

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

ENVER HOXHA

**OUR PARTY WILL CONTINUE TO
WAGE THE CLASS STRUGGLE AS
IT HAS ALWAYS DONE —
CONSISTENTLY, COURAGEOUSLY
AND WITH MATURITY**

(From a conversation with Zhou Enlai)

June 24, 1966

ISBN: 978-1-4357-7816-0

THE NOVEMBER 8TH PUBLISHING HOUSE
TORONTO 2022



ENVER HOXHA

Our people have a saying, the waters may sleep but not the enemy. Woe betide those who fall asleep. This will never occur with the Marxist-Leninist parties and all revolutionaries if they keep the sword of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the class struggle and the revolutionary vigilance sharp, if they continue their struggle against imperialism, modern revisionism, internal and external reaction without interruption.

The class enemy is cunning and savage, therefore we must be extremely severe and merciless with him, in life-and-death struggle with him. The enemy is remorseless, therefore we must have no compunction but should destroy him root and branch. We must have no illusions about the enemy and make no concessions to him. This is the principle which has always guided our Party.

We must not allow that catastrophe which occurred in the Soviet Union, the European countries of people's democracy and in many communist and workers' parties of the world, to take place in our countries and parties. Not only must this never occur, but it is a vital duty, a major internationalist task for us, together with the other Marxist-Leninist parties of the world, with the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary groups and all the Marxist-Leninists¹, in Marxist-Leninist unity of

¹ The Marxist-Leninist parties and groups put great hope in the support of the CP of China as «a great Marxist-Leninist party» and in China as «a great socialist country». But they were disillusioned. In connection with this Comrade Enver Hoxha, speaking to a Chinese delegation, stressed: «...It is up to us, to both your big party and our Party, in the first place, to take the first steps to concretize closer, more effective links with the whole world Marxist-Leninist movement, so that our Marxist-Leninist unity is further tempered and our joint activity against our common enemies is strengthened.» («Reflections on China», vol. 1, p. 305, Tirana 1979, Eng. ed.)

Geng Biao, then director of the foreign department of the CC of the CP of China, in a talk he had with comrades of our Party in 1973, has said: «China does not approve the creation of Marxist-Leninist parties and does not want the representatives of these parties to come to China.» (Enver

thought and revolutionary unity of action, to lead the peoples to battle against the current, to overthrow this situation in the international communist movement, to expose, defeat and finally destroy the revisionists and their imperialist bosses.

Irrespective of the putschist and fascist methods that the Khrushchevite revisionists used when they seized power, what happened in the Soviet Union was certainly not a spontaneous phenomenon, but something prepared in advance. The fact that before the death of Stalin, Khrushchev and his main collaborators in the putsch were some of the top leaders who worked under his lap, who made preparations and waited for the suitable moment to act openly and on a large scale, shows this. The fact is that these traitors were conspirators hardened with the experience of various Russian counter-revolutionaries, the experience of the anarchists, the Trotskyites and the Bukharinites, and the experience of the revolution and the Bolshevik Party. They did nothing for the revolution, but on the contrary, did everything in

Hoxha, «Imperialism and the Revolution» p. 442, Tirana 1979. Eng. ed.)

their power to undermine the revolution and socialism, while escaping the blows of the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. In a word, they were counter-revolutionaries and operated in a two-faced way. On the one hand, they sang the praises of socialism, the revolution, the Bolshevik Communist Party, Lenin and Stalin, while on the other hand, they prepared the counter-revolution.

All of us must ask ourselves: Why were they not discovered and dealt with in time? Timely discovery and treatment are of decisive importance in preventing the microbe of a disease from proliferating and gathering strength in a body infected by the illness. To combat and eradicate the disease, to prevent it from breaking out and becoming a danger again, a precise diagnosis is indispensable.

Our Party has been waging a stern, ceaseless and unflinching struggle against Titoite modern revisionism for about 20 years on end and is absolutely clear about the origin, the line, the strategy, the tactics and the methods by which this agency of the bourgeoisie and imperialism conducts its struggle. Our Party has been fighting actively with all its might against Khrushchevite

revisionism ever since it first appeared. It has gained great experience in this struggle, an experience which has been added to that gained in the struggle against the Titoites.

Our Party is of the opinion that the line followed by Stalin during his lifetime was a correct Marxist-Leninist revolutionary line.

Let us take the question of class struggle. Not the slightest criticism can be made of Stalin for an opportunist stand towards the capitalist and imperialist powers. On the contrary, he waged a stern, merciless, blow-for-blow struggle against them. His theoretical and political works, as well as the activities of the Soviet Union in the international arena confirm this. If some weak points of tactics can be found in the policy of the Soviet Union during the whole period of Stalin, tactics dictated by various circumstances, by tactical withdrawals or inadequate judgements due to lack of facts and comprehensive analyses of various circumstances, these do not constitute the essence. The essence was correct. This was a colossal victory for the Soviet Union, for the international communist movement and for the peoples who fought and are fighting against the imperialist powers and fascism. In the light of current events

it becomes even clearer that the correctness of this class stand was the merit of Stalin, because after his death his close collaborators, with the Khrushchevites amongst them, threw this banner in the mud.

Let us examine in broad outline the class struggle within the Soviet Union after the Revolution and during the whole of Stalin's lifetime. In the opinion of our Party there were no errors of principle in the line of the Bolshevik Party in the time of Stalin, while in the tactics, forms and methods errors can be found, but we must take account of the circumstances and conditions of the time and not judge them from our present viewpoint and in the light of the rich experience gained by our parties.

It cannot be said that the dictatorship of the proletariat withered away or slackened during the lifetime of Stalin. On the contrary, it hit the class enemy politically, economically and militarily and liquidated it without mercy. After the triumph of the Revolution, after the seizure of power, after the intervention and NEP, we can say that the capitalist exploiting classes of town and countryside in the Soviet Union had been

dealt a crushing mortal blow. Economically, they were left biting their knuckles, as the saying goes.

However, we cannot say that as long as Stalin was alive the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union operated one-sidedly and was directed solely at the elimination of the economic strength of the exploiting classes and that the political and ideological struggle against them was neglected or weakened. On the contrary, the political and ideological struggle, too, was tremendous. Abundant proof of this is the concrete daily struggle of Stalin, the Bolshevik Party and the entire Soviet people, Stalin's political and ideological writings, the documents and decisions of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the press and massive propaganda of those times against the Trotskyites, Bukharinites, Zinovievites, the Tukhachevskies and thousands of other traitors. This cannot be called anything but a stern political and ideological class struggle in defence of socialism, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the party and the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

Stalin has great merits in this struggle. He showed himself to be a great Marxist-Leninist with clear principles, with great courage and cool-headedness, with the maturity and foresight of a

Marxist revolutionary. We need only think of the strength of the external and internal enemies of the Soviet Union, the only socialist country in the world at that time, of the schemes they concocted, the unrestrained propaganda and the cunning tactics they used, to appreciate properly the correct actions of Stalin at the head of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Were there mistakes, excesses, definitions not always rigorously exact? Of course there were. Now we can analyse and evaluate them more correctly in their context, in the existing circumstances and can say what the consequences would have been if some different action had been taken. But the essence was and is correct. It is hardly possible to criticize Stalin of violation of and failure to defend the Leninist principles, it is difficult or impossible to accuse him of opportunist manifestations in line, of lack of proletarian political and ideological foresight Stalin's revolutionary vigilance is confirmed even in the last years of his life. He discovered and exposed the treacherous

revisionist activity of Tito and Titoism.¹ This is a great merit of Stalin's.

Before he died, and Khrushchev himself has admitted this, Stalin told the Soviet leaders he was afraid they would capitulate to imperialism. And that is precisely what happened. Was this lack of vigilance on the part of Stalin? Was this just a fortuitous remark or was it a conclusion from the profound reflection of a great revolutionary who foresaw the future and warned the Party and the people that they must keep their eyes open, be vigilant and face up to the dangers which might threaten them in the future? Our Party holds the latter to be true.

Then the question arises: if this is how matters stood, why did the Bolshevik Communist Party and the Soviet people allow the Soviet revisionists to seize power?

The seizure of power by the Soviet modern revisionists from within, without using

¹ Allusion to the mistaken views of the Chinese on Titoism and Stalin, which Mao Zedong himself expressed to Comrade Enver Hoxha in 1956, in Beijing, during the proceedings of the 8th Congress of the CP of China. (See Enver Hoxha, «The Khrushchevites» (Memoirs), pp. 241-243, Tirana 1980, Eng. ed.)

weapons or violence, is so to speak, a new phenomenon. We think that in fact Stalin had not envisaged this, for the Soviet Union least of all. He never underrated the ferocity of the elements left over from the exploiting classes who, the closer they draw to their grave, the more fiercely they fight socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat, but we think that considering the state these remnants were in, Stalin assessed the internal situation as sound and correctly foresaw that the ally which could revive these remnants was foreign imperialism.

Stalin put the stress on the danger from outside, while we can say that he did not foresee the full implication of the danger of the revisionist elements who, as a result of many subjective and objective circumstances, might emerge within the party and the socialist state and be gradually transformed, wittingly or unwittingly, consciously or unconsciously, with or without a premeditated plan, into an anti-Marxist trend, especially within the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union itself. He was convinced that if some anti-party hostile activity emerged within the party, this might be developed and organized in the usual ways, but he was

also firmly convinced that this activity would be attacked and liquidated by the same methods and forms that had been used to expose and liquidate all such activities in the past. The fact is, however, that this time matters did not follow the usual course with the anti-party work of the modern revisionists.

As regards the activities of the Yugoslav Communist Party and the Titoite group, Stalin's view was more penetrating and he drew correct conclusions. Proof of this are the letters sent to Tito and the documents of the Cominform which are of great importance and when we read them, now especially, we can form a better judgment of how correct Stalin's class views were.

The Khrushchevite revisionist chiefs concealed their schemes very intelligently by acting under cover of the red flag of Stalin.

We think that there were contradictions and frictions in the leadership of the Soviet Union and we cannot accept the absurd thesis of the Khrushchevites that none of the leaders could open his mouth to express his opinion for fear of Stalin. From what we have heard, Stalin called Khrushchev a narodnik, criticized Voroshilov, Molotov and others. Hence, on the one hand we must

conclude that Stalin was not politically short-sighted while on the other hand, that he did not always use bullets and terror as his enemies claim, but on the contrary used conviction and exchange of opinions.

Although we have no access to the internal documents which would verify many things, it is a fact that Stalin did not detect the danger posed by the traitors Khrushchev, Mikoyan and others, and that the Patriotic War exercised a great influence in this direction. If there is anything for which we can blame Stalin it is the fact that after the war, and especially in the last years of his life, he did not realize that the pulse of his Party was not beating as before, that it was losing its revolutionary vigour, was becoming sclerotic and, despite the heroic deeds of the Great Patriotic War, it never recovered properly and the Khrushchevite traitors took advantage of this. Here, if I am not mistaken, is where we must seek the origin of the tragedy that occurred in the Soviet Union.

The construction of socialism in the Soviet Union and the fight against both external and internal enemies were carried out by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Stalin who led it in a lofty revolutionary spirit. The merciless

blows justly dealt to the Trotskyites, the Bukharinites and others were the logical conclusion of this great class struggle.

All this complex, many-sided struggle rightly enhanced the authority of Stalin and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik). This was positive, but the methods and forms of work which were used in the leadership of the Party had an opposite result.

If a minute analysis is made of the political, ideological and organizational directives of Stalin on the leadership and organization of the Party, the struggle and work, generally speaking, no errors of principle will be found, but we shall see that little by little the Party was becoming bureaucratized, that it was becoming overwhelmed with routine work and dangerous formalism which paralyze the party and sap its revolutionary spirit and vigour. The Party had been covered by a heavy layer of rust, by political apathy and the mistaken idea spread that only the head, the leadership, acted and solved everything. It was this concept of work that led to the situation in which everybody, everywhere, said about every question: «The leadership knows this», «the Central Committee knows everything», «the Central

Committee does not make mistakes», «Stalin said this and that's the end of it». Many things which Stalin may not have said at all were attributed to him. The apparatuses and officials became «omnipotent», «infallible», and operated in bureaucratic ways, misusing the formulae of democratic centralism and Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism which were no longer Bolshevik. There is no doubt that in this way the Bolshevik Party lost its former vitality, it lived by correct formulae, but only formulae; it carried out orders, but did not act on its own initiative.

In such conditions, bureaucratic administrative measures began to prevail over revolutionary measures. After the adoption of these bureaucratic methods and forms of work, the correct revolutionary measures taken against the class enemy achieved an effect opposite to that desired and were used by the bureaucrats to spread fear in the Party and the people. The revolutionary vigilance no longer operated, because it had ceased to be revolutionary, although it was advertised as such. It was being transformed from a vigilance of the party and the masses into a vigilance of the bureaucratic apparatuses and, if not in all aspects, at

least in form, into a vigilance of the security organs and the courts.

It is understandable that in such conditions, sentiments and views which were non-proletarian, not of the working class, took root and developed in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in the ranks of the communists and in the consciousness of many of them. Careerism, servility, charlatanism, cronyism, anti-proletarian morality, etc. developed and eroded the Party from within, smothered the spirit of the class struggle and sacrifice and encouraged the hankering after a «good», comfortable life with personal privileges and gain, and with the least possible work and toil. «We worked and fought for this socialist state and we won. Now let us enjoy it and profit from it. We are untouchable, our past covers everything.» This was the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois mentality which was being created in the Soviet Union and the great danger was that this was developing in the old cadres of the Party with an irreproachable past and of proletarian origin, cadres who ought to have been examples of purity for the others. Many of those who used beautiful words, the revolutionary phrases and theoretical formulae of Lenin and Stalin, who reaped the

laurels from the work of others and who set and encouraged the bad example, were in the leadership, in the apparatuses. A worker aristocracy made up of bureaucratic cadres was being created in the Communist Party of the USSR.

Unfortunately, this process of degeneration developed under the «happy» and «hopeful» slogans that «everything is going well, normally, within the norms and laws of the Party» which in fact were being violated under the slogans that «the class struggle goes on», that «democratic centralism is preserved», that «criticism and self-criticism continue as before», that «a steel unity exists in the party», that «there are no more factionalists and anti-party elements», that «the Trotskyite, Bukharinite groups are a thing of the past», etc., etc. Such a distorted understanding of the situation, and this is where the essence of the tragedy and the fatal mistake lies, was considered even by the revolutionary elements as a normal reality overall, and that is why the idea existed that there was nothing to be alarmed about because the enemies, thieves and violators of morality were condemned by the courts, the unworthy party members were expelled from the Party in the usual way and new members admitted, that the plans were

fulfilled, although some were not, that people were criticized, condemned, praised and so on and so forth. According to them life was proceeding normally and it was reported to Stalin that «everything is in order.» We are convinced that had Stalin, as the great revolutionary he was, been aware of the real situation in the Party, he would have dealt a crushing blow to this unhealthy spirit and the Soviet Party and people would have risen in his support, because they rightly had great faith in Stalin.

But why did Stalin not deal this blow? Could it be that he had reconciled himself to this unhealthy situation, that he was making political and ideological mistakes of principle? Not by any means! We think that on this question Stalin must be defended to the end. Stalin can be criticized because in the last years of his life he weakened his links with the masses of the Party and the people, but he did so only physically and never ideologically and politically. Stalin had confidence in the cadres, but one cannot say that he had confidence only in the cadres and did not have or had lost his confidence in the ordinary people, the masses of party members and the people.

The apparatuses not only misinformed Stalin and bureaucratically distorted his correct directives, but had also created such a situation among the people and in the Party that even when Stalin went among the masses of party members and the people, to the extent that his age and health permitted, the masses did not inform him of the shortcomings and mistakes which occurred, because the apparatuses had inculcated in them the idea that «we should not worry Stalin».

As regards the so-called cult of Stalin, the Khrushchevite traitors propagated it deliberately in order to use it extensively against Marxism-Leninism, as they did in fact. We think that Stalin was a great Marxist on account of his work and his struggle. He was modest and there was no need for the Soviet press and propaganda to inflate his figure in the way they did as long as he was alive. On this question we think that Stalin personally did not take severe measures to ensure that this propaganda was balanced in a Marxist-Leninist manner and to avoid the many negative and dangerous aspects of this propaganda which could conceal and, as the facts showed, did conceal great dangers, because this unbalanced propaganda about Stalin served to conceal such

enemies and traitors as Khrushchev and company, who shouted louder than the others and covered the plot under this disguise. After the death of Stalin, it became clear that these traitors used this unbridled propaganda as a weapon not only against Stalin and the Soviet Union, but also against Marxism-Leninism on an international scale.

We must not blame Stalin for those faults and mistakes which he did not commit, did not want others to commit and which, if he had detected them, he would have attacked mercilessly as a revolutionary. Hence, the grave guilt falls on many others, great and humble, and on the CPSU as a whole, because it did not know how to fight and react powerfully, in a revolutionary way and on the basis of the militant Marxist-Leninist theory, against bureaucratic distortions, and this led to ideological and political distortions, to the creation of the current of modern revisionists who, by awaiting the opportune moment, the death of Stalin, took power from within.

Mikoyan admitted to us that at one time they had decided to assassinate Stalin, but later had abandoned the idea. This is proof not only of the criminal intentions of these bandits, but also of

the fact that, when they decided to kill Stalin, they must have been in danger of being discovered. Had they carried out this attempt, they would certainly have lost and been destroyed, because the entire Party and people would have torn them to pieces. Apparently they decided to wait a little longer. Hence, this group of conspirators, putschists and traitors knew the situation in the Party, knew the cadres and their shortcomings and weaknesses, had quietly placed these cadres in key positions and had devised their tactics and strategy well in advance. It is very important to analyse this.

Molotov and his comrades were old revolutionaries, honest communists, but were the typical representatives of that bureaucratic routine, that bureaucratic «legality», and when they made feeble attempts to use it against the evident plot of the Khrushchevites,¹ it was already too late. Instead the bureaucracy and the bureaucratic «legality» were used by the traitors who covered up their palace intrigue with this «legality» and manoeuvred through their network and the entire stratum

¹ See Enver Hoxha, «The Khrushchevites» (Memoirs), pp. 29-32, 185-187, Tirana 1980, (Eng. ed.).

of bureaucrats of proletarian, and not kulak, capitalist or feudal, origin to seize the reins of the Party and the organs of state power.

Immediately after the death of Stalin, the Khrushchevite plotters manoeuvred deftly with this «legality», with the «rules of the party» and «democratic centralism», with their crocodile tears over the loss of Stalin, while gradually preparing to torpedo his work, his figure and Marxism-Leninism, until all their activity was crowned with success at the 20th Congress and in the crematorium where the body of Stalin was burned. This is a period full of lessons for us Marxist-Leninists, because it highlights the bankruptcy of bureaucratic «legality» which is a great danger to a Marxist-Leninist party, brings out the methods which the revisionists use to turn this bureaucratic «legality» to their advantage, shows how honest leaders, who have experience but have lost their revolutionary class spirit, fall into the traps of conspirators and make concessions, submit to the pressure and retreat in face of the blackmail and demagoguery of revisionist traitors disguised with revolutionary phraseology.

In this transitional period for the consolidation of their power we see how the

Khrushchevites, with great boasting about how they were acting in a «lofty party spirit», «freed from the fear of Stalin», and «in truly democratic and Leninist forms», worked actively to spread the most monstrous slanders which only the bourgeoisie has dared to use against the Soviet Union and Stalin. This whole campaign of slanders supported and tried to prove with allegedly legal documents the slanders which all the capitalists had been making for years against Marxism-Leninism. Everything was used by the Khrushchevites. They searched through the archives, documents and minutes which covered decades of work and from which they extracted isolated ideas and phrases which they quoted to interpret the tactics used in the way that suited them, they even used anecdotes about people's private lives, in one word, they used typical Trotskyite methods of work. All this was done in order to attack the correct revolutionary strategy of Stalin, to attack and undermine the Leninist norms, to attack the Marxist-Leninist ideology with pseudo-legal forms and to discredit Stalin and socialism in the Soviet Union and the world.

The subsequent development of the treacherous work of the Khrushchevite revisionists is well

known. They have taken control of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and enjoy the support of a large stratum of the Party which has been bureaucratized, which has been and is being systematically transformed into a new bourgeoisie. The remnants of the capitalist exploiting classes in the Soviet Union could not attack the dictatorship of the proletariat because they were powerless and defeated, but the lack of revolutionary vigilance, the weakening of the class struggle inside and outside the Party, the enfeebling of the revolutionary spirit in everything, lack of profound revolutionary political and ideological work on a mass scale and the bureaucratization of the Party brought about that a whole stratum of the Party completely lost the features of the proletariat, of revolutionaries, and became bourgeois, created its own cadres in the Party and the state and took power into its own hands. They did what the remnants of the exploiting classes were quite unable to do and now, in this revisionist legality in power the class fusion of these elements against the revolution, Marxism-Leninism and socialism is faking place.

Although the modern revisionists in the other countries where they are in power used the same

means and furthered the same ends as the Khrushchevites who helped them to seize power by all manner of means, it is of great interest to us Marxist-Leninists to study the strategy and tactics used by the traitors to Marxism-Leninism and the role the bourgeois-capitalist classes played in each of these countries. Why? Because in this direction there are marked differences, differences in the waging of the class struggle, in the intensity of the national liberation struggle, in the role of the parties in this struggle, in their line in the struggle for victory, for the liberation of the country, for the seizure and organization of state power and the consolidation of the people's democracy. This process did not take place in the same way everywhere. It took place in different ways in different countries.

Let us take Yugoslavia, for instance. We long ago came to the conclusion not only that socialism is not being built in Yugoslavia now, but that it had never started to be built, that the Communist Party of Yugoslavia was never a Marxist-Leninist party, not only since Tito came to the head of it but also in the time of the Comintern and before the war. From the legal documents of the Comintern we are acquainted with the

rampant factionalist and Trotskyite activity that took place in it. Allegedly it achieved stability with the emergence of Tito, but the fact is that Tito was nothing but a disguised, long-standing Trotskyite agent of capital.

The peoples of Yugoslavia waged a heroic war. This is a fact. There were revolutionary communists in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia who fought heroically. This, too, is a fact. It is also a fact that Tito was at the head of the party, at the head of the leadership of the war, but he was not a Marxist. He was a disguised bourgeois agent who knew how to channel the will and militant vigour of the people for the liberation of Yugoslavia to further his own purposes, how to involve the communists in this war and, at the same time, to liquidate them, to select the right individuals and create a whole team of military and political leaders sharing his own views. During the war, he created and consolidated his staff and his own prestige. Tito and his staff were disguised bourgeois national chauvinists who acted under the guidance of British policy. Although Tito posed as a Marxist and pro-Soviet, if we read those few official Yugoslav documents from the time of the war, we shall see that he had contradictions with

the Soviets and after liberation, especially on the question of Venezia Giulia and Trieste, regardless of whether he was right or wrong on the ethnical aspect in regard to these places, his stand was openly chauvinist, anti-Soviet and anti-Stalin.

Later, the nature of Tito's secret close links with the imperialists and his pursuit of a hegemonic policy in the Balkans and Central Europe, of course in collaboration with the Anglo-Americans, to hinder the development and consolidation of socialism in the countries of Eastern Europe and the Balkans and to bring about the breaking of their friendship with the Soviet Union, became clear. Nowadays, Tito pursues this policy in other forms. The *zadruga* (agricultural cooperatives) of the beginning were only a hoax and were quickly broken up. Hence, socialism in the Yugoslav countryside never got started, but on the contrary the private sector was strengthened and the kulak class developed. Confiscations and nationalizations were carried out in industry too, but these were not for socialist aims, although they were carried out in the name of socialism. It was only natural that the property of the bourgeoisie would pass «into the hands of the people» who fought, but this property was to serve to

consolidate the power of the clique, and very quickly, after their break with us, in the form of self-administration, was to become the property of the new exploiting and oppressing class headed by Tito. After the war, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia became an auxiliary of the UDB, of the apparatus of suppression, and hundreds of thousands of revolutionaries who militated in it were accused of being «Informbureauists» and were liquidated. How things are developing in Yugoslavia now is all too clear.

The time and the moment do not allow us to speak even briefly about Bulgaria, Romania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, etc., as I did about Yugoslavia. You, of course, have analysed them, but the fact is that although the process of degeneration in each of these countries has a generally similar character and features, it also has its own nuances and characteristics of development depending on the conditions I mentioned earlier.

In regard to our country, I do not wish to speak about the great struggle our Party has waged for the construction of socialism, but I want to dwell briefly on the process of the class struggle that our Party has waged and on the course it has

followed for the liquidation of the exploiting classes.

Allow me, comrades, to continue the expose I did not finish yesterday.

The elimination of exploiting capitalist classes as classes is a complicated process which is completed with the construction of the economic base of socialism. However, the struggle against remnants of these overthrown classes and their ideology and world outlook is a long, complicated and very difficult process. How has this process been carried out in our country and what results have been achieved?

The exploiting classes could not be eliminated immediately, either in our country or in the other socialist countries. A fierce political and ideological fight, a violent war with arms, a stern and continuous class struggle under the unwavering leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party is needed **for the proletariat to wrest political power by violence from the hands of the exploiting capitalist class and establish the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat in order to eliminate the economic base of the exploiting class and private**

property in general, to eliminate the capitalist relations of production and establish socialist social ownership and the socialist relations of production, to turn the existing socialist property into the property of the entire people; and simultaneously, to build a new socialist superstructure, by radically purging every remnant of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois policy and ideology from the consciousness of the people.

The process of the abolition of the exploiting classes not only is extremely difficult, but it also depends on several factors:

1) **The strength and all-round organization of the capitalist exploiting class.**

2) **The violence and severity of the armed struggle for the seizure of power by the proletariat, the clarity of the line, the determination and intelligence with which it is consistently and unwaveringly applied by the Marxist-Leninist communist or workers' party which heads the struggle for liberation, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the construction of socialism after the seizure of power and the political and military defeat of the capitalist exploiting classes.**

3) **The consistent construction of a new socialist structure and superstructure, on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the actual material conditions of the country, always keeping the dictatorship of the proletariat as a sharp weapon and having the class struggle as the main motive force until the abolition of world capitalism and the establishment of communism.**

In order to really understand the development of the struggle for the elimination of the exploiting classes in our country, we must know the situation of these classes before the war and during the war, their economic, political and ideological strength, their influence among the broad masses of the people before and after Liberation.

1) Albania has always been a country occupied by foreign enemies and exploited to the bone. Its «independence» was gained late, and even then, if it was not occupied *de jure*, it was occupied economically and politically *de facto*. This situation determined the nature, the strength and the development of the Ottoman feudalism of the exploiting class of the country which supported the policy of the occupiers, the colonial policy of foreigners towards a country with a very backward economy, in which not the

slightest effort was made to embark on the road of capitalist development. Hence, although the feudal lords retained their domination over the land, their estates and the peasantry, thanks to the armies of various occupiers, they had degenerated as a class and were heading towards total elimination.

2) For centuries the Albanian people had been in continual struggle, in uprisings and revolts against the occupiers, against the feudal lords as well as against religion. We can say that this was a continuous anti-colonial, anti-imperialist war and at the same time an anti-feudal class struggle.

The struggle of our people, a people of peasants and herdsmen, is very interesting as regards their twofold, or better threefold liberation from the foreigners, the local landowners and feudal lords and from religion, which served the former two. Hence, the people were continually in struggle against the structure and the superstructure of the feudal-occupier order, in armed struggle or passive struggle, in political and ideological struggle. This kept the flames of the struggle for liberation, of the class struggle and the struggle against feudalism ablaze and contributed

to the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, but it also affected the economic-political power of the feudal class which was becoming extremely weak from the economic aspect and beginning to sell its land and estates partly to the middle peasants and partly to city merchants who were gaining strength.

3) The proclamation of the independence of Albania in 1912 and the entire activity of the country up to the Italian occupation in 1939 did not result in great changes in the ratio of classes. After a series of ups and downs, Zog, the bankrupt representative of bankrupt feudalism, seized power. The clique of Zog was supported by a small army of mercenaries and by fascist Italy, to which it sold mining and land concessions and handed over the organization of the army and the gendarmerie, allowing it to prepare our country for the impending occupation and for use as an armed base for the future wars of fascism.

The population of the cities was relatively increased with the unemployed peasants abandoning the countryside which became even more impoverished than before. Those land-owners and feudal lords around Zog lived on the rent of the land still in their hands, which

they continued to sell to the rich peasants who oppressed the poor and middle peasants. These aghas of the countryside and the cities became the supporters of the Zog regime.

In the cities trade began to revive through terrible speculation with the relations between town and countryside, usury, the purchase and sale of land, and the exploitation of the land rent, without even the smallest investment being made in agriculture. **Those speculator merchants, who supported the feudal semi-colonial regime, were relatively few in numbers and had no great economic power. The main activity of the big merchants who constituted the support of the regime was usury and the monopoly they enjoyed over imports and exports, to the extent the speculation by the Italian fascist trading companies and the deplorable economic situation of the country allowed them.**

This merchant bourgeoisie which was prospering gave little or no consideration to investments of capital for the development of some sort of local industry, and that is why we see that during this entire period **not even a modest industry was set up, with the exception of a few small cigarette factories, a small cement plant, a**

brewery or an oil-press, and even those were owned jointly with Italian capitalists. The dumping of Italian goods impoverished our shops, allowed speculation by usurious merchants who, in partnership with Zog and his clique, lined their purses by acquiring the riches of the country and exporting them to Italy. Handicraft provided the only local industrial products, but it was very backward and relentlessly impoverished as a result of the impoverishment of the people, the heavy taxes and Italian dumping. The urban petty-bourgeoisie was in a deplorable situation, its only means of livelihood being small-scale speculation and employment as clerks. As for the intellectuals, the only source of livelihood was employment in the bureaucratic administration of the regime, a bankrupt bureaucracy which did not pay their salaries for ten months on end.

The great mass of the people, the poor and middle peasantry, the broad working masses of the town, the poor, the workers and craftsmen, were in open class struggle against the clique of Zog, the speculator merchants and the semi-merchants, the semi-feudal rich bourgeoisie of town and countryside. **Hence the period was too short for and the remnants of the feudal class and the**

bourgeoisie which were building up in the countryside and the town proved incapable of strengthening their positions as a dominant class, first of all because of the class resistance of the proletarian masses of town and countryside, and because of the economic weakness of the feudal class and the new bourgeois class, their great cultural and technical backwardness, their medieval world outlook and their policy of enslavement to Italian fascist capital, which had its own pre-determined aims for the complete colonization of Albania, aims which it tried to achieve later, but which encountered the heroic struggle of the Albanian people led by their Communist Party.

In short, we can say that **the occupation of our country by fascist Italy found the capitalist exploiting class of the town and countryside in a state of chaos, politically and economically weak**; it was not the owner of the mining industry, because Italy had concessions over all the existing mines; it had no industry, because, as I said, it dealt only in trade, usury and the rent of land. This new bourgeoisie of town and countryside which was developing, was backward, without culture and education, miserly in the basest sense,

without a political organization and savage and barbarous towards the broad masses of the people; it closed its ranks around the Zog clique and its administration, frequently not because it fully agreed with it, but because thanks to this clique, to its gendarmerie and the links it had with fascist Italy, the new bourgeoisie of our country could continue its speculations and enrich itself.

Thus, the ideology of the regime of Zog and the capitalist exploiting class of the country was robbery, speculation, plunder, the knout, terror and treachery. The development of the exploiting class of our country as a capitalist class cannot be equated with that of the other capitalist countries of Europe.

After the occupation of Albania, fascist Italy tried to hitch these remnants of feudalism, this class of bourgeois merchants, the aghas of the town and countryside, to its chariot to further the interests of colonization and war. In fact it won them over and placed them in its service against the National Liberation War of the people led by the Communist Party of Albania.

Fascist Italy was economically unable to make investments in the economy of Albania, and in any case, the circumstances of the war did not

permit such a thing, so, after the occupation of the country, it interested itself mainly in military projects, in stepping up the extraction of oil to some extent, but only in Kuçova, in ensuring peace in its rear in Albania and in plundering whatever it could lay its hands on in our country. Italy hoped that it would win the war and that Albania would remain its permanent colony. **The impulse which the occupiers gave the Albanian exploiting classes was only by means of speculative trade between Albania and Italy and through this speculation they turned this class into an agent of theirs to strengthen the Italian domination in Albania, to sell land to Italians, to recruit mercenaries and to hurl them into the war against the people who were fighting.**

Thus, the Italian occupation enriched some speculators, who never thought about making investments in the country, but only about accumulating gold, hoarding it, or depositing it abroad for the bad times that would come. **Fascism tried to hand this class the banner of the fascist ideology and to rally people around it with the aim of consolidating the political positions of this class.** However, our fight utterly defeated this scheme. **The banner of the fascist party was**

replaced with the banner of Balli Kombëtar and of some other mushrooming «parties». On the urging of Italian and German fascism, Albanian reaction tried to create a class «ideology» of its own through these traitor organizations which it set up to assist the occupiers and to fight our Party and the National Liberation Front. This was the final desperate attempt which fascism and Albanian reaction made against the war of our people which was led by the Party. **This attempt of theirs was drowned in blood, and Albanian reaction, together with the occupiers, received the final lethal blow.** The exploiting classes of our country suffered the greatest imaginable defeat, political, military and economic. They lost their political and military power forever. The revolution triumphed. The National Liberation War, led by the Party, routed the occupiers and traitors and the regime of people's democracy, the dictatorship of the proletariat was established.

Hence, the National Liberation War exposed in the eyes of the people the exploiting class which had sold itself to the bloodthirsty occupiers and oppressors of the people. The policy and activity of our Party at the head of the people forced this class to take a stand and

tore off its disguises, fought it mercilessly with arms, dealt it countless blows in the direction of physically liquidating a large number of its leaders (the remainder were obliged to flee the country on the ships of the occupiers), it made a deep and sharp differentiation and thus prepared the terrain for the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the construction of socialism and the complete liquidation of the exploiting capitalist classes as classes in our country.

How was this process developed after the seizure of power by the people? How did the Party organize and lead the restriction and, finally, the liquidation of the exploiting classes as such?

The different stages of this great process have been analysed in a Marxist-Leninist way in many important documents of our Party. I shall dwell briefly on the main points.

This political process against reaction and the collaborators with the occupiers continued its uninterrupted build-up from the first days after Liberation. Besides the heavy blows the exploiting classes were dealt throughout the war, in which they suffered total defeat, **they were dealt other crushing blows by the people's courts which**

were set up all over Albania immediately after Liberation. All the collaborators with the occupiers were arrested and brought to trial.

Their continual political unmasking and their fear and terror of the people's courts shattered the ranks of the enemy. The dictatorship of the proletariat struck the enemies of the people mercilessly, discovered the Anglo-American plots, put their agents on trial and condemned them.

The resolute, just, revolutionary blows against the enemies of the people further enhanced the enthusiasm and trust of the people in the Party, in the state and in the weapons of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and created a high revolutionary vigilance among the people which is tempered every day and has become a powerful political weapon of the broad masses against the class enemy and enemies from abroad.

I shall not speak at length about the large-scale nationalizations carried out after Liberation, but I shall dwell on those political and economic measures which were taken against the capitalist class of the city and the countryside and which further propelled the process of its liquidation as an exploiting class.

Extraordinary taxes were imposed on all the merchants and industrialists who had made great profits during the war at the people's expense. This was a radical economic measure which, in fact, led to the confiscation of all their fixed and liquid assets. The majority of these people were put on trial and imprisoned, because the property confiscated did not cover the amount of taxes imposed on them and the court's verdict would be reviewed only when the defendant had completed payment of the taxes, i.e. only when he brought out the gold he had hoarded up. This was a measure of great economic and political importance, because it removed a major capitalist element without, however, as yet liquidating the bourgeoisie as a class.

We did not follow the policy of liquidation towards those merchants who did not qualify for the extraordinary taxes and who were mainly small traders, however, in conformity with the economic and political conditions of the time, we established strict control and restrictions on them, with the aim of barring the way to speculation. Along with the establishment and strengthening of the socialist sector, we fought to achieve the socialist transformation of the small-scale producers

of the city. The opportunist Sejfulla Malëshova tried to distort this correct process by advocating that «the private sector should be given aid in credits and materials by the socialist sector, by the state; the socialist sector should compete with the private sector, and the peaceful integration of capitalism into socialism would be carried out in this way.» **His anti-Marxist theory was rejected by the Party, was exposed among the people and Sejfulla Malëshova was expelled from the Political Bureau of the Central Committee and the Party.**

After a time, the shops of the small and middle merchants, who dealt in industrial goods left over from the period of the war and before it, were emptied; they could no longer buy goods abroad because foreign trade and wholesale trade was the monopoly of the state; the handicrafts sector, which had not yet become cooperative, was not in a position to supply them; **thus, after many vain efforts, most of them were compelled to close their shops, abandon trade and work in production.**

During this time, besides the socialist state sector, the people's socialist controlled sector of consumer cooperatives was also created

everywhere, the handicrafts cooperatives were organized and thus, as we shall see, the state socialist sector and cooperation gradually eliminated the overwhelming majority of the private capitalist elements in the sphere of commodity circulation. Thus we can say that in 1955 small-scale industrial production had been almost totally liquidated and its place taken by the handicraft cooperatives. Unable to survive any longer, small private trade gave way to state trade and consumer cooperatives. Even those few small shopkeepers selling fruit, vegetables and meat that we allowed to continue with their trade, were organized in trading collectives¹ controlled by the state.

That is how the process of the liquidation of the exploiting classes in the city developed and, as a result of this, the capitalist elements, defeated politically and economically, no longer constitute an exploiting class on their own as before. That is why we say that exploiting classes no longer exist in our country, because

¹ They were created in 1958 in order to strengthen state control on the private owners to create the necessary conditions for them to enter the state sector. They were abolished in 1968.

they have been liquidated as such, that only remnants of these classes exist, but despite the blows they have received, these elements still dream of restoration.

How did this process develop in the countryside? Our working peasantry is very patriotic and ardently revolutionary. It participated broadly in the National Liberation War. It had great trust in the line of the Party to which it remains loyal. It was and is whole-heartedly for the alliance with the working class, understands clearly and accepts without the slightest hesitation the leadership of this alliance by the working class. It is loyal to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In these conditions our revolutionary peasantry with ancient traditions, became, under the leadership of the Party, one of the decisive factors in the victory: the liberation of our country and the construction of socialism, especially in the countryside.

I shall not dwell at length on the Land Reform which was completed in the first years after Liberation, a reform which expropriated both the land and the livestock of the beys and aghas of town and countryside, distributed the land and livestock to the poor peasants, and at the same

time created the premises for the establishment of the socialist sector of agriculture.

In this period, the orientation of the Party for the all-round political isolation and economic restriction of the kulaks who constituted the last exploiting class and the potential support for class resistance against the Land Reform and, later, against the collectivization of agriculture, was applied thoroughly and without hesitation. The Land Reform also somewhat restricted certain middle peasants who were not kulaks, but who tended to enrich themselves. However, a correct struggle was waged successfully to unite the middle peasants with the poor peasants against the kulaks and in support of collectivization. The Party carried out a correct political, ideological and economic struggle of differentiation in the countryside.

The collectivization of agriculture was a great revolution of the countryside which continued for some years. It went through several stages and was carried out prudently, with great care, by convincing the peasants and without any compulsion or violence, by doing a great deal of intensive and continuous political work, beginning in the lowlands, in the zones with the most suitable

socioeconomic conditions. The peasants received great economic aid from the state, were provided with agricultural credits and land protection and irrigation schemes, etc., etc. were undertaken. In this way the collectivization was completed with success. The land was not nationalized directly, but through the implementation of the Land Reform large-scale ownership of land was abolished, the basis for the development of capitalism in the countryside was extremely restricted and cooperation was brought about without using intermediate forms based on rent, etc., but directly, through completely socialist forms.

Parallel with the class struggle in the city, the class struggle in the countryside was waged successfully throughout this great process. This class struggle led to the gradual liquidation of the kulaks as an exploiting capitalist class in the countryside.

The following are some figures to illustrate this process of the isolation and liquidation of the kulaks:

The Land Reform expropriated nearly 5,000 kulaks (kulak economies). In 1947, there were still about 2,000 kulak economies. The taxes imposed on these economies were 50-100 per

cent higher than normal, not to mention the other restraints, obligations and political restriction.

Nearly 500 kulak families left the countryside in 1950-1951. In 1955 the land owned by the kulaks constituted 1.7 per cent of the total agricultural land of the country; grain production from this land made up 1.9 per cent of the total; they had 2,200 oxen and buffaloes, 1,900 cows and 20,000 sheep and goats.

By 1955, more than 560 out of the original 2,000 kulak families owned no animals at all and half of this total owned 2 to 3 hectares of land and no more than 10 head of sheep.

In 1962 there were 1,326 kulak families in all, who owned a total of 2,391 hectares of land, 1,645 head of cattle and 12,432 sheep and goats. **They comprised about 0.7 per cent of the total number of peasant economies. This percentage has been further reduced in recent years.**

As a conclusion, the capitalist element does not constitute a class in the countryside either.

I am not going to speak here about the class struggle in the countryside which continues and will continue, or about the intensive political work of the Party among these elements, and

especially among the youth of kulak origin, for their re-education, differentiation, etc., etc.

As a result of this great struggle, the situation and composition of classes in our country in 1960 was as follows:

Working class	22.5 %
Cooperativist peasantry	62.7 %
Intelligentsia	13.6 %
Remnants of exploiting classes divided into:	1.1 %
Kulaks	0.8 %
Speculator elements in the city	0.3 %

The specific weight of the socialist sector in 1960.

National income	90 %
Total industrial output	99 %
Wholesale trade	100 %
Retail trade	90 %
Total agricultural output	80 %

These are the concrete achievements in regard to the situation of classes in our country, achievements which allow us to say that the bourgeois-capitalist class of our country has been liquidated as the main exploiting class. However, the elements and remnants of this class do exist. They have not been liquidated physically and no question of this has ever been raised. What matters is that these elements do not raise their heads, but submit to the laws of the proletarian state and give up their hostile activity. We have created the possibilities for them to work and live like everyone else, but without slackening our vigilance or clamping down on them when necessary; as for their children, we take care to educate them in the new spirit.

As regards the political struggle, the ideological struggle, the education of the masses in the revolutionary spirit, with the ideology of the proletariat, as regards the class struggle against the class enemy, against the capitalist and revisionist idealist ideology and imperialism, as well as the continuous education of the masses for the elimination of vices, superstitions and petty-bourgeois hangovers in all fields and sectors, these are big continuing problems which must be the first

concern of the Party and a primary objective of the struggle of the Party and the working class. If the Party at the head of the masses does not continue this great struggle on all fronts, then the danger arises of the revival and regrouping of elements of the hostile classes, the danger of the creation of a new revisionist class which, as in the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries, seizes power and transforms the country from a socialist country into a capitalist one.

Hence, our Party believes that, notwithstanding that the exploiting classes have been liquidated, the danger of bourgeois and revisionist restoration always exists if you rest on your laurels and do not advance at a great revolutionary tempo, if you are not guided in everything by Marxism-Leninism, if you cease the class struggle instead of waging it consistently and uninterruptedly, if you weaken the dictatorship of the proletariat instead of further strengthening it, if you divorce yourself from the people instead of linking yourself with them as closely as possible, if you prove cowardly instead of being valiant and courageous and in continuous, dauntless, unrelenting struggle against imperialism, revisionists of all hues and all lackeys of the bourgeoisie and capital.

With its usual courage, valour and maturity, our Party will consistently pursue its correct Marxist-Leninist course.

Our Party, at the head of the Albanian people, is aware of the great responsibility it has in this life-and-death struggle against imperialism, modern revisionism and reaction. The main task it has set itself is to keep the revolutionary spirit consistently high, to temper and retemper itself ideologically and politically day by day, to keep its ranks pure, to purge itself of rotten elements, sluggards, mere talkers, careerists and incorrigible bureaucrats through an active struggle within the Party and the real and factual verification of the activity of each party member in struggle and life.

What happened in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will never happen in our Party, because it does and will do continuous, intensive political and ideological work in depth and breadth with the masses, with the aim of ensuring that the entire people understand and apply every directive of the Party and its correct policy in a creative manner, that they work and live every day and every hour as in battle, as in revolution. Only in this way can every attack of the internal and external enemy be smashed. Only in this way will

the activity of any enemy, however sophisticated and disguised, who tries to restore capitalism, be nipped in the bud and defeated. For such a struggle and in such a struggle we are fighting and tempering our Party and people. Aroused, in revolutionary unity of thought and action, the Party and the people are invincible.

The imperialists and modern revisionists thought that the Party of Labour of Albania would be only a morsel they could dispose of at one bite. However, it turned out to be an unconquerable and invincible steel fortress, because its Marxist-Leninist ideology and policy is invincible, is supported and applied by an invincible, fighting, revolutionary people.

In the euphoria of their triumph in the Soviet Union and other countries, the modern revisionists, headed by the Soviet revisionists, tried to throw dust in our eyes, to flatter and deceive us, but they failed, received heavy blows from us and were badly exposed. They still retain their material power and are manoeuvring with it, but they have lost their moral and political power, not only over us, but also over the Marxist-Leninists of the whole world and all the progressive peoples.

The modern revisionists are capitalist-bourgeois and the states which they are leading have been and are being transformed in essence into outright bourgeois-capitalist countries. Only if an armed revolution breaks out within these countries will this course be stopped and reversed. We are helping and must help the revolutionary course to reverse this anti-Marxist, anti-proletarian capitalist course in the communist and workers' movement.

We think that Kim Il Sung and his comrades are mistaken in certain stands of theirs towards Soviet modern revisionism and, unfortunately for the Workers' Party of Korea and the Korean people, if they do not change the course they have taken, they will become modern revisionists like the rest. The truth is bitter but it must be told before it is too late. The theories of Kim Il Sung and the Japanese that «Khrushchev who was bad has been removed, but there is reason to hope that those in power now will correct themselves and one of the ways to help them do so is to unite with them»¹ allegedly against imperialism, show that

¹ The Chinese leaders have also expressed this view. Zhou Enlai expressed this view to our Party when he was

they do not see the issue correctly, that they are no longer able to make true class analyses and are embarking on a dubious course.

As for the Romanian leaders, they are shame-faced revisionists who are trying to steer a middle course which they proclaim as a «wise and flexible» policy, although in fact it is a policy dictated by the great fear that haunts them. The Romanians are afraid of the Soviets, the Bulgarians and the Hungarians and that is why they have linked themselves with Tito, with the imperialists and even smile at us when it suits them. This is what the Romanians call a «special authentic Marxist-Leninist» course. According to them the lines of the Soviets, the Titoites, the Bulgarians, of Kim Il Sung, of the Japanese and many others are all «authentic Marxist-Leninist» lines.

The Romanians raise a hue and cry against the Warsaw Treaty and present themselves as «boldly independent». This is the line of Tito and the imperialists. If Romania left the Warsaw Treaty that would be fine. But where would it go? It would

on a visit to Albania from December 31, 1963 to January 9, 1964, and so did Liu Shaoqi to an Albanian delegation in Beijing, (See «Reflections on China», vol. 1, pp. 116-124, Tirana 1979, Eng. ed.).

get out of the bed of one enemy to get into bed with another. Whether in NATO or the Warsaw Treaty, it's all the same to us. As long as these treaties remain what they are, it makes no difference to us because both of them are fighting us. Even if they fuse into one, they are still our enemies because they are united against us. If on the other hand, they disintegrate and break up they do not do this in the interests of the revolution. What then is the purpose of the Romanian leadership in raising this hue and cry? To show the Soviet Union that they are «strong», because they are with Tito and the imperialists. They do so to assert their territorial claims,¹ to get money from the imperialists as a reward for acting to weaken the Soviet Union, as well as to carry out the capitalist transformation of Romania before the

¹ Two years before this talk took place, Comrade Enver Hoxha wrote on this problem: «Zhou Enlai is making a grave mistake that he is inciting the Romanians to make territorial claims on the Soviet Union... This is neither the time nor the occasion to raise such problems which provide Khrushchev with a weapon to accuse us of being chauvinists. The ideological and political struggle against Khrushchev must not be diverted into delicate questions of territorial claims.» («Reflections on China», vol. 1, p. 74, Tirana 1979, Eng. ed.).

Soviets can launch any attack. They play the Chinese card only for this political expediency and to the extent that it does not harm the policy and general strategy of imperialism.

The Romanians are smiling at us too, they have invited me, several ministers and party workers for holidays, they invite us privately to the meeting of the Warsaw Treaty and similar nonsense. We do not swallow such bait. We shall reply to them openly so that they understand that these manoeuvres will get them nowhere.

The modern revisionists of all hues are engaged in all kinds of manoeuvres not only to dodge the blows they are receiving and avoid further exposure, but also to create the impression that «something is happening, there is something in the air», bestowing a smile here, a smile there, undertaking a «democratic» action or a diplomatic one. These are all forms of an outdated bourgeois diplomacy to which they return for lack of anything better, and use them in the new circumstances after dressing them up in a new cloak. These lackeys are ready to kiss your hand today so as to bite it tomorrow. However, we do not allow them to kiss our hand, let alone bite it! They are terrified of our stands because these correct and

determined stands have smashed and defeated them. **To pursue this Marxist-Leninist policy in a consistent, resolute and revolutionary way means to continue to wage the class struggle in the international arena,** to defeat the imperialist-revisionist alliances against the socialist countries for the domination of the world by capitalism under all kinds of masks and disguises.

The Warsaw Treaty meeting is of no interest to us other than as an object to serve the unmasking of the revisionists whom we are going to expose.

The contradictions between the revisionist cliques which are growing deeper are part of the imperialist chess game, part of the process of breaking, patching up and establishing new bridges between the various imperialists and revisionists. The process of a new integration between them is developing alongside the process of their disintegration.

In Europe, capitalist France, in its own interests, is operating against the American hegemony, exerting pressure on Great Britain and especially on Bonn to detach them from the United States of America and win them over to its side. Its tactic is: the closest possible rapprochement with the

Soviet Union, to use it not only as a means of blackmail against the United States of America and Bonn, but also as a means of penetration into the revisionist countries of Eastern Europe.

The Soviet Union on its part, while safeguarding its major interests with the United States of America, is playing the card of France as blackmail for the opportunist settlement of the German question and the Vietnamese question through the capitulation of Vietnam, which would save the face and prestige of the United States of America in Asia. What it has in mind is, together with the United States of America, to achieve the encirclement of China politically and militarily in new conditions, i.e. that North Korea, too, should be brought into the sphere of this encirclement. The Soviet Union and the United States of America, which are heavily influenced by false euphoria about the capitulation of Vietnam, will not fail to proclaim this capitulation as a «great victory for peaceful coexistence and the peace policy of the Soviet Union and Johnson».

We are of the opinion that all these political developments in the world and especially in Europe will not take place quietly, without sharp contradictions between the various imperialists

and revisionists. However, these contradictions will also give rise to other contradictions within cliques of different tendencies; contradictions between cliques and revolutionaries, the Marxist-Leninist parties and groups which have been and are being formed; contradictions between the revisionist cliques and the peoples of the countries where they are in power.

The fact is that the process of the disintegration of the revisionist countries has not only created political chaos among the people to the disadvantage of the cliques in power, but has also raised problems in industry, agriculture, the economy, the supply system, etc.

Tito plunged the country into economic chaos despite the billions¹ with which the United States of America and others have provided him. The other revisionist countries, which are turning their socialist agriculture into a capitalist agriculture (Yugoslavia has never had a socialist agriculture), are encountering resistance and political and economic difficulties. The abolition of the cooperatives and the process of their

¹ Until 1981, Yugoslavia's foreign debt amounted to 20.1 billion dollars (Tanjug, June 26, 1982).

transformation into kulak property has resulted in the degeneration of agriculture, speculation and impoverishment, and together with this, a mounting wave of resistance.

In industry and the economic sector the revisionist cliques have begun the transformation of the socialist state property into the property of capitalist groups according to the Titoite pattern or with a slight touch-up. Just by looking at the Titoite economy we can envisage what is occurring and will occur in the other revisionist countries which have pinned their hopes on U.S. aid to enable them to follow this pattern. The Americans financed the Titoites generously and achieved their aim. The Yugoslav peoples are now at the end of their tether and this will increase the contradictions and their resistance, but the Americans will be more tight-fisted and merciless with the other cliques which find themselves between two fires, the imperialists and the peoples of their own countries. This contradiction will become more and more pronounced.

The formation of Marxist-Leninist communist parties in the countries where the revisionists are in power will play a decisive role, therefore we must help the new fraternal Marxist-Leninist

parties at all costs, and this is our primary internationalist duty, our revolutionary duty.

We think that the new bourgeoisie which has come to power through the counter-revolution in the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Romania, Mongolia, etc., and which disguises itself with Marxist phraseology, cannot be overthrown except by means of a revolution. The modern revisionists are determined to suppress the revolution with arms, therefore, in those countries especially, genuine revolutionary Marxist-Leninist parties must be created to prepare and lead the revolution. We think that without the formation of these parties which have mastered the doctrine of the proletarian revolution, the past and present experience of revolutionary struggle, which are clear about the struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism and wage it correctly, the revolution cannot be carried out successfully. The revolution needs a leadership with experience, tempered and determined to carry it through to the end.

Of course, we are not going to export revolution or give orders that others must do this or that. Neither is it up to us to support the

revolution in these countries by armed intervention. This is very clear to us.

However, we have a primary duty to help the proletarian revolution in all countries, and in the revisionist countries in particular. The objective and basis of our all-round assistance of every kind should be the stern and uncompromising struggle against the imperialists, headed by the American imperialists, and against the modern revisionists, headed by the Soviet revisionists.¹ The Marxist-Leninists all over the world, the new Marxist-Leninist parties and groups which have been and are being created, are in great need of our political and ideological assistance. The American imperialists and the Soviet revisionists operate on the basis of an identical strategy and co-ordinate their

¹ The Communist Party of China did not come out immediately and openly against the revisionists. Since April 1962 Comrade Enver Hoxha underlined: «The revolutionary communists expect China to come out openly against Khrushchevite revisionism.» But even when it took an open stand against both the Soviet revisionists and the Yugoslav revisionists, the Communist Party of China displayed pronounced opportunist waverings in line and went so far as to seek reconciliation with them. (See «Reflections on China», vol. 1, p. 7, Tirana 1979, Eng. ed.).

tactics, irrespective of the contradictions which they have and which are increasing. They are preparing for war against us and other peace-loving peoples, they are fighting with every means to prepare the counter-revolution in our countries at any cost, to liquidate the staffs of the proletarian revolution in any part of the world. Their «non-interference in internal affairs, defence of and respect for the independence of others», etc., are nothing but empty slogans, demagoguery, and these and many others of this kind are being used as a great hoax to conceal their plots, putsches and any other interference of theirs in our countries and parties. On the other hand, the modern revisionists indulge in political and ideological moralizing, trying to describe our correct, effective and powerful Marxist-Leninist support for the revolution in the world as interference in their internal affairs.

What must our two parties and states, in the first place, and all the Marxist-Leninist parties of the world do? We think that we must be fully armed politically, ideologically, economically and morally and should continue our struggle until we triumph over the imperialists and modern revisionists, should continue our ideological, political

and economic struggle, and if the need arises, we should wage even an armed struggle in defence of our countries and the victories of the revolution.

One of the aspects of preparation for this life-and-death struggle is the successful preparation and the assistance we should give the revolutionaries all over the world and the revolution in the revisionist countries in particular. By this we by no means diminish the colossal, unsparing and all-round assistance we should give to the peoples who are fighting and the Marxist-Leninist parties and groups of the countries of Asia, Africa, Australia and Latin America. This is one of the major questions, but the revolution which must be prepared and break out in the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries is also a major question...

As to how this assistance should be organized, how this struggle should be waged on a more concentrated, world scale against modern revisionism, our Party has communicated some of its ideas to your Party, either directly or publicly through the press. Of course, they are not necessarily complete and always precise, but we still persist in our opinion that our two parties should study this great and urgent question deeply and

come up with a decision on the basis of facts and the new situations which have been created.

The modern revisionists are working actively, inventing numerous «theories» and doing everything in their power to fight the international proletarian Marxist-Leninist unity which spells death for them. From the Khrushchevites to the Romanians they have discredited the great idea of international Marxist-Leninist unity in order to replace it with their revisionist hegemony. **Therefore, we must raise high the great banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, the banner of the steel international proletarian unity and smash any revisionist hegemony.**

Selected Works, vol. 4