communism and the peoples’ freedom.

2) Khrushchev’s pacifist foreign policy is suffering defeat. The American imperialists are making him no concessions anywhere, but, on the contrary, are demanding more and more from him. The Americans are gaining time and stepping up their military preparations, while this Tartarin is just talking, proposing toasts and constructing Quixotic plans. However there is a limit to words and the Tartarin is getting nowhere, the Americans have the initiative. Khrushchev has to find a way out, therefore Gromyko goes to Tito to talk with him about arranging the compromises which Khrushchev has to make with the American imperialists. Tito, who knows the desires and aims of the Americans and of Khrushchev, will play the role of arbiter, with one hand reaching out for the dollar and the other for the ruble. The Americans and the “non-aligned” will soon be informed confidentially about the new concessions which Khrushchev will make to them. As can be seen, the policy of backroom deals dominates everything. Long live Geneva and UNO!

The peace conferences are of no value, they are just playing to the gallery. The struggle against genuine socialism will be the most welcome gift which the Khrushchev group will make to the American imperialists, Tito and his “neutral” friends. On Albania, Khrushchev will be in full agreement with Tito that he should liquidate us and establish their joint agents in Albania. Of course, they will reach agreement on the methods, ways and time to act and avoid compromising themselves in the eyes of world opinion. But mark my words...! The Party and the people are vigilant and we will smash the head of anyone who dares to touch us! Their plots will fail.

ENVER HOXHA

The revisionists failed in their plan to “strangle” Albania. They were unable to drag on to their counter-revolutionary road a number of communist and workers’ parties which have seen the correctness and strength of our Marxist-Leninist line and the decay of the revisionists. The revisionists are meeting resistance even in their own parties and are struggling with difficulties. Now they are trying a new tactic, that of “softening,” of “unity.” We must be vigilant! We must uncover their objectives! We must stand firm as always!

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, pp. 70-73, Eng. ed.

A NEW AGREEMENT WHICH WILL SERVE THE ARMING AND THE WARMONGERING PLOTS OF THE USA AND THE USSR

May 25, 1962

According to radio reports, an agreement has been reached in Geneva between the Soviets and the Americans on “stopping the cold war and warmongering propaganda.” The American imperialists are making much ado about this, advertising it as an important achievement, although everyone knows that not only will they not cease such activity, but they will find a thousand and one ways to continue it. By publicizing the Geneva agreement they want to avoid exposure and to operate more freely in arming themselves and implementing their plans and plots. For their part, the Khrushchevites have long been applying this line and no longer expose imperialism. However the genuine Marxist-Leninists do not accept this demagogical line of the two superpowers and they will tear the mask from the American imperialists and the Khrushchevite revisionists.

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, p. 77, Eng. ed.

THE KHRUSHCHEVITES ARE COWARDS, COMPROMISERS AND TRAITORS

October 23, 1962

In connection with Kennedy's warmongering speech on the question of Cuba, the Soviet government, wanting to appear unalarmed before world opinion, made a wishy-washy, non-committal pacifist statement after some delay. The statement does not say that the Soviet Union will defend Cuba, nor does it reply to the direct attacks and threats which Kennedy made. The Khrushchevites are showing themselves to be what they are, cowards, compromisers and traitors who leave their friends in the lurch, individuals devoid of principles and morals, therefore, they are unmasking themselves in the eyes of world opinion. They will come to terms with Kennedy, will make concessions to him, but if they leave heroic Cuba in the lurch, this will be a great crime and mean total exposure for them.

Cuba decreed general mobilization under the slogan "the Homeland or death." It demanded a meeting of the Security Council of the UNO. The United States of America and the Soviet Union also demanded this and it will meet today.

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, p. 81, Eng. ed.

KENNEDY REVEALS KHRUSHCHEV'S COURSE OF BETRAYAL

June 12, 1963

The day before yesterday, Kennedy delivered an allegedly pacifist, demagogic speech. He meets the revisionist and traitor Nikita Khrushchev half-way, and using almost the same terms as the latter, takes him by the hand to set him properly on the course of betrayal. In fact, in this speech Kennedy reveals Khrushchev's course of betrayal so as to drag him along like Tito and to crucify him like Christ. He lauds Khrushchev, telling him that they both have the same policy, the same aim, so they should come to agreement. Therefore, Kennedy calls on Khrushchev to maintain the monopoly of atomic weapons, advises him to destroy the socialist camp and trusts him to do so, because Khrushchev, in agreement with Kennedy and Tito, has long been engaged in this task. The betrayal could not be more open!

Everything is clear to all; everything and every day confirms the foresight of the Party of Labour of Albania and the correctness of its actions. There is no time to lose, the traitor gang of Nikitich¹ must be attacked openly, without any hesitation, because it is doing colossal damage to communism and humanity. Nikita is heading with giant strides towards integration into capitalism. It is a mistake for the Chinese comrades to proceed with such "prudence" and procrastination against these international bandits. The United States of America, Britain and the Soviet Union have decided to hold a meeting in Moscow to talk about a moratorium on nuclear tests, to draft a treaty on banning these tests, which means confirmation on their part of the safeguarding of their nuclear monopoly in order to suppress communism and the revolution throughout the world. We will do our

¹ An ironical distortion of the name Nikita.

ENVER HOXHA

duty to the end to expose these plans, even if we stand alone. But we will not be alone!

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, pp. 91-92, Eng. ed.

MODERN REVISIONISM IN THE SERVICE OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

Notes¹

June 14, 1963

Modern revisionism, headed by the renegades from Marxism-Leninism, Khrushchev and Tito, has placed itself in the service of the general strategy of American imperialism.

Nothing has changed in the general strategy of imperialism, with American imperialism at the head.

Its main aims:

— to insist on preparations for war in order to establish the hegemony of capital in the world, to destroy the camp of socialism, to enslave the peoples by crushing the proletarian and national revolutions.

Decisions by both sides:

— to continue arming themselves and to continue the imperialist-revisionist ideological diversion,

— the arming of the capitalists,

— the arming of the revisionists,

— the arming of the “neutrals” (the “non-aligned”).

The aim of the Americans:

— to retain and increase their armaments, to retain their monopoly of atomic weapons, to keep their allies under control;

— to compel the revisionist Khrushchev to stop any further arming of the Soviet Union and its allies, to place them under American

¹ These notes were used by the author in the article “Kennedy’s new demagogy and the old plan,” published in the newspaper *Zëri i Popullit*, June 23, 1963.

control or to neutralize them, or the two of them together to have the atomic monopoly in the end;

— to vie with Khrushchev in the supply of arms to the so-called neutral countries and tie them to their chariot so as to have them always subordinated, to crush the revolution in these countries, to have them as allies in local wars, to have them as allies in the struggle against socialism, to have them under their own leadership in a war for the redivision of the world.

— To all of them the main enemies are Marxism-Leninism, socialism, the dictatorship of the proletariat. Therefore, everything is organized and directed against these enemies.

— Atomic blackmail and the psychosis of terror are made universal by the imperialists and the revisionists. The blackmail and threats of the imperialist and revisionist blusterers are intended to intimidate the weak and make them surrender to them, to intimidate and discourage the revolutionaries. Therefore, the “complete and general disarmament” trumpeted by both sides is a bluff, which is part of the efforts to let the dupes, whom they have terrified, to continue hoping.

— The atomic moratorium in connection with the prohibition of tests and the signing of an agreement on this issue between the Soviet Union, the United States of America and Britain has no connection with general disarmament, but is connected with the strengthening of the monopoly of atomic weapons and with “outlawing” those who dare to conduct tests and produce atomic weapons.

— This bluff must be exposed.

— The imperialist bloc and its enslaving world economic policy. The character of aid and credits: the strengthening of reactionary cliques, the exploitation of the countries that receive them, neo-colonialism, armed interventions in other countries to defend the interests of foreign capital and the dependent local capital, the preservation of spheres of influence or colonies. The demagogy of the “free world,”

the anti-communist struggle in all its savagery.

— The revisionist bloc, its enslaving economic policy. Credits with enslaving political terms attached, securing markets, spheres of influence, and military bases, the aim to suppress revolutions, to bring about the destruction and degeneration of the communist and workers' parties, to re-establish the capitalist hegemony.

— The common points and the contradictions of this strategy.

— The general political-ideological line of the modern revisionists suits imperialism and serves its main strategy.

— Anti-Leninist peaceful coexistence — conciliation with the bourgeois ideology, with imperialism, with Christianity, with religion in general. Ending the polemic and the so-called cold war, that is, the class struggle, eliminating revolutions. Conciliation and smoothing over any antagonistic contradiction through forms of peaceful agreement to the disadvantage of the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Evolutionary development, the taking of power in peaceful ways, parliamentarianism, structural reforms, etc. (The statements of Khrushchev, Tito, Kennedy, Togliatti bring into the open the unity of their views on all this line).

— The question of war and peace, the question of disarmament and their bluffs in order to prepare for war against communism.

— The destruction of the socialist camp, the main aim of imperialism (according to statements by Truman, Churchill, Eisenhower, Kennedy).

— Tito's activity in words and deeds.

— Khrushchev's splitting activity in words and practical actions.

— The European Common Market, its aims and difficulties.

— The Council of Mutual Economic Aid (Comecon), the aims of Khrushchev and the revisionists, their difficulties. (These two organizations have the same aim and face the same difficulties.)

— The modern revisionists are proceeding toward the liquidation

ENVER HOXHA

of the socialist camp, toward “independent” states, as imperialism and the capitalist development want.

— The Khrushchev group is moving toward establishing the same ideological and political, economic and military relations as American imperialism has with its satellites.

— Capitalist relations of the great power.

— The obstacles for both sides: Marxism-Leninism, the revolution and the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

— The struggle against Albania.

— The struggle against China.

— The struggle against the other countries and Marxist-Leninist parties.

— The political, ideological, and economic struggle, and the preparations for general war with arms, sabotage and plots.

General preparations for this by the imperialists and the modern revisionists:

a) denigration of the Marxist-Leninist theory and its open distortion;

b) the ideological, political degeneration of the communist parties, their organizational degeneration and liquidation;

c) the degeneration of the socialist structure of the economy and its gradual transformation into a capitalist economy;

d) the degeneration of the army into an aggressive, predatory, megalomaniacal, anti-popular, anti-socialist army;

e) the strengthening of the bureaucracy, the worker aristocracy and the kulaks, the degeneration of intellectuals by all means and in all fields of life.

— With his speech, Kennedy gave Khrushchev and the other traitors his complete approval and help.

The Main Issues From Kennedy’s Speech Of June 10

REVISIONISM IN THE SERVICE OF IMPERIALISM

His main idea is demagoguery about peace, “peace for all,” but “Pax Americana” imposed with American weapons, and not “the peace of the grave.” (Here he means that the dogmatists allegedly want this kind of peace — the Kennedy variant of the issue plus the Khrushchevite revisionist variant. A common hostile line.)

All the demagoguery of this imperialist about peace is indistinguishable from Khrushchev’s demagoguery about peace.

The other idea which supports this demagoguery about peace is the question that now their atomic weapons neutralize the opponents and ensure peace. That is, according to Kennedy and Khrushchev, who are in agreement, the United States of America and the Soviet Union must work for the “American-Soviet peace,” because they have the atomic bombs and must retain their monopoly, while the others must follow and obey, and these two, that is, the USA and the USSR, should conclude a treaty on the prohibition of tests of nuclear weapons and ban tests of these weapons. (Obviously, the reference here is to China, which, according to them, must in no way be allowed to conduct tests and have such weapons, and if China dares to do this, they will condemn it, not merely as not a peace-loving state, but as a state which is endangering peace, therefore, they should liquidate it with weapons and partition it between them. On this Khrushchev and Kennedy are in agreement and have long been engaged in such a game).

Another demagogic idea which Kennedy and Khrushchev have in common is the issue that “there will be a large surplus of funds, and these we shall use for construction, for the improvement of life,” etc., that is, to keep the peoples under their domination and dictate by feeding them a few crumbs, and creating the worker aristocracy and the strata of the bureaucracy. Kennedy says to Khrushchev: “You have advocated this, and I am with you, we are in agreement on our aims and means. Let us proceed hand in hand on this road.”

While putting the problem of “peace” on the same demagogic course as Khrushchev, Kennedy also defines the objective and subjective obstacles on both sides, which must be eliminated and how to eliminate them.

Kennedy openly implies that there are “madmen” in the United States of America (allegedly Khrushchev is right), “but they must and will reflect, must be restrained, and we shall restrain them” (he placates the fears of Khrushchev, the modern revisionists, the dupes).

Kennedy calls on the “madmen” to revise their views about the Soviet Union. This is what is needed and it will do no harm, says Kennedy, we are making no concessions and we hope to triumph and to strangle communism. We may make some minor sacrifices. Elisabeth Flynn¹ can do us no harm, we have her in the FBI.

Kennedy assures the American sceptics that the Soviet leaders will change, or are in the process of changing. They are no longer the former ones, and to please Khrushchev he says that they (the Americans) will change their attitude towards the Soviet Union.

Whether they will change, or where they ought to change, this Kennedy defines with great demagogy.

In regard to peace — this is possible “now,” war is not inevitable. (That is, Kennedy tells Khrushchev: “**I, too, was convinced with your famous theses at the 20th Congress. What more do you and your friends, who are also my friends, need to be convinced?**”)

Therefore, says Kennedy, peace can be achieved through **the evolution of social institutions** (the changes that are being made in the Soviet Union and its satellite countries). There may be, and probably will be, differences, but we must solve them and march forward, says Kennedy (there will be ideological differences between “Marxists,” say Tito and Khrushchev, but these we shall solve through talks, or by

¹ At that time chairman of the National Committee of the Communist Party (revisionist) of the USA.

putting them aside to be solved later, now let us march forward). And Kennedy tells Khrushchev openly: **“We shall help you on this course, don’t be afraid, go ahead.”** In regard to the Soviet Union, Kennedy tells the Americans, and at the same time, Khrushchev (in order to flatter and help him, just as he has helped Kennedy by describing him as reasonable and peaceful) that there are worthy people in every regime, and these worthy people do not believe the “madmen” of the (Soviet) propaganda. Therefore, Kennedy advises Khrushchev to “restrain” his “madmen,” because Kennedy has “restrained” or is going “to restrain” the diplomats, the officers of the Pentagon, and others.

Hence, on this question, too, Kennedy tells Khrushchev, we are in complete agreement.

Kennedy goes even further in his use of Khrushchev’s formulas: The United States of America and the Soviet Union have never made war on each other. You “unfortunate people of the Soviet Union lost 20 million dead, you fought valiantly, your country was put to the torch,” etc., and today, if war were to break out (from the Chinese) we would suffer damage, therefore, says Kennedy, let us agree to proceed on the course which we two have set jointly.

Therefore, Kennedy advises Khrushchev, “We should not enter into polemics,” but should take effective secret measures, should be linked directly by telephone, so the two of us can co-ordinate everything. And you, Khrushchev, leave the countries of people’s democracy free, let the socialist camp break up, as we have agreed with Tito, and we should settle the German question and the problem of Berlin as I have advised, because I do not change my position.

Kennedy says openly that with these splits which exist in the camp, everything will go well, the American-Soviet peace will be secured, therefore, carry on, Khrushchev. In brief, Kennedy’s speech lets the cat out of the bag, and confirms the correctness of our views about

ENVER HOXHA

Khrushchev. The American imperialists are convinced that Khrushchev is moving closer to them, that he is deeply committed to the course of betrayal, but at the same time, to the course of exposure. Therefore, Kennedy comes to his aid to tell him, go ahead, because I am with you, I am helping you on your line which I have dictated to you, to compromise you further, so that you won't turn back because your head will roll.

Therefore, Kennedy tells him, let us work together, continue to deceive the Castros, organize sabotage under your slogans, hatch up plots against every socialist country, bring your men and mine to power, establish the dictatorship of the revisionist group, etc., etc., and you have me beside you at every moment.

This, in broad outline, is the meaning of Kennedy's speech.

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, pp. 93-101, Eng. ed.

THE MODERN REVISIONISTS ON THE WAY TO DEGENERATING INTO SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS AND TO FUSING WITH SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

Article published in the newspaper "Zëri i Popullit"

April 7, 1964

Every passing day brings to light new facts which show that the modern revisionists, the Khrushchev group and its followers, have utterly betrayed and have turned into enemies of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, of socialism and the revolutionary and liberation movement of the working class and the enslaved peoples, enemies of the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement. They have joined in a "holy alliance" with the American imperialists and the reactionaries of different countries, with all the anti-communist forces against the peoples and socialism. All their struggle is spearheaded against Marxism-Leninism, against all the fraternal parties and revolutionary communists loyal to it, against the anti-imperialist, liberation and revolutionary movement of the peoples. All their utterances about "loyalty" to Marxism-Leninism, to the cause of socialism, to the revolution and proletarian internationalism are sheer bluff and demagoguery from start to finish.

In order to carry through their anti-Marxist, anti-socialist and counter-revolutionary course, they are in need of allies. And where could they find better allies than among the revisionist elements in the various parties and among the Titoite clique in Yugoslavia? Therefore Khrushchev and his group succeeded, through putsches and plots, in deceiving some and compromising others, under the guise of fighting the "cult of the individual," in bringing to power and placing at the head of certain communist and workers' parties revisionist elements while, on the other hand, they rehabilitated the renegade Tito clique

and united with it completely. Thus, the united revisionist front came into being. This was the first step.

In addition to this, the modern revisionists have never given up their efforts to find other allies, too. And who could these be? It is quite natural for them to turn to, and they could not fail to turn to their “brothers” in treachery — the right-wing social-democrat leaders, for present-day revisionism and social-democracy are two manifestations of the same ideology — bourgeois ideology. Social-democracy is the manifestation of bourgeois ideology in the workers’ movement, while revisionism is the manifestation of bourgeois ideology in the communist movement.

This is the common ideological basis that draws the revisionists closer to and unites them with the social-democrats and creates the premises for their complete fusion not only ideologically and politically, but also organizationally. Therefore, it is completely natural and logical that the attempts of the revisionists to cause the degeneration of the communist parties they lead into social-democratic parties, and their tendency to fully fuse with social-democracy, are becoming ever more clear today.

The trend to rapprochement and unity with social-democracy, like the whole treacherous line of the modern revisionists, has its beginnings in the 20th Congress of the CPSU. This trend was re-emphasized at the 21st and 22nd Congresses and was sanctioned in the new program of the CPSU. Speaking of this course of rapprochement and unity with social-democracy at the 22nd Congress, Khrushchev said: “This is not a temporary tactical slogan but the general line of the communist movement dictated by the basic interests of the working class.” Khrushchev has also said: “If we are to speak of the role and position of the non-communist parties, we should stress, first of all, that in the present situation, in order to achieve the socialist transformation of society, collaboration of the communist party with the

other parties is not only possible but also indispensable” (Khrushchev’s reply to John Waters, editor of the Australian newspaper “Herald,” published in “Pravda.” June 25, 1958).

The course of rapprochement and unity with the social-democrats began to be put into effect immediately after the 20th Congress. The CC of the CPSU sent letters to the social-democratic parties of Western Europe, calling for unity. Beginning from 1956, the Soviet Union has been visited by many social-democratic leaders and by whole delegations of social-democratic parties that had meetings and held talks with the Khrushchev group.

The campaign for unity with the social-democrats has been greatly stepped up, especially in recent times. Evidence of this can be seen in the last year’s visits to Moscow of such leaders of social-democracy as P.H. Spaak, Secretary-General of the Belgian Socialist Party, Harold Wilson, the present Chairman of the British Labour Party, and Guy Mollet, Secretary-General of the French Socialist Party, who conducted talks with Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders. In connection with these talks, in an interview with foreign journalists in Moscow, Guy Mollet said that he had discussed with Khrushchev “a number of questions which included all the problems of theory and doctrine of a permanent character and which characterize the relations between social-democratic and communist parties.” While, in an interview granted to the newspaper “Unità” (February 22, 1964), Guy Mollet stated: “The talks which the delegation of SFIO conducted with the leaders of the CPSU, and in particular with Nikita Khrushchev, gave us sure satisfaction on many points.”

Under the dictate of the “conductor’s baton,” the leaderships of communist and workers’ parties in certain other countries are also following the line of amalgamation with present-day social-democracy. This is evident in many of their acts, in various articles and statements, in the columns of the Khrushchevite review “Problems of Peace and

ENVER HOXHA

Socialism,” in the “Document of the CC of the Italian CP for the National Conference on Organization” published in the newspaper “Unità,” January 9, 1964, in the draft-resolution for the 17th Congress of the French CP which will be held in May this year, and so on.

In all these attempts, documents and materials of the modern revisionists, regardless of the phrases they use to camouflage their designs, the prevailing idea is unity and fusion with the social-democrats “on whatever basis” and “at all costs,” renouncing anything that might prejudice this union, be it in the field of ideology or in that of organization.

The attempts of the modern revisionists for rapprochement and unity with the social-democrats are a logical consequence of their betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, a component part of their grand strategic plan of “world integration” clearly formulated by Tito in his well-known interview granted to Drew Pearson on August 7, 1962. To realize this objective the revisionists make extensive use of demagogical slogans. They are trying to justify their rapprochement and unity with the imperialists and reactionaries in the name of “peaceful coexistence” and of “saving the world from a nuclear war of extermination,” their approach to and union with the Tito clique, in the name of “socialism,” with the Pope in Rome, in the name of “humanity,” with the social-democrats, in the name of “unity of the working class.”

THE MODERN REVISIONISTS ARE FOLLOWING IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF TREACHEROUS SOCIAL- DEMOCRACY

The modern revisionists try to justify their rapprochement and unity with the social-democrats under the pretext that “positive trends” are allegedly being observed, especially in recent times, among the ranks of social-democracy, that they have allegedly expressed themselves in favour of peace, peaceful coexistence, disarmament, that

REVISIONISM ON THE WAY TO SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

they have modified their attitude towards the USSR in a positive direction, that they have expressed themselves in favour of some kind of approach to the communists, that they have expressed some sort of willingness to fulfil the demands of the working class, to preserve and strengthen democratic institutions, have stated that they are in favour of the socialist transformation of society, and so forth. Thus, in order to justify their course of approach to the right-wing leaders of social-democracy, the revisionists try to create the illusion that it is not the revisionist train which is speeding its way to the social-democratic station, but the social-democratic station is coming up to meet the revisionist train.

This is no new tactic for revisionists. Khrushchev's traitor group and those who follow them have used precisely this manoeuvre to justify their rapprochement and complete union with the Titoite clique, pretending that the Yugoslav leaders have allegedly corrected many of their errors and have adopted "Marxist-Leninist" positions. In the same way, in order to justify their treacherous course of reconciliation and rapprochement with imperialism, American imperialism in particular, they have spread and continue to spread the illusion that the leaders of imperialism have now become "wise," "realistic," "peace-loving," "reasonable," and what not.

But facts prove that the present social-democratic leaders have changed as little in their nature and in their attitude as the Titoite clique and imperialism. If we may speak of any kind of change of views and stands of the social-democratic leaders, the only change apparent is their ever growing inclination to the right.

WHAT DOES PRESENT-DAY SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY REPRESENT?

Present-day social-democracy is a direct successor to the traitorous Second International. It has inherited all the ideological,

organizational and tactical baggage of the parties of the Second International. The social-democrats began their betrayal with their deviation from the basic teachings of Marxism-Leninism, which they proclaimed as outdated and unsuitable, by renouncing the class struggle and replacing it with the “theory” of class harmony and class conciliation, by negating the revolution and replacing it with reforms within the capitalist order, by abandoning the revolutionary road and replacing it with the “peaceful,” “democratic,” parliamentary road, by denying the indispensable need to smash the old bourgeois state apparatus and accepting the capitalist state as a means of transition to socialism, by negating the dictatorship of the proletariat and replacing it with “pure, universal democracy,” by deviating from proletarian internationalism, and going so far as to slide completely into the positions of national chauvinism, to open unity with the imperialist bourgeoisie.

Unmasking the betrayal of the old social-democrats Lenin wrote in his book “What Is to Be Done?”:

“Social-democracy must change from a party of social revolution into a democratic party of social reforms. Bernstein has surrounded this political demand with a whole battery of well-attuned ‘new’ arguments and reasonings. Denied was the possibility of putting socialism on a scientific basis and of demonstrating its necessity and inevitability from the point of view of the materialist conception of history. Denied was the fact of growing impoverishment, the process of proletarianization, and the intensification of capitalist contradictions; the very concept, “ultimate aim,” was declared to be unsound, and the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat was completely rejected. Denied was the antithesis in principle between liberalism and socialism. Denied was the theory of the class struggle, on the alleged grounds that it could not be applied to a strictly democratic society governed

REVISIONISM ON THE WAY TO SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

according to the will of the majority, etc.”¹

By embarking on this road, social-democracy turned into a loyal supporter of the capitalist order, into a servant of the bourgeoisie, into the most important ideological and political support of bourgeois policy within the workers' movement. It has aided the bourgeoisie to oppress and exploit the workers of its own country and the peoples of other countries, to suppress their revolutionary and liberation movement.

“It has been shown in practice,” says V.I. Lenin, “that working-class activists who follow the opportunist trend are better defenders of the bourgeoisie than the bourgeois themselves. Without their leadership of the workers, the bourgeoisie could not remain in power.”²

But present-day social-democracy has gone even further in its betrayal when compared with the time of the Second International. In the present era it is characterized by an ever greater leaning to the right.

Beginning from 1955, the social-democratic parties in West Europe, like the British Labour Party, the social-democratic parties in France, Austria, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Luxemburg, West Germany and in the Scandinavian countries have changed their programs, or have been engaged in elaborating new programmatic stands. What characterizes these programs and new programmatic stands? They are characterized by the eclectic blending of old opportunist theories with the “modern” bourgeois theories, by their final renunciation of all the principles and ideals of socialism, by their open support for the capitalist order of exploitation and by their frenzied anti-communism.

¹ V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 5, pp. 414-415, Alb. ed.

² V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 31, p. 254, Alb. ed.

If the former reformists avowed, even in words alone, that the establishment of socialism was their ultimate goal, the present-day social-democrats have openly rejected this aim. They preach that they are in favour of the so-called “democratic socialism,” which has nothing in common with genuine scientific socialism. It is its negation, its replacement with some bourgeois liberal reforms which do not threaten the foundations of capitalist society in any way. Of what socialism can we speak when many of the social-democratic programs have discarded the elementary demand of socialism for the abolition of private ownership of the means of production?

Following the well-known statement of the socialist International on “The Aims and Tasks of Democratic Socialism” (1951), the new programs direct the working class not against capitalism but against “uncontrolled” capitalism. The nationalization of some enterprises by the bourgeois state, the establishment of state monopoly capitalism, the intervention of the capitalist state in the economic life of the country, the implementation of some bourgeois-democratic reforms in the new programs and statements of the social-democrats — all these are regarded as facts which show that the foundations of socialism have allegedly been laid in certain capitalist countries. At the same time, they deny the socialist character of transformations in the socialist countries. In this way, directly or indirectly, they repeat the bourgeois theories in vogue on “people’s capitalism,” “controlled capitalism,” “organized capitalism,” “democratic capitalism,” and so on.

The bourgeois reactionary press has more than once hailed this departure of the social-democrats from the principles of socialism and their defence of capitalism. In a leading article under the title “The Burial of Marxism,” the newspaper “Washington Post and Times Herald” wrote:

“Eighty-four years after its establishment at the historic Congress at Gotha, the German Social-Democratic Party at its Congress at Bad-

Godesberg renounced Marxist ideology and, in fact, ceased to be socialist in the true sense of that word. It reconciled itself to the principle of 'free individual enterprise, wherever that is possible' in economic life."

The new programs of the social-democratic parties have left out all mention of contradictions, antagonism and class struggle, have wiped out the dividing lines between the oppressed and oppressors, between the exploited and exploiters. In place of the class struggle they preach "the sense of responsibility" of man "in general." Thus the program of the German Social-Democratic Party has it:

"Freedom and democracy in industrial society are possible of attainment only if the maximum number of individuals raise their social conscience and express their willingness to share responsibility. The social-democrats uphold the solidarity and harmony of all mankind," in the attainment of their "supra-class" objective — "democratic socialism."

Since "democratic socialism" does not encroach upon the bases of the capitalist order in any way, but is a sort of "reformed" capitalism, it naturally follows that there is no need for any kind of socialist revolution. "Democratic socialism," according to them, will come about through "spontaneous economic evolution," through limitation of the prerogatives and power of monopoly combines and through the aid of the capitalist state itself. Nevertheless, in order to attain this ideal, it is necessary that the social-democrats come to power, and the only way to achieve this is through electoral campaigns to win the majority of votes in the bourgeois parliament. Eulogizing the declaration of the socialist International on "The Aims and Tasks of Democratic Socialism," one of its leaders, Braunthal, has said that this declaration "puts an end to the discussion of the dictatorship of the proletariat," "rules out the revolutionary class struggle as a method to achieve socialism," and "rejects adherence to any socialist theory."

The social-democratic parties have severed any connection with Marxism-Leninism, with the theory of scientific socialism and with the materialist world outlook. The program of the Austrian Socialist Party has it:

“Socialism is an international movement which does not at all demand an obligatory identity of views. Regardless of from what source the socialists draw their views, from a Marxist or any other social analysis, from religious or humanitarian principles — they all aim at a common goal.” Speaking at the Congress of the German Social-Democratic Party at Bad-Godesberg, its former chairman E. Ollenhauer said that “the demand to make the political program of K. Marx and F. Engels the substance of the social-democratic program for 1959 is so anti-Marxist that it is unimaginable,” and he added. “We cannot be understood if we speak in the language of the past, we cannot solve problems of today with our old concepts.”

Social-democracy has not only long ago slipped into positions of philosophical idealism and today it not only defends idealism, but is also trying to find support in and even fuse entirely with its most extreme form — religion. Thus, for instance, the programs of German, Austrian, Swiss and other social-democratic parties maintain that “democratic socialism” has its roots in the Christian ethic and doctrine, that socialism and religion, far from being mutually exclusive, are completely at one with each other. Speaking at the Congress of the Austrian Socialist Party in 1958, the author of the new program, B. Kautsky, said: “We wanted to draw up a program, which could be fully endorsed by both Marxists and non-Marxists, by both atheists and socialist believers.” A similar attempt to reconcile Christianity with socialism, the religious idealist world outlook with the scientific materialist world outlook, is made also in the interview given to the correspondent of the Italian newspaper “Unità” by Guy Mollet, which was published in that paper on February 22 of this year.

REVISIONISM ON THE WAY TO SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

Such, in general, are the ideological views of present-day social-democracy. What must be stressed here is that its programs, as a rule, are more leftist than its acts. If the right socialists still try, in words, to pose as socialists in order to deceive the workers, in deeds they have long become staunch defenders of the capitalist order. Both when they are in opposition and when they are at the head of bourgeois governments, or take part in them, the chiefs of social-democracy serve to preserve and strengthen the bourgeois order with all their views and acts. All the socialist demagoguery of present-day social-democracy has been refuted by life itself. Socialists have more than once been at the head of bourgeois governments both in Britain, France and elsewhere. To this day they are at the head of or take part in the governments of many capitalist countries. And what have they done for the workers; for socialism? They have done nothing but follow the instruction of Leon Blum that, being in power, the socialists must be “loyal directors of capitalist society.”

Let us dwell briefly on the activity of the French Socialist Party and its leader Guy Mollet, who has more than once taken part in and even headed the French government, and whom the revisionists present as a left-wing element and hold cordial talks with him. When at the head of the government, the French socialists set the dogs on striking workers, incited the outbreak of the dirty war in Indochina, undertook police repression against the peoples of other colonies, carried on the fighting against the Algerian people with more ferocity, approved the North Atlantic Treaty and the rearming of West Germany. Guy Mollet's government signed the agreement for the “European Common Market” and “Euratom” and was one of the organizers of the military aggression against Egypt; Guy Mollet's betrayal paved the way for personal rule in France, and so on and so forth. Speaking of Guy Mollet's government activity, even the Labourite weekly “Tribune” wrote at the beginning of 1957 that “Mollet is a disgrace both

to France and to socialism.”

Such is the real traitor face of social-democracy today. It is not for nothing that many representatives of the bourgeoisie have stressed the great role of the social-democratic parties in suppressing the revolutionary movement of workers and in defending the capitalist order, and have sung their praises. For instance, T. Junilla, director of a capitalist bank in Finland, has declared: “In the struggle to win over industrial workers spiritually only the social-democrats can serve as a powerful force against the communists. If social-democracy loses this battle, it may very well be the end of democracy in Finland. This is why I, a conservative bourgeois, feel obliged to state that we need a united, militant social-democratic party which firmly upholds northern democracy.” The British bourgeois newspaper “Financial Times” wrote in the same vein on June 28, 1963: “...the industrialists are less afraid of the Labourites, and some of them are of the opinion that a Labour government will open up better prospects for development than the Tories.”

Precisely because the social-democrats are agents of the bourgeoisie in the workers’ movement the Marxist-Leninists have always been clear that without a determined struggle to unmask and smash social-democracy ideologically and politically, the working class cannot wage its struggle successfully and carry it on to victory.

“The fact is,” V.I. Lenin wrote, “that ‘bourgeois labour parties’, as a political phenomenon, have already been formed in all the foremost capitalist countries, and that unless a determined and relentless struggle is waged all along the line against these parties — or groups, trends, etc., it is all the same — there can be no question of a struggle against imperialism, or of Marxism, or of a socialist labour

movement."¹

J.V. Stalin, too, as a revolutionary and consistent Marxist, stressed:

"Present-day Social-Democracy is an ideological support of capitalism. Lenin was a thousand times right when he said that the present-day Social-Democratic politicians are 'real agents of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement, the labour lieutenants of the capitalist class', that in the 'civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie' they would inevitably range themselves on the side of the 'Versaillese' against the 'Communards'.

*"It is impossible to put an end to capitalism without putting an end to Social-Democracy in the labour movement. That is why the era of dying capitalism is also the era of dying Social-Democracy in the labour movement."*²

The 1960 Moscow Declaration, too, stressing the fact that "the right-wing leaders of social-democracy have gone over completely to the positions of imperialism, uphold the capitalist system, split the working class" and are "enemies of communism," called upon the communists to continue the struggle to expose them.

But the modern revisionists, headed by the Khrushchev group, as renegades from and enemies to Marxism, act in complete opposition to the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, to the instructions of the Moscow Declaration: they pursue the line of unity and amalgamation with the right-wing leaders of social-democracy. And this is not accidental: present-day social-democracy and the modern revisionists have many things in common which link them together, they proceed in the same direction or towards a common counter-revolutionary objective.

¹ V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 23, p. 138, Alb. ed.

² J.V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 10, p. 242, Alb. ed.

THE MODERN REVISIONISTS HAVE SLIPPED INTO THE POSITIONS OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

Just as the old opportunists and reformists betrayed Marxism-Leninism, the cause of the working class, of the revolution and socialism in the past, so the modern revisionists have betrayed these ideals and are pursuing the same road as their predecessors who are at the same time their spiritual inspirers. Those who have changed are not the social-democrats but the modern revisionists, who have fallen into the treacherous positions of social-democracy.

Rejecting Marxism-Leninism, the social-democrats claim that “the problems of today cannot be solved with the old concepts.” Following in their footsteps, the revisionists, too, misrepresent the new conditions and phenomena, and under the guise of fighting “dogmatism” and upholding “the creative development of Marxism,” claim that today many things should be looked at with a critical eye, that what was right 30 years ago cannot be right today, that atomic weapons and the danger of a thermo-nuclear war make it indispensable to revise our views and stands on many questions of strategy and tactics, that he who adheres to the basic theses of Marx and Lenin in the sixties of the 20th century is a dogmatist who takes no account of the great changes that have come about in the world, and he who consults the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism in order to analyse and explain the present historical process is afflicted with “quotation-mania,” and so on and so forth. Hence, for the revisionists, too, Marxism-Leninism is outdated, is no longer appropriate in the new conditions and must be “enriched” with new ideas and new conclusions. Just like all the opportunists and reformists, old and new, the revisionists, too, are stripping Marxism of its critical and revolutionary spirit and are attempting to turn it from a weapon in the hands of the working class to be used against the bourgeoisie into a weapon in the hands of the bourgeoisie to be used against the working class.

“Not the class struggle, but the solidarity and harmony of all men who possess the sense of responsibility towards society” — this is the motive force of present-day society, say the social-democrats. The revisionists, too, have erased the class struggle from their books, and in fact have replaced it with the idea of class conciliation in the name of “preserving peace” in the world, they have renounced this struggle in the name of “saving the world from the danger of thermo-nuclear war,” and instead of the class struggle they preach “peaceful coexistence” as the only means to solve all the vital problems facing human society. “Peace at any price and on any condition, peace with all and above all,” “Christian love for everybody,” “abstract humanism above classes,” these are the ideas that the modern revisionists preach far and wide. In the name of this ideal the revisionists make common cause with the class enemies, with the imperialists and reactionaries of various countries and their agents and lackeys — the right-wing social-democratic leaders and the Titoite clique, while, on the other hand, they fight furiously against all those who remain loyal to the interests of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist ideology — the communist parties and all the revolutionary communists.

The social-democrats long ago rejected the revolution and preach that socialism will come about through reforms within the framework of the bourgeois order, democracy and legality. Following in their footsteps, the revisionists, too, have abandoned the revolutionary road, saying that the road to socialism is the road to an ever broader democracy, the road of respecting and implementing bourgeois constitutions, the road of “structural reforms.” Just like the social-democrats, the revisionists, too, identify the struggle for democracy with that for socialism, confine the struggle for socialism to that for democracy. Exhuming the theories of Kautsky and Bernstein, they express themselves in favour of the “peaceful,” “parliamentary” road which they present as a strategic principle worldwide and have concentrated

all their efforts on the struggle for votes in order to win the majority of seats in bourgeois parliaments.

The social-democrats consider the capitalist state as a state above classes, which expresses and defends the interests of society as a whole, they are opposed to breaking up the old bourgeois state machine, they are opposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat, which, according to them, is the negation of democracy, is a totalitarian state, and so on and so forth. The revisionists also spread illusions that the capitalist state can change its class nature, that it can become a state that will express not only the interests of the bourgeoisie but also those of the proletariat and the labouring masses; they say that Lenin's thesis on the indispensability of smashing the bourgeois state apparatus must be modified, that the dictatorship of the proletariat is an outdated idea, or, at most, suitable only for backward countries, that it may not only have various forms but can also assume quite a different content. Both the social-democrats and the revisionists slander the dictatorship of the proletariat and describe the entire period of its rule as a period of mass terror and despotism, as a period of brutal violation of socialist legality and democracy, and so on and so forth.

In their practical political activity, too, the modern revisionists are proceeding in the footsteps of the traitorous leaders of social-democracy. In fact, they have united with the enemies of socialism and the peoples — with the imperialists, especially the U.S. imperialists, and with the reactionaries of various countries. For the sake of rapprochement with imperialism, for the sake of achieving Soviet-American collaboration, which is the highest aspiration and ideal of Khrushchev and his group, the revisionists do not hesitate even to betray the true friends and allies of the Soviet people, the vital interests of the socialist countries, the working class, the peoples and nations oppressed and exploited by imperialism. Evidence of this can be seen in such activities of the revisionists, headed by the Khrushchev group, as their

REVISIONISM ON THE WAY TO SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

adventurous and capitulationist attitude in the Caribbean crisis, in their pressure exerted on Cuba to capitulate to American imperialism, sacrificing its dignity and its sovereignty, in their unity with the Indian reactionaries against the PR of China, with the Titoite clique and with Venizelos against the PR of Albania, in the infamous Moscow Treaty for a partial ban on nuclear tests, which is a major betrayal of the interests of the Soviet Union, the other socialist countries and peace and in favour of American imperialism, as well as in many other facts.

Anti-communism pervades the entire ideology and practical activity of modern social-democracy: it slanders the socialist countries and communist parties, splits the workers' movement, opposes scientific socialism with "democratic socialism," which is nothing but reformed capitalism; tries its utmost to preserve the capitalist order where it prevails and to re-establish it where it has been overthrown. The modern revisionists also carry on anti-socialist and anti-communist activities on a wide scale. The Khrushchev group and its revisionist followers have split the socialist camp and the international communist movement and are pressing on towards making the socialist countries degenerate into "docile bourgeois republics," and the communist and workers' parties from parties of social revolution into "parties of social reforms." Khrushchev and his group deny the proletarian class nature of the socialist state and the communist party, they are liquidating the dictatorship of the proletariat and the communist party in the Soviet Union under the pretext of turning them into the state and party of "the entire people." The revisionists are organizing and reorganizing their economy with a view to changing its forms of management after the pattern of Titoite Yugoslavia, violating the Marxist principles of the construction and management of the socialist economy, they denigrate the experience of many years of socialist construction in the Soviet Union and in other socialist countries, and call on all to learn

from the experience of the capitalist countries, especially from the American experience. They express themselves in favour of all-round collaboration with the capitalist countries, going as far as to hold out their hands to the imperialists for aid, credits and capital investments “to build socialism and communism,” as Khrushchev himself did of late. Under the guise of fighting “the cult of the individual and its consequences,” they have done away with the sound Marxist-Leninist cadres and have rehabilitated the traitors to and enemies of socialism, living and dead. They have flung open the doors of the socialist countries to the unhindered penetration of bourgeois ideology, of all kinds of alien anti-socialist trends and manifestations in art, literature and the whole life of the country, in the name of “freedom of thought” and of an abstract “humanism” that overrides classes. This “liberal” and “humane” socialism of the modern revisionists is getting closer and closer to the so-called “democratic socialism,” which the leaders of present-day social-democracy preach.

Thus, all the facts show clearly that the modern revisionists are following in the footsteps of treacherous social-democracy. This is very clear to the socialist leaders who have openly expressed their approval, their joy and hopes regarding the traitorous course followed by the Khrushchev group and its followers. Here are some of their statements:

In a speech to the General Assembly of the United Nations at its last session P.H. Spaak said: “Khrushchev is trying an experiment of peaceful coexistence and the West should not make this experiment more difficult for him. It would be a terrible and inexcusable mistake to discourage him. At this moment the future line of demarcation will no longer be between communists and non-communists, between the colonized and colonizers, between ideologies and races. We are witnesses of the struggle between those who wait the opportune time and inhuman doctrinarians, on the one hand, and those who have had

faith in progress and have never ceased to hope, on the other. We must not let this great occasion slip from our hands”

In his interview of February 24, 1964, the leader of the British Labour Party, H. Wilson, pointed out that he was the first of the Western politicians who visited Russia after the death of Stalin, and on his return from Russia, reported to W. Churchill, who was prime minister at that time, that “a great change is taking place in Soviet policy” and that “this is of major importance as regards relations between East and West.” He has every right to be proud of his long-term predictions which, today, have become reality.

Before going to Moscow with the socialist delegation to talk with Khrushchev and the other Soviet leaders, Gérard Jacquet, director of the newspaper of the French Socialist Party, stated: “We have long given up engaging in polemics with the Soviet Union and accept that this country is in the full phase of evolution... The problems raised are those of democracy and the democratic guarantee of the single party, the role of the socialist party in socialist society, the nature of the socialist regime and its structure. The stand taken by the CPSU in the differences between Moscow and Beijing provides a positive clarification of the attitude of this party towards dogmatism and political sectarianism.”

After his return to Paris from the talks with Khrushchev, the General Secretary of the French Socialist Party Guy Mollet, stated that he had been convinced that “a positive evolution is taking place in the Soviet Union,” and in his words, it was summed up in these points: “the recognition of many roads to the construction of socialism,” “the end of the dictatorship of the proletariat,” “internal evolution,” and so on. Whereas in an interview given to the newspaper “Unità” (February 22, 1964), Guy Mollet declared: “I am convinced that the communist world is on the road to transformation.”

These statements of leaders of social-democracy are at one with

ENVER HOXHA

the statements made by leaders of imperialism and their spokesmen who also express their support for Khrushchev's revisionist course and consider him "the best friend of the West in Moscow." They say that "the Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev acts like an American politician" and affirm that leading officials in the State Department in the USA are of the opinion that "the United States should make Khrushchev's task easier to a certain extent," etc., etc.

TOWARDS A COMPLETE AMALGAMATION OF THE MODERN REVISIONISTS WITH THE SOCIAL- DEMOCRATS

The falling of the modern revisionists into the ideological positions of the social-democrats on the major issues constitutes the basis for the complete amalgamation of revisionists with the social-democrats. By pursuing this course and recommending it to the communist and workers' parties of different countries, the modern revisionists, headed by the Khrushchev group, aim to cause the degeneration of the communist parties into reformist parties of the social-democratic type, to strengthen the influence of bourgeois ideology and reformist illusions among the working masses, to weaken the revolutionary fighting spirit of the working class movement and alienate it from the only correct course against the capitalist order of oppression and exploitation.

The revisionists, of course, do not, as a rule, proclaim their hostile intentions openly. They accompany every step they take to the detriment of the cause of the revolution and of communism; with demagogic slogans and cloak it with all kinds of justifications. They even try to justify their anti-Marxist action of amalgamation with social-democracy with the pretext that the social-democratic parties, too, are allegedly workers' parties and that the unity of the working class is essential in the struggle against capital. Let us dwell briefly on this.

REVISIONISM ON THE WAY TO SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY
WORKERS' PARTIES OR "BOURGEOIS PARTIES OF THE
WORKING CLASS"?

Are the social-democratic parties truly parties of the working class? To judge whether a party is a party of the working class one cannot proceed from the name it attaches to itself. Even Hitler's party called itself "national-socialist"! The only correct criterion is whether or not it defends and expresses the interests of the working class, whether or not it fights for the cause of the working class. And in order to elucidate this matter one should see to whose advantage are the ideology, policy and all practical activities of this or that party.

"Put not trust in catch-cries," V.I. Lenin teaches us, "but rather see who benefits from this!"¹

And if we examine the question from this standpoint, the class standpoint, which is the only correct, Marxist-Leninist criterion, then it becomes clear to every true communist that the social-democratic parties are not working class parties, but are, as Lenin has dubbed them, "bourgeois parties of the working class." We showed above with numerous facts, that from both the ideological and the political viewpoints and in all its activity social-democracy today is nothing but, as Lenin describes it, a "political detachment of the bourgeoisie," a "promoter of its influence," a "true agency of the bourgeoisie in the workers' movement."

Even from the point of view of their social composition the social-democratic parties have undergone and are under going obvious changes. The number of workers in their ranks is steadily diminishing and the elements of the petty bourgeoisie and the workers' bureaucracy are increasing. The present-day reformists have themselves

¹ V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 37, Alb. ed.

launched the slogan of the “deproletarianization” of the social-democratic parties. And this has been expressed in the new programs of many social-democratic parties. Thus, the program of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party, for example, says: “At first socialism was the cause solely of the working class which was exploited by capitalism... Now socialism has become the concern of all mankind. It affects every person with a sense of responsibility for the well-being of society.”

So much for the rank-and-file, the masses of the social-democratic parties, whereas as far as the leading cadres are concerned, the higher up you go in the hierarchy of the social-democratic parties, the fewer workers you find in them. In fact many social-democratic leaders have long ago turned into real capitalists: many of them take part in the administrative councils of the biggest banks and own solid portfolios of shares, drawing millions upon millions in income each year. Thus, according to recent figures, 410 principal functionaries of the German Social-Democratic Party, for example, occupied 929 highly paid posts in the major banks and corporations of West Germany, 62 prominent social-democrats were directors of firms of Mannesman, Kleckner, Krupp, Flick and others. The same situation prevails in the other social-democratic parties of the West, as in France, Britain, Belgium, the Scandinavian countries, etc.

This is the kind of “working class” the social-democratic parties represent! The modern revisionists, who are themselves nothing but traitors to the working class, have every reason to stick the label “workers’ party” not only on themselves, not only on the social-democrats, but also on some bourgeois conservative party if such a thing is dictated by their anti-Marxist, anti-revolutionary plan of action.

Thus it is obvious that the argument of the modern revisionists, alleging that the social-democratic parties are parties of the working class, is utterly false. Hence their slogan about “the need for unity of the working class” is demagogical, a pretext to justify their union with

the “bourgeois parties of the working class.”

The workers’ movement in almost all the advanced capitalist countries has been split. Who is to blame for this split? Who hinders the achievement of unity of action in the workers’ movement? The 1960 Moscow Declaration points out that the originators and promoters of this split on a national and international scale are “the ruling classes, the right-wing leaders of social-democracy and the reactionary leaders of the trade unions.” Under these circumstances, in order to realize unity of action in the workers’ movement, the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists are guided by the following considerations:

a) that unity of action can be attained only in struggle with splitters, therefore they wage a relentless and persistent struggle of principle against the splitters — the treacherous social-democratic leaders;

b) that all their efforts must be concentrated on the achievement of unity of workers’ action at the base with the worker masses of the socialist parties, that the watchword of the Marxist-Leninists for unity of the working class can and must be reliance on the rank and file, alliance with the leftists, uncompromising struggle against the traitors and splitters, the right-wing leaders, in order to expose and isolate them:

c) that, while seeking unity of action with the socialists, the communist parties should consider this not collaboration between two political parties of the working class, but collaboration between a proletarian and a non-proletarian party in order to achieve certain specified objectives. In connection with this, it is essential to always keep in mind and strictly observe the teachings of Lenin, who more than once stressed with force that it is essential that, when concluding an alliance or agreement with other movements on this or that question or objective, the revolutionary party of the working class must maintain its political independence at every moment and in every situation, and clearly differentiate itself ideologically and politically from all other

classes and parties so that it does not lose sight for one moment of the fundamental interests of the working class and its fight to achieve its final objective — the triumph of socialism and communism.

Any deviation from these Marxist-Leninist positions brings as a consequence the deviation of the working class from the revolutionary road and its fall into the mire of opportunism. Such is the stand of the Marxist-Leninists on the question of the unity of the workers' movement.

But what stand do the modern revisionists maintain in connection with this? Not only have they given up the struggle against the splitters of the workers' movement — the right-wing leaders of social-democracy but, what is more, they advocate unity "at any price" and "on any condition" with these splitters and traitors. Indeed the revisionists rise against all those who struggle against the right-wing leaders of social-democracy and who expose their betrayal, and describe this struggle as a "sectarian" and "dogmatic" stand, "abuse," "insults," "harmful attacks," and so on.

But everybody knows that social-democratic leaders like Spaak, Guy Mollet and others, with whom Khrushchev and his followers conduct "cordial talks" and try to achieve unity "on any condition," are lackeys and agents of the bourgeoisie, who have been and still are at the head of bourgeois governments in many capitalist countries. Therefore unity with these traitors is by no means unity of the workers' movement, but an attempt at "unity" of the working class with the bourgeoisie, for subjection of the working class to the bourgeoisie, unity and collaboration with the reactionary, allegedly "socialist," bourgeois governments.

Formerly, when they had not yet revealed their treacherous features so openly, the modern revisionists used to claim they were opposed to the right-wing leaders of social-democracy, that no unity was possible with them, and so on, and they even said a word or two

against them. None other than Khrushchev said at the 21st Congress of the CPSU that the cause of unity of the working class was hindered by “imperialist reaction and its lackeys in the workers’ movement such as the anti-communist leaders of social-democracy — Guy Mollet and Spaak. We know these leaders of anti-communism by name and we do not rely on them when we speak of the unity of action of the working class.” Whereas now it is the same Khrushchev who is holding “cordial talks” with such anti-communist leaders as Guy Mollet, Spaak, H. Wilson and their ilk and begging them for collaboration in order to achieve the “unity of the working class”! One of two things must have happened: either Guy Mollet, Spaak and company have ceased to be anti-communists or Khrushchev himself has ceased to be a communist and made common cause with the leaders of anti-communism, the lackeys of imperialist reaction. So far there is no sign to prove the former, while all the facts point to the latter.

Regardless of the demagogic slogans they employ to deceive the masses, the modern revisionists in fact are not only in favour of “unity at all costs” with the social-democrats, including their traitorous leaders, but have gone even further, expressing themselves for unity and collaboration with them “on any basis.” Thus, an article in the magazine “Kommunist” of the CPSU, issue 3, 1960, says:

“Unity of action with the reformists, even the most inveterate ones, on this or that issue, is always possible, provided they are really trying to achieve some sort of reforms, however minor, for the benefit of the working class and the toilers.” Whereas the leaders of the French Communist Party, on the basis of a resolution of the plenum of the Central Committee of September 27-28, 1961, regarding collaboration with the socialist and other parties, have stated: “For our part, we are ready to collaborate *on any basis*.”¹

Thus, speculating on the slogan of “unity,” the revisionists

¹ Taken from the magazine “Kommunist,” issue 3, p. 95, 1962.

ENVER HOXHA

sacrifice the principles, erase the distinction between communists and social-democrats, trample upon and sacrifice the fundamental interests of the working class. This is a sham unity, a unity in favour of the bourgeoisie and its agency in the workers' movement the aim of which is to subjugate the workers' movement completely to bourgeois and reformist influence, to liquidate the revolutionary spirit and the revolutionary party of the working class. This is a major betrayal of the cause of the working class and of socialism.

An important conclusion can be drawn from all this: the genuine unity of the workers' movement on a sound basis can and will be achieved in stern struggle not only with the right-wing leaders of social-democracy but also with the modern revisionists, against their dangerous attempts to subject the workers' movement completely to the poisonous, counter-revolutionary influence of social-democracy and its treacherous right-wing leaders.

THE LIQUIDATION OF COMMUNIST PARTIES — THE GOAL OF THE MODERN REVISIONISTS

The facts prove that the hue and cry the modern revisionists are raising about "unity" of the workers' movement is nothing but a bluff, a demagogic manoeuvre to cover up their tracks. Whereas their true objective is to cause the degeneration of the communist parties into parties of the social-democratic type, to unite with the social-democrats "on any condition" and "on any basis" and, finally, to liquidate the communist parties, to amalgamate them completely with the social-democratic parties.

The social-democratic leaders, who cannot fail to see these attempts and intentions of the revisionists and agree with them, have defined their stand and their tactics towards them. Like the American imperialists and the Titoite clique, the social-democratic leaders pursue a two pronged tactic towards the revisionists:

REVISIONISM ON THE WAY TO SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

On the one hand, they eulogize their revisionist course, give them support and encourage them as allies in their betrayal, incite them against Marxism-Leninism and all those who stand loyal to it. To keep ahead of the revisionists and to mislead the masses, certain social-democratic leaders, especially of late, have begun to speak in: terms similar to those of the revisionists and to make statements in favour of peace, peaceful coexistence and disarmament, and moreover, have somewhat changed their attitude towards the Soviet Union and towards the communists in their own countries, and so on. This, of course, has nothing to do with any real, basic change of the position of the social-democrats, but is merely a change in their attitude *towards the revisionists* for the above reasons. It is exactly this kind of “change” that the revisionists try, in a demagogic way, to present as “an inclination to the left” of the social-democrats, in order to justify their own move to the right, to justify their own line of rapprochement and collaboration with them.

On the other hand, the social-democratic leaders maintain a “stern” and “haughty” attitude towards the servile requests and appeals of the revisionists for rapprochement and collaboration, put pressure on them and demand new, ever greater concessions. And what do the social-democrats demand?

In the ideological field, they demand that the revisionists finally renounce the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the leading role of the communist party, proletarian internationalism, and so on, not only in essence but also formally.

In the field of politics, they demand further “democratic guarantees,” toleration of many parties, consequently of bourgeois parties as well, and the sharing of power among them in the socialist countries, changes in the electoral system to allow the inclusion of anti-socialist elements in the lists of candidates, etc. In other words, they demand

the “liberalization” of the socialist regime and its transformation into an ordinary bourgeois democracy.

In the economic field, they demand the abandonment of the cooperative system in the countryside, of the “old forms” of organization and management of the economy, in order to proceed towards rapprochement and “extensive and all-round collaboration” of the socialist countries with the capitalist countries, and so on.

In the field of international relations, they demand new and bigger concessions towards imperialism in the name of “preserving peace,” renunciation of support for the revolutionary and national-liberation movements and even the sacrifice of the German Democratic Republic as a condition for the establishment of peace in Europe.

Such are the demands put forward, for instance, by Spaak, Guy Mollet and other social-democratic leaders. These demands are identical with those made to the revisionists by the imperialists, particularly the American imperialists, through Eisenhower, Dulles, Kennedy, Johnson, and others.

The social-democratic leaders are convinced that the revisionists will continue to make further concessions, for this is an inevitable consequence of the traitorous line which the revisionists pursue. And the facts are proving ever more clearly as the days go by that their hopes are not misplaced. In fact, having gone a long way in the social-democratic degeneration of the communist parties they head, the revisionists are now attempting to make the next move — that of complete fusion with the social-democratic parties. At the head of these efforts stand the revisionist “troika” — the Khrushchev group, the Tito clique and the revisionist leadership of the Italian Communist Party headed by Togliatti. The clearest example of how to proceed along this treacherous road is that of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party. Togliatti and other revisionist leaders have imposed on the Italian Communist Party a line which is opportunist and

REVISIONISM ON THE WAY TO SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

reformist from start to finish, a line that flagrantly deviates from the teachings and basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, a line which has replaced the class struggle, the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat with the so-called “Italian road to socialism” through “structural reforms” within the framework of “bourgeois democracy,” of the bourgeois state “above classes,” of the bourgeois Constitution. And this is not all. Proceeding along their anti-Marxist road, Togliatti and other revisionist leaders of the Italian Communist Party have long been loudly trumpeting the necessity of changing the “character, functions and organizational structure” of their party, allegedly to adapt it to deal with the great political problems it is faced with, and the “transformations that have taken and are taking place in the economic, social and political structure of the country,” “with the problems of the struggle for socialism in the advanced capitalist countries,” etc., etc.

Just in what direction these changes will be made and what their objective is, is made clear by the “Document of the CC of the Italian CP for the National Conference on Organization,” published in the newspaper “Unità” dated January 9, 1964. This document says: “The essential exigency is that a system of new contacts and connections among all forces which accept a socialist policy and future must be sought for and applied,” with the prospect that “the division which exists among the various organizations of the working class will be organically overcome while laying the basis for a single organization.” Indeed, it says that in the light of the struggle against the monopolist development of the country and in order to set it on the road of socialist development, we should look into the “problem of the relation and dialogue with the democratic catholic political movement, which is the other major force, the support of which is essential in building a new society in Italy.”

These theses of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party are

the continuation and further concretization of opportunist views expressed long ago by Togliatti. At the meeting of the CC of the Italian CP on June 24, 1956, Togliatti said: "In fact, we can see an impulse towards socialism, a more or less clear trend towards economic reforms and transformations of the socialist type even in countries where the communist parties, far from taking part in the government, are sometimes not even a major force... This situation is apparent today and assumes special significance in those regions of the world which have been emancipated from colonialism only recently. But even in very advanced capitalist countries it may happen that the working class, in its majority, may follow a non-Communist party and it cannot be excluded that, in such countries, even non-communist parties based on the working class may express the urge which comes from the working class for a move towards socialism. Even where there are strong communist parties, other parties, which have their basis in the working class and a socialist program, may exist along with them. The tendency to bring about radical economic changes in a direction which, in general, is that of socialism, may come in the end from organizations and movements which do not call themselves socialist."

What is new about the latest document of the CC of the Italian Communist Party for the conference on the organization of the party, is the fact that now attempts are being made to pass from pseudo-theoretical considerations to practical steps to set up the so-called "single organization of the working class," in other words, the liquidation of the communist party as the independent revolutionary vanguard of the working class.

We have already had the occasion to point out that these views of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party are not at all original, but completely identical with those of the Titoite renegades, sanctioned in the program of the LCY and long condemned by the whole international communist movement as profoundly anti-Marxist. This

revisionist program says: "The view that communist parties have a monopoly in every aspect of the development towards socialism, and that socialism is expressed by them and through them, is theoretically incorrect and very harmful in practice." It says also: "...the LCY considers it dogmatic to claim the absolute monopoly of the communist party over the political power as a universal and perpetual principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of socialist construction."

The unity of views of the leadership of the Italian CP with those of the Titoite clique is not confined to these questions alone, but extends over to their entire line. This revisionist unity was clearly expressed in the joint Tito-Togliatti communique signed in Belgrade on January 21 of this year, as well as in a leading article by Togliatti published in "Rinascita" on his return from his visit to Yugoslavia.

During this visit Togliatti and Tito did not conceal that they discussed the co-ordination of their activity for the spreading and triumph of the "new positive course" in the communist movement, especially in Europe, and for overcoming the obstacles in the way of the "unity" of the workers' and communist movement on the basis of this course. The talks again highlighted the "special role" which the leaders of the Italian CP have assigned themselves in the communist and workers' movement in Western Europe (let us recall the theory of "polycentrism," implying, of course, that one of the principal and most "attractive" centres of leadership would certainly be the Italian Communist Party with Togliatti at the head!).

To achieve their end — the triumph of the "new course," the degeneration of the communist parties, it was necessary for the revisionists with the Khrushchev group at the head, first and foremost, to smash, completely subdue and set moving towards degeneration not only the Italian CP, which Togliatti himself is zealously trying to do, but also the French CP, as two major parties in Western Europe. Precisely for this reason the "Trojan Troika" — the Khrushchev group,

the Tito clique and the revisionist leadership of the Italian Communist Party, are exerting strong and all-round pressure on the French CP to compel it to completely renounce the Leninist revolutionary principles. At the same time daily pressure in this direction is also being exerted on the French CP by the right-wing socialist leaders under Guy Mollet, as well as by the various revisionist elements in the ranks of the French Communist Party itself like Raymond Guyot and others.

The French CP is a party with revolutionary traditions. In the past it has made a valuable contribution to the struggle against various anti-Marxist trends, ranging from the right-wing socialists like Leon Blum and Guy Mollet to the renegade Tito clique. Now this criticism seems to have been suppressed, as a result either of obedience to the “conductor’s baton” or of the pressure from revisionist elements who are bent on leading the French CP on the inglorious road towards anti-Marxist degeneration, to the line against which it fought.

Let us take, for instance, the latest document of the leadership of the French CP — the draft-resolution for the 17th Congress of the party which will be held in May this year. It says there that for the sake of unity and collaboration with the socialist party, the French CP has done much and is willing to do more to eliminate the “obstacles” in the way of this collaboration, that “it has given up the idea that the existence of a single party is an essential condition for the transition to socialism. This idea, which was defended by Stalin, constituted an unwarranted generalization of the specific circumstances under which the October Revolution was carried out. Subsequent experience proves that common objectives of the parties representing the working classes of the town and the countryside lead to an ever more profound unity for transition to socialism, for building socialist society.”

Here we have to do with a new major concession of principle which the leadership of the French Communist Party is making to the

social-democrats. With this very serious step the French revisionists are jeopardizing the very existence of the communist party, proceeding towards its liquidation, towards its complete fusion with Guy Mollet's Socialist Party. This is another clear proof of whither the modern revisionists are leading the communist parties. No wonder the big bourgeois newspaper "Le Monde" greets this statement with these words: "The Communist Party most firmly rejects the theory of the 'single party'." However much they try to justify this step, or slander Stalin, the revisionists of the French Communist Party will not succeed in covering up their betrayal, the plot they are hatching up to cause the social-democratic degeneration of the French Communist Party.

Stalin, like all consistent Marxist-Leninists, never denied the possibility of collaboration with other parties for the seizure of power and the construction of socialism. He never absolutized the specific historical circumstances which determined the existence of a single party in the Soviet Union. It is an indisputable fact that it was precisely in Stalin's time that the communist parties in various countries of Europe and Asia collaborated successfully for the first time with other parties, both during the revolution for the seizure of power, and after the seizure of power, during the construction of socialism. But it is clear both in documents of the leadership of the Italian CP and in those of the French CP that the question is not whether the communist party may or may not collaborate with other parties during the socialist revolution and during the construction of socialism. The question here is that for the sake of this collaboration these documents erase all distinction between the communist parties and other parties, and deny, in fact, the necessity for the leading role of the communist party armed with the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

J.V. Stalin, however, upheld precisely this idea, the idea of the leading role of the communist party, an idea which is not Stalin's

alone, but a basic teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin, emanating from the historic mission of the working class and from its Marxist-Leninist ideology, which is the only ideology of scientific socialism. This is clearly emphasized also in the 1957 Moscow Declaration which says that “the leadership of the masses by the working class, the nucleus of which is the Marxist-Leninist party, during the accomplishment of the proletarian revolution in this or other form, during the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in this or that form” is a universal law of the transition from capitalism to socialism.

Time was when the leadership of the French CP sternly criticized the leadership of the Italian CP because the latter placed the communist party on an equal footing with the other so-called “workers” parties, advocated the existence of many parties under socialism as essential and denied the indispensability of the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party. Debating these views of Togliatti and company, the theoretical organ of the CC of the French CP

“Cahiers du communisme” published in its January 1957 issue an article under the title: “Concerning the Italian Road to Socialism,” pointed out that to deny the radical distinction between the communist party and other so-called “workers” parties which are permeated with the ideology of other classes, and therefore, cannot fully represent the present and future true interests of the working class, means, in fact, to place the communist party on the same level as the non-proletarian parties, to deny that “there is only one scientific socialism which clearly determines the historic role of the working class, the tactics and the strategy, which enables it to carry out its mission,” and “to admit the possibility of a reformist ‘road’ to socialism, which is given equal importance with the revolutionary road.” “Cahiers du communisme” at the time likewise stressed that this means to slip into the positions of Kardelj and other Yugoslav leaders, who have proclaimed the Scandinavian social-democratic road as one of the

possible forms of advance towards socialism, thus erasing the radical distinction between scientific socialist ideology and social-democratic ideology, which preaches conciliation, class collaboration and peaceful integration, in other words, renunciation of the aims of socialism.

To renounce the thesis on the leading role of the communist party as an essential condition for the transition to socialism, to place the communist party on the same footing as other “workers” and “socialist” parties, as the modern revisionists do, means to sever all connections with true scientific socialism and true socialist ideology, means to renounce the principles and program of the communist party and to unite and amalgamate with the social-democratic parties on the basis of their anti-Marxist program. And that is exactly what the revisionists are doing.

There was a time when the French Communist Party did not agree with the treacherous, utterly revisionist line of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party headed by Togliatti. But does the French Communist Party have any differences with the revisionist leaders of the Italian Communist Party now? If it has, why does it remain silent? Why did the French Communist Party find it so easy to attack the CP of China and the PL of Albania and keep silent towards the Italian revisionists? If it has no differences, then why does it not say openly that it is in agreement with them and that it was wrong before? Or is it because “the conductor’s baton” beats that tune?

To keep silent, to shut your eyes to the treacherous line and activities of the revisionists — such an attitude is not only anti-Marxist, but also dangerous. It causes serious damage not only to the Italian Communist Party, which must be helped to see where Togliatti’s revisionism is leading it, but also to the French Communist Party itself, and the entire communist movement. The revolutionary Marxist-Leninists are seriously concerned about the catastrophe which is threatening the communist and workers’ parties. They cannot and

must not remain silent when a group of traitors is trying to lead the communist parties, like the CPSU, the Italian Communist Party, the French Communist Party, etc., to disaster, but should raise their voice to help the genuine communists, members of these parties to see the danger clearly, to understand where their present revisionist leadership is taking them before it is too late.

There was a time when the communist parties of France and Italy were set up, at the Congresses of Tours and Leghorn, as revolutionary proletarian parties of the new type, breaking away from the socialist parties of that time which had betrayed the interests of the working class and socialism, severing all connections with the opportunism and reformism of the treacherous Second International and adopting the conditions and the Marxist-Leninist program of the Communist International. Now we are witnessing a reverse process. The line of demarcation, which was established at the Tours and Leghorn Congresses is being wiped out. The attempts of the modern revisionists to unite and amalgamate with those they had earlier detached themselves from — the treacherous social-democratic leaders, by making to them repeated concessions, by renouncing the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism, are daily becoming more and more evident. That is why the revolutionary communists of Italy and France, as well as those of other countries, who are being threatened by the danger of revisionism, should rise in struggle against these renegades. This is the only correct course. The attacks which the revisionist troika led by Khrushchev are making on the communist and workers' parties are very similar to the treacherous acts of the social-democrats of the Second International. Therefore, the Marxists should draw lessons from history, should follow the revolutionary traditions of earlier times to defend the party, Marxism-Leninism and the revolution.

On the eve of its 17th Congress, the French Communist Party is more than ever on the horns of a dilemma: will it continue to give

blind obedience to the conductors' baton and allow the revisionist group in the leadership to set it definitely on the road of betrayal, or will it break the conductor's baton, correct its mistakes, and return to the heroic revolutionary road of Marxism-Leninism?

Many leaders of the French Communist Party have hurled insults and made disgraceful attacks on the PLA and its leadership. This we will not forget. The time will come, if not today, tomorrow, when everything will be put in order in a Marxist way. We are convinced that those who have acted in this manner will eventually blush with shame... We owe the French Communist Party nothing, its leaders owe the PLA an apology. Nevertheless, we sincerely call on the French Communist Party to return to the road of the revolution, to the true Marxist-Leninist road before it is too late, for the good of the French people, the French proletariat and the international proletariat. Its place is on that road. Those who correct their mistakes command the respect of others and enjoy the support of the communists and all the progressive people of the world, while the traitors are loathed by all. Everyone despises them and fights them mercilessly, as they are doing with the Khrushchev, Tito and Togliatti groups and their loyal henchmen — all the modern revisionists.

**A STOP MUST BE PUT TO THE TREACHEROUS
ACTIVITIES OF THE REVISIONISTS, THE COMMUNIST
PARTIES MUST BE DEFENDED!**

With their political course and all their practical activity, the modern revisionists, with traitor Khrushchev at the head, have created a grave situation in many communist parties and in the international communist and workers' movement. They have undermined the internal unity of individual parties and the movement as a whole, and are proceeding posthaste on the course of the social-democratic degeneration of the communist parties, trying to set the whole world

communist movement on an opportunist and traitorous road. This reminds one of that period when, as a result of the betrayal of their leaders, the parties of the Second International deviated from the revolutionary road, renounced Marxism, plunged completely into the mire of opportunism and reformism, and degenerated into “bourgeois parties of the working class.”

The betrayal of the parties of the Second International which was expressed clearly especially during the First World War, when they crossed over openly to the positions of social-chauvinism, encountered, and could not but encounter, the resolute resistance of the revolutionary communists with Lenin at the head. The latter, though in the minority, but expressing the true, fundamental interests of the working class and the working masses, waged a stern struggle of principle for years on end to unmask the traitorous leaders of the Second International, to expose the opportunism and reformism of the parties of this International, in defence of Marxism and proletarian internationalism and to create new revolutionary parties of the working class.

*“It is impossible,” V.I. Lenin wrote at that time, “to carry out the tasks of socialism at present, it is impossible to achieve true internationalist unity of workers, without a thorough break with opportunism, and without explaining to the masses the inevitability of the fiasco it will suffer.”*¹

Speaking of this struggle of Lenin, Stalin has written:

“Every Bolshevik, if he is a real Bolshevik, knows that long ago, as early as about 1903-1904, when the Bolshevik group was formed in Russia and the leftists appeared for the first time in German social-democracy — Lenin pursued the line of separation, of breaking with

¹ V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 21, p. 19, Alb. ed.

REVISIONISM ON THE WAY TO SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

the opportunists, both amongst us, in the Social-Democratic Party of Russia, as well as there, in the Second International, and especially in German social-democracy.”¹

This resolute and principled struggle by Lenin and other revolutionary communists to completely smash the opportunism and betrayal of the Second International ideologically and politically, led to further major victories of Marxism-Leninism and the world revolutionary movement. It was crowned with the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia, with the setting up of new revolutionary parties of the new type, and with the bankruptcy of the Second International and its replacement by the Communist Third International.

Today, too, the betrayal of the modern revisionists, who have totally deviated from Marxism-Leninism, from the principles of the revolutionary proletarian party and from the vital interests of the revolutionary proletariat and the broad masses of workers, has encountered, and could not but encounter, the firm resistance and principled struggle of the Marxist-Leninist parties and all revolutionary communists. This is a struggle of major historic significance, which concerns the future of the world revolutionary and liberation movement, a struggle in defence of Marxism-Leninism against revisionism, in defence of proletarian internationalism against nationalism and chauvinism, in defence of the socialist order against liberal-bourgeois degeneration, in defence of the revolutionary communist parties against social-democratic degeneration, in defence of the Marxist-Leninist unity of the communist parties, the international communist movement and socialism against revisionist splitters.

Just as the classics of Marxism-Leninism and all the experience of the communist movement teach us, the only right way to respond to

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 13, p. 83, Alb. ed.

the challenge of the revisionists is to unite all the Marxist-Leninist forces for a determined, uncompromising struggle against the revisionist renegades. The attacks and pressures of the revisionists, foreign and internal, cannot be withstood by pursuing a vacillating centrist line, nor by being solely concerned to preserve a false and formal unity. The party cannot be saved by sighs of regret, nor should it be sacrificed for the sake of preserving the “prestige” of anyone, at a time when this “prestige” is being unscrupulously exploited to bury the great cause of the working class and socialism.

The Khrushchev group has led the leaders of many communist parties into a blind alley. He has impelled them to deny the revolutionary past of the CPSU and their own parties, with his false slanders against Stalin he has put the old revolutionary leaders who have had a brilliant past in a difficult position. Many of them were deceived by the Khrushchevite line of peace and coexistence, which has now been clearly shown to be an anti-Leninist line, a line of rapprochement and collaboration with the enemies of peace and of socialism — the imperialists. The tragic thing about some of them is precisely that, although they have now got wise to a number of things, although they see that the line of the Khrushchev group is a revisionist line with colossal errors, nevertheless they do not find the Marxist courage to say to themselves: stop! They do not behave towards this matter as it befits them as revolutionary Marxist-Leninists. They try to protect the party on the revisionist road which is fatal to it. They try, to varying extents, to “justify” this road, about which they nurture doubts and are not in complete agreement, sometimes they even say, in narrow circles, that they have differences with Khrushchev. But that’s all they do. They go no further. They do not take the courage to bring these matters up for discussion in their parties in a Marxist-Leninist way. They agree that the materials sent to them by Khrushchev should be discussed within their parties, but they are afraid to discuss within their parties

the documents and written materials of other parties as well. A big struggle is going on in their conscience. But the Khrushchev group is at work, too. It has won over many adherents in the leaderships of many other parties, who exert pressure, blackmail with various manoeuvres to make their parties obey the conductor's baton. Following in Khrushchev's footsteps, some communist party leaders have entered into a blind alley with their political stand. Of course, it is correct to struggle against the threat to world peace from West-German militarism and from the imperialist Bonn-Paris axis, but it is altogether incorrect and anti-Marxist to give up the struggle against American imperialism, which is the main force of war and aggression, the bastion of world reaction, the international gendarme and the biggest exploiter, the most ferocious enemy of the peoples of the whole world, as the 1960 Moscow Declaration has called it, under this pretext. It is correct and Marxist to fight against "personal power" and its consequences, but it is altogether anti-Marxist to blindly follow Khrushchev's pro-American policy and not to take advantage of the split that is becoming ever deeper in the imperialist camp. We know why this attitude is maintained. Of course, this is what the "conductor of the orchestra" has ordered. But tomorrow, if this "conductor" flirts with "personal power" for adventurous anti-Marxist purposes, how are they going to swallow that? Or is the conductor training other musicians to open the way to new adventures?

The revisionist camp is in great difficulties. Its ship has been holed, water is gushing in and it is foundering. The Khrushchev group is striving in every way to avert the catastrophe. To escape further exposure, it is raising a hue and cry about ceasing the polemics which it itself started and which it formerly described as fully justifiable, necessary and Leninist. But under present conditions, to cease the polemics means to every true Marxist and revolutionary to unite with the traitors, to create possibilities for them to corrupt and destroy

ENVER HOXHA

Marxism-Leninism. In his attempt to mislead people, Khrushchev swears by unity. But the true revolutionaries and consistent communists cannot be deceived by adventurers, demagogues and splitters. The revolutionary communists loyally follow the teachings of the great Lenin, who said:

*“Unity is a great issue and a major slogan! But the cause of the workers demands unity of Marxists not unity of Marxists with opponents and distorters of Marxism.”*¹

Already it is clear that Khrushchev and his group represent just these opponents and distorters of Marxism in the communist movement today. On the other hand, the Khrushchev group continues its hostile, disruptive work in diverse forms, through regional meetings, or bilateral talks, dictating new instructions and tasks with a view to compromising and leading the other parties and their leaders further down the road of revisionism and betrayal. The time has come for all to stop and think, to cease obeying the “conductor’s baton,” to begin to resist the traitors in order to defend Marxism-Leninism and socialism, in order to defend the great revolutionary cause of the working class.

It is the duty of all communists to fight imperialism, headed by American imperialism, with all their strength. And the struggle against modern revisionism is a component part of the struggle against imperialism, for it is the offspring and ally of imperialism, the manifestation in theory and practice of bourgeois ideology, imperialism’s “trojan horse” in the socialist camp and the international communist movement. The words of the great Lenin, when he said that without waging a firm and consistent struggle through to the end against opportunism and revisionism, no successful struggle can be waged against imperialism, ring truer than ever today. Without exposing and

¹ V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 20, p. 256, Alb. ed.

REVISIONISM ON THE WAY TO SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

smashing revisionism, the revolution cannot triumph and socialism and communism cannot be built and defended success fully.

We are firmly convinced that, just as in the past, the present fight against modern revisionists, headed by the Khrushchev group, will be crowned with new victories for Marxism-Leninism, socialism and the international revolutionary movement. The revisionists cannot succeed in turning the historical revolutionary process backwards. We are witnesses to the fact that the revisionists are being more and more exposed and discredited in their own countries, as well as in the international communist movement. They are suffering defeat after defeat, while the ranks of the parties loyal to Marxism-Leninism and of the revolutionary communists are increasing and becoming stronger, their struggle against modern revisionism is rising to an ever higher level. The total defeat of revisionism and the triumph of Marxism-Leninism are inevitable.

Selected Works, vol. 3, Tirana
1980, pp. 518-562, Eng. ed.

AN OPEN LETTER

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE
SOVIET UNION

October 5, 1964

Dear Comrades,

A grave situation has been created in the international communist and workers' movement. The Soviet Union, the socialist camp, the communist parties, the cause for which the communists and proletarians of the whole world have fought heroically, not sparing their very lives, the cause of socialism and of communism, are facing a great danger, are passing through one of the most difficult periods of their history. Open revisionism, complete division, betrayal and degeneration are threatening them today more than at any other time.

The originator and principal culprit for this grave situation is the Khrushchev group. After having usurped the leadership of the glorious party set up by the great Lenin, and of the first and most powerful socialist state in the world, the Soviet Union, by putschist and conspiratorial methods, this group have now embarked on the road of the greatest betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and the cause of socialism, have now become the principal bearers and disseminators of the opportunist and revisionist trend that is eroding the international communist and workers' movement today, and which has undermined the very foundations of its unity.

The Party of Labour of Albania and other Marxist-Leninist parties have, time and again, urged the leadership of your party, with Khrushchev at the head, to give up the line of revisionism and disruption, to courageously re-examine its position, and return to the road of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, to condemn its own

chauvinistic attitudes and hostile activities towards sister parties and fraternal socialist countries, and to re-establish relations of friendship and proletarian solidarity with them.

Even since the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, when Khrushchev launched his vilest public attacks and most monstrous slanders against the Party of Labour of Albania and its leadership, our Party has called on the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to re-examine its position and to return to the right road. As it was said in the speech delivered on November 7, 1961, "Calmly and with a clear conscience, the Party of Labour of Albania appeals to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, appeals to its Central Committee newly elected by the 22nd Congress, to consider the situation created in the relations between our two parties and our two countries with Leninist justice, objectively, dispassionately and in an unbiased way. Our Party has always been ready to settle the existing differences, for the sake of the unity of the communist movement and the socialist camp, and in the interests of our countries. But it has always been and remains of the opinion that these matters must be settled correctly and only in a Marxist-Leninist way, under conditions of equality and not of pressure and dictate."

As late as April 1963. in an article published in the organ of its Central Committee "Zëri i Popullit," our Party emphasized: "If Khrushchev is in favour of the settlement of differences and consolidation of unity, he should show this by deeds, should take real, and not fictitious steps, to remove all the obstacles he has created in the relations between our two parties and our two countries. Just as he dared to attack our Party and our country in a slanderous way, to interfere in our internal affairs, and to undertake hostile activities against us, he should take the courage to publicly denounce these anti-Marxist stands and acts and return to rigorous respect for the internationalist norms of relations between communist and workers' parties and

between socialist countries.”¹

However, the Khrushchev group not only failed to listen to the voice of reason and scorned the comradely advice of our Party and the other fraternal parties, but persisted with even more vehemence in their course of betrayal, increased their assaults and hostile acts against our Party and other fraternal parties, against Marxism-Leninism, against the unity of the socialist camp and the communist movement. Events and facts have proved indisputably that Khrushchev is a conscious traitor and enemy, determined to pursue his counter-revolutionary line to the end.

Their recent decision to arbitrarily call an illegal special meeting of the parties that follow in their footsteps is another great plot that testifies most clearly that the Khrushchev group are the greatest splitters that the history of the international communist movement has ever known. Khrushchev is trying to drag as many parties as he can into this new anti-communist plot which is intended to sanction the full and open splitting of the socialist camp and the communist movement. In connection with this he has sent a letter to all parties, and through them to our Party as well, informing that he has decided to call a meeting of the editorial commission on December 15 this year, and the international meeting of the communist and workers' parties towards the middle of the coming year. In this letter our Party is invited to send its delegation to Moscow to take part in the work of the editorial commission and to announce the composition of the delegation as early as possible.

Taking into account the fact that the Khrushchev group have completely betrayed the cause of Marxism-Leninism and socialism, and that all efforts and hopes of bringing them back to the right course have totally failed, the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of

¹ From the article of the newspaper “Zëri i Popullit,” April 18, 1963 entitled: “Khrushchev Again in the Role of the Demagogue. Slanderer and Splitter.”

Albania has decided not to reply to their letter of July 30, 1964. The Party of Labour of Albania has no more to do with Khrushchev's group of renegades.

On this occasion and under these circumstances, the Party of Labour of Albania has decided to address this open letter to you, members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, pioneers of the great cause of communism, for whom we have always had a profound respect and affection. In this letter, we want to tell you with open hearts and fraternal sincerity that truth which Khrushchev has hidden from you for years on end. He has deceived you and continues to do so. He has denied you any right to acquaint yourselves with the materials of our Party and of other Marxist-Leninist parties.

The Party of Labour of Albania is addressing itself to you, for it is of the opinion that in this situation your responsibility and role are of historic significance. It is up to you to say your word. In the Soviet Union no one else but you can call a halt to Khrushchev's revisionist course. You are the force which can save the Soviet Union, the fatherland of the Great October Revolution and the glorious Party of the Bolsheviks, from the blind alley into which Khrushchev has led it, you must defend Marxism-Leninism, the honour and dignity of the Soviet Union and raise aloft the revolutionary banner of your party which Khrushchev has sullied with disgrace.

Dear Comrades,

The Khrushchev group are making a great fuss about the so-called international meeting of the communist and workers' parties. They are trying to persuade you and all the communists of the world that allegedly this meeting is necessary, that allegedly it will help to settle differences and consolidate the unity of the socialist camp and the communist movement. This is a big fraud, a bluff, a dangerous

manoeuvre.

In fact, this meeting by no means helps the cause of Marxist-Leninist unity, either as to the circumstances in which it is being called, and the way it is being prepared, or as to its political platform. Its aim is to undermine unity, to irrevocably split the communist movement, to consolidate the shaky position of revisionism, to intensify the struggle against Marxism-Leninism, in this way carrying out the greatest service for the imperialist bourgeoisie.

The Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania declares that the Party of Labour of Albania is firmly opposed to this disruptive meeting of the modern revisionists, and categorically denounces this new plot of the Khrushchevite clique.

For what reasons does the Party of Labour of Albania refuse to take part in this meeting and why does it condemn it?

First, the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania is convinced that the hasty calling of the meeting of the communist and workers' parties under the present conditions and circumstances, when deep divergences on basic strategic issues exist in the international communist movement between Marxist-Leninists and revisionists, about which a great polemic is being carried on, is not in the interests of settling differences and of consolidating unity on sound Marxist-Leninist foundations, is by no means the "most effective way of strengthening the solidarity of the communist movement," but, on the contrary, is the way to completely undermine it.

Through their views and deeds the modern revisionists have made the existing differences increasingly sharper and deeper, have constantly undermined unity, have plunged themselves deeper and deeper into the mire of betrayal and disruption. With all this they have made the calling of the international meeting of the communist and workers' parties even more difficult, they have postponed it even further. Greater efforts and a longer time are now required to prepare the

necessary conditions for the calling of a meeting that would truly serve the Marxist-Leninist unity of the socialist camp and the communist movement.

Second, the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania declares that the meeting which is now being called on the initiative of the Khrushchev group is absolutely arbitrary and illegal, since the norms and principles sanctioned in the 1960 Moscow Declaration governing relations between parties have been brutally violated. No one is entitled to call a general meeting of the communist and workers' parties to suit his whims without first consulting the other parties and receiving their consent. We publicly declare that no preliminary consultation on this matter has taken place with the Party of Labour of Albania.

Khrushchev has quite arbitrarily decided to replace the principle sanctioned in the 1960 Moscow Declaration of arriving at unification of views through equal and comradely consultations, with the principle of subjecting the minority to the majority. The Party of Labour of Albania has always opposed such a principle, because this is a flagrant violation of the equality and independence of fraternal parties, an attempt to impose the will of the so-called majority on others. But even if we speak of the majority, the real majority, and not the false and fictitious one, is by no means on the side of the revisionists. A considerable number of fraternal parties, whose ranks contain about half the communists of the entire world, without reckoning here a whole army of revolutionary communists enrolled in the parties of other countries whose leaders have slipped into the revisionist position, and who also condemn Khrushchev's treacherous splitting activities, are quite definitely opposed to the calling of the international communist meeting under the present conditions and circumstances.

Third, the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania declares that by organizing the so-called international meeting in a

hasty, arbitrary and illegal manner, the Khrushchev group are in fact trying to organize a meeting of factionists. This is clearly evident in the July 30 letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which runs: "In our opinion, the commission should start its work even if any of the 26 communist parties fails to send its delegation at the appointed time." And the letter continues: "The refusal of this or that party to take part in this collective work must not serve as a justification for further postponement of measures aimed at working out the ways and methods of consolidating the internationalist unity of the Marxist-Leninists of the whole worlds."

Thus it is clear that Khrushchev has made up his mind to convene the meeting even without the participation of the representatives of many parties which have already expressed their opposition to an international meeting under the present conditions and circumstances. This means that the meeting which is being called now will only be a meeting of the leaders of a few parties and mainly of those that follow Khrushchev, a meeting of revisionists. And this fact alone refutes all Khrushchev's demagoguery about alleged unity and solidarity and lays bare his anti-Marxist and divisive aims.

Now it is becoming clear to all that, by hastily convening the so-called international meeting of the communist and workers' parties, the Khrushchev group are aiming to achieve two main objectives: on the one hand, to intensify their fight against Marxism-Leninism, to condemn certain socialist countries and certain communist parties, and "to expel" them from the socialist camp and the communist movement; and, on the other hand, to strengthen the ranks of the revisionist front, to subject all the revisionists to their dictate, to force a "new charter" on them, while binding them hand and foot.

The attainment of these objectives is decisive for the fate of the Khrushchev revisionist group, who are facing grave difficulties. The determined and principled struggle waged by the Marxist-Leninist

parties and the revolutionary communists of the world has not only torn the mask off the Khrushchevite revisionists and is frustrating their hostile schemes, but has brought about a grave situation within the ranks of the modern revisionists themselves. Deep contradictions have arisen between them, contradictions which are expressed with particular clarity by the tendency to oppose the hegemony and paternalism of the Khrushchev group.

Under these circumstances there is no other way left for the Khrushchevite revisionists: they must carry the split with Marxist-Leninists through to the end and, at the same time, hobble their revisionist allies, impose their control and domination over them, check any attempt on their part, however formal, for independence.

These plans, which Khrushchev aims to achieve with the meeting he is preparing, have encountered great obstacles, not only from the Marxist-Leninist parties, which are quite clear about Khrushchev's treacherous aims to the detriment of communism and the socialist camp, but also from some of his revisionist allies. In the first place, it must be said that some of the revisionist opponents of Khrushchev's proposed meeting, in the preparatory stage of which they are nevertheless participating, are just as revisionists as, even more consistently revisionist than, Khrushchev himself. Their opposition to the holding of the international meeting is not inspired by any concern about the unity of the communist movement and the socialist camp, but from their aim that the complete split and fight against Marxism-Leninism should be carried out by methods different from those of Khrushchev, methods which they consider more effective and with fewer dangerous consequences for them, by trying to prolong their own existence through creating false illusions about their position, and so on. Moreover, their opposition is inspired by the fact that they do not want to be tied down; they want to gain their "independence" from the Khrushchevite clique, to be free to link themselves directly with the

social-democrats or the imperialist bourgeoisie, how and when they want.

The manoeuvres which Khrushchev and his followers are now resorting to, the tactics they are using, cannot conceal the anti-Marxist aims of the modern revisionists, their hostility to Marxism-Leninism. They will not succeed in deceiving anyone. Whether or not the revisionists hold their meeting, whether they hold it now or later, makes no difference. The true Marxist-Leninists will intensify their principled struggle for the exposure of the Khrushchevite and other modern revisionists, a struggle that will bring defeat and total destruction to these dangerous enemies of communism.

The Party of Labour of Albania has been and continues to be in favour of the international meeting of the communist and workers' parties. But it has been and continues to be in favour of a meeting that would serve the real unity of the communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, on the basis of the revolutionary principles laid down in the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations. It has opposed and continues to oppose any meeting that would sanction an open rift or would create a false unity on an anti-Marxist revisionist basis.

The Party of Labour of Albania has stated earlier, and is repeating now, that in order to prepare a meeting of the Marxist-Leninist unity of the communist movement it is essential to take into account the present situation of the communist movement, the changes that have taken place, and the processes that have gone on in it since the 1960 Meeting, and in conformity with these circumstances and conditions to specify the measures and steps that should be taken to achieve an international meeting which would really express the opinion and wishes of all the communists of the world, and would serve to achieve and strengthen that militant unity of which our movement stands in greater need today than ever before.

The only basis for true unity of the socialist camp and the communist movement lies in Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. No unity can be achieved on the basis of revisionism. There can be no unity between Marxists and revisionists who have betrayed the cause of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Khrushchev's plan to unite the communist movement on the basis of revisionism is a plan of disruption, and is doomed to failure and disgrace. Likewise, any attempt, any hope, any illusion of finding an intermediary platform, satisfactory to all, that would unite both Marxists and revisionists, is futile and detrimental to the attainment of true principled unity of the communist movement, which is the only unity possible.

The treacherous designs which the Khrushchev group are striving to attain at the present meeting are by no means accidental. The Khrushchevite revisionists have always striven towards attaining these objectives. They began the split by spreading their revisionist course. They deepened it with their anti-Marxist and anti-socialist activities. And they are now carrying this division to its logical conclusion. But the revisionists should bear well in mind that the heavens will not be overturned because of their separatist meeting and because of the "collective measures" that they will take. Their meeting will be fruitful and very favourable to the international communist movement. The day of the revisionists' meeting will go down in history as the day of their complete and open betrayal, and at the same time, as the day that will mark their final catastrophe. The revolutionary communist movement will forge ahead without the revisionists and in struggle against the revisionists, and it will certainly achieve its unity in this militant way. This will be true Marxist-Leninist unity for which the Marxist-Leninists of the world are fighting and will fight courageously.

ENVER HOXHA

Dear Comrades,

Khrushchev is trying to persuade you, communists of the Soviet Union, the Soviet peoples and all the peoples of the world that with his assumption of power a new epoch has begun, a great turn in history. The decade of his rule is described as the decade of the “blossoming of the Soviet Union,” of the “triumphal march towards communism,” as the decade of the “triumph of peace and peaceful coexistence,” as the decade of the “consolidation of the communist movement” and of the “creative development of Marxism.” The modern revisionists begin the “real history” of the Soviet Union in 1953.

These are all lies, nothing but lies. It is true that an historical turn started when the Khrushchev group took the reins of state in their hands, but this was a big retrogressive turn, a turn that flung the doors open to opportunism and revisionism, to betrayal and degeneration, to the undermining of unity and the beginning of the rift in the communist movement, to approaches to and unity with the imperialists and other enemies of the peoples and socialism.

No other person or group up till now has caused so much harm and so much evil to the Soviet Union, to the socialist camp, to the communist movement, to the cause of socialism and communism, as Khrushchev and his group. The history of the Soviet Union and of international communism records no greater renegade, no more rabid and dangerous enemy than the group of Khrushchevite revisionists.

What the imperialists were unable to do through their armed intervention, what Trotsky, Bukharin and other enemies of the Soviet power could not do in their time, what the German fascists could not do during the Second World War. Khrushchev’s group are set on doing now.

Who has defamed, discredited, assailed so vehemently, who has slandered the Soviet power, the Soviet socialist order as much as

Khrushchev has done?

It is Khrushchev who cancelled out the most glorious period of the Soviet Union, when the Soviet peoples, led by the party with Stalin at the head, overcame colossal difficulties, courageously coped with the ruthless capitalist encirclement, smashed the counter-revolution, built the first socialist society in the world, reaped the great historic victory in the Patriotic War, and transformed the Soviet Union into a powerful, developed and advanced socialist state with an unparalleled authority and role in the international arena. He presented the whole of this period as one during which terror and persecution, prisons and concentration camps, violations of the law and democracy, arbitrariness and despotism, poverty and hunger reigned in the Soviet Union. He rendered the imperialists great service through these deeds of his, providing them with weapons to attack and discredit the Soviet Union. The infamous “secret” report which Khrushchev delivered at the 20th Congress and his subsequent speeches became the main nourishment, the inexhaustible source of all the most reactionary anti-communist and anti-Soviet propaganda.

Who can believe Khrushchev’s slanders about the crimes of Stalin? Can we have any faith in the concoctions of investigatory commissions appointed by Khrushchev, in the writings of the Adjubeys,¹ the diaries of the Solzhenitsyns,² and their ilk? Can it be that imperialism and its agents, for whom the Soviet Union has always been an acute irritation, which they tried to get rid of by strangling it in its cradle, have sat with folded arms all this time, and have done nothing about it? In times gone by Khrushchev himself said in 1938: “The Yakirs, the Balitskys, the Tyupchenkos, the Zatonkys, and other rogues intended to bring the Polish aristocracy back to the Ukraine, to bring

¹ Khrushchev’s son-in-law, former editor-in-chief of the newspaper “Isvestia,” mouthpiece for Khrushchev’s revisionist ideas and actions.

² Counter-revolutionary, ultra-revisionist writer.

the German fascists, the landlords and capitalists here... We have exterminated many enemies but still not all of them. Therefore we should keep our eyes open. We should always bear in mind Comrade Stalin's words that so long as the capitalist encirclement exists spies and wreckers will be sent into our country."

One year earlier, in 1937, this same Khrushchev said

"Our Party will mercilessly crush the band of traitors, will sweep all the Trotskyite rightist carrion from the face of the earth. The guarantee of this is the unwavering leadership of our Central Committee, the unwavering leadership of our leader, Comrade Stalin... We shall completely exterminate the enemies from first to last, and scatter their ashes to the winds." But instead of wiping the Trotskyite carrion from the face of the earth, or exterminating all the enemies and scattering their ashes to the winds, the renegade Khrushchev burned Stalin's remains, scattered his ashes to the wind, the ashes of this great defender and leader of the historic achievements of the Soviet Union. He rehabilitated all the counter-revolutionaries, from first to last, proclaimed them victims of Stalin, and decided to raise monuments to them.

Just who these victims are whom Khrushchev takes under his protection, we Albanians know only too well from our own experience. While Khrushchev has dubbed the leaders of the Albanian Party and state, who have led the people in the great fight for liberation and the building of socialism, agents of imperialism who have sold them selves for 30 pieces of silver, murderers and terrorists, he has openly taken under his protection the enemies of our Party and of our people, describing them as true revolutionary communists, internationalists, patriots and innocent victims.

Only a traitor, an enemy of communism, could hurl such monstrous slanders and attacks on Stalin, this great leader of the Communist Party, the Soviet peoples, and the international communist movement. In his anti-communist attacks on Stalin, Nikita

Khrushchev has surpassed even the imperialists, the most rabid reactionaries and renegades from communism, Kautsky, Trotsky, Tito and Djilas. What has he not said against Stalin! He has called him a “murderer,” a “common criminal,” a “despot of the type of Ivan the Terrible,” the “greatest dictator in the history of Russia,” and so on and so forth. J.V. Stalin, who for 30 years on end led the Party of the Bolsheviks and the Soviet peoples from victory to victory, who courageously defended the line of the great Lenin, who inspired the Stakhanovs and heroes of the socialist construction in the Soviet Union, who aroused and resolutely led all the workers and peasants, all the Soviet people, in the Great Patriotic War, with whose name on their lips the Matrosov,¹ the Kozmodemyanskayas,² the heroes of Stalin-grad, and hundreds of thousands of other heroes and fighters threw themselves into attacks on the enemy and fell in battle.

Have you ever stopped to think, comrades, why such savage hatred is expressed for Stalin, why he is discredited and attacked so furiously, why the whole glorious period of the Soviet people and their party, when J.V. Stalin was at the head, is blackened so shamefully? Don't you see a logical connection between attacks and slanders against Stalin and songs of praise for the leaders of imperialism, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and others whom Khrushchev has called “reasonable” men who “enjoy the absolute trust of their people,” who “are earnestly concerned about the preservation of peace,” the death of one of any of these chiefs of imperialism, as in the case of Kennedy, he described as a “great loss for mankind” and proclaimed

¹ A. M. Matrosov — soldier of the Soviet Red Army, who educated by the Communist Party of Lenin and Stalin, in February 1943, blocked the fire from a German bunker with his own body to ensure the victory of his detachment.

² Z. A. Kozmodemyanskaya — heroic daughter of the Soviet people, brave and dauntless partisan fighter, who was captured by the enemy and, after inhuman torture, was barbarously murdered by the German nazis in November 1941.

as a day of mourning even for the communists? Only a charlatan, a man without character or shame could behave as Khrushchev has done towards Stalin, to whom, when he was alive, he used to sing the most rapturous praises, whom he used to call “the great Lenin’s close friend and comrade-in-arms,” “friend of the people and beloved father,” “the great Marshal of the victory over fascism,” “the greatest genius and leader of mankind.”

How could it have been possible that you, Soviet communists, the Soviet people, achieved such colossal victories of historic significance with your party and state headed by a man who did nothing but commit all kinds of crimes and mistakes? Can there be any greater absurdity and more clumsy falsification of history than to deny Stalin’s great merits as the leader of the party and the commander-in-chief of the Soviet Army and to praise to the skies the role and merits of Khrushchev, who is presented as a great strategist, not only of the Patriotic War, but even of the Civil War, as the pioneer of the cosmic era, and so on and so forth. It is a regrettable thing that even some comrades-in-arms of Stalin who directed the major operations during the Patriotic War with him and under his leadership, are falsifying history under instructions from Khrushchev, are now denying what yesterday they admitted with their own mouths.

With his base calumnies and attacks against Stalin, worthy only of a hooligan, Khrushchev gravely insults the great Soviet people, their party, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Soviet socialist order, insults the glorious Soviet Army, the international communist movement and the workers and peoples of all the world, insults socialism and Marxism-Leninism. Time was when Khrushchev himself used to say: “Whoever raises his hand against Comrade Stalin has raised it against all of us, against the working class, against the working people! Whoever raises his hand against Comrade Stalin has raised it against the doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin.” (From his speech at the

Moscow rally in January 1937.)

This is precisely what Khrushchev himself has done. By raising his hand against Stalin, he raised it against everything, against communism, against Marxism-Leninism.

By raising his hand against Stalin, Khrushchev raised his hand against the Soviet socialist system itself. He is afraid to admit this in public, despite the calls of his most consistent allies to carry the elimination of the consequences of the “cult” through to the end. But the fact remains that by calling the three decades of Stalin’s leadership an anomaly, a deviation from the Leninist road, and by working intensively to undermine the socialist system, Khrushchev is actually breaking the Soviet socialist system itself and is leading the peaceful evolution of the degeneration of socialism in the Soviet Union. And the irony of it is that he calls this treacherous social-democratic road a “return to Lenin,” “following the true Leninist road”!

This is the purpose and true significance of all of Khrushchev’s hue and cry about the so-called struggle against the cult of the individual and its consequences.

The Khrushchev group have raised their hand against the most sacred thing, the most powerful weapon of the Soviet people for the defence of the achievements of the revolution and the construction of communism, against the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Communist Party. They are trying to disarm the people, to take the power from the people’s hands, to cause the degeneration of the party. They have trampled upon and rejected the consistent Marxist-Leninist line of the Bolshevik Party, its revolutionary tradition and spirit, they have imposed an opportunist and revisionist course on the party in all fields of its life and activity, a course which jeopardizes the historic victories of socialism in the Soviet Union, for which the party and the Soviet people have fought heroically, have made great sacrifices, have shed their blood.

To carry their course through, the Khrushchev revisionist clique have carried out great and continuous purges in the ranks of the cadres of the party and the state, from both the central organs and the base, have dismissed all those about whom they are doubtful and have replaced them with cadres loyal to their course. Within ten years Khrushchev has removed over 70 per cent of the members of the Central Committee elected at the 19th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1952, and at the 22nd Congress about 50 per cent of the members of the Central Committee elected at the 20th Congress. Likewise, on the eve of the 22nd Congress, on the pretext of the circulation of cadres, he replaced 45 per cent of the members of the central committees of the parties of the Federated Republics, of the party committees of districts and regions, as well as 40 per cent of the members of the party committees of cities and city quarters. In 1963, under the pretext of reorganizing the party on the basis of production, the Khrushchev clique once again replaced more than half of the members of the central committees of the Federated Republics and regional party committees.

The men who surround and serve Khrushchev today constitute a privileged stratum, degenerated from the point of view of ideology, who have betrayed the revolutionary cause of the Soviet working class, who are fighting against Marxism-Leninism and socialism. Their sole concern is to consolidate their economic position and their political domination. Relying on this stratum the Khrushchev group are turning the glorious Communist Party of the Soviet Union into a revisionist party and the Soviet socialist state into a dictatorship of the Khrushchevite clique.

Their theses on the so-called “party of the entire people” and “the state of the entire people,” are a great fraud. They have nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism and serve only to pave the way for the restoration of capitalism.

“The march forward, that is, towards communism, passes through the dictatorship of the proletariat, and it cannot be achieved otherwise,” said Lenin. By proclaiming that the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union has been liquidated, the Khrushchev group have taken a very dangerous step back towards capitalism. Khrushchev’s so-called “state of the entire people” is nothing but a mask to hide the dictatorship of his clique directed against the Soviet working class and peasantry, against the Soviet people. It is only the dictatorship of the proletariat that Khrushchev fights. He is for the preservation of state power in order to use it as a means to attain his own counter-revolutionary objectives and to keep the Soviet people and communists under oppression and subjection. Equally dangerous is his thesis about the “party of the entire people” which wipes out the proletarian class character of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and opens the way for the degeneration of the Marxist-Leninist party into a revisionist one. All the organizational and re-organizational steps, which Khrushchev has undertaken time after time in the party and state, serve these aims.

Comrades, the Soviet state, the first socialist state in the world which the October Revolution established, the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union, are faced with the grave risk of degenerating into a bourgeois state and a revisionist bourgeois party. Passivity at these moments is inexcusable and fatal. It is the imperative, lofty, sacred and historic duty of all the members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the broad masses of the Soviet people to defend the dictatorship of the proletariat, to defend the Communist Party founded by Lenin.

Since he came to power Khrushchev has taken a number of steps and has made a number of reforms in the field of the economy, particularly in agriculture, about which he has bragged a great deal. But what is the purpose and real meaning of these measures and reforms?

They are in opposition to the principles of socialism and communism, they are an attempt to introduce into the Soviet socialist economy organizational forms and methods of management borrowed from the experience of Titoite Yugoslavia and the capitalist countries. The Khrushchev group have replaced the socialist principle of payment according to the work done with the material stimulus, which they absolutize and fetishize. They have undermined the planned and centralized management of the economy, and by encouraging the capitalist principle of the struggle for profits, are inciting unrestrained capitalist competition, are destroying the common property of the whole people, and are breaking it up, as they have done with the machine and tractor stations.

In essence Khrushchev's communism is a variety of bourgeois socialism. His hue and cry about his concern for the welfare of the people, for better living conditions for everyone, are hypocritical and demagogical from first to last. What the Khrushchev group hanker after is an easier life, more comfort and prosperity for a privileged and degenerate stratum which secures fat incomes in the form of high salaries, bonuses and honoraria, and by means of abuses, bribes, theft and so on. Khrushchev has reduced the lofty ideal of communism to a "good plate of goulash." The United States of America, the experience of the industrialists and the recommendations of big American ranch holders and farmers like Eaton, Hearst and company serve as a pattern for his communism. He has gone so far as to hold out his hand to the U.S. imperialists in order "to build" communism in the Soviet Union with their dollars and credits. The Khrushchevite revisionists have flung the doors open to the penetration of bourgeois ideology, the bourgeois way of life, bourgeois decadence in art, literature and culture, to the enlivenment of all kinds of anti-Soviet, anti-socialist tendencies, to the spreading of decadent Western trends. They loudly propagate bourgeois individualism and selfishness, bourgeois

humanism and pacifism.

Are all these things not clear testimony of the dangerous course on which Khrushchev is leading the Soviet Union? These are not at all steps ahead towards communism — they all lead backwards to capitalism. Under these circumstances, the revolutionary Soviet communists, and the Soviet people face the question: will they allow the Khrushchev group to carry out their criminal, counter-revolutionary work in peace, or will they rise up in defence of the victories of socialism and communism in the Soviet Union and call a halt to the anti-Soviet, anti-socialist course of Khrushchev?

Dear Comrades,

As long as your party held the banner of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism high and unsullied and pursued a consistent revolutionary line in home and foreign policy, the Soviet Union was, for whole decades, the bastion of the revolution and socialism, the standard-bearer of the struggle against imperialism, the great defender and supporter of the freedom and independence of the peoples, the great fighter for the emancipation of the working class and the cause of peace in the world. The revolutionary communists and peoples of the whole world looked upon the great Soviet Union with deep respect and admiration, took as their example and were inspired by its principled revolutionary stand. The establishment of the socialist camp, the growth of the communist and workers' movement, the great impetus of the peoples' liberation struggles are closely bound up with the internationalist role and contribution of the first country of socialism, the Soviet Union. At that time there was full unity of views and action in the socialist camp, in the communist movement, and in all the international democratic organizations. All the revolutionary forces of the world, with the Soviet Union at the head, acted united

ENVER HOXHA

as a single body against the forces of imperialism and reaction.

But Khrushchev undermined the prestige, authority, and role of the Soviet Union in the world with his political course. In the name of the Soviet Union he splits the socialist camp and the international communist movement, he sabotages and strangles the revolution and the peoples' liberation struggles, deceives and intimidates the peoples, defends capitalism and imperialism and paints them in beautiful colours.

See, comrades, what a great tragedy the Khrushchev group are playing with your country which has such brilliant revolutionary traditions, such great historical merits! They are constantly linking and uniting the Soviet Union with its most ravaging enemies, with those against whom the communists and peoples of the Soviet Union have waged a resolute and heroic fight.

The Khrushchev group have made allies and friends of those who would like to bury the Soviet Union. They have made U.S. imperialism, which is the head of world imperialism, the centre of reaction, and the main source of war and aggression, the international exploiter and gendarme, the number one enemy of the peoples of the whole world, an ally and friend of the Soviet Union.

They have made a friend and brother of the Tito clique, who have long since betrayed Marxism-Leninism, who carry on activity to undermine the forces of socialism, freedom and peace in the world, who serve imperialism most zealously, who are maintained on U.S. dollars, and whom the international communist movement has unanimously denounced.

They have made friends and allies of the renegades of the working class, servants of the bourgeoisie and most rabid anti-communists, the reactionary right-wing leaders of social-democracy like Guy Mollet, Spaak, Wilson, and others.

They have made friends and allies of the reactionary Indian

bourgeoisie whom Khrushchev is equipping with armaments and whom he is inciting to oppress the Indian people and launch aggression on such a fraternal country as the People's Republic of China.

They have made friends and allies of the Vatican in Rome, this old centre of reaction and obscurantism, with all the reactionary and counter-revolutionary forces of the world, including the Bonn revanchists with whom Khrushchev is trying to come to terms.

Khrushchev has turned the sharp edge of his attacks against the true and loyal allies and friends of the Soviet Union.

You know the fierce attacks, monstrous slanders and accusations, the hostile acts which the Khrushchev group have launched against the Party of Labour of Albania, against the People's Republic of Albania, against the Albanian people and their leaders. What "crime" is there that he has not accused our Party and our people of! In his campaign against our Party and our people, Khrushchev resorted to threats and pressure, brutal interference in our internal affairs, established the economic blockade and broke off diplomatic relations. From the rostrum of the 22nd Congress he openly called upon the communists and people of Albania to launch a counter-revolution, to overthrow the leadership of the Party and the state, exhortations which are continually repeated by the Soviet propaganda organs, and especially by Radio Moscow in its broadcasts to Albania. But why all this resentment, all this hostility towards a socialist country, towards a Marxist party and a fraternal people, hatred and enmity which even the most rabid imperialist enemies have not expressed towards our country? What was the "crime" this Party and this people committed? Their sole "crime" was that they refused to submit to Khrushchev's line of betrayal, came out in defence of Marxism-Leninism, and unmasked and opposed the disruptive aims of the revisionists.

The Khrushchev group are waging a bitter struggle against other socialist countries which do not submit to their dictate, as well as

against all the communist parties which oppose revisionism and uphold Marxism-Leninism. They are using against them all the weapons and methods which the class enemy uses, interfering brutally in their internal affairs, violating their sovereignty and independence, using pressure and blackmail to force them to their knees, sowing dissension and organizing plots, as they did recently against the Communist Party of Japan. They use the joint organizations of the Council of Mutual Economic Aid and the Warsaw Treaty in order to put the socialist countries under the domination of this group, to exploit them for their own selfish and chauvinistic purposes.

With the whole of his course and activity Khrushchev has rendered and is rendering great services to imperialism and world reaction, and has caused and is causing heavy damage to the cause of socialism, the freedom of the peoples and peace in the world.

Modern revisionism, which spread very rapidly following the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, paved the way for the bloody counter-revolution in Hungary, to the counter-revolutionary events in Poland, jeopardized the very existence of certain communist and workers' parties, as in the United States of America, in Denmark, and elsewhere. Following Khrushchev's course, the Communist Party of India, with Dange at its head, transformed itself into a tool of the reactionary big bourgeoisie, into a national-chauvinist party that has betrayed the ideals of the Indian working class and people. In Algeria the revisionists diverted the party from the armed resistance together with the people, isolated it from the masses, placed it at the tail end and made it lose its place in the political life of Algeria. A real tragedy befell the Communist Party of Iraq, which, having succumbed to pressure from the Khrushchev group, followed an opportunist course, lost its vigilance, and as a consequence, received a heavy blow from the reactionaries, and the cause of the revolution in Iraq suffered a big defeat.

Revisionism is eroding many communist and workers' parties, particularly in Europe, which is full of revisionism. They are being transformed from parties of social revolution into parties of social reform, they are approaching and amalgamating with the social-democrats, departing from the revolutionary traditions and the revolutionary spirit, they are nurturing themselves with illusions about the peaceful parliamentary road, which the revisionists have raised to a principle of world strategy.

For the sake of his rapprochement under any conditions and all-round collaboration with the U.S. imperialists who are the real beneficiaries from the whole of his policy of so-called peaceful coexistence, Khrushchev has committed grave crimes against the peoples' freedom and independence, against peace, against the Soviet Union itself, against its security. For the sake of this rapprochement and reconciliation, following his adventurous actions, Khrushchev capitulated shamefully to U.S. imperialism during the Caribbean crisis, when he did not hesitate to sacrifice Cuba's sovereignty. He brought great shame on the Soviet Union, on its armed forces, when he allowed the U.S. imperialists to search Soviet ships on the open seas in a most humiliating way, while Cuba, a tiny country, only 90 miles from the USA, honourably upheld its dignity, did not allow any imperialist searches within its territory, even of Soviet ships in Cuban territorial waters.

Khrushchev sacrificed the national interests of the Congolese people when he voted in favour of the intervention of UN troops under the direction of the U.S. imperialists. This compromise brought tragic consequences to the cause of freedom and independence of the Congolese people, as everybody now knows.

A great betrayal and deception of the peoples was the Moscow Treaty on the Partial Ban of Nuclear Weapons Tests, which is in fact directed against the interests of the Soviet Union itself and the socialist

camp, gives the U.S. imperialists the possibility of continuing their underground tests unilaterally and of increasing their atomic potential, of continuing their nuclear blackmail to threaten and intimidate the peoples.

Khrushchev has made many deals with imperialism at the peoples' expense. In spite of the great noise made for years on end about the signing of the peace treaty with Germany and the settlement of the West Berlin problem, Khrushchev has now virtually dropped this matter, and on the eve of his visit to West Germany, is preparing to make further compromises with the Bonn revanchists to the detriment of the vital interests of the German Democratic Republic. While all the peoples throughout the world rose in anger and resolutely denounced the new aggressive acts of the United States of America against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Khrushchev, to avoid losing favour with the Americans, raised only a feeble voice, with difficulty managed to say a couple of words in an undertone to express his regrets over the Tonkin Gulf incidents, at a time when a fraternal socialist country was faced and is still faced with grave danger.

Not only has Khrushchev given up the fight against imperialists himself, but he is doing his best to stop the other peoples from carrying out the revolution and from fighting imperialism, and trying to restrain and strangle the world liberation movement. He spreads all sorts of pacifist illusions about imperialism and its leaders, advises the peoples to be docile, not to irritate the imperialists but to submit to them, because, according to him, a "world conflagration could be kindled from any little spark." He threatens and intimidates them with the horrors of atomic war and preaches peace under any conditions and at any price. He has gone so far as to suggest the setting up of an international police force within the framework of the United Nations Organization, to become an international gendarme, together with U.S. imperialism, in order to suppress any peoples' liberation and

revolutionary movement in the world.

It is not by chance that the U.S. imperialists, the right-wing leaders of social-democracy, and reactionaries of all hues lavish praise on the person of Khrushchev, on his policy, on his attitude. They describe him as a “great realistic politician with whom one can readily come to terms,” “the most suitable man for the West in Moscow,” “the Soviet premier who acts like an American politician,” “the man who is putting the communist world on the road to great transformations and evolution,” and so on and so forth. They have rested great hopes on Khrushchev and his group, and that is why they come to meet him half-way and give him all kinds of aid and support to lure him further down the road of betrayal on which he has long since embarked. They speak openly about “not allowing this great occasion to slip through their fingers” and that “the USA should, to a certain extent, make Khrushchev’s task lighter,” and so on and so forth.

History has not recorded any other case of this kind, in which the leaders of imperialism, the class enemies, have lavished so much praise on, are so enthusiastic about, a leader of a communist party as Khrushchev, have expressed so openly their approval, joy, and hopes regarding his political course. This fact alone makes clear who benefits from Khrushchev’s actions, whom his views and deeds serve.

Dear Comrades,

In face of the great danger of Khrushchevite revisionism that is menacing the socialist camp, the international communist movement and the Soviet Union itself, today the communist parties that have adopted sound Marxist-Leninist positions, all the revolutionary communists the world over, have risen in resolute and principled struggle.

And it could not happen otherwise. The communists, who have dedicated their lives to the cause of the revolution and socialism, could

ENVER HOXHA

not have failed and cannot fail to rise up against this great betrayal of the working class on the part of the modern revisionists. We are fully convinced that this struggle will take ever greater proportions, and that this is precisely what will bring about the final defeat of revisionism.

In this great historic battle between Marxism and revisionism, on the outcome of which the present and future of socialism depends, a great responsibility and role devolves upon you, dear comrades, members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It is precisely in the leadership of your party that the great evil has taken root, it is the centre of revisionism today. The great danger which revisionism constitutes for the entire international communist movement today lies in the fact that it has manifested itself in the oldest and most authoritative party in the world, in the Bolshevik Party, in the Party of Lenin and Stalin, that it has infected the first and most powerful socialist country, the Soviet Union.

Taking advantage of the authority of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, of the Soviet state, and utilizing the state power with all the colossal means at its disposal, the Khrushchev group are trying to deceive the Soviet communists, to force their course of action on them, to confuse the leaders of many parties, and to plunge them into the mire of opportunism.

In this grave situation created by Khrushchev's betrayal, the time has come for you, Soviet communists, to perform your lofty revolutionary duty towards your glorious party, people and country, towards the communists, the proletarians and peoples of the whole world, to prevent the treacherous Khrushchevite clique from jeopardizing the future of socialism and communism. The Soviet revolutionary communists have never sat back on the strength of their traditions and merits of the past. Today more than ever before these traditions should be reasserted in the same revolutionary spirit, with the same

determination and devotion to principle, to defend the name of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, to raise high its revolutionary banner flung to the ground by Khrushchev. The vital interests of the Soviet Union, the socialist camp, the revolutionary and liberation movement of the world demand this.

You live and work in the country where the leaders of modern revisionism hold sway. Therefore your fight in defence of Marxism-Leninism is of decisive importance. No doubt this fight is far from easy. It demands great efforts, courage and determination, even sacrifice. But the Soviet communists during their glorious history have given many proofs of their heroism and self-sacrifice for the great cause of the working class. They have never been intimidated, they have never retreated before the enemy, carrying out their duty gloriously even in the most difficult moments.

The Party of Labour of Albania addresses this open letter to you, members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, because we love you, because we consider you today, as we have always done, our comrades-in-arms. The attempts of the Khrushchev group to smash the Soviet-Albanian friendship, to sow dissension and enmity between our peoples, will fail. The sentiments of friendship and brotherhood of our Party and our people towards your party and peoples have not been extinguished and never will be. The Albanian communists and people are lifelong friends of the Soviet Union. Regardless of the fact that a group of renegades stands today at the head of the Soviet Union, the Party of Labour of Albania, the People's Republic of Albania and the Albanian people will always defend the Soviet Union, the first socialist state, created by the great Lenin, against all the foreign and internal enemies. We have never forgotten, nor will we ever forget, what the Soviet Union means to us, we will never forget its internationalist aid for the liberation of our country and the building of socialism.

The stand of the Party of Labour of Albania, of the Albanian

people, has been and remains clear-cut: an uncompromising struggle of principle through to the end for the destruction of the Khrushchev revisionist group; friendship, loyalty and full internationalist and fraternal solidarity with the peoples of the Soviet Union.

Our Party abides strictly by the statement made at the solemn meeting on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Party of Labour of Albania, on November 7, 1961: "Our Party and our people keep intact in their hearts pure sentiments of friendship towards the fraternal peoples of the Soviet Union, regardless of the attacks, slanders, and hostile acts to which they have been subjected. Our Party has taught us to love the Soviet Union, the great Homeland of Lenin and Stalin, both in good times and in difficult ones."

Guided by these principles, these feelings and this spirit, the Party of Labour of Albania turns to you, confident that the Soviet communists will know in these historic moments how to fulfil their revolutionary internationalist mission with dignity, will face every storm as worthy sons of their party, of its heroic road and history.

How many plots and attacks have been made by the class enemy, the enemies of the Soviet party and people, against the Soviet Union since the time of the October Revolution! But the enemy has always been crushed. The cause of socialism, the Soviet power, has been defended with honour. You, the sons of the Bolshevik Party, under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, smashed the intervention of the imperialist powers, which like ravening beasts tried to strangle the revolution, and you triumphed in the bloody Civil War against the rabid class enemies. Supporting you, heart and soul, with militant actions during those days were the communists, the proletarians, all the revolutionaries and oppressed peoples of the world. You, the sons of the Bolshevik Party, fought with unparalleled heroism under the leadership of the great successor to the work of Lenin, J.V. Stalin, during

the Patriotic War, bravely vanquished German fascism on the field of battle, and became the saviours of the peoples of Europe. In this great war, again you had as allies the communist and workers' parties throughout the world, the proletarians and all the peoples, the whole of progressive mankind.

Today a great danger is again threatening your party and the Soviet Union. They are being menaced from within and from abroad by the plot that the imperialists, together with the modern revisionists, are hatching up. This plot, which is being effected under peaceful conditions, is, in fact, much more dangerous to the fate of socialism in the Soviet Union, to all the international communist and workers' movement, to the fate of the revolution in general. At the head of this plot are the leaders of U.S. imperialism and world reaction and the Khrushchev clique. The cause of socialism and the October Revolution, to which you have dedicated your lives, calls on you once more to defeat the great counter-revolutionary plot, which is threatening you, with the same heroism and revolutionary spirit that have characterized your whole life as militant Leninists. And today, as yesterday, in this just fight in defence of Marxism-Leninism and the Soviet Union you are not alone. Standing by you are the Marxist-Leninist communist and workers' parties, all the revolutionary communists, all the proletarians and the peoples of the world, who comprise a much greater force than the supporters and allies you had in your battles against the class enemy, the enemies of the Soviet Union in the days gone by.

The Party of Labour of Albania, which is not accustomed to whispering behind the door, but speaks openly and frankly, declares resolutely with a clear conscience that it is with you. We consider the struggle that must be waged against the revisionist and imperialist plot, in defence of Marxism-Leninism, in defence of the Soviet Union, the first socialist country, a lofty internationalist duty. And the

Soviet Union cannot be defended by saying, "We are with the Soviet Union, right or wrong." Only traitors think that way. The Soviet Union cannot be defended in that manner. That would only defend the betrayal. We do not want a Soviet Union dominated by the revisionist traitors. We do not want to see the revisionists wreck the achievements of the October Revolution and push the country towards alliances with imperialism for the restoration of capitalism over the soil drenched with the blood of the finest sons of the party, the working class, and the Soviet people. We want to see the Soviet Union remain today, tomorrow, and always, a powerful bastion of the cause of socialism and communism, of the revolution and the freedom of peoples, of peace in the world.

We Albanian communists, all the workers and patriots of socialist Albania, regardless of our being few in number and the object of continuous ruthless attacks from the imperialists and revisionists, are fighting and will fight resolutely, unyieldingly, to the end in defence of our great common cause, Marxism-Leninism, in defence of the Soviet Union. In this fight we accept all the responsibilities that fall on us and we think that it is time for all true communists and revolutionaries, for all those to whom the cause of Marxism-Leninism, socialism and the revolution are dear, to boldly assume their full responsibilities in this situation.

Once again we express our full confidence and unshaken belief that our comrades, the communists of the glorious party of Lenin and Stalin, who yesterday were an example of great inspiration for all the communists and peoples of the world, today, too, with a lofty revolutionary consciousness, will know how to carry out the very responsible duties with which history charges them.

In defence of Marxism-Leninism, in defence of socialism and communism, in defence of the Soviet Union, under the great banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, the Soviet communists will unite

their efforts, their powerful struggle with those of all the communists and proletarians of all countries, for the complete exposure and defeat of modern revisionism and imperialism.

The Central Committee of the Party of
Labour of Albania
First Secretary

Enver Hoxha

Selected Works, vol. 3, Tirana
1980, pp. 604-636, Eng. ed.

THE FALL OF THE TRAITOR NIKITA KHRUSHCHEV

October 17, 1964

Yesterday¹ was truly a day for great rejoicing for all the Marxist-Leninists of the world and, especially, for the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian people. Our heroic Party has a legitimate right to rejoice and to feel great satisfaction, because it has fought heroically, with great Marxist-Leninist maturity against modern revisionism, in general, and against Khrushchevism and Titoism, in particular. The Khrushchevites were the first to open fire on the Party of Labour of Albania. This fire became general, from all the modern revisionists, assumed a breadth and depth never seen before and was transformed into a furious ideological, political, economic, diplomatic and military crusade against the Party of Labour of Albania, the Albanian people and the People's Republic of Albania. Our Party replied to the fire which they opened, stood up to this fire with mature Marxist-Leninist courage and, not only was not brought to its knees, but fought proudly in the forefront and became an example and a banner. With this it won the trust, admiration, respect and support of all the Marxist-Leninist parties which took a correct stand, and of all the Marxist-Leninists and the revolutionaries in the world. Our heroic, unflinching, just struggle continued for years on end and every year was filled with victories for our Party. These victories are like shining medals which decorate its valiant chest and their lustre will never be dulled. Step by step we mercilessly pursued, unmasked and fought modern revisionism, the traitor group of Khrushchev, the traitor group of Tito

¹ On October 16, 1964, Nikita Khrushchev was expelled from the Presidium of the CC of the CPSU and was dismissed from the functions he held as first secretary of the CC and chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

THE FALL OF THE TRAITOR KHRUSHCHEV

and all the other revisionist groupings. We contributed powerfully to the unmasking of their all-round betrayal.

We had unshakeable confidence that the traitor would be defeated,¹ and there is nothing surprising about the manner in which he was eliminated, but the sudden dismissal of this traitor from his leading posts, and especially by his own associates, came as a surprise to us. This is a palace putsch. Just as Khrushchev organized his putsch when he eliminated Molotov, Kaganovich and Malenkov, just as he tried and executed Beria, just as he eliminated Zhukov, his own associates eliminated Khrushchev himself.² Judging from the first information, apparently the putsch was organized in a conspiratorial way and the traitor and his closest henchmen knew nothing about it, or

¹ On April 7, 1964, in a talk with a delegation of the Trade Unions of the DR of Vietnam which had come for a visit to Albania, Comrade Enver Hoxha, among other things, said: "The fact is that today the revisionists are going downhill. Khrushchev is being exposed more and more each day. The situation is extremely difficult for him because the Marxist-Leninist parties new have lined up and are linked together as solidly as reinforced concrete, while the façade of the Khrushchevites is unstable, swaying whichever way the wind blows: their ship is leaking and the rats are beginning to leave it; they have Malta fever." (Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 26, Alb. ed., Tirana 1978, p. 230.)

² "Khrushchev seized power through a putsch, and Brezhnev toppled him from the throne with a putsch.

"Brezhnev and company got rid of Khrushchev to protect the revisionist policy and ideology from the discredit and exposure resulting from his crazy behaviour and actions and embarrassing buffoonery. He did not in any way reject Khrushchevism, the reports and decisions of the 20th and 22nd Congresses in which Khrushchevism is embodied. Brezhnev showed himself to be so ungrateful to Khrushchev, whom he had previously lauded so high, that he could not even find a hole in the wall of the Kremlin to put his ashes when he died! Meanwhile, neither the Soviet peoples, nor world opinion have ever been informed of the real reasons for the overthrow of Khrushchev. Even to this day, the 'main reason' given in the revisionist official documents is 'his advanced age and deteriorating state of health!'" (Enver Hoxha, *With Stalin (Memoirs)*, 3rd Eng. ed., Tirana 1984, p. 35.)

were placed in a situation where they had no time either to warn him or to take measures. In time the facts will make everything clear to us.

We are obliged to think that the Soviet revisionists came to the conclusion that they could go no further with Nikita Khrushchev as their leader. The Soviet revisionist group thought that the rush to disaster under the rash leadership of the traitor Khrushchev had to be brought to a halt, and in order to do this at least Nikita Khrushchev had to be eliminated and the blame for the crimes and sins loaded onto him, and in fact he deserved to be blamed for them, but he is not the only one — his associates who brought him down are equally to blame. It is logical that their betrayal, which began with their 20th and 22nd Congresses (although even earlier, before these congresses, immediately after the death of Stalin, the modern revisionists worked out their betrayal, reached agreement with one another, organized plans and intrigues and prepared the terrain inside and outside the Soviet Union), led them on a terrible course, to colossal losses of the internal and international prestige of the Soviet Union as a great power, to the weakening of its military-economic potential, and to the loss of the authority of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the international communist movement. They had not foreseen and reckoned on such catastrophe. They thought that their betrayal would bring them gains, but, as is logical, it brought them all-round defeats. They did not score the slightest success in any direction, but on the contrary, suffered terrible defeats, which they strove to the end to cover up with loud-mouthed demagogy, to present as victories, but in vain. Neither their demagogy nor their lies did them any good. The cup was full.

Peace in the world, which their revisionist line advocated, was not achieved, but on the contrary, was further compromised and endangered.

The Soviet revisionists and the American imperialists strove, the

THE FALL OF THE TRAITOR KHRUSHCHEV

former with their political and ideological disarmament, and the latter with fire and steel, to quell the revolutions and the national liberation wars, but instead of being quelled they increased.

Disarmament about which there was so much boastful propaganda has not been achieved, on the contrary, each year the arms race is increasing and becoming more threatening, and while the Americans are increasing their armaments and exerting atomic blackmail, the Khrushchevites are disarming their friends, that is, the satellite countries. With this policy they are contributing powerfully to the arming of world reaction against socialism and the peoples' revolution.

The partial prohibition of nuclear tests, on which the Moscow Treaty was signed, was a fraud, a betrayal which did not yield the slightest result, because the Americans had no further need for tests in the atmosphere and the treaty did not prevent them from conducting underground tests, increasing their stocks of nuclear weapons and supplying these to their allies. Hence, in fact, the Soviet revisionists betrayed the cause of socialism, peace and mankind, because the Moscow Treaty did not put the slightest restraint on American imperialism in its preparations for a nuclear war. On the contrary, Khrushchev prettified these feverish preparations, whitewashed the United States of America, made it its friend and ally and now, as a friend and ally of the Soviet Union, it is continuing on its own course without any political, ideological, or propaganda worry. On the other hand, the Soviet revisionists, the Americans and those who signed the Moscow Treaty were able to rise in a joint anti-Chinese chorus when China carried out its first test of an atomic bomb.

The question of the treaty with Germany and the Berlin problem is a great and shameful defeat. On this question it is possible that Khrushchev's betrayal has gone even further with Washington and Bonn. Time will certainly confirm this.

Instead of being eliminated, the contradictions among the revisionists were increased and exacerbated (the Romanians, Italians, etc.). A basket of crabs.

Our struggle and that of all the Marxist-Leninists in the world against the modern revisionists, and especially against the Khrushchevites, was not quelled but, on the contrary, grew stronger and was waged with great success. It exposed their betrayal step by step, strengthened the revolutionary struggle of communists throughout the world, inspired and assisted the creation of new Marxist-Leninist parties and groups, deepened the crisis in the ranks of modern revisionism, exposed the falsity of Khrushchevite “unity,” and the “cessation of polemics” to the point that the Khrushchevite revisionist group decided to hold the factional meeting to expel us from the communist movement. This was the ultimate catastrophe for them.

On the internal plane, the Soviet revisionists and their counterparts in the former people’s democracies of Europe have suffered and are suffering great defeats in every field. They have great problems, are encountering countless, insurmountable difficulties.

All these defeats and other acts of betrayal about which we still do not know, but which we presume because they are the logical consequence of their betrayal, forced the Soviet revisionists to remove the arch-traitor from their midst.

Having removed Khrushchev, they declared that they would resolutely pursue the line laid down by the 20th and 22nd Congresses, that is, the Khrushchevite line. Time and their actions will make clear to us what is hidden under this formula, but we must have no illusions about the individuals who are left. They are revisionists of the worst kind who cannot return to the right road; they are genuinely for the line of the 20th and 22nd Congresses but with some modifications, which they will certainly try to formulate or to apply in order to improve the grave situation which they themselves created. They will try

to do something to deceive the Marxist-Leninists, to throw dust in their eyes, and will try to build some sort of new tactic towards us, towards their revisionist friends, towards the imperialists and the world bourgeoisie. Otherwise, it would be meaningless for them to remove Khrushchev and raise new difficulties for themselves, both in the Soviet Union and in the international arena, because the removal of Khrushchev was a major defeat for the modern revisionists and, especially, for the Soviet revisionists, an act which immensely discredited and weakened them. Therefore, even without having any other facts in hand, one can guess that the Soviet revisionists were driven to carry out this “operation” not because they liked it, but because they had no alternative. The issue of Khrushchev’s “old age” and “cult of the individual” are piffle. The failure of their line and Khrushchev’s other actions of even greater treachery, which we do not know about, and which the Soviet revisionists have concealed, allegedly on account of the supreme interests of the Soviet Union, are weighty facts.

We are obliged to think that the army must have played a role in carrying out the Kremlin putsch because the senior officers must have been upset in their views about the “defence” of the Soviet Union and the struggle for its interests. Khrushchev had his trusted men among the top officers, hence logic tells us that they must have been confronted with such compromising documents that they were obliged to refrain from putting up the slightest show of resistance. This must have had an effect within the hierarchy of the party and the state, too. Hence, any resistance in this direction, especially at the first moments, was eliminated. Next, it was important for the new Soviet leadership that the Soviet communists and the Soviet people should not be alarmed, should be deceived and consider these things normal, carried out on the party road, on account of “old age,” “the cult of the individual,” “cronyism,” and other piffle. Hence, their first concern was to give the party and the people the impression that “the line is in

order, correct,” that “it is successful,” and especially to prevent the people and the communists from learning about the new betrayals which were being prepared by Khrushchev. This is the meaning and the purpose of the first dry, false communiqués, articles and speeches of the Soviet leadership after the fall of Khrushchev. Instead of deceiving anyone, they have further exposed the revisionists as incurable anti-Marxists, incorrigible cowardly putschists who are terrified of the people, of the opinion of the communist and the imperialist world, because they are criminals, just as guilty as Khrushchev. They are afraid to answer for this; therefore, they will put nothing in order, but will fail in everything they do.

What do the Soviet leaders want and what initial steps can they take?

They want to be left in peace and, first of all, want the polemic to stop, want us to cease the polemic because it has crushed, exposed and ruined them. They will come out “pleading” that Khrushchev, who exacerbated matters, has been removed, therefore “we can reach agreement,” “should strengthen our unity,” “unity above all,” “the struggle against imperialism,” “we must eliminate the differences,” etc., etc., in brief all the old arsenal of Khrushchevite demagoguery but without Khrushchev.

According to them, Khrushchev is the culprit both for us and for them. For us the polemic must not cease but, on the contrary, must be strengthened, enriched, we must take advantage from the victory to go on to new victories, to the total and final defeat of modern revisionism and the betrayal, and the creation of genuine Marxist-Leninist unity in the international communist movement, by definitively throwing all revisionists, under whatever disguise they are hidden, out of the communist movement. The principled polemic saves you from decay, from the traps. The unflinching revolutionary struggle made us triumph, it and it alone will lead us to victory after victory. Unprin-

THE FALL OF THE TRAITOR KHRUSHCHEV

cipléd concessions and compromises, intoxication with success, soft-heartedness, vain illusions, uncalculated actions, fear of what enemies might say or of their attacks are dangerous. Therefore, we must further sharpen our vigilance because the present state of affairs is dangerous and can and will lead to situations in which dangerous views mount up.

Indeed, the whole tactic of the modern revisionists who have suffered defeats is to carry on similar hypocritical work, that of “holding out the hand of friendship,” of “the penitent,” of “the misled,” of the flatterer who “praises” you in order to stab you in the back, until they recover from their defeat.

Our experience is great. It is clear to all how savage and cunning revisionism is, what destruction it has brought and is ready to bring, therefore, to soften the struggle against it is an impermissible crime. We must continue the struggle more vigorously than before, we must act in such a way that we not only expose the revisionists and revisionism to the end, but force them to unmask themselves, their line and their betrayal. Through our struggle, we forced them to overthrow Khrushchev, their chief, we forced them to unmask their line themselves. This is how we must continue. There is no other way. Had our Party and the other Marxist-Leninist parties not pursued this correct Marxist-Leninist course, Khrushchev and Khrushchevism would have been left in peace to spread and flourish.

We must closely watch the steps which the Soviet revisionist leadership, the other revisionists, and the imperialists will take. But it is impermissible for us to do only this, merely watch their steps and then unmask them. We must be on the offensive, must force them, through our correct and considered stands, to reveal their cards, their games, their aims, the directions of their policy, because they will have tendencies to proceed under cover, on the quiet, to leave us waiting open-mouthed like the fool in the fable, to say some sweet-sounding

ENVER HOXHA

words to us so that we hesitate and say “let us wait and see, for who knows what plans they have,” “they may turn out to be good, but they have to proceed step by step, they can’t make a turn for the better all at once,” etc., etc. We must not fall into these traps which they will set for us.

Where must we attack them and how must we attack them?

We must continue to attack the 20th and the 22nd Congresses with a much greater force.

First of all, we must defend the cause of Stalin. We must make the modern revisionists, and first of all, the Soviet revisionists, publicly acknowledge that they have been wrong about Stalin, that they have slandered Stalin. This is one of the primary questions of principle. This is the question of the defence of Marxism-Leninism, of the Soviet Union, of the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union, of the correct Marxist-Leninist line in ideology, in the economy, in policy and in organization, the defence of the Marxist-Leninist unity of the international communist movement, the defence of the unity of the socialist camp, and the essence of the struggle against imperialism, capitalism, opportunism, Titoism, Khrushchevism, and modern revisionism. If this victory is achieved the whole tangle comes apart.

The question of Stalin must inspire any action which will cause the fall of the revisionist fortress. Proper recognition of the great work of Stalin is the guarantee for proceeding on the correct Leninist road. Stalin was and is a glorious Leninist, irrespective of any minor mistakes he may have made. This matter must be understood properly and we must fight out to the end in order to defend him and to restore his glory.

The second question is that we must fight the 20th and 22nd Congresses and the treacherous consequences of this line in connection with the open and secret alliances of the Khrushchevites and other revisionists with world imperialism, American imperialism and

other reactionaries.

First of all, we must force the modern revisionists to openly denounce American imperialism and the Khrushchevite open and secret negotiations with the Americans. The Moscow Treaty must be denounced, the betrayal of Cuba and Vietnam must be denounced, the aims of the Soviet aid for the Indian reactionaries must be denounced, the German Democratic Republic must be defended and the peace treaty with Germany signed with the two German states, but if the others do not want this, with the German Democratic Republic only, as we have decided jointly.

The demagogy about disarmament must be exposed, demanding that the Americans accept complete, definite disarmament, etc., and if they refuse, then we must unmask all their manoeuvres and aims.

All the treaties of defence and economic and political collaboration signed between socialist countries must be re-examined in that direction which we proposed to Zhou Enlai when he was in our country on a visit.

We must fight persistently and relentlessly on all these and other things. We must build up a new tactic on these lines to achieve these objectives, because a new period with many known and unknown elements is opening before us. However, this does not mean that we should leave things to spontaneity and seize on momentary things or be influenced only by our desires, while not making proper use of the facts, and not following the events, etc., etc.

From the reports which we hear and read we can draw the conclusion that the fall of the traitor came like a great and unexpected bombshell to the modern revisionists. It astonished them, crushed them, and shook them to their foundations. Such a thing had never crossed their minds and was totally unexpected. Right up to the last day the revisionist press, including that of the Titoites, who are more vigilant and more prepared on these matters, continued to beat the

drum as before. This shows that the action to purge Khrushchev was carried out in secret, very secret ways and in the form of a putsch. Their friends were left in the lurch, in silence, and caught unprepared. On the other hand, the report given from Moscow is very brief and justified with ridiculous arguments so that even the modern revisionists were unable to use them to calm those they had duped for so many years on end. Therefore, they were not only dumbfounded, but also terrified, because they did not know what to cling to. Their ship was sinking. There was only one word of hope, that the new Soviet leadership “will follow the line of the 20th and 22nd Congresses.” Therefore, in the first days and even now they continue to clutch at this straw, with fear in their hearts, but at the same time they are “angry” that Khrushchev was overthrown, “indignant” about the method used to overthrow him, want clarification and explanations about why this was done. Some of the revisionists are defending Khrushchev and calling him a great man, because they want to defend their own positions (without thinking about the future, when a great stink will rise from Khrushchev’s betrayal), others defend him whole-heartedly and they are very close to American imperialism and the bourgeoisie, others, more reserved (once burnt twice shy), are awaiting explanations, others pretend they are not surprised, because Khrushchev had allegedly told them “a year ago” that he was going to resign (rubbish!), some others are sitting on the fence waiting to lick the boots of the new overlords, while still others, like the Bulgarian revisionists, are saying “the king is dead, long live the king!”

All of them are very worried about public opinion in their countries and the opinion of their parties. And this grave political and ideological crisis found them in a grave economic situation. They are greatly concerned about how they are going to get through the winter which will be severe from every standpoint. They have lost all authority and are left with only two roads to follow, both bad for them,

either to get out or to use terror against the revolution which will rise and threaten them. The middle road will not take them far. For the Soviet revisionists and modern revisionists in the former countries of people's democracy there is one road which is open to them, and they have long been working for this. This is the Titoite road, that is, they can follow Tito, strengthen their alliance with Tito, create the Titoite "cordon sanitaire" round the Soviet Union and exert pressure on it from these positions. In this dangerous transitional phase for modern revisionism, too, Titoism and Tito will play a major role as an agency of imperialism. The fall of Khrushchev was a heavy blow to Titoism as an ideology, a policy and an agency. But now the Titoite agency, financed by the Americans, will operate in the direction of linking the revisionist countries more closely with the United States of America, of concentrating them around Titoism ideologically and politically, in a word, will ensure the continuity of the revisionist line, etc. It will exert pressure in an organized way on the Soviet revisionist leaders to prevent them from relinquishing power to the Stalinists, and will try to drag them behind the bandwagon of the Titoites and the Americans and to continue to weaken the Soviet Union in all ways and in all fields. This will be the diabolical role of the Titoites in the new situation. They will hatch up all kinds of plots with all their might. Woe betide those who consider Tito an unimportant "minor devil." The Titoite agency is deeply entrenched in all the former socialist countries of Europe and in the Soviet Union, and American imperialism is deeply entrenched in them, too. Therefore, it is very naive to think that Marxism-Leninism will win new positions easily, without struggle. We shall fight and fight hard.

The fall of Khrushchev took the American imperialists by surprise, too. In him they had a good friend, a person adept at betrayal and making concessions to them, who liked to boast and who was compromised and compromised himself readily. Now the American

ENVER HOXHA

imperialists will act intensively to preserve the status quo gained through Khrushchev for the time being, will exert blackmail and try all kinds of provocations to ensure that the new Soviet revisionist leaders proceed on Khrushchev's road, the road of concessions and betrayal. If the Soviet revisionists in essence proceed in the direction of the Americans, the latter will continue to work through their own agency directly and through their agency — Titoism, towards the weakening of the Soviet Union, towards separating the European "socialist" satellites completely from the Soviet Union and linking them with American imperialism. Nevertheless, the Americans, too, suffered a defeat with the overthrow of Khrushchev.

The general strategy of American imperialism, too, has entered a grave crisis. In general, the situation will become more tense, the revolution will mount and the betrayal will gradually be exposed and overcome. But only by fighting will we triumph. Our Party will remain unwavering, vigilant, in the forefront of the fight. These are the first days of a new, very interesting, very complicated situation. Major factors are in collision. In these conditions we must do our duty, must fight hard to make our contribution. Our Party has gained strong positions in the international communist movement, its voice is listened to, therefore, we have great responsibility in this situation as in all other situations. Our correct line has been vindicated, we must hold high the banner of Marxism-Leninism.

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, pp. 115-128, Eng. ed.

THE FALL OF KHRUSHCHEV DOES NOT PUT AN END TO KHRUSHCHEVITE REVISIONISM

Article published in the newspaper "Zëri i Popullit"

November 1, 1964

Khrushchev, the principal representative of modern revisionism, the renegade from the great cause of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union founded by V.I. Lenin, the splitter of the socialist camp and the international communist and workers' movement, or as the imperialists used to call him, "the man most suitable to the West in Moscow," has been ousted from the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and discharged from his functions as First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union.¹

The inglorious end of Khrushchev is a result of the resolute, courageous and principled struggle of all revolutionary Marxist-Leninists against modern revisionism from the positions of proletarian internationalism, of the struggle of all revolutionaries to defend the purity of Marxism-Leninism, a result of the open and merciless exposure of the activities of this renegade from communism. His end is a great victory of Marxism-Leninism over modern revisionism.

In the ousting of the person of Khrushchev from the leading posts in the party and the Soviet state, the Marxist-Leninists and all the revolutionaries see the failure of the political and ideological course of modern revisionism formulated at the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU. The casting out of Khrushchev like a squeezed lemon shows the decay of Khrushchevite revisionism, its degeneration, the

¹ Khrushchev was discharged from these functions on October 14, 1964 allegedly "because of his advanced age and deteriorating state of health."

irreparable discredit its practical activities have suffered and are suffering every day. It bespeaks the fact that complete and sure defeat is the natural result of the present revisionism. It testifies that the days are numbered for whoever dares raise his hand against Marxism-Leninism, against socialism. Marxism-Leninism, the revolutionary forces have triumphed and will triumph over their enemies under whatever name or guise they may appear.

The elimination of the traitor Khrushchev from the political scene proves once again what our Party has always emphasized, namely, that the truth is on the side of the Marxist-Leninists, that our cause is just and will triumph. Marxism is invincible. Revisionism is doomed to failure. At the time of the Statement of October 20, 1961,¹ a few days after Khrushchev and his revisionist group launched their anti-socialist and anti-Albanian attacks at their 22nd Congress, the Central Committee of our Party expressed the conviction that *“the fight imposed on our Party and people will be protracted and difficult. But difficulties have never frightened our Party and people... They will never bow or fall to their knees before the slanderous assaults, blackmail and pressure of Khrushchev and his followers. Party and people, in steel unity, will, as always, forge ahead with determination and will triumph on their right*

¹ This statement of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania was published in the newspaper “Zëri i Popullit” on October 21, 1961.

The statement was an immediate, resolute and courageous reply to the base anti-Marxist and anti-Albanian attacks made publicly by Khrushchev and his lackeys on the PLA at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU. It stressed that, in face of Khrushchev’s organized attack, the PLA, “with facts and documents, will make the truth about the relations between the Party of Labour of Albania and the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union known to the entire communist and workers’ movement, as well as to the world public so that they may see which side is right, and will expose the anti-Marxist and anti-Albanian actions of Khrushchev and his group.” This statement is also included in the “Principal Documents of the PLA,” vol. 4, pp. 153-155, Tirana 1970, Alb. ed.

KHRUSHCHEVITE REVISIONISM CONTINUES

road, the road to the victory of Marxism-Leninism and the cause of socialism and communism."¹ Experience, time and facts have proved that our Party was right, that our Party was on the right road and that on this road it scored victory over the Khrushchevite revisionists. It will march on this road, resolute and unfaltering, until the complete and final defeat of modern revisionism.

The ousting of Khrushchev is a clear expression of the fact that revisionism is being eroded by numerous contradictions which the revisionists will never be able to resolve. It is another confirmation of the old teaching that whoever departs from Marxism-Leninism, whoever makes common cause with the enemies of the proletariat, with the enemies of the peoples, of socialism, will be ruthlessly crushed by the wheel of the revolution, by the wheel of history. It is a vivid proof that whoever follows the road of revisionism, whether that of Kautsky, Tito or Khrushchev, will be utterly defeated.

Khrushchev is the principal representative of the revisionist line worked out at the 20th Congress and developed at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU. By planning and working to put this anti-Marxist line into effect, he branded himself as the most dangerous traitor to and enemy of Marxism-Leninism, of the Soviet Union itself, of the socialist camp, of the revolution, and the peoples.

Through this line, under the guise of the so-called struggle against Stalin's cult of the individual, or the struggle for "de-Stalinization," as their Titoite friends and imperialist allies called it, the Khrushchevites opened the doors to opportunism and revisionism, to betrayal and degeneration. The Khrushchevites undermined the unity of the socialist camp and the communist movement, thus becoming the greatest splitters known in the history of the revolutionary communist movement, made approaches to and united with the U.S. imperialists and the other enemies of the peoples and socialism, united

¹ "Principal Documents of the PLA," vol. 4, p. 154, Alb. ed.

ideologically with Titoism, with this aggressive agency of U.S. imperialism, and wrecked the cause of the revolution and opened all the doors to the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

The history of the Soviet Union knows no agent more rabidly anti-Soviet than Khrushchev. No one has discredited and disgraced the land of the Soviets as much as he. No one has slandered the Soviet state, the Soviet socialist order more than he. By attacking J.V. Stalin and concocting the most monstrous calumnies against him, Khrushchev cancelled out the most glorious period of the history of the Soviet peoples, the period of the reconstruction of the country, of the transformation of the Soviet Union from a backward country to a powerful colossus with advanced industry and agriculture, the glorious period of the struggle to defend the achievements of the October Revolution from the imperialist enemies and renegades of every hue, the heroic period of the Great Patriotic War, when the great Soviet people, under the leadership of J.V. Stalin, vanquished the most savage enemy of mankind — German fascism, thus becoming the liberators of the enslaved peoples of the world.

Pursuing his line of betrayal, Khrushchev raised his hand against the thing most sacred to the Soviet peoples, against the dictatorship of the proletariat and its Communist Party, the guarantee of the triumph of socialism and communism, under the demagogic revisionist slogans of the “party of the entire people,” the “state of the entire people,” a blow which was intended to bring about the degeneration of the Bolshevik Party into a bourgeois social-democratic party, and of the socialist state into a bourgeois state.

He belittled and poured scorn upon the heroic work, the abilities of the Soviet people in building socialism, and set up America, raised and fattened on the blood of the proletarians and the oppressed peoples of the world, as a model for the Soviet Union.

Khrushchev pursued the line of wrecking the fraternal Marxist-

Leninist unity of the countries of the socialist camp and the international communist and workers' movement. He isolated the Soviet Union from its true friends and brothers and linked its destiny with that of the most rabid enemies of socialism and peace, of the freedom and independence of peoples — with U.S. imperialism, with the Tito-clique of renegades and with all the reactionaries of the world.

As a consequence of this treacherous line, the Khrushchevite revisionists launched savage attacks against the PLA and the PRA, against a fraternal party and a fraternal socialist country. Khrushchev personally made open calls for counter-revolution to overthrow the leadership of the Albanian Party and state; the economic blockade was established against the PRA; hostile plots were organized with the collaboration of the Tito clique; diplomatic relations, and all other economic and political relations were severed with the PRA.

From these anti-Marxist and counter-revolutionary positions, Khrushchev and the Khrushchevite revisionists hurled themselves with the fury of the class enemy upon the CP and PR of China. Thus the friendship of the Chinese and Soviet peoples and their fraternal collaboration were undermined.

Brutal interference, violation of sovereignty and independence, pressure and blackmail for subjugation and submission to his dictate, violation of the national interests of socialist countries, sowing dissension and organizing plots, breaching of all Leninist norms in relations between socialist states and fraternal parties, great-state chauvinism, — these are the typical features of the revisionist line of betrayal that inspired all the deeds and attitudes of Khrushchev towards socialist countries, towards fraternal peoples, towards Marxist-Leninist parties and all revolutionaries.

His rapprochement with U.S. imperialism and all the reactionaries and enemies of socialism and peace is the other side of the medal of the revisionist line followed by Khrushchev. Under the demagogical

slogan of ensuring peace and implementing the policy of peaceful co-existence worked out by the revisionists, Khrushchev capitulated to U.S. imperialism, to its nuclear blackmail, not hesitating in the least to betray the interests of freedom and independence not only of other peoples, but also of the Soviet Union, for this purpose. Cuba, the Congo, the signing of the Moscow Treaty, the German problem and that of Berlin, etc., remain grave indictments of the betrayal by Khrushchevite revisionists, and are crimes against peoples' freedom, sovereignty and independence and in favour of U.S. imperialism. Under the slogan of the "peaceful way" and "total disarmament," Khrushchev and all the modern revisionists, not only abandoned the revolution themselves, but they hampered the revolutionary struggles and movements of the peoples, the working class, and the proletariat of various countries in every way, thus ensuring peace for imperialists, colonialists and blood-sucking exploiters.

The list of Khrushchev's hostile deeds is very long. The roots of his betrayal are deep and fraught with lethal consequences for the future of socialism and the revolution. Therefore, while the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists consider Khrushchev's end in disgrace, his disappearance from the political arena, a very important victory over modern revisionism, a proof of the failure of the political and ideological course of modern revisionism, at the same time they consider that their fight is not over.

Despite the fact that Khrushchev was the head of modern revisionism, his political liquidation as a person does not mean the liquidation of his political, ideological, economic and organizational course, which has brought so much evil and harm to the Soviet Union, to Marxism-Leninism, to the socialist camp and the communist and workers' movement, to the cause of the revolution and of the freedom and independence of peoples, to the cause of peace. With the expulsion of Khrushchev from the leadership of the party and Soviet

state, Khrushchevite revisionism is not dead, his ideology and policy expressed in the line of the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU are not liquidated. It has deep roots and in order to eliminate the danger, to cut off the possibility of its recurrence, revisionism must be wiped out root and branch. This is the only remedy.

We should not create and nurture illusions. We should not be deceived by demagoguery and disguises. Marxism-Leninism teaches us to judge not by words but by facts, by the concrete, practical attitudes towards great essential issues. For the Marxist-Leninists the fight against Khrushchevite revisionism will end when its course has been liquidated politically and ideologically, when the Khrushchevite revisionist spirit, practice, and stand have been liquidated, when every party, in its policy, ideology and practice, proceeds from and bases itself only on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, consistently implements the revolutionary principles of the Moscow Declarations, resolutely fights the common enemy — imperialism headed by that of the United States of America, and its agents of every hue, fights persistently, as for a sacred duty, to consolidate the Marxist-Leninist unity of the socialist camp and the communist and workers' movement, defends the principles of proletarian internationalism and puts them into practice, supports the cause of the revolution, of the freedom and independence of peoples, the cause of peace, without reserve. Every step taken in this direction will be considered positive and will have support from the PLA.

Without resolutely condemning Khrushchevite revisionism and its whole ideology and consequences with Bolshevik courage, unimpressed by the troubles and threats made by the imperialists, by the tears and pressures of its most determined friends who are not only the enemies of Marxism-Leninism in general, but rabid enemies of the Soviet Union in particular, any genuine return to Marxism-Leninism, any genuine return to the Leninist norms of relations between parties

ENVER HOXHA

and socialist countries, so brutally trampled upon by Khrushchev, is unthinkable.

The Party of Labour of Albania, like all the true Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries, will resolutely continue its just struggle until the final destruction of modern revisionism. Without falling victim to illusions, without falling into the trap of demagogy and bluffs, however camouflaged they may be, after the victory they have scored against the head of modern revisionism, Khrushchev, the revolutionary communists will tighten their ranks even more, strengthen the great anti-revisionist front, raise the banner of Marxism-Leninism even higher, sharpen their revolutionary vigilance against the enemies of the people, the imperialists, and intensify the fight against Khrushchevite revisionism which constitutes the main danger in the communist and workers' movement in our days.

We are fully convinced that in the great battle against imperialism and the offspring of bourgeois ideology — modern revisionism, Marxism-Leninism, socialism, will triumph completely. The days of revisionism and betrayal are numbered and their approaching defeat will be decisive.

Selected Works, vol. 3, Tirana
1980, pp. 657-665, Eng. ed.

THE CHINESE WANT TO IMPOSE THEIR OPINIONS ON US

November 3, 1964

The Chinese comrades are not behaving like Marxists and with modesty towards our criticisms. They are angry and their stands towards us are neither Marxist nor correct. They are displeased that we are not following them in the actions which they have decided to undertake as to the Soviets. The Chinese want and are trying to impose their mistaken opinions and actions in this direction on us. They do not even agree to prior discussions with us about the common stands that should be maintained in the common interest.

In the new situation which was created after the fall of Khrushchev, a consultation at least between the communist and workers' parties of China, Albania, Korea, Vietnam, Indonesia, Japan and New Zealand was absolutely essential. This was not done. The Chinese comrades avoided such a meeting earlier, and despite our repeated insistence, they are avoiding it again now.

Before any change, the leaders of the communist and workers' parties meet, discuss, define their stands and take decisions. This is essential. The problem is of a general character for the world communist movement, it does not have the character of a specific interest for a particular party, therefore **it was essential to hold a joint consultation at which the views of our parties would be put forward and discussed so we could come out with a common stand.**

It is absurd and unacceptable that, without such a preliminary consultation, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China should come out and say to us:

“This is how I judge matters, this is what I have decided, therefore you must follow me like a pet lamb”!

These are anti-Marxist methods which they themselves have

condemned when others have wanted to impose them on us through the “conductor’s baton.” Now they are forgetting these evil actions of others, are adopting them without the slightest shame, and using them as if there were nothing wrong in this.

Of course, the refusal on our part ever to accept these wrong methods and stands leads to quarrels, disagreements, splits, and differences, and if errors are not caught in time, and if they are not understood and corrected immediately by those who make them, they get worse and gradually the road of Khrushchev is adopted.

What is impelling the Chinese to fall into this error of principle which is so simple and easily understood, but which has grave consequences for them and the international communist movement?

Petty-bourgeois conceit. This shows that the Chinese leadership is not so essentially modest as it pretends to be and as it says it is.

The spirit of great-state and big-party chauvinism. There is no speech and article in which they don’t “denounce” these dangerous anti-Marxist views as such. They are constantly accusing the Soviet revisionists of this sin. But how can you describe their disdain for the other parties, for their opinions, individuality and dignity, such as Zhou Enlai displayed, when in other words, he said, “Pack your suitcase and go to Moscow — to Canossa.” These things cannot be described as anything but great-state and big-party chauvinism. Zhou Enlai’s outlook must be no different from that of Kosygin, when the latter tried to convince me not to express our opinions at the Moscow Meeting in 1960, by saying to me: “You must bear in mind the prestige of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.” And I replied to Kosygin: “I love the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and I am protecting its prestige which you, yourselves, are violating. However, you, too, must consider the prestige of the Party of Labour of Albania.”

The Chinese leaders consider, unrealistically, that the whole

THE CHINESE WANT TO IMPOSE THEIR POSITIONS

“victory” and “glory” in the exposure of Khrushchev and his elimination from the political scene belongs to them, that the others have been, as you might say, their “drummer-boys.” Thus, they have made their judgements and decisions, prompted not by Marxist modesty, but by big-party chauvinism.

Nobody can deny the contribution of the Communist Party of China to this battle, but there are others who have not twiddled their thumbs and who “have not beaten the drum for nothing,” but who have fought and made sacrifices, possibly proportionally even more than the Chinese. To underestimate the struggle of others is impermissible, but the others do not allow this, either, and are not concerned at all about your anger, which is unjust and out of place.

If the Chinese comrades do not stop their career down this course towards the Soviets, which was wrong from the start, if the Chinese comrades do not consult, discuss, and decide with the other communist and workers’ parties, which have fought shoulder to shoulder in this struggle, if the Chinese comrades do not show themselves to be realists who judge events and their stands from a sound Marxist-Leninist platform, but are impelled by egoism, megalomania, or aims of domination, they will certainly slip into grave errors and will end up the losers.

Why did the Chinese comrades, who in words pose as models of “patience” (they had set 20 years for bringing down Khrushchev and they have set three hundred years for the triumph of socialism in China), not wait at least one month, until the “Soviet comrades” could have said at least two words about Khrushchev and two words about their line? Why this impatience to embrace the Soviets?! Why this great haste and zeal to go to Moscow “in order to help the Soviet comrades and the Soviet people”?!

A few months before Khrushchev was overthrown, and at a time when our struggle with him was at its fiercest, the Chinese comrades

ENVER HOXHA

sent a telegram to “Dear Comrade Khrushchev” and wished him a “long life.” “We did this,” they said, “because of our friendship with the Soviet peoples, in order to strengthen this friendship.” A fine way to strengthen it, by wishing him, who was digging the grave for the Soviet people, a long life!!

Today the Chinese comrades are rushing to go to Moscow as quickly as they can. Why? To assist the revisionist “dear comrades,” the closest collaborators of the traitor, and “through them to help the revolutionary forces in the Soviet Union,” etc., etc. **Astounding views!!!**

For us Marxists these reasons don’t hold water. Behind them there are other, unhealthy, non-Marxist aims.

We do not bring down the Soviet leaders, it is up to their party and people to do or not to do such a thing. Our correct militant stands should assist the Soviet revolutionaries to make the right decision.

The question arises: Can it be that by assisting the revisionists with such zeal you have assisted the Soviet revolutionaries?! To accept this means that you are not a revolutionary. Or is it a revolutionary gesture that, when the enemies of the revolution suffer a heavy defeat, precisely in these moments favourable for the revolution, you rush to offer your hand to counter-revolutionaries to help them, at a time when not only are they giving no sign of any change but, on the contrary, are declaring loudly that they will continue on the treacherous course of the 20th and 22nd Congresses?! No, this is counter-revolutionary, anti-Marxist and revisionist.

After all, it was not required of you, Chinese comrades, to hurl yourselves into “major attacks,” because you had broken off these polemical attacks long before, but could you not have been patient at least a few months in order to see what these “Soviet comrades” would do?!

Wouldn’t it have been in order, legitimate and worthy of your

THE CHINESE WANT TO IMPOSE THEIR POSITIONS

party and state for the defeated enemies to have asked to come to you, to have been obliged to come to you? All these things are ABC.

Why are you so generous, to the point of opportunism, towards enemies, now at these moments, when yesterday you demanded from the Soviet Union the “territories which it had seized from you,” and “Mongolia which it had cut off from China,” when you said the Romanians were right to “demand Bukovina,” etc., and said that “Stalin made mistakes over the borders,” and that you did all these things and set about conciliating the Romanians, Poles, Germans and other revisionists like these, as pressure to isolate the Soviet Union? What are these stands? How can you change them so quickly in a matter of months? Why were you angry with us when we criticized you in a comradely way over these wrong stands? Your anger with us, who told you the truth, remained, while your incorrect “leftist” stands, your sectarian, even hostile stands towards the Soviet Union have turned completely round to the right, and you describe them as Marxist, and at the same time, you still bear us a grudge because we say to you: “Let us discuss matters, don’t be hasty.”

It is evident that the Chinese comrades are making mistakes. They have no stable line. There are waverings in their line, as far to the right as to the left, and their policy, likewise, cannot have a principled Marxist-Leninist stability.

Finally, let us also judge the Chinese stands by the *par l’absurde* method. Let us say that the Chinese comrades had full knowledge of the putsch against Khrushchev before hand. They had been secretly informed by the Soviet “comrades.” The Chinese comrades kept the secret from their Marxist-Leninist comrades in the struggle for no other reason but for security (here we are judging all the time *par l’absurde*). Being aware of this impending putsch, the Chinese comrades slowed down the polemic, and left us to continue it, because this is what their secret tactic required. Fine. Now the putsch was carried

out. Khrushchev was eliminated. This phase was over. The Chinese knew, we did not.

The second phase begins (always by the *par l'absurde* method). The Chinese comrades are informed about the future plans of the Soviet "comrades." They have told the Chinese: Today we shall do this, tomorrow that, the day after tomorrow something else, and so on; they have reached agreement with each other, and this plan is very good (I am still continuing by the *par l'absurde* method). But this new phase can no longer be a putsch phase. It is a constructive phase (always *par l'absurde*) which requires the co-ordination of actions by Marxist-Leninist parties.

In the first phase of the operation of the putsch, the Chinese comrades did not inform us of it, and they are continuing not to inform us even in the second phase, that of the "consolidation." Does this reasoning worked out by the *par l'absurde* method hold good? Not even this method can explain the wrong stands of the Chinese. It (the Communist Party of China) cannot deceive us for long, and cannot lead us, the other parties by the nose, blindly, and say to us, "Come this way, because this is what I want, I know what I am doing. Yours is not to reason why." This is absurd!

Are the Chinese comrades fully convinced that the two biggest parties, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, are going to solve and ought to solve all the problems in international communism, and the others ought to follow them meekly? Previously, there was one conductor's baton, and this did not please us (the Chinese). Now there must be two conductor's batons and they must act à *l'unisson*¹. Previously, you the Soviets with Stalin (continue the Chinese) walked all over us (the question of the pupil and the teacher). Stalin died. You the Soviets discredited him, meanwhile this opened up great expectations for us the Chinese.

¹ In unison (French in the original).

THE CHINESE WANT TO IMPOSE THEIR POSITIONS

Khrushchev came, we applauded you, we were happy, but Khrushchev became a conductor with a heavy stick, who not only did not accept us (the Chinese) in the leadership of the world, but attacked us with his big stick.

Now Khrushchev has been liquidated. Great joy. We forget all you Khrushchevites have done to us, as long as you accept that the two of us, the Chinese and the Soviets, should conduct together now, and this, you the Soviets must accept, because Stalin made mistakes, Khrushchev made mistakes, only Mao has not made mistakes. It is “legitimate,” “Marxist-Leninist” that in case you do not agree that I (the Chinese) should conduct and give leadership, we must at least agree that both of us should conduct, therefore if we two come to agreement, everything in this world will be put right!

But how will it be put right? We are the conscience of the world. But Marxism-Leninism? We are Marxism-Leninism.

However, Marxism-Leninism does not teach us to act in this way. **Just as Marxism-Leninism struck one “conductor’s baton” an iron blow to the head, it will strike an equally powerful blow at another “conductor’s baton,” or at two “conductor’s batons” together, or a combined clique of other conductors.**

No, Chinese comrades, I am convinced that you are wrong, terribly wrong, and you should pull back from these mistakes, which will become dangerous, very dangerous, later. We, as Marxists, are greatly interested that you should not make mistakes, but although we are small, although our Party is a small party, although our people are a small people, no one has the power to shut our mouths, to stop us telling the truth, defending the truth, defending Marxism-Leninism.

Selected Works, vol. 3, Tirana
1980, pp. 666-673, Eng. ed.

BREZHNEV IS TRYING TO FOOL THE CHINESE FIRST OF ALL

November 7, 1964

A rubber speech on the occasion of the 47th anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution. Only inveterate opportunists and revisionists could write such a speech, neither fish nor fowl, a speech which tries to please everybody, but satisfies nobody, and especially tries to fool the wavering Marxists and the Chinese comrades, first of all.

It was expected that this speech would clear up something, but it cleared up nothing, or more correctly, it made clear all those things which we Albanian communists had thought of in advance. This speech was a reflection of the spiritual and material state of the Soviet revisionists and their cohorts, it showed how thunderstruck they are at the catastrophe they have suffered, and the fear which has seized them about the future, their hesitations over how to delay the catastrophe, if they prove unable to prevent it. Faced with the great difficulties, which they have created, with the fire which their treacherous policy has brought upon them from all sides, faced with countless contradictions in which they are wallowing, and their fear of the Marxist-Leninists and the Soviet people, the Soviet revisionists, with fear in their bellies, try to patch up the tense situation with this rubber speech, try to apply balm to the wounds, to give others a dose of opium in order to escape from this dangerous chaos for the moment.

The main objectives of this speech are:

a) **To calm the internal situation. To weaken the revolutionary situation** simply with the demonstrative fact of the removal of Khrushchev, while implying, "Khrushchev had made mistakes. We spoke of these in the party basic organizations, and with what we alluded to in the papers. There are other grave mistakes and

exaggerations which you are aware of yourselves, but you can hope that slowly, little by little, everything will be put in order. In order to maintain the prestige of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, we cannot go further now. Gradually, we must correct some flagrant economic mistakes (here, naturally, we have to work and moreover tighten the belt, and Khrushchev is to blame for this), and respect certain norms of the party (for a time there will not be many photographs of Brezhnev and Kosygin). And here is the first proof of the struggle against the cult of the individual: one person does not hold two main posts in the party and the government,” etc., etc.

In this way, with a bagful of such demagoguery, the revisionists will strive to sooth the discontent within the country.

The partisans of Khrushchev and the internal revisionists have things easier, because, although Khrushchev has gone, the Khrushchevites remained in power, the line remained unaltered, the “changes” which they intend to make will be carried out under their direction, therefore they are given to understand that they can maintain their nostalgia and admiration for Khrushchev, but must close their ranks round the new Khrushchevite leadership, because “otherwise we are done for, the revolution will break out.” And when the revolution breaks out, everyone knows who wins. Therefore, they are reminded: We must avoid the revolution, in the end we have even to suppress it, but we lose little if we make some concessions and throw the blame on Khrushchev — the “scapegoat.” In this way, the revisionist leadership will consolidate its ranks.

Brezhnev’s speech told them that they lost nothing with the fall of Khrushchev, his line, the line of the 20th, 21st and 22nd Congresses remains unchanged. While for the Soviet Marxists and revolutionaries, Brezhnev’s speech was heavily larded with principled formulae about “unity,” “criticism, self-criticism,” “collective leadership,” etc.

b) To placate the revisionist cliques outside the Soviet Union.

Certainly, the contradictions which have existed between them and the Soviet Union will become even deeper; with the Italians and the Romanians, they have come out in the open, but with the others, too, although they have not come out in the open, they were no less acute. The fall of Khrushchev will make them even more acute, not so much because their “hearts bleed for Khrushchev,” but because they are concerned about themselves, their own stability.

The very fact that the revisionist cliques lost the “Polar Star,” notwithstanding that they fought and quarrelled with him, as well as obeyed him, and exerted pressure on him, and in this way the light of their “Star” was being dimmed and they no longer have a “Polar Star,” both pleases and frightens them. It pleases them because they are now free to think and act as they like. They can go to bed with the United States of America, just as they can with Britain, and possibly even with the two together. On the other hand, it frightens them because Khrushchev, this branded traitor, is no longer for them, not because those who replaced the traitor are not like him, but because they are the same sort of traitors who are sitting on burning coals. Hence, from this angle, even that alleged Marxist-Leninist unity has died.

Each of these revisionist groupings, in power or not, will declare itself independent in the full meaning of the term. The Czech and the French leaders have begun to declare it, and tomorrow the others will do so in turn. Yesterday they were swearing by the 20th and the 22nd Congresses, today they are speaking about them in lower tones, tomorrow they will be quite silent and will allegedly maintain the spirit of these congresses. The Soviets fought for hegemony, but they came up against polycentrism. Now, decentralism and anarchy will develop fully under the slogans of the “banner of Marxism-Leninism,” “proletarian unity,” the “unity of the international communist movement.”

The revisionist groups are listening diffidently to the “beautiful

words” of the Chinese, in whom they have not the slightest trust, but are also watching the Soviets distrustfully to see to what extent they are going to swallow the “dithyrambs” coming so unexpectedly from the Chinese comrades. Are the “big two” going to unite, are they going to make the law, and be like a sword of Damocles hanging over our heads? — think the revisionists. Should we sit meekly with our mouths open and await salvation from heaven? — ask the “small” revisionists. They do not trust either the one or the other, and their distrust will increase; they will certainly react. Not only will the Soviet revisionists make no concession to the Chinese, but also the revisionist groupings will exert pressure from their independent platform to prevent any concession being made. The Chinese must be repelled, brought to their knees, disarmed, and follow the course of the revisionists. Hence, the Soviet revisionists do not have a peaceful situation from this aspect, and they are making efforts to calm it.

Brezhnev’s speech paid attention to this question, telling them: Nothing has changed, everything goes on as before; the 20th, 21st, and 22nd Congresses are in order, our alliances are in order; with good or bad grace I’ll relax my hold on you (until I strengthen my position and until the situation is more favourable; then the “ugly duckling turns into a beautiful swan”). Hence in the direction of the Chinese, no concession. Let them be satisfied with the fact that we removed Khrushchev and let them live in hopes like that fox in the fable who followed the ram in the hope that his balls would drop off at some turn of the road.

c) **To placate the Chinese, to fool them into stopping the polemic** and gradually to shackle them. Both sides are proceeding on this principle, who will deceive the other, and who will shackle the other first. The principles of the struggle are no longer revolutionary, certainly either from the Soviet side, or from the Chinese side. Both sides are pursuing the tactic of a cat and mouse game.

Although Brezhnev's speech makes no concession in principle to the Chinese, in the way it was constructed it creates certain superficial illusions, spreads a few drops of "synthetic honey" to keep the fly buzzing around. But the fact is that the Chinese, who thought they were going to enter Moscow like Caesar entering Rome and would send a telegram to Peking saying *veni, vidi, vici*, did not achieve this. On the one hand, Brezhnev defended the regime and triumph of Johnson and on the other hand, he managed to satisfy the hopes of the Chinese with the "threat of Malinovsky" to the Americans. As if such things, indeed even more threatening, have not been said before by Khrushchev and by Malinovsky himself!

In a word, the two sides have the same tactics. The Soviets say: We must proceed slowly, cautiously, because we cannot get the shackles on the Chinese all at once, but with patience, with a little honey, a little sugar, we shall introduce the poison pill and then, once they have swallowed it, matters will take their own course. The thing is that we must compromise them, make them like ourselves ideologically, but as to the contradictions in our course, they will never be eliminated. This is clear! It is the law of force, the law of the jungle, that settles accounts amongst this lot.

For their part, the Chinese are following the same tactic: We must be patient, we must not attack them, we must sing them lullabies and gradually slip the handcuffs on them, under our direction. Moreover, say the Chinese, this tactic is one we know and has proved fruitful. This is like the history of General Fu Zuoyi, a Chiang Kai-shek general, who was defeated by the communists, surrendered, and Mao made him Minister of Water Resources and Energy, and Vice-Chairman of the Military Commission of China. This is authentic. The Chinese comrades are basing their present policy in regard to the new Soviet leadership on this imbecile experience. One can imagine the results of such a policy.

d) **To placate the American imperialists.** In this direction, Brezhnev's speech gives complete satisfaction and assurances to the former allies of Khrushchev who still remain their allies. Brezhnev says to the Americans: "You have no reason to worry, we are not changing our course in our relations with you, indeed you ought to be pleased, because we are not going to tell you: 'We shall bury you', as Khrushchev blurted out. With us things are going to proceed 'quietly, gently and to our mutual satisfaction'." Over certain minor tactical matters Brezhnev tells the Americans: We shall reach agreement over the hot-line which we have established between the Kremlin and the White House.

e) **Brezhnev has nothing to give the genuine Marxist-Leninists in the world.** They are his resolute enemies who are going to bury the modern revisionists under whatever disguise they are hidden. They are ruining the sleep of all these categories of revisionists whom Brezhnev's speech is designed to placate. These categories will have no peace, nor will they ever have.

Therefore Brezhnev's speech has solved nothing. All the hosannas of the Soviet revisionists about the "brilliant road," the "great party," which they have disgraced, the "Leninist" road, which is nothing but betrayal, amount to beating a broken drum. All this is like the noise from a tin can tied to a dog's tail.

At such favourable moments for the international communist movement, it is a tragedy to assist the detested revisionists, as the Chinese, basing themselves on the experience of the Chiang Kai-shek general, Fu Zuoyi, intend to do, and to reject the experience of the world Marxist marshals: Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

Reflections on China, vol. 1,
Tirana 1979, pp. 153-160,
Eng. ed

TOGLIATTI'S "TESTAMENT," THE CRISIS OF MODERN REVISIONISM AND THE STRUGGLE OF THE MARXIST-LENINISTS

Excerpts from the article published in the newspaper "Zëri i Popullit"

November 13, 1964

TOGLIATTI SEEKS FURTHER DEGENERATION OF THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES AND COMMUNIST PARTIES

The final notes of Togliatti are a clear expression of the differences which exist between various revisionist groupings in connection with the courses and rates of development of modern revisionism in theory and practice.

Togliatti heaps criticism on the Khrushchev group and its followers because they are proceeding at a very slow pace on the course of the "democratic and liberal transformation" of life in the socialist countries. He demands that they should proceed more rapidly, more openly, with greater determination on the course of the degeneration of the socialist order.

Togliatti again raises the old question which he, together with the renegade Tito, had raised in 1956, at the time of the counter-revolution in Hungary, about the "origin of the cult of the individual of Stalin." He writes, "...generally speaking, the problem of the origin of the cult of Stalin and how it was made possible is considered unsolved. People in the West, and many communist sympathizers among them," says Togliatti, "do not accept that it can all be explained 'simply with the grave personal vices of Stalin'. Efforts are made to track down what might have been the political mistakes which contributed to the birth of this cult."

It is obvious that in raising the issue of the sources of Stalin's "cult

of the individual” in this way, Togliatti is demanding fundamental changes in the very foundations of the socialist order, in the main principles of the organization of this order and the policy of the socialist construction that was followed in the Soviet Union in the time of Stalin’s leadership.

But what does Togliatti want concretely?

This comes out very clearly in an interview which he gave to the correspondent of the American magazine

“Time” immediately after the elections of April 28, 1963 in Italy, which was published for the first time after the death of Togliatti¹ as a document which includes many of the theses developed later in the Yalta memorandum of Togliatti. In this interview Togliatti quite openly criticizes the policy of the nationalization of capitalist industry, the collectivization of agriculture, and the leadership of a single party, etc., in other words, the fundamental line of socialist organization and construction which was followed during the period of Stalin’s leadership in the Soviet Union. He demands that such a line must be rejected and that “Stalin’s mistakes must not be repeated.”

It is not in the least fortuitous that in his memorandum Togliatti demands the organization of “public discussions” from time to time in the socialist countries, in which “leading figures who have varying viewpoints” about the problems of socialist construction should take part and express their “original” opinions in regard to the ways and methods of development of the socialist economy. It is not hard to see what Togliatti is driving at. It is known that such “discussions” are being held now in the Soviet Union in connection with the ways to introduce the principle of “profit” into the Soviet enterprises, a thing which constitutes a step towards the application in the Soviet economy of the experience of the Tito clique about the so-called workers’ self-administration. This is the road to the capitalist degeneration of

¹ “Unità,” September 18, 1964.

the socialist economy. And Togliatti issues the call for more rapid and bolder advance precisely down this road.

But in the first place and above all, for Togliatti, for all the Italian revisionists and those who, openly or secretly, tag along after them, the “process of de-Stalinization” in the countries where the revisionists rule is not satisfactory and is not being carried out as rapidly as it should.

“The problem which commands the greatest attention today, in regard to both the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries,” he says in his “testament,” “is especially that of overcoming the regime of restriction and suppression of democratic and personal rights which was established by Stalin... The general impression is that there is a slowness and resistance to returning to the Leninist norms which ensure extensive freedom of expression and discussion inside the party and outside it, in the field of culture and art, as well as in the political field.”

Thus, with the process of “de-Stalinization,” Togliatti means the radical transformation at accelerated rates, in theory and practice, of the regime, of the system, of the internal and foreign policies of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries of Europe, with the aim that these countries should be turned from the right road of the construction of socialism on a scientific Marxist-Leninist basis, to countries with a liberal, social-democratic, state capitalist order. In other words, Togliatti demands that the road, which Khrushchev and the 20th Congress of the CPSU opened towards the degeneration of the Soviet Union from a socialist country to a bourgeois liberal country, must not be interrupted, the process must not be slowed down, but on the contrary, must be accelerated.

According to the Italian revisionists, for this process to advance, the Soviet system which allegedly gave birth to “Stalin’s cult of the individual” must be discredited completely, both politically and

ideologically. Stalin, who allegedly perverted Marxism-Leninism, “created the most savage dictatorship known to mankind,” caused “great harm” with the “unnecessary” and “barbarous” class struggle, and “made the Soviet Union a fearsome spectre to the world bourgeoisie, to social-democracy,” etc., must be discredited.

In reality, the Khrushchev group and its followers are completely at one in principle with Togliatti, and are proceeding precisely on the anti-Soviet road he preaches. The fact is that in the Soviet Union, in the context of “liberalization” and “democratization” of the social order, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the proletarian party are being liquidated. It is known, also, that in the Soviet Union and in some former countries of people’s democracy, the doors have been opened wide to the spread of all sorts of anti-socialist and decadent bourgeois trends in the field of culture and art. These things are no longer a secret to anyone. But to advance on this course with rapid steps is something very delicate and accompanied with a number of negative consequences for the revisionists themselves, and this is what forces Khrushchev and his group to show more restraint and caution than Togliatti would like.

They are obliged to show more caution and restraint because to go at the gallop down the road of liberal-bourgeois degeneration of the socialist order would quickly expose them to the masses as the renegades from socialism who are restoring capitalism, which they are in fact. Apart from this, it seems that the Khrushchev group is afraid to allow the extremist revisionist elements much rope by giving them complete freedom of speech and action, because they will bring troubles upon its own head, as has occurred in fact with a number of writers in the Soviet Union who began to demand an accounting even from Khrushchev himself over the so-called “crimes” of the Stalin era. In the final analysis, the Khrushchev group and its revisionist followers in other countries cannot be for unrestricted “liberalization,”

because such a thing would face them with the problem of freedom of speech and action also for the sound revolutionary and Marxist-Leninist elements who oppose their revisionist line. But it is known that the Khrushchev group and its supporters have established the most severe censorship and the harshest police regime against Marxist-Leninists.

Naturally Togliatti and the Togliattists hail the steps undertaken in the Soviet Union and a number of other socialist countries for the degeneration of the socialist order and the widespread introduction of bourgeois ideological influences as “very positive.” However, according to them, this process is being carried out very slowly, with zigzags, and stops and starts, and is encountering the resistance of “the old”; they need matters to go more quickly on the road of the complete liquidation of the “harmful consequences of the dictatorship of the proletariat,” on the road of the capitalist degeneration in the socialist economy, in the field of culture and art, and all other fields. They want the process of degeneration in the CPSU, which has now become a “party of the entire people,” to advance more rapidly, and demand that it should become completely a party of the type of the ICP, without rules, without discipline, “free,” “democratic,” with factions and tendencies of every kind included in it. In a word, Togliatti recommends to the Khrushchevite revisionists that the reforms undertaken for the liberalization of the party should be taken further, that the CPSU and the parties of the republics which form it should have great freedom (even the present “dogmatic” forms which the Khrushchevite revisionists use must be rejected) and the best of all possible blessings would be if they went even from the old “dogmatic” system of one party to the multi-party system. According to the Togliattists, this would be the culmination of “socialist democracy” (they don’t quite say that “Lenin had long dreamed of this,” but Stalin had hindered the realization of this “dream of Lenin’s” for dozens of years on

end! But they may get around to saying it one day).

Togliatti and all the Italian revisionists, who operate in a capitalist country, don't want to take account of the special conditions and difficulties which the Khrushchevites and the other revisionists run into, which stop them going full tilt down the road of degeneration. The Togliattists want the process of degeneration in the Soviet Union, and consequently also in the other socialist countries of Europe, to be speeded up, because only in this way will the capitalist world no longer be afraid of the Soviet Union, of socialism, of communism, because only in this way will the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois intellectuals be convinced that the "devil is not as ugly as they say," that socialism is not so unacceptable to them (and even if up till now there have been things in the socialist countries unacceptable to the bourgeoisie, these have been the "distortions" of Stalin!). Hence it is possible to talk about building a "new system of world socialism" with "Marxists," with "socialists," with social-democrats, with Christian Democrats, with capitalists, on the "peaceful" road, without class struggle, without the dictatorship of the proletariat, without destroying the old state power of the bourgeoisie, but by means of "structural reforms," on the parliamentary road, acting according to the laws of bourgeois Constitutions, etc., etc.

But, since the principles of transition to "socialism" in such "democratic" and "peaceful" ways were accepted at the 20th Congress, the Italian revisionists argue, then they should be applied in a consistent manner, not only in words but in deeds, and it devolves on the Khrushchevite and other revisionists to set the example for the whole world, to remove the "democrats'" fears by proving that they are wiping out the "spectre of Stalinism" in deeds and have changed the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries into social-democratic paradises, into countries of "popular socialism," acceptable to all the democrats of the world!

Togliatti also expresses dissatisfaction and pretensions regarding the problems of the development of revisionism in the Western countries. "We have always been of the opinion," he writes, "that it is not correct to present the workers' and communist movement of the Western countries always in optimistic colours. In this world, even although there has been some progress here and there, our development and our strength, to this very day, are inappropriate to the tasks before us."

This is a truly interesting admission. It is known that in the overwhelming majority of these countries, the leadership of the communist parties is in the hands of revisionist elements who proceed on the same opportunist and anti-Marxist course advocated by Togliatti, Tito, and Khrushchev and company. Togliatti's admission shows to what a pretty pass the trend of modern revisionism has brought the communist movement.

And what does Togliatti want? What does he recommend to pull the communist movement of the Western world out of this unpleasant situation? The most elementary logic demands that the first decisive step in this direction should be the rejection of the revisionist anti-revolutionary line which has dragged the prestige and authority of the communist and workers' parties in the West down to ground level and has led to the alienation and isolation of the communists from the masses. However, Togliatti recommends precisely the opposite: he demands that they go even further down the revisionist road of the 20th Congress of the CPSU. "In general," he writes, "in compiling our policy, we set out, and we are convinced that we should set out, from the positions of the 20th Congress. But today, even these positions require deepening and development."

Concretely he demands that all the forces and efforts of the communist and workers' parties in the Western countries should be directed towards the "peaceful" and "legal" forms of struggle, following

the example of the so-called “Italian road” to socialism (the demand for the working out and putting into practice of an “overall plan of economic development” in the interests of workers “to be counterposed to the capitalist program” which is in the interests of big monopolies, for the “democratization” of the management of economic life in the capitalist countries, etc., etc.). “For example,” writes Togliatti, “a more profound judgement on the theme of the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism impels us to define more precisely what we mean by democracy in a bourgeois state, how can the limits of freedom and democratic institutions be expanded, and what will be the most effective forms of the participation of the masses of workers and working people in economic and political life. The question arises of the possibility of the working class winning positions of power within the framework of a state which has not changed its nature as a bourgeois state, and consequently, whether the struggle from within for a progressive transformation of this nature would be possible. In countries where the communist movement has become strong, as in our country (and in France), this is emerging as the fundamental question in political life today.”

We have had occasion previously, especially in the article “About the Theses for the 10th Congress of the ICP” published in “Zëri i Popullit” on November 17th and 18th, 1962, to dwell in detail on the analysis of the so-called Italian road to socialism, and to prove that it is characterized by flagrant departure from the fundamental teachings of Marxism-Leninism about the class struggle, the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, that it is an utterly opportunist and revisionist “road” identical with the preachings of Bernstein, Kautsky, and other opportunists of the past, of the right-wing socialists, the Tito clique, and other renegades of the present time. And it is precisely the further deepening of this treacherous line of negation of the revolution, of weaning the communist parties and

masses of working people away from revolutionary struggle, that Togliatti recommends as the way out of the crisis into which modern revisionism has led the communist movement in the West!

Togliatti also wants them to renounce anything that might hinder the alliances of the revisionists with the liberal bourgeoisie, the bourgeois intellectuals, the Christian Democrats, the social-democrats, and all their other “allies” on the “democratic Italian road to socialism.” He mentions as an example the absolute need to renounce the “ancient atheist formula,” in other words, the principled struggle against religion and the reactionary policy of the Vatican, as well as the struggle for the principles of Marxism in the fields of culture, art, science and philosophy.

In fact, this is the line of the political and ideological degeneration of the communist and workers’ parties in the Western countries, of turning them into parties of the social-democratic type. To complete the picture, we shall add here that at the same time the leadership of the ICP headed by Togliatti has long been following the policy of the organizational degeneration of the proletarian party, changing it gradually from a militant, organized and disciplined revolutionary vanguard of the working class into an amorphous organization, with no clear-cut limits, with out a sound party discipline, which anyone can enter or leave as it pleases him, and where the supreme duty of a party member is considered to be that he gives his vote to the Communist Party in the parliamentary or other elections which are held in the capitalist countries.

Thus, willy-nilly, the Italian revisionists regretfully admit that their road of betrayal has brought them no gains. On the contrary, not only are the revisionist parties in the capitalist countries far from taking power through the “parliamentary” road, but they are even losing those seats which they had in the past in the bourgeois parliaments; not only are they quite unable to consolidate their old alliances

and create new ones with the Socialists, the Christian Democrats, the social-democrats, etc., but those they have had have fallen apart, by means of their “structural” reforms and covering under bourgeois constitutions, they have not only “failed to marry the priest’s daughter but they are not even accepted in the village.” And above all, they see that the resistance of opponents within the party is increasing from day to day, and that outside the party, Marxist-Leninist groups are being formed which are growing and becoming stronger and will turn into new Marxist-Leninist parties. For the revisionists the outlook is disastrous because they can see their utter defeat as a not distant prospect.

With this situation in mind, the cry of alarm which Togliatti sends out to the other revisionists, especially to the Soviet revisionists headed by Khrushchev, is quite understandable. He demands that the tactics of the struggle against the “dogmatists” must be changed, and at the same time, demands the speeding up of the degeneration of the socialist countries and further rapprochement with the bourgeoisie and imperialism; according to Togliatti, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries ought to provide the “good example” of the complete liquidation of the “Stalinist anomaly” and the creation of a “democratic” and “liberal” socialism of the type that the right-wing social-democratic chiefs advocate, which they even claim they have achieved in a number of European capitalist countries!

Thus, for the sake of the triumph of the “Italian road to socialism,” for the sake of their alliances with the bourgeoisie, the social-democrats, the Christian Democrats, etc.; Togliatti and all the Italian revisionists demand that the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries must be sacrificed, that the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the people’s revolutions in the other countries, achieved through the struggle and bloodshed of the peoples, must be liquidated. This is a great anti-Soviet and anti-socialist plot,

ENVER HOXHA

which reveals the real, traitorous features of the Togliatti revisionists.

However, as was inevitable, these demands of Togliatti have run into opposition from the Khrushchev group, which now finds itself in a difficult situation. It has gone a very long way down the road of betrayal and is neither willing nor able to turn back, because such a thing would mean utter defeat and complete liquidation for it. But neither can it advance at the accelerated rates that Togliatti demands, because this would speed up its complete exposure and defeat. Faced with this difficult situation, the Khrushchev group opposes the line of Togliatti and tries to impose its own line on the Togliattists, by relying on the power of the “ruble” and on the military power and authority of the USSR and the CPSU.

All this shows that, although they are all treading the one path of betrayal, between the revisionists there is not and cannot be unity, that the differences among them are incapable of solution, but will become steadily deeper and deeper, disrupting and fragmenting the revisionist front...

RESOLUTE AND PRINCIPLED STRUGGLE AGAINST ALL REVISIONIST TRENDS — A SACRED DUTY OF REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNISTS

Togliatti’s “testament” and many other facts testify clearly that the revisionists’ front has been split and that this split is becoming deeper and will become deeper still in the future. The contradictions in the ranks of the revisionists are not something unusual, but entirely natural phenomena, because the revisionists are people without principle, because whether Khrushchevite, Togliattist, Titoite, or of any other brand, they are lackeys of the bourgeoisie and their theories are variants of bourgeois ideology, hence they contain the seed of contradictions, of nationalism, separatism, and splits. There can be genuine unity of thought and action only on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist

ideology and proletarian internationalism, which the revisionists have betrayed and abandoned. Consequently, amongst the modern revisionists, in their overall struggle against Marxism-Leninism, which they will always continue obstinately, there will be forms, nuances, alliances, prompted and inspired by all sorts of general factors, temporary and chance, co-ordinated and disconnected, and there will be various contradictions and differing tactics.

Togliatti's "testament" brings out that there are now at least two different tactical lines in regard to the struggle against Marxism-Leninism crystallizing in the revisionist camp: the monocentrist line of the Khrushchev group and the polycentrist line of Togliatti.

These differences between the Khrushchevites and their associates and the Togliattists and their associates are not new; they came out in the open immediately after the 20th Congress of the CPSU. All the revisionists unanimously endorsed the 20th Congress. But while some of them described it as "complete" and "adequate" for that time, the Togliattists showed that they were the "most radical" revisionists and wanted and demanded that the "analysis" should go "deeper." For propaganda effect and demagogy, and from fear of a deep and immediate split in the international communist movement, the Khrushchevite revisionists acted in a more cautious manner, tried to quiet things down, but without managing to convince the Togliattists, who, without making this a matter of "conflict," developed their own rightist views, of course, while at the same time supporting and endorsing the 20th Congress and later the 22nd Congress of the CPSU. This relative "silence" of the Italian revisionists, or, so to say, their inclusion in the general "euphoria" among the revisionists, was due to their aim of first consolidating these revisionist positions in the ranks of the international communist movement, to ensure that the "poison pill" was swallowed, and then to take further steps, in theory and practice, on the road of revisionism and degeneration.

It can be said that in the method of starting their work of betrayal the Khrushchevite renegades were more restrained, more cautious, more wily, more demagogic, while the Togliattists, in their equally treacherous work, were less cautious and more adventurous. To “quiet down” Togliatti and company, the Khrushchev group used the French “communists” to put pressure on them, which they did in fact, and several times the “fire” of their polemic reached the ears of the public.

Although the traitor group of Khrushchev, who had been working secretly in the ranks of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, were aware that the revisionists’ betrayal would not remain for long without being detected, unmasked and combatted, still they showed themselves very naive. The Khrushchevite revisionists believed, especially in the beginning, that everything would go on smoothly, without any great opposition. They had great faith in their demagoguery, thought that the prestige of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union would cover their betrayal and they relied on the great economic potential of the Soviet Union, on the others’ dependence on Soviet economic credits and their military alliances. The Soviet leaders, headed by Khrushchev, also believed that their “partners” — the various imperialists, and the U.S. imperialists in the first place, would readily agree to their “peace proposals” to “put the world in order.”

But the modern revisionists were quite unable to realize any of these aims and others like them as they wished. The principled struggle of the PLA, as well as of all the Marxist-Leninists of the world and of all progressive people seriously hindered them. And the obstacles are increasing from day to day and will go on doing so.

The modern revisionists, with the Khrushchevite revisionists at the head, have gone far down the road of betrayal and they will go further. But now they have been exposed in the eyes of the whole world, in the eyes of the international communist movement. The

struggle of our Marxist-Leninist parties has become a great and mortal danger to them. Therefore, now they have to take serious account of our struggle which is mounting and becoming very threatening to the revisionists. The great, just and principled struggle of the Marxist-Leninist parties not only tore the mask from the revisionists and ruined their plans, but it also created insurmountable difficulties for them, and also led to the sharpening of latent contradictions and the birth of new ones amongst them.

Seeing that their cunning tactics have all failed, including their lies, demagogy, blandishments and threats, their economic blockades, their breaking off of diplomatic relations and their slanderous accusations of being “nationalists,” “splitters,” “renegades,” “agents of imperialism,” etc., the Khrushchevite revisionists and their supporters see no other way than to link themselves more closely with imperialism and carry the splitting of the international communist movement to its conclusion.

In these conditions, the Khrushchev group wants to call the meeting of all the revisionist groupings in Moscow and there to dictate to them their will as renegade splitters and to incorporate them afresh in the continuation of a “more organized” struggle against revolutionary Marxist-Leninists, using all their means (including the “new weapon of extermination” which Khrushchev mentioned recently against the PR of China and the fraternal socialist countries). This is the desperate and hopeless struggle of a traitor clique.

The acolytes of Khrushchev are in a great dilemma. They do not want to be eliminated and quickly driven from the scene, do not want to stake everything on one card, but want to extend their lives and serve the international bourgeoisie longer. Therefore, differences between the revisionists are emerging and, at these moments of a great and unavoidable crisis for them, these contradictions are becoming markedly more abrasive.

The contradictions between the Khrushchevites and the polycen-
trist Italian revisionists are showing up as the most acute. These two
tendencies are confronting and attacking each other over the Khrush-
chevite plan of calling the international meeting of communist and
workers' parties. The revisionists of various countries are grouping
themselves around these two main tactical lines. In fact, the line of
Togliatti has caused quite a disturbance in the revisionist frog pond.
Some are openly supporting this line of Togliatti, some approve it in
a low voice since they have rubles sticking in their throats, some others
criticize parts of it, while supporting it in other directions. On their
part, the Italian revisionists have sent delegations to many countries
to explain their position, to win the maximum number of allies for
their tactics.

It is more than clear that, regardless of what tactics are used by the
revisionists of all shades, from Khrushchev to Togliatti, Tito and the
rest of them, they all have one aim and concern in common: to intensify
the struggle against Marxism-Leninism, against the revolution
and socialism, to consolidate the positions of revisionism and extend
its life. They are trying to put out the flames of the struggle of the
Marxist-Leninists against them, to bring about the cessation of the
great polemic over principles which is going on today, to hinder the
creation of genuinely revolutionary groups and parties. In this struggle
and for these aims they are united, act on the one front. The differ-
ences between them are not over questions of strategy, but over ques-
tions of tactics, over how to make their struggle against Marxism-Len-
inism more effective and how to achieve their objectives more easily.

Having no illusions about the tactical manoeuvres of the revision-
ists, the Marxist-Leninists and all the revolutionaries consider the res-
olute and consistent struggle against all trends of modern revisionism,
the struggle for the unmasking of their counter-revolutionary plans
and aims to be their sacred duty. This struggle is guided by the

teachings of Marxism-Leninism, which constitute the compass and the tested weapon for every true revolutionary.

In sowing all sorts of illusions about the possibility of resolving the differences, even assuming the pose of enemies of imperialism and opponents of Khrushchev, the pose of fighters for unity, the modern revisionists' objective is to deceive the communists, to hide their real faces and aims. But these deceptive manoeuvres will not succeed.

Only the communist parties and all revolutionaries who stand firmly on the positions of the ideology of the working class are and can be genuine fighters against Khrushchevite revisionism, for genuine Marxist-Leninist unity. Revisionism cannot be fought from revisionist positions, just as genuine unity cannot be established on a revisionist basis.

In this struggle the Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries also have allies, with whom they are united on a number of issues. But while uniting with them in struggle, the Marxist-Leninists do not make concessions over principles, do not hide their revolutionary line, and have the duty of making this line and these principles clear to all.

It is a different matter with those like the Togliattists and their ilk, who, although they have contradictions with Khrushchev and his associates, remain consistent revisionists whose main aim is the struggle against Marxism-Leninism. Regardless of the contradictions among them, all these revisionists are enemies of the revolution and communism. Undoubtedly, the contradictions amongst the revisionists are in our favour and should be exploited, because they weaken the revisionist front. The continuous, consistent, and principled struggle against modern revisionism will make these contradictions ever deeper and more acute, but the Marxist-Leninists have no illusions about the revisionists, are not deceived by their demagogy and do not fall into the traps they try to set for them.

Modern revisionism is the main enemy in the international

communist and workers' movement. The group around Khrushchev is the head of modern revisionism, and its most powerful detachment. From this group, which has seized the leadership of the party founded by Lenin and of the first socialist state in the world — the Soviet Union, comes the greatest and most serious danger today. Therefore the struggle against this group, for its exposure and defeat, is the fundamental task of all Marxist-Leninist parties and revolutionary communists throughout the world.

Apart from the Khrushchev group, the other revisionist groups, and especially the Togliattists and Titoites also represent a great danger. Titoism is an important part of modern revisionism in power, which has behind it an imperialist great power, which directs and assists it — U.S. imperialism. The voice of the Titoites is the voice of U.S. imperialism, which sings in the ranks of international communism through the mouth of Titoism. By means of the direct activities of its agency, Titoism, which it has bought with dollars, U.S. imperialism tries to sabotage and undermine the camp of socialism, to bring about the degeneration of the whole international communist and workers' movement. Khrushchev rehabilitated the Tito clique, strengthened it, and somewhat reluctantly, made it a powerful ideological and political partner which is causing him headaches, because now it is not only the Khrushchevites but also the Titoites who lay down the law in the revisionists' ranks. The Tito clique tries to incite and deepen the contradictions that have emerged in the revisionists' ranks and to weaken the domination of the Khrushchev group over its partners, in the interests of its own egocentric line. The Tito clique also tries to bring about that the contradictions between the Khrushchev group on the one hand, and the other revisionist groups on the other hand, do not impel these latter to return to the positions of Marxism-Leninism, but that the dissatisfied should cry on the bosom of Titoism. Tito urges the revisionists within Comecon to gain the

maximum possible economic independence from the Khrushchev group. And since he, himself, is not in a position to give the “aid” and credits, he urges them to turn for “aid” to the West, to make approaches to and link up with imperialism and, on the example of Yugoslavia, “to build socialism” with the aid of U.S. dollars!

For the Marxist-Leninists there can be no doubt that the “struggle” of the Titoites, like the “struggle” of the Togliattists against Khrushchev is a struggle amongst traitors for domination, for leadership, a struggle of different groups of revisionists against the peoples of the Soviet Union, against Marxist-Leninists and all revolutionaries, of whom they are afraid.

The revisionists of different groups are all part and parcel and representatives of one retrogressive trend — modern revisionism. Whether they are large or small, powerful or weak, disguised or exposed, those who march in the vanguard or those that tag along behind, they all fight against Marxism-Leninism, some openly and with all their batteries, while others throw the stone and hide their hand, according to the situation and circumstances. Sometimes they act separately, sometimes they stick together, sometimes they divide to regroup themselves in factions, depending on the interests of the struggle against socialism or the contradictions between them.

Togliatti’s “testament” shows clearly that the modern revisionists are determined to carry the struggle against Marxism-Leninism and all the revolutionary forces of the world through to the end. There is no other road for them. The consistent principled struggle of Marxist-Leninists has exposed their revisionist features, now they can no longer act under the rose but are obliged to come out in the open to defend their revisionist positions and fight the Marxist-Leninists actively. This is a great victory achieved, a victory which must be carried deeper by means of the constant strengthening of our struggle against modern revisionism, under whatever disguise or in whatever form it

ENVER HOXHA

may present itself.

As a result of the struggle of the Marxist-Leninist parties and the revolutionary communists in the different countries, and as a result of the efforts of the revisionist leaders to preserve their positions at all costs by expelling sound communists from party ranks, the process of differentiation has taken place in the communist movement, new revolutionary Marxist-Leninist parties and groups have been created. This process is still going on and will go on unceasingly. This is another great victory which has been achieved, which should be carried deeper, by defending, assisting and supporting these new revolutionary forces unreservedly in their struggle against revisionism, against all the wily manoeuvres and cunning tactics of the revisionists to smother and paralyse the revolutionary current in the communist movement.

The resolute struggle of the Marxist-Leninists, the exposure of the modern revisionists, the defeats they have suffered and are suffering every day in all fields of their national and international activity, have brought about the outburst and deepening of fierce contradictions in the ranks of modern revisionism. And this is another great victory for revolutionary Marxism-Leninism in action, which must drive forward, deepening the contradictions in the revisionist camp. For this it is essential that the resolute struggle of all Marxist-Leninists against modern revisionism of all trends must be intensified more and more.

These historic victories of Marxism-Leninism will increase and become more thorough-going from day to day. The decisive condition and guarantee of this is the principled, uncompromising struggle of all Marxist-Leninist parties and forces against the treacherous aims and activities of the modern revisionists, to bring about their complete and final defeat. Victory in this struggle inevitably belongs to Marxism-Leninism.

Selected Works, vol. 3, Tirana
1980, pp. 685-695, 701-710,

TOGLIATTI AND THE CRISES OF REVISIONISM

Eng. ed.

TWENTY YEARS OF SOCIALIST ALBANIA

Extract from the speech at the solemn meeting commemorating the 20th anniversary of the Liberation of the Homeland

November 28, 1964

OUR PARTY HAS FOUGHT AND WILL CONTINUE TO FIGHT AGAINST KHRUSHCHEVITE AND TITOITE REVISIONISM UNTIL THEY ARE COMPLETELY DESTROYED

Comrades,

During these twenty years our Party and people have grappled bravely not only with imperialism, but also with revisionism, with treachery, first with the Titoite clique and later with the Khrushchevite revisionists.

Revisionism, as a weapon of the ideological struggle of the bourgeoisie against communism, is not a new phenomenon. It has manifested itself ever since the first steps of the development of Marxism. Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin waged a determined, open, uncompromising war on revisionism and its different variants. Marxism has emerged ever stronger and always triumphant from these encounters.

The present-day Khrushchevite revisionism is the successor to the revisionism of the past. The revisionist group of Khrushchev and its followers have consistently pursued a line of betrayal towards the cause of socialism, a line which conforms to the demands and interests of the international bourgeoisie. The Khrushchevite revisionists have betrayed the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, rejected its basic theses, renounced the class struggle, the revolution, and the dictatorship of the proletariat. They have pursued the line of undermining the

Marxist-Leninist unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement, the line of wrecking the Soviet socialist system built under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, the line of degeneration of the socialist states into bourgeois states and of the communist parties into social-democratic parties. They have adopted the treacherous course of rapprochement with, of shameful capitulation and submission to world imperialism. They have pursued the line of sabotaging the revolution, of diverting the peoples from the struggle for national and social liberation and have seriously damaged the peoples' cause of peace and security.

This revisionist line, formulated at the 20th, 21st and 22nd Congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, has inflicted great damage upon the communist movement and the peoples' anti-imperialist struggle. Nevertheless, the revisionists have been unable to stop Marxism-Leninism and the revolution on their triumphant march. Revisionism encountered a great, insurmountable resistance in the resolute, heroic, and principled struggle of the Party of Labour of Albania and the fraternal parties, which stand on Marxist-Leninist positions, it encountered the struggle of all genuine revolutionaries and communists throughout the world. As a consequence of this principled struggle, the pseudo-Marxist mask was torn from the whole revisionist course of the Khrushchevites and their treacherous aims were exposed.

In all fields, in politics and in the economy, on a national, as well as on an international scale, the failures of the revisionist line began to appear one after another. Through their powerful propaganda apparatus the Khrushchev group and their followers made great efforts to cover up these failures with clamorous demagoguery, tried hard to present them as victories, but without success. Moreover, the situation within the ranks of the revisionists became more complicated and aggravated: the squabbles, disputes, disagreements, usual among those

who have no principles, came out in the open. This is clearly apparent whether in Togliatti's so-called testament or in the reserved attitude maintained by many communist parties towards the Khrushchevite project for a factional international meeting of parties. The crisis of Khrushchevite revisionism came to a head, jeopardizing its whole anti-Marxist course and the very existence of modern revisionism.

In these circumstances, the revisionists felt obliged to remove their leader from the political stage. The removal of Khrushchev, this dangerous traitor to and renegade from communism, from the leading positions he held in the Communist Party and the Soviet government, constitutes a great defeat, a heavy blow to the whole of modern revisionism, to its anti-Marxist ideology and policy, and a significant victory for the Marxist-Leninists.

The Albanian people and communists rightly rejoiced at this major triumph over revisionism, because in the fall of Khrushchev they saw once again the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist line of the Party, the importance of its ceaseless principled struggle in defence of the great cause of communism.

The fall of Khrushchev is a major triumph, but this does not mark the end of Khrushchevite revisionism, nor of modern revisionism as a whole. Regardless of the major role which Khrushchev has played as the leader of the revisionists, his removal does not mark the end of the course, policy, and social and economic roots of revisionism, or Khrushchevite revisionism itself, which has caused so much harm to the communist movement, to the Soviet Union, to the socialist camp and to the peoples' liberation struggle. Therefore our Party of Labour, like all the genuine revolutionaries, should not and will not entertain any illusions in this respect.

The fall of Khrushchev undoubtedly marks the beginning of a new stage in the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism, which will lead to the complete defeat of present-day revisionism and

to the inevitable triumph of Marxism-Leninism.

In this stage our communists and people must be clearer than ever about the attitude and the future line of struggle, which have been correctly defined by the Party, basing itself on the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and on the interests of strengthening the entire international communist and workers' movement.

Our Party has fought and will continue to fight consistently against modern revisionism, Khrushchevite or Titoite, until it is completely destroyed as a retrogressive line, as an anti-Marxist course, as an ideology and policy which has found its concrete expression in the revisionist resolutions of the 20th, 21st and 22nd Congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This stand of our Party is thoroughly correct and principled, because the defeat of revisionism and the triumph of Marxism cannot be thought of without rejecting the ideological and political foundation and kicking out the platform of revisionism.

Following the downfall of Khrushchev the present leaders of the Soviet party and government have proclaimed more than once that they will follow to the letter the line of the 20th, 21st and 22nd Congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, as well as its program approved at the 22nd Congress. They have announced, likewise, that the removal of Khrushchev will in no way prejudice the essence of the line pursued up till now by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It is evident that the pursuit of this anti-Marxist course in the future, regardless of the tactical nuances that may be used and will undoubtedly be used in its application, and which are designed to deceive the revolutionaries and the peoples, cannot fail to arouse the firm opposition and the open, principled struggle of genuine Marxist-Leninists.

Our Party is of the opinion that the real liquidation of the revisionist platform, and consequently, of Khrushchevite revisionism

itself, must and will be achieved through the principled struggle of the Marxist-Leninists, to put in order and gradually correct all the evils which the revisionists have inflicted up till now on international communism with their treacherous line.

First and foremost, the putting in order of the question of Stalin, his rehabilitation as a great Marxist-Leninist, regardless of any minor mistake he might have committed, is a major matter of principle of international importance. Our Party and all the Marxist-Leninists regard the question of Stalin not as a sentimental matter, but as it is in fact, a question of line, a matter of principle.

No Marxist, no honest person believes the revisionist piffle that Stalin was a "ruthless dictator," because during these last few years all the revolutionaries and honest men have seen what kind of people the revisionists are, what their moral character is, and what they are capable of doing. It is well known that Stalin never behaved like a dictator, not even towards the opponents of Leninism, but within Leninist norms, he engaged in open, patient controversy for years on end with Trotskyites, Bukharinites, Zinovievites and others, inside the Party and outside it. Whereas today, the revisionists fight their opponents quite differently, by police methods, and not at all according to Leninist norms. It is not in Stalin's time, nor by Stalin, but by the revisionists that anti-Leninist putschist methods are being systematically used, as a consequence of which leaders are being brought down one after the other, not only in the Soviet Union, but also in other socialist countries.

The revisionists claim that Stalin was allegedly a "murderer" and a "terrorist." Why? Because in the time of Stalin the enemies of the revolution, traitors and spies were done away with. And it was not Stalin that killed them, but the revolution, the protection of the achievements of socialism. They were tried in revolutionary courts after public debate and sentenced publicly. Whereas the revisionists

behave like thieves, like conspirators, in secret. They kill by night and weep by day. They act like an international "Mafia." They opened the doors of the Soviet Union to the agents of the imperialists. They are striving to ingratiate themselves with the imperialists, white guards, Trotskyites, counter-revolutionaries, revisionists and traitors, by rehabilitating their men, one after the other, secretly, in offices with the blinds drawn, by deciding to set up monuments to traitors, and so on. This revisionist kitchen cannot be trusted, therefore, Stalin must be rehabilitated as soon as possible and from the Marxist position.

Stalin was neither a traitor to Marxism-Leninism, nor an exhibitionist clown. He was a great Leninist, he was a man of few words and much work for the Soviet Union and for the revolution. When Stalin spoke the bourgeoisie and imperialists did not applaud, nor burst into laughter, but shook in their boots.

Stalin never kowtowed to the imperialists, never betrayed the revolution, nor turned it into a blind alley. Stalin was no warmonger. He did not declare war on any state, but others declared war on and attacked the Soviet Union. Stalin defended the Soviet Homeland with consummate skill and heroism.

Stalin never made common cause with counter-revolutionaries, nor decreed the liquidation of the Communist Party, as some have done who parade today as Marxists with the diploma granted them by Khrushchev and Tito. Stalin smashed the counter-revolutionaries and further tempered the great party of the Bolsheviks.

Putting the question of Stalin in order means to defend Leninism, which was consistently defended during more than thirty years by Stalin and the Bolshevik Party. It means to reinstate the correct line and direction, under which the revolution, the struggle against intervention, the struggle to build socialism in the USSR, were successfully carried out. It means to reinstate the Soviet system, the line according to which the class struggle and the Patriotic War were waged, the

triumph over fascism in the Second World War was assured, and the way was opened to the building of communism in the USSR. The question of Stalin is closely linked with the creation and consolidation of the socialist camp, and with the strengthening of Marxist-Leninist unity in the international communist movement, with the all-round internationalist aid and support for socialist countries and fraternal parties. The attitude towards the question of Stalin is linked with the correct line and attitude towards peaceful coexistence, vigilance towards external and internal enemies, aid for the national liberation struggle of the peoples, the struggle against imperialism, and the struggle for peace.

It is no accident that the Khrushchevites and all the modern revisionists began their treacherous activity by repudiating J.V. Stalin, by launching the most tendentious and ugliest calumnies and attacks against his life and glorious work. Repudiation of J.V. Stalin was a fundamental issue for the revisionists, for by so doing they paved the way for repudiation of Leninism, for the revision of Marxism, for betrayal. It is now clear to all the revolutionaries and men of integrity the world over that the U.S. imperialists and modern revisionists organized and carried out a great conspiracy to wreck the Soviet Union, to attack Marxism-Leninism, and socialism itself. We publicly accuse these traitors of this conspiracy. Therefore, to put things right on this key issue of principle, to raise the prestige and authority of the Soviet Union and its Communist Party, to enhance the devotion of the peoples and of the Marxist-Leninist parties towards them, our Party and all genuine revolutionaries should and will fight consistently.

In order to return to the position of Marxism-Leninism it is necessary that Khrushchev's revisionist course of alliances and overt or secret agreements with U.S. imperialism must be fully exposed, that all the details of his treacherous foreign policy must be carefully re-examined and denounced, and steps taken to set things right.

The Khrushchevite group had Khrushchevite peaceful coexistence as the foundation of their entire policy. Experience has shown that this was used by Khrushchev to make approaches to and link himself with U.S. imperialism, while betraying the interests of socialism. The fact is that Khrushchevite coexistence yielded no positive results for world peace: international tension was not relaxed, on the contrary, the threat of war and the aggressiveness of imperialism increased. Disarmament was not achieved, on the contrary, the Khrushchevite policy created more favourable conditions for the imperialists to arm themselves, while this was denied to the socialist countries. The policy of Khrushchevite peaceful coexistence failed, just as the revisionist line of assuming power by peaceful parliamentary methods suffered complete fiasco.

The policy of Khrushchevite coexistence was used to bring about the degeneration of the Soviet socialist system, with the aim of “liberalizing” and “democratizing” it, to “westernize” it, and hence make it acceptable to the bourgeoisie, and to eliminate the fear of the “spectre” of communism. This treacherous Khrushchevite policy was fully supported by all modern revisionists, and found the support of the international bourgeoisie, who, not without purpose, stated that “Khrushchev was the man the West trusted in Moscow.” This betrayal by Khrushchev, his concessions to U.S. imperialism to the detriment of socialism, were sanctified as “easing of tension.”

Our Party, other fraternal parties and all Marxist-Leninists have fought courageously against this treacherous policy of the revisionists. The Khrushchevites called us “warmongers,” but life proved that we are revolutionary Marxists, fighters against imperialism, resolute defenders of the Soviet Union, of the revolution and peace. Marxists are partisans of Leninist peaceful coexistence, but not to betray socialism, not to make concessions to imperialism, not to confine this merely to relations with the big imperialist powers, but to defend socialism and

ENVER HOXHA

the revolution, to strengthen friendship and collaboration on the basis of peaceful coexistence with all the peoples of the world. Marxist-Leninists and all the peoples are in favour of and will strive for general disarmament, but by totally repudiating all of Khrushchev's treacherous concessions to imperialists, by imposing disarmament on imperialism, by strengthening the defence potential of the socialist countries and the newly liberated countries if the imperialists keep up their armaments race.

A return to the correct Leninist course demands deeds, not words: it is necessary to denounce Khrushchev's treacherous policy and his rapprochement with the imperialists; it is necessary to condemn his adventurist and capitulationist policy in the Cuban events and to give unreserved support to the fraternal Cuban people in their fight against the aggression of U.S. imperialism; it is necessary to denounce the tripartite Moscow Treaty as an act of treason to the interests of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries; it is necessary to conclude a peace treaty with Germany and to settle the Berlin problem in the way that was jointly agreed upon long ago. The Marxist-Leninists must not and will not cease their just and consistent struggle without attaining these objectives.

Selected Works, vol. 3, Tirana
1980, pp. 736-745, Eng. ed.

MODERN REVISIONISM — THE MAIN DANGER AND ENEMY IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' MOVEMENT

From the conversation with a delegation of the CP of New Zealand

October 6, 1965

How does the Party of Labour of Albania view the Soviet-led modern revisionism, and on what principles and with what methods and tactics does it wage the struggle against modern revisionism in general, and in particular against Soviet revisionism, Titoite revisionism, the revisionism of the so-called socialist countries, the revisionists in the communist and workers' parties of the capitalist countries?

Our Party has considered and considers modern revisionism not as a separate ideology, but as an anti-Marxist-Leninist trend of major world proportions, as a modern variant of the bourgeois ideology, adapted to the new conditions of the period following the Second World War, in the ranks of the international working class and especially in the socialist countries, where the dictatorship of the proletariat had been established. It constitutes a very serious threat, therefore the mobilization of all the Marxist-Leninist forces of the world is necessary in order to expose it as a trend heading towards complete identification with social-democracy. With our struggle we must ensure that the revisionist demagogy can no longer be camouflaged under Marxist slogans, but that modern revisionism is seen clearly as a trend of betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, a trend of the bourgeoisie and its ideology.

The essence and strategic aims of this anti-Marxist-Leninist trend are identical with those of social-democracy in the capitalist countries. Both these trends distorting Marxism-Leninism serve world capital,

imperialism. They are variants of the bourgeois ideology to destroy the revolution, to quell the national liberation struggles of the peoples and keep these peoples under the yoke of exploitation and oppression by capital with new forms and methods. These trends are in open or disguised alliance for the one ultimate aim. They are different only in their tactics, slogans and methods of work which are dictated by the current general and particular national and international circumstances, by the contradictions between different capitalist states, by the differing levels of economic development of these capitalist states, by their spheres of influence and domination, etc. As well as that, the modern revisionists are compelled to alter their tactics by the level of the active revolutionary force which is resisting them in the socialist countries where they have seized power, by the struggle and revolutionary drive of Marxist-Leninist forces of the world, by the vigour of the peoples' national liberation struggles, and many other more or less important factors.

Social-democracy in the world, and especially in the capitalist countries, has its own objectives, organization and methods of work. It has stabilized, perfected and co-ordinated its activity with its national bourgeoisie and the international bourgeoisie, and has also stabilized its own international connections in content and in organizational forms.

On its part, modern revisionism in the so-called socialist countries, in collaboration with modern revisionism in the communist and workers' parties of the capitalist countries, has likewise formulated its national and world strategy and tactics.

In the Soviet Union and in the so-called countries of people's democracy of Europe, modern revisionism has become a party and state ideology, therefore our struggle must be adapted to this characteristic of the time.

As an anti-Marxist trend in power, on the national plane modern

revisionism tries to bring about the degeneration of the Marxist-Leninist party into an anti-Marxist party and the degeneration of the socialist state into a capitalist state. On the national plane, it subordinates everything to these two main aims. On the international plane, the aim of the modern revisionists is to penetrate the international communist movement in order to split it, make it degenerate, to influence and infect it with the whole gamut of their activity, with their stands, tactics and methods.

Modern revisionism in power is trying to attain unity of thought and action with all the revisionists in the world, of course, with Moscow as its centre. Naturally, there are great contradictions and they will increase until these links, whether based on unity of thought or of action, are reduced to something like those that exist more or less in the ranks of world social-democracy today.

Modern revisionism, whether in power or not, is under fire from many quarters: under the fire of the Marxist-Leninists and the people in the parties and countries where it rules, under the fire of our Marxist-Leninist parties which are fighting and exposing it, under the fire of the insoluble contradictions within modern revisionism itself, under the fire of the contradictions among the degenerate strata which it has brought to power, and under the fire of the world capitalist bourgeoisie and imperialists, with their particular contradictions, aims and purposes, under the fire, pressure, blackmail of these and various trends of the bourgeoisie.

Hence it is natural that, faced with this situation and complex of things, the modern revisionists should look for an ally in the struggle against Marxism-Leninism, against the Marxist-Leninist parties, the world communist movement, the peoples and their national liberation struggles, and this cannot be other than imperialism, and first of all, U.S. imperialism.

This alliance is expressed in their world policy, on all the key

problems with which mankind is concerned.

It is of great importance to understand this, both in regard to the scale these alliances have attained, and in regard to their ups and downs, their intensity, the forms used and the methods arrived at, their complete or partial successes and sometimes their complete failure. These things are not fixed, they are influenced and conditioned by many objective and subjective circumstances.

Viewing matters from this angle, let us briefly take up some key problems of our great struggle.

I do not intend here to enter into the essential principles of these problems which are clear both to you and to us, and on which there is complete unity of opinions between our two parties. However, during our talks we may also develop them further.

I want to elaborate on what the holy alliance between world imperialism and the modern revisionists, between capitalist bourgeois ideology and Soviet-led modern revisionism, consists of.

This holy alliance was formed at moments of grave crisis for world imperialism which was preparing for world war in order to overcome the major crisis which was threatening it from the revolutionary drive of the peoples, from the political-ideological, economic and military strength of the camp of socialism and the struggles of the peoples for national liberation. The modern revisionists, headed by the Soviet revisionists, immediately came to the aid of world imperialism, to rescue it from crisis and defeat. Herein lies their great betrayal.

Because they are ideologically, spiritually and morally on a course identical with that of U.S. and world imperialism, and have the same bourgeois ideology, the modern revisionists were terrified by the threats of war from U.S. imperialism and its atomic blackmail, despite the great military potential at their disposal. Not only were they terrified of a world war that the Americans were preparing, but they were terrified also of the immediate and subsequent consequences of this

war, terrified for themselves and for the moral, material and ideological patrimony of the world bourgeoisie, because the world revolution would wipe them forever from the face of the earth. Camouflaging their abject fear under their entirely bourgeois “humanism,” they came before world capitalism with a complete platform, presenting themselves as obedient lackeys, as tested agents, devoid of all scruples, at the head of the Soviet Union, at the head of the socialist camp, at the head of the world communist movement.

The Soviet revisionists and their accomplices wanted to demonstrate to the imperialists, in words and deeds, that “times have radically changed, that Marxism-Leninism, in its old forms, and in its actions and aims, has become obsolete, is out-of-date, that new conditions have been created, therefore we are presenting the new Marxism of modern times.” (Of course, without altering the essence, I am simplifying their thoughts and I shall not go into the specific forms they use to disguise their revision of our theory.)

Apart from the intensive, open and behind-the-scenes preliminary work carried out by the Khrushchevite revisionists within the Soviet Union, in the ranks of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in the socialist countries and in the international arena, in order to prepare putsches, the terrain and the people for the “great action,” the 20th, 21st, and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU are key moments, at which the modern revisionists came out openly with their traitorous theories.

We are obliged to think that the Soviet modern revisionists had come to the conclusion that the situation was ripe for such a turn on a worldwide scale, so they hoped that everything would go off peacefully, without resistance. The euphoria and exaltation of the first days of this great betrayal both on the part of the modern revisionists and the open and camouflaged opportunists, and on the part of U.S. and world imperialism confirmed this. The heads of world imperialism

rejoiced over what was happening, but they constantly demanded *tangible*¹ proofs, which the revisionists did not fail to supply. As for themselves, they did not budge from their principles, their world strategy, but made only some tactical gestures to back up the Soviet revisionists in their betrayal and urge them to go further.

What do the betrayal of the Soviet revisionists and their advances and promises to imperialism and world capitalism consist of, what is the foundation of their holy alliance, and what assurances have they given the imperialists as a pledge of their loyalty to the bourgeois ideology and the struggle against Marxism-Leninism, socialism and communism?

a) "Peaceful coexistence and economic competition." There is no need to go into long theoretical argument, since it is clear, both to you and to us, that there is nothing Leninist in these slogans; they are anti-Leninist both in the way they are presented and in the concrete activity with which the modern revisionists go about applying them (irrespective of the demagogic phraseology with which they are dressed up).

The fact is that a great revisionist-bourgeois capitalist racket was kicked up about these slogans, and those who refused to fall into step with them were described as warmongers, anti-Marxists and dogmatists. With this the Soviet modern revisionists wanted to implant in people's minds the idea that, "there is no alternative to peace at any price, bourgeois peace, bourgeois humanism. So we should coexist with capitalism, must preserve the status quo, give up revolutionary struggles, and solve everything through economic competition, which will determine who will triumph." Political coexistence, ideological coexistence, economic coexistence, all this camouflaged with demagoguery, with a great hullabaloo, sensational, phoney outbursts, with retreats under intimidation, and advances when they considered the

¹ French in the original.

situation favourable, and all this dressed up in a falsified, revised, Marxist-Leninist theory — that is the line of the Khrushchevites over this important problem. The capitalist bourgeoisie welcomed this turn and supported it with its means, tactics and strategy, without making the slightest concession on its own part.

b) “A world without wars, a world without arms.” This was the second assurance that the Soviet revisionists gave U.S. and world imperialism. This was a consistent continuation of their betrayal. However, the Soviet revisionists did not give up their own armaments, because, as bourgeois capitalists, they need them to dominate the world and fight the socialist states, or in case of a flare-up with the other bourgeois imperialist states. With these slogans the Soviet revisionists are pursuing other aims: to create a mirage of peace in the minds of the peoples, to disarm them morally, to take the weapons from their hands and eliminate the spirit of hatred for oppressors, imperialists, old and new colonialists, and the revolution against them.

In other words, the Soviet revisionists gave up the revolution, proletarian internationalism, aid to national liberation wars, support for the rights of nations. They not only renounced all support to national liberation wars, but condemned them, and jointly with the Americans, participated directly in suppressing them. Any action of the Soviets, which may be presented in opposition to our theses, such as supplying a few weapons to some peoples, is done with definite aims, in order to keep them under their control, to employ those who receive arms from them to suppress the revolutionaries, to use them against the socialist countries, and of course, to counterbalance the intentions of the imperialists, who want to weaken this budding imperialist power and are working to this end.

This anti-Marxist and imperialist line of the Soviet revisionists against socialism and the freedom of peoples is proceeding on the course of the creation and strengthening of two powerful blocs in the

world, of the United States of America and the Soviet Union, which intend to divide the spheres of influence between them, to have the monopoly of atomic weapons, to be the most powerful economically, and dictate their own laws to other states and peoples.

It is this line that inspires the notorious Moscow Treaty, the proposal for an alliance between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, the agreements and intrigues over Germany, the empty talk about disarmament, the great aid to Indian reaction, the extensive trade relations, the mutual granting of huge credits, the unprincipled and unprecedented development of cultural relations aimed at bringing about the degeneration of the socialist countries and the rejection of Marxism-Leninism.

This constitutes an entire complex of questions. We Marxists are able to see it clearly and to organize our struggle, but only provided we are able to single out the key problem, the main thing, for only in this way will we not lose our bearings in the great labyrinth where the problems present themselves not in simple form, but in complicated ways. They develop rapidly and with great complexity, with ups and downs, advances and retreats, clear at one moment and obscure at another. The circumstances are not the same everywhere, many factors exert their influence for better or worse, defeats make the enemy draw in their horns, conceal their intentions temporarily, slow down their actions, smile and give way a bit.

None of this deceives us Marxists; we judge everything cool-headedly and in a revolutionary manner. Their temporary victories make the enemies arrogant and menacing, but we Marxists do not waver in our confidence in victory, are not afraid of the enemy and do not capitulate.

Let us take, for example, the evolution of the Soviet revisionists' stand on several key problems. Their stands on some of these problems have undergone evolution, but the aim remains the same. We

must be clear about this in order to be able to see these evolutions properly.

At first, the modern revisionists seemed to be monolithic. This did not mislead the Party of Labour of Albania. Whereas today the revisionists are quarrelling with one another, but this does not deceive us, either, because their quarrels are not about rectifying their course of betrayal. Their quarrels express natural, internal contradictions, which are bound to emerge and which we should exploit, but not by violating principles, not by making concessions to revisionists, not by cherishing illusions or toning down the struggle and polemics against them.

Violating the basic principles of fraternal, internationalist economic relations, the Soviet revisionists built up an entire system of economic relations with the socialist countries, Comecon, etc., which, at the outset, appeared to be the “last word” in Marxism-Leninism on these questions.

The real aim of the Soviet revisionists was to have the entire economy of the socialist countries under their thumb, to make it an appendage of their own economy, to dictate the law to others, to exert pressure on and blackmail them and have them dependent and obedient politically, too. Comecon degenerated. There are insoluble contradictions among its member countries, the law of the jungle prevails among them. Things are not going the way the Soviets want in Comecon today, and this is natural. There are contradictions, which will become more profound and lead to the weakening of these links, which are capitalist in essence. The revisionist countries are putting themselves more and more thoroughly into the clutches of world capitalism.

Let us take the Warsaw Treaty. When it was created, its aims were just, but the revisionists changed them. They are dominant there, they make the law. The armies of the Warsaw Treaty are under the direct

command of the defence minister of the Soviet Union, they have no modern weapons, apart from those with which the Soviet Union supplies them to the extent it wants or deems “reasonable.” The revisionist slogan, “Don’t worry, for I am defending you,” was on the order of the day and accepted without a word of protest. Now things have begun to move there internally, but not to our advantage. The partners of the Soviet Union, the other revisionists, want to command like the Soviet revisionists; they want missiles, want to be informed about the plans for war and defence, want not just one to give the orders, but all of them. This is a situation which is developing, but we are not jumping with unfounded “joy.” However, this does not mean, either, that these things are not weakening the revisionists’ strength and we should not profit from them, but we must act carefully, without violating our principles, without cherishing vain illusions or toning down our struggle and polemics.

The same thing may be said in regard to many other problems.

c) “The taking of power in a peaceful way, on the parliamentary road,” was another betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, the basic principles of the revolution and its primary aim — the seizure of power by the proletariat and its allies. It was a real offer and solemn promise made by the modern revisionists to the capitalist bourgeoisie that it would no longer be threatened by the revolution, that the communists would settle everything on the road of social reforms, so dear to social-democracy, which has experience in this field. According to the revisionist theory, everything would be solved through reforms by the pseudo-Marxist parties which had betrayed the revolution, the working class and the working peasantry. According to the revisionists, this “taking of power by the proletariat” would come about completely peacefully, under the protection of the armed forces and the police, which, as is known, are in the hands of the bourgeoisie and the capitalists. This would mean liquidation of the Marxist-Leninist parties in the

countries of the West, in the capitalist countries; it was the road of their transformation and degeneration into social-democratic parties standing for social reforms, the road of open and secret compromises with the national bourgeoisie, which would mean the elimination of the revolutionary spirit of the communists, departure from every basic Marxist-Leninist principle in theory and in revolutionary practice.

In its materials our Party has elaborated its theoretical-political views about this and other problems in detail. Therefore, I am not going to enlarge on these questions since you may already be acquainted with these materials. We know that we are in agreement, in unity, with your Party's views on these problems. The modern revisionists are employing demagogy on a large-scale and no end of sophistry on this question, just as on other questions. There is a marked tendency among them to engage in sterile, allegedly theoretical discussion of these questions in which they bombard you with formulas and quotations designed to cover their tracks, in order to weaken the real struggle and leave the revisionists in peace so they can go on with their destructive work and concoct alliances with the bourgeoisie and the social-democrats and other anti-Marxist trends.

In these situations, we see that, on the one hand, modern revisionism is split into separate trends, heading in different but always anti-Marxist directions, and on the other hand, that new Marxist-Leninist parties and revolutionary Marxist-Leninist groups are being created, are fighting, becoming consolidated, and finding their true road through struggle and innumerable difficulties.

Your Marxist-Leninist Party, which militates in a capitalist country, has a great deal of experience in this direction. We want you to tell us about this experience in order to arm ourselves better for our great, difficult but glorious struggle for the defence of Marxism-Leninism from the attacks of modern revisionism.

Modern revisionism did not fall from the sky, but was prepared

in certain conditions and objective and subjective circumstances. It has its own process, causes, reasons, forms and methods, as well as its own strategic and tactical objectives. It has its own process of formation, organization, growth, ascent and decline, and of its final destruction. It is a fact that this anti-Marxist line has been of extraordinary assistance to the capitalist bourgeoisie; it has weakened the revolutionary struggle inside the capitalist citadel. But Marxism-Leninism will undoubtedly triumph over it, will defeat revisionism, and this defeat has already begun under the severe blows which the Marxist-Leninist parties are dealing it. Our fight against revisionism is on and will continue with great severity. Khrushchevite modern revisionism originated, became organized and consolidated, and seized the reins of power in the Soviet Union, in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its leadership, after the death of Stalin, and not because of any fault of Stalin's, we emphasize, not because of the so-called mistakes of Stalin. The Party of Labour of Albania will not budge from this view, which is not an *apriori* view, but one formed from a thorough Marxist-Leninist analysis, based on internationally known facts and documents. It is a view which, we consider and are convinced, is right, correct. The events and their development have confirmed our analysis and conviction. Linked by imperceptible threads inside and outside the Soviet Union, the counter-revolutionaries, headed by Khrushchev, worked towards this betrayal in the greatest secrecy. Right to his death, revolutionary vigilance had never been lacking in Stalin. This is evidence, also, of his revolutionary justice, which did not admit "arbitrariness" and "unwarranted condemnation" of suspects. The Trotskyite criminals, like Khrushchev and Mikoyan, skilfully kept a low profile.

It is a fact, however, that after Stalin's death his collaborators lost their vigilance, became involved in the intrigues hatched up by the counter-revolutionaries of the Khrushchev and Mikoyan type, badly

compromised themselves, forgot the teachings and criticisms of Stalin, lost their militancy, and eventually, consciously or unconsciously, fell into the trap the counter-revolutionaries set for them. In our opinion, they bear great responsibility for this catastrophe. To determine the degree of their responsibility many documents, which we do not possess, are needed, but it would be un-Marxist not to charge them with responsibility, while on the other hand, it would be an anti-Marxist action to condemn them on the basis of the slanders of the counter-revolutionaries headed by Khrushchev.

Our stand towards the great Stalin is publicly known. This stand will never change, since it is based on a Marxist-Leninist analysis, and not a sentimental one. The Party of Labour of Albania has rejected and will reject all the slanders of the modern revisionists against Stalin. This campaign they have undertaken against Stalin is the cabal of a great international mafia, organized to discredit Stalin as a great Marxist-Leninist leader and as a person, and through him, to discredit Leninism, the Bolshevik Party, the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the socialist camp, etc. We cannot be shifted in the slightest in our view on this question, and we do not permit ourselves to discuss the filth, the facts and the arguments concocted by the Khrushchevites.

The Marxist-Leninist activity which was characteristic of Stalin during his whole life is as clear as the light of the sun. We must judge him on the basis of his consistent, principled, revolutionary activity, full of struggle and sacrifice, self-denial and heroism, and complete loyalty to Leninism. And from this analysis his activity is completely positive, excellent, and free from any blemish. Which is that party that, in the course of its long road, has made not even a single mistake, who is that Marxist-Leninist leader who has not been wrong even once in his assessments and decisions, or over one or several separate problems in his revolutionary life? Neither the Bolshevik Party, nor Stalin

could avoid this. Some mistakes may have been made in certain circumstances, under special conditions, if they were made at all. But if such mistakes have been proved, not those Khrushchev claims, Stalin has recognized them himself and has criticized them, as the great Marxist he was.

Our Party has fought and will fight to the end, to defend the great revolutionary work of Stalin. We consider this as one of the most important questions of principle.

Why do we do this, why do we treat this question in this way, and have we correct and solid grounds for our stand? As traitors to Marxism-Leninism, as anti-Marxists, as allies of the capitalist bourgeoisie in ideology and everything else, as enemies of the Soviet Union and socialism, first and foremost the Soviet modern revisionists had to give real proof of their being revisionists in everything and of their definite break with Marxism-Leninism and socialism.

They had to expose the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union, to uncrown the victories of socialism in theory and practice, to discredit the Soviet socialist system, and build up an entirely anti-Marxist theory to prove, allegedly, that “Lenin did not think that socialism would be built as it was built; that Stalin distorted Lenin’s teachings through his anti-Leninist views, his arbitrariness and cult.” In a word, according to the revisionists, the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union was a monstrous *aberration*¹ for which Stalin was to blame, that had to be totally liquidated and turned into “genuine socialism,” as the Khrushchevite revisionists envisaged it, in all its aspects.

Hence, according to the Khrushchevites, Leninism is only a variant similar to social-democracy, and the Soviet Union should return to “genuine Leninism.” The Khrushchevites did nothing other than what the capitalists had been doing all along in their struggle against

¹ French in the original.

the Soviet Union, the revolution and Marxism-Leninism. They proved to be the dirtiest agents of world imperialism. To attain their goal, they resorted to all means, to every kind of demagogy and theoretical distortion, concocted all sorts of slanders, which they raised to a system, to the level of theory, organized putsches within the Soviet Union and outside it, exploited the trust of the Soviet masses, their faith and love for the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, spread illusions, and promised the earth and the sky. We lived through all these things, saw them develop, saw the hidden aims behind their sophism, their hypocrisy, their demagogy, saw their traitorous actions carried out systematically in practice, one by one, within and outside the Soviet Union.

These actions were very much to the liking of world imperialism, which cheered and applauded them, backed them up and exploited them to the maximum. In this way the imperialists achieved a success even greater than they had expected. But still they were not satisfied. In order to achieve their expansionist aims their revisionist agency had to go even further and deeper: the communist and workers' parties and their ideology, their minimum and maximum objectives had to be smashed; the revolutionary spirit of Marxist parties had to be extinguished; the dictatorship of the proletariat had to be destroyed to its foundations; the Soviet state power had to be changed in substance and form and its apparatus had to be purged of revolutionaries; the economy had to be radically transformed in its ideology, content and organizational forms; education and culture, the way of life, the sound proletarian morality had to be corrupted; the ideological, political and organizational concepts of all these "old" and "harmful" things had to be changed; the Trotskyites, the counter-revolutionaries, dead and alive, had to be rehabilitated, and placed in power; all measures had to be taken in order to create and strengthen the stratum of the new bourgeoisie, the pillar of the revisionist regime in the Soviet Union,

ENVER HOXHA

to develop moral corruption and the “new superstructure” of a “new structure” which was being built. All this was carried out amidst great confusion and under a deafening racket kicked up with the deliberate purpose of bemusing people with a dreadful concerto organized on a world scale.

Not only was there nothing Marxist about the struggle of the revisionists against the “cult of the individual,” and especially the “cult of Stalin,” but it had definite aims, both within the Soviet Union, for the reasons we have mentioned, as well as in the other parties, in the direction of the liquidation of sound Marxist-Leninist leaderships and preparing the ground for suppression of any resistance to revisionist betrayal. All those who opposed the revisionist course were to be accused as Stalinists, hence “anti-Marxists,” “dogmatists,” “warmongers,” “criminals,” “agents of imperialism,” and what not. The entire Trotskyite, counter revolutionary vocabulary was to be used, as in fact it was.

With their anti-Marxist views, their megalomania, their economic and military power, and relying on and camouflaging themselves behind the prestige and authority of the CPSU and the Soviet Union, the Khrushchevite revisionists thought that the resistance to their betrayal would be weak and quickly eliminated. As anti-Marxists, they underrated the strength of Marxism-Leninism, its dynamism and revolutionizing power. But it would be a mistake to think that the modern revisionists foresaw no resistance at all on the part of the Marxist-Leninists and the Marxist-Leninist parties, whether in power or not, but which stood loyal to principles. However, they thought that the course which they followed would bring the results they desired and hoped for in their advances and capitulation to imperialism and the world capitalist bourgeoisie over all international issues. Of course, this did not occur. Their betrayal brought them no gains and the struggle of our Marxist-Leninist parties, the struggle of all the

communists in the world, the peoples' liberation struggles, and the aggressive actions of U.S. imperialism exposed this great betrayal and brought about the failure and unmasking of their sinister plans. And the resolute resistance, the stern, ceaseless, principled struggle of the Marxist-Leninist parties against modern revisionism began. One of these parties, which basing itself on the Marxist-Leninist principles, strongly opposed the modern revisionists, is the Communist Party of New Zealand, for which we have a great and sincere respect.

The Khrushchevite revisionists and all the other modern revisionists found themselves facing an extremely difficult situation, facing a struggle which they had to cope with, because it threatened them with death and destruction. This struggle developed to a crescendo, passing through many phases. The modern revisionists used all their means, all their demagogy to subdue us, to split us and set us quarrelling with each other, and to silence the polemics. What did they not set in motion to achieve these aims, but they achieved only defeat and disaster, up to the liquidation of the arch-revisionist Khrushchev.

We have lived through the vagaries and phases of this great struggle, and have been active, militant participants in it. We know the stands of our Parties, therefore, it seems to me that there is no need to enlarge upon this here. However, I want to explain some aspects of our Party's struggle which were not very clear to some comrades loyal to Marxism-Leninism and to our Party in particular, notwithstanding that, in principle, they were in agreement with the principled stands we have maintained.

The Party of Labour of Albania has done its duty to the end and will continue to do so, without any deviation from the Marxist-Leninist principles, in the struggle to defeat modern revisionism. The Party of Labour of Albania embarked on this struggle against this anti-Marxist trend fully conscious of its implications and with deep convictions based on well-studied facts. With full maturity, it considered

this as the most serious issue of great responsibility, on which depended its own fate, as well as that of its beloved people that gave it birth and tempered it in struggle, precisely to lead them in struggle and to the great victory of the liberation and the construction of socialism in our country. Our Party embarked on this struggle and was ready to make any sacrifice, because only in this way could Marxism-Leninism, socialism, communism, the future of mankind and our small country be safeguarded. At first, some comrades did not understand this major decision of our Party, but they were to become convinced later, totally convinced.

There were some who underrated our decision and our struggle. The enemies thought that it was an adventure by a handful of people, a blaze in the straw which would flare up but quickly burn itself out. But they were mistaken and broke their heads. Some friends called our decisions imprudent, rash and immature. Their opinions were ill-based. We were convinced of the correctness of our decisions and actions, we were calm and patient, because we knew that later we would be understood and supported, and this is what did occur.

What was the source of our confidence in the justice of our struggle, which to others appeared an exaggerated confidence? Our Party was a young party created in struggle and tempered in war and revolution. Throughout its struggle and activity it has always rigorously and faithfully upheld our Marxist-Leninist principles and ideology.

But of special importance is our Party's great experience from the struggle against the Yugoslav revisionists in the course of nearly fifteen years prior to the 20th Congress of the CPSU. In stern struggle with the Titoite traitors, our Party had learned to be extremely vigilant, as it had bitter first-hand experience of the tactics, the sinister plans, the demagogy, the methods of struggle and propaganda, open and subversive, of the Yugoslav modern revisionists against our country, as well as against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, day

by day, over fifteen years. This was a great school for our Party. The struggle tempered us, strengthened our confidence in victory, taught us to distinguish the enemies, no matter how well camouflaged. Thus in the struggle against modern revisionism, our Party was not so young and inexperienced despite its youth. Had it proceeded imprudently and irresolutely in its struggle against the Yugoslav revisionists, against the Greek monarcho-fascists, the Italian neo-fascists, and all the imperialist conspiracies, our Party would have broken its neck long ago. But this did not occur either in our Party's struggle against these enemies, or in its great struggle against the Khrushchevite and other revisionists.

Our Party's resolute and principled stand against Khrushchev at the Bucharest Meeting came as a surprise, as a bombshell, to some. Because of the still obscure circumstances of the Soviet revisionists' actions at that time, this is understandable up to a point. But our Party was completely clear about the Khrushchevites' betrayal and had taken the definite decision that the resistance to it had to begin.

This decision was taken after a long process of years of normal collaboration with the Soviet leadership which came to power following the death of Stalin. But during this collaboration we were vigilant; at first, some things made an impression on us, later we saw that they were assuming forms that were not in order, were becoming serious. Since then there were frictions between us and the Khrushchevites; we had discussions, sought explanations and opposed some of their actions.

Khrushchev's rapprochement with the Titoites was the alarm signal for our Party. We immediately opposed this action of the Khrushchevites, but they discounted our concern. The struggle started in the Presidium of the CC of the CPSU. This made us even more vigilant. The public denigration of Stalin began even prior to the 20th Congress, at which it reached its climax. Our Party expressed its

dissatisfaction openly and maintained its former stand towards Stalin.

If you examine our Party's practices in relations with the Soviets over this period, then you will form an accurate idea of our careful and cool-headed stand as well as of our efforts to solve the contradictions which had begun to appear, in a friendly and fraternal manner. Our resistance, which was steadily mounting, was known to the Soviet revisionists, hence our stand in Bucharest did not come as a surprise to them.

Prior to the Bucharest Meeting, the Soviet revisionists had started their sabotage and open and disguised threats and blackmail against our country. All these things were planned and were to precede the blow which Khrushchev would strike at our Party and other Marxist-Leninist parties. We understood that the struggle of the Soviet revisionists against our Party was beginning, therefore we decided to accept their challenge whatever the cost, and made everything ready to put forward our views at the Moscow Meeting. The Bucharest Meeting was a warning, a threat to us, also, to submit to Khrushchev, to demonstrate our obedience to him at the Moscow Meeting. However, we gave them our answer beforehand, at the Bucharest Meeting.

The delegation of your Party was present at the Moscow Meeting, heard our speech, heard their speeches, witnessed their bandit-like attacks on us, their behind-the-scenes intrigues and pressures. After the Meeting, the Soviet revisionists broke off all connections with us, and their attack on us reached its crescendo as you know, therefore I need not enlarge upon this. Only I want to emphasize that our Party was not afraid of confrontations, discussions, talks. It was the Soviet revisionists who were afraid of them, therefore they resorted to every means to force us to our knees but they were unable to crush us with the "great weight" and authority of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Neither the one means nor the other succeeded. They began their struggle against our Party openly, and we answered them,

prepared, monolithic, convinced that we were waging a just struggle against a great betrayal and against the biggest traitors the world communist movement has ever known.

Why did the Soviet revisionists act so brutally and unreasonably against the Party of Labour of Albania?

First, because they were inveterate and incorrigible enemies.

Second, because the resistance and the determined struggle of our Party was well based on principles and facts. They were clear that they could expect no opportunist compromise or giving way on principles from us. They made every effort to deceive us, to corrupt us, to discredit and overthrow us. All their plots were defeated. They went to the limit, because, from day to day, our Party's struggle was becoming a greater danger to them; the more the days passed the worse it was for them.

Some friends say that the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union made mistakes in regard to the Party of Labour of Albania, therefore it should correct them. This is true, but it is not the whole truth. The Soviet revisionist leadership made mistakes in regard to Albania because it betrayed Marxism-Leninism, otherwise it would not have made these mistakes. The mistakes of the Soviet revisionists towards us are the result of their betrayal, the logical conclusion of their deviation from Marxism-Leninism. Our Party did not commence the struggle against the Soviet revisionists, proceeding from their mistakes towards us, but because they were betraying Marxism-Leninism. The mistakes they piled up in regard to us were proof of this betrayal, but only a small part of this betrayal. Therefore those friends were gravely mistaken in thinking that the hostile actions of the Soviet revisionists towards us would be corrected as something separate from their betrayal, or that after one or two meetings with the Soviet revisionists, we would be reconciled with them and that the profound, general disagreements on principles which existed between

the Party of Labour of Albania and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union would disappear. In its struggle our Party was not guided by economic considerations, nor by other minor practical considerations which could be solved easily, as some people thought.

Now, I want to explain briefly the reasons for the known stand of our Party in regard to bilateral meetings, to the calling of a meeting of the communist and workers' parties, and the cessation of the polemics.

Prior to and during the Moscow Meeting, we have held bilateral meetings with the Soviet leadership. On their part, these meetings were mean and hostile, all pressure and blackmail. We were convinced at that time, and our conviction was strengthened later, that the Soviets sought meetings with us and the others in order to disguise themselves, to bring pressure to bear on us, to create the illusion that talks were being held and to put the blame on us. After the Moscow Meeting we agreed publicly, in principle, to have bilateral meetings, but we imposed well-based conditions, of which you know. To some, these conditions appeared exaggerated, rather particular, special. In making such a judgement these people were mistaken. These conditions were not imposed to flatter the amour-propre of our Party, but because if they were accepted (which the revisionists could never do), only Marxism-Leninism would have benefited. We knew that nothing of benefit could emerge from meetings with the revisionists either for the Party of Labour of Albania or for the international communist movement, but the thing was that the blame for not going to the meeting should fall on them, and not on us. And this was what occurred. The Khrushchevites were unable to profit from their demagogy. Our principled stand was a modest contribution to the exposure of their betrayal and manoeuvres.

Also for the general meeting proposed by the revisionists, we put forward stringent conditions which are known. Why did we put

forward these conditions? Precisely in order that the meeting should not be held from the positions of the revisionists and to prevent them from achieving what they were aiming at.

We have made an extensive analysis of the revisionists' intentions in regard to this meeting in the public documents of our Party. They were in urgent need of this meeting, for they were in a very grave and difficult situation, while we did not need it, because it was harmful to Marxism-Leninism and because we were in a very strong position. If we were to go to that meeting, we would weaken the position we had already gained and they would exploit it to prolong their existence and carry on their betrayal at their ease, since their sole aim was to have us cease the polemics and to create the impression that work was going on to reach unity.

What does our Party think about the polemics and unity? It has defined its opinion on these two matters, too, in its official and public documents.

There can never be unity of thought and action with the revisionist traitors. Herein lies the source of the polemics which can never cease.

There can be no hope of unity on the basis of demagoguery, speculation, wishful thinking, or sentimentality. The unity of Marxist-Leninists is something entirely different from the unity about which the revisionists are talking and is based on sound principles. If these principles are not fully applied there can be no unity.

To the modern revisionists unity means the cessation of the polemics, failure to recognize their betrayal, continuation of this betrayal, unity on the things that "unite us" (in fact nothing, absolutely nothing unites us, but everything divides us), etc., etc.

This unity can never be acceptable to us. If you accept it you have slipped into revisionist positions, have accepted their whole line of betrayal. Our Party will never fall into this trap. An agreement with

the modern revisionists can begin only when they have condemned their whole betrayal, openly and publicly, and not just in words, but in everything, and when they have made a complete change.

Can the revisionist traitors make such a change? Anyone who thinks they can has no brains. If the revisionists do this (which they will never do), then they will have condemned themselves to death. Other people will come and we shall talk with them. They will be revolutionaries, Marxist-Leninists, but the revisionists will not hand them their head on a platter. The head of the revisionists has to be cut off with struggle, with revolution.

The revisionists betrayed completely and wanted the whole international communist movement to follow their course. This did not and could not happen. The modern revisionists were exposed and are suffering defeat after defeat. They continue to howl about unity, and are striving in a thousand ways to corrupt others in order to achieve at least a compromise, a false unity, an alleged unity. We must fight this manoeuvre and these efforts of theirs with all our might, and with our fight against modern revisionism must temper the true revolutionary unity of the Marxist-Leninists. This is the only correct road for us.

Khrushchev was brought down. This was a victory for Marxism-Leninism, and a major defeat for the revisionists. With due modesty, we should recognize that great merits in this victory belong to our Parties and other parties which take a sound stand, which have been carrying on a stern, unwavering, correct and principled struggle against the traitors to Marxism-Leninism.

But who are these people who have succeeded Khrushchev? They are precisely the same people, the main ones who prepared and carried out the counter-revolution in the Soviet Union, who worked out and implemented the revisionist line, who launched furious attacks on Marxism-Leninism in ideology, politics, organization, the economy,

culture and art, etc., etc.; the same people who attacked and are fighting our Marxist-Leninist parties; the same people who linked themselves with U.S. imperialism and the world bourgeoisie and are working with might and main by all manner of means to temper this alliance against communism, socialism and the peoples of the world.

How can any communist think, for one moment, that with Khrushchev's downfall, something has changed in the Soviet Union, how can he nurture any hopes in these renegades? The new chiefs in the Kremlin are worse than Khrushchev, even more cunning than he was, and their actions are confirming this. Therefore the fight against them must be carried through to the end and more sternly than ever.

We cannot agree with some people to whom the present-day revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union appears "somewhat more positive," and therefore, according to them, "we should try not to be so severe towards them," and other such nonsense, nor with the views of some others, who, although they say that they take a Marxist-Leninist stand, "argue": "As long as the Soviet revisionists do not attack us by name, we shall not name them, while those parties which the Soviets have attacked by name have the right to reply and attack the Khrushchevites by name." Or the other opinion: "We are learning from the struggle against revisionism and from your parties." This is a good thing, and we thank them for their sympathy for our parties. But to learn from others is one thing, and to learn from the struggle which your party should wage itself is another thing. The two should be linked together, co-ordinated.

Since they are unable to stop the polemics, the revisionists are very content if there is only talk about modern revisionism in principle, without stigmatizing them. They will even give you credits and aid to this end. But to close your eyes to this great betrayal, and some are doing this in return for economic aid, does not smell of Marxism.

It is impossible (and in no way permissible) "to keep the goat and

the cabbage together,” in other words, to take a sentimental centrist stand, as some people do, by saying, “We should avoid an open, unrelenting, ruthless fight against modern revisionism, for in this way, even indirectly, we would be attacking the Soviet Union, the first homeland of socialism, the homeland of Lenin and Stalin, the homeland of the great traditions of the Bolsheviks.”

These questions must be separated. It is an historical fact that revisionism, a bourgeois, capitalist, anti-Leninist trend, is in power in the Soviet Union, and that it absolutely must be fought. Never for one moment should we allow the Khrushchevite revisionists to take advantage of a situation of calm to consolidate their treacherous positions. If we hesitate in our struggle against them, tomorrow we shall be obliged to do what we should have done today, and it will be more difficult for us, when the Khrushchevite revisionists have forced Leninism into deep illegality in the Soviet Union. And this day will come if we do not make life impossible for the revisionists right now.

We are not in agreement with, and cannot understand, those parties and those Marxist-Leninists who say they are against modern revisionism and are fighting it, but who do not fight Khrushchevite revisionism openly and consistently.

Modern revisionism is not a shadow but a reality. And we must fight the reality and not the shadow. If we fight the shadow, then we are not Marxist-Leninists, but modern Don-Quixotes.

To sacrifice principles for momentary interests and benefits, to think only about internal national interests, and to lose sight of international interests, lured by the aid, credits, flattery and illusions of the modern revisionists, and first of all, of the Khrushchevites, such things cannot be considered compatible with a Marxist-Leninist stand, no matter how much the bearers of these ideas and actions, which are out-and-out centrist and opportunist, may beat their breasts and swear they are Marxist-Leninists.

Of course, our principled struggle against the bearers of these centrist views will be differentiated from the struggle we are waging and will wage against the modern revisionists, because we must strive to the end to make clear to these people the serious weaknesses of their stands, because amongst them there are also some correct aspects which are of value to us, in order to contrast with their opportunist stands. But despite this fact, which we shall take into account in our relations with these parties or with these individuals, we shall make no concession at all on principles.

The modern revisionists make use of every means to split us because our unity means death to them and to their patrons, the U.S. imperialists. Therefore we must temper this unity under the unflinching guidance of Marxism-Leninism.

The modern revisionists have slogans about unity on the tip of their tongues, but they violate them in pursuit of their own interests and to urge those who do not obey them to a distorted concept and application of these slogans, in order to damage our Marxist-Leninist unity which is based precisely on a correct understanding and application of these principles.

For our parties there is no such thing as commanding and commanded parties, mother and daughter parties, dependent and independent parties, big and small parties, and so on; the only guide for our parties is Marxism-Leninism, and the strength of our unity depends on correct understanding and application of it. In this context, it is impossible not to recognize the merits of one or the other party in the common cause, not to recognize their possible shortcomings and mistakes and not to correct them, while exchanges of opinions and advice between our parties, the threshing out of problems and the finding of a common and more fruitful course of action cannot be considered harmful. This is necessary and in conformity with our principles. Otherwise, there would be no unity, no joint action, and

we would find ourselves disarmed in the face of our savage enemies.

That is how we understand these things. The enemies call us “satellites of China.” This absurd insult does us no harm, provided that our work goes on smoothly. The fabricators of this slander are the very ones who, some years ago, called us “agents of the imperialists,” but time has proved that it is they who are agents of the imperialists, and not we. But to fail to unite to a man in order “to shut the mouths of the revisionist slanderers” (who never stop slandering), and some have this in mind, and thus weaken the links of our unity, this is the greatest mistake that could be made. Our Party has not made this mistake and never will make it.

The Party of Labour of Albania has its own opinions, reached after a thorough analysis. It considers that the situation in the world and the international communist movement is revolutionary, to our advantage and to the disadvantage of our enemies. But the situations must be looked right in the eye and faced up to with courage, because despite the defeats they have suffered and are suffering, the enemies have not laid down their arms. They are continuing and extending their aggressions and preparations for war. We must respond to the enemy’s violence with violence, and not allow him to attack us with shells and napalm, while we fight back at him with cotton wool. The time has come for a blow-for-blow struggle with the enemies of every kind.

U.S. imperialism and world reaction are perpetrating one aggression after another against the peoples in Korea, Vietnam, Laos, Pakistan, the Congo, Santo Domingo, and elsewhere. The Soviet modern revisionists are in close alliance with them, assisting them indirectly in all these aggressions. The modern revisionists themselves have not begun open aggressions, but they will come to this, too. At present they are in the phase of putsches and plots.

At a time when imperialism is attacking the peoples with war and

has created many hotbeds of conflict, the Soviet and other revisionists, with all their means, with their economic strength, with the power of their propaganda and diversion, with the whole gamut of theory and policy and in the other fields of their treacherous activity, are intensively preparing for imperialism the terrain for the open struggle it is waging. We are of the opinion that the thesis of the 1960 Moscow Declaration, "Revisionism is the main danger in the international communist movement," is no longer complete. **Now it has also become the main enemy in the international communist and workers' movement.**

The present circumstances in the world, which we should always have under thorough analysis at the necessary level, call for meetings and consultations among us. The Marxists should face these situations with ever rising revolutionary impetus. Our Party thinks that the times we are living through are not times for never-ending, sterile, academic discussions, but for courageous, militant revolutionary actions, full of self-denial and sacrifice. The modern revisionists and the bourgeoisie with its parties are waging a great propaganda campaign about peace and bourgeois humanism; they want to create the opinion that our revolutionary militancy is "sectarianism, dogmatism," and so on, among vacillating and cowardly elements, both communist and non-communist.

We Marxists are neither sectarian nor dogmatic. We combat these manifestations because they are alien to communists. But to fall apart ideologically, politically and organizationally under the false accusations made by the revisionists with ulterior motives, to tone down or cease the attacks on the enemies, this cannot and must not ever be allowed.

The ranks of our parties must be strongly organized, tempered and ready to fight without let-up. Our parties must be raised to a high level politically, ideologically and militarily and trained to perfection,

not for parades, not just to recite quotations from the classics of Marxism-Leninism, but for struggle, for revolutionary actions. The militant revolutionary spirit of the heroic times of the Comintern in the time of Lenin and Stalin should characterize world communism today. It was not without definite hostile aims that Khrushchev and Co. undertook the struggle to discredit the Comintern.

This is neither the place nor the time for us to discuss and judge the activity of the Comintern. Such a judgement will have to be made at the appropriate time by all of us on the basis of authentic facts assessed within their own circumstances and time, and we must not accept the slanders of the Khrushchevites and their hostile judgements on the Comintern, formed by manipulating the documents, which unfortunately they have in their hands today, to the advantage of their treacherous cause.

Should such an analysis be carried out now? Our Party is of the opinion that our imperative task is not to analyse all the activity of the Comintern, but to take over and study its fine, heroic, revolutionary experience in order to employ it in our actual conditions, and we must not consider it "ancient history," good only for dusty archives, merely because Khrushchev attacked the Comintern.

The Comintern may have committed mistakes in its ideas, actions and organization, but even these errors, if they were made, are lessons to us. However, the great role and work of the Comintern, which gave powerful assistance to the creation, organization and tempering of the communist and workers' parties of the world, are undeniable. It waged a correct and severe struggle against opportunism and all the anti-Marxist trends and exposed them, successfully unmasked the capitalist war, tempered the communist and workers' parties with the doctrine of the revolution, achieved the definite break with social-democracy, mobilized the peoples for the exposure of and the struggle against fascism in the world, and helped the communist and workers'

parties during the Second World War.

Who can say that many present-day situations are not similar to those of the time of the Comintern? Formerly, world communism had the struggle against social-democracy in its ranks, today it has the struggle against modern revisionism. In the opinion of our Party today, **not unity with the revisionists but the definitive split with them** is on the agenda. Today the creation of the new Marxist-Leninist parties and the assistance which should be given them is on the agenda. Today we are confronted with a threat of war from imperialism, social-democracy, and modern revisionism. That is why the mobilization of all the communists and peoples to cope with and definitively defeat the danger is on the agenda.

Is there not a similarity to the difficult times of the Comintern? Can we communists allow ourselves to neglect its great experience, which is the experience of the struggle of the world working class, with its victories, its errors and its shortcomings? The present period is not the same as that in which the Comintern was operating, and I am not saying that we should adopt or copy the forms of work, the methods, forms of organization and leadership of the Comintern, appropriate to that period, with all their good points and defects. No! That would be wrong and inappropriate today, but our Party is of the opinion that the general line of the struggle, the militant revolutionary spirit, the militant understanding and implementation of our theory in struggle against enemies, the creation of contacts for cooperation and coordination in the new present-day conditions are urgently necessary.

Each Marxist-Leninist party is independent in its judgements and decisions, but none of our parties can be independent from Marxism-Leninism, and its decisions cannot be at variance with our revolutionary theory. No party should meddle in the internal affairs of another party, this is a correct principle, but this does not prevent and should not prevent the coordination of actions among parties on the basis of

ENVER HOXHA

Marxism-Leninism.

Our struggle will become even more powerful and we shall score greater results if we are more active in the preparation and multiplication of our attacks, against the imperialists and revisionists.

Sluggishness, hesitation, vacillation will not do in the present situations, which call for courage and maturity. Insipid, weak, opportunist tactics and phraseology will not do in these situations. They should aim at swift militant actions, which will assist our revolutionary strategy every day and every hour.

This does not mean that our parties should not be creative in their tactics, on the basis of the situation that presents itself, in the circumstances in which each of them is working. But neither is it correct, while wanting it to be considered militant, to adopt a tactic of marking time, aiming to take up whatever issue arises, without any international perspective in aid of the world revolution and national liberation struggles.

Selected Works, vol. 3, Tirana
1980, pp. 794-826, Eng. ed.

ON BREZHNEV'S REPORT TO THE 23rd CONGRESS OF THE CPSU

March 30, 1966

The first reading of the short excerpts from Brezhnev's report to the 23rd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union issued by the TASS news agency gives the impression that it is a report with no meat in it, a wishy-washy report, devoid of personality and quite unconvincing on the problems it tries to raise. From this we may draw some conclusions:

— The presentation of problems in such a way as has been done in this report, means further emphasis on the "Christian" policy of peaceful coexistence.

— Further departure from Khrushchev's methods of boastful arrogance and *rodomontade*¹ in regard to us and, naturally, in regard to the Americans.

— Hardly a word addressed to us and the other Marxist-Leninist parties, apart from a hypocritical "sermon" about unity.

In regard to the American imperialists some harmless "pricks" in the elephant's rump, while the tone of the entire report opens brilliant prospects for fruitful Soviet-American collaboration. The only "flaw" in this idyllic tableau is the war in Vietnam. Once that is over, and this emerges from the report, Soviet-American relations will advance. But in fact they are advancing even without the ending of this aggression.

— In regard to the other imperialists, a policy giving them hope, naturally under the American umbrella; the most eulogistic phrases about Gaullist France, for the interests of the moment; less so about

¹ bluster (French in the original).

Britain; some “tear” gas bombs for Bonn and brilliant perspectives for Japan in a somewhat muted tone, but rising to a crescendo on selling the riches of Siberia.

— With the European revisionist allies, apparently “milk and honey,” “complete unity” as never before and this, of course, to conceal the major political, economic quarrels with them over questions of prestige, over their subjection to Soviet influence and plunder, over troop deployments etc., etc., which are undermining their ideological “alliance.”

— With the Vietnamese, the Koreans, and the Romanians the Soviet revisionists seem to be behaving with caution, to avoid breaking the cracked cup completely. They are behaving as towards a patient who has reached the stage of convalescence and they are waiting till they cast the dice and cross the “Rubicon” completely.

— In regard to the internal situation, from the report it can be deduced that the economy is in decline, the organization in every field is taking a downward course, that they are moving towards Titoite self-administration, rather cautiously until the situation has deteriorated completely and then they can make the great leap into the capitalist abyss without any hesitation.

Some mild perfunctory criticism of people of the Sinyarsky ilk and no criticism at all, even formal criticism, of Khrushchev, but on the contrary, complete affirmation of the line of the 20th and 22nd Congresses. The new Khrushchevite line without Khrushchev will be followed from now on.

What I read in this report convinces me that the treacherous revisionists want to imply that, “we held this Congress merely to say that we held it,” hence, with wishy-washy placatory phrases, completely opportunist *verbiage*¹, while their line remains the same as before, that

¹ French in the original.

is:

- Struggle against Marxism-Leninism.
- Degeneration of socialism, freedom for disruption to flourish, for the spread of revisionist ideas, as it pleases each of them, according to the place and circumstances.
- Alliance with the United States of America and the creation, as quickly as possible, of conditions for the capitulation of Vietnam.
- A new division of the world between the Soviet revisionists and the American imperialists, leaving the peoples to warm themselves in their “sunshine.”

On the other hand the report leaves the clear impression that under this Soviet “carpet” there are splits, internal feuds and, contradictions which are boiling up and have found this temporary cover that does not deceive or satisfy any faction. All of them are weak, all are playing for time, trying to gain strength so that the strong can gobble up the weak.

Therefore the very moderate tone of this report indicates great internal weaknesses and opposition.

It is clear that these bland positions which the Soviet revisionists have taken have been dictated, also, by their revisionist allies who are very much afraid of the Marxist-Leninists, the polemics, and the struggle with us and, on the other hand, it is in their interest that the Soviet Union should show itself to be weak, confused and powerless, as it is, in order to strengthen their own positions and their direct alliances with the social-democrats and reactionaries of their own countries as well as with the various imperialists.

The other revisionists will advertise the 23rd Congress but, as they are well aware, this will be advertising a house with a leaky roof and rotten foundations.

It is our task to step up the struggle against them, because our positions are becoming stronger every day, while theirs are being

ENVER HOXHA

weakened, and concrete proof of this is their Congress, a congress of traitors with fear in their bellies, because those who are holding it are hypocrites, allies of American imperialism and the international bourgeoisie.

The Superpowers, Tirana
1986, pp. 185-188, Eng. ed.

THE OFFICIAL PROCLAMATION OF REVISIONISM

The 20th Congress of the CPSU. Khrushchev's theses — the charter of modern revisionism. The "secret" report against Stalin. Togliatti demands recognition of his "merits." Tito in the Soviet Union. Molotov is dismissed from the task of foreign minister. Abortive attempt of the "anti-party group." The end of the career of Marshal Zhukov. Another victim of the Khrushchevites' backstage manoeuvres: Kirichenko. May 1956: Suslov demands that we rehabilitate Koçi Xoxe and company. June 1956: Tito and Khrushchev are displeased with us. July 1957: Khrushchev arranges a dinner in Moscow so that we meet Ranković and Kardelj.

The betrayal at the top of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the country where the October Socialist Revolution was carried out, was an all-round attack on the name and great teachings of Lenin, and especially on the name and work of Stalin.

In the framework of its post-Second World War Strategy, imperialism headed by American imperialism, when it saw the first vacillations and retreats of the new Soviet leadership, further intensified its all-round attacks and pressure to force Khrushchev and company to go further and further down the road of capitulation and betrayal. The "striving" and big expenditure of imperialism in this counter-revolutionary direction were not in vain. Having set out on their course of concessions and betrayal, Khrushchev and his henchmen were continually justifying the long-standing efforts and the old desires of imperialism.

When they thought that they had strengthened their positions, had control of the army through the marshals, had turned the security force to their course, had won over the majority of the Central

ENVER HOXHA

Committee, Khrushchev, Mikoyan and the other Khrushchevites prepared the notorious 20th Congress held in February 1956, at which they delivered the “secret” report against Stalin.

This congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has gone down in history as the congress which officially legalized the thoroughly anti-Marxist, anti-socialist theses of Nikita Khrushchev and his collaborators, as the congress which flung the doors open to the penetration of alien, bourgeois-revisionist ideology in a series of communist and workers’ parties of the former socialist countries and the capitalist countries. All the distortions of the major issues of principle, such as those about the character of our epoch, the roads of transition to socialism, peaceful coexistence, war and peace, the stand towards modern revisionism and towards imperialism, etc., etc., which later became the basis of the great, open polemic with modern revisionism, have their official beginning in Khrushchev’s report to the 20th Congress.

From the time Stalin died to the 20th Congress, the Khrushchevite conspirators manoeuvred cunningly with “bureaucratic legality,” “the rules of the party,” “collective leadership” and “democratic centralism,” shed crocodile tears over the loss of Stalin, thus step by step preparing to torpedo the work of Stalin, his personality and Marxism-Leninism. This is a period full of lessons for the Marxist-Leninists, because it brings out the bankruptcy of “bureaucratic legality,” which represents a great danger to a Marxist-Leninist party, brings out the methods which the revisionists used to profit from this “bureaucratic legality,” brings out how leaders, who are honest and experienced but who have lost the revolutionary class spirit, fall into the traps of intriguers and give way, retreat before the blackmail and demagogy of revisionist traitors disguised with revolutionary phraseology. In this transition period we saw how the Khrushchevites, in order to consolidate their power, operated allegedly with “a great party

THE OFFICIAL PROCLAMATION OF REVISIONISM

spirit,” “free from the fear of Stalin,” with “truly democratic and Leninist forms,” about which they set up a great clamour, while they worked actively to organize the filthiest slanders which only the bourgeoisie has been able to concoct against the Soviet Union, Stalin and the entire socialist order. All these monstrous calumnies of the Khrushchevite revisionists, all their destructive activity, were intended to “prove,” allegedly with legal documents, with “arguments” and “analyses in the new spirit,” the slanders which the reactionary bourgeoisie had been spreading for many years against Marxism-Leninism, the revolution and socialism.

Every good thing of the past was distorted, allegedly in the light of the “new situations,” “new developments,” “new roads and possibilities,” in order to go ahead.

Many were misled by this demagoguery of traitors. However, the Party of Labour of Albania was not misled. It has made a detailed principled analysis of this question and has had its say in defence of the Marxist-Leninist truth long ago.

Together with members of the Political Bureau Gogo Nushi and Mehmet Shehu, I was appointed by our Party to take part in the proceedings of the 20th Congress. The opportunist “new spirit,” which Khrushchev was arousing and activating, was apparent in the way in which the proceedings of this congress were organized and conducted. This liberal spirit pervaded the whole atmosphere, the Soviet press and propaganda of those days like an ominous cloud; it prevailed in the corridors and the congress halls, it was apparent in people’s faces, gestures and words.

The former seriousness, characteristic of such extremely important events in the life of a party and a country, was missing. Even non-party people spoke during the proceedings of the congress. In the breaks between sessions, Khrushchev and company strolled through

the halls and corridors, laughing and competing with one another as to who could tell the most anecdotes, make the most wisecracks and show himself the most popular, who could drink the most toasts at the heavily laden tables which were placed everywhere.

With all this, Khrushchev wanted to reinforce the idea that the “grave period,” the “dictatorship” and “gloomy analysis” of things were over once and for all and the “new period” of “democracy,” “freedom,” the “creative examination” of events and phenomena, whether inside or outside the Soviet Union, was officially beginning.

In fact, the first report delivered by Khrushchev at the congress, which was trumpeted loudly as a “colossal contribution” to the fund of Marxism-Leninism and a “creative development” of our science, constitutes the official charter of modern revisionism. From those days on, the bourgeoisie and reaction gave exceptional publicity to Khrushchev’s “new developments,” spoke openly about the radical changes which were occurring in the Soviet Union and in the political and ideological line of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

While they gleefully welcomed Khrushchev’s great and radical about-turn, reaction and the bourgeoisie, at the same time, did not fail to describe this turn on some occasions as “more dangerous” to their interests than the line of the time of Stalin. Khrushchev and the Khrushchevites used these “criticisms” by the bourgeoisie as arguments to convince the others that the “new line” was “correct” and “Marxist,” but in fact, the fear of the international bourgeoisie had another source: In Khrushchev and his “new policy” it saw not only a new ally, but also a new and dangerous rival for spheres of influence, plunder, wars and invasions.

On the last day, the congress proceeded behind closed doors, because the elections were to be held, and we were not present at the sessions. In fact that day, besides the elections, a second report by Khrushchev was read to the delegates. It was the notorious, so-called

THE OFFICIAL PROCLAMATION OF REVISIONISM

secret report against Stalin, but which had been sent in advance to the Yugoslav leaders, and a few days later it fell into the hands of the bourgeoisie and reaction as a new “gift” from Khrushchev and the Khrushchevites. After it was discussed by the delegates to the congress, this report was given to us and all the other foreign delegations to read.

Only the first secretaries of sister parties taking part in the congress read it. I spent all night reading it, and extremely shocked, gave it to two other members of the delegation to read. We had known in advance that Khrushchev and company had cancelled out the glorious work and figure of Stalin and we saw this during the proceedings of the congress in which his name was never mentioned in favourable terms. But we could never have imagined that all those monstrous accusations and calumnies against the great and unforgettable Stalin could have been put on paper by the Soviet leaders. Nevertheless, there it was in black and white. It had been read to the Soviet communists, who were delegates to the congress, and had been given to the representatives of other parties taking part in the congress to read. Our hearts and minds were deeply and gravely shocked. Amongst ourselves we said that this was a villainy which had gone beyond all bounds, with catastrophic consequences for the Soviet Union and the movement, and that in those tragic circumstances, the duty of our Party was to stand firm on its own Marxist-Leninist positions.

After we had read it we immediately returned the terrible report to its owners. We had no need for that package of filthy accusations which Khrushchev had concocted. It was other “communists” who took it away to give to reaction and to sell by the ton in their book-stalls as a profitable business.

We returned to Albania heartbroken over what we had seen and heard in the homeland of Lenin and Stalin, but at the same time we returned with a great lesson that we must be more vigilant and more alert towards the activities and stands of Khrushchev and the

Khrushchevites.

Only a few days later the black smoke of the ideas of the 20th Congress began to spread everywhere.

Palmiro Togliatti, our near neighbour, who had shown himself to be the most remote and unapproachable towards us, was among the first to come out in his party beating his breast. Not only did he praise to the skies the new “prospects” which the congress of the Soviet revisionists opened, but he demanded that his merits should be recognized as the precursor of Khrushchev in regard to many of the new theses and as “an old fighter” for those ideas. “In regard to our party,” declared Togliatti in March 1956, “it seems to me that we have acted courageously. We have always been interested in finding our own way, the Italian way, of development towards socialism.”

The revisionists of Belgrade rejoiced and aroused themselves as never before, while the other parties of the countries of people’s democracy began, not only to envisage the future, but also to re-examine the past, in the spirit of Khrushchev’s theses. Revisionist elements, who up till yesterday had kept undercover while they poured out their poison, now came out openly to settle accounts with their opponents; the wave of rehabilitations of condemned traitors and enemies erupted, the doors of prisons were opened and many of those who had been condemned were placed directly in the leadership of the parties.

The Khrushchev clique was the first to set the example. At the 20th Congress, Khrushchev boasted that more than 7,000 persons condemned in the time of Stalin had been liberated from the prisons of the Soviet Union and rehabilitated. This process was to continue and be deepened.

Khrushchev and Mikoyan began to liquidate, one by one, and finally all together, those members of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the party whom they were to describe as an “anti-party group.” After they brought down Malenkov, replacing him

THE OFFICIAL PROCLAMATION OF REVISIONISM

temporarily with Bulganin, Molotov's turn came. This took place on June 2, 1956. That day the newspaper "Pravda" carried a huge photograph of Tito on the front page and the *dobro pozhalovat!*¹ to the head of the Belgrade clique arriving in Moscow,² and page four ended a report of daily events with the "news" about the removal of Molotov from the post of foreign minister of the Soviet Union. The report said that Molotov had been released from this position "at his own request," but in fact he was released because this was a condition laid down by Tito for his coming to the Soviet Union for the first time since the breaking off of relations in 1948-1949. And Khrushchev and company immediately fulfilled the condition set by Belgrade for Tito's satisfaction, since Molotov, together with Stalin, had signed the letters which the Soviet leadership had sent the Yugoslav leadership in 1948.

The positions of the revisionist reactionaries were becoming stronger and their opponents in the Presidium, Malenkov, Molotov, Kaganovich, Voroshilov and others, now began to see more clearly the revisionist intrigue and the diabolical plans which Khrushchev hatched up against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. At a meeting of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the party in the Kremlin, in the summer of 1957, after many criticisms, Khrushchev was left in the minority, and, as Polyansky told us from his own mouth, Khrushchev was dismissed from the task of the first secretary and was appointed minister of agriculture, since he was an "expert on *kukuruz*a"³. However, this situation did not last more than a few hours. Khrushchev and his supporters secretly gave the alarm, the marshals surrounded the Kremlin with tanks and soldiers and gave orders that not even a

¹ welcome (Russian in the original).

² Tito visited the Soviet Union from 2 to 23 of June 1956.

³ maize (Russian in the original).

fly was to leave the Kremlin. On the other hand, aircraft were sent to the four corners of the Soviet Union to gather up the members of the Plenum of the CC of the CPSU. "Then," said Polyansky, this product of Khrushchev, "we entered the Kremlin and demanded admission to the meeting. Voroshilov came out and asked what we wanted. When we told him that we wanted to enter the meeting, he cut us short. When we threatened to use force he said: 'What does all this mean?' But we warned him: 'Mind your words, otherwise we shall arrest you.' We entered the meeting and changed the situation." Khrushchev was restored to power.

Thus, after this forlorn attempt, these former co-fighters of Stalin's, who had associated themselves with the slanders made against his glorious work, were described as an "anti-party group" and received the final blow from the Khrushchevites. No one wept over them, no one pitied them. They had lost the revolutionary spirit, were no longer Marxist-Leninists, but corpses of Bolshevism. They had united with Khrushchev and allowed mud to be thrown at Stalin and his work; they tried to do something, but not on the party road, because for them, too, the party did not exist.

All those who opposed Khrushchev, in one way or another, or were no longer necessary to him, were to suffer the same fate. For years on end the "great merits" of Zhukov were publicized, his activity during the Great Patriotic War was used to throw mud at Stalin, and as minister of defence his hand was used for the triumph of Khrushchev's putsch. But later, we suddenly learned that he had been discharged from the functions he held. During those days Zhukov was on a visit to our country.¹ We welcomed him warmly as an old cadre and hero of the Stalinist Red Army, talked about problems of the defence of our country and the socialist camp, and did not notice anything disturbing in his opinions. On the contrary, since he had come from

¹ He visited Albania from 17-26 of October 1957.

THE OFFICIAL PROCLAMATION OF REVISIONISM

Yugoslavia, where he had been on a visit, he told us. “With what I saw in Yugoslavia, I don’t understand what sort of socialist country it is!” From this we sensed that he was not of one mind with Khrushchev. On the very day that he left, we learned that he had been removed from the post of minister of defence of the USSR for “mistakes” and “grave faults” in his application of the “line of the party,” for violations of the “law in the army,” etc., etc. I cannot say whether or not Zhukov was guilty of mistakes and faults in these directions, but it is possible that the reasons went deeper.

In one meeting at Khrushchev’s, their attitude towards Zhukov and made an impression on me. I can’t remember what year it was, but it was summer and I was on holiday in the south of the Soviet Union. Khrushchev had asked me to lunch. The local people there were Mikoyan, Kirichenko, Nina Petrovna (Khrushchev’s wife), and some others. Apart from me, Ulbricht and Grotewohl were there as foreign guests. We were sitting outside, eating and drinking on the verandah. When Zhukov came, Khrushchev invited him to sit down. Zhukov seemed out of sorts. Mikoyan got up and said to him:

“I am the *tamada*¹, fill your glass!”

“I can’t drink,” said Zhukov, “I am not well.” “Fill it, I say,” insisted Mikoyan in an authoritarian tone, I give the orders here, not you.”

Nina Khrushcheva intervened:

“Don’t force him when it harms him, Anastasiy Ivanovich,” she said to Mikoyan.

Zhukov said nothing and did not fill his glass. Khrushchev changed the subject by cracking jokes with Mikoyan.

Can it be that the contradictions with Zhukov had begun to arise as early as that, and they had begun to insult him and to show him that others were giving the orders and not he? Perhaps Khrushchev

¹ master of ceremonies (Russian in the original).

and company had begun to fear the power which they themselves had given Zhukov in order to seize state power, and that is why they accused him of “Bonapartism” later. Could it possibly be that information about Zhukov’s views on Yugoslavia reached Khrushchev before Zhukov returned to the Soviet Union? In any case, Zhukov was eliminated from the political scene despite his four “Hero of the Soviet Union” stars, a series of orders of Lenin, and countless other decorations.

After the 20th Congress, Khrushchev elevated Kirichenko to the top and made him one of the main figures of the leadership, I had met him in Kiev many years before, when he was first secretary of the Ukraine. This big florid-faced man who did not make a bad impression on me, did not welcome me haughtily or as a mere formality. Kirichenko accompanied me to many places which I saw for the first time, showed me the main street of Kiev, which had been built entirely new, took me to the place called Babi Yar, notorious as the site of the massacre of Jews by the nazis. We also went together to the Opera, where we saw a performance about Bogdan Khmelnytsky,¹ whom, I remember, he compared with our Skanderbeg. I was pleased about this, although I was sure that Kirichenko had remembered only the name of Skanderbeg from all that the *chinovniki* had told him about the history of Albania. He did not fail to respond to my love for Stalin with the same terms and expressions of admiration and loyalty. However, since he was from the Ukraine, Kirichenko did not fail to speak about Khrushchev, too, about his “wisdom, ability, energy,” etc. I did not see anything wrong with these expressions which seemed natural to me at that time.

In the Kremlin I frequently had occasion to sit at the table beside Kirichenko and talk to him. After Stalin’s death, many banquets were

¹ Bogdan Mikhailovich Khmelnytsky (1595-1657), leader of the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people against Polish oppression.

THE OFFICIAL PROCLAMATION OF REVISIONISM

organized, because, at that period it was usually only at banquets that one met the leaders of the Soviet Union. The tables were set day and night, laden with food and drink to the point of revulsion. When I saw the Soviet comrades eating and drinking, I was reminded of Gargantua of Rabelais. These things occurred after the death of Stalin, when Soviet diplomacy was carried out through *priyoms*, and Khrushchevite “communism” was illustrated, apart from other things, with banquets, with caviar, and the wines of the Crimea.

At one of these *priyoms*, when I was sitting near Kirichenko, I said to Khrushchev in a loud voice:

“You must come to visit Albania some time, because you have gone everywhere else,”

“I shall come,” replied Khrushchev.

Kirichenko jumped in at once and said to Khrushchev:

“Albania is far away, so don’t promise when you will go and how many days you will stay.” Of course, I did not like this intervention of his and asked:

“Why are you ill-disposed towards our country?”

He feigned regret over the incident, and to explain his gesture, said to me:

“Nikita Khrushchev is not well at present. We must look after him.”

This was just a tale. Khrushchev was as healthy as a pig, and ate and drank enough for four.

Another time (at a reception, of course, as usual), I happened to be seated near Kirichenko again. Nexhmije was with me, too. It was July 1957, the time when Khrushchev had fixed things up with the Titoites and was flattering them, as well as exerting pressure on them. The Titoites seemed to like the flattery, while as to the pressure and the stabs in the back, they gave as good as they got. Khrushchev had informed me the night before, “in order to get my permission,” that

he was going to ask me to this dinner at which Zhivkov and his wife, as well as Ranković and Kardelj, with their wives, would be present. As was his custom, Khrushchev cracked jokes with Mikoyan. This is the way they combined their roles, with Khrushchev accompanying his arrows, trickery, wiles, lies, and threats with jibes at “Anastasiy” who played the “king’s jester.”

When he finished his introduction with jokes with the “king’s jester,” Khrushchev, in proposing a toast, started to give us a lecture about the three-sided friendship that ought to exist between Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, and the four-sided friendship, between the Soviet Union, Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria.

“The relations of the Soviet Union with Yugoslavia have not proceeded in a straight line,” he said. “At first they were good, then they were cool, then they were broken off, and later, following our visit to Belgrade it seemed they were put right. Then the rocket went up (he was referring to events of October-November 1956 in Hungary), and they were ruined again, but now the objective and subjective conditions have been created for them to improve. Meanwhile the relations of Yugoslavia with Albania and Bulgaria have not yet been improved, and as I told Ranković and Kardelj earlier, the Yugoslavs must stop their undercover activity against those countries.”

“It is the Albanians who do not leave us in peace,” interjected Ranković.

Then I intervened and listed for Ranković the anti-Albanian actions, sabotage, subversion, and the plots which they organized against us. That night we had Khrushchev “on our side,” but he soft-pedalled his criticisms of the Yugoslavs.

“I don’t understand this name of your party, the ‘League of Communists of Yugoslavia’,” said Khrushchev, waving his glass. “What is this word ‘League’? Besides, you Yugoslavs don’t like the term ‘socialist camp’. But tell us, what should we call it, the ‘neutral camp’, the

THE OFFICIAL PROCLAMATION OF REVISIONISM

‘camp of neutral countries’? We are all socialist countries, or are you not a socialist country?”

“We are, of course, we are!” said Kardelj. “Then come and join us, we are the majority,” replied Khrushchev.

Khrushchev was on his feet throughout all this discourse, interspersed with shouts and gestures, and full of “criticisms” of the Yugoslavs, which he delivered in the context of his efforts to stand over Tito, who never agreed to consider Khrushchev as the “head” of the council.

Kirichenko, who was beside me, listened in silence, Later he asked me in a low voice:

“Who is this woman beside me?”

“My wife, Nexhmije,” I replied.

“Couldn’t you have told me earlier? I have been keeping my mouth shut, thinking that she is the wife of one of them,” he told me, indicating the Yugoslavs. He exchanged greetings with Nexhmije and then began to abuse the Yugoslavs.

Meanwhile Khrushchev continued his “criticisms” of the Yugoslavs and tried to convince them that it was he (of course, under the name of the Soviet Union and the Soviet communist party), and no one else who ought to be at the “head.” He was getting at Tito, who, for his part, tried to place himself and the Yugoslav party above everyone.

“It would be ridiculous,” he told them, “for us to be at the head of the camp if the other parties did not think us worthy, just as it would be ridiculous for any other party to consider itself at the head when the others do not consider it so.”

Kardelj and Ranković replied coolly, making great efforts to appear calm, but it was very easy to understand that internally they were boiling. Tito had instructed them to defend his positions well and they wanted to do their master’s bidding.

The dialogue between them was dragging on, frequently interrupted by the shouts of Khrushchev, but I was no longer listening. Apart from the reply I gave Ranković, when he made the accusation that we had interfered in their affairs, I exchanged not one word with them. I talked the whole time with Kirichenko, who left nothing unsaid against the Yugoslavs and described the whole stand of our Party towards the revisionist leadership of Yugoslavia as very correct.

But, this Kirichenko, also, was slapped down by Khrushchev later. Although foreign observers for a time considered him to rank second after Khrushchev, he was sent to a small remote town of Russia, without doubt, virtually in exile. One of our military students told us when he returned to Albania:

“I was travelling on a train and a Soviet passenger came and sat down beside me, pulled out the paper and began to read. After a while he laid down the paper and, as is customary, asked me: ‘Where are you going?’ I told him. Noticing the accent with which I spoke Russian, he asked me: ‘What is your nationality?’ ‘I am an Albanian’. I said. The traveller was surprised, but pleased, looked at the door of the carriage, turned to me, and shook my hand warmly, saying: ‘I admire the Albanians’. I was surprised by his stand,” said our officer, “because at this time the fight with the Khrushchevites had begun.” It was the period after the Meeting of 81 parties. “‘Who are you?’ I asked,” related the officer, “‘I am Kirichenko,’ he told me. When he told me his name, I realized who he was,” our officer told us, “and I prepared myself to talk to him, but he straight away said: ‘Shall we play dominoes?’ ‘All right,’ I replied, and he pulled the box of dominoes out of his pocket and we began the game. I quickly understood why he wanted to play dominoes. He wanted to tell me something and to cover his voice with the rattle of the dominoes on the table. And he began: ‘Good for your Party, which exposed Khrushchev. Long live Enver Hoxha! Long live socialist Albania!’ And in this way

THE OFFICIAL PROCLAMATION OF REVISIONISM

we continued a very friendly talk, covered by the rattle of the dominoes. While we were talking, other people entered the compartment. He placed the last domino saying: 'Don't yield, give Enver my best wishes!' and took the newspaper and started to read it as if we had never met," said our officer in conclusion.

Khrushchev and company did everything possible to spread and cultivate their openly revisionist line and their anti-Marxist, putschist actions and methods in all the other communist and workers' parties. We saw how Khrushchevism began to flourish very quickly in Bulgaria and Hungary, East Germany, Poland, Romania and Czechoslovakia. The process of large-scale rehabilitations, disguised as the "correction of mistakes made in the past," was transformed into an unprecedented campaign in all the former countries of people's democracy. The doors of the prisons were opened everywhere, the chiefs of other parties were competing with each other as to who would be quickest to release the most condemned enemies from the prisons, and who would give them the most positions right up to the head of the party and the state. Every day the newspapers and magazines of these parties published communiques and reports about this spring of the revisionist mafia; the pages of the press were filled with the speeches of Tito, Ulbricht, and other revisionist chiefs, while "Pravda" and TASS hastened to report these events and to spread them as "advanced examples."

We saw what was occurring and felt the pressure mounting against us from all sides, but we did not waver a fraction from our course and our line.

This could not fail to anger Tito and company, first of all, because, exalted by the decisions of the 20th Congress and what was occurring in other countries, they expected a cataclysm in Albania, too. The activity of the Titoites who worked in the Yugoslav Embassy in Tirana, against our Party and country, was stepped up.

Taking advantage of our correct behaviour and the facilities we had provided for them to carry out their task, the Yugoslav diplomats in Tirana, on orders and instructions from Belgrade, started to arouse and reactivate their old agents in our country, instructed them and gave them the signal to attack. The attempt to attack the leadership of our Party at the Tirana Conference in April 1956, an attempt which failed, was the work of the Belgrade revisionists but, at the same time, it was also the work of Khrushchev and the Khrushchevites.¹ With their revisionist theses and ideas, the latter were the inspirers of the plot, while the Titoites and their secret agents were the organizers.

When they saw that this plot had failed, the Soviet leaders, who posed as our friends to the death and men of principle, did not fail to make demands and exert pressure on us openly.

On the eve of the 3rd Congress of our Party, which was held at the end of May and the beginning of June 1956² Suslov quite openly demanded that our leadership should “re-examine” and “correct” its line in the past.

“There is nothing for our Party to re-examine in its line,” we told him bluntly. “We have never permitted serious mistakes of principle

¹ Misusing the inner democracy of the Party and taking advantage of the passive stand of the camouflaged enemy Beqir Balluku, at that time the representative of the Central Committee, the revisionist elements created a tense atmosphere at this conference. Through their men who had managed to get themselves elected as delegates they put forward their anti-Marxist platform in the spirit of the 20th Congress of the CPSU and attacked the line and the Marxist-Leninist leadership of the PLA. But as it emerged later, their activity was prepared in secret by the Yugoslav Embassy in collaboration with the Soviet Embassy in Tirana and carried out by the local agents in the Yugoslav secret service headed by the multiple agent M. Shehu whose activity was not yet discovered at that time. (See Enver Hoxha, *Selected Works* vol. 2, the “8 Nëntori” Publishing House, Tirana 1975, Eng. ed., pp. 436-482 and *The Titoites* (Historical Notes), the “8 Nëntori” Publishing House, Tirana 1982, Eng. ed., pp. 586-610).

² The 3rd Congress of the PLA was held from 25 May to 3 of June 1956.

in our line.”

“You should re-examine the case of Koçi Xoxe and his comrades, whom you condemned earlier,” Suslov told us.

“They were and still are traitors and enemies of our Party and people, enemies of the Soviet Union and socialism,” we replied bluntly. “If their trials were reviewed a hundred times, they would be described only as enemies a hundred times. Such was the nature of their activity.”

Then Suslov began to speak about the things that were occurring in the other parties and the Soviet party in regard to looking at this problem with a “more generous,” “more humane” eye.

“This has made a great impression on and has been welcomed by the peoples,” he said. “This is what should occur with you too.”

“If we were to rehabilitate the enemies and traitors, those who wanted to place the country in the chains of a new slavery, our people would stone us,” we told Khrushchev’s ideologist.

When he saw that he was getting nowhere with this, Suslov changed his tack.

“All right,” he said, “since you are convinced they are enemies, that is what they must be. But there is one thing you should do: you should refrain from speaking of their links with the Yugoslavs and should no longer describe them as agents of Belgrade.”

“Here we are speaking of the truth,” we said. “And the truth is that Koçi Xoxe and his collaborators in the plot were downright agents of the Yugoslav revisionists. We have made known worldwide the links of Koçi Xoxe with the Yugoslavs for hostile activities against our Party and country and the great mass of facts which prove this. The Soviet leadership knows them very well. Perhaps you have not had the chance to acquaint yourself with the facts and, since you persist in your opinion, let us present some of them to you.”

Suslov could hardly contain his temper. We calmly listed some of

the main facts and finally stressed:

“This is the truth about the links of Koçi Xoxe with the Yugoslav revisionists.”

“*Da, da,*”¹ he repeated impatiently.

“And how can we distort this truth?!” we asked him. “Is it permissible for a party to conceal or distort what has been proved with countless facts, to please this or that person?”

Suslov snorted, “But there is no other way you can repair your relations with Yugoslavia.”

Everything had become more than clear to us. Behind the “fraternal” intervention of Suslov lurked the Khrushchev-Tito deals. The Tito group, which had now gained ground, was certainly demanding as much as possible space, along with economic, military and political advantages. Tito had insisted with Khrushchev that the Titoite traitors such as Koçi Xoxe, Rajk, Kostov, etc., be rehabilitated. While Tito achieved this aim in Hungary, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia, he was quite unable to do so in our country. In those countries the traitors were rehabilitated and the Marxist-Leninist party leaderships were undermined. This was the joint work of Khrushchev and Tito. With our resolute and unwavering stand towards him, we were a thorn in Tito’s flesh. And if the enemies dared to undertake actions against us, we would counteract. Tito had long known this, and Khrushchev knew it and was becoming convinced of it, too. He, of course, was inclined to restrict Tito’s roads and not allow him to graze in the “pastures” which Khrushchev considered his own.

About 15 to 20 days after the 3rd Congress of our Party, in June 1956, I was in Moscow for a consultation, about which I spoke above, in which the leaders of the parties of all the socialist countries took part. Although the purpose of the consultation was to discuss economic problems, Khrushchev, as was his custom, took the

¹ yes, yes (Russian in the original).

opportunity to raise all the other problems.

There, in the presence of all the representatives of the other parties, he admitted with his own mouth the pressure which Tito had exerted on him for the rehabilitation of Koçi Xoxe and other enemies condemned in Albania.

“With Tito,” said Khrushchev among other things, “we talked about the relations of Yugoslavia with the other states. Tito was pleased with the Poles, the Hungarians, the Czechs, the Bulgarians and the others, but he spoke very angrily about Albania, thumping his fist and stomping his feet. ‘The Albanians are not in order, they are not on the right road,’ Tito told me, ‘they do not recognize the mistakes they have made and have understood nothing from all these things that are taking place.’”

In fact, by repeating Tito’s words and accusations Khrushchev found the opportunity to pour out all the spite and ire he felt against us, because at the congress we did not rehabilitate Koçi Xoxe, “whom Tito described as a great patriot,” stressed Khrushchev.

“When Tito spoke about the Albanian comrades he was trembling with rage, but I opposed him and said to him, ‘These are the internal affairs of the Albanian comrades, and they will know how to solve them,’” said Khrushchev, continuing his “report,” trying to convince us that he had had a great “quarrel” with Tito. However, we were now well aware of the meaning of the never-ending kisses and quarrels between these two heralds of modern revisionism.

Up to his neck in treachery, Tito hatched up numerous plots against the socialist countries. However, when Khrushchev betrayed, he strutted like a “peacock” and posed as Khrushchev’s “teacher.” Tito was quite right to demand a great deal from him, and did not hang back in this direction. He aimed to make Khrushchev obey him and act according to his orders. Tito had the backing of American imperialism and world reaction, therefore Khrushchev, for his part,

followed the tactic of making approaches to Tito, in order to flatter him and win him over, to embrace him and eventually strangle him. However, he was dealing with Tito, who had his own tactic of making approaches to Khrushchev in order to impose himself on him and not to submit to him, to dictate to him and not to take orders from him, to get the maximum possible unconditional aid and to compel Khrushchev to subjugate all Belgrade's opponents, first of all, the Party of Labour of Albania.

It is precisely for these reasons that we see many zigzags in Khrushchev's line towards Tito — sometimes they got on well, sometimes their relations were embittered, sometimes he attacked and cursed him and at other times he retracted only to criticize him again. This was the result of lack of principle in his political stand. Tito and Khrushchev were two revisionists, two agents of capitalism, who had things in common, but also contradictions, which were expressed in the zigzags and erratic behaviour of that time, which continue to this day, between Tito and Khrushchev's heirs.

There was nothing Marxist-Leninist in their actions and stands. They were guided by counter-revolutionary aims and had assumed the leadership of revisionism, which is capitalism in a new form, the enemy of the unity of peoples, the inciter of reactionary nationalism, of the drive towards and establishment of the most ferocious fascist dictatorship which does not permit even the slightest sign of formal bourgeois democracy. Revisionism is the idea and action which leads the turning of a country from socialism back to capitalism, the turning of a communist party into a fascist party, it is the inspirer of ideological chaos, confusion, corruption, repression, arbitrariness, instability and putting the homeland up for auction. This tragedy occurred in the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries. Khrushchev and the Khrushchevites, incited and assisted by American imperialism and world capitalism, created this situation.

THE OFFICIAL PROCLAMATION OF REVISIONISM

The Khrushchevites, Tirana
1984, pp. 183-202, 2nd Eng.
ed.