

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

ENVER HOXHA

**THE
SUPERPOWERS**

Publisher's Note

This edition of *The Superpowers* has been reprinted
from the “8 Nëntori” Publishing House edition,
Tirana 1986.

THE NOVEMBER 8TH PUBLISHING HOUSE
OTTAWA 2024



ENVER HOXHA

CONTENTS

Foreword	1
June 2, 1959. Khrushchev continues his visit to the South Peng Dehuai has left	6
June 3, 1959. From Khrushchev's stay in Albania	7
June 6, 1959. Some matters from the talks with Khrushchev which arouse doubt	9
January 31, 1960. The Soviets try to brainwash us against China.....	11
March 25, 1960. Policy of softness, compromises and concessions towards American imperialism	12
March 30, 1960. Our suspicions about the improper work of the Soviet geologists are confirmed	13
May 16, 1960. Opposing views with the Soviet ambassador.....	15
May 17, 1960. An abortive conference	16
June 8, 1960. Khrushchev's second letter — what is hidden behind his actions	17
June 21, 1960. A meeting which is turning into a plot.....	19
June 22, 1960. Khrushchev will never deceive the Party of Labour of Albania	20
June 27, 1960. Our struggle against the new, disguised revisionists has begun.....	21
August 6, 1960. Thorez has still not begun to have doubts about the course on which Khrushchev is leading the Soviet Union.....	22
August 16, 1960. They summon us to Moscow to force us to capitulate	23
September 10, 1960. Khrushchev and his col-	

leagues increase the pressure on us.....	24
October 7, 1960. We are not for serenade nocturne	25
November 8, 1960. A dishonourable and anti-Marxist act by Khrushchev.....	26
November 10, 1960. The Meeting of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties of the world has begun.....	27
November 12, 1960. Stormy meeting with the Soviet leaders	29
November 16, 1960. We have done our sacred duty to Marxism-Leninism.....	30
January 18, 1961. The Khrushchevite revisionists exert economic pressure on Albania	31
January 21, 1961. The Soviets have begun to withdraw their specialists.....	33
February 10, 1961. Khrushchev's men organize coups d'etat the same as the CIA agents	34
March 20, 1961. Khrushchev and the Soviet leadership are trying to compromise us through their trickery and actions.....	35
March 28, 1961. Grechko threatens and tries to frighten us.....	38
April 4, 1961. We must denounce the visit of the American 6th Fleet to Yugoslav ports	40
April 5, 1961. We will never allow Vlora to be occupied by Soviet troops	42
April 17, 1961. The American imperialists attack Cuba	43
April 20, 1961. Brilliant victory.....	44
April 21, 1961. A base and shameful act on the part of the Soviets	45
June 2, 1961. The revisionist chiefs pin great hopes	

on Khrushchev's meeting with Kennedy	46
June 6, 1961. A fiasco meeting	47
July 20, 1961. Khrushchev is also a coward	48
July 25, 1961. Kennedy's threat.....	49
August 4, 1961. Flagrant Trotskyite violation of every norm of Marxism and equality	50
October 20, 1961. The Political Bureau approves the statement against the modern revisionists' attacks	52
November 25, 1961. They try to intimidate us, we terrify them.....	53
December 3, 1961. The Soviet government has broken off diplomatic relations with us	55
December 31, 1961. Panorama of the year 1961	56
January 4, 1962. The problem of Germany and Berlin a great worry to Khrushchev	62
February 4, 1962. Khrushchev's "matryoshka"	63
February 12, 1962. Khrushchev's pacifist slogans on disarmament prepare the terrain for imper- ialist wars	64
April 17, 1962. Why has Gromyko gone to visit Tito?.....	65
April 25, 1962. Khrushchev's acrobatic tricks.....	69
April 27, 1962. The Khrushchevites continue to beg for disarmament while the American imper- ialists continue to arm themselves	71
May 25, 1962. A new agreement which will serve the arming and the warmongering plots of the USA and the USSR.....	72
May 31, 1962. Comecon facing great differences....	73
October 22, 1962. Kennedy's warmongering speech	75

October 23, 1962. The Khrushchevites are cowards, compromisers and traitors.....	76
October 27, 1962. Khrushchev capitulated and left Cuba in the lurch.....	77
November 8, 1962. Shame on Khrushchev!	78
December 13, 1962. Khrushchev tries to explain his betrayal.....	79
January 21, 1963. A shameful retreat	81
January 30, 1963. The split in Brussels.....	82
February 3, 1963. Kennedy has recommenced underground nuclear tests.....	83
March 18, 1963. Propagandist of the American way of life	84
April 6, 1963. A direct telephone link between Khrushchev and Kennedy	85
June 12, 1963. Kennedy reveals Khrushchev's course of betrayal.....	86
June 14, 1963. Modern revisionism in the service of American imperialism.....	88
July 26, 1963. Instructions on two notes of protest	96
August 1, 1963. The Khrushchevites' betrayal is clear to all.....	98
January 15, 1964. China's recognition by France ..	101
April 25, 1964. We must expose the revisionist activity in Europe.....	104
October 17, 1964. The fall of the traitor Nikita Khrushchev	109
October 27, 1964. No concessions to the Soviet revisionists!.....	123
November 23, 1964. A barbarous imperialist action against the Congolese insurgents	127

December 5, 1964. We must defend the heroic war of the people of South Vietnam	128
January 4, 1965. At UNO the Americans and the Soviets are intriguing against the peoples.....	131
January 6, 1965. We must give the members of the Warsaw Treaty the proper reply	133
January 8, 1965. Again about the letter which we are to send the member countries of the Warsaw Treaty.....	143
January 25, 1965. On the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty	147
February 9, 1965. The American provocations against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam....	150
February 16, 1965. A just and firm step of our country in UNO	153
February 17, 1985. Sensation in UNO.....	154
February 20, 1965. We exposed the Americans and the Soviets badly in UNO.....	155
April 28, 1965. Aggression of the United States of America in Santo Domingo.....	158
June 12, 1965. About the international situation in the light of current events.....	159
June 17, 1965. We should support the struggle of the Afro-Asian peoples against imperialism.....	165
September 3, 1965. We must be conscious of our great strength	167
October 16, 1965. Collaboration with American imperialism for world domination — the general line of the Soviet revisionist leadership.....	171
January 11, 1966. The comedy of Tashkent	173
March 21, 1966. The Soviet Union is forming new alliances with the imperialists.....	175

March 30, 1966. On Brezhnev's report to the 23rd Congress of the CPSU.....	178
February 20, 1967. The Soviet revisionists are trying to intimidate us	182
July 5, 1967. Tragi-comedy at UNO.....	184
August 11, 1967. The further degeneration of the modern revisionists	188
January 4, 1968. The development of the crisis of capitalism	191
January 5, 1968. Change of lackeys in the revisionist leadership of Czechoslovakia — Brezhnev congratulates Dubček	199
January 6, 1968. The Federal Republic of Germany, Europe and the United States of America	201
March 25, 1968. The meeting in Dresden	208
July 23, 1968. The Soviet revisionists and Czechoslovakia.....	210
August 21, 1968. The Soviet revisionists carry out the military invasion of Czechoslovakia	213
August 28, 1968. The epilogue to the Czechoslovak drama.....	217
September 13, 1968. The People's Assembly of the PRA approved the bill on the denunciation of the Warsaw Treaty.....	220
September 23, 1968. The aim of the Soviet revisionists — the establishment of world hegemony in alliance with the USA.....	221
October 7, 1968. Notes on the speech which our representative will deliver at this year's session of the UNO.....	229
March 5, 1969. The bogey-man Yakubovsky	236

July 29, 1969. Some aspects of the international situation.....	241
February 19, 1970. The Soviets are trying to create big mixed military units with their satellites....	248
March 4, 1970. On the Franco-American contradictions.....	249
March 24, 1970. All-round crisis in the Soviet Union.....	256
May 1, 1970. The American troops have attacked Cambodia.....	264
August 11, 1970. Soviet-West German friendship under American patronage.....	266
September 27, 1970. Nixon's coming to Europe....	272
October 5, 1970. What is hidden behind Pompidou's visit to Moscow?.....	277
January 12, 1971. The Soviet policy towards "friends".....	281
February 11, 1971. The invasion of Laos by the Americans and the Saigonese, a result of the traitorous policy of the Soviet revisionists	289
September 11, 1971. Brezhnev goes to Tito	292
March 27, 1972. Hands off the Balkans!.....	295
May 13, 1972. The United States of America and the Soviet Union sacrifice the vital causes of the peoples for their own interests	297
May 22, 1972. Nixon in Moscow — China is silent.....	302
June 3, 1972. We must denounce and oppose the counter-revolutionary Soviet-American alliance with all our might.....	305
July 5, 1972. American imperialism and Soviet revisionism — responsible for the genocide in	

Vietnam	317
January 15, 1973. Some anti-Marxist statements by Zhou Enlai.....	321
January 25, 1973. Panorama of the current polit- ical developments in Europe	332
February 9, 1973. A shameless attempt of the Soviet revisionists.....	337
June 4, 1973. NATO is showing interest in our country, why?.....	338
June 28, 1973. The new Soviet-American agree- ments — a grave challenge for all the peoples ..	342
July 15, 1973. The small must build a policy of their own.....	353
October 1, 1973. The tragic events in Chile — a les- son for the revolutionaries of the whole world...	355
December 15, 1973. The secret diplomacy of the two superpowers — a great danger to the free- dom and independence of the peoples.....	359
December 14, 1974. The presidents have problems	372
February 25, 1975. American imperialism and Soviet imperialism are preparing the third world war, but are also afraid of it.....	374
April 8, 1975. Another de profundis for the United States of America	378
April 21, 1975. An analysis of the international situation in the light of dramatic events for the United States of America	388
April 30, 1975. South Vietnam has been liberated	394
June 21, 1975. China is getting caught up in the political game of the two superpowers	396
July 31, 1975. The Helsinki conference — a hope- less infernal gamble.....	405

March 1, 1976. Notes on the denunciation of the 25th Congress of the CPSU	412
November 1, 1976. The 7th Congress of the Party opens	416
March 5, 1977. China is aiming to become a super-power	419
September 27, 1977. The multinational companies — a noose around the necks of the peoples	424
December 9, 1977. Things that we must keep thoroughly in mind in the field of the economy in the present international situation	429
January 2, 1978. Carter's policy of out-and-out demagoguery	440
January 25, 1978. Attempts at capitalist "stability"	444
February 18, 1978. The centres of the war for plunder are multiplying throughout the world	448
February 22, 1978. A coordinated Sino-American neo-colonialist tactic	452
May 20, 1978. The use of mercenaries on the agenda	455
August 29, 1978. The triangle of superpowers	460
October 21, 1978. The two superpowers and the other pretenders for world hegemony are endangering the peoples.....	463
October 22, 1978. A Polish Pope at the head of the Vatican.....	472
December 31, 1978. On the international situation during 1978.....	474
March 3, 1979. Imperialist plans and trickery	480
May 13, 1979. An agreement which does not prohibit the continuation of the nuclear armaments	

race	484
June 13, 1979. A formal Parliament	489
July 17, 1979. President Carter's hoax.....	493
August 13, 1979. Great oscillation in the policy of imperialism and revisionism	497
December 31, 1979. Through its intervention in Afghanistan the Soviet Union is carrying out its imperialist strategic plans.....	505
February 13, 1980. Panorama of the international situation.....	509
February 28, 1980. Thoughts on the interview given by Zbigniew Brzezinski.....	517
March 16, 1980. The policy of "non-alignment" — a castle built on sand	527
April 30, 1980. On the international situation.....	533
July 1, 1980. The great world economic crisis is intensifying.....	543
August 14, 1980. Imperialist frictions	556
September 1, 1980. What lies behind the workers' strikes at the Polish Baltic ports?	562
June 1, 1981. On the secret Soviet-Great-Serb collaboration	580
July 15, 1981. Reflections.....	583
February 1982. On the international situation	608
May 10, 1982. The Malvina Islands belong to the Argentine people and state.....	619
October 25, 1983. The United States of America occupies tiny Grenada.....	621
November 30, 1983. "Euro-missiles".....	623
April 27, 1984. Reagan in Beijing	625
June 13, 1984. A grave situation of tension in the	

Persian Gulf	627
June 19, 1984. What is happening in the Soviet leadership?.....	634
June 20, 1984. The two imperialist superpowers and their respective orthodox churches.....	637
December 30, 1984. Panorama.....	639

FOREWORD

In the rich fund of the all-sided creative work of Comrade Enver Hoxha, the beloved and unforgettable leader of the Albanian Party and people, along with the series of volumes of his Works, theoretical books, volumes of reminiscences, correspondence with the people, etc., his Political Diary on International Questions (1958-1984), which is kept in the Central Archives of the Party, takes an important place. Up till now the following publications: "Reflections on China" in two volumes, "Reflections on the Middle East" and "Two Friendly Peoples," have come from this Diary. And now here is a new publication "The Superpowers."

This whole book reflects many acute and important events of international political life which have occurred during the quarter century (June 1959 to December 1984). In particular, while observing all aspects of the policy and stand of the United States of America and the Soviet Union with unremitting attention, in this book Comrade Enver Hoxha makes a profound analysis of them. He explains how the superpowers were created, what they represent and what characterizes their internal and external policies, what is their true nature and strategy, their place and the role which they play in the various political developments of our time.

By means of notes, reflections and political panoramas, written with great passion and expressive and generalizing force, the author makes a wide-ranging analysis of the aims and efforts of American imperialism to establish and extend its hegemony everywhere in the world. By presenting a complete tableau of American policy, from the end of the Second World War to the present day, he exposes the gendarme role of the United States of America, its secret and open economic, political and military interventions and pressures against freedom-loving peoples and sovereign countries in order to subjugate and plunder them.

Likewise, by analysing the retrogressive process which occurred in the Soviet Union when the Khrushchevites came

to power, Comrade Enver Hoxha shows how, at the beginning of the sixties, a new great capitalist and social-imperialist power, thirsting for world domination, was arising and emerging on the world scene. In a number of articles from this period, he points out those features which characterize the Khrushchevite strategy for the transformation of the Soviet Union from a socialist country into an aggressive imperialist superpower. In these aims and feverish efforts to create their empire, the Khrushchevites tried to destroy socialism and the genuine communist parties and to quell the revolutionary and liberation movements of the peoples everywhere. In the Soviet Union and in the other countries of people's democracy they caused the tragedy which we know about, while with the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian people they did not succeed, but failed in their intrigues, conspiracies and open military threats. On what basis did the contradictions arise and the struggle develop between the Party of Labour of Albania and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, what proportions did the struggle assume and how did the Albanian people cope with the difficult situation and the savage blockade of the Soviet revisionist leadership which spoke and acted from the positions of a great power towards a small but indomitable people? This book, which speaks about these stormy events, throws light on these facts of historical importance. This struggle of the Party of Labour of Albania not only saved the Albanian people from a terrible fate, but was also a major contribution to the common cause of the peoples whom it warned from the outset of the new dangers with which they were being threatened by a new superpower disguised with a "socialist" veil.

Being a man of broad erudition and profound knowledge of world political developments, and following and interpreting them from the standpoint of dialectical and historical materialism, in this book Comrade Enver Hoxha penetrates to the essence of questions which are worrying the whole mankind today and reveals the true causes of the continuous increase of international tension and those who are

causing it. With great political and ideological courage, he denounces the superpowers which, through their expansionist and hegemonic policy, have created a threatening, explosive and unstable situation in the world, as well as grave major dangers for the security of peoples and general peace. He exposes the demagoguery about peace and the plots of American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, their secret diplomacy and the intrigues which they hatch up in the United Nations Organization and everywhere else to the detriment of the freedom and sovereignty of peoples. He strongly and publicly condemns their aggressive and reactionary character, their strategy and the fascist doctrines which they have elaborated to put their strategy into practice. In this context, many events such as the Caribbean crisis, the American aggression against Vietnam, the Soviet revisionists' aggression against Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan, the American interference in the Middle East, especially in Lebanon, the invasion of little Grenada, the deployment of new American and Soviet missiles in the European countries and the "star wars" for the occupation of outer space, occupy a special place in this book. In the analysis which he makes of these events, Comrade Enver Hoxha denounces the brutal methods and practices of superpower intervention, the terrorism which the superpowers have raised to a system and transformed into state policy.

The book "The Superpowers" also deals extensively with the Soviet-American collaboration, from its first steps with the establishment of the direct telephone link to the summit meetings between chiefs of American imperialism and the Soviet social-imperialism. A detailed analysis is given both of the idyllic picture of Soviet-American relations and the law of the jungle which exists in these relations. Comrade Enver Hoxha defines clearly that nothing good comes to the world either when the superpowers quarrel or when they are in close alliance with each other. In each case, the peoples pay the cost.

The analysis, facts and events which are presented in the

book inform the reader not only about the strategy and tactics which the two superpowers pursue for world domination, about the specific and common features which characterize them, but also about the relations they have with their "allies," the countries of the West and of the East which they have incorporated in the military blocs of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty. The policy of other imperialist or social-imperialist powers, of "United Europe" and China to become superpowers; their approaches to, collisions and contradictions with the United States of America and the Soviet Union, are dealt with from the same standpoint.

The arguments which Comrade Enver Hoxha puts forward in this book refute the myths spread by bourgeois propaganda about the "invincibility" of the superpowers. He discloses the American and Soviet "Achilles' heel," while making a high appreciation of the great and invincible force of the proletariat and the freedom-loving peoples of the world, who are resolutely and boldly opposing and challenging the aggressive policy of American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and other imperialist powers. Coming out in defence of the lofty aspirations of the peoples, of their just struggle for freedom and independence, Comrade Enver Hoxha says firmly that every people is able to live free and independent in its own country, without holding out a hand to either superpower and without their credits or atomic umbrellas.

The conclusions presented in this book about the present international situation, about the repeated economic, political, moral and ideological crises which are more and more shaking the capitalist and the revisionist world, are of great theoretical and practical value.

This book once again brings out clearly that brilliant course on which socialist Albania has proceeded and is proceeding uninterruptedly, that resolute and courageous struggle which our Party and people have waged against imperialist, revisionist and other enemies to defend not only the freedom and independence of socialist Albania, but also the

just cause of all the freedom-loving peoples of the world. The book is a further testimony to that correct, revolutionary, internationalist policy which the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian socialist state have worked out and always applied in international relations, a policy which is followed and defended loyally by the Central Committee of the Party with Comrade Ramiz Alia at the head.

TUESDAY
JUNE 2, 1959

KHRUSHCHEV CONTINUES HIS VISIT TO THE SOUTH PENG DEHUI HAS LEFT

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

While we were looking at the beauties of Butrint, Khrushchev** 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. Grotewohl*** was with us, too.

Today Marshal Peng Dehuai**** left Albania.

* Ancient city in South Albania.

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

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

**** At that time Minister of Defence of China.

WEDNESDAY
JUNE 3, 1959

FROM KHRUSHCHEV'S STAY IN ALBANIA

When we were looking out to sea from the veranda of the villa at Uji i Ftohtë,* 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!** 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 "Tua-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.

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

** 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.)

Dinner at the Palace of Brigades for the Soviet delegation.

SATURDAY
JUNE 6, 1959

SOME MATTERS FROM THE TALKS WITH KHRUSHCHEV WHICH AROUSE DOUBT

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.* 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

* 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.

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

MOSCOW, SUNDAY
JANUARY 31, 1960

THE SOVIETS TRY TO BRAINWASH US AGAINST CHINA*

Today we went to the home of Mikoyan by his invitation. For five hours on end he tried to brainwash us against China. What evil things did he not say against it!

Everything he told us astonished us, aroused our suspicions, because the way in which he told these things was by no means a correct Marxist-Leninist way. The aim of the Soviets was to line us up against China.

Our comrades who will participate in the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty arrived this afternoon from Tirana.

In the evening we went to Luzhinsky to see the Czech ice ballet. There we met Khrushchev and other Soviet comrades.

* The delegation of the Party of Labour of Albania, headed by Comrade Enver Hoxha, had gone to Moscow at that time to participate in the meeting of the representatives of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries of Europe on the question of the development of agriculture.

FRIDAY
MARCH 25, 1960

POLICY OF SOFTNESS, COMPROMISES AND CONCESSIONS TOWARDS AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

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.

WEDNESDAY
MARCH 30, 1960

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

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.* 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

* 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 Lenin-grad 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.)

up our control on the activity of the groups of Soviet geologists.

MONDAY
MAY 16, 1960

OPPOSING VIEWS WITH THE SOVIET AMBASSADOR

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,* 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.

* This meeting was held on February 4, 1960.

**TUESDAY
MAY 17, 1960**

AN ABORTIVE CONFERENCE

The summit conference in Paris was aborted before it ever got going. The despatch by the American imperialists of their "U-2" spy plane over the air space of the Soviet Union complicated the situation.

My opinion is that the conference won't begin at all,* because the American imperialists will not apologize.

The international situation will be aggravated. On the problems of the international situation up till now Khrushchev has followed the road of opportunism, flattery and concessions towards American imperialism.

* In fact that is what occurred. The summit conference in Paris never met to begin its proceedings, because it was sabotaged by the American imperialists and by the wavering stand of the adventurer Khrushchev.

WEDNESDAY
JUNE 8, 1960

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

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?!* 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.** Another comrade should go, perhaps Comrade

* 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.

** 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 sec-

Hysni [Kapo].* 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.

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

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

TUESDAY
JUNE 21, 1960

A MEETING WHICH IS TURNING INTO A PLOT

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.*

* 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.)

WEDNESDAY
JUNE 22, 1960

KHRUSHCHEV WILL NEVER DECEIVE THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA

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.* After carefully analysing the situation created, we decided what stand Hysni must adopt in the meeting, and communicated this to him urgently.**

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

** Ibidem, p. 8.

**MONDAY
JUNE 27, 1960**

**OUR STRUGGLE AGAINST THE
NEW, DISGUISED REVISIONISTS
HAS BEGUN**

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.

DAJT, SATURDAY
AUGUST 6, 1960

**THOREZ HAS STILL NOT
BEGUN TO HAVE DOUBTS
ABOUT THE COURSE ON WHICH
KHRUSHCHEV IS LEADING THE
SOVIET UNION**

Today I went to Durrës where I met Maurice Thorez* and talked with him about all the vile things which the Soviet ambassador and his associates are doing against our Party. He was indignant and told me that we must not allow them to do such things. When I told him of the measures we had taken to have them removed, he considered these measures correct, but doubted whether the Soviet leaders were aware of these acts which the Soviet diplomats are committing here. I told him that he should have no doubt about that, because everything is done on orders from Moscow. Moreover, I told him about all the ideological and political disagreements which we have with the Soviet leadership. He listened to me attentively and said that these things must be put in order.

My belief is that Thorez has still not begun to have doubts about the terrible course on which Khrushchev is leading the Soviet Union. It will be a headache to him later!

* Former general secretary of the French Communist Party; at that time he was on holiday in Albania.

**TUESDAY
AUGUST 16, 1960**

THEY SUMMON US TO MOSCOW TO FORCE US TO CAPITULATE

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.

SATURDAY
SEPTEMBER 10, 1960

KHRUSHCHEV AND HIS COLLEAGUES INCREASE THE PRESSURE ON US

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.* 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.

* “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?’ Krushchev 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.)

FRIDAY
OCTOBER 7, 1960

WE ARE NOT FOR SERENADE NOCTURNE

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 letter* which I am sending him on some matters which he must bear in mind in the proceedings of the Commission.

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

MOSCOW, TUESDAY
NOVEMBER 8, 1960

A DISHONOURABLE AND ANTI-MARXIST ACT BY KHRUSHCHEV

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.*

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

MOSCOW, THURSDAY
NOVEMBER 10, 1960

THE MEETING OF THE 81 COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES OF THE WORLD HAS BEGUN

The Moscow Meeting of the 81 communist and workers' parties of the world has begun in the "Georgievski" Hall. We have been allocated the place near the tribune (for a purpose),* in the same row as the Koreans. The atmosphere prevailing in the hall was suffocating, like before the outbreak of a storm.

Suslov was the first speaker. He delivered a report on behalf of the Commission which prepared the draft of the declaration.

Today Mikoyan, Kozlov, Suslov, Pospyelov and Andropov came to Zarechie for a meeting. From our side all were present. A dreadful talk.**

Khrushchev's envoys came to deceive us and to "persuade" us to abandon our views and not raise them in the Meeting of the 81 communist and workers' par-

* Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: "There was a tense atmosphere when the meeting opened. Not without a purpose they had put us near the speaker's rostrum so that we would be under the reproving finger of the anti-Marxist Khrushchevite 'prosecutors.' But, contrary to their desires, we became the prosecutors and accusers of the renegades and the traitors. They were in the dock. We held our heads high because we were with Marxism-Leninism. Khrushchev held his head in his two hands, when the bombs of our Party burst upon him." (Enver Hoxha, *The Khrushchevites (Memoirs)*, 2nd Eng. ed., "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1984, pp. 437-438.)

** Published in: Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 19, Alb. ed., "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1975, p. 358.

ties. Not only are they aware of the disagreements which exist between our two parties, because they themselves have caused and are the authors of these disagreements, but Maurice Thorez has informed them about the stand that we shall maintain at the Meeting. They are terrified of this correct, clear, unmasking stand of ours.

The Soviets are employing all their manoeuvres in the contacts and meetings which we have had with them up till now. They are doing this solely to make us yield, but it is useless: at first they attacked us, then they pretended to soften, even made tactical retreats, “acknowledged” a series of faults, tried to butter us up, and even tried to make differentiations amongst us. But every time they received blows they had never even dreamed of from us.

These meetings are proving very well that right is on our side and that we have to deal with revisionists, tricksters, hypocrites, swindlers, shameless individuals that are selling out Marxism-Leninism. They went away from the first meeting with us empty-handed and with “bruised” faces.

**MOSCOW, SATURDAY
NOVEMBER 12, 1960**

STORMY MEETING WITH THE SOVIET LEADERS

At the Meeting of 81 parties the discussion continues and the intrigues of the Soviets continue, also, behind the scenes.

The Soviets have run into trouble with us. Yesterday they sought a new meeting in the Kremlin, this time with delegates of the Presidium of their Central Committee. We went to this meeting. From the Soviet side Khrushchev, Mikoyan, Kozlov, Andropov and others were present. Right from the outset Khrushchev tried to place us in the dock. But we put him there. He declared that he would not withdraw anything that he had said against us and even exerted military pressure by threatening that he might withdraw the naval base from Vlora. But we attacked him hard on this issue and exposed his aims. In a tight spot, he compared the way I spoke to him with the way MacMillan had spoken to him. Then, Comrade Hysni demanded that Khrushchev withdraw this base insult and after this we all stood up, broke off the talks and left the room.

Everything proves that Nikita Khrushchev is a dangerous revisionist. Therefore, we must be very, very vigilant towards him and his group!

MOSCOW, WEDNESDAY
NOVEMBER 16, 1960

WE HAVE DONE OUR SACRED DUTY TO MARXISM-LENINISM

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!"

* See: Enver Hoxha, *Selected Works*, vol. 3, Eng. ed., "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1980, pp. 93-163.

WEDNESDAY
JANUARY 18, 1961

THE KHRUSHCHEVITE REVISIONISTS EXERT ECONOMIC PRESSURE ON ALBANIA

Through our embassy in Moscow, we sent the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union the letter of the Central Committee of our Party* in reply to the note the Soviet government sent us a few days ago on the question of economic relations between our two countries.

In our letter we refer to the shameless pressure the Soviet government is exerting on our Party and government, by demanding that we send a top-level party and government delegation to Moscow in order to re-examine the question of credits, which in fact has already been discussed and settled at top-level meetings of representatives of the parties and governments of both countries. We reject their proposals while, at the same time, demanding that the vice-chairman of the Council of Ministers and president of the State Planning Commission go there just to sign the clearing agreement for the years 1961-1965, which has not yet been signed. Everything else between the two sides has been already settled. In this letter we make it clear that the Soviet government raises the questions in a distorted manner which can be rightly taken as economic pressure exerted by the Soviet leadership on our state and on the Party of Labour of Albania on the eve of our 4th Con-

* Published in: Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 20, Alb. ed., "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1976, p. 27.

gress* in order to create economic difficulties for us.

By demanding that we go to Moscow, Khrushchev wants to impose his will and anti-Marxist views on us. In other words, with his demand he wants to say: "Either your 4th Congress will be held in full conformity with what I dictate to you, or the economic agreements we have already signed become invalid." Thus, in the opinion of this adventurer and blackmailer, our Congress cannot be held.

But we are not afraid of the threats of the Soviet revisionists. We will hold the Congress and deal the Khrushchevites a crushing political-ideological blow.

* The 4th Congress of the PLA held its proceedings from February 13 to 20, 1961.

SATURDAY
JANUARY 21, 1961

THE SOVIETS HAVE BEGUN TO WITHDRAW THEIR SPECIALISTS

Today the Soviet government, through an official of GUES* informed our Minister of Industry, Adil Çarçani, that it is withdrawing 20-25 Soviet specialists who are working in the oil sector under the pretext that “the period of their stay has ended.” It is true that the period of the stay of those specialists in Albania has ended, but for four months our side has been officially requesting the Soviet government to extend this period. The Soviet official told Adil that the Soviet specialists will leave Albania within five days.

A similar thing is occurring with a group of military technicians at the Vlora base. With the work still unfinished, because the necessary materials have not come from the Soviet Union, they were notified to leave our country. These activities undertaken on orders from the Soviet leadership show that the hostile pressure is being stepped up before our Congress. Therefore, it is necessary that we unmask every hostile action of theirs, as they deserve, and that we inform the Soviet leaders by letter that they bear responsibility for everything they are doing in this direction.

* Government Office for Economic Co-ordination.

**FRIDAY
FEBRUARY 10, 1961**

**KHRUSHCHEV'S MEN ORGANIZE
COUPS D'ETAT THE SAME AS
THE CIA AGENTS**

At the meeting we had at the Central Committee with the delegation of the Workers' Party of Korea which has come to our country to take part in the proceedings of the 4th Congress of the PLA, the head of the delegation spoke very well of our Party. He also told us that "that same Ivanov, who was ambassador of the Soviet Union in your country, when ambassador in our country, Korea, in 1956, organized the armed counter-revolution together with a revisionist group, to topple our leadership." What bandits Khrushchev's men are! Like the CIA agents who organize coups d'état throughout the world.

MONDAY
MARCH 20, 1961

KHRUSHCHEV AND THE SOVIET LEADERSHIP ARE TRYING TO COMPROMISE US THROUGH THEIR TRICKERY AND ACTIONS

I received Soviet ambassador J.V. Shikin, who handed me a letter from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in which it is proposed that the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the member countries of the Warsaw Treaty should be held on 28th and 29th of this month. The letter says that the meeting should be held at the top level, that is, with the participation of the first secretaries, prime ministers, ministers of foreign affairs and defence, and chairmen of the planning commissions of each member state.

There are two reports on the agenda: the report of Marshal Grechko on the state of the armies of the member countries of the Warsaw Treaty, and that of the chairman of the Planning Commission of the Soviet Union on the armaments industry and the distribution of weapons.

I asked the ambassador whether there would be a political report at that meeting, and if so, who would deliver it and what the theses were. While asking some other questions "for clarification," I pointed out that before approval was sought from us the theses of the reports and the draft-resolutions of the meeting must be sent to us so that we could go there prepared and not just to say that we had attended.

He did not reply to the questions I asked, because he did not know what to say, but promised that he would refer the matters I raised to Moscow. As can be

seen, the only concern of Moscow and the ambassador is whether we agree unquestioningly that the meeting should be held on the date that they set and whether I shall go there.

Those few meetings of the Warsaw Treaty which have been held up till now have been completely formal, technical meetings without any significance, just to be able to say that a meeting of the Treaty had been held. And this which is summoned now is of a similar nature. Nikita Khrushchev is holding this meeting on account of his plans in the international arena, while as to the deals and combinations which he is hatching up, no one demands an accounting from him. Khrushchev is holding up and refusing supplies of weapons for us. Meanwhile, his aim in asking me to go to Moscow is to make us cover up his sinister plans. However, I shall not go, not only because the matters which will be discussed at that meeting are simply technical military questions for the minister of defence, but also because of all the base and hostile attitudes which all the members of the Warsaw Treaty maintain towards our Party and country.

Of course the provision of weapons has very great importance for us, but they could be supplied to us without any need for us to meet, as Khrushchev demands, because there are agreements on this. This meeting must certainly have political aims, but Nikita will present the political issues in the way that interests him. He will present them as matters of secondary importance that happen to crop up (while they are decisive), i.e., without official reports and decisions, because he violates even those decisions which he himself demands. He pretends to consult the others (while he doesn't do even this with us), and then does whatever he pleases. These actions of Khrushchev's are scandalous and dangerous not only for our socialist countries, but also for all mankind.

A similar procedure was followed at a meeting of this nature a year ago. There Nikita began to talk against the imperialists and, indeed, a decision was taken on the question of the peace treaty with Germany, that we, the socialist states, must “put the imperialists with their backs to the wall” by signing a peace treaty with Democratic Germany, etc. But not one decision of this meeting was carried out because Nikita Khrushchev trampled on them.

The same thing will occur with this meeting, too. Khrushchev’s actions are insulting and destructive. He demands that we sing the descant to his tune and compromise ourselves in his trickery. But we won’t swallow this. Enough of his lies!

TUESDAY
MARCH 28, 1961

GRECHKO THREATENS AND TRIES TO FRIGHTEN US

At 5 a.m. I received a radiogram from our delegation which is in Moscow to take part in the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the member countries of the Warsaw Treaty. The delegation reports that at 23 hours yesterday Marshal Grechko had handed them a letter with aims of intimidation and blackmail. In it he threatened that if we do not agree that the Vlora base should become entirely Soviet and that all the ships should be taken over completely by the Soviets, then he will raise this question at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty and ask the Soviet government to remove the base from Vlora.*

As can be seen, this threatening Soviet demand is similar to the earlier Titoite demand about the dispatch of the "famous" Yugoslav divisions to Albania, a thing which had as its aim the occupation of Albania.** It is clear that the Khrushchev government has the

* Grechko, then commander-in-chief of the armed forces of the Warsaw Treaty, deliberately delivered the letter very late so that the Albanian delegation would not have time to prepare its reply about the question of the base of Vlora. Grechko's letter was completely contrary to the agreements reached in the framework of the Warsaw Treaty, under which the naval ships of this base would be handed over to the PR of Albania after a short period.

** In January 1948, inventing the pretext of the threat of an imminent attack of Greece against Albania the Yugoslav revisionist leadership presented the urgent demand of sending some divisions of the Yugoslav army to Albania in order to make the military occupation of Albania an accomplished

same aim. The Soviets want to violate the treaties and agreements which have been signed, to have Vlora as their base and do whatever they want there. But we will never let them get away with these things. Therefore, I instructed the comrades of the delegation that they should reply to the Soviets blow for blow,* and Grechko received his reply today, March 28, before he could deliver this report to the meeting.

In fact, in his report Marshal Grechko did not mention the question of the base at all. Apparently, at least our reply made the Marshal retreat from his vile act. We shall see what Khrushchev and the other participants have to say when they make their speeches. However they act, we have our reply ready. Whoever dares harm the interests of our people, our Homeland and our Party, will get such a blow as they will never forget.

fact. This plan of the Titoite leadership failed in face of the determination of the CPA and Comrade Enver Hoxha who did not allow the Yugoslav troops to enter Albania. (See: Enver Hoxha, *The Titoites (Historical Notes)*, Eng. ed., "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1982, pp. 439-446.)

* The radiogram which Comrade Enver Hoxha sent to the Albanian delegation attending the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty, on March 28, 1961 at 7:30, pointed out:

"The question of the base: The Albanian government refuses to permit the slightest alteration to the existing status quo defined in the official agreement between the two governments... You must emphasize that any decision they may take in regard to the removal of the base and the failure to supply it with armaments according to agreements and contracts weakens the defence of the socialist camp and Albania, and the entire responsibility for this falls on them." (Published in: Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 20, Alb. ed., "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1976, pp. 368-369.)

TUESDAY
APRIL 4, 1961

WE MUST DENOUNCE THE VISIT OF THE AMERICAN 6TH FLEET TO YUGOSLAV PORTS

I had another look at my article* on the visit of the commander of the American 6th Fleet to Yugoslav ports. I altered the title of the article and placed more stress on some parts of it, especially the part that speaks about the joint plots which the Yugoslavs and Americans are hatching up against our country.

Among other things, I stressed that visits of this nature by naval units and admirals of the American 6th Fleet to Yugoslav waters and ports are not taking place for the first time and are not accidental. The American navy sails the waters of the Mediterranean and the Adriatic with “haughty” aggressiveness, as if they were the territorial waters of the USA.

It is evident that the commander of the American 6th Fleet is not going to Yugoslavia on a tourist visit on a cruiser equipped with telecommanded missiles and with 1,000 marines on board. He is going to his friends, to those who have a common language with him.

Rear-admiral George Anderson is visiting Yugoslavia only a few weeks after we publicly denounced from the tribune of the 4th Congress of the PLA the dangerous plot hatched up against the independence of Albania by Yugoslavia and Greek reaction in collaboration with the American 6th Fleet, and some Albanian traitors, a plot which was crushed and which blew up in their hands.

* Published in the newspaper *Zëri i popullit* on April 8, 1961 under the title “Warships of the American 6th Fleet in the Yugoslav Ports.”

Everyone knows that the American 6th Fleet is the main aggressive striking force of American imperialism and NATO in the Mediterranean. It is on continual patrol, demonstrating and threatening, trying to show the peoples around the Mediterranean shores that any attempt of theirs to win freedom and for a better life will be replied to with the weapons of that fleet and the bayonets of the marines aboard the cruisers. The American 6th Fleet is always ready to hurl itself furiously against the independence of the peoples. The events in the Near East and the landing of the marines in Lebanon demonstrated this clearly.

The peoples are watching this activity of the American imperialists and their allies with vigilance. The vigilance of the Albanian people and their Party of Labour is becoming ever greater. The new Albania of the people will never forget its national and international duties.

**WEDNESDAY
APRIL 5, 1961**

WE WILL NEVER ALLOW VLORA TO BE OCCUPIED BY SOVIET TROOPS

We handed the ambassadors of the countries of people's democracy and of the Soviet Union the letter of our government to their governments in connection with the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty and the decision taken there on the future of the Vlora base.* We make it clear in the letter that we refuse to allow the Soviets to take control of the Vlora base. The warships of the base must be handed over to us as soon as possible because, on the basis of existing agreements, they belong to us. Otherwise our government demands that the Soviet military personnel be withdrawn from the base because in this situation this would be the best and most desirable solution for us. We will never allow Vlora to be occupied by Soviet troops. We will defend ourselves against the imperialist danger even without the base, but if we accept Khrushchev's demand the Vlora base will become a great danger to the independence of our Homeland and of the neighbouring countries...

* At this meeting Khrushchev and his followers took the decision to cut off all arms supplies and economic aid accorded to the PR of Albania on the basis of previously signed agreements, and to dismantle the naval base of Vlora.

MONDAY
APRIL 17, 1961

THE AMERICAN IMPERIALISTS ATTACK CUBA

At 5 o'clock this morning the Americans and the Cuban mercenaries attacked Cuba.* The fighting began. The heroic Cuban people will not be conquered!

Khrushchev's empty boasting that he would launch his missiles were shown up for what they are in reality. How false sounds the famous "peaceful road" for the taking of power which the revisionists Khrushchev, Gomulka, Togliatti and company preach! Not only will the bourgeoisie not relinquish power, unless it is seized by violence, but even when you have seized it by violence, the bourgeoisie will attack you to rob you of it. Cuba will suffer, but the great betrayal of the revisionists, headed by Khrushchev and company, will be exposed in the eyes of the peoples and the genuine communists.

* On April 15 and 16, American "B-26" aircraft bombed Havana and some other Cuban cities. Landings were made at different points in Oriente province, including the Bay of Pigs.

**THURSDAY
APRIL 20, 1961**

BRILLIANT VICTORY

The Cubans triumphed. The attack of the American imperialists and their mercenaries was smashed and the counter-revolutionaries were wiped out. Castro announced this today.

A brilliant victory! A great victory for Cuba, a great victory for us and the revolution in general. Confirmation of the correct line of our Party, defeat for the opportunist-revisionist line of Khrushchev and company, defeat for the policy of flattery, smiles and concessions to the imperialists. Defeat for the American imperialists. The plans of the American imperialists, Yugoslav revisionists and the Greek monarcho-fascists who are plotting against us will be defeated in the same way.

Our people and all the revolutionary peoples can never be conquered. The enemies will always be unmasked!

Bravo Cuba!

**FRIDAY
APRIL 21, 1961**

A BASE AND SHAMEFUL ACT ON THE PART OF THE SOVIETS

A base and shameful act of the Soviets has been reported to me. They ordered the ship which was unloading iron and other materials at Durrës for the Palace of Culture in Tirana to reload these materials and take them back to the Soviet Union.

Only the imperialists and revisionists could show such hostility as this towards our people and country. Never mind, we shall advance, but woe betide the fraternal Soviet people who have fallen into the hands of these unscrupulous bandits who have seized power in the Soviet Union!

FRIDAY
JUNE 2, 1961

THE REVISIONIST CHIEFS PIN GREAT HOPES ON KHRUSHCHEV'S MEETING WITH KENNEDY*

Khrushchev set out for Vienna. On the way he stopped in Czechoslovakia where he was welcomed by the "great friend" of the Soviet Union, Novotny. We are informed that Dej, Zhivko** and Kadar were also in Bratislava, *incognito*.

Khrushchev does not even deign to inform us about the hash he will cook up in Vienna. All the better! Let the revisionists themselves bear the responsibility!

The revisionist chiefs of the camp have pinned great hopes on this meeting. Indeed, they are living in the hope of some concession from Kennedy, while he is demanding that they make more concessions to him. And the revisionist chiefs will make him more concessions. They will certainly be exposed for their treachery!

* The meeting between Khrushchev and Kennedy to discuss Soviet-American relations and some questions on the banning of nuclear tests, disarmament and the German question was held on June 3-4, 1961 in Vienna.

** Derogative diminutive for Todor Zhivkov.

**TUESDAY
JUNE 6, 1961**

A FIASCO MEETING

Today at midnight Kennedy made a statement on the talks he held with Khrushchev in Vienna. Their meeting was a fiasco. They agreed on nothing. As for the question of Laos, which is one of the questions on which they allegedly “agreed,” nothing will be done about it, either. The Americans will certainly spoil things. The Vienna meeting had no aim other than the loud propaganda which both Kennedy and Khrushchev need in order to raise a smokescreen and hide their dirty linen.

**DAJT, THURSDAY
JULY 20, 1961**

KHRUSHCHEV IS ALSO A COWARD

The imperialists continue to make threats over Berlin, while Khrushchev, who follows a personal policy of conciliation and who usually delivers speeches at the rate of one per hour, has shut himself up in Sochi and is saying nothing. We shall see how he will act. Certainly, he does not like these tense situations because he is also a coward. As our Party has said, only a resolute stand makes the imperialists pull back in panic. There is no other remedy. Any other action is a retreat and capitulation to the imperialists.

DÜRRES, TUESDAY
JULY 25, 1961

KENNEDY'S THREAT

Kennedy made a very threatening speech on the question of Berlin. He must be given a powerful reply. We will give him a blow,* although it may seem like a slap at an elephant. The revisionist Khrushchev ought to reply to him. We shall see what he will do. His satellites, of course, will wait until the master speaks.

* On 29 July 1961, the newspaper *Zëri i popullit* published the article entitled, "President Kennedy Is Brandishing His weapons..." which points out: "...The use of the question of West Berlin to fan up the fire of the 'cold war' is a well-known and discredited tactic of the imperialist powers. Kennedy and his NATO allies never tire of screaming about the 'legitimate rights' of the western powers to stay in West Berlin and the 'capability of the USA to fulfil its pledge' to the population of that city and its NATO partners... The question of West Berlin must be solved in one way or another. This city cannot be kept occupied forever. The occupation forces must leave West Berlin at all costs. West Berlin now is by no means 'a city of peace,' as Mr. President claims, but a hotbed of tension and dangerous provocations..."

DAJT, FRIDAY
AUGUST 4, 1961

FLAGRANT TROTSKYITE VIOLATION OF EVERY NORM OF MARXISM AND EQUALITY

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.* 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.** Ulbricht

* 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.

** 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., "8 Nën-

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 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 publishing,* 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.

tori” Publishing House, Tirana 1976, p. 422).

* 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.

FRIDAY
OCTOBER 20, 1961

THE POLITICAL BUREAU APPROVES THE STATEMENT AGAINST THE MODERN REVISIONISTS' ATTACKS

Today we held the meeting of the Political Bureau. In my contribution,* 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.**

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.

* Published in: Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 22, Alb. ed., "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1976, p. 55.

** Published in: *Principal Documents of the PLA*, vol. 4, Alb. ed., "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1970, p. 153.

SATURDAY
NOVEMBER 25, 1961

THEY TRY TO INTIMIDATE US, WE TERRIFY THEM

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.

SUNDAY
DECEMBER 3, 1961

THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT HAS BROKEN OFF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH US

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.* 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.

* 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., "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1976, pp. 401-402.)

**SUNDAY
DECEMBER 31, 1961**

PANORAMA OF THE YEAR 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 leading and defending it gloriously.

THURSDAY
JANUARY 4, 1962

THE PROBLEM OF GERMANY AND BERLIN A GREAT WORRY TO KHRUSHCHEV

The problem of Germany and Berlin began to be discussed *en vase clos** at the first meeting between Gromyko and Llewellyn Thompson,** the ambassador of the United States of America in Moscow. Everything is being kept secret. The Khrushchevite diplomacy has now switched to “secret diplomacy” while through these talks the Americans are speculating, gaining time, making deals, feeling the pulse, exerting blackmail and threats. The reactionary French press advises that “Khrushchev should be protected because he is the most suitable person,” for the imperialists, of course.

Ulbricht also put in his spoke and said, “We shall do everything to safeguard the prestige of the Westerners.” These revisionist traitors have gone as far as this. The problem of Germany and Berlin has become a major worry for Khrushchev and Co. They don’t know which way to move. All directions are bad for them. They will continue the talks and, in the end, make concession after concession to imperialism. Khrushchev and his gang are working to defeat the communist forces, therefore the communists must defeat him and all his followers.

* Behind closed doors (French in the original).

** The meeting was held on the basis of the decision taken on December 12, 1961, by the meeting of Foreign Ministers of the Western countries, and approved by the Council of Ministers of NATO, on the resumption of contacts with the Soviet government over the question of Berlin.

**SUNDAY
FEBRUARY 4, 1962**

KHRUSHCHEV'S "MATRYOSHKA"

The Western news agencies say that the latest Soviet proposal to the Americans is that "Berlin should become a separate state." There were two Germanies, now they propose to make them three (the third within the second). The Soviets have the experience of "Matryoshka" — the dolls which fit one inside the other, and all into a big one. They are droll rascals!

MONDAY
FEBRUARY 12, 1962

KHRUSHCHEV'S PACIFIST SLOGANS ON DISARMAMENT PREPARE THE TERRAIN FOR IMPERIALIST WARS

As a counter-proposal to the meeting of foreign ministers on disarmament which the Western powers have proposed to be held in Geneva on March 14, Khrushchev proposed a top-level meeting on disarmament with the participation of 18 states. Of course this proposal proved unsuccessful, as it was bound to do. Today the Westerners replied that they do not accept it, but "will keep it in mind for later," after "the meeting of the foreign ministers has been held," etc. This was the reply that Khrushchev expected, because the aim of the Khrushchevites is to deceive the public which is waiting for a solution. Thus they leave the public hoping that this meeting "will be held today or tomorrow," and "if not, then be patient because it will certainly be held the day after tomorrow," and so on. Meanwhile, nothing is being solved. Imperialism gains time, arms itself, suppresses the peoples' anti-imperialist movements and consolidates its alliances, while Khrushchev weakens our alliances, deepens the split in the socialist camp and prepares the war against communism. It is clear that, although in somewhat different forms, the Westerners have the same essential aim as Khrushchev. One side prepares the war while the other, through its pacifist slogans, prepares the terrain for this war and for the imperialist revisionist embrace.

**TUESDAY
APRIL 17, 1962**

WHY HAS GROMYKO GONE TO VISIT TITO?

Yesterday Andrey 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 workers' 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, 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.

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!

WEDNESDAY
APRIL 25, 1962

KHRUSHCHEV'S ACROBATIC TRICKS

As is his custom, Nikita Khrushchev, the fair-ground acrobat, gave a lengthy interview to the manager of the American magazine *Look*, who declared that he was very satisfied with his friend Khrushchev. The great concern of this clown about the situations which he himself has created and the defeats which he is suffering emerges clearly from the interview. As on every other occasion, when he sees things going badly Nikita does a recapitulation on some matters of principle, precisely on those on which his line is suffering defeat, and declares demagogically that he is in favour of "just wars," that "these wars will occur," that he "will support them," etc., etc., idle words which he himself does not believe, but which he is obliged to say.

All the blame for his own failures in agriculture he lays on Stalin, whom he describes as completely ignorant about the problems of agriculture, he also blames the backwardness of the peasantry and the cadres, and ends up with himself as the "saviour of the situation," and shouts that soon "everything will change in the Soviet Union." Khrushchev shamelessly boosts American agriculture and technique and expresses great eagerness to go amongst the farmers of the United States of America to see and learn from them, etc. He tones down his deafening propaganda about intensive agriculture, takes a course to excuse himself tomorrow for the failure of his agricultural policy by saying that, "Later, although we cannot set the date, we shall reduce the area sown when we raise yields." Goodbye to the "new lands"! On the one hand, he abuses Stalin, on the

other hand, he boosts him, on the one hand he abuses Molotov, Kaganovich, Voroshilov and others, on the other hand he boosts them. With these issues which are boiling up, his well-known acrobatic tricks are not going down with public opinion inside and outside the Soviet Union in the way he would like.

The acrobat Khrushchev did not fail to attack us before the American who was pleased with this. He said that there are people who know theory, but who apply it wrongly in practice. He said that there are disagreements with us, that we are quarrelling, but he “has never interfered in the internal affairs of Albania.” What a disgraceful lie! But he is a man with no shame. The fact is that he is in great difficulties in regard to us, because even his friends cannot accept his actions against us. Now the Khrushchevites want to continue the struggle against us with new methods, with new tactics, but our firm stand is blocking the way, therefore they are thrashing around to find a way to overcome it. It is difficult for them and will remain difficult!

FRIDAY
APRIL 27, 1962

**THE KHRUSHCHEVITES
CONTINUE TO BEG FOR
DISARMAMENT WHILE THE
AMERICAN IMPERIALISTS
CONTINUE TO ARM
THEMSELVES**

The session of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, which was opened at the beginning of the week with Gromyko's speech, further hushed up the struggle against American imperialism for the reason that they are allegedly negotiating with it. And what compromises they are negotiating?! However, the Americans make no concessions. Yesterday they began their tests of nuclear weapons. Their great demagoguery about the prohibition of testing nuclear weapons was drowned out by the roar of American atomic explosions on Christmas Islands. The Americans continue to arm themselves, but the Khrushchevites continue to beg for disarmament. In Europe, in secrecy, trampling on the Warsaw Treaty and the joint talks on Germany and Berlin, the Khrushchevite clique has given way to the imperialists over Berlin, has accepted the internationalization of the control of entry into West Berlin, while the Americans, British and French refuse to remove their troops from there. Words, always words. The settlement of the German question, of Berlin and the Peace Treaty has been put off indefinitely.

**FRIDAY
MAY 25, 1962**

A NEW AGREEMENT WHICH WILL SERVE THE ARMING AND THE WARMONGERING PLOTS OF THE USA AND THE USSR

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.

THURSDAY
MAY 31, 1962

COMECON FACING GREAT DIFFERENCES

The Council of Mutual Economic Aid will meet on June 6. Up till now we have not been invited and, certainly, they are not going to invite us. Nevertheless we can guess that the meeting will deal mostly with the differences between the revisionists themselves. Nikita Khrushchev has his objectives, but the others have theirs, too. Nikita wants to keep his friends bound to his chariot, to have the fewest possible economic obligations to them, while advancing them credits in order to keep them engaged, and, in those directions that are beneficial to him, to supply them with raw materials and to increase the dependence of their economies. Naturally the Poles, the Czechs and the Germans want to get the maximum amounts of raw materials and, especially, foodstuffs, with which the Soviet Union is reluctant to supply them because it has not enough for itself. These states are making many efforts to retain and even extend their capitalist markets. Poland has received and is receiving credits from the United States of America, while East Germany engages in speculation and is always begging. Now it is begging even from Adenauer.

In these conditions, the relations between the revisionists are not heading towards harmonious coordination, but towards the deepening of contradictions. In fact Gomulka has expressed his discontent in regard to the Council of Mutual Economic Aid to Khrushchev himself. Gomulka would like to liquidate this organ completely so as to have his hands free to act like Tito and make open approaches to the American imperial-

ists.

The situation of international markets is becoming more and more difficult. The European Common Market prepares the terrain behind the lines for NATO, i.e., it prepares the Western states for hot war and, at the same time, for economic struggle against our camp. Thus the European Common Market will impose serious restrictions and the “socialist countries” will wage a disorganized struggle in the field of trade, because Nikita Khrushchev and his partners are wrecking their unity and common actions. Many countries of “people’s democracy” which live by trading with the West, like Czechoslovakia, and which are led by revisionists, will move to make underhand deals over principles. The Poles have already set out on this course and now Ulbricht is preparing to do the same thing.

It was Khrushchev himself who encouraged the seeking of credits from the Americans and that is why he had not said one word against the European Common Market until recently. Now he has spoken and proposed a discussion at UNO on the establishment of a joint international trade organization. This is just idle talk. Khrushchev might even propose that Comecon and the European Common Market be disbanded and other tales of this kind, but even if he does disband or weaken Comecon its members would still depend on one another for a number of things and would not have complete autonomy, while their coordination would remain on paper. This means disintegration, capitulation. This is the course that these betrayers of Marxism-Leninism are deliberately following.

How matters are going to develop, we shall see more clearly later.

**MONDAY
OCTOBER 22, 1962**

KENNEDY'S WARMONGERING SPEECH

Addressing the Soviet Union, and concretely on the question of Cuba, Kennedy delivered another very threatening, warmongering speech, a Hitlerite speech. The essence of it was his threat to launch a new world war. Cuba is the pretext, just as Danzig was for Hitler. In the speech Kennedy proclaimed a naval blockade on Cuba, because offensive weapons threatening the American continent have been deployed there by the Soviets. Kennedy declared that any ship sailing to Cuba would be stopped and searched and those that would resist would be sunk. He declared, also, that if rockets were launched against the USA from Cuba, then the Americans would launch their atomic bombs and missiles against the Soviet Union, etc. In a word, the USA is preparing to attack Cuba, is establishing a blockade to stop aid reaching it, and is threatening Khrushchev. Kennedy, the friend of Khrushchev and the revisionists, is playing hell with them.

**TUESDAY
OCTOBER 23, 1962**

THE KHRUSHCHEVITES ARE COWARDS, COMPROMISERS AND TRAITORS

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.

**SATURDAY
OCTOBER 27, 1962**

KHRUSHCHEV CAPITULATED AND LEFT CUBA IN THE LURCH

It turned out as we thought. Khrushchev capitulated to Kennedy and left Cuba in the lurch. Messages were exchanged. Kennedy issued an ultimatum to Khrushchev that he must stop the construction of missile launching pads, dismantle those he has established and remove the missiles from Cuba. The traitor Khrushchev accepted Kennedy's conditions in a servile tone and with fear in his belly. The terrible thing is that with his stand the traitor has utterly discredited the Soviet Union. This is a new great betrayal which has been committed against the Soviet Union, Marxism-Leninism, socialism, mankind and peace. This stand whets the imperialists' appetite.

**THURSDAY
NOVEMBER 8, 1962**

SHAME ON KHRUSHCHEV!

The news agencies report that the Soviet missiles are being shipped away from Cuba, and that American warships are going to verify their removal on the high seas. Shame on Khrushchev and his henchmen who have stooped so low as to humiliate the Soviet Union to such a degree! But the day will come when they get their just deserts.

**THURSDAY
DECEMBER 13, 1962**

KHRUSHCHEV TRIES TO EXPLAIN HIS BETRAYAL

Yesterday Khrushchev delivered a speech on the international situation and Soviet foreign policy at the session of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union. Beside him in the presidium of the meeting he had his brother and close comrade, the traitor Tito. The main purpose of his long speech was to make a long-winded explanation of his betrayal (in fact, to avoid explaining it), of his retreat before the strength of American imperialism. His whole problem was to try to clear himself, to wipe out the bad impression created and the great disgrace which he brought upon the Soviet Union. But he could not and never will be able to do this. Now the whole revisionist chorus has adopted this theme and aim. Nikita Khrushchev presented the removal of missiles from Cuba as a victory, as a road open (through a catastrophe) to new victories (new scandalous compromises and concessions). The second aim of the speech was the complete, official, public rehabilitation of the Titoite renegades, both from the state standpoint and, especially, from the ideological standpoint. On this issue he threw off all disguises. The predictions of the Party of Labour of Albania have been confirmed.

As usual, Khrushchev attacked the Party of Labour of Albania and its leadership without any argument. In this way he pleased Tito greatly. Likewise, he attacked the Communist Party of China. The treacherous aims of the Khrushchevite revisionist group, the splitting of the camp, the formation of the international revisionist bloc, the feverish open approaches to American imperialism, the efforts on Khrushchev's part to provide

Kennedy with more and more proofs of his goodwill so that the agreements they will reach with his agent Tito will be welcomed by Kennedy, are becoming clearer every day. The future will make clear all their intrigues and capitulationist plans.

**MONDAY
JANUARY 21, 1963**

A SHAMEFUL RETREAT

Today the traitor Nikita Khrushchev accepted the international control of nuclear tests on the territory of the Soviet Union. This is another shameful concession, another retreat before Kennedy and American imperialism. After this the Americans will certainly demand other concessions and Khrushchev will make them. In fact, Kennedy declared that, on the whole, he was pleased by this concession of Khrushchev, but he let it be understood that other demands will follow. We have no doubts about this.

**WEDNESDAY
JANUARY 30, 1963**

THE SPLIT IN BRUSSELS*

France has risen against the United States of America and Britain. The latter was not admitted to the European Common Market because of the opposition of De Gaulle, who wants to see that country prostrate itself to him and Adenauer. At the same time, this is the second blow France has struck the United States of America (the first was De Gaulle's opposition to the deployment of the American "Polaris" missiles on French territory and his creation of the independent French nuclear striking force).

This is not a bad situation for us. The quarrels are getting worse in the imperialist camp, the leader of which is encountering and will encounter obstacles. Our policy must be to take advantage of the inter-imperialist contradictions in order to deepen them. Who is there to do this? Khrushchev is on the course of betrayal. He is committed to the Americans and will undoubtedly take their side, because he considers them less dangerous than De Gaulle and Adenauer. Khrushchev dreams that he will succeed in getting the United States of America lined up with him against Adenauer and De Gaulle. However, the Americans, who have imperialist ambitions, will not readily relinquish Adenauer.

* On January 29, 1963, the Executive Committee of the European Common Market convened in Brussels decided to suspend the talks with Britain about its application for membership.

**SUNDAY
FEBRUARY 3, 1963**

KENNEDY HAS RECOMMENCED UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR TESTS

Another defeat for Khrushchev and another proof of the correctness of our line. Khrushchev's "good man," Kennedy, is continuing the armaments race and the nuclear blackmail, as he was bound to do. He has announced the recommencement of underground nuclear tests. After this Kennedy will demand further concessions from Khrushchev and he will certainly make them, because his course has been set. He is already in Kennedy's clutches. Along with the announcement about the recommencement of nuclear tests, the American imperialists have raised the question of the presence of 17,000 Soviet soldiers in Cuba and are sure to launch a campaign for their withdrawal. The Americans will get what they want easily because Nikita rages and fumes, but it's all talk because he is a coward. On the other hand, by withdrawing the missiles he has in Cuba, Khrushchev ensures that the Cubans never get possession of them.

MONDAY
MARCH 18, 1963

PROPAGANDIST OF THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

The traitor Khrushchev has turned into a simple propagandist of the American way of life. While claiming that he has entered into competition with the United States of America, in reality, for a long time he has been advertising the economic progress of that country in industry, agriculture, construction and elsewhere. Apart from the propaganda in favour of the United States of America by means of the film which was made on the occasion of Khrushchev's visit there, Kozlov, Polyansky and other Soviet revisionist chiefs, in their own ways, have become apologists for that great capitalist country. Now that Khrushchev is in great difficulties, because of the failure of his destructive line in agriculture, and has engaged in a series of disgraceful somersaults, such as the continual dismissals of a whole series of secretaries, the frequent changes in the Ministry of Agriculture, the recent letter which he sent the Presidium allegedly about the creation of vegetable farms around the cities (they have existed for a long time), or about a new regionalization of agriculture (he does this every year), still he does not fail to spread propaganda in favour of the United States of America by speaking about the use of maize there, etc., etc. Even Tito has not fallen so disgracefully low. He acts but does not advertise the fact.

**SATURDAY
APRIL 6, 1963**

**A DIRECT TELEPHONE LINK
BETWEEN KHRUSHCHEV AND
KENNEDY**

It was made public today that a direct telephone link between Khrushchev and Kennedy has been established. The Americans called it the "line of hope." In fact it is a victory for the American imperialists, because from now on the two international gangsters can converse in secret and hatch up plots against communism and the freedom-loving peoples.

WEDNESDAY
JUNE 12, 1963

KENNEDY REVEALS KHRUSHCHEV'S COURSE OF BETRAYAL

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 Nikitich* 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 morator-

* An ironical distortion of the name Nikita.

ium 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 duty to the end to expose these plans, even if we stand alone. But we will not be alone!

FRIDAY
JUNE 14, 1963

MODERN REVISIONISM IN THE SERVICE OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

Notes*

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 control or to neutralize

* 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.

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 cap-

ital, 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 (Comcon), 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 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-social-

ist 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

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 Flynn* 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.

* At that time chairman of the National Committee of the Communist Party (revisionist) of the USA.

Whether they will change, or where they ought to change, this Kennedy defines with great demagoguery.

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 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 coordinate 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 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.

VLORA, FRIDAY
JULY 26, 1963

INSTRUCTIONS ON TWO NOTES OF PROTEST

We must prepare two notes against the Soviet government (the Khrushchev group) and the governments of the other member countries of the Warsaw Treaty. Their content must be as follows:

1) As members of this Treaty, we must expose the enslaving economic aims which are hidden behind the façade of Comecon, the economic integration under revisionist leadership through which the Soviet Union wants to exert political-economic pressure on the former socialist countries so as to drag them towards their gradual transformation into capitalism and degeneration. We must expose the evil purpose of Khrushchev's traitor group, which is working for the degeneration of the Soviet Union by creating chaos in the economy, while extending political, economic and ideological links with the capitalists.

2) As members of the Warsaw Treaty, we must expose the treacherous objectives which the member countries of this Treaty want to achieve through the treaty on the partial banning of tests of nuclear weapons.* The Moscow treaty is directed against the peoples of the world and wants to prevent others from having nuclear weapons, so they will be dependent on, and always under the pressure of, the double nuclear threat of the Soviets and the Americans, who want to safeguard their monopoly of nuclear weapons. With this treaty, which does not solve the problem of disarmament and, especially, that of the destruction of stocks of atomic bombs, the Khrushchev group once again betrays the

* This treaty was signed in Moscow on July 25, 1963.

cause of the peoples, the revolution and communism. This group makes proposals which are to the advantage of the Americans, who, through Kennedy's speech, said openly that this treaty does not prohibit nuclear war, does not oblige the Americans to reduce their stocks of bombs, or prevent them from producing others, from arming their allies, or from cancelling this agreement. The excuses for this can be very quickly concocted. Woe betide those who trust the capitalists!

Kennedy declared bluntly that China is a threat to mankind and quoted Khrushchev on this point.

These notes are of principled importance, reflecting the stands we must maintain towards these questions which are vital for socialism and communism.

VLORA, THURSDAY
AUGUST 1, 1963

THE KHRUSHCHEVITES' BETRAYAL IS CLEAR TO ALL

The Moscow Treaty on the partial prohibition of nuclear weapons is a shameful capitulation of the Soviet government to American imperialism. Nikita Khrushchev is the Americans' man. They have him completely in their grip. Now Nikita Khrushchev will act according to the directives from Washington in everything. The disguises, methods, demagoguery, which his group of traitors will employ are of no importance. The Khrushchevites will go from concession to concession, from capitulation to capitulation. Khrushchev is an ally and agent of the Americans. It is difficult to say precisely how they have managed to achieve this success, but I think that apart from Khrushchev's personal disposition Tito played a major role in getting Khrushchev, this intriguer, conspirator, careerist, boaster and whatever else you like to call him, into the shackles of a compromised agent. Tito got a tight hold on him and took him to the Americans bound hand and foot. Let us take just the question of the prohibition of nuclear weapons. It is known that Khrushchev capitulated disgracefully, recanted and violated all his previous declarations on this issue, and accepted the American draft, which constitutes the essence and the entire content of the Moscow Treaty on the partial prohibition of tests of nuclear weapons.

What does this mean? When has such a thing been seen in history? Only when there is betrayal, only when he who commits this betrayal is an agent.

As a man, as a politician, as an agent and as a traitor, Khrushchev is another Laval. The one, Khrush-

chev, sold out the Soviet Union and the socialist camp and betrayed communism, the other, Laval, betrayed France. But while Laval betrayed France only, Khrushchev is a traitor of an international character, who has inflicted great damage on socialism and communism. And Khrushchev's allies in other parties are dangerous traitors, too, therefore we must fight them with all our might.

The world communist movement is going through a grave crisis which must be overcome in a revolutionary way, and in a revolutionary way alone. Modern revisionism is rallying its forces, and in collaboration and in alliance with world imperialism is attacking us. We must reply to their attack with even sterner attacks. Irrespective that our enemies have colossal military, economic and propaganda potential, nothing frightens us, because we are on the right road, our line is correct, we are Marxists and they are traitors. The majority is with us, or will be with us, during the revolutionary struggle.

It is important that the Chinese leaders have apparently corrected their tactic in the struggle against these traitors and have begun their open, just and justified struggle.* I believe that now the Chinese comrades are fully understanding our correct views, which we have expressed to them many times over a period of more than a year. Perhaps their hesitation has done harm, because for a long time ours has been the only voice

* From the analyses which Comrade Enver Hoxha has made of the stand and policy of the Communist Party of China toward the Khrushchevites, it emerges that the Chinese leaders sometimes made approaches to the Soviet revisionists in order to reach a compromise with them, sometimes fell out with them, depending on their interests and the circumstances. They waged the struggle against the Khrushchevite revisionists not from principled Marxist-Leninist positions, as the Party of Labour of Albania did, but from national-chauvinist positions.

which exposed the traitors, who took advantage of the very formalist stand of the Chinese in order to deceive people, to establish closer links with one another and with imperialism. But better late than never. Now we must press forward to win terrain and defeat the betrayal. The struggle will be long, but the victory will be ours, the Marxist-Leninists.

VLORA, WEDNESDAY
JANUARY 15, 1964

CHINA'S RECOGNITION BY FRANCE

Zhou Enlai told us* that during his visit to Africa a communiqué may be issued to announce that the French Republic has recognized the People's Republic of China. This act is a result of the talks between Edgar Faure — De Gaulle's semi-official envoy to China, and the Chinese leaders.

The establishment of diplomatic relations between China and France, with France accepting China's conditions, that is, the breaking off of diplomatic relations with Taipei and non-recognition of the American policy of "two Chinas," will have great international importance and profound consequences in world policy. This act isolates the adventurous and predatory policy of the American imperialists and is truly a heavy blow to the American hegemonic policy.

Undoubtedly, this event will make the serious split that exists between France and the United States of America even deeper. The present circumstances are such that despite the strong, all-round pressure which the American and British imperialists and, to some extent, Bonn Germany are exerting on France, the French bourgeoisie and its president have refused to submit to their dictate. France is revolting against the military line of NATO and against the economic policy of the USA, etc. Faced with such a situation, American and British imperialism, with the aid of the revisionist group of Khrushchev, are trying to isolate France, to bring it to its knees and make it an obedient state. But the French imperialist bourgeoisie is making a change

* During his visit to Albania early in January 1964.

in its policy towards establishing diplomatic relations with China.

Of course, in these conditions France will be able to develop its trade more freely with China and many other countries of the Far East, thus to some extent it escapes the boycott of its markets which American imperialism is gobbling up, and this is vital to it. This cannot fail to have profound political consequences within NATO, because economic pressures are among the main means of struggle between imperialists.

By recognizing the People's Republic of China, De Gaulle has shown himself to be an intelligent bourgeois. This event will certainly cause a chain reaction within NATO, in the different reciprocal links among the member countries of this organization, in their international stands towards important problems of a world character. The omnipotence of the authority of the United States of America has suffered a marked defeat. Sooner or later other states will follow France in their stand towards China. For example, one of the first will be Japan, which is striving to escape from the American yoke and has great commercial and political interests in the establishment of relations with the People's Republic of China. Likewise the American positions in UNO, in defence of the corpse Chiang Kai-shek, also become difficult.

This whole situation created by the establishment of diplomatic relations between France and the PR of China puts the American world trade in difficult positions, discredits and undermines the aggressive policy of the United States in Vietnam, Korea and elsewhere, where France will strive to regain some positions, perhaps weak, but better than nothing. Seeing this situation, the British Commonwealth, too, will be in a fever against the American pressure.

The sharpening of contradictions among imperialist countries, their splitting up, the weakening and iso-

lation of the United States of America and the triumph of socialism and the peoples who are fighting for freedom are important for us.

On the other hand, Khrushchev's "world" policy, an adventurous and completely anti-Marxist policy, is suffering a colossal defeat. His ally, the United States of America, with which he reached a treacherous compromise, is losing its chess match. In order to link up with and gain the trust of the Americans, the traitor Khrushchev threw off his disguise, attacked Marxism-Leninism, socialism and our country.

The traitor Khrushchev thought he had attained his goal, and that he, together with American imperialism, would rule the world. But their plans are crumbling. In these circumstances, the way things are developing, his difficulties are increasing day by day. What will the traitor do? He will go even further to his utter exposure until he is put in his grave. Day by day the peoples and communists of the world are seeing more clearly the betrayal of Khrushchev and the modern revisionists as agents of the bourgeoisie in alliance with the world gendarme — American imperialism...

SATURDAY
APRIL 25, 1964

WE MUST EXPOSE THE REVISIONIST ACTIVITY IN EUROPE

Project and notes for an article

Exposure of the revisionist activity in Europe is becoming an urgent need.

— The revolutionary traditions in Europe: against monopoly capital, against imperialism, against Italo-German fascism, against opportunist traitors, social-chauvinists and other anti-Marxist currents: Trotskyites, Mensheviks, Bukharinites and other servants of the bourgeoisie;

- a) the ideological struggle;
- b) the political struggle;
- c) the economic struggle;
- d) the armed struggle

(from the time of Marx to the collapse of nazi-fascism and the strengthening of people's democracy in the European countries).

After the Second World War

The economic, political and military positions of the capitalist bourgeoisie in Europe. The alliance with the United States of America, American aid, its purposes. The aims of various plans of this imperialist bourgeoisie in Europe for the re-assertion and strengthening of the power of the monopoly capital and its political positions, its military preparations, its struggle against communism, against the communist and workers' parties, against the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy.

The struggle of social-democracy as a servant of imperialism.

— The positions of the revolutionary forces in Europe after the Second World War:

— the political-ideological positions;

— the militant positions;

— the positions of the workers' and communist parties in the European capitalist countries towards the revolutionary movement in these countries. The coherence of their revolutionary line, the solidarity of the revolution cemented by the revolutionary theory, Marxism-Leninism.

The force of the Soviet Union in the time of Lenin-Stalin

— the epicentre of the revolution;

— the country where the revolution triumphed;

— the Homeland of the world proletariat;

— the successful construction of socialism;

— the Marxist-Leninist ideology in action and on the correct course;

— the correct, principled foreign policy;

— the Soviet Union — a powerful help in the revolutionary struggles of the peoples;

— the other socialist countries of Europe and Asia, under the leadership of the communist and workers' parties, were created after the triumph over fascism;

— the successes of the socialist camp after the war until Stalin's death.

— After Stalin's death, revisionism began to spread all over Europe.

— World imperialism, headed by American imperialism, continues to arm itself rapidly, to consolidate its forces through financial enslavement, through military alliances, through capturing colonial markets, through predatory wars, various aggressions, through blackmail, and above all, through atomic blackmail.

The anti-communist propaganda is raised to a climax, measures of reprisal against communists and the communist and workers' parties in the capitalist countries, etc.

Titoite revisionism

What it represents. The first signal of the revisionist danger. The struggle against it and its exposure. The unanimity of the communist and workers' parties in fighting it.

After Stalin's death: Khrushchevite revisionism

What it represents, its aims, the tactics it employed to seize power in the Soviet Union and hatch up revisionist plots in the communist and workers' parties in Europe.

The alliance of the Khrushchevite revisionists with the United States of America and their public exposure by us, the Marxist-Leninists.

- Capitulation on all political-military problems;
- demands, aid in credits and experience from the United States of America;
- the organization of the struggle against Marxism-Leninism on a world scale in alliance with world capitalism and social-democracy;
- their aims: seizure of power by the modern revisionists; the degeneration of Marxism-Leninism and Marxist-Leninist parties; the degeneration of socialism to bourgeois state power (moral-political degeneration, degeneration of agriculture, industry, degeneration of the state and economic apparatuses, etc.); the Khrushchev group's subjugation of the former countries of people's democracy in Europe in all directions: political, economic, military (Comecon, the Warsaw Treaty).

The imperialist-revisionist world plan

- **The domination of the world by American im-**

perialism, with the Soviet Union playing first fiddle (gradually transformed by the Khrushchev group into a bourgeois-capitalist state of a special type);

— cold and hot war against communism, against the construction of socialism, against the peoples' freedom, against revolutionary, national liberation struggles. Two main weapons, on the one hand, demagogy and lies, and on the other, the atom bomb;

— these two weapons are in the hands of the Americans and Khrushchevites;

— the other weapon, the economic strength of these two partners, a means for the enslavement of peoples, the rehabilitation and the prolongation of the existence of capitalism, the degeneration of individuals.

Battlefields

— Wherever the links of the capitalist chain are weakest, there hot wars are being and will be waged — Asia, Africa, Latin America;

— together with the Americans, Khrushchev is working in Asia and Africa against communism, hatching up plots against the peoples, contributing through UNO (Congo) to putting down the revolution, providing credits for the strengthening of reactionary cliques, etc. Khrushchev cannot poke his nose into Latin America, the USA keeps him out. For the time being it thinks that it is able to quell the revolution and the national liberation struggle in every country in this continent. The special task of modern revisionism is to spread all over Europe.

The aim

— To snuff out any attempt at revolution in Europe, to cause the degeneration of Marxism-Leninism into revisionism, of the communist and workers' parties of Europe into bourgeois, social-democratic parties, of the socialist countries into bourgeois-revision-

ist capitalist countries, and turn Europe into a reliable platform from which reaction can attack socialism and communism everywhere in the world.

— Hence, world capitalism and its lackeys are striving to divert Europe from revolution before they prepare a nuclear war, hence, to establish the dictatorship of the capital everywhere in Europe.

— This plan is being carried out also by the Khrushchevite revisionists, together with their followers, who employ demagoguery by saying:

Genuine Marxism, according to Lenin and Marx, is flourishing only in Europe, and the centre, the guiding light, is the Khrushchev group.

According to the revisionists, everywhere else, Marxism-Leninism has degenerated, has fallen into dogmatism, bourgeois nationalism, neo-Trotskyism, etc.

Therefore, according to them, the Khrushchevite enlightenment has to be taken everywhere.

The revisionists say that Europe is and will remain the cradle and bed of “pure Marxism.”

The great, urgent sacred duty of all communists of Europe and the world is: to rise and fight heroically against this gross betrayal...

**SATURDAY
OCTOBER 17, 1964**

THE FALL OF THE TRAITOR NIKITA KHRUSHCHEV

Notes

Yesterday* 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

* 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.

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 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,* 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.** Judging

* 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 now 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., "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1978, p. 230.)

** "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.

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 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 Commun-

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., “8 Nëntori” Publishing House, Tirana 1984, p. 35.)

ist 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 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 be-

cause 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 demagogy 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. Unprincipled 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 undercover, on the quiet, to leave us waiting open-mouthed like the fool in the fable, to say some sweet-sounding 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 Con-

gresses.” 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 wholeheartedly 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 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.

TUESDAY
OCTOBER 27, 1964

NO CONCESSIONS TO THE SOVIET REVISIONISTS!

There can be no talk about settling the ideological differences, about bilateral or multilateral meetings, about preparatory meetings or meetings of all parties, without the Soviet government's first putting its state relations in order with the People's Republic of Albania.

The Soviet government, which is solely to blame for breaking off all relations with our country, must publicly acknowledge its faults, its mistakes and the political and material damage it has caused the People's Republic of Albania.

The Soviet government must declare that the Soviet government, headed by Khrushchev, has acted in a hostile way towards the People's Republic of Albania, wanting to endanger its independence, to damage the socialist regime in Albania, to weaken and strangle the economy of the People's Republic of Albania, to hinder the normal development of socialism in our country, and to weaken the military defence of our country.

The Soviet government, headed by Khrushchev and his clique, sabotaged the economy of the People's Republic of Albania. It cut off credits to the People's Republic of Albania and seriously damaged our 3rd Five-year Plan, broke off all commercial relations with us and inflicted grave economic-financial damage on us, causing a reduction in the standard of living of the Albanian people. All these hostile anti-socialist actions were carried out with the premeditated diabolical aim of making the People's Republic of Albania and the Albanian people capitulate to the hostile anti-socialist

dictate of the Soviet government, headed by Khrushchev.

Khrushchev, at the head of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, called on the Albanian people to rise in counter-revolution and overthrow the leadership of the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian government.

The Soviet government broke off diplomatic relations with the Albanian government, with a socialist country, so that it could operate freely, in a hostile way, against the People's Republic of Albania.

Khrushchev, as head of the Soviet government, and behind the back of Albania, plotted with Sophocles Venizelos, an enemy of the People's Republic of Albania, of the Albanian people, of the independence and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Albania, to annex Southern Albania to Greece.*

The Soviet government, headed by Khrushchev, expelled the People's Republic of Albania de facto from the Council of Mutual Economic Aid, with the aim of sabotaging the economy of the People's Republic of Albania, sabotaging its economic plans and cutting off economic aid for our country from all the member countries of Comecon, a thing which they did and which gravely damaged the economy of the People's Republic of Albania. This charges all the members of the Council of Mutual Economic Aid with grave material responsibility.

The Soviet government, headed by Khrushchev, stopped the supply to the PRA of necessary armaments decided through regular bilateral agreements, which were brutally torn up by the Soviet government. This was done to weaken the defence of the People's Republic of Albania and to facilitate the secret and open

* See: Enver Hoxha, *Two Friendly Peoples*, Eng. ed., "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1985, pp. 87-88, 94-95.

conspiratorial aims of Khrushchev and the Titoites, the Greek monarcho-fascists and the American imperialists. This charges the Soviet government with grave responsibility.

The Soviet government, headed by Khrushchev, tore up the signed military agreement and robbed Albania of naval ships, actions which were to the detriment of the defence of the People's Republic of Albania and the socialist camp. The stolen military means must be returned to the People's Republic of Albania.

The Soviet government, headed by Khrushchev, expelled the People's Republic of Albania *de facto* from the Warsaw Treaty, and this hostile act was carried out with the aim that, at the opportune moment, the Soviet government, headed by Khrushchev, could attack the People's Republic of Albania under the pretext of protecting it from impending danger.

While aiming all these hostile plans against the People's Republic of Albania, against the leadership of the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian government, the Soviet government, headed by Khrushchev, publicly accused the leaders of Albania of being "agents who had sold themselves to the imperialists."

Of course the new Soviet revisionist leaders will take steps to establish relations with us and, no doubt, will try to pass over in silence all these evil things which they have done to us from the state standpoint (without mentioning the issues of principle which make up another colossal chapter), as though nothing had occurred. They will pretend that by making such a proposal they are doing us a great "favour," giving us adequate "satisfaction," and we "ought to be very happy that we reached this day." We must reject all these base attempts of theirs with disgust. **They must pay politically, ideologically, morally and materially for all the damage which they have caused us. No concession!**

Not only must they publicly acknowledge the dam-

age, but in order to establish diplomatic relations with us they must first pay for the political and material damage which they have caused the People's Republic of Albania. If they do not make such a public political declaration and pay us for the damage we must not accept diplomatic relations with them.

Otherwise it will be sheer deception. They need to establish diplomatic relations with us. They attacked us first, they declared war on us, we won, they lost the war. Now let them pay for the political-material damage down to the last penny. This must be our principled stand because they are revisionists. Had they been definitely routed, that would be another situation. But in the existing situation we must unmask the revisionists to the end and force them to unmask themselves.

The compensation for the damage they have caused us in the economy must be calculated down to the last penny in all the branches in which they have damaged us. These claims must be real, backed by facts. We are not the sort who want to take advantage of the situation. They caused us damage, they harmed us with their hostile work, therefore they are obliged to pay. If they are not going to pay we must still make up the balance for what we owe them and what they owe us. The difference must be paid by the side that owes it. This is a normal legal action. We respect the agreements, but the others, too, must respect them and pay the debts they owe us.

MONDAY
NOVEMBER 23, 1964

A BARBAROUS IMPERIALIST ACTION AGAINST THE CONGOLESE INSURGENTS

The barbarous Americans and their Belgian mercenaries today made a paratroop attack on the town of Stanleyville, which is in the hands of the Congolese insurgents. This is a brutal intervention of the imperialists — friends of the Khrushchevite and Titoite revisionists — who are striving jointly in a thousand ways to quell the flames of peoples' national liberation struggle. Spaak,* the close friend of both Khrushchev and Tito, together with the Americans, is at the head of this bandit-like operation.

* P.H. Spaak, at that time vice-premier and minister of Foreign Affairs of Belgium.

**SATURDAY
DECEMBER 5, 1964**

WE MUST DEFEND THE HEROIC WAR OF THE PEOPLE OF SOUTH VIETNAM

The people of South Vietnam are waging an heroic war against American imperialism. This heroic war has, at the same time, a major international significance, because the fraternal Vietnamese people are not only fighting for their own liberation, but also fighting for all of us, the countries of socialism, for all the peoples who have risen against imperialism and colonialism. They are an example of heroism and sacrifice, and are demonstrating to the world that American imperialism can be beaten, as it is being beaten, can suffer defeats, just as it is suffering them, can be routed despite the many weapons it possesses and uses, as it is being routed in South Vietnam.

American imperialism has got itself into very great military and political difficulties. It has been discredited. Meeting after fruitless meeting is being held in Washington. In Vietnam the Americans are continually changing their puppets, are sending more and more reinforcements and new weapons, but to no avail. The Khrushchevite revisionists, both with Khrushchev and now without Khrushchev, are sabotaging the struggle of the heroic people of Vietnam, giving them nothing. The few weapons they gave them at first were old captured weapons, which were sabotaged and of no use whatsoever. With their silence, with their secret actions coordinated with the American imperialists, the Soviets are giving the Americans political and diplomatic assistance to quell and defeat the struggle of the people of South Vietnam for the benefit of the Americans. The

Khrushchevites are striving to pull the Americans out of the mire and to drown the heroic Vietnamese people. For their part, the Americans are hatching up savage diabolical plans to attack North Vietnam.

American imperialism cannot so quickly forget the thrashing it took in Korea at the hands of the Koreans and the Chinese. If they undertake another adventure, then they will find themselves facing the resistance of the whole Vietnamese people. The other peoples of peninsula and the whole world, too, will rise and the imperialists together with their allies, the modern revisionists, will suffer terrible political and military defeats. Hence, apart from stepping up their attacks on South Vietnam, the Americans will try to drag the UNO into adventures, and if they succeed in this, then larger-scale adventures on their part can be expected. If they fail, then they will be obliged to refrain from extending the war and save their "honour." Therefore our struggle in the UNO is of great importance.

First, the manoeuvres and plans of American imperialism against South Vietnam must be unmasked; second, the manoeuvres of the Soviets and the modern revisionists must be unmasked and they must be forced either to expose themselves, or to remain isolated, or to defend Vietnam reluctantly (but even in these circumstances they won't do this); and third, all the representatives of the countries of Africa and Asia must be rallied to the defence of the heroic Vietnamese people, and a pro-Vietnamese and anti-American unity should be created for this purpose in the UNO. I gave advice and instructions to this effect to Comrade Behar [Shtylla],* who left for New York.

Comrade Behar must expose the American manoeuvres, the aim of which is to make the UNO inter-

* At that time minister of Foreign Affairs of the PR of Albania.

vene in the affairs of Vietnam and the whole of Indochina. He must expose the Americans' preparations to intervene in North Vietnam and Lower Laos and to replace the decisions of the Geneva Conference with the decisions of UNO. He must refute the Americans' slanders about Vietnam and stress that the Americans must withdraw from South Vietnam. He must fight for the Geneva agreement, and forcefully condemn and expose any decision which the UNO may take contrary to what has been said above, and describe it as illegal and unacceptable.

I instructed Behar to fight in these directions for complete solidarity with the Vietnamese brothers and comrades. I talked with Comrades Hysni and Ramiz and told them that we must keep this great issue alive in our press in a militant spirit.

Our heroic Vietnamese brothers and comrades will triumph.

**VLORA, MONDAY
JANUARY 4, 1965**

AT UNO THE AMERICANS AND THE SOVIETS ARE INTRIGUING AGAINST THE PEOPLES

Last night the news agencies reported that Indonesia has announced its withdrawal from the United Nations Organization because Malaysia has been elected a member of the Security Council. Indonesia lays claim to Kalimantan, where the Indonesian partisans have long been fighting to liberate it from the British colonizers. Indonesia's withdrawal from the UNO has caused or will cause great concern among the Americans and the Soviets, first of all, as well as among their satellites. The former use the UNO as an organ of theirs and commit atrocities in the world under its cloak. They commit acts of aggression in the name of UNO and engage in espionage through its different activities. The modern revisionists, who collaborate closely with American imperialism, have begun to behave like the Americans, to use the UNO as a disguise, and to reach agreements with the Americans to convert it into a joint tool, so that the Americans can operate and the Soviets indulge in demagoguery. The prestige of the United Nations Organization has long been at a low ebb. The non-admission of China has made the crisis even deeper. No one can accept the fact that the biggest state in the world is not allowed into this organization. This is a flagrant demonstration of how the Americans and the Soviets are intriguing against the peoples in UNO.

Some newly-liberated countries have vain illusions that the UNO serves to defend them. In fact, through this organization, the American imperialists try to de-

defend their own interests. The Soviet revisionists, who are opposed to revolutions and the freedom of the peoples, follow the Americans there, and carry on secret diplomacy with the United States of America in the UNO. Therefore the withdrawal of Indonesia will have repercussions and cause shock among the imperialists and revisionists, because this breaches the calm in which they have operated in the UNO. The countries newly admitted to the UNO are being convinced that their freedom and independence are not defended by the UNO but by the strength and organization of their own peoples. Only a correct stand and close alliance of the peoples of those countries with the Marxist-Leninist forces can defend and save them. The peoples of those countries will understand, in the long run, that the strengthening of the revolutions in the world, the mounting struggle against imperialism and revisionism, and not empty palaver and intrigues, will strengthen the UNO.

VLORA, WEDNESDAY
JANUARY 6, 1965

WE MUST GIVE THE MEMBERS OF THE WARSAW TREATY THE PROPER REPLY

Orientations*

I wrote to Comrade Ramiz that, as I told him on the telephone, we must accept the letter which the Polish government, obviously on behalf of the other members of the Warsaw Treaty, sent us, in which it invites us to take part in the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee, and not refuse to do so, as the comrades in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs think. We must not reject the letter, first, because it is sent to us not by the Soviet government alone, but by all the other members, with whom (with the exception of the Soviets) we have diplomatic relations, and second, we must give them a reply which will remain an historic document, in which we unmask them all for their illegal and reprehensible actions.

The letter must be drafted in serious terms by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the name of the Government, and any ideological consideration in polemical form should be omitted. The document should have a state character and must be couched in strong direct terms in regard to facts and arguments.

We shall not take part in this meeting in the existing conditions, or in any conditions, as long as the members of the Warsaw Treaty are what they are. Therefore

* "The Letter of the Government of the People's Republic of Albania addressed to the participants in the meeting of the Warsaw Treaty of January 19, 1965" (*Zëri i popullit*, February 2, 1965) was drawn up on the basis of these orientations.

the conclusion of our reply is that we do not take part. In this letter, however, we must list a series of facts and demand a series of conditions which are fair to us from any legal, political and moral angle. If they do not fulfil these conditions, we do not go and all the blame falls on them.

What are the conditions to be included in our letter? I am putting down some that seem to me the main ones, though there may be others, and the people of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs should think about them.

First, in formulating our reply we must bear in mind all the documents linked with "Warsaw": the Treaty, the decisions taken, the practice, the correspondence. I think that, first, the political, moral, ideological and military reasons for which the Treaty was signed, the rights and duties of each signatory state, etc., should be set out (although this may be repetition of some earlier letter). Then we should enter into the theme:

The People's Republic of Albania, a signatory state of the Warsaw Treaty, has been and is a member of this Treaty with full, equal and inviolable rights, and has always honourably performed its obligations in the context of the Warsaw Treaty. It has been expelled *de facto*, if not also *de jure* (which we do not know). It has not been invited, either to the official meetings or to the secret meetings of this military political organization, and illegal decisions have been taken. Hence, you have violated the Treaty. This charges you with great responsibility. You have violated the legitimate rights of an independent, sovereign socialist state. Now, as if nothing had happened and thinking that you can act as you wish with the lawful rights of a socialist republic, you invite us to take part in a meeting.

If socialist Albania is to occupy its lawful and fully merited place, if it is to be guaranteed justice and equal conditions with the other member states on the basis of the provisions of the Treaty and the norms of rela-

tions between socialist states, if it is to be guaranteed its sovereign rights, freedom of speech and action within the Treaty, which have been arbitrarily violated and denied, if the former grave mistakes are not to be repeated in the future, a series of lawful demands, which are listed below, must be fulfilled on your part.

The Albanian Government desires to know, and this is its lawful right:

a) What were the reasons which led to the violation of the Treaty and its provisions, and to the exclusion of Albania from the meetings of the Treaty? Which member government of the Treaty undertook this hostile action against a socialist country? The Albanian Government, as an equal member and within its lawful rights, desires that copies of the confirmed minutes of meetings, at which illegal decisions against the PR of Albania have been discussed and taken, should be handed over to it.

b) The Albanian Government also desires to know your present joint opinion about these illegal actions against the People's Republic of Albania.

c) The Albanian Government has the right to be and must be fully informed about all the activity of the organization of the Warsaw Treaty, without hiding anything from it, since Albania has been excluded from meetings of the Treaty in an arbitrary and illegal way. Therefore, on the basis of the rights which the Treaty gives it as an equal and sovereign member, it desires to be sent all the minutes and the decisions which have been taken during this period on various questions by the Warsaw Treaty and its military and political organs in all the open or closed meetings. The Albanian Government must be fully informed of the activity of the organization, without hiding anything from it.

d) In the period before the arbitrary and illegal *de facto* exclusion of the PR of Albania from the Warsaw Treaty, a series of very important political, economic

and military decisions of an international character and of an internal character for the signatory countries of the Warsaw Treaty were taken jointly and unanimously.

With lawful right the Albanian Government desires to know what the fate of these joint decisions has been, which of them have been applied and how they have been applied, which have not been applied, for what reasons and by whom have they been violated. In order to be fully informed it desires to be sent copies of the reports, discussions and decisions taken on these questions by the leading organs of the Warsaw Treaty during the four-year period since Albania has been deprived of the right of its participation in the meetings of the Treaty.

e) The Albanian Government desires to know whether the Moscow Treaty on the prohibition of nuclear tests in space and underwater is a decision taken collectively by the Warsaw Treaty. If this is so, this decision is illegal. If the Moscow Treaty is the work of one member of the Warsaw Treaty and the others have only adhered to it, then the Albanian Government arrives at the conclusion that the Organization of the Warsaw Treaty has been undermined over a question so vital for the socialist camp and the whole world by the arbitrary will of one government. This disdainful stand of the Soviet government must be sternly condemned and the legality of the Moscow Treaty must be discussed. The Albanian Government remains firmly opposed to the Moscow Treaty, does not recognize it, condemns it and proposes that it should be denounced.

The members of the Warsaw Treaty, some directly and some indirectly, bear grave responsibility for a great number of hostile and very dangerous actions against the People's Republic of Albania and its independence and sovereignty. Grave responsibility falls on the Organization of the Warsaw Treaty which allowed the Soviet government, headed by Nikita Khrushchey, to

act in hostile ways against Albania. (We should mention some of these activities which come within the sphere of the activity of the Treaty.) Other hostile actions of the Soviet government and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Soviet Union, both headed by Nikita Khrushchev, come within other spheres of activity, and we have raised and will continue to raise them until they find the correct Marxist-Leninist solution.

The Soviet government, in the spirit of the Warsaw Treaty, in the spirit of the alliance and the joint defence against imperialism, had undertaken obligations towards the People's Republic of Albania. It arbitrarily tore up the bilateral agreements on arming the Albanian army and on the defence of the People's Republic of Albania.

With hostile aims the Soviet government tried to disarm our army, cut off supplies of weapons, ammunition, fuel, spare parts, etc. The Soviet government tore up these agreements and robbed Albania of four submarines, the property of the People's Republic of Albania. These arbitrary, illegal, hostile actions of the Soviets weakened the defence of the People's Republic of Albania, threatened its independence, left the borders of Albania unprotected against enemies — the American imperialists, the Greek monarcho-fascists, the Italian reactionaries and the Titoite traitors and plotters, and compelled Albania to slow the tempo of the development of its economy in order to strengthen the defence of the Homeland and the borders of the socialist camp. The other members of the Treaty are aware of these actions of the Soviet government. We do not know, and we want to know, whether they have approved these actions. If so, they bear responsibility. If they have not approved them, then have they condemned them and what opinion have they at present about these hostile Soviet actions? The Albanian Government rightly demands that the Soviet government

not only acknowledge these hostile actions, but immediately return all the material means and military equipment that belong to the People's Republic of Albania, and pay for the damage which it has caused the economy through the unilateral cancelling of credits, and various agreements and relations of an economic character. If these actions are not taken by the Soviet government, this means that it is maintaining its hostile stand to the People's Republic of Albania and its government, and does not want fair, equal and lawful conditions to be created for it within the Organization of the Warsaw Treaty, therefore the invitation which is made to our Government to take part in the meeting of the Warsaw Treaty is a fraud.

How is it possible for the Government of the People's Republic of Albania to take part on equal terms and in the spirit of friendship in the meeting of the Warsaw Treaty when some members of this Organization have withdrawn their ambassadors without sound, proper reasons, although they maintain formal diplomatic relations with our Government? They must correct this in the same forms in which they undertook these actions. Meanwhile the government of the Soviet Union brutally broke off diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of Albania and, thus, crowned its hostile activity towards our country. The government of the Soviet Union must have the courage to repair this fatal mistake immediately. As to how it must repair it, our Party and Government have made this known publicly to the Soviet government. If it does not do so, this means that the Soviet government is maintaining its hostile stand towards the People's Republic of Albania, that it is continuing to work in subversive ways against it and the Albanian leadership, and apart from other things, this is obviously contrary to the provisions and spirit of the Warsaw Treaty. In these conditions it is clear that the spirit of the Warsaw Treaty which brought this organiz-

ation into being does not exist through the fault and the arbitrary desire of the Soviet government which wants to impose its decisions, opinions and desires on other members of the Warsaw Treaty and on the People's Republic of Albania, in particular. Obviously, also, those hostile and illegal activities of the Soviet government, its persistence in these actions, its lack of desire and courage to correct them, show that it continues to prevent the participation of the People's Republic of Albania with full rights and full equality in the meetings of the Warsaw Treaty. In these conditions, while retaining all our rights, we cannot take part in this meeting. All the responsibility falls on you and on the Soviet government, in particular.

On the other hand, without making the other members of the Warsaw Treaty directly responsible for this, we accuse the Soviet government of hostile activities, both subversive and open, against an allied socialist country, a member of the Warsaw Treaty, such as the People's Republic of Albania. From the tribune of the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, the Soviet leadership headed by Khrushchev openly called on the Albanian people to rise in counter-revolution against the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian Government, openly called for the overthrow of the leadership of the Party and the Albanian state. The Soviet government has openly armed the Titoite traitor group, that agency of American imperialism which has consistently plotted against the People's Republic of Albania, to destroy socialism in our country and to make Albania a Yugoslav republic. These actions of the Soviet government cannot be unknown to the other members of the Warsaw Treaty, just as the open supply by the Soviet government of large quantities of modern weapons to the Indian reactionaries who attacked the borders of China cannot be unknown to them. How is it possible that the socialist countries and members of the organization of

the Warsaw Treaty permit such monstrous activities which, even if they are not carried out in the name of the organization of the Warsaw Treaty, are carried out by a member of the Warsaw Treaty and, moreover, by the main one? Our activities, whether inside or outside the Warsaw Treaty, must be directed to a just common aim.

The Albanian Government cannot approve and cannot fail to sternly denounce all the arbitrary, illegal and anti-socialist acts which have been undertaken against it by the Soviet government, in particular.

Our Government demands that the members of the Warsaw Treaty sternly condemn these hostile actions of the Soviet government, make the Soviet government immediately cease supplying weapons to the Titoites, the Indian reactionaries and any government which uses these weapons for aggression and to oppress its own or other peoples. Correct actions on your part in this direction will assist the organization of the Warsaw Treaty to take the right road, to adopt the genuine revolutionary spirit and become the true defender of the socialist camp. But if our organization is truly to become that organization for which it was founded and adapt itself to the present situation in the world, our Government cannot reconcile itself to the arbitrary actions of one government which thinks that it alone makes the law and that the others must obey it blindly, even in its "legal" actions. Our Government thinks that if you take the measures which we propose in our letter in a correct and favourable way, then all the conditions will be created for our Government really to take part in meetings with all its rights and have the possibility and full right to present its views openly on the work of the Warsaw Treaty, on its activity, its organization, its political and military plans, and many other problems which the Soviet government headed by Khrushchev has set on the wrong and dangerous course. If you re-

ject our proposals this will confirm our legitimate suspicion that you, and especially the Soviet government, are afraid of the truth, of the democratic and socialist spirit which ought to prevail between our states and, especially, in the Organization of the Warsaw Treaty.

For our part we have always spoken openly and sincerely with the other socialist countries, because for us the defence of genuine Marxist-Leninist unity has always been the central aim of our principled struggle. Others have fought savagely against the PR of Albania, have conspired against it and damaged it. The Albanian Government has in its possession incontestable documents and proofs that a group of individuals who were and are at the head of a powerful "socialist" state, a member of the Warsaw Treaty, have collaborated with the Titoite renegades, the Greek monarcho-fascists, the American 6th Fleet, and their agents inside Albania to liquidate the People's Republic of Albania by force, through an armed attack. The Albanian Government is also aware that the same group of people has striven within the Organization of the Warsaw Treaty to do very evil things against our people in the name of this organization. In both instances, however, thanks to the unity, patriotism and vigilance of the Albanian people led by the PLA, they were unable to attain their sinister, hostile, anti-Marxist objectives. Are these people still going to be defended, are their criminal actions to remain uncondemned? This must not be permitted. You may be sure that we will defend ourselves with all our might and means against enemies and scoundrels. We are on the right course, we warn our friends and comrades that they should re-examine their wrong stands, we want our friends to avoid compromising themselves in the dangerous actions of the secret enemies, actions which, sooner or later, will be revealed in the true light of facts. Marxism-Leninism cannot be reconciled with hostile actions against peoples, against socialism and

communism.

For the sake of major interests, the Albanian Government appeals to the governments that took the step of summoning the PR of Albania to meetings, to carry matters boldly through to the end so that the road is cleared of hostility, of rotten things, and the situation becomes healthy. We are convinced that Marxist-Leninist justice will triumph regardless of whether or not some want it. For our part, our conscience is clear, because we have done, are doing and will do our duty...

VLORA, FRIDAY
JANUARY 8, 1965

AGAIN ABOUT THE LETTER WHICH WE ARE TO SEND THE MEMBER COUNTRIES OF THE WARSAW TREATY

Additions

I wrote to Ramiz again about the reply we are going to send the member countries of the Warsaw Treaty, suggesting that in the formulation of the letter these ideas, which I believe are important, should be borne in mind:

1. — In these conditions which you have created for the People's Republic of Albania in the Warsaw Treaty, the Albanian Government, through this letter, expresses its opinion with full responsibility about the agenda you propose:

Against the arming of Bonn Germany with atomic weapons. This has been, is and always will be our view. We have fought, are fighting and always will fight against the Americans' supplying it with atomic weapons.

The source of the danger lies in the anti-Marxist and anti-socialist capitulationist policy to American imperialism adopted by the Soviet government headed by former prime minister, Nikita Khrushchev, who linked the issue of the notorious Moscow Treaty with the supplying of atomic weapons to West Germany and with dubious deals about sacrificing the rights, freedom, independence and sovereignty of the German Democratic Republic.

We have openly and publicly denounced the sinister aims of Khrushchev when the Moscow Treaty was

signed; Khrushchev and his associates concealed their true aims. Now these are emerging openly, in dangerous ways. Irrespective of the Moscow Treaty and Nikita Khrushchev's pledges, the United States of America, Khrushchev's "reasonable and peaceful" friend, is arming Bonn with atomic weapons. We ask: Why was this Moscow Treaty signed? Against whom was this Treaty concluded?

With a policy of capitulation to American imperialism, such as this that the Soviet government continues to pursue, a policy which it hides under the formulas of "peaceful coexistence," "peaceful competition" and others of this type, which in practice are anti-Leninist, you cannot get very far, and peace and the existence of mankind cannot be defended from the nuclear catastrophe which American imperialism and its allies want to launch.

We Albanians and all the peoples are concerned, but not intimidated. American imperialism is the number one enemy, it is preparing for war and arming its allies to attack us. This situation must be dealt with not by making concessions to the Americans, but by pinning them down and forcing them to retreat. With the present policy which is being pursued by the Soviet government and some governments of other Warsaw Treaty member countries, a dangerous course is being pursued, assisting the outbreak of war by American imperialism.

Earlier we took correct joint decisions, but they have been violated, abandoned, in order to take wrong decisions.

We must defend the German Democratic Republic with all our strength. We have taken a decision to sign the peace treaty with it, whether or not the others come. The Soviet government headed by Khrushchev was intimidated by and capitulated to the Americans and breached this decision, with aims very harmful to

the future of the German people, the peoples of our countries and the peoples of the world. You bear grave responsibility for this, too. If the German Democratic Republic is not defended, the Oder-Neisse border, the Sudetenland and Czechoslovakia cannot be defended, either. These things are linked together and are dear to all of us. We must defend our countries, defend our peoples and socialism, and not concoct plots against fraternal countries, as Nikita Khrushchev and some of his associates did. The truth is bitter, but it is the truth.

It is urgently necessary to correct the fatal mistakes made by the Soviet government. In the first place:

a) The peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic should be signed as soon as possible.

...

c) The Moscow Treaty should be denounced immediately by the Soviet government and those governments which signed this treaty.

The Government of the PR of Albania is convinced that no other measure or decision will have any effect in face of the threats of the USA and its allies and stop them in their warmongering activity.

Khrushchev's policy of capitulation and charlatanism has failed ignominiously, causing colossal damage and creating serious dangers. This cannot but be clear to the governments of other member states of the Warsaw Treaty. If you do not see this, you should reflect more profoundly; if you pretend not to see it, you are making a colossal mistake; if you persist in that hostile policy and continue to pursue it, you are committing a colossal crime and bear full responsibility for this before your peoples, before all the peoples of the world, before socialism.

We appeal to you to re-examine your foreign policy from start to finish, and courageously put it back on the right course as quickly as possible, because not only do we have colossal strength, but the international cir-

cumstances are such that they favour such a change of course. We appeal to you to study the circumstances profoundly so that we benefit from them, benefit from the deep contradictions in the ranks of the imperialists in order to deal them even more powerful blows.

2. — There where we speak about the arming of the Indian reactionaries by the Soviets, we must put in that the former are imprisoning and torturing communists and that it is unheard of for the murderers and torturers of communists to be called friends and loyal allies of a socialist state and to be helped by that state with all its means. This shows clearly that the Soviet leaders are in solidarity with the reactionary Indian bourgeoisie and the agent of the bourgeoisie, Dange,* for the suppression of the Indian revolutionary Marxist-Leninists.

P.S.

The Polish government, to which the letter is addressed, should be requested to present it to the plenary meeting of the Political Consultative Committee or simply to the plenary meeting of the Warsaw Treaty, at which it should be read. If this is not done, we must tell them that they are not only continuing an old injustice, but also trying, in an illegal way, to conceal the views of a member of the Warsaw Treaty. We can add, also, that the Albanian Government reserves the right to make the views expressed in this letter known to the general public at the moment it deems opportune and through the means it has at its disposal.

* At that time Chairman of the Communist Party of India (revisionist).

MONDAY
JANUARY 25, 1965

ON THE MEETING OF THE POLITICAL CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE WARSAW TREATY

Notes*

The first reports we are receiving on the proceedings of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty confirm our forecasts. At this meeting there were quarrels, profound contradictions and disagreements over nearly all the main problems which were raised, or better to say, should have been raised. As we expected, the communiqué which was published did not express anything concrete. But what is worse for them is that neither the problem which was on the agenda nor the other problems which might have been added were analysed to the end, as such a forum as the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty should do. Hence the agenda was only superficially dealt with in some general formulations, and even on these there was and could be no unanimity.

The main reason for such an unsuccessful meeting is the fear of an open split between the revisionists, because the contradictions between them are insurmountable. This is the sword of Damocles which is hanging over their heads. In fact they do not agree with one another, they act separately, each state defending its own purely national interests to the detriment of unity of

* Published with some abridgments in Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 28, Alb. ed., "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1978, p. 438.

joint action. They have undermined any real unity. The problems which emerge at various periods and which require urgent solution and clear, resolute stands are glossed over superficially, and they come out with a communiqué like the one they published, at which the whole Western press sneered and jeered; the American press alone, in order to enhance the “prestige” of this worthless communiqué, sought to find some alleged invisible and very disguised threat concealed behind its phrases. Apparently the American imperialists are scandalized, and at the same time saddened by this “flagrant incapacity to act” of their allies, the Soviet revisionists.

The fact is, however, that the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty was demanded by Ulbricht, who did not succeed in having even one phrase about the defence of the German Democratic Republic or any warning, albeit formal, to Bonn inserted in the communiqué. Ulbricht got nothing. Khrushchev, at least, “did a bit of shouting” for appearances’ sake. On the other hand, it is rumoured that Dej opposed some formulations and in particular “threatened to leave the meeting and refused to sign the communiqué if acceptance of Zhou Enlai’s proposal on the meeting of heads of governments were not included in it...” Apparently the others did not want to include it because they considered it an imposition of the Chinese policy on their states which are “united” by a formal treaty, but which, in fact, are disunited and without any treaty.

We are not fully informed about what they did with the letter of our Government to the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty, but even if it were not read out, it must have been distributed, and it has dominated and crushed the panic-stricken revisionist plotters. They are certainly anxiously awaiting the public explosion of our bomb which will go off without

fail and without delay.

Not wanting to add insult to injury the Soviets, of course, did not dare to raise other very acute problems, especially such problems as the “famous” meeting of March 1965,* which they are so anxious to hold.

On bad terms with the Romanians, on bad terms with the Germans and not on good terms with the others, the Soviet revisionists are getting together with the revisionist Gomulka, the agent of the bourgeoisie, to talk things over tête-à-tête and discuss their problems, but the snake is biting them deeper than before.

The Mikoyan-Brezhnev clique is destroying the Soviet Union. This is the period of the Soviet Union’s slide to disaster, a process begun by Khrushchev, which his group is continuing and is now being consummated by the trio of traitors and their revisionist group.

It is the immediate task of genuine Marxist-Leninist parties to fight relentlessly against the Khrushchevite revisionists and other revisionist groupings, to thoroughly expose them, because only in this way will they encourage, enlighten and strengthen the revolutionary forces in order to rescue the peoples of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the former people’s democracy from the clutches of modern revisionism and world capitalism.

* The revisionists held this meeting on March 1-5, 1965 in Moscow with the aim of condemning the Marxist-Leninist parties as “dogmatic” and expelling them from the communist movement.

**TUESDAY
FEBRUARY 9, 1965**

THE AMERICAN PROVOCATIONS AGAINST THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

Yesterday and the day before American aircraft bombed a number of inhabited centres in North Vietnam, killing civilians and destroying homes, hospitals and schools. The purpose of these barbarous provocative acts is to threaten the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, to extend the aggressive war into North Vietnam, to quell the heroic fight of the partisans of South Vietnam and to rescue the American prestige which is at rock-bottom in the eyes of all the peoples of the world. This displays to the world the weakness and savagery of the United States of America, the aggressiveness and warmongering character of the gendarme of the peoples — American imperialism.

Before he left for Hanoi, Kosygin made his calculations as it pleased him. The Soviet revisionist leaders smiled warmly on Johnson's recent speech, welcomed his suggestion that he would like to visit the Soviet Union, and, likewise, expressed the desire for the Soviet leaders to visit the United States of America, as well as many other actions which are advanced for the Americans. All these things done before Kosygin's trip had the aim of strengthening friendly gestures towards American imperialism, of assuring the Americans that Kosygin's going to Hanoi should not upset them at all and that they ought to understand that Kosygin's speeches in Hanoi would be demagogy, words very far removed from their deeds. However Kosygin had not taken account of the heroic struggle of the people of South Vietnam, who would not stop their war against

the American aggressors, and this war was bound to ruin Kosygin's bourgeois, pacifist plans, just as it did.

Kosygin fell into the trap which he tried to set for others. He was caught unawares and his first demagogic words in Hanoi were saluted with volleys of fire by the Vietnamese partisan heroes who attacked an American airbase with great success, and as the Americans themselves admitted, destroyed several American aircraft and helicopters, killed nine American airmen and wounded 130 others.

Naturally this heroic action ruined Kosygin's plans and inflicted a big military and political defeat on the Americans. In this situation the Americans undertook their provocation with the aims we have stated. However the provocation, somewhat similar to that of the Caribbean, although different in forms and tactics, was carried out by the Americans following the tactics of the Soviet revisionists, of course, with some considerable differences. At the same time as Kosygin was issuing bombastic, demagogic phrases in Hanoi, the Americans were speaking through the language of bombs, and while the Soviet revisionists declared their loyalty to their friendship with the United States of America before they set out on their journey, the Americans, after their provocative act, declared that this act had no connection with the presence of Kosygin in Hanoi.

The Soviet revisionists were dumbfounded, were terrified, as always, because the American's barbarous action was blackmail for them, a serious warning to the Soviets not to go beyond the bounds (which possibly they had decided jointly). In fact, less than 28 hours after the American bombardment, the Soviet revisionists issued a brief "hot air" communiqué and this they buried amidst the news on the third page of *Pravda*. This astonished the world, but not us. The whole of progressive world opinion was indignant, and the revisionists were caught between two fires, confused. Yesterday

they managed to bring out a somewhat official declaration which, of course, is demagoguery and counts for nothing, because the development of events forced them to issue it, and this, without doubt, will lead to further concessions to the Americans later, to make amends for this reluctant "boldness" which they were obliged to display. However this will have bitter consequences for them in the world and in their own country because, while it is true that the revisionists will use this demagogic gesture, it is a two-edged sword, which involves the fundamental exposure of the pro-American policy of the modern revisionists.

We are solid to the end with the heroic people of South and North Vietnam. We are issuing a government declaration of solidarity with them to the end. All over our country today rallies are being held and popular demonstrations will burst out in solidarity with Vietnam and in condemnation of the American aggressors. Our press is full of materials about the war in Vietnam and this will continue. The Women's Organization has launched a campaign for aid for the fighting people of South Vietnam. All these things will strengthen our internationalist solidarity with the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, with the valiant Vietnamese partisans and all the peoples of the world who are fighting for freedom.

**TUESDAY
FEBRUARY 16, 1965**

A JUST AND FIRM STEP OF OUR COUNTRY IN UNO

This evening our representative to UNO, Comrade Halim Budo, will take the floor and demand that the Assembly continue its work on the basis of the procedure laid down in the Charter, which the Americans and the Soviets have violated. Of course, our motion will shock them, will take them by surprise, and we have chosen the appropriate moment when, behind the scenes, the gangsters in UNO have reached an agreement to adjourn the meeting until autumn. We will certainly ruin their plans. They will violate the Charter in order to escape from the stranglehold we shall put on them, but we are determined to do our duty manfully. We shall expose them badly and Albania will be spoken of with admiration in the world.

**WEDNESDAY
FEBRUARY 17, 1985**

SENSATION IN UNO

The motion presented by our delegation in the General Assembly of the UNO* today has caused a great sensation throughout the world. All the news agencies are speaking about the Albanian action, which they describe as “a bombshell which is shaking the UNO,” etc. When Halim finished speaking, he was warmly applauded. The dumb-founded President of the Assembly three times begged Halim to withdraw the demand. Of course he did not budge. Great astonishment! Many are obliged to speak well of Albania... The President of the Assembly closed the session and adjourned it until tomorrow evening in order to find a way to break our grip, which, whatever they do, remains like the sword of Damocles hanging over their heads.

* The representatives of the United States of America and of the Soviet Union tried to ensure that the proceedings of the 19th Session of the General Assembly of the UNO took place in abnormal conditions and that any question that ought to be put to the vote was not discussed. These efforts were defeated thanks to the struggle of our delegation which demanded that its motion to the effect that “the General Assembly should immediately begin its normal work in conformity with the Charter and its internal rules, and proceed immediately with the election of the bureau and the adoption of the agenda in order to begin the examination of different questions without delay,” should be discussed with priority, before any other question, and be decided by immediate roll-call vote.

**SATURDAY
FEBRUARY 20, 1965**

WE EXPOSED THE AMERICANS AND THE SOVIETS BADLY IN UNO

With our motion which was approved by the General Assembly of the UNO, a motion which demanded that this Assembly should begin its normal work immediately in conformity with the Charter and its internal rules, a thing that was being hindered by the representatives of the USA and the Soviet Union, we won an important political battle of international significance against the most powerful grouping in the world today, the most reactionary grouping known in history, that of American imperialism and Soviet revisionism.

The struggle which we waged before the eyes of the whole world at UNO against these savage enemies was a difficult struggle full of traps on the part of world reaction.

We waited for the most appropriate moment to attack because this had decisive importance, because the strength of the enemies is such that they could find a thousand and one procedural tricks to defeat our plan. For more than two months we were waiting to act, while the Americans and the Soviets had been applying their shameful decisions that one side should display strength, the other demagogy, when the two were in agreement and had divided their roles to achieve the one aim: to hinder UNO from working, to ensure that only they led it, to suppress the will of other member countries, to carry on a secret diplomacy, and to ensure that the American-Soviet diplomacy is developed, applied and coordinated to the detriment of the world, outside UNO. We observed all these things carefully

and instructed Halim to be patient, to goad them a little from time to time, sometime over a word, sometime over a problem, so that the enemies would understand that we were hitting at them but not hard, and through our calm stand we let them think they could operate freely, although they were afraid of us.

The Americans and the Soviets came to terms, reached complete agreement, the plot was organized and made ready, the conspirators were rehearsed behind the scenes, the scenario was arranged with the people who were to act, those who were to speak, how they were to speak, how they were to vote, and then they came out in the Assembly to present their “bouquet of flowers,” and receive the approval of “Madam Assembly.”

Twenty-four hours earlier we gave Halim his instructions to open fire and attack, and as soon as the President of the session of the Assembly, the Ghanaian Sakay, rang the bell, the eagle flew to the tribune of the Assembly of the United Nations and, as you might say, dropped the bomb.

The camp of the conspirators was taken aback and caught by great panic, while our friends, and especially the representatives of Arab and African countries, applauded Halim frantically. And our struggle continued uninterrupted until victory was achieved. Bravo Comrade Halim!

He fought bravely, with determination, intelligence and wisdom. The United States of America bowed to our will, agreed to vote on the motion and the whole rotten plan was exposed. The Soviets voted together with the Americans and they were caught naked in bed together.

The name of Albania rang all round the world as an example of a fearless fighter against darkness, for light, for peace and for socialism. The small peoples take Albania as an example and the enslaved peoples, who are

fighting, are encouraged. We must hold high the banner of Albania and our Party.

**WEDNESDAY
APRIL 28, 1965**

AGGRESSION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN SANTO DOMINGO

The American imperialists have landed troops in Santo Domingo where fighting is going on between the tools of the Americans who are in power and revolutionaries who support the former president Bosch. The gunboat policy continues. The American aggressors have become quite shameless. They went there to drown in blood the revolutionary people of Santo Domingo who for decades on end suffered every kind of evil from the clique of the dictator Trujillo, a tool of the Americans.

Moscow is for "saving the lives of American and foreign citizens." All this is a bluff. Of course, the Soviet revisionists "will raise the question" in the Security Council, as usual, will deliver one or two bombastic speeches, the meeting will drag on and on, and during this period the Americans will go about their business on the island and will reach agreement with the Soviets behind the scenes. Secret diplomacy. We shall expose them; we shall make a statement and defend the Dominican people.

**SATURDAY
JUNE 12, 1965**

ABOUT THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION IN THE LIGHT OF CURRENT EVENTS

The positions of American imperialism are being weakened. The Americans are suffering political-military defeats everywhere and, in the first place, in South Vietnam.

Their bombardment of the DR of Vietnam did not bring them any political or military advantage. On the contrary, they suffered utter fiasco. Their blackmail was to no avail. They were unable to bring Vietnam to its knees or to help the Soviet revisionists in their constant pressure on Vietnam to bring them to the negotiation table with the Americans. The opposite occurred, the bombardments have exposed the Americans, have increased the hatred of the Vietnamese, have strengthened them and made them strengthen their defence, their resistance, their training and their war. Furthermore, these savage but fruitless bombardments have shaken the allies of the United States who have begun to speak out, to criticize, to reproach it and give it advice. Within the United States of America Johnson's policy has created discontent among the public and his defeats have caused forthright bitter comments about the aggressive policy of the American President. Naturally the peoples' hatred of American imperialism has increased and those who put their trust in its "great might" have lost all hope. The Americans' brutal intervention in Santo-Domingo, their vile manoeuvres have increased the suspicions and hatred of the peoples, and especially of the peoples of South America. With all this complex of barbarous actions the Americans have

bitten off more than they can chew, and the lump in their throat is choking them.

The main difficulty for the Americans at present is the war in South Vietnam. There they have completely lost face, let alone their mask which was torn from them long ago. No longer can they hide behind the Vietnamese puppets, since in practice they no longer exist, neither the so-called south Vietnamese government, nor the military command or the army exist. All these have been liquidated politically, liquidated by the partisan war. They have been reduced to mere mercenaries, so much so that even the United States of America itself no longer puts any trust in them, no longer counts on them, and keeps changing them every week. The puppet army does not exist as an army, or even as a detachment of mercenaries. It has lost any will to resist and the Americans have lost any trust they had in it and are using it only as cannon fodder, to make up numbers. So the Americans are fighting alone in Vietnam, as aggressors, as colonizers. This is the catastrophic situation they have reached. The whole world sees this. No amount of their demagogy can deceive anyone. Others who had pinned their hopes on the Americans have begun to think deeply about what is in store for them. This is a great political loss for the Americans who are taking terrible punishment in the fighting with the Vietcong. They have no victories at all, nothing but defeats. They have shut themselves up in fortified centres and bases, and there they await the attacks which Vietcong is striking at them successfully, throwing them into indescribable panic. The Americans find themselves in a totally hostile country, besieged on a few fortified islands without any way of escape or rear area into which to withdraw, or rather, their only remaining escape routes are by air and sea and their fleet is their rear-guard. Of course, the airforce can do little against partisans, either in good or in bad weather. It

is ineffective. At present, in the monsoon period, the Americans are in great panic and constantly on the defensive because the Vietcong forces are attacking them relentlessly.

American imperialism, its allies and the modern revisionists are experiencing moments of great anxiety. Any diplomatic activity has been toned down, the war in Vietnam and the defeats of the Americans have stifled them. All their attempts, individual or combined, accompanied with blackmail and intimidation are no longer of any value. Thanks to the war of the Vietcong all these attempts have failed, American imperialism has lost the war, the revisionists have been exposed, world capitalism has been weakened and the American strength shaken, its policy of blackmail has been discredited and the contradictions within world capitalism have become deeper, hence, our correct positions have been strengthened.

In this situation of failures for them, the modern revisionists, headed by the Soviet revisionists, have suffered a colossal defeat, especially in regard to their "peaceful coexistence," "the world without arms," etc., friendship with "the peace-loving and wise American leaders."

They have helped and are helping the United States of America with all their might, and time and again Johnson thanks them, smiles at them, rounds them up and makes proposals to them about the extension of the collaboration between them, and never "gets angry" but adopts a stand of "Olympian" indifference or even benevolence when *Pravda* prints some "rude words" about "American madmen." Johnson knows very well that the Soviet revisionists do this not from choice but from necessity, indeed they undoubtedly have an agreement with the Americans about this, since it is not in the interest of either side to expose themselves totally and simultaneously. It is necessary to both that one

should attack from outside while the other undermines from within, through demagoguery, to achieve the same result. The two sides, the American imperialists and the Soviet revisionists, are agreed on this.

Thus in all the fields of diplomacy the Soviet revisionists have kept quiet in order to avoid causing embarrassment for their American partners; they do not raise any problems and when they do say a few words on some issue they do this to serve their one-sided intensive demagoguery about "the war for the defence of Vietnam."

Wherever the peoples are fighting for the consolidation of the struggle against American imperialism, for its exposure, for the strengthening of the anti-imperialist alliance, the Soviet revisionists and their friends are there to fight against them, to sabotage them, to present their revisionist, pro-imperialist theses. The Soviet, the Titoite and other modern revisionists, together with the reactionaries, have become the cutting edge of the sword of American imperialism, they are the fifth column, its most qualified secret agency.

In this direction and in this context a fierce struggle is being waged with the Soviet revisionists and the reactionaries over the 2nd Afro-Asian Conference, which is to be held at the end of this month in Algiers. The aim of the Soviets and the Americans is to sabotage it. They have set all the wheels in motion to ensure that the Soviets take part in it, are admitted as observers, and to prevent many of those who have the right to take part from participating in this conference.

All those who side with the Americans are trying to take part and, if possible, to issue revisionist declarations. The countries that are under the influence of France say that they will not take part in it, and are allegedly staying neutral, neither on one side nor on the other. De Gaulle is pursuing the policy of intermediarity between the United States of America and China.

All the allegedly neutral states of these two continents are using this meeting to obtain credits and immediate political advantages, therefore, they swing sometimes in one direction and sometimes in another. We shall see how the situation develops, but we shall fight.

The policy of French capital is, so to say, more active. In these circumstances, De Gaulle continues to create embarrassments for the Americans, to oppose them, to attack them, sometimes politically sometimes economically, and in particular is making efforts to wean Bonn away from them. But here, of course, France meets great resistance, because Bonn itself wants to dominate in Europe, indeed to dominate France, and is still greatly interested in remaining, even if temporarily, on the side of the United States of America. De Gaulle, naturally, is trying to mirror Bonn's desires by exerting pressure on the Soviets so that they give way over the German Democratic Republic, extract concessions from it for the Federal Republic of Germany in order to wean it away more easily from the United States of America. De Gaulle is making many attempts to link up with the revisionist countries of Europe and extend the economic and political influence of French capital there with a number of objectives in view: to strengthen the influence of France, to weaken the influence of the United States of America, to weaken the links of the latter with the Soviet Union, to encircle the German Democratic Republic and force it to capitulate in favour of Bonn and the French hegemony in Europe.

The Soviet revisionists are flirting in several directions: they are with the United States of America, and mainly with it, and at the same time they are smiling at De Gaulle and are also trying to make deals with the Germans. Apart from sensational political acts, which for the time being they have toned down, the Soviets and all their comrades and friends in Europe have plunged up to their waists into trade deals, "cultural

exchanges,” credits, degeneration, etc., etc. Everything is moving towards close, all-round alliances with world capitalism. This seems to be a quiet phase on the surface, but it is full of hidden contradictions and terrible fights among various capitalists (the revisionists are capitalists), which will erupt in open conflicts and wars between them. The political and ideological stand and the military-economic preparation of the socialist countries are an insurmountable obstacle for them, and their heroic, unflinching, dauntless, resolute and consistent struggle will cause the capitalist states great defeats, expose them and finally destroy them.

The revisionist countries are experiencing a very grave ideological, political, economic and military crisis; likewise, the revisionist parties of the capitalist countries. The Italian Communist Party is degenerating completely, the French Communist Party is decomposing, the others are following the same course. Meanwhile the Marxist-Leninist parties are growing stronger and are in complete unity. We have economic successes and complete unity within the Party and between the Party and the people. This shows that we are on the correct course and will defeat our enemies, no matter how great their number, however they present themselves and whatever weapons they possess. Our strength is unconquerable. Everything is proceeding in favour of Marxism-Leninism, in favour of the revolution, socialism and communism.

THURSDAY
JUNE 17, 1965

WE SHOULD SUPPORT THE STRUGGLE OF THE AFRO- ASIAN PEOPLES AGAINST IMPERIALISM

Notes*

The expansionist aims of the American imperialists and the new Soviet revisionist imperialists, who disguise themselves under a phoney communist cloak for spheres of influence and exploitation are combined and intermingled in Asia and Africa.

Their true aim of economic and political exploitation is manifested in different aspects. The United States of America attacks with fire and dollars, while the Soviet revisionists with cunning, rubles, lies and demagogy.

The aim common to both of them is to work against and stamp out revolutions, to oppress the peoples, to distort the idea of socialism and to combat the genuine revolutionary forces of these continents.

We must develop these theses:

— Who interferes in the internal affairs of the peoples.

— What do we and the imperialist-revisionists mean by freedom, independence and sovereignty.

— What is meant with our alleged isolation which the imperialists and revisionists claim exists and what do we mean with the struggle for the isolation of our

* These notes were used for the article "The 2nd Afro-Asian Conference — A Heavy Blow Against Imperialism and Its Collaborators" (*Zëri i popullit*, June 19, 1965).

enemies.

We must develop these theses, linking them with the example of our struggle and with the direction that the struggle of the peoples of Asia and Africa should take, especially after the forthcoming meeting in Algiers.

These theses should have as their objective our struggle to prevent the participation of the Soviet revisionists in the Algiers meeting, and to arouse awareness of the need for resistance by the Afro-Asian states which are wavering and being subjected to every sort of pressure by the imperialists-revisionists.

**FRIDAY
SEPTEMBER 3, 1965**

WE MUST BE CONSCIOUS OF OUR GREAT STRENGTH

Addition to the speech of our delegation at UNO

I read the speech which the head of our delegation will deliver at this year's session of the General Assembly of UNO. I instructed that the following piece should be added to this speech:

The concept that a small state must subject itself to a big state, that, in order to earn the right to exist in this world, a small state must blindly follow the policy the big states impose on it, that an economically weak state must subordinate itself to the economy of an economically powerful state, is unacceptable in the present epoch. The freedom, independence, sovereignty, self-determination, self-government and political decisions of any people, of any independent state, cannot permit interference, open or disguised, in any form or in any circumstances. The big capitalist states and degenerate chauvinist leaders have never given up this policy of oppression, of political-economic blackmail, of brutal interference, of open and disguised machinations against sovereign peoples and states. They continue to fight to prolong the existence of this dirty policy and do everything possible to pass it off as a "democratic" policy, to cover it up with pseudo-peaceful, pseudo-humanitarian slogans and cloak it with the mantle of pseudo-peaceful coexistence. This policy conceals in itself their political and economic aggression, blackmail and pressures, it conceals their armed interventions, prepares for war and endangers peace.

When these states and the degenerate chauvinist leaders we mentioned above are fighting with all the means at their disposal against the freedom and independence of other peoples and states who want to live free, sovereign and independent, do not we, the small countries, have the right and duty to fight with the greatest determination against this state of affairs which threatens us at every moment of every day? We have this right and we must boldly accomplish this vital task.

He who has right on his side is the strongest, and right is on our side. In words, in demagogy, neither the imperialists nor their partners deny us this right, but in practice they do everything possible to strangle us.

We are not against big states and big peoples as states and peoples, we are not against the American people or any other big people, but we are and will fight to the end against the servitude, the enslavement, the barbarous exploitation, the colonialism, the imperialist blackmail and warmongering policy which the leaders and governments of those states practise.

Compared with the strength of world imperialism, the strength of the small freedom-loving countries is colossal. We must be conscious of our great strength which neither the many armaments, nor the economic strength of the imperialists are capable of withstanding. Time has proved this great truth, and it is being reconfirmed every day in life.

There are some who are afraid of the imperialist bogey, afraid of the imperialists' reprisals, afraid they will cut off their credits, afraid that the imperialists will organize plots in their countries. However, the threats, the plots and the brutal intervention, armed or not, can be coped with, all can be coped with, as they have been and are coped with every day by the peoples, by heroic, honest and courageous folk. The history of mankind, of each individual people, is a brilliant history of revolu-

tionary battles against tyrants, invaders, bloodsuckers, colonialists and imperialists.

The Albanian people are a people small in number, the Albanian state is a small state, but it has never harmed anyone, while many others have done it harm, have invaded it, have killed, burned and massacred, but have never achieved their diabolical aim of physically and spiritually oppressing and enslaving, and eliminating the Albanian people, because they fought, resisted and were not afraid even in the gravest moments of their history through the centuries. However, the example of our small people is only one among many examples in the brilliant history of the peoples who have fought for freedom, independence and sovereignty.

In fact, the governments of the USA and some other countries have not wanted and do not want to establish diplomatic relations with Albania, because it does not please them that a small people like ours should live free and independent. But this has done the Albanian state no harm. The People's Republic of Albania exists and prospers. The government of another great power, also, broke off diplomatic relations with Albania, with the aim of intimidating and oppressing us, but the Albanian people were not afraid, and the People's Republic of Albania exists and prospers.

It is customary for the enemies of our country and people to describe us as a satellite of one state or another, just as they do in general with all states which defend their freedom, sovereignty and justice, because we are a small people. Tomorrow they may go so far as to make us a satellite of the moon (!), regardless of the fact that it has no satellites. All those who have tried to trifle with the fate of the Albanian people and the People's Republic of Albania, those who have tried to impose their treacherous and enslaving views through hypocritical friendship, have been put in their place by the Albanian people.

Through its correct peaceful policy, the new Albania, which maintains and develops friendly relations with many states of the world on the basis of the principles of equality, non-interference and reciprocal respect, has earned the right to speak freely in this Assembly, to express its opinion openly and without kid-gloves, regardless of the fact that this does not please the representatives of the USA and some others. It is quite certain that, irrespective of the forms of regimes, Albania enjoys your sympathy, honoured representatives of the majority of the states of the world. Herein lies the great strength of small Albania. We are different states with different regimes. On many questions we may not, and do not, have identical opinions, but in regard to what I said above, you and the peoples whom you represent, in your hearts and sound reasoning agree that we have no great differences. This is the basis of the unity and the sincere collaboration of the People's Republic of Albania with your states and governments in struggle over the major problems which are concerning all mankind, against world imperialism, against predatory imperialist war, for a peace in equality and justice.

Loyal to these principles and its policy of peaceful friendship amongst peoples, of solidarity and support for revolutionary and liberation movements and peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, the People's Republic of Albania unites its efforts with those of other peace-loving states to remove the threat of a new world war, to smash the aggressive policy of American imperialism, to completely liquidate colonialism and to solve the great international problems in the interests of peace, freedom and national independence, democracy and social progress.

SATURDAY
OCTOBER 16, 1965

COLLABORATION WITH AMERICAN IMPERIALISM FOR WORLD DOMINATION — THE GENERAL LINE OF THE SOVIET REVISIONIST LEADERSHIP

Today the newspaper *Zëri i popullit* carried an article with the title “Collaboration With American Imperialism for World Domination — The General Line of the Soviet Revisionist Leadership.”* In this article we deal mainly with some questions which have to do with the secret and open Soviet-American collaboration, one year after the fall of the arch-revisionist Khrushchev.

— Since its advent to power, the new Soviet leadership has implemented the Khrushchevite policy of rapprochement and collaboration with American imperialism more persistently by continually establishing collaboration with it in new fields.

— At present it can be said and defined with precision that the general line of the Khrushchevite revisionists is Soviet-American collaboration for the domination of two powers in the world. The joint imperialist-revisionist efforts for domination by the two great powers have now assumed a more than concrete character. They are now in a common front against revolutionary movements in various regions of the world, together they are fighting and undermining socialism, together they are helping the reactionaries of different countries and together trying to create their international gendarmerie, etc., under the flag of UNO.

* Published in: Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 30, Alb. ed., “8 Nëntori” Publishing House, Tirana 1979, p. 309.

— Today both the Khrushchevite revisionists and the imperialists talk about spheres of influence, about common interests in various regions of the world, about joint responsibilities for the “preservation of peace,” about the special responsibilities of the two great powers, about their special missions, etc., etc. Both sides are making great efforts to convince or compel others to accept the concept and practice that “all the current international problems can and must be solved only within the framework of Soviet-American relations and collaboration.”

— The rapprochement with American imperialism, which Khrushchev began, has been continued by the new Soviet leaders with the establishment of complete collaboration in all fields. For the sake of this collaboration the present Soviet leadership made deals with the United States of America over the violation of the rights and future of the German Democratic Republic, is sabotaging the glorious liberation struggle of the Vietnamese people, etc.

— Today there are no important international questions about which, irrespective of the demagogical stands that might be taken for political expediency, there is no prior Soviet-American agreement, on which they have not held talks and coordinated the tactics to be followed. The UNO is a very clear example. At UNO the imperialist and the revisionist actors play the roles they have learnt by heart before the performance, just as in a theatre. During the play they sometimes get angry, sometimes become gentle, they shout and smile, but as in every farce it all ends peacefully and they shake hands with each other.

— The existence of a great imperialist-revisionist plot against socialism, international security and peace is a fact that is clearly obvious, and no demagogy can cover it up.

TUESDAY
JANUARY 11, 1966

THE COMEDY OF TASHKENT

In Tashkent the Soviet revisionists and the American imperialists are jointly staging a diplomatic comedy which they describe as “a top-level meeting.”

The Soviet revisionists invited Lal Bahadur of India and Ayub Khan of Pakistan to Tashkent to make peace between them. Hence, the essence of the comedy is the tragedy caused by the Indian aggression* against Pakistan, an attack hatched up openly and indirectly by the Americans and the Soviet revisionists against Pakistan which maintained friendly relations with China. However, this plot failed. Pakistan resisted the aggression which was turning into a defeat for those who organized and launched it.

All the endeavours and manoeuvres of the imperialists and revisionists to close this wound which remains permanently open, are well-known. One of these manoeuvres is the comedy of Tashkent. American imperialism and Soviet revisionism, in agreement with each other had, without fail, to put an end, even if only temporarily and in appearance, to this India-Pakistan conflict, which was unfavourable to their plans.

Naturally, American imperialism, which is known as an inveterate aggressor and behind-the-scenes organizer of the Indian aggression, could not assume this role. It was entrusted to the Soviet revisionists, loyal friends of the Indian reactionaries, because they have been entrusted by the Americans with the filthy role of fighting socialism, fighting Marxism-Leninism, fighting the socialist countries and the Marxist-Leninist parties, and forcing the heroic people of Vietnam to

* On September 5, 1965.

their knees before the American aggressors. In order to play this role, however, the revisionists, exposed and bankrupt in the international arena, had the need for a lustre, for a diplomatic “success,” even a temporary one, for this immediate contingency.

The Americans and the Soviets had the Indian reactionaries in the bag. This is a fact; therefore, it was Ayub Khan that had to be brought into line, and Johnson did this. Johnson summoned Ayub Khan to Washington and put the cap on him, telling him to go to Tashkent. The propaganda was organized in such a way as to give the impression that this “useless” conference would yield no results, that this would be a defeat for the Soviet Union, etc., etc. This pessimistic refrain was kept up until the final day of the meeting, and at the very last minute, the “bouquet” was presented, the astonishing “success” was achieved: India and Pakistan reached agreement and this miracle was brought about by the Soviet revisionists, the revisionist diplomacy “triumphed,” hence, great publicity for all their filthy ideological and political baggage. But the bluff and the comedy was so clumsy and the publicity about the success so obviously false that Lal Bahadur Shastri collapsed on the spot and died in the arms of Kosygin at the time when the champagne glasses were being raised to the “success” which had been achieved.

Thus, the “comedy” of Tashkent ended with a death. The American aggression will end with a death, too; and the Khrushchevite revisionists and their allies will end with their political and ideological death, as well.

MONDAY
MARCH 21, 1966

THE SOVIET UNION IS FORMING NEW ALLIANCES WITH THE IMPERIALISTS

The treacherous Soviet revisionists have got themselves into an impasse. Their great betrayal is putting the Soviet Union and world peace in a dangerous situation.

The Soviet revisionists are acting as imperialists and the title communist they give themselves is a mask. Together with the Americans, the Soviet revisionists are trying to dominate the world and the peoples. Both of them are trying to fight communism (this unites them), both are trying to establish their own hegemony (this divides them).

With their ideology the Soviet revisionists have assumed the role of the “last of the Mohicans” in order to “defeat” communism, and American imperialism is helping them with its sword.

The American hegemonic policy is aimed at intimidating the peoples who are fighting against it for freedom but, in fact, it is frightening its capitalist partners who are struggling to escape from its strangling grip. The Soviet hegemony is less frightening to the Americans’ partners who are fighting under the disguise of American allies in order to gain their lost strength especially in Europe, and thus become prepotent powers.

Soviet revisionist imperialism, although a great power, is and will remain incapable of matching American imperialism in the economic field, therefore, in order to counterbalance this *handicap** the Soviets are

* English in the original.

trying to strengthen their nuclear potential and, together with the United States of America, to retain their monopoly of nuclear strength. Hence, the purpose of the Soviet nuclear potential is not to preserve the peace, but to preserve the balance of power with the United States of America as a temporary means of blackmail until it recovers economically. Therefore, this is fraught with the great danger of a nuclear war.

In order to weaken and make the Soviet Union more and more dependent on it, while waging an armed struggle against the freedom of the peoples (and in this direction it is waging a relentless struggle to strangle the Soviet Union and its partners), American imperialism is endeavouring, particularly in Europe, to arm Bonn Germany with nuclear weapons in order to have it as a strong partner against the Soviet Union and, eventually, also against France, which is pursuing an anti-American and anti-NATO policy, a thing which has become disturbing to the American hegemony in Europe and could become even more so.

Having set out on this anti-American course, capitalist France, while fighting against its isolation is, of course, awaiting a more favorable moment to separate Bonn from the United States of America so that, if not alone, the two of them together can rule Europe. In order to achieve this, France, of course, is smiling at the Soviet Union, trying to revive the old alliances in order to change the balance of power in Europe; France is trying to increase the influence of its former policy in the countries of East Europe: Poland, Romania, Bulgaria. With such a policy France aims to blackmail Bonn and to threaten the United States of America and to create a mirage for the Soviet Union.

While maintaining their “good relations” as lackeys with the American leaders, smiling at France and signing agreements both with it and with Japan (with the latter for two aims, against China and to neutralize

the policy of the United States of America with Japan to some extent), those allegedly clever politicians, the Soviet leaders, will not fail to exert some kind of blackmail on the United States of America to reduce the great pressure it exerts on the Soviet Union.

These sinister aims of the revisionist traitors are, of course, achieved at the expense of their allies, the European revisionists, whom the Soviets regard simply as pawns in the game of chess.

But here, too, as the traitors they are, they prove they are short-sighted because the other European revisionists want to sell their Homeland for the highest price and will sell it to whoever bids the most. Therefore, there is no doubt that we shall see great contradictions and friction among the revisionists, as well as between them and the various imperialists, and this will certainly lead to a struggle for hegemony, for domination. With each passing day the peoples will see the danger of this betrayal more clearly and will rise in revolution.

This will be the final war. Marxism-Leninism, socialism, will triumph through struggle, with great sacrifices, but they will win. The Party of Labour of Albania is proud of the glorious struggle it is waging and will continue to wage until victory, on the road of Marxism-Leninism.

WEDNESDAY
MARCH 30, 1966

ON BREZHNEV'S REPORT TO THE 23RD CONGRESS OF THE CPSU

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:

1) 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.

2) Further departure from Khrushchev's methods of boastful arrogance and *rodomontade** in regard to us and, naturally, in regard to the Americans.

3) Hardly a word addressed to us and the other Marxist-Leninist parties, apart from a hypocritical "sermon" about unity.

4) 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.

5) In regard to the other imperialists, a policy giving them hope, naturally under the American umbrella; the most eulogistic phrases about Gaullist France, for

* Bluster (French in the original).

the interests of the moment; less so about 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.

6) 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.”

7) 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 east the dice and cross the “Rubicon” completely.

8) 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** while their line remains the same as before,

* French in the original.

that 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 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.

MONDAY
FEBRUARY 20, 1967

THE SOVIET REVISIONISTS ARE TRYING TO INTIMIDATE US

In one of its broadcasts two weeks ago, if I am not mistaken, Radio Moscow tried to blackmail and intimidate us. Speaking about the “joint European security,” it said that “Albania is endangered by NATO, which has its bases in Italy and Greece, and the fleet of the United States of America is prowling about the Mediterranean, especially now that the United States of America has changed its tactics and attitude towards China,” etc. In other words, the Soviet revisionists want to tell us that now China “cannot protect you, hence you must accept our protection.”

The Soviet revisionists really think like imperialists. They proved this with the plot they hatched up together with Greek reaction, with the Yugoslav Titoites and the American 6th Fleet, a plot which we uncovered at the time of the 4th Congress (Teme Sejko’s plot). Therefore the stealing of our submarines by the Soviet revisionists favoured precisely the NATO forces for an aggression, towards which we never slacken our vigilance.

Likewise the Soviet revisionists are confirming our forecasts that, by inciting a coordinated aggression against us, the forces of the Warsaw Treaty under the pretext of the alliance would try to attack us with paratroops, who would come, allegedly as liberators, to wipe us out. But we fear neither their blackmail nor their threats. They will never catch us unawares; we have taken all the measures to fight and to win. Any adventure which the imperialists or their agents might hatch up against us will fail, and this will be the beginning of their catastrophe. Our heroic fight against any

adventure of theirs will arouse the peoples of the world to fight the aggressors.

None of this blackmail will get anywhere with the Albanians, who, led by their heroic Party, are marching forward fearlessly, with the pick in one hand and the rifle in the other.

WEDNESDAY
JULY 5, 1967

TRAGI-COMEDY AT UNO

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

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

Such a tragedy was played in recent times in this organization of "united" nations over the question of the Arab-Israeli war. The Israeli aggression is already known to the whole world, and those who urged and directly aided this aggression are known, too. Likewise, the treachery of the revisionists is recognized. After stabbing the Arabs in the back, the Soviet revisionists were obliged to do what they could to enhance their lost prestige through demagogy. **During the period of the Israeli aggression, all the peoples of the world saw once again the dirty face of the Soviet revisionist capitulators, saw more clearly once again that the revisionists are friends of the American imperialists. The peoples**

saw that the United States of America acts, attacks, enslaves, while the Soviet revisionists beat the drum to conceal the aggression under the din.

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

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

The culmination of treachery and cynicism. Colossal derision for the Arab peoples! Colossal derision for the peoples of the world! Derision for the UNO which waited for the solution to emerge from the “supreme will” of Hollybush, the star of Bethlehem. But at the United Nations Organization the speech of our government delegation whistled over the heads of imperialists, revisionists and aggressors like a well-aimed bullet, and by unmasking the plots of the enemies of mankind, the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imper-

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

** Building in which the Johnson-Kosygin secret meetings were held.

ialists, gave courage to the delegations of other small countries. Speaking with respect for small but indomitable Albania, friends and enemies said that “Such a strong, courageous and forthright speech has not been heard at UNO for 20 years on end.”

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

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

The Chinese leaders know nothing about politics. Either they do not know how to apply the principles properly or they violate them deliberately. On no account should Maurer have been received in Beijing be-

cause he is the representative of a clique of renegades and the Chinese proclaim that they are against renegades. Besides this, he proved himself an enemy of the Arabs at a time when the Chinese declare that they defend the Arab cause. He also went to Johnson and kissed his hand at a time when the Chinese say they are sworn enemies of the Americans.

However, the culmination of the Chinese political short-sightedness was achieved when, allegedly to avoid giving importance to Maurer's delegation, they gave it colossal importance in fact by not welcoming him publicly at the airport, by not publishing any report that Maurer had gone to Beijing, by shrouding this visit in mystery, at a time when everything ought to be clear and open. This is precisely what Maurer wants: let everything be shrouded in mystery, in suppositions, in order to lower the prestige of China and to imply to the world, "See, China is conspiring, too."

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

FRIDAY
AUGUST 11, 1967

THE FURTHER DEGENERATION OF THE MODERN REVISIONISTS

The revisionist states of Europe, with the Soviet Union at the head, are rapidly turning into capitalist regimes. The former countries of people's democracy are falling apart and linking up with the United States of America and the other capitalist countries with the aim of winning "independence" from the Soviet Union and allegedly conducting an independent policy. What was done in a somewhat disguised form at the beginning of the political disintegration and degeneration of the former countries of people's democracy, has now turned into a great and open race as to who will be first and best ensure the friendship of the imperialists.

It is very difficult for the Soviet revisionists to retain their monopoly in this process of disintegration that is occurring. They cannot keep their satellites under rein, on the one hand, and embrace imperialism, on the other hand; cannot advocate liberalism towards the West, on the one hand, and keep the other revisionists in their iron grip, on the other hand.

The modern revisionists' betrayal of Marxism-Leninism was bound to bring about the betrayal of the alliances between them, just as it is doing. The aim of American imperialism to divide and defeat the revisionist countries has been achieved and is being consolidated. This is the outcome of the Khrushchevite betrayal.

The day when deeper and bloody conflicts will burst out between the revisionists will not be long delayed. The Soviets will lose all political and economic control over their satellites in Europe and this will also change the military alliances to their detriment.

Capital from the USA, West Germany, France, Britain and last not least from Italy has poured into the revisionist countries and is capturing key economic and political positions. This capital is carrying moral-political corruption into the former countries of people's democracy. The phrases about socialism and communism, in the mouths of revisionist cliques, are nothing but tattered disguises. Yugoslavia has been turned completely into a capitalist country and, in the international arena, Tito has become the open and unashamed Spaak of the Americans. Romania, afraid of being left behind in the race towards degeneration, has become a battlefield for the foreign capitalist monopolies. It is proud that it is "liberating" itself from the Soviet yoke and happy that, under the thin disguise of false communist slogans, it is freely finding other partners — the USA, West Germany, France, Italy, etc. While claiming that it pays off the credits it receives with the country's great assets, Romania boasts that it is developing economic relations with the capitalists on a reciprocal basis, while allegedly safeguarding its principles and independence.

No one can swallow such rubbish. Romania has degenerated and will very quickly go over completely to capitalism, as Yugoslavia has done.

The example of Romania is being followed by the Bulgarians. Of course, for the latter the roads to the West are not as free and convenient as for the Romanians, nevertheless there are others who are teaching the Bulgarians their craft, in order to gradually break their links with the Soviet revisionists. The credits from the Soviets are insufficient for the Bulgarians who are, therefore, seeking and obtaining credits from the Germans of Bonn and from the French and have begun to talk openly about the "old traditions and links" of Bulgaria with those states. The Bulgarians are abandoning cooperation, are abandoning agriculture, and are crowding into the cities. They are "developing" in-

dustry with the credits they obtain and are producing, but they are not finding markets in which to sell their products, or the big wolves will not allow them into the monopolized markets. So, one fine morning the whole structure of Bulgaria will fall like an over-ripe fig into the clutches of foreign capitalists.

Czechoslovakia has opened the throttle wide and is making deals with the capitalists, especially with Bonn, and if Bonn rejects the Munich agreement, then even those few links that still exist between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union will be broken off. Poland, likewise, is waiting only for official recognition of the Oder-Neisse border by Bonn, before leaving the Soviets in the lurch even worse than it has done already.

All these traitors swear black and blue that they are defending the German Democratic Republic, but in reality all of them are digging its grave. For its part, Democratic Germany is not lagging behind the other revisionist countries; it has developed extensive economic links with Bonn. Tomorrow this will bring political links, and the union of the two Germanies on the capitalist road.

But there is a good and bad side to everything. All this will lead to stern conflicts. The peoples will rise because everything will be done at their expense. The revolution is certain to mature and will break out. Blood will be shed. However, nothing is won without struggle and sacrifices.

THURSDAY
JANUARY 4, 1968

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CRISIS OF CAPITALISM

Notes*

The general political and economic crisis of the world capitalist system is getting deeper. This is due to the revolutionary impetus of the peoples, the revolutionary struggle, armed or in other forms, which has broken out everywhere, to the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people, to the national liberation armed struggle of the peoples against American imperialism and its lackey allies, etc. The principled, revolutionary stand of our Party and the Marxist-Leninist parties against imperialism and revisionism has played a major role in making this crisis ever deeper, so that it is becoming more severe and will assume catastrophic proportions for American imperialism and the other capitalist states. All this will cause even graver crises in the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries, too.

As it presents itself today, this crisis is many-sided and caused by profoundly antagonistic political, economic, social and military contradictions. The symptoms of it have long been apparent in the main capitalist and revisionist countries.

The hegemonic and aggressive aims of American imperialism in the political, economic and military fields constitute one of the main causes of the grave crisis which has beset the capitalist world. The pact-making

* These notes, some of them updated, were used for an article in the newspaper *Zëri i popullit* under the title "A Deep and All-Round Crisis Is Shaking the Capitalist World," on March 31, 1968.

mania of Dulles, reinforced by that of Kennedy and now by that of Johnson and supported by the betrayal of the Khrushchevite revisionists, could not withstand the revolutionary impetus of the peoples and their struggle for liberation. American imperialism set up military bases and deployed its forces in all corners of the world. This not only aroused a legitimate hatred for this aggressive gendarme and savage enemy of the freedom of the peoples, but also became a staggering burden on the American budget, loaded the American people with taxes, increased the balance of payments deficit, and caused a big inflation of the dollar, the value of which cannot be covered by gold and is being maintained with difficulty, by means of threats and political and military blackmail.

American imperialism also had to finance supplies of arms and credits, of course on savagely exploiting terms, for other cliques and hangmen of the peoples, who, with the help of the Americans, are trying to intimidate their peoples and plunder them in the interest of their boss. American imperialism grabbed the markets of the British Empire, made it economically, politically and military dependent on U.S. imperialism. At the same time, however, it inherited the difficulties which had long been eroding that decaying empire, and this will lead to the decay of the new world empire of the Yankee fascists. All over the world, wherever the capitalists are in power, and especially where American influence and domination make themselves felt directly or indirectly, there are movements, insecurity, great instability, crises of all kinds, ranging from hunger and unemployment to open armed conflicts. The peoples are rising in struggle against tyrants. The so-called allied capitalist countries clash with one another over political-economic interests. Cliques carry out putsches against cliques in order to establish fascist dictatorships, to suppress movements, strikes, democratic free-

doms, etc.

In the grave circumstances of the existing situation this crisis of capitalism is developing furiously. Naturally the first to be hit hard by this crisis was Britain, the weakest link in the chain of the so-called great imperialist powers. It was obliged to devalue the pound sterling and now is allegedly restraining its decline with expedients provided by other imperialists, who, in order to ease the crisis in their own countries, are hastening to dig its grave even deeper. Although it is suffering losses as a result of this British defeat, the American patron is unable to finance the pound sterling, which will fall even further in value, and British imperialism is falling and will continue to fall into the abyss of John Bull.

French capital, which pulled in its horns in time and freed itself of some American obligations and shackles (political, economic and military), *fait le crâneur** and is “stubbornly” closing the doors of the European Common Market to Britain and, indirectly, to the United States of America, too. For its own hegemonic interests, France is raising obstacles to the United States of America, Great Britain, Canada and their partners in NATO. It is trying to get out of this crisis without much pain, but it seems to me it will not achieve this. Sooner or later capitalist France, too, will be writhing in this “vicious circle” of the crisis which has all the capitalist countries in its grip.

What are the characteristics of this crisis?

In order to lighten the heavy burden of its colossal expenditure of financial means, materials and loss of human lives, which the war against peoples, and especially the Vietnam war, is causing it, American imperialism tried without much success to draw its NATO partners and all the cliques in its service, into its ad-

* Displays pride (French in the original).

ventures. While staying on in NATO, the overwhelming majority of its member countries evaded the American pressure and make only a partial contribution to the NATO military expenditure, with the exception of West Germany, whose contribution is second only to that of the United States. It is true that their military budgets gobble up colossal sums which enrich the arms magnates of the United States of America, first of all, but that country is interested, above all, in keeping its partners obedient to it and completely under its dictate. This is also the source of the profound contradictions within NATO, which give rise to “revolts” and splits.

France was the first to “revolt,” and practically left NATO. This disease was a contagious disease for the other partners, who, although not yet moving as France is doing, are squirming like fish in a net, striving to escape, in one way or another, from the enslaving American net. Anti- American political currents are being created below the surface, if not openly, and they are manifested in various ways, by demanding supplementary economic and military credits from the all-powerful Uncle Sam, by exerting political and economic pressure on it, by exporting their capital to the “underdeveloped” countries, by investing capital in the countries where the revisionists are in power and where capitalism is being fully restored. Thus, the United States of America is seeing with concern that those whom it has nurtured and raised are kicking out against it.

The collapse of the pound sterling has begun and we shall see how far it will fall. In the first days and weeks the capitalist world tried to present this monetary crisis, i.e., this economic and political crisis, as an isolated phenomenon of Britain and the sterling zone. Of course, this is a bluff to conceal the fever which had gripped them all, because the sterling crisis could not be isolated from that of the dollar and other currencies which are weaker and, moreover, greatly dependent

on the former two. In these conditions the gold fever began, along with the crisis of the dollar, which will cause a chain reaction of the crisis.

American imperialism was the first to sound the alarm. The bugle was blown! In order to protect the dollar, it began to make efforts to cut expenditure, to increase taxes, to reduce investments abroad, to restrict American tourism, etc. It was officially declared that there would be a cut of as much as 3 billion dollars in the aid of American imperialism for its partners all over the world and especially those in Europe.

These measures of the Lyndon Johnson administration caused alarm in the finances and budgets of Italy, Great Britain, Spain, France, the Benelux countries, the Scandinavian countries, Yugoslavia and Greece as well as in the revisionist countries, which thought that, through their treachery, they had “discovered America”! This is only the first tremor of the earthquake.

Let us take the question of American tourism. The European capitalist countries secure considerable income from this and have built up a big industry in this direction. Restriction of this source will mean crisis and unemployment, not only in this branch, but also in those branches and sectors of industry and agriculture which are closely connected with tourism. The Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries were licking their lips in anticipation of this income on the strength of which they built castles on sand with the “generous” aid of their Uncle Sam. Now they are left biting their knuckles. Hence, the economic disturbances and disappointments will increase in those countries, too.

But the crisis of tourism from the United States, the richest capitalist country, will certainly aggravate the general crisis, and will aggravate it badly, because it will reduce the number of tourists from the other capitalist countries, too. If we look at the situation in Great Britain we shall see that the belt is being tight-

ened more and more on the people, that efforts are being made to stop the fall in the value of the pound by raising the cost of living of the masses, and there can be no thought of encouraging the development of British tourism abroad. Then imagine what will happen in Yugoslavia and elsewhere, in the countries where the revisionists are in power, where the currency brought in by tourists from capitalist countries is welcomed as something which can work miracles. Of course the wealthy will continue to enjoy their pleasures at the cost of the poor. This will result in intensified oppression and the further development of banditry and robbery in the capitalist and revisionist countries.

Now let us take the question of the reduction of the economic investments of American capital in the various countries of the world. This will have major consequences for American capital itself, which is forced to restrict the broad pasture on which it has browsed, but especially for those countries which allegedly benefited from these investments. Then what about the revisionist countries which are hungrily seeking American credits? A “beautiful” prospect is opening up for them! Their difficulties, unemployment, impoverishment and discontent will increase.

But the decrease of American investments will not be the end of the matter — it will cause a chain reaction in all the capitalist and revisionist countries. The crisis will shake the world market, imports and exports and all fields of production. Great upheavals in the capitalist and revisionist countries, upheavals in the economy and in policy, with the prospect of new tensions and conflicts which may and will develop into armed clashes. New hotbeds of aggressive wars and other hotbeds of revolutionary struggles will emerge.

The USA will become a greater menace to its capitalist and revisionist partners, the contradictions between them will become even deeper, the decay of the

capitalist and revisionist regimes will become even more apparent and their hegemonic, predatory, war-mongering policy will be further exposed.

For their part, the Soviet revisionists will try in their propaganda to present this as a crisis of capitalism and not of their country, as though it has escaped the crisis, etc. This is a fraud. The crisis has had them by the throat for a long time, ever since they betrayed communism and have been proceeding with big strides towards the complete restoration of the bourgeois capitalist political and economic regime. They have long been in crisis in every sector of their economy and in order to cover up their great ulcers to some extent, they are selling off the assets of the country and the toil of their people to foreign capitalists.

Because of their internal crisis, the Soviet revisionists have been unable to invest in the economies of their satellite countries. The savage squabbles within Com-econ and the efforts of the former countries of people's democracy to slip from their grip confirm this. But the crisis which is threatening the capitalist world today will drive them even further down the road on which they have set out and will create great problems for them, because their regime, which has been put back on the rails of capitalism, cannot but be affected by and suffer as a result of the general crisis which has gripped the whole rotten system of world capitalism.

The leader of world capitalism, American imperialism, together with its main partner, the revisionist Soviet state, is certainly heading for deeper crises and greater upheavals. The contradictions between them are inevitable and with the exacerbation of these contradictions the revolutionary struggle of the peoples will be further stepped up and our enemies of all hues will be weakened.

The revisionist countries of Europe, also, will be in a grave crisis. The traitors in those countries will vacil-

late at the mercy and under the terrible pressure of the Soviet revisionists and world capitalism. They will continue to crawl on their knees to whomsoever pays them most handsomely for their betrayal. In those countries the political and ideological degeneration will increase, the corruption, poverty, exploitation, unemployment, etc., will increase, and their transformation into capitalist countries will be deepened and completed if the peoples of those countries, and first of all the working class, do not rise in struggle and revolution in order to take power into their own hands again, to re-establish the dictatorship of the proletariat and to put down the betrayal.

Thus, the situation in the world is developing in favour of the world revolution, of national liberation wars. This is in our favour. The predictions of our Party, based on objective Marxist-Leninist analyses, are being proved correct...

Our Party will always march forward boldly, with heroism and maturity on its clear and enlightened revolutionary course, determined to make its contribution to this great revolutionary struggle. We shall follow the development of the crisis, the forms and directions it will take with great attention so that nothing will take us by surprise. We must try to foresee everything and always be well prepared to act in both the internal and the international planes.

FRIDAY
JANUARY 5, 1968

CHANGE OF LACKEYS IN THE REVISIONIST LEADERSHIP OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA — BREZHNEV CONGRATULATES DUBČEK

Radio Prague announced the “resignation” of Novotny from his position as First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. In short, the revisionists have tipped out this revisionist and obedient lackey of the Soviet renegades. He was replaced by a Slovak, a certain Dubček who, they say, declared that he would continue the liberalization of the regime in economy and politics at a more rapid pace, that is, will run more quickly towards capitalism. At the same time, what has occurred in Czechoslovakia is awful exposure for the Soviet and the other revisionists. They built their plans on sand and now the edifice is collapsing.

We must continue our resolute struggle against them with even greater severity because life is confirming all our forecasts in connection with the revisionists.

Brezhnev tossed Novotny on the rubbish heap once he had squeezed him dry and immediately sent his congratulations to Dubček. Novotny is of no further use to him.

In his telegram, Brezhnev stressed the need to preserve the Soviet-Czechoslovak “friendship.” But now this friendship will not be preserved, it will evaporate. Even the friendship between Czechs and Slovaks will be weakened, let alone that with the Soviets. And this because bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism are flourishing on both sides. Their respective capitalist in-

terests will guide the whole policy of each side. **What sort of basket of crabs will the Warsaw Treaty, Com-econ and all their so-called collaboration in an internationalist spirit, become?!**

We shall see many scandalous things!

**SATURDAY
JANUARY 6, 1968**

THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The circles of Bonn are preparing their revenge, preparing to establish their hegemony in Europe and their neo-colonialist expansion to other continents...

The Hitlerites established their fascist dictatorship, revived and recreated their military potential, spoke and acted against the injustices of the Treaty of Versailles, against bolshevism and against the Soviet Union. They tore up the Treaty of Versailles and with this "freed" Germany from the tutelage imposed by those who won the First World War. After the First World War, the Hitlerites inherited a Germany not all that greatly damaged by the war. In order to strangle the internal revolution, to ensure the country's recovery, to revive its industry, agriculture and finances, this bourgeois Germany relied on American imperialism, first of all. In capitalist France the British Empire saw a greater and more dangerous rival than Germany, therefore, it, too, did not fail to support the revival of Germany by shutting its eyes on many occasions. Capitalist France, which triumphed in the war against Germany, emerged weaker and had not only to defend the advantages which the Treaty of Versailles gave it, but also to develop a more savage expansionist, colonialist policy and defend its old colonies which were certainly coveted by British imperialism, and especially by the United States of America, whose aid it needed during and after the war. Above all, however, the victorious capitalist powers in the First World War saw in Germany a power ready to and capable of launching an attack on

the Soviet Union, communism and the revolution, and therefore they assisted it.

The subsequent development of events, how the war was prepared by the Hitlerites, the ups and downs it experienced, and its aims, what sort of alliances were created and what was the outcome of the Second World War, is all well-known.

After the Second World War, American imperialism became the main financier and supplier of aid for the all-round revival of the Federal Republic of Germany.

What was the aim of American imperialism in this instance? The same as after the First World War, but in new conditions, when a powerful and triumphant Soviet Union was in existence, when other socialist states had been created through struggle in Europe and the world, when Germany was divided into two parts, when France had emerged from the war exhausted, Britain triumphant but weaker, and Mussolini's Italy defeated and in ruins from every viewpoint. After the war, American imperialism, through the "Marshall Plan" and all sorts of other plans, aimed to establish American hegemony in Europe and everywhere in the world, aimed to subjugate and exploit peoples and states which put themselves under the yoke of these plans on the promise of "aid" to revive their economies ruined by the war, and to prepare a third world war against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. In order to achieve the main objectives in this diabolical plan, this time the United States of America came to the conclusion that the isolationist policy was no longer advantageous to it, and in those wishy-washy forms in which it was applied, was a hindrance to its great appetite for domination of the world. This time it chose the most suitable and most natural ally for American fascism, the ally which could become a powerful support base in a future war against the Soviet Union and against the socialist coun-

tries. This ally was Bonn Germany. Irrespective of the camouflage with which they were covered up, the main forces of American imperialism in Europe were concentrated on rescuing, reviving and defending the Hitlerites. The United States of America set about reviving and strengthening the industry and the economy of the Federal Republic of Germany, the building and strengthening of its war industry and the formation of the German army, and took care to equip this army with all the modern weapons in existence. And this aim was achieved. The Federal Republic of Germany became a powerful capitalist state in Europe and in NATO, in which it dominates after the Americans. The United States of America has its alliance with Bonn which it tries to preserve, because Federal Germany is the main power in Europe on which the American plans are based. In these circumstances the United States of America has great need for Bonn, while Bonn has great need for the United States of America.

What were and are the political aims of Bonn? To stabilize its power in Europe and the world. Federal Germany has not yet fully accomplished this aim, but in the present circumstances, when the revisionist traitors are in power in the Soviet Union and other countries, it has become an important and threatening power. Neither the United States of America, nor Western Europe can do anything without it. Hence, it has become a dominant industrial, economic and military factor in Western Europe. The Federal Republic of Germany, in alliance with the United States of America, is a threat to Gaullist France, which, nevertheless, it protects and has as an eventual counterweight against the United States of America. The Federal Republic of Germany does not declare its opposition to Britain's entry in the European Common Market. Indeed, in principle it seeks this, but in practice it is in no hurry, because it wants to avoid losing anything from Britain's presence

in this Market, to have Britain on its side and to weaken it from every point of view. West German capital is penetrating into various countries of the world and its products are threatening the markets of other capitalist and revisionist states. This is one aspect of the policy of Bonn. Thanks to this policy, it has scored major victories and continues to score fresh ones. Let us look at the other aspect, that of Bonn's policy towards the East. Bonn's first objective is to gobble up the German Democratic Republic, that is, to unite Germany under its complete domination. The Federal Republic of Germany is working intensively in this direction but has not achieved its purpose yet.

The betrayal by the Soviet revisionists has opened to Bonn the prospect of success for its policy of gobbling up the German Democratic Republic. In this direction Bonn is employing numerous tactics, combined and co-ordinated with those of the United States of America, and indirectly, through the Americans, also with the Polish, Romanian, Yugoslav and other revisionists.

One of these tactics, without relaxing its efforts of every kind, directly and in various forms, to unite the German Democratic Republic with the Federal Republic of the Germany, has to do with Bonn's efforts to outflank the German Democratic Republic, while penetrating deeply in the countries of Europe where the revisionists are ruling. Thus, the Federal Republic of Germany is leaving the Halstein Doctrine in silence and is establishing diplomatic, consular and economic relations with, providing short- and long-term credits, today to Romania, tomorrow to Yugoslavia, the day after tomorrow to Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Bulgaria, etc. Its machine has been set thoroughly in motion and has found ready clients who, by betraying socialism, have also betrayed the cause of the German Democratic Republic. Apart from Albania, all of them are betraying the German Democratic Republic. It is

being isolated and is becoming a pawn in the treacherous policy of the Soviet revisionists.

This tactic of Bonn and the Americans is not only preparing the revenge, not only preparing the German-American hegemony in Europe, but also weakening the positions of the Soviet revisionist state as a capitalist state, from which they are winning away its satellite “allies” and narrowing its markets in Europe and the world. In vain the Brezhnevs met at Karlovy Vary to prepare the coming meeting at Budapest, in vain they sounded the alarm that Bonn Germany is becoming fascist. In reality, irrespective of a few forms which they retain, or a few charlatan gestures they make, the satellites of the Soviet Union are abandoning ship.

Revisionist Romania is openly pursuing a policy of open rapprochement with Bonn. This means that Romania does not see any danger coming from the Federal Republic of Germany. So long as Bonn says an odd, even ambiguous, word about the question of the Oder-Neisse border and the Munich Treaty, revisionist Poland and Czechoslovakia see no danger, either. But even without this being said, these revisionist states are falling into the lap of Bonn.

They will cover up this falling into the arms of the enemy with a great deal of demagogy, with the “objective needs,” with the “historical needs of development,” with the need for the practical preparation of the terrain for the achievement of the “European security,” etc., etc. But all this is a fraud and dust in the eyes of the innocent.

There can never be European security between the capitalists and revisionists. This “security” is a shibboleth concocted especially to hide from the peoples the treachery of the revisionist policy, to cover up the process of its degeneration and to prepare new alliances on the basis of the new process of the state degeneration of the countries in which the revisionists rule.

In the situation created by the crisis which has broken out in the capitalist world, and which includes the revisionist states, new links and new combinations will be made. I may be wrong, but I believe that the Federal Republic of Germany will play a primary role for the exploitation of the new situations, first of all, to strengthen its positions in Europe and elsewhere, and on the other hand, for the realization of joint German-American aims. This because economically and militarily it is the most powerful capitalist state in Europe. The United States of America sought the aid of Bonn to support the dollar. It sought the "aid" of its other allies, too, but the real significance of the request for "aid" was the forewarning that their hand-outs would be cut off. Italy, for example, gave the United States its "aid" while begging it to preserve the aggressive Atlantic Alliance, not to hinder American tourism and to continue its supply of funds for major industrial investments in Italy, especially in Southern Italy. This is what will occur with the other partners of the United States of America, too. They are obliged to tighten their belts, and make no protest about the American pressure and threats. We may see the formation of openly fascist regimes, as has occurred in several capitalist and revisionist countries. The pressure of the peoples and the revolutionaries on the ruling cliques, which will attack and suppress even those pseudo-democratic freedoms which may exist in some of these countries, will certainly build up.

Bonn and Washington will coordinate and intensify their work in the direction of the European countries in which the revisionists rule. These will be faced with catastrophic situations. The countless, insurmountable difficulties, which the revisionist countries are facing at present, will be increased. In Poland, Bulgaria and elsewhere prices are going sky high, and no one knows when this will end. In these countries there is great dis-

content, demonstrations are being held and people are being arrested en masse.

Washington and Bonn will make the most of this situation to carry the degeneration of these countries through to the end and to harness them more tightly to their chariot.

Of course, the Americans and Bonn will become more tight-fisted with their aid and credits. In order to save themselves from the threat of the people, the hungry traitors will sell everything for the hand-outs of the enemies of their countries. The Soviet capitalist state, of course, will not sit idle, watching this drama which the betrayal of the Khrushchevites is causing. Its "allies" are deserting it one by one and this marks the beginning of an isolation which will prove fatal to it. Hence, we shall see the birth and growth of profound and insurmountable contradictions and severe clashes between them, which may even reach the point of armed conflicts. This is the law of the development of the capitalist world.

The Soviet peoples and the peoples of the former countries of people's democracy of Europe, along with the peoples and revolutionaries of all countries of the world, must rise, get organized, close their ranks and fight at these moments so difficult for the capitalists and revisionists. The revisionists must be attacked and thoroughly unmasked, because this is the best way to fight imperialism which will receive powerful assistance in this crisis from its lackeys, the revisionists.

MONDAY
MARCH 25, 1968

THE MEETING IN DRESDEN

With the exception of the Romanians, the traitor chiefs of the parties and governments of the revisionist countries of Eastern Europe, headed by those of the Soviet Union, gathered in Dresden allegedly to discuss a number of common political, economic and military problems and “completed their work” very quickly, within one day.

The communiqué which they published about this meeting was so long that it gave the impression they had worked for 15 days on end. It says that these great men have studied all the international problems, from the crisis of gold, the dollar and sterling, down to... down to uncle Remus’ moustache! What frauds, what clowns they are! In fact, they discussed none of the things mentioned in the communiqué, but simply exerted pressure and blackmail on their colleague, Dubček.

What was the nature of this pressure? We still knew nothing precisely, but without doubt it was military (the threat of intervention with tanks under the pretext that the Czechoslovaks are going too far and too quickly, are damaging the interests of the “socialist” countries, endangering the German Democratic Republic, etc., etc.), economic, and much other pressure of this type. Immediately after the proceedings ended in Dresden and Dubček returned to Prague, rumours were spread that Soviet troops were being concentrated round the borders of Czechoslovakia. This may be true, because either they must stop the “Czech illness” with tanks, a thing which will create a great scandal among the public, or it will spread to the German Democratic Republic. Then, what will they do? Will they fold their arms and allow East Germany to break away, too? If this

happens, the only alternative for the Soviet leadership is to step into its grave, or to intervene in Germany, too. Therefore, because of the very tight spot they are in, intervention is a possibility. For the moment, the Soviets, the Germans and the Poles are of one opinion. But it is likely that this time they have threatened Dubček, demanding that he does not rush matters, but restrain himself a little. In the second phase, the economic pressure will begin, because we notice that the communiqué says that a meeting of Comecon is to be held soon. We shall see how things go.

One thing is clear, the crisis of revisionism is very deep and it will become even deeper, just as we have said.

TUESDAY
JULY 23, 1968

THE SOVIET REVISIONISTS AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Recently I finished the article which I began to write on July 15 about the difficult situation of the Czechoslovak people. Today I added three more parts to the article, and did some re-arrangement and updating. We sent it to the newspaper *Zëri i popullit* to be published tomorrow under the title: "The Soviet Revisionists and Czechoslovakia." Some of the problems we deal with:

— The Czechoslovak people are going through difficult days, being threatened from within the country and from abroad. This is a result of the treachery of the Khrushchevite revisionists, the Czechoslovak revisionists, internal Czechoslovak reaction, the external revisionist coalition and the world imperialist-capitalist coalition.

— The problem of Czechoslovakia, in fact, is not so simple. Here we have to do with a major plot against a people, against a country which has an important strategic position in Europe. Czechoslovakia is the chessboard and the cliques which have gone, have come and will come are the pawns in the hands of the Soviet revisionists and American imperialism. The international mafia is operating in all directions in Czechoslovakia.

— The modern revisionists of different countries are struggling to separate themselves completely from Soviet revisionism and are forging new links, new alliances and bridges with American imperialism and world capitalism. In this direction, the greatest, most concrete and real example is set by Soviet revisionism itself, which is bound hand and foot in an endless alliance with the United States of America and world cap-

italism. Today this alliance dominates the capitalist-revisionist world. The two big capitalist powers are struggling to rule the world and to divide it between them into spheres of influence, while having as their primary aim the struggle against Marxism-Leninism, socialism, and the revolution. Their struggle for spheres of influence also includes the question of keeping their satellites under their thumb. Naturally, this brings about the separation of satellites from one power and their dependence on the other. Therefore, a fight between wolves is waged, with plots and intrigues to the detriment of the peoples of many countries, one of which is the Czechoslovak people.

— Czechoslovakia, a revisionist satellite of the Soviet revisionists, is now struggling to split away from the Khrushchevites and to link up with the Americans and Western capitalism. In these efforts Czech reaction and the Czech revisionists have the aid of world capitalism.

— The Soviet, Polish and German revisionists, in the first place, then the Bulgarians to a lesser extent and the Hungarians just to say “we’re in, too” — are engaged in repeated attempts to blackmail and put pressure on the Dubček clique to make it submit to them, to remain in the fold, and so on and so forth. They accuse the Dubček revisionist clique of all the things they themselves have done earlier and on a colossal scale. In other words they say to the Dubček clique: “You must not have links with the United States of America, whereas we should; you should not accept credits from the capitalists, whereas we should,” and so on. The Soviets have even reached the point of threatening with military intervention in Czechoslovakia under the mask of the Warsaw Pact and the alleged troop manoeuvres. And this is not the end of this brutal threat. Now thousands of “tourists” from the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries, who are in fact militarymen, are

invading Czechoslovakia and, in practice, are replacing the regular armies.

— That matters between the Soviet and Czechoslovak revisionists have reached this point does not surprise us in the least, because we know, and we have said, that gangsters settle accounts between themselves by gangster methods.

— The Warsaw Treaty, which was signed for other purposes, has become a means of attack and aggression in the hands of the Soviet revisionist gangsters against those members who do not obey the Soviet revisionists.

— The Czechoslovak crisis is not an accidental, unexpected phenomenon, nor an isolated crisis. It is part and parcel of the great crisis of modern revisionism, the epicentre of which is in the Soviet Union. This crisis is felt, also, on the outskirts of the Soviet Union, among its satellites, which want to cast off the yoke of Soviet revisionism.

— Soviet revisionism is passing through several severe crises for which it is paying dearly, and the great evil should be sought in the Khrushchevites' great betrayal, which must be destroyed with fire and revolution.

WEDNESDAY
AUGUST 21, 1968

THE SOVIET REVISIONISTS CARRY OUT THE MILITARY INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The Soviet revisionists, under the mantle of the Warsaw Treaty, have committed a military aggression against the Czechoslovak Republic and its people. This morning all Czechoslovakia found itself captive under the tracks of Soviet tanks. A typical fascist aggression without any excuse, violating international standards and laws and the clauses of the Warsaw Treaty itself.

The Soviet revisionist invaders and their allies of the Warsaw Treaty entered Czechoslovakia like thieves in the night, after they had embraced and kissed at Bratislava,* the declaration from which was proclaimed

* Reference is to the meeting in Bratislava about which Comrade Enver Hoxha wrote the article "Defeat of the Soviet Revisionists at Bratislava," published in the newspaper *Zëri i popullit*, dated August 10, 1968. In his Political Diary, on August 5, 1968, among other things he wrote, "The whole presidium of the Soviet Union went to 'Canossa' to make the last threat. Never before has such a thing occurred, never before has the whole Political Bureau gone to such humiliation, but they went there like braggards; large-scale military exercises were being conducted in the Ukraine in order to threaten Czechoslovakia and defend the 'heroes' who travelled by train, ate on the train, had meetings and went back in the evening by train to sleep in Soviet territory and returned in the morning to Czech territory. And these shameful comings and goings went on for four days on end!... Will the Soviet revisionists accept these sensational defeats, or will they go further with their craziness and roguery? After all that has happened this seems hardly likely, but they are nothing but fascists in a very desperate situation, so they can be expected

*urbi et orbi** as an “historic document” which “settled everything, strengthened the unity and friendship” between them, etc. We alone exposed this as a great fraud, and that is what it turned out to be. Bratislava was a smokescreen for this aggression.

As I have said earlier, it could also have been the last chance, virtually hopeless, given to the liberal revisionist wing which thought it could come to terms with the Czech revisionists. The fact is, however, that at the Bratislava meeting and in the document which was published after it, there was no mention at all of Czechoslovakia, or of the Warsaw Letter, or of what had occurred and what was going to occur a few days later. It was just a piece of paper, an utterly unsavoury dish, which satisfied no one and deceived no one apart, of course, from the Czechs.

After the Bratislava meeting the Czechs triumphantly welcomed Tito, who strutted as the saviour of Czechoslovakia and departed from Prague full of confidence, full of boasts, with his head up and his chest out, and received a cheque for 13 million dollars from the Czechoslovak government and another for 16 million dollars from the Americans for services rendered. A few days later the Czechoslovaks welcomed Ceausescu, who posed as the “brave of the brave.” He signed the treaty of mutual aid in which it is specifically stressed that “the two states will defend one another from any aggressor state or group of aggressor states”! Not con-

to do anything..., all the activities of the Soviet revisionists... are manoeuvres to conceal their sinister plans towards Czechoslovakia..., a tactics to lull people to sleep and to provide a justification for them so that, when they return to the Czechoslovak question with acts of war, they will be able to say to the public, ‘We could do nothing else! We did everything we could, but the Czechoslovaks did not listen to us!’”

* Publicly (Latin in the original).

tent with defence against “one aggressor,” Chaush* insisted on including defence against a “group of aggressors.”

The Soviet, Polish, German, Hungarian and Bulgarian revisionists poured across the borders of Czechoslovakia from all directions and within the night occupied Prague, captured the Radio station, surrounded the buildings of the government, the Central Committee, Parliament and the president, and not a shot was fired. Moreover, the Czechoslovak revisionist chiefs issued orders that the army and the people should “remain calm and peaceful.”

There is no need for us to dwell on the aid from Romania on the basis of the treaty. Far from defending others, the Romanian revisionists are trembling with fear themselves.

Of course, we are still in the first moments and events are sure to develop.

The Soviet revisionists have committed a desperate act which will have lethal consequences for them. They have discredited themselves all-round even among their revisionist friends, because most of them are not in agreement with this brutal act which will have grave implications for them. However, the Soviet revisionists did not commit this desperate act from choice, but were driven to it by their problems. Crises, especially crises like this, which bring to light the decay of revisionist opportunism, are not in their favour but in favour of the revolution. The military must have had a finger in these events and their view has prevailed.

This whole development will exacerbate the international situation and possibly revisionist-capitalist opinion will become alarmed. The contradictions will be deepened, in the stinking swamp of “peaceful co-

* Chaush — corporal (Turkish), ironical shortening of Ceausescu’s name.

existence” the waters will be disturbed, and the Russo-American alliance will suffer serious damage or may even be split. World opinion, fear and suspicions will play their role.

The revisionists everywhere will squabble and fight with one another worse than they are doing already. The revolutionary forces must rouse themselves to take advantage of this situation which is greatly in our favour.

For our part, we must continue our struggle and propaganda against imperialism and revisionism with the greatest intensity.

We must take a stand immediately to condemn the aggression, to defend Czechoslovakia and the Czechoslovak people, must unmask the Soviet revisionists and the Czech revisionist capitulators and unmask imperialism and Titoism at the same time. We must tell the Czechoslovak people and the Czechoslovak revolutionary Marxist-Leninists that, if they want to live free and truly build a socialist country, their only way out is to take up arms in the revolution against the external revisionist invaders and their lackeys within the country, and against any interference of the imperialists and the Titoites. There is no other way.

The armed struggle demands the formation of a new Czechoslovak Marxist-Leninist party of the Lenin-Stalin type. Other parties which try to patch things up are useless and will not lead them on the correct course.

WEDNESDAY
AUGUST 28, 1968

THE EPILOGUE TO THE CZECHOSLOVAK DRAMA

Yesterday the treacherous revisionist capitulationist leaders of the Czechoslovak people returned to Prague from Moscow. Statements were made and the “proclamation” of Moscow, the communiqué signed by the aggressors and their captive lackeys about the talks held between them, was published.

The Moscow “agreement” sanctions the continuation of the dictate of the Soviet imperialist leadership and the occupation and suppression of the Czechoslovak people.

The Soviet people, who are permitting another people to be oppressed, are not free themselves. Since they do not react with the force of arms against this treachery of their revisionist leaders, this must be so and nothing can alter the fact; the false slogans of *Pravda*, which ought to be called not *Pravda* (truth) but *Llozh*,* do not alter it.

Moscow covered itself with shame; due to the acts of traitors it was covered with the veil of Berghof, when the new “Hacha” of Czechoslovakia, President Svoboda, signed the enslavement of his own people, just as former President Hacha did in his time.

The dictate of Moscow is the dictate of a bourgeois fascist clique which is strangling any freedom of the Czechoslovak people.

The Czech revisionists, headed by the traitors Dubček, Svoboda, Smrkovsky and others, confirmed what we had said about them that they are traitors to the Czechoslovak people. They proved to be the most

* Lies (Russian in the original).

cowardly capitulators there could be among the bourgeoisie. Not only did they allow the Soviet army to occupy their country by appealing to the people and the army to remain passive when the tanks occupied the country, but even after their return from Moscow, the first words they said to their people were the same: “Remain calm, don’t oppose, don’t react,” which in blunt terms means — submit to the occupation.

The fascist Soviet army will never withdraw from Czechoslovakia voluntarily. Those who undertook this barbarous act of aggression and have discredited themselves forever did not go into Czechoslovakia in order to leave it, but in order to stay there. From now on everything in Czechoslovakia, every quisling collaborationist government, will be dictated from Moscow.

Even though they have imposed their dictate on the Czechoslovak revisionist leaders, for the Soviet revisionists this is an irreparable defeat. This defeat will be enlarged and other defeats will follow, one after the other. The Soviet revisionists themselves know that nothing has been solved. On the contrary, the problems have become even more complicated and burdensome, both in the Soviet Union and in the international arena.

In all this tragedy it is quite obvious that the Soviet-American alliance fully accomplished its task. For the United States of America what occurred in Czechoslovakia was not the slightest cause of “concern.” West Germany was not alarmed, either. After the Moscow “agreement” the spokesman of the State Department of the United States of America went so far as to declare that he was pleased that Dubček remains in power and that “matters can be settled” between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. **It is clear that the Soviets had been given a free hand, just as they have given and will give the American imperialists a free hand in their aggressions against other peoples.** They have divided the zones between themselves. Each of them can do as it

pleases in its own zone. Indeed, the Soviets gave proof of this on the occasion of the Israeli aggression against the United Arab Republic (Egypt) and the Arab peoples and in hundreds of other cases.

The Czechoslovak people are not and will not be satisfied. They understand the great betrayal which has been perpetrated against them and they will understand this still more clearly later. They will not accept the occupation and will struggle in different ways. The fact is that, despite the betrayal by their own leaders, they are putting up an organized passive resistance against the occupiers. The Soviets did not expect such a thing, and this has staggered them and ruined their demagogic plans. It is very important for Czechoslovakia and for socialism that this resistance should continue, become stronger and go from passive to active, armed resistance. The national motive is great and the moment suitable. The Czechoslovak revolutionaries must make the most of them.

The dictate of Moscow imposed on the Czechoslovak capitulationist leadership is a terrible defeat, also, for the revisionist lackeys in all parts of the world. They “condemned” the Soviet aggression, but now the Soviets will demand that they eat their own words. What filthy traitors!! But they are utterly shameless.

We must assist the resistance of the Czechoslovak people. The Czechoslovak revolutionaries have love and admiration for the correct line of our Party. They listen to Radio Tirana with the greatest attention. We must strengthen and improve our propaganda in the direction of Czechoslovakia. We have all the possibilities to do this, and we shall continue to do it in the interests of Marxism- Leninism and the proletarian revolution.

FRIDAY
SEPTEMBER 13, 1968

THE PEOPLE'S ASSEMBLY OF THE PRA APPROVED THE BILL ON THE DENUNCIATION OF THE WARSAW TREATY

Today in the People's Assembly the deputies discussed the report which was presented yesterday "On the stand of the PRA towards the Warsaw Treaty" and supported the proposal to denounce this Treaty. The bill presented on the denunciation of the Warsaw Treaty by the People's Republic of Albania was approved unanimously by the Assembly.

The cup was full! We were outside the Warsaw Treaty *de facto*, but with the aggression against Czechoslovakia, this step had to be made *de jure*.

Our country's denunciation of and withdrawal from this Treaty is a measure of great importance and has to do, first of all, with the defence of the independence of our Homeland.

MONDAY
SEPTEMBER 23, 1968

THE AIM OF THE SOVIET REVISIONISTS — THE ESTABLISHMENT OF WORLD HEGEMONY IN ALLIANCE WITH THE USA

The Chinese ambassador has invited us to the reception he is going to give on September 30 on the occasion of the 19th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China. I am making some preliminary notes on the speech that I might deliver at that reception.

The further degeneration of the Soviet revisionists was bound to develop in the direction of pronounced great-state chauvinism in order to impose their will by armed force on those who are partners in ideology but disobey their orders and dictate. The pseudo-Marxist slogans and phraseology that have been in use for years on end could no longer serve to smooth over or conceal the great differences which were growing deeper.

The revisionist demagogy in policy, in ideology, in economic and cultural relations and in their military "alliances" had lost its power of action. So the wolf bared its teeth. Soviet revisionism went over to militarism of the fascist type. Now to resolve contradictions it threatens armed aggression and occupies those "allied" states which disobey its dictate. It attacked and occupied Czechoslovakia. No one can be made to believe that the Soviet revisionists, who are even more degenerate than the Czechoslovak revisionist clique of Dubček, had the moral, political and ideological right to intervene by force of arms to establish order in the Czecho-

slovak Communist Party and in the Socialist Republic of Czechoslovakia at a time when they themselves are the initiators and supporters of this capitalist degeneration, when they have turned their own communist party into a revisionist party and the Soviet Union into a capitalist country.

No one can believe the tale that the Soviet Union was allegedly forced to occupy the Socialist Republic of Czechoslovakia by force of arms because that country was in danger of being attacked by the imperialists, when the Soviet revisionists had reached full agreement in advance with its ally, the United States of America, over this aggression, against which the Americans did not bother to lift a finger and even Bonn Germany did not display the slightest alarm, although large Soviet forces were brought to the southern border of its territory. An astonishing situation if there were any bases for the preposterous Soviet legend about the "plot," which they are trumpeting with all their might.

Then, what compelled the Soviet revisionists go over to open aggression against Czechoslovakia, their ally in the Warsaw Treaty?

The aim of modern revisionism is the liquidation of Marxism-Leninism, the liquidation of socialist regimes and the restoration of capitalism. The aim of Soviet revisionism, in particular, is to establish its world hegemony in alliance with the United States of America under the pretext that being world superpowers they should divide up their spheres of influence and rule the world.

It is clear that the countries where the modern revisionists are in power are not only within the Soviet sphere of influence but are considered *de facto*, if not *de jure*, under direct Soviet domination.

Nevertheless, the present division of spheres of influence between the two world superpowers does not have the external or juridical features of the old classical colonialism, but those of the new colonialism. The

capitalist transformation and degeneration of the Soviet Union and other revisionist countries has resulted in the creation, in each individual revisionist country, of a new bourgeoisie which aspires to and fights to establish its domination over the people, to create its own dictatorship, to have its own policy, to form new alliances with that capitalist bourgeoisie or imperialist superpower with which it is linked by tradition, affinity or interests.

This process is the main leitmotif of the struggle which modern revisionism, as a bourgeois capitalist ideology, wages against proletarian internationalism, the socialist order and Marxism-Leninism.

American imperialism, the European capitalist bourgeoisie and world reaction are taking part actively and doing everything in their power to assist this transformation towards capitalism in the Soviet Union and the other countries where the revisionists are in power, on the basis of the policy of “peaceful coexistence” and the Soviet- American alliance, which the Khrushchevite revisionists and their satellites have eagerly accepted and proclaimed as the only correct course.

This was the period of the honeymoon, of the provision of credits by world capitalism, of the building of bridges, of the much-publicized visits of statesmen of capitalist and revisionist countries, of the pouring of Western tourists, literature, films and artists into the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries, it was the period of uninterrupted slanders and attacks against the Party of Labour of Albania, the People’s Republic of Albania and all the Marxist-Leninist parties of the world.

With their great-power chauvinist megalomania, the Khrushchevite renegades who have betrayed Marxism-Leninism, the peoples of the Soviet Union, Lenin, Stalin and the world revolution, thought that they would not only have their revisionist satellites under

firm control, but would also deceive the whole world with demagogy, blackmail, and with rubles and dollars. But they achieved neither the former nor the latter. The relentless, ever-mounting, fierce, heroic and principled struggle of all the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist parties of the world tore the mask from them and ruined their plans. The Soviet revisionists were unable to stop the process of the political, ideological and economic disintegration of the revisionist camp. They were beset by the political crisis and ideological degeneration, polycentrism developed, while a profound economic crisis prevails everywhere in the Soviet Union and in the countries where the revisionists are in power.

Such a situation exists not only in Czechoslovakia where the crisis has erupted, but it has begun in Romania, in Bulgaria, in Poland, in East Germany and in Hungary. Above all, this situation exists within the Soviet Union.

Thus, the threat of the splitting up of the Soviet revisionist empire comes primarily from within rather than from an "imminent" imperialist military plot from outside, as the Soviets claim in order to "justify" their aggression against Czechoslovakia.

Hence, the situation is as follows: the harmony which had allegedly been established in the revisionist camp has been destroyed, the domination of the Soviet revisionists is in jeopardy and can no longer be restored through shibboleths and slogans, or through promises and blackmail, but only through the force of arms. Soviet revisionism and the revisionism of its satellite countries have passed into a new stage, the stage of a fascist military dictatorship.

The situation in the Soviet Union must be so difficult, and the oppression, the terror, the censorship, the deportations confirm this, that the ruling revisionists have been obliged to establish the fascist military dictatorship to suppress the revolution within the Soviet

Union and in the other countries where the revisionists are in power and, at the same time, to take control of the situation in all those countries *manu militari* under cover of the Warsaw Treaty on the pretext of the “defence of the socialist countries.” They deploy Soviet forces in these countries, and the ruling cliques will either be completely obedient to the Soviets or they will be thrown out and replaced with open quislings.

This process is going on today not only in Czechoslovakia, but also in the other revisionist countries.

Of course, the actions of the Soviet revisionists cannot stop the evolution of the process of the disintegration and crisis of revisionism, let alone curb the impetus of the revolution. The revolution and resistance in the Soviet Union, in Czechoslovakia, in the countries where the revisionists are in power and all over the world, will gain tempo, will be further crystallized and strengthened, and will enter a new qualitative stage, even more active and militant.

The eyes of the revolutionaries, the peoples and patriots will be opened even wider and they will fearlessly follow the road of struggle, the road of the revolution on which they are led by Marxism-Leninism, the banner of which the Marxist-Leninist parties uphold.

Likewise, the aggressive actions of the Soviets will be unable to stop the resistance of that section of the revisionist new bourgeoisie which aspires to liberation from the yoke of the Soviet bourgeoisie which is trying to establish its fascist dictatorship. It will continue its struggle in various forms and in coordination with the ever-mounting struggle which world imperialism and capitalism will wage against this Soviet aggressive force, which sooner or later will certainly become a threat to them, too.

The great complex of contradictions between the revisionist cliques, between the various revisionist parties, and between the imperialists and the revisionists

will be further extended and deepened to their detriment and to the advantage of the revolution.

Therefore, the revolutionaries must organize their struggle on two fronts, against imperialism and against revisionism. The resistance against the revisionist cliques in power has begun and is growing. In Czechoslovakia, it is neither the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie nor the revisionist clique of Dubček-Svoboda, which capitulated to the invaders, that represent this resistance, but the working class and the working masses of the Czechoslovak people. The genuine Marxist-Leninists must place themselves at the head of this resistance. They must be clear about and never confuse the “resistance” of cliques like that of Dubček, or anyone else like him, in Czechoslovakia, or anywhere else, with the genuine resistance and struggle of the people, of the working class, a struggle which must be organized and led by the revolutionary communists against imperialists, the foreign and internal capitalists, the Soviet revisionists, the invaders and their satellite revisionist cliques and quislings.

— We can say that now, with the occupation of Czechoslovakia, Poland, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary and Bulgaria have also been placed under a stern regime of military occupation by the Soviet imperialist-revisionists. Now Marshal Yakubovskiy, the military representative of the junta of Moscow, exercises complete military-political-ideological power in these countries and visits one capital city after the other, giving directives to his occupation forces and keeping the leading cliques in terror.

— The differences between the revisionists will degenerate into open clashes at the Budapest meeting, where the fate of the Moscow meeting, which the revisionists want to hold in November, will be decided. The Party of Labour of Albania long ago foresaw the ignominious failure of this meeting. To keep some sort

of order in the debates at Budapest and get the revisionist bohemia to Moscow, the Soviet leaders could do no worse than to send Marshal Yakubovsky to Budapest, together with the director of the Gosbank, in case of any eventuality.

— When the Party of Labour of Albania tore the mask from the traitor, Nikita Khrushchev, he could find no argument in rebuttal other than to slander that “the Albanian leadership has sold itself to the imperialists for 30 pieces of silver.” And now when the Party of Labour of Albania and the Government of the People’s Republic of Albania have denounced the Warsaw Treaty as an aggressive Treaty, once again the Khrushchevite traitors, Brezhnev, Kosygin and their lackeys, could find no argument other than to slander that “the Albanian leadership has sold Albania to imperialism.”

Today in the Soviet Union, the broadcasts of Radio Moscow and the columns of the revisionist press of the Soviets, Gomulka, Zhivkov and others, are crammed with slanders. One morning, TASS and Radio Moscow which feed the radio stations of the satellite countries, too, discovered in an Italian fascist yellow newspaper called *The Moon* that the Albanian leadership had allegedly begun secret talks with the Western countries. Dogs bark at the moon and it is natural that they understand each other’s language.

For its part, Gomulka’s worthless rag revealed that “the Albanian economy has been made dependent on Italy.”

Such inventions and slanders cannot sully the reputation of socialist Albania or of its leadership. The whole world understands that the Soviet Khrushchevite clique and the other revisionist ruling cliques have to use these allegations to cast a shadow over the correct policy of the Party of Labour of Albania which shines as clear as the light of day, enjoys the sympathy of the peoples and has their ardent support.

— The Soviet fascist militarists who have concentrated their aggressive forces in the People's Republic of Bulgaria, and the clique of Todor Zhivkov, which has allowed Bulgarian territory to be turned into a base for aggression against the peoples of the Balkans, and against Albania in particular, can deceive no one when they say that we are lying about the presence of these troops on Bulgarian territory; neither can the aggressive aims of the Soviet revisionists to disturb peace in the Balkans be disguised with a worthless declaration of the Bulgarian news agency, which under the Soviet dictate, can turn out as many as 20 such declarations a day. The Bratislava declaration, a declaration "solemnly" signed and sealed, on which the ink was not yet dry when the Soviet tanks rolled over it and invaded Czechoslovakia, is still fresh in the memory of the world.

We call on the fraternal Bulgarian people to be extremely vigilant and to take immediate stern measures against the new invaders of their country, who are the Soviet revisionists, and against their lackeys, the Bulgarian quislings. As true and loyal friends of the fraternal Bulgarian people, it is our duty to speak frankly and warn them that any attempt at aggression against socialist Albania from Bulgarian territory by the Soviet revisionist aggressors and their lackeys will be wiped out immediately, and victory will go to the Albanian people.

MONDAY
OCTOBER 7, 1968

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

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

The revolution is advancing and there is no force which can stop it. Neither the talks and agreements at Glasboro, nor the future meetings and agreements of imperialist and revisionist chiefs, and their secret and open plans will alter matters in their favour. Everything

will go against their desires and actions and in favour of the genuine freedom and independence of the peoples. New, great, sensational and final defeats are in store for the imperialists and revisionists.

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

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

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

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

Why, Mister Secretary, did you have to set the tone

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

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

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

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

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

perialists and revisionists.

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

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

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

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

Of course, both of them were aiming at one point: to consolidate their alliance and to calm their partners in NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, respectively. They have to create the atmosphere among their partner cliques

that the Soviet-American alliance is strong; must create the feeling among them that their salvation depends solely on the greatest possible submission to the United States of America and the Soviet Union, must convince them that the danger which threatens them comes from the revolution, the peoples' national liberation struggles, the broad democratic masses of the peoples, and the powerful world proletariat.

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

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

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

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

Each people knows its own duty and the measures which must be taken in these threatening situations, but

we are convinced that the peoples cannot be deceived by the imperialists and the revisionists, who are already armed to the teeth and continue to arm themselves, when they say, "You disarm because we are defending you." In other words, "Become our slaves, because we will defend your freedom, independence and sovereignty." This means to invite the wolf to guard your sheep.

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

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

onialists.

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

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

The Soviet revisionists, too, are imperialists. They are opposed to the unity of the Arab peoples. They have the same motto as the others: "Divide and rule." We love the Arab peoples. We know the Soviet revisionists and their aims only too well and, like the Arab leaders, we are well aware of the threats which Nikita Khrushchev made against them. They should never trust his disciples who hide the dagger under the cloak of their "aid." On the South American continent the Soviet revisionists and their local lackeys preach coexistence with the cliques in power, while American imperialism attacks the revolution, which is seething everywhere, with weapons. The one disarms the revolution ideologically, the other attacks it militarily.

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

WEDNESDAY
MARCH 5, 1969

THE BOGEY-MAN YAKUBOVSKY

Opinions and theses

— Today the Soviet revisionists are acting through Marshal Yakubovsky as the Americans did through Dulles in his time.

— Dulles at least was the Secretary of the American State Department and hid his aggressive military plans in his diplomat's briefcase, while Yakubovsky has displayed them on his cap, his epaulettes and the decorations which cover his chest. This commander of the Warsaw Treaty has become a roving *foudre de guerre** who is emerging in his true colours, has become a bogeyman roaming the countries which are under the heel of the Soviet revisionists in order to threaten them militarily, to occupy them, to hatch up political-military putsches, to exert economic pressure and to obtain concessions for the ruling clique of the Kremlin.

It is characteristic especially in recent years and, in particular, before and after the occupation of Czechoslovakia, that the militarymen have been playing a decisive role in Soviet foreign policy, and they cannot act with methods other than military. Military blackmail is the basis of the Soviet revisionist leadership's activity, their reasoning and their solutions of any problem are based on military deductions and aggressive operations. The political, ideological and economic relations of the Soviet revisionists with their satellite allies are all based on the Warsaw Treaty, which has become the main weapon of their blackmail. "If you don't obey me willingly, I will either overthrow you with intrigues

* Great warrior chief (French in the original).

from within or set in motion the Soviet army, disguised under the label of the Warsaw Treaty, and occupy you.” This, in a nutshell, is the political concept of this fascist militarist gang which is ruling in the Soviet Union. All the satellites are terrified of this threat and none of them likes it, but they have been placed in the iron grip of the Soviet leaders.

Yakubovsky is precisely the roving military envoy of the Soviets who goes from Poland to Hungary, from Hungary to Bulgaria, from Bulgaria to Czechoslovakia, from Czechoslovakia to Romania and back again, who inspects the Soviet occupation troops, organizes the network of Soviet agents in the ranks of the officers of the “allied” armies, controls the political situation in each satellite country and takes measures to exert pressure on them. It is claimed that he is engaged in the organization of “joint manoeuvres,” but in reality he goes to these countries to demonstrate the Soviet force to keep the “allied” countries under its heel.

For a long time the Soviet leaders have been openly and scandalously prowling around Romania like wild beasts. The Soviet pressure is now undisguised. “Romania must be occupied like Czechoslovakia” — this is the aim of the Soviet revisionist gangsters. According to the Soviets, the armies of the Warsaw Treaty must be stationed in Romania, too, just as in every other “allied” country, and of course, not the Romanian army, but only the jackboot of the Russian muzhik can be called an army of the Warsaw Treaty. But, following its revisionist-Titoite line, Romania is resisting. This has put the Soviets in a quandary. They both want and do not want to repeat the stale game they played in Czechoslovakia, a game which blew up in their hands and brought them such great difficulties, discredit and defeat.

To justify the occupation of Romania, the Soviet revisionists cannot build up the legend they concocted

about Czechoslovakia, alleging that it was threatened by the FR of Germany and by internal reaction. The former “excuse” does not exist because Romania does not have a common border with the FR of Germany. The latter “excuse,” likewise, cannot be used, because the Romanians are concealing their betrayal better than the Dubček- Svoboda Czechoslovak revisionists. The Soviets’ only remaining excuse for the invasion of Romania is Titoite Yugoslavia, which is allegedly threatening Romania, but the problem is that Yugoslavia does not have the weight of the FR of Germany and Tito not only shows no intention of becoming an “aggressor and occupier” of Romania but, on the contrary, declares himself its ally in its resistance to the Soviets. That is why the Soviets are threatening and blackmailing Tito who is hindering them in the execution of their “Romanian plan” quickly and with the least possible disturbance.

The Soviet revisionists want to occupy Romania, but not by the means they used in Czechoslovakia. They want this to be done with the approval of the Romanians, within the “orderly framework” of the Warsaw Treaty. They have occupied Bulgaria militarily and this is a fait accompli because of the betrayal of the Zhivkov clique. This occupation was accomplished on the quiet. This is what they want to do with Romania, too, but in order to achieve this aim, they must have the Romanian leadership, which does not obey them, under their control. They are trying to win it over through flattery, putsches, plots and all kinds of threats. Up till now they have achieved nothing, but they are working intensively in this direction.

At the same time the Soviet revisionists are playing the card of the Warsaw Treaty there, too. Their purpose in insisting on conducting military manoeuvres on Romanian territory is obvious. They want to find an excuse to “burst through” Romanian borders “legally,”

never to leave that country, and thus accomplish the occupation of all the “allied” countries and complete the “fence” around the “Warsaw” concentration camp.

But the fact is that they are encountering resistance from the Romanians. We shall see to what extent they will resist the grip which is trying to close on them.

The international circumstances are not favourable to the Soviet revisionists for the execution of the “Romanian plan,” especially since the occupation of Czechoslovakia, therefore they have set themselves the task of pressing Romania to affirm that it is a member of the Warsaw Treaty with all its “rights” and obligations, and, hence, should take part in all the manoeuvres which the “armies” of the Warsaw Treaty carry out in each “allied” country. **Deriving from this is the other “obligation,” so greatly desired by the Soviet renegades, to conduct manoeuvres on Romanian territory, too.**

To this end the bogeyman Yakubovsky is going back and forth to Bucharest, accompanied by Kuznetsov, allegedly the political representative of the czars of the Kremlin. This is the chessboard on which the pieces are being moved.

Recently the Soviets contrived the absurd military exercises in Berlin allegedly to prevent the visit of the president of the FR of Germany to the western sector of Berlin. They attempted to conduct these fake manoeuvres within the framework of the Warsaw Treaty, but the Romanians refused. So the Soviets turned round and conducted them with East Germany only.

In this whole plot the Soviet revisionists have an important agency for provocation in the Bulgarian revisionist clique which is using the so-called question of Macedonia to put pressure on Tito. But Tito is neither Dubček nor Ceausescu. They will get nowhere with him through bluffing unless they have decided to attack militarily. Tito will not surrender to the Soviets without war, and a war with Yugoslavia would be very difficult,

if not impossible, for the Soviets, therefore they cannot venture into it, at least for the time being. Thus, these quarrels with Tito do nothing but further expose and weaken both sides.

The policy of military blackmail by the Soviet revisionists is applied not only within the Warsaw Treaty, and Yakubovsky, who is prowling around Europe, is not the only bogeyman. There is also the bogeyman Grechko who as the Minister of Defence of the Soviet Union travels to Cairo, Beirut, Algiers, Damascus, Iraq, Pakistan and recently to India, with military plans in his briefcase. All these movements of his reflect the aggressive military aims of the revisionists of the Kremlin, are evidence that those countries are included in their plans and indicate the efforts they are making to solve the acute problems of these regions solely in the Soviet-American interests and the preparation of an aggression against the People's Republic of China.

The provocation on the Chinese border, on the Ussuri River, a provocation which was coordinated with Grechko's visit to India, was hatched up in this context.

Nevertheless, all this treacherous fascist policy can have no outcome other than ignominious defeat for the Soviets. The peoples' patience with occupiers and local cliques sold out to the Soviets will not last long. The movement of resistance and opposition began long ago. It will grow, build up pressure and erupt with great fury.

TUESDAY
JULY 29, 1969

SOME ASPECTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

The anniversary of the occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet army is drawing near. During this year the Soviet revisionists have used every means to subjugate the Czechoslovak people completely. They have not achieved their aim. It is true that they removed the revisionist Dubček from power and replaced him with Husak, another quisling allegedly with more personality than Dubček, but more obedient and submissive to the orders of the occupiers.

All that this year brought forth was that the occupation troops acquired warmer quarters and greater hatred among the people. The press, the radio and the other means of propaganda were gagged, but the passive resistance of the people increased.

The economic situation in Czechoslovakia is catastrophic, the market is empty, the shops are being stripped by *Ivan* who grabs anything he can find and sends it off to *Marushka* in Russia.

Czechoslovakia has completely lost its dignity, individuality and its activity as a sovereign and independent state in the international arena is nil. It is a country completely subjugated by the Soviets with the force of arms. The Soviets have utterly discredited themselves, not only within Czechoslovakia, but also in the international arena. Even with the actions of quislings and the pressure of the Soviets, it is hard to “gloss over” lies. The situation in Czechoslovakia will become even more embittered. There is talk of silent strikes on the occasion of the first anniversary of the occupation; illegal leaflets and articles against the Soviets are circulating

wholesale in Czechoslovakia. Hatred for the occupiers is simmering in every Czechoslovak home. There are many attempts at organization, by good and bad elements. What is important is the formation of a Marxist-Leninist party which must galvanize the resistance and energies of the people and lead them in resolute actions, lead the armed resistance.

The national moment is very suitable. The Czechoslovak problem is a gangrenous ulcer for the Soviet and other revisionists. Czechoslovakia remains a country seething with discontent and resistance. The Czechoslovak people will find sound revolutionary forces which will revolt.

The revisionist camp is trying hard to give the impression that calm and harmony exist in its ranks. Nothing they say rings true; evil cannot be covered up with words. Their quarrels and disagreements have increased and are becoming more profound.

The Soviets are no longer smiling at their "allies."

They are putting economic pressure on the Poles, are not supplying them with the steel and oil they need. The same thing is occurring with the others, too. Of course, the reason for this is that the Soviet plans are not being fulfilled, that the Soviet-American alliance requires political and economic sacrifices, and that the Soviet imperialist expansion demands disposability of investments, thus, all these factors taken together, as well as the pressure exercised on these countries, are making the satellite countries discontented with their patron. Naturally, their discontent has not reached the level at which it undergoes a qualitative change into open revolt, but it is manifested in various stands, in their political problems, in their "semi-legal" relations with West Germany, the United States of America, France and the other capitalist countries. But one thing is certain: the revisionist chiefs are at "daggers drawn" with one another; in fact, they hate one another, but the

situation requires them to cover up their profound disagreements, however difficult this may be.

The struggle against Bonn and against American imperialism, which they advocate, is a hoax. Nobody is deceived by this demagogy. They themselves are well aware of this, therefore, all of them are making great efforts to tie themselves to the capitalist West with a thousand threads. There is a great race to do this. The Soviet revisionists are strengthening their links with the Westerners and trying to weaken, tangle up or sever the links which their satellite "allies" want to establish.

West Germany, the United States of America, Great Britain, etc., are developing their activities in all forms. Nixon's visit to Romania is an important move, a major test in this direction.

The Soviet revisionist empire sees that it is in a very difficult position in Europe. It is keeping its European satellites under rein only with difficulty and wondering how long it will be able to do so. One day the reins will break. Therefore, the Soviet efforts are intended to woo Bonn, to create conditions attractive to it and, of course, the Soviets will make concessions at the expense of their "allies," but they must ensure that the "allies" remain in the Warsaw Treaty. The Soviets will insist on this, because they need "cannon fodder" for the defence of their western border. The Soviets foresee that the day will come when they can no longer keep their "allies" under control as they wish. Their political and economic threats and blackmail will no longer have their former effect. The United States of America is doing all it can to assist in this direction. The West German-American "peaceful" competition in this sector is producing tangible results in the disintegration of the Soviet empire in its decline.

That is why the Soviets are turning their eyes to the East, to countries "suitable" for colonization.

So, without lessening its caution or abandoning its

pro-western policy, while maintaining and strengthening its friendship with the United States of America, which it still considers as its great rival, the Soviet Union has directed its gaze and its greatest activity to the Middle East, the Far East and the Pacific Ocean.

The revisionist Soviet Union advocates the idea of a “security” alliance with the peoples of Asia and has begun to work actively in this direction. The aim of Soviet social-imperialism is to prepare for war against China, to achieve its isolation and restriction and the colonization of the countries of Asia. The Soviet revisionists think that their investments in weapons, etc., for India, Pakistan, Indonesia and other countries will bring them economic, political and military advantages, while the big concessions they are making to Japan will make that country friendly to the Soviet Union, so that it will help to achieve the Soviet aim of the isolation of China and take part in a crusade against China. The purpose of this whole strategy of the Soviet revisionists is to prepare the big attack on China, an attack of propaganda and armed provocations.

The aim of this revisionist strategy is to intimidate China, to sweeten up the capitalist states of Asia, and to dispel the fears of and please the United States of America and Japan.

The war which the Soviet Union is preparing against China is greatly to the liking of the United States of America and Japan which are encouraging it in this direction. But, on the other hand, the latter do not like the Soviet plan of manoeuvres for alliances with states in which the USA has already got its hooks and upon the plunder of whose wealth the existence of American capitalism itself is greatly dependent.

Thus, Nixon’s present trip must be seen as a counter to this Soviet plan. The purpose of it is not only to strengthen the positions of the United States of America in India and elsewhere, but also to penetrate into

Romania, into the lair of the Soviets. With this Nixon is telling the Soviets: "You are getting into my sheepfold, but I am getting into yours." Of course, this kind of activity is not without dangers and conflicts. And the armed conflicts have not ceased, either in the Middle East, in Vietnam or in many other countries of Africa and Latin America.

These conflicts will continue because they reflect the conflicts of the two big imperialist powers which are allies and rivals at the same time, which are at peace with each other but are fighting by means of others, exploiting the blood shed by other peoples to adjust their own dirty interests and spheres of influence...

The Soviets are making great efforts to gain influence in India and to make it an ally of theirs. They are providing India with credits and arms, making many investments there in order to extract big economic and political benefits. In India, however, three imperialisms, which have great influence in that country, are confronting one another. India is a member of the British Commonwealth, which is bankrupt. Nevertheless British capital has an appreciable influence and plays a considerable role in this part of the sterling zone, where the dollar, in particular, has penetrated deeply. Besides this, in India the Soviet Union has to deal with a feudal-capitalist bourgeoisie with no little experience in gobbling up wealth, in striking up false friendships and turning its back whenever it suits it.

India, after all, is an enormous, poverty-stricken country which, in order to act as it would like, needs capital in amounts which the Soviet Union will never be able to provide. India is a continent that is stirring, ripe for revolution. The Indian capitalist bourgeoisie is anti-Chinese, but at the same time is also realistic in regard to the strength of China. It will be cautious in regard to the Soviet-American plans, not from choice but from necessity.

Meanwhile Pakistan, which is in hostility with India over the question of Kashmir, does not put much trust either in the Americans, or in the Soviets, who are unlikely to choose its side in preference to a slice of the Indian "cake." Their "smiles" and approaches to Pakistan are accompanied with threats and pressure.

Pakistan maintains good relations with China. At this time, when the Soviets and the Americans are undertaking these endeavours in Asia, Pakistan is strengthening its links with China.

The road into the Soviet Far East has been opened to Nipponese imperialism. With the Japanese investments in the territory of the Soviet Union the Soviet revisionist leadership is trying to compensate for its own investments in the other countries it intends to colonize, and to make Japan, if not a fighting ally against China, at least a neutral ally in case of an armed conflict with China. In its relations with Japan, the Soviet Union also aims to block the trade of Japan with China, in the hope of strangling the huge Chinese market.

The Middle East is and will continue to be a zone of Soviet-American influence, intrigues and domination. The puppets who are in power in the Arab countries are sold out lock, stock and barrel. Only the organization of the resistance and the people's struggle can pull the Middle East out of the mire. The resistance of the Palestinians is the beginning. This resistance is not to the liking of either the Arab puppets in power or of their respective patrons. It is supported by the Arab peoples. This is a hopeful sign, but as long as it is not led by communists, the dangers are great.

Neighbouring Italy is a country in chronic crisis. They are not succeeding in forming a government there; the neo-fascists, the military putsches prepared by the Americans are ready to emerge from behind-the-scenes. The prospect of these putsches has terrified the Italian revisionists, who are doing their utmost to make

common cause with the bourgeois parties. They have put themselves up for auction, but nobody is buying them.

Post-De Gaulle France, also, is writhing in the grip of a crisis, trying to find a *modus vivendi* between the two big powers and a powerful Federal Germany which has captured the strongest dominant positions in Western Europe in the economic, monetary, political and military fields.

The South American continent is stirring. Castro is an anti-Marxist bound with Soviet chains. What is positive is that there is a pronounced sentiment against the United States of America in Latin America. The genuine Marxist- Leninist parties there are organized and in struggle.

Faced with this situation, which is fraught with dangers, we must be more vigilant than ever. Great caution and vigilance towards the Soviet revisionists, the American imperialists and the Titoite neighbours, towards the monarcho-fascist reaction of Athens and the neo-fascists of Rome. We must always keep our powder dry, preserve our steel unity, keep the people on the alert and the Party invincible. These are the conditions for our victories at all times and in any situation.

**THURSDAY
FEBRUARY 19, 1970**

THE SOVIETS ARE TRYING TO CREATE BIG MIXED MILITARY UNITS WITH THEIR SATELLITES

Under various pretexts and in the context of the Warsaw Treaty, the Soviet revisionists are making efforts to create big mixed military units made up of contingents from each member state of this Treaty. They say that Romania has not agreed. According to our information, in fact these units have been created already. They say, also, that such units have been sent to the border with China, but this has still to be verified. It is clear that the Soviet revisionists are doing this to eliminate the independence of each separate army, to put them all completely under Soviet command, to create mercenary troops for military adventures, to demoralize the military cadres of each state, and to crush any kind of resistance on their part.

WEDNESDAY
MARCH 4, 1970

ON THE FRANCO-AMERICAN CONTRADICTIONS

The Franco-American contradictions are contradictions between two imperialist powers. Sometimes they become acute, sometimes they seem to die down a little, but they never disappear and they cannot disappear completely. These are contradictions between a powerful imperialism, such as that of the United States of America, which is striving to establish its hegemony over the world, and French imperialism, which no longer has its former strength or the aggressiveness to be able to challenge American imperialism properly, or even to create stable alliances in its own favour.

These two imperialist powers talk about their “traditional friendship,” but this sort of friendship represents nothing but the defence of their capitalist interests in the given crisis conditions, when their interests are in danger of being completely wiped out by a third imperialist power, which undertakes an imperialist world war for the redivision of the spheres of influence in the world. In the last two great crises, the First and the Second World War, in fact, American imperialism did come to the aid of its Anglo-French “allies,” but in the final analysis, its gains were again colossal in comparison with its minimal human and material losses. The two great world wars and the blood of others, which was poured out in torrents, enriched and strengthened American imperialism. At a time when France, Britain and the countries of Europe were devastated and their economies ruined, the United States of America suffered not the slightest damage and its economy was enormously developed and enriched.

France and Britain emerged from the First World War victorious over the Germany of Kaiser William. Although the war brought them losses, these two imperialist powers still retained their superiority in capitalist Europe and retained their colonial empires, which were to become a source of colossal income for the metropolises for a period that lasted up to the Second World War. Of course, their American “friends” did not sit idle in these circumstances so favourable to them, when they had victorious “friends” and defeated “friends.” The victorious “friends” who were economically weakened, had to be placed under the firmest control possible to ensure that American capital could penetrate as deeply as possible into their metropolises and economies. Thus, the United States of America emerged from its former isolation, and the policy of the dollar, the struggle to capture the sources of raw materials and markets in the world was being waged more and more sternly. There was talk about the sterling area and the franc area, but the dollar area was assuming preponderance.

The closest “friend” and “blood relation” which could be fleeced most easily was the “British lion.” It took the Second World War to bring the transfer of the former British colonies *grosso modo** under the domination and neo-colonialist exploitation of Uncle Sam. Like it or not, Britain was forced to transfer its plundered wealth to the hands of American imperialism, not in the previous form of colonies, but as various states to which it “generously gave independence and self-government.” Almost formally, to keep up appearances, but also for its own, of course, reduced economic interests, it continued to call them the “Commonwealth” and the “sterling area.” Nevertheless, after the two world crises, British imperialism became and remained

* In general (Italian in the original).

the “friend” of the United States of America, its obedient friend, its impoverished, though close, relation.

French imperialism, on the other hand, did not submit so readily to the pressure of American imperialism. Through the Treaty of Versailles and the alliances it put together, especially in Europe, the French bourgeoisie tried to restrain the revival of German militarism, its strongest and traditional rival, especially in Europe. At the same time, French imperialism, as a power which emerged victorious from the First World War, exerted all its strength to hold on to its many colonies against the greedy ambitions of others and to exploit their enslaved peoples to the bone. American imperialism found it very difficult to penetrate into and weaken this old imperialist and colonialist power. In order to achieve these aims, to establish its domination over its “friend,” American imperialism was to use capital investments in France and its colonies, as well as the financing of the defeated “friend,” German revanchism, the traditional enemy of imperialist France.

A series of circumstances, the crises, the revival of German militarism in the form of the former Hitlerite nazi Reich, more ferocious in its ideology and organization, brought about that the French bourgeoisie was weakened and lost the Second World War without fighting at all. France capitulated, its colonial empire declined, Africa was occupied by the American armies, and France itself was to be occupied in order to attack the German armies of occupation. After the Second World War the United States of America thought and hoped that France was finished as an imperialist and colonial power and would follow the American dictate obediently and humbly.

Of course, France, which emerged from the war economically and morally defeated, could not have its former prestige or weight or play a first-rate role in the international arena. The partisan and Gaullist

forces which took part in the war could not and did not make such a contribution to the war as to give France its old "grandeur." The forces of "Free France" were under the command and orders of the allies, despite De Gaulle's spirit of French "grandeur." However, the circumstances created in liberated Europe required that France should be revived as a bourgeois power. The persistence of De Gaulle and his intransigence, especially with American imperialism, with Roosevelt and, later, with Truman assisted in this direction. Hence, France's opposition to American imperialism is of long standing and became deeper during the war, because Roosevelt had great hopes in Petain and Vichy and virtually disregarded De Gaulle and his movement.

After the War, this France accepted and benefited from the "Marshall Plan." In order to strengthen its assets with the American aid and to preserve its empire which was shaken to its foundations the French capitalist bourgeoisie showed itself disposed to the Atlantic collaboration with the United States of America in all its forms. Naturally, American capital poured into France and its colonies more freely. Anti-Sovietism reached its culmination, NATO was created with France an important member of it and the country where the command of this organization was located.

The facts showed that the French capitalist economy was reviving. France began to display more independence in its policy, began to strengthen its political and economic links with Bonn, to play the main role in the European Common Market, and during this development, of course, its contradictions with American imperialism did not disappear, but, on the contrary, became deeper until they became extremely exacerbated with De Gaulle as president of France. During this time, however, the French colonies burst into flames, liberation wars began in Vietnam and Algeria and disturbances broke out in Morocco, Tunisia

and everywhere. The French colonial empire was collapsing. The French bourgeoisie dispatched soldiers to be killed in the hopeless attempt to prop it up. Thus, the withdrawal began: "Let us save what we can." Independent bourgeois states emerged, some of which retained their political and economic links with France, while others did not.

In any case, wherever there was a vacuum the United States of America moved in with its military bases, its capital investments, its credits and its agents. The old French colonialism was being replaced with the powerful American neo-colonialism. This, of course, made the contradictions between French imperialism and American imperialism even more acute.

De Gaulle tried to crystallize his alliance with Bonn, first of all, with the aim that France would be dominant in this alliance and that the two countries jointly would neutralize the American influence in Europe. From this angle De Gaulle regarded Britain as dependent on the United States of America, as it was, therefore, he tried to keep it out of his multilateral European policy, or to make it the "poor" partner of this alliance.

At the same time, in the situation when the Soviet Union and the United States of America had entered the phase of a feverish alliance between them, De Gaulle tried to make approaches to the Soviet Union with the aim of exerting pressure in two directions, upon both Bonn Germany and the United States of America. However, neither Bonn nor Moscow responded to De Gaulle's advances in the way he wanted. They moved towards him just as far as this suited their own interests. Bonn could not jeopardize its interests with the United States of America and Britain and, while retaining its friendship with France, it undertook its own imperialist economic expansion in the world, but especially in the revisionist states and, first of all, in the Soviet Union. Thus, the era of open and secret Soviet-West German

talks began under the umbrella of the Soviet-American alliance.

To attain his political objectives with the Soviet Union, De Gaulle also intended to carry out some sleight of hand in his internal policy in order to deceive the working class and the opposition. Faced with the failure of his policy, however, the French capitalist big bourgeoisie lost confidence in De Gaulle, manoeuvred and brought him down, replacing him with Pompidou. The latter looks like the representative of the French big business bourgeoisie, and that is what he is. At present this bourgeoisie seems to be adopting a policy less intransigent towards the United States of America than that of De Gaulle, less intransigent towards Britain, etc. This is on the surface. The United States of America is feeling the pulse, trying to see to what extent the French policy has softened.

If we look deep into the essence of the question, however, and not just at external appearances, the contradictions exist and are growing deeper. At the moment we see that these contradictions are becoming acute in two directions: in the demands of the French policy that the American and the Soviet fleets be withdrawn from the Mediterranean, and second, in the direct participation of France in the Arab-Israeli conflict. This latter direction presents two aspects: the anti-American aspect and the anti-Soviet aspect. In order to gain influence in Africa and the Near East, France is allegedly supporting the Arabs without being openly opposed to Israel. This situation, of course, will make the contradictions and conflicts between these three imperialist powers even more acute, and this is in the interests of the revolution, because it weakens the aggressive forces of the imperialists that are under attack by the peoples.

We must follow the development of these situations attentively. Our task is to follow the development of these contradictions carefully, to make them clear to

our people and to our friends and to mercilessly expose the demagogy of enemies, which covers up all this cruel business to the detriment of the peoples who are fighting and shedding their blood for freedom.

**TUESDAY
MARCH 24, 1970**

ALL-ROUND CRISIS IN THE SOVIET UNION

The Soviet Union has had crises for the past 10-15 years and will go on having them. This is a logical result of the restoration of capitalism and the decay of the present regime in that country. The antagonistic contradictions amongst groups in the leadership and the contradictions between these groups and the people are becoming more profound, more fierce. They are heading for conflicts. The crisis of the Soviet capitalist-revisionist regime is manifested in its internal and international policies. In the ideological field it has led to degeneration with its worst consequences, and in the economic field, likewise, to degeneration with catastrophic consequences. All this brings about the crisis and the degeneration of the structure, leads to the strengthening of the fascist military forces as the only means the capitalist bourgeoisie has to crush the resistance, to suppress the people and to prepare military adventures abroad, against the other countries and peoples.

The course which the Soviet revisionists are following is that of forcing the pace of the militarization of the Soviet Union. Of course this cannot be done without clashes, without contradictions and without violating the vital interests of the working people. On this course they are in alliance with and have the support of American imperialism and world capitalism.

The fact is that capital from America and other capitalist countries is pouring into the Soviet Union. This is going on just as in every other capitalist country and their colonies, just as it did in capitalist Germany after the First and the Second World Wars. This means that

the Western capitalists who are investing in the Soviet Union are confident about what they are doing: they are helping the Soviet revisionists for a great common goal which is anti-communism. But by assisting in the development of the Soviet Union's industry, to the extent that interests them, at the same time they are creating possibilities for the revisionists to increase their armaments. This appears a paradox, but it is a reality. There is no enigma about this.

Of course, with its investments in the Soviet Union, world capital, headed by American capital, aims to draw huge economic profits and is doing so in fact. The investments it makes in the Soviet Union are advantageous to world capital in many directions. For example, amongst other things, regardless of the fact that the Soviet economy is powerful, especially in raw materials, the international capital influences the orientation of the Soviet Union's economy and inhibits development in those directions which are not in its interests. At the same time, the foreign capital which is pouring into the Soviet Union is preparing the ground for ever greater collaboration by capitalist trusts and concerns with the Soviet trusts and concerns. The latter are only disguised as socialist concerns, while in content and organization they are modelled on capitalist concerns, and indeed are improving on the original models. The revisionist economic reforms which are being carried out have precisely this aim, to perfect the capitalist regime so that it corresponds to, and if possible, outstrips that of the other capitalist partners, while finding and maintaining the disguises necessary to an allegedly socialist economy. The betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and the going over of the Soviet renegade leadership to revisionism was bound to and did bring the degeneration of the Soviet Union, moral, political, ideological degeneration and degeneration of its structures. For tactical reasons the Khrushchevite traitors have tried

and will continue to try to retain certain external features of these structures unaltered but will strip them completely of their "Marxist-Leninist" essence.

Now this degeneration in the Soviet Union has assumed monstrous forms, with the creation of a corrupted class which rules in the economy, politics, ideology and the military field. The machinery of betrayal has been set working and is being oiled so that world capital sees that in the Soviet Union it has security and a prosperous future.

International capitalism has reached the conclusion that through the Khrushchevites' betrayal it gained a powerful agency with the help of which it will be able to fight communism and world revolution "successfully." It would never be able to do this on its own, either with social demagoguery or with the force of arms. World capitalism realizes that, for a long time, the Soviet revisionist traitors will be able to exploit the great authority and prestige of the Soviet Union, the international authority of Lenin, Leninism and Marxism-Leninism for their counter-revolutionary undermining work.

At the same time, however, world capitalism knows that the advent to power of Khrushchevite revisionism in the Soviet Union is a temporary victory. Nevertheless, it is trying to consolidate this victory.

What benefits did Khrushchevite revisionism bring world capitalism?

— It sowed the seed of disruption within the communist parties, and within the international labour movement.

— It is playing the role of a scab in the revolution and a fire-extinguisher to quell the flames of national liberation wars which the international gendarme, American imperialism, puts down by force of arms.

Hence, world capitalism and modern revisionism are fighting in unison against the revolution, communism, socialism and the peoples who have risen to their

feet and are fighting for their freedom.

American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism are the arch-enemies of the peoples. They are both fighting against other peoples and countries, against the revolutionary forces. This common objective brings them together, unites them. But as the imperialists they are, they also have separate aims which divide them and pit them against each other. One such aim is world domination, the redivision of the world into spheres and zones of influence, while quietly torpedoing each other's positions in the existing spheres of influence. Thus, there are contradictions between them which are becoming more and more acute. These contradictions must not be forgotten or underestimated. Indeed, they may become so acute that they burst into armed conflicts, into imperialist war between them.

At present there are tacit military-political agreements between the two blocs, the Atlantic bloc headed by the United States of America and the Warsaw bloc headed by the Soviet Union. Within these blocs there is a spider's web of multifarious connections, but there are also innumerable contradictions which weaken these links. In fact we see that outside and inside blocs and alliances talks are taking place, contracts are being concluded, treaties are being signed, credits are being given, capital is being invested, and the capitalist-revisionist osmosis is taking place. The most important among these agreements are those which are signed between the two chiefs of world imperialism, the Soviets and the Americans. True, the United States of America is aiding the revisionist Soviet Union through the provision of credits, but at the same time, by means of this aid it is striving to neutralize and, if possible, to weaken the Soviet military strength, and keep it at a level inferior to that of its own aggressive military strength. This is the aim of the treaties they have signed or are trying to conclude in the fields of atomic and other weapons.

Their true aim is not the preservation of peace, the elimination of armaments or the elimination of wars, but the temporary avoidance of conflicts between two imperialist powers, and the maintenance of the status quo of the domination of the world by the two great powers.

American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism are preparing for war. In this context they are sabotaging and hampering the national liberation wars of peoples who have risen and will continue to rise against them in armed struggle. At the same time they are obliged to wage an internal struggle against their own peoples who are rising in revolution, in political and economic strikes; they are obliged to combat the centrifugal forces within their so-called blocs which are seething with discontent, and in which revolt and insurrection are imminent.

The imperialism of the United States of America feels "stronger" within its empire. It is fully prepared ideologically and militarily for aggression, which it has in its bloodstream and is developing in all forms, on all continents.

From the time the Khrushchevites betrayed socialism they set out, as they themselves declared, on the course of catching up with and surpassing the United States of America." Naturally, this "was to be done" on the antisocialist, capitalist road. Such a thing could not be done openly, because the Khrushchevites had to travel the road of the degeneration of the Soviet Union, of its transformation from a socialist country into a capitalist country. Therefore they had to ruminate and find such capitalist forms as would keep the betrayal involved in these transformations disguised. Betrayal does not pay, betrayal does not strengthen but weakens, betrayal does not rebuild but destroys. This process is a law regardless of whether you are a big or small state, powerful or weak economically. It is only a matter of

time; sooner or later the process of degeneration, weakening, transformation takes place. Only armed insurrection, the revolution can stop and destroy this process.

Already the Soviet Union is deeply immersed in this destructive process. It is in crisis everywhere, in every sector. Agriculture is in a great crisis, light and heavy industry, the structural organization of the state and the economy likewise, reforms follow reforms. As the people say, the Soviet Union "is eating its own flesh." Colossal investments are being made for the militarization of the country and preparation for imperialist military aggressions. Colossal funds have been invested for space research. But now that the United States of America has been given the green light in this field, these funds are no longer sufficient.

A great crisis has gripped the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It is no longer a Marxist-Leninist party. It has degenerated into a worthless bureaucratic apparatus, which has discarded any Leninist norms, which engages only in demagogy and whose propaganda serves only to say that "the tradition is maintained."

The whole superstructure of the Soviet Union is in the chaos of bourgeois degeneration, under a thin coat of allegedly Marxist paint. The union of the various nationalities and republics which form the Soviet Union, a union achieved on the Marxist-Leninist course, can no longer be preserved now that they are on the capitalist course. Modern revisionism incites nationalism and great-Russian chauvinism, incites the domination of big nationalities over smaller ones, suppresses any democratic freedoms, because it has abolished the dictatorship of the proletariat, has created the stratum of exploiters with an exploiting capitalist economic apparatus and the oppressive military force in the service of this new regime which has been restored.

Thus, the revisionist clique in the Soviet Union is

kept in power by means of counter-revolutionary violence. Abroad, this clique no longer completely dominates the revisionist camp. Unity does not exist, it is a formal unity, a charade of unity. Likewise, between the Soviet Union and the revisionist states, its alleged allies, there is no unity, but there is intervention, and the Soviet revisionists have intervened and will intervene violently by means of armed force.

Thus, the methods of the Soviet militarist-fascist violence have come into operation. They are a logical outcome of the establishment of the capitalist regime in the Soviet Union. The militarist-fascist violence operates within the Soviet Union, operates in the other revisionist countries which are allies of the Soviet Union, on the one hand, against the anti-Soviet ultra-revisionist cliques which oppose the pro-Soviet cliques and, on the other hand, against the popular revolt which is being fanned up and prepared against them.

In the international arena, the militarist-fascist Soviet power has begun to emerge in the Near East and establish its bases in Egypt and elsewhere, under the disguise of military aid for the peoples. The aggressive Soviet fleet has begun to show itself and conduct manoeuvres on seas and oceans, manoeuvres which have a distinct character of preparation for a world war. Although disguised with bombastic slogans, all this preparation is coordinated with American imperialism.

Bent on their course of adventures and imperialist wars, the Soviet revisionists are experiencing great difficulties and political, economic and other crises. They are making great efforts to overcome them, to conceal or belittle them, but in vain. They are encountering resistance and great struggle in every direction, internally and externally. Albania and the other revolutionary forces are irreconcilable enemies of revisionists and imperialists; therefore their main attack internationally is directed against us and revolutionaries all over the

world.

There is talk of a crisis in the Soviet revisionist leadership. No doubt there is and always will be. The militarymen are in the saddle and will strengthen their militarist-fascist power. The state power in the revisionist Soviet Union will go increasingly to the right until the new proletarian revolution, which will be organized in the Soviet Union by a new, genuine Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist party, wipes it out.

**FRIDAY
MAY 1, 1970**

THE AMERICAN TROOPS HAVE ATTACKED CAMBODIA

Once again Nixon has shown his face as the war-mongering representative of American imperialism and exposed his own pacifist lies and demagoguery. Two or three days ago he declared he was going to withdraw 150 thousand troops from Vietnam. This was just another bluff, but on the other hand, it shows that American imperialism, which has got itself caught up in a terrible meatgrinder, is lashing out wildly, trying to extricate itself from its very great difficulties, and now, by sending its troops into Cambodia, it has gone deeper into an even vaster, more intense and destructive sea of fire. Now American imperialism will have to throw new, greater forces into the holocaust and face more numerous united forces, which have great possibilities to manoeuvre.

The peoples of Indochina are uniting as one against their common enemy and will put him in his grave all the sooner. The American imperialists and their friends, the Soviet revisionists, are frantic and they have good reason to be. Their plans have been and will be foiled.

The Soviet revisionists have been caught like rats in a trap. They cannot extricate themselves from the consequences of their treachery and are sinking deeper into the mire. Their statements on Cambodia are stale, false, cynical. Their ambassador still maintains close links with Lon Nol. A positive thing is that Sihanouk is not in their clutches. Sihanouk is beginning to recognize what the Soviet revisionists, who are trying to carry out many actions to weaken the united front of the peoples of Indochina, really are.

But with the Americans' invasion of Cambodia, the North Vietnamese, too, must certainly be greatly disillusioned with the lies of the Soviets, who are for talks with the Americans.

The American imperialists have recommenced the bombing of North Vietnam. This is a great defeat for the Soviet revisionists, a terrible exposure for them as friends of American imperialism. The Vietnamese will draw the proper lessons.

VLORA, TUESDAY
AUGUST 11, 1970

SOVIET-WEST GERMAN FRIENDSHIP UNDER AMERICAN PATRONAGE

The Soviet revisionists and Bonn have signed a treaty on the non-use of force against each other,* and opened the prospect of all-round collaboration between these two imperialist states.

This agreement was achieved in record time, a thing which shows that in essence social-democracy, which is in power at present in both signatory countries, quickly ironed out the disagreements. The interests of German revanchism and Soviet social-imperialism reached a meeting point and both of them were in need of a more or less lengthy pause in order to prepare for new adventures and to assist each other.

Thus, West Germany will have possibilities to strengthen its military, economic and political potential even more than it has done already, while the Soviet revisionists will have a time of relative peace in Europe in order to stabilize the power of their bourgeois dictatorship on somewhat stronger foundations within the Soviet Union in disfavour of socialism, which they have destroyed, and will have greater possibilities to operate against revolutionary and national liberation struggles of the peoples in general.

This friendship of the Soviet revisionists with Bonn is being developed with the calculated approval of American imperialism. "These three friends" are in agreement as long as their individual interests are not damaged. Actually, American imperialism domin-

* This treaty was signed on August 7, 1970 in Moscow.

ates this alliance while standing above it. German imperialism is rising, growing stronger and has gained a privileged position. Both the Americans and the Soviet Union, the latter especially, need it. The Soviet Union needs it but is also afraid of it. These two important factors are operating to control the power of the Soviet Union, both by Bonn directly and by Bonn and Washington together (standing in judgement of the circumstances of the treaty).

The victory of Bonn is considerable. The Federal Republic of Germany, with the assistance of world imperialism and American imperialism, in particular, has become the most powerful partner in NATO after the United States of America. Its economy has become exceptionally strong and is one of those that make the law in the European Common Market. It is financing the United States of America to maintain the stability of the dollar, and its capital is spreading everywhere in Europe and to other continents to occupy places "in the sun."

For Bonn, of course, no position gained can be complete without the annexation of the German Democratic Republic. In the existing circumstances it could not do this without the use of force. Moreover, the Soviet-American alliance made the prospect of doing this with such means a remote one. Hence American-German imperialism altered its tactics in order to achieve its strategic aim. The Soviet revisionist traitors accepted the new tactic and concluded the treaty referred to, which favours American-German imperialism to the detriment of the peoples of Europe and the world, to the detriment of peace and the revolution.

Now the imperialists, the modern revisionists and world capitalism in crisis are setting up a deafening clamour to advertise this treaty. According to them, "This treaty has removed the threat of war from Europe and ensured the status quo of the borders of the states

of Europe as they were established after the Second World War. The Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union pledged that they would not touch these borders," etc., etc. All euphoria, all demagoguery, all lies, and the sharpening of knives behind the scenes. "No one could propose a better solution than that provided by this treaty," is more or less what the revisionist traitor, Kosygin, said in his speech to Willy Brandt.

This imperialist treaty tramples on the rights of the peoples who fought against Hitlerite Germany. For the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic it eliminates the question of the Peace Treaty which they, as defeated states, have to sign with the victorious states. The treaty made this concession to Bonn. Such a thing did not occur either with defeated Italy or with defeated Japan. Stalin defended the blood which the peoples shed to defeat the fascist and militarist beasts, while the Khrushchevite revisionist traitors betrayed both the blood the peoples shed and their rights, and assisted the revanchists of Bonn with this treaty.

Stalin never assisted imperialism or Hitlerite fascism. He was a glorious Marxist-Leninist and their sworn enemy. The Soviet-German treaty cannot be equated with this present one. Stalin was well aware who he was dealing with, knew that a life-and-death battle with the Hitlerites was imminent, so Molotov signed a treaty to gain time and he did this only when he saw that the Western "democracies," Britain and France, were against an alliance with the Soviet Union and were urging Hitler to make his move to the East as quickly as possible. The treaty which Kosygin signed, however, is a treaty between friends, a treaty on which great hopes have been pinned for the financing of the Soviet Union.

Willy Brandt stressed several times, in his official speech in Moscow, and talking to reporters on the oc-

casation of the signing of the treaty, that it would be successful and would achieve the purposes for which it was signed if what might be called a situation for the development of good relations is created in Central Europe. In other words, he pointed out again to the Soviets that the restrictions and pressures on Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria and Romania must be relaxed.

The capitalists of Bonn want to penetrate those countries in other ways: in political, economic and ideological ways. The other issues will come later as a consequence of the former. West Germany wants and will try on the basis of this treaty to achieve its purpose of extending its influence in those countries, replacing the detested Soviet influence, eliminating any influence of communism and achieving the unification of the two German states.

The Soviet revisionist counter-revolutionaries are afraid of the peoples and the revolution, therefore they have few illusions about keeping their satellites under a firm grip, especially in the political and ideological fields, because sooner or later the satellites will desert them. Their concern is to corrupt these cliques, to have other cliques ready to replace them, and to keep them militarily and economically dependent for as long as possible. Naturally, there will be contradictions between them and they will grow deeper. Bonn, Washington and others will take advantage of this to get their hooks into them. The Soviets must make concessions to them, and this treaty makes this obligatory, because the Soviet Union will sink into all-round collaboration with Bonn, a collaboration which will demand concessions for the foreign capital which will pour into the Soviet Union.

The revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union will see the problems through glasses different from those through which it is seeing them today. It will be caught up in the capitalist storm with its cycles of political,

economic and military crises, with its way of life and thinking about the solution of political problems and alliances, just as the other capitalist powers do. The imperialist powers sought to bring the Soviet Union to this point, and through the Khrushchevite traitor clique they have achieved their aim.

Soviet revisionist imperialism now hopes that by making major sacrifices through this treaty and, later, the treaty on "European Security," if this is achieved, it will dominate Europe together with German imperialism so the two of them will make the law in Europe, weaken NATO and increase their influence in the other parts of the world.

Hence, the current euphoria which is being expressed in the world about this imperialist treaty is not real for all. For the satellite countries of the Soviet Union it is a "joy" which conceals the desire of cliques to break away from the Soviet tutelage and link up with the West. True, the capitalist countries of Europe have found and will find possibilities for capital investment in the countries of the East from which they will draw profits, but only for as long as the big fish allows them. Certainly, France already sees itself isolated and encircled, or will do so later if it does not act. The other capitalist countries will either remain obedient slaves to the United States of America or come under the new tutelage of the two European powers. The status quo and peace in Europe, where the biggest capitalist wolves are prowling, is a fraud to deceive *gogos*.*

The French capitalist bourgeoisie is in a quandary. Either it must activate the intransigent policy of De Gaulle, or it must capitulate to the other imperialist powers, the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union, which dominate Europe at present and are forging new chains. Of

* Fools (French in the original).

course, in the face of a German-Soviet danger in Europe, American imperialism will certainly strengthen its old alliance with Britain and France. Time will tell this...

SUNDAY
SEPTEMBER 27, 1970

NIXON'S COMING TO EUROPE

Notes

1) Whenever the positions of American imperialism anywhere are shaken or endangered, either the president or the vice-president of the United States of America, according to the occasion, emerges from his lair.

2) This time, President Nixon himself is coming to Europe with an impressive suite, but he is very worried.

3) The objects of his visit, Italy, Yugoslavia, Spain, the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean, the meeting in Naples with the American ambassadors in this region, and finally his visit to Britain, in themselves, are clear indications of the nature of Nixon's worries and objectives.

4) Nixon will meet and talk with Saragat, Tito and Franco, friends and loyal allies of American imperialism, because at the present juncture the American strategic, economic and military positions in these countries are shaky and "a presidential impulse" should be given to them...

5) His purpose in coming to Italy is:

a) to strengthen the American military bases;

b) to encourage and assist the friends, the venal agents of America, to keep the state power firmly in their grip and, in case of danger, the "De Lorenzos" should be ready;

c) to keep the vigorous tendencies of nostalgia for the "Rome-Berlin Axis," now the Rome-Bonn axis, under his control, and also, to keep a cold shower pouring on the revisionists' hopes of any unduly close embrace with their Moscovite ally.

6) Besides this, the Americans have big economic interests in Italy. They have to defend them at all costs

by means of their policy, the stock exchange, the men loyal to the Americans, and by means of force.

7) Spain is a country where open fascism reigns, not even “disguised democracy” exists there. But Spain, like Italy, is in crisis; the people, the workers there are fighting, are on strike. Spain is living on credits from the Americans, but now Bonn is getting well established there, while the Soviet Union is flirting with it. Of course, Nixon is worried about that country full of American bases and airfields, full of political and economic interests. American imperialism is very concerned to make sure that the fascist Franco and his dictatorship are completely in the hands of the United States of America, because Spain is its means to control the Mediterranean, to put pressure on France, to ensure the security of the 6th Fleet and paralyse the French fleet, and is one of the most important pawns of NATO in this zone.

8) It is self-evident that in the talk with his ambassadors in the countries of the Mediterranean basin, it is not their health, but the “health” of the countries to which they are accredited, that interests Nixon. He will recommend to them that these are not moments to be optimistic, neither about their political power, the power of intrigues, or the power of the American dollar, tanks and gunboats. The peoples have risen and are fighting against them. Therefore, Nixon will point out to the ambassadors that they must toughen up their diplomatic game, that the Latin proverb, “The guns are hushed because the muse is singing!,” never has and never will have any value for the Americans. American diplomacy will be subordinated to the military strength of the 6th Fleet.

9) Nixon’s inspection of this aggressive Fleet will not be to watch a parade of the marines, but to incite them to war against the peoples, to be ready to intervene and attack the peoples and national liberation struggles, to

be ready to defend the wealth of the United States of America, and of course, to impress the discontented peoples of the so-called free world. Nixon will draw the attention of the American marines to the fact that another fleet, that of the Soviet revisionists, is alongside them. It would be better for them if it were not there, but there it is, because "its aim is to invade our free world, therefore, keep your eyes open, be vigilant. We shall do our utmost to neutralize it, and in the end, when the time comes, we shall deal with it and there will be another Trafalgar and Aboukir."

10) Nixon could not overlook either Yugoslavia or Tito. American imperialism has no military bases in Yugoslavia, but American capital is firmly established there, and the United States of America has major economic and political interests in that country. This is due to Tito and Titoism, which turned Yugoslavia from a country in which the construction of socialism had begun into a capitalist country.

The colossal loans that the United States of America has provided and is providing for Yugoslavia have turned it into a chaotic appendage of American imperialism. As a result it is experiencing great and incurable economic and political crises.

With his anti-Marxist policy and ideology, Tito has not only ruined his country and endangered its independence and sovereignty, but has also rendered great services to American imperialism, which gave him its backing when he abandoned Marxism-Leninism. This imperialism is still backing him now when Yugoslavia is in chaos and on the eve of Tito's "retirement," as he himself has declared, from the post of president of the Yugoslav republic, because he is going to be engaged in "other work."

Of course, Nixon is very interested in this "other work" in which Tito, this close and loyal friend of the Americans, has been engaged in the past and will con-

tinue to be engaged. Therefore, at their meeting these two close friends will define new plans of work, internal plans regarding Yugoslavia, and international plans.

It is not without purpose that this anti-Marxist who poses as Marxist is being publicized as “an international political personality for specific questions” of the so-called third world, as “an expert on Balkan and European affairs,” as “an expert on Soviet affairs,” as “an expert and friend of the Arab peoples.” For American imperialism Tito is the man ready to “tackle whatever dish they serve up to him,” and that is why Nixon declared that he will even take the trouble to visit the village where this “great man” was born.

These are not the sole reasons for Nixon’s visit to Yugoslavia. He is thinking, also, about the defence of the outposts of NATO. But the peoples of Yugoslavia are enemies of NATO and of the Warsaw Treaty, and we are fully convinced that they will fight against any imperialists who dare encroach on their freedom and independence. The freedom-loving and patriotic peoples of Yugoslavia will never go over to the side of American imperialism or to the side of Soviet social-imperialism.

11) The last stop on Nixon’s trip is in Britain, the traditional, favourite ally, but the lion’s teeth have been drawn. Nevertheless, it has been called upon, as always, to play a role in Europe, and especially, in moments of grave crisis, to set in motion the secret diplomacy of the Intelligence Service. This ally of the United States of America, also, is in crisis, its influence on the European continent has declined, it no longer carries much weight in the world. Thus, Germany becomes “threatening,” the Soviet Union “encircling,” and France isolated even from America.

With what role will Britain be charged in regard to France, how will its fears of Bonn and the Soviets be dispelled, how should it sharpen its “vigilance”? The two cousins, the American and the British, will thrash

out all these things, will talk them over, as between the rich uncle and the poor nephew.

Conclusion: The purpose of Nixon's visit is to check up on the readiness of the American naval forces in the Mediterranean, and the air and land forces on the European territories, to control and give aid and explanations to the political forces which support the United States of America in Europe and its global policy. This is an attempt by Nixon to issue "forewarnings" (at the appropriate levels) to the Soviets, Bonn and France, to urge Italy, Spain and Yugoslavia to give greater assistance to the American penetration into the African continent, and to weaken and neutralize the Soviet penetration there.

In order to strengthen NATO in the Mediterranean and bottle up the Soviet fleet, the United States of America has placed great importance on this basin and the African continent. The Soviet-American rivalry in this zone will increase. At present the Soviets are in very much weaker positions.

MONDAY
OCTOBER 5, 1970

WHAT IS HIDDEN BEHIND POMPIDOU'S VISIT TO MOSCOW?

Today Pompidou sets out on an official visit to the Soviet Union. In an interview he gave some days ago, he stressed that in regard to the Soviet Union and in general he will pursue the same policy of De Gaulle. This visit of his is significant and is made precisely on the day after Nixon's departure from Europe. On his European tour Nixon completely ignored France, and this indicates the contradictions that exist between France and the United States of America. By going to the Soviet Union and stressing that he is pursuing De Gaulle's policy, that is, resistance to the United States of America and the elimination of its influence in Europe, Pompidou is giving Nixon a tit for tat reply. The only opposition France can put up to the United States of America is its "alliance" with the Soviet Union. Therefore, Pompidou wants to derive political gains from the contradictions that have emerged and will grow deeper between the two imperialist world superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

In fact, Britain, the United States of America and their satellites in Europe regard the exchange of kisses between Bonn and Moscow with concern unexpressed as yet, and have begun their underground activities to thwart the two of them. Of course, Bonn and Moscow are manoeuvring to dominate Europe, naturally to the detriment of American influence there. The strengthening of this bloc will mean the weakening of NATO, a thing which the United States of America does not desire and Nixon said bluntly that he will never permit

it; he declared that he will increase the American military strength in the Mediterranean; that he will continue the military aid for Greece; declared openly that the United States of America will provide Israel with unlimited credits to buy armaments.

Hence, it is clear that the American positions in Europe and the Mediterranean are shaky and this is due to the Moscow-Bonn manoeuvres, the Gaullist resistance in France, the weakness of Britain and, above all, to the anti-American and anti-revisionist revolutionary impetus which is mounting in this continent, in Africa and in other continents.

Hence, Gaullist France does not want to miss the bus on this course; it wants to become the third partner in this new European anti-American coalition that is taking shape. Of course, both Bonn and Moscow want to have France on their side, not as an equal partner, but merely as a partner whose economic and particularly its political and strategic positions in Europe, the Mediterranean and Africa they could exploit. That is why Moscow is making such propaganda clamour about Pompidou's visit to the Soviet Union.

In my opinion Europe, the Mediterranean and the Middle East are the current focal points of the major contradictions that exist among the imperialist-revisionist powers. In Europe the cauldron is simmering over domination. Nixon came to strengthen the positions of the American influence. The results he achieved are poor because neither Italy, Yugoslavia nor Spain are able to play the role the United States of America requires. Nixon knew this, therefore he put the stress on the 6th Fleet and the military threat. He went to Britain and his neglect of Paris and Bonn speaks of the contradictions which have begun. Bonn is acting silently and stealthily. Unable to continue the road of talks himself, Nixon left Tito to act in his stead and on his behalf. It was not by accident that on the same day that Pompi-

dou left for Moscow, Tito, as a counterweight, set out for Belgium, then for Holland and Luxemburg. Hence Tito, as Nixon's emissary, is going to these countries to speak, to work and to complete the strengthening of the bloc of those countries with the United States of America and Britain, against Paris, Bonn and Moscow. Hence, the situation is very complicated, and the problems interconnected with it are not only of a European character, but also of a world character.

France, of course, wants to dominate not only in Europe but also in the Mediterranean and on the African continent. It sees the danger in the Mediterranean, and that is why it demands the withdrawal from the Mediterranean of the two fleets: that of the Soviet Union and of the United States of America. But it knows that this can not be achieved, so it aims to strengthen its independent fleet, to set an example to and to exert its influence as much as possible in this direction on the fleets of Italy and Spain, so that they, too, become "independent" and especially become friendly with the Soviet fleet within the context of friendship that can be attained on land. Thus, if such an agreement between France and the Soviet Union is concluded in the Mediterranean, too, then the American 6th Fleet is placed in even greater difficulties: the Soviet fleet blockades Turkey and the Dardanelles, the French fleet threatens the Spanish and the Italian bases. The United States of America foresees such a gloomy prospect, and this accounts for Nixon's laying stress on the 6th Fleet and the Mediterranean.

On the other hand, France is very interested in Africa and the Middle East. Here again, its interests are in harmony with those of the Soviets, who, I think, do not disapprove of the intervention in those regions of a partner "friendly" to them, which is very much weaker and less dangerous than the Americans, and in case of any eventual confrontation with the latter, they might

not be alone but have colonialist France on their side. In the African continent there will be clashes, also, among the other capitalist powers like the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and Spain, which will act in their own interests, but also in the interests of their present or future alliances.

Our duty is to follow these developments and make them known to our people at home so that they are prepared, but we should also make them known to public opinion abroad.

We do not know what China thinks about these major world problems. Mao told the comrades of our government economic delegation absolutely nothing. When he met them he asked them only the simple question: "Are there contradictions between the Soviet Union and the United States of America?," and when he received the answer "yes," he merely endorsed this, saying "Yes, there are," and did not bother to say any more. Zhou Enlai added: "The facts indicate this in the Middle East."

Probably the Chinese comrades make more profound analyses, but with friends like us who are fighting in the conditions that everybody knows, they ought to be more open.

TUESDAY
JANUARY 12, 1971

THE SOVIET POLICY TOWARDS “FRIENDS”

In all the revisionist countries without exception, the internal and external situation is very unhealthy and unstable. This is not visible from outside, but within it is seething and causing all sorts of national and international troubles for the cliques in power as well as difficulties in their reciprocal relations.

In the international arena the revisionist countries have lost any prestige they had, have no personality, do not play any prominent political role. Certain “international issues,” like the signing of treaties with Bonn or “European security,” problems doomed to fiasco, have been concocted by the Soviet revisionists and the American imperialists. On these problems, the other revisionists, the satellites of the Soviet Union are simply “beating the drum to orders.” Their role in the international arena is merely that of pawns. They are nothing but camp followers tagging along in the wake of the Soviet clique, who shout about “unity” with the Soviet Union and with one another, but secretly, behind the scenes, smile at imperialism, and accept credits from it at a time when they aim kicks at one another, but cautious kicks, because they themselves are sitting on a volcano and are afraid. To remain in power they need the help of the Soviet revisionists, too.

The German problem is a burning issue for all the revisionists, but they do not see eye to eye on its solution. In general and outwardly, they all approve of the Moscow- Bonn Treaty, but in reality there is opposition among them. The main opposition comes from the German revisionists. This opposition is based on the

fact that this Treaty was concluded at the expense of the German Democratic Republic. The Soviet Union, the main partner and the “protector” of the German Democratic Republic, signed this Treaty with West Germany, giving it the *de jure* recognition before the United States of America and its other allies inside and outside NATO, without signing the peace treaty with the two German states, while the German Democratic Republic was left at the mercy of the Soviet hegemonic policy. In such conditions neither as a sovereign state nor in the Warsaw Treaty does the German Democratic Republic have that juridical status which the other partners in this Treaty have. The German revisionists are discontented and this discontent stems not from revolutionary, but from revisionist positions. They made concessions on the question of signing the peace treaty with the two German states, or if Bonn was unwilling, with the German Democratic Republic alone, and the second and third fatal concessions were their acceptance of the Moscow-Bonn and Warsaw-Bonn Treaties.

These two treaties lower whatever authority the German Democratic Republic has in the international arena, keep it in the status quo of a pawn of the policy of the Soviet revisionists in Europe, in the latter’s dealings with American imperialism and with Bonn. For the Soviet revisionists the German question can be presented only as follows: either an obedient satellite of theirs, and in Moscow’s view the unification of the two German states will be achieved in this way (while in our view this cannot occur), or the German Democratic Republic is a buffer state for them in a future imperialist-revisionist war. While by signing the treaty with Bonn on the Oder-Neisse border, which, in reality, is not the border of Poland with Bonn, but only of Poland with the German Democratic Republic, the Gomulka clique showed clearly that it considers the German Democratic Republic as a temporary state with no fu-

ture. For Poland the guarantee is Bonn. The Polish revisionists cannot believe in socialism, but they believe in the power of treaties they sign with their Bonn colleagues. Brandt and Gomulka are of the same ilk. And Brezhnev-Kosygin are not different from the latter, for these two notorious treaties were their doing.

These two treaties must be ratified by Bonn which, naturally, is demanding further concessions, and these have to do with ensuring international legal guarantees (official acceptance by the German Democratic Republic) of routes of entry into West Berlin and with the opening of the wall, so that the German Democratic Republic becomes an inn with its doors wide open for Bonn to go in and out freely and realize its plans for gobbling up the German Democratic Republic.

To what extent will the German revisionists resist this plan, to what extent will the Soviet revisionists, the present bosses of the German Democratic Republic and Brandt's allies, be in solidarity with these aims of Bonn? Will the Soviets be able to persuade the Ulbricht clique to make further treacherous concessions, or will they tip him out and replace him with someone more obedient?

The East German diplomats tell our diplomats that "the policy of the Party of Labour of Albania towards the German Democratic Republic is the only correct policy. We agree with it but cannot act in that way because we have the noose round our necks."

The newspapers of the German Democratic Republic describe the men of Bonn as revanchists, as the most dangerous imperialist force in Europe, as the cutting edge of the sword of American imperialism, while the other revisionists say the opposite. The Soviets and the Poles exchanged kisses with Brandt. Ulbricht, Ceausescu, Zhivkov, the Czechs and others were insatiable in accepting credits from Bonn.

Naturally these revisionist traitors regard the policy

of the Soviet Union towards Bonn as a policy of “peace and security” in order to obtain aid and credits from the Federal Republic of Germany. They have trampled principles underfoot, they have gone so far as to betray their own peoples, let alone the interests of the German Democratic Republic.

The German Democratic Republic must be subjugated to their interests and the interests of each individual clique prevail over the general interest, since for them the latter is not a matter of principle but is only something momentary and conditioned by changing circumstances.

Seen from this angle, the situation in the Soviet Union is very turbulent, very critical for the revisionist clique in power. It is facing many key problems of capital importance, which it is incapable of solving on this treacherous course on which it has set the country and the party.

After Stalin’s death, the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism created the present situation which is catastrophic in all directions.

In the first place, the communist party has been turned into a corpse, which exists only in form, because other laws, other principles, other decrees operate. It is overwhelmed with routine and slogans. It no longer exists as a leading party of the working class. Although it is decomposing it tries to cover itself with its past fame. This is the picture developing in all the economic and cultural life there. Life in the Soviet Union has degenerated because they have brought about the degeneration of the Marxist-Leninist ideology and the revolutionary political struggle. Capitalism, with all its ugly moral, political and economic features, has been established there.

From a country of socialist democracy, the Soviet Union has turned into a country of the new repressive bureaucracy with its laws, norms, prisons, concentra-

tion camps, corruption, unemployment, prostitution, great shortages of products, conflicts among nationalities, etc., etc. This mire of corruption has engulfed society in the Soviet Union and the situation is deteriorating day by day. The anti-socialist situation that has been created is obscuring the glorious past of the Soviet Union more and more each day.

The Soviet revisionists are caught up in a vicious circle. Internally they want to create the impression that they are following the Leninist course in everything, both in theory and in practice, but the situation is developing in the opposite direction. Their demagogy cannot cover up anything. On the contrary, it is creating a highly dangerous situation for them, because it is impossible to go on for long covering false stands with words: to be a rabid anti-Marxist and say some empty words about Lenin; to be the most hated anti-Stalinist and to turn a deaf ear when someone speaks of Stalin; to speak against imperialism and to link up and collaborate so closely with the United States of America; to speak of a Leninist policy in the economy and to have nothing to eat; to speak about a Leninist party and, on the other hand, to build a revisionist party, a so-called party of the entire people; to speak about the alleged terror, prisons and concentration camps of the time of Stalin and to turn the country into a prison, a concentration camp, a lunatic asylum; to try to soften your slanders by imprisoning the Solzhenyitsins and, on the other hand, allow the decadent corrupting literature to flourish. Such an anti-Marxist policy, full of contradictions and implemented with half-measures, because the revisionists are still unable to use their fascist dictatorship openly, since they want to preserve appearances to some extent, has reduced the country to the worst capitalist chaos. Degeneration, of course, can create nothing but degeneration, which is asserting itself, gaining positions in policy, in the economy, in

culture but, at the same time, is also creating its opposite, the opposition which the revisionist leadership fears and wants to placate through lies. But to make these lies stick the clique has to “tighten the screws” a little on people of its revisionist line. Here it comes up against contradictions and is bound to resort to oppression, to violation of every principle and the establishment of fascist violence.

The revisionist policy, the moral-political degeneration and the internal economic defeats have totally eroded the authority and prestige of the Soviet Union in the international arena. The Soviet Union no longer has sincere friends in the world as it had in the time of Lenin and Stalin. The revisionists alienated its friends; revisionists cannot be friends even with one another, just as capitalists cannot be friends with one another. Among them the law of the jungle reigns, the bourgeois interest of enrichment and capitalist domination prevails.

The revisionist satellites put no trust in and have no love for the Moscow revisionists who dominate them. Each side tries to deceive and cheat the other, each tries to use every trick in the bag to swindle the other, is servile when it sees some danger looming somewhere and is ready to do the opposite the next day. Today Novotny is fine for the Soviets, but the next day he is kicked out to make way for Dubček and later, he, too, is kicked out to make way for Husak. Yesterday Gomulka was a fascist, as Khrushchev himself told us, then for a time he became a Khrushchevite and the purest “pro-Soviet” element. He, too, was kicked out for Gierak, and tomorrow Gierak will be kicked out for someone else. And so on for all of them in turn.

Thus there is nothing friendly about the Soviet policy towards “friends.” It is a policy of friendship among wolves, an imperialist policy cloaked with false socialist slogans which no one believes. When the policy of

the Soviet revisionists is a chauvinist, imperialist policy towards self-styled sovereign, friendly socialist states, then the nature of their policy towards the peoples of the world who are fighting for freedom and other states can be easily imagined. This is especially so today when the decisive factor in the imperialist-revisionist policy is the capture of world markets, the division of spheres of influence, the policy of the Soviet-American alliance, and the revisionists' mortal fear of an armed confrontation with the United States of America, a thing which has resulted in the revisionists' granting concessions in favour of American imperialism and at the expense of the vital interests of the peoples. All this policy of betrayal of the Soviet revisionists cannot be covered up, and neither can it deceive the bourgeois who support it, because they calculate their profits and losses.

The so-called Soviet economic aid means chains of slavery and exploitation. The economic crisis in the Soviet Union is increasing and becoming more intense, the imperialist clique in power is obliged to invest in other countries and to attract foreign capital in their own country. In this way the Soviet revisionists hope to expand their empire, to link up closely with the big American and world trusts and to come to terms over the further exploitation of the world. The Soviet revisionists think that the interlinking of capital and the monopoly of atomic weapons are the two means which will save them from crises and wars. But in fact they are making the crisis deeper, are preparing the bloody world war together with American imperialism. Nothing can save the revisionists from crisis and defeat.

Their grave was dug in Czechoslovakia and it remains open. A second grave, bigger and more dangerous for them, has been dug: the Polish grave. The Gierek clique is a temporary clique which, even if it plays in both tableaux, will be unable to remain on the throne. The Soviets want a strong fascist clique of theirs

in Poland, but it is hard to find one. Thus new disturbances are likely to occur in the future. On the eve of their congress* the Soviets were obliged to hand out some crumbs to Gierk, who is making speeches and promises that he will find it hard to keep. At the congress Brezhnev must say something just to deceive the unwary, because the policy which he and his henchmen are pursuing is failing in all directions. We are far from the revisionist honeymoon of "steel unity." Revisionist "friends" with gloomy faces will greet the congress.

* The 24th Congress of the revisionist party of the Soviet Union was opened on March 30, 1971.

THURSDAY
FEBRUARY 11, 1971

THE INVASION OF LAOS BY THE AMERICANS AND THE SAIGONESE, A RESULT OF THE TRAITOROUS POLICY OF THE SOVIET REVISIONISTS

A foreign military force over 40,000 strong has invaded Laos. The various news agencies say that 30,000 of them are soldiers of the Saigon puppets and 10,000 American soldiers and officers. Their aim is to extend the scope of the aggression, to “Vietnamize” the war, and to attack the “Ho Chi Minh” trail which passes through Laos and serves as a supply route for the national liberation war of South Vietnam. The entry of the American-Saigon military forces into Laos also has the major aim of weakening the liberation struggle in South Vietnam and the partisan war in Cambodia and Laos, and achieving some sort of unity and solidarity of the “ballists”* of Indochina, under the direction of the United States of America, against the peoples of both parts of Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos and Thailand.

In this way American imperialism is involving itself more disastrously in the war and will certainly suffer overwhelming defeats. There can be no more hope for it. The more it escalates and extends its aggression, the more defeat becomes imminent and inevitable for it and its puppets. The attacks it is launching are nothing but hopeless efforts it is forced to make in an attempt to

* This is what the members of the reactionary organization of Balli Kombëtar, which collaborated with the nazi-fascist occupiers in Albania during the National Liberation War, were called.

get out of the difficult situation it is in. Bloodthirsty American imperialism cannot withstand people's wars. The bombing of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam for three years on end brought it no success; against villages and partisan units which are launching fierce and incessant attacks on airstrips and in the jungle, it will be even less successful.

Nevertheless, the Americans are accompanying the operations in Laos and Cambodia with the recommencement of the bombing of North Vietnam. They have also announced the landing of fresh amphibious forces at the 17th parallel allegedly to reinforce the border between the two Vietnams and to prevent the "North Vietnamese military forces" from crossing the border and coming to the aid of the forces in the South.

The other side of the medal: the great and continuous betrayal by the Soviet revisionists, their secret and open collaboration with American imperialism on the Vietnamese question, must be seen in the light of these developments.

The Soviet revisionists directed their whole policy and all their efforts to quelling the liberation war in Vietnam, to making the Vietnamese capitulate to the Americans, reach a compromise and enter into negotiations with them...

As a result of many secret Soviet-American deals, the Americans had, they say, given some sort of undertaking that they would stop the bombing of North Vietnam. "A great victory has been achieved," shouted the Soviets. They thought that "heaven was within their reach," that now everything would be accomplished as they desired and the secret plan would be easily applied, until the Americans would leave Vietnam "of their own free will." Thus, they set out with great zeal on the opportunist course of bargainings and talks with the Americans...

The fact is that during these "famous" talks... Nix-

on did his bit, declaring that he would allegedly withdraw from Vietnam, leaving the Vietnamese to fight Vietnamese. And in order to deceive the American public he did withdraw a minimal contingent of forces from South Vietnam.

This whole manoeuvre was in favour of the Americans, and for them everything went on as before. Why? The American imperialists needed a pause in the fighting and this they gained. During this period, while engaging in empty talk and palaver, they reorganized, trained and built up the army of Saigon to the point that it was capable of dispatching a force 60-70,000 strong from Vietnam to invade Cambodia and Laos, attack the partisan forces and endanger their supply routes to the South.

This is the result, also, of the treacherous policy of the Soviet revisionists.

SATURDAY
SEPTEMBER 11, 1971

BREZHNEV GOES TO TITO

Notes

Moscow has announced that Brezhnev is going to visit Belgrade this month. Of course, the situation between the “comrades” will be eased, they will embrace each other. Probably the Soviet Union will accord economic credits to its “southern Slav brothers.” There is nothing surprising in this. The Soviets have and will certainly continue to have contradictions with Tito, but these contradictions will not go beyond the usual “pressure and blackmail.” The psychosis of an attack of the Soviet Union on Yugoslavia (even Tito himself, who did not believe it, trumpeted this in order to alarm public opinion, to show his determination to maintain his “neutrality” and especially to get credits from his western friends and allies), was blown up by the Romanians because they were and are more in real danger of some Soviet intervention and, naturally, were interested in linking their fate with that of Yugoslavia.

The contradictions between Tito and the Soviet revisionists have not sprung up today. The Soviets want to have Tito “obedient” to them, but they have not achieved and will not achieve this even after his death, with whatever type of leaders emerge in Belgrade, because Tito has prepared his own followers and even his internal opponents well to prevent them from falling under the tutelage of the Soviet revisionists. He has taught them to eat from any trough and to lean towards and assist the trough which has the greatest amount of food. In this situation the wind which is blowing in Titoite Yugoslavia is not favourable to the Kremlin.

Moscow sees that Tito and Titoism play a role which

is advantageous to American imperialism, and this role is to the liking of both Tito and American imperialism. The circumstances are as follows: Nobody else can play the card of "socialism" which Tito plays for the Americans. Both the United States of America and Tito know this, while Tito is also well aware that if he does not play this role and joins the ranks of the Zhivkovs, his "individuality" is finished and his role is finished, too.

The Soviet revisionists are megalomaniacs and worried because they are not achieving this aim. Hence, taking advantage of the chaos and confusion which Titoism has caused in Yugoslavia, they intensified their pressure on it. But, when they did not succeed with blackmail, they changed their tune, softened it, and that is why Brezhnev is going there. This is the more "natural" road. Tito will not make concessions over "principles" in violation of his line but will make some concessions in minor matters. The Soviets will be well aware that they are concessions in minor matters, but they will shut their eyes to this and will accord credits to "comrade" Tito, because by this means they may penetrate more deeply.

The Romanians are afraid Tito will leave them in the lurch, but they are wrong, because Tito will defend them, not because of their beautiful eyes, but in the interests of Yugoslavia and to weaken Soviet influence. At present the Soviets' tendency is to reduce the tension in Europe and to exert pressure on the United States of America because they are afraid the Americans might draw closer to China; therefore they are making frantic preparations to oppose China more strongly. Hence, the present Soviet policy is not to aggravate matters with Yugoslavia and Romania, but to placate them, in order to work for the consolidation of the alliance with the United States of America and prevent its rapprochement with China. If they do not achieve

this, the Soviets will work at weakening the positions of the United States of America in France, Bonn, etc., and will make preparations against China. It is in the light of these moves that we must see the visit of Brezhnev to Belgrade and later to France, the visit of Podgorny to Hanoi and that of Kosygin to Canada.

**MONDAY
MARCH 27, 1972**

HANDS OFF THE BALKANS!

According to news agency reports, the minister of defence of the Soviet Union, Marshal Grechko, arrives in Belgrade today.

— The visits of ministers of war of big imperialist powers to other countries have never enjoyed the support of public opinion, and this visit is just like all the others. Experience has shown that ministers of war are the most uninhibited bearers of the expansionist and adventurous policy, the most zealous inciters and executors of imperialist aggressions and occupations.

The Marshal of the Soviet Union, Grechko, too, is notorious in this direction. His name is closely linked with the counter-revolutionary overthrow in the Soviet Union, with the revival and application of the chauvinist policy of imperial Russia, with incitement of the Tsarist militarist spirit within the country and neo-colonialism and military blackmail abroad.

— Moscow covets the Balkans as a transit road, as a land bridge connecting it with its forces in the Mediterranean, as a desirable base for its expansionist plans in Europe and other continents.

Both Soviet and American warships call frequently at the ports on the Yugoslav coast. The visits of these fleets are called friendly visits, but they contain the seed of danger, not only for the peoples of Yugoslavia, but also for all the countries of the Adriatic region.

— In order to put their expansionist and annexationist plans into effect the Soviet revisionists have always used intimidation and blandishments, rubles and tanks. Time has shown that when they talk of peace, they are preparing for war; when they pledge friendship, they are preparing the dagger to stab you in the

back; when they offer help, they are thinking about how to strangle you.

— The Albanian people have always been vigilant towards the aims and activities of enemies of their freedom and independence. Neither the American imperialists, nor the Soviet social-imperialists will ever find them unprepared and unarmed.*

* Comrade Enver Hoxha used these notes in the article “Hands off the Balkans!,” published in the newspaper *Zëri i popullit*, dated March 29, 1972.

**SATURDAY
MAY 13, 1972**

**THE UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA AND THE SOVIET
UNION SACRIFICE THE VITAL
CAUSES OF THE PEOPLES FOR
THEIR OWN INTERESTS**

The offensive of the Vietnamese against the aggressive American armies and their Saigon puppets is progressing successfully. Broad regions and towns are being liberated. The liberation forces are only 10 km from Hue, An loc is encircled and likely to fall, Saigon, also, is being threatened as is the entire defence and strategy of the United States of America and its puppets. They are on the verge of ignominious defeat.

Nixon's "Vietnamization" of the war has suffered the most ignominious defeat. This war is a further brilliant proof that there is no force that can withstand the people's liberation war. In face of the fighting spirit, courage and ability of a people fighting for their own just cause, the enemy will be defeated, even though it may have large forces equipped with the most modern weapons, as the United States of America has. The American demagogy which presents the question as though the Saigon puppets are waging the war, does not hold water. The Vietnamese stooges have been defeated like our ballists who were supported by the Italian and German occupiers. Their fate is and will always be the same, everywhere and at any time. He who joins and serves the enemy of his own people is condemned to death.

The war against the people of Vietnam is the Americans' war. They are greatly worried because they are

losing the war and their “honour,” if they have ever had any. Their defeat in Vietnam increases the peoples’ confidence. The American beast is writhing in the Vietnamese agony, but it is struggling to escape from the trap alive, trying to tell the world that it withdrew unscathed and not with its tail between its legs.

Now it has become impossible for the Americans to stay in Vietnam not because they do not want to, but because they cannot. The earth is ablaze under their feet. They employed all means at their disposal, including their allies, the revisionists of Moscow, but to no avail. Now only one road remains open for them — they must capitulate — but they want to keep “a certain hope” alive for the future in Vietnam, at least “to preserve” a contingent of their own men in order to have them in the “future government” as contacts, as agents, as saboteurs and diversionists. The United States of America wants to make this strategic withdrawal by imposing its conditions on the heroic fighters of Vietnam from positions of strength. This is the aim of all the current military measures which Nixon is taking, from the bombing of Hanoi, Haiphong, etc., and the mining of the ports of North Vietnam to the secret and open talks which have been and will be held in Moscow between Brezhnev, Kosygin and Nixon.

The blockade of the ports of North Vietnam shows that the United States of America has lost the war on the land. The aerial bombing has proved ineffective because the Vietnamese are used to it and have taken measures to cope with it, therefore the United States of America cannot achieve any tactical or strategic objective in this war by random bombing. The defeated American armies cannot return to Vietnam again; they were there, they fought and were defeated, and if they do return they will be defeated once again. The Saigon puppets are worthless; they are melting away like salt in water. The United States of America and Nix-

on have lost militarily, but they are also losing heavily politically. The air strikes and the naval blockade are undertaken so that the United States of America will win something in the political field. But this is a Pyrrhic victory. The progressive world condemns these aggressive actions of the American imperialists.

The aggressive naval blockade of the Vietnamese ports imposed by Nixon exposed not only him, but also the Soviet revisionists. They have been and are opposed to the liberation war of the Vietnamese people and have striven for compromises and the capitulation of Vietnam to the United States of America. The Soviet revisionists wanted to see the war in Vietnam quelled and their policy of “peaceful coexistence” and “the world without wars and arms” triumph. At a time when the Vietnamese are being martyred, they are trying to emerge as “saviours” and to establish their own hegemony.

It was necessary for them to give the Vietnamese some aid, otherwise their perfidious intentions could not be disguised from the eyes of the peoples and the Vietnamese themselves. All along the Soviet revisionists have had the one unalterable main aim: to try to make the Vietnamese capitulate and, at the same time, create the impression that they were running this war, that the victories of the Vietnamese were their “victories.” The present offensive of the Vietnamese, too, is being trumpeted in the same manner, but this is precisely what is exposing them. Nixon, too, is helping to expose them. “A drowning man clutches at a straw,” say the people. And so in order to save his “honour” Nixon is presenting the war of the Vietnamese people as if the Soviets are waging it, that is, as if the United States of America is fighting in Vietnam against the Soviet Union. Consequently, we, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, “must come to terms” to impose order in Vietnam, where “both you, the Soviets, and we,

the Americans, have major interests,” said Nixon. The two imperialist robbers revealed their bloodstained faces.

It is clear that the United States of America had forewarned the Soviet Union about its blockade of the Vietnamese ports, had sounded out the Soviets on this and was sure they would not make any move, and in fact they did not. The Soviet Union issued a communiqué of “protest” which pleased the United States of America and all its allies rather than frightened them. “We were saved from the armed confrontation between the United States of America and the Soviet Union,” shouted all who want to keep the peoples under the fear of war, therefore, according to the Soviet Union, the United States of America and their sycophants this means: “Peoples, do not fight for your liberation, do not anger the great powers, accept their dictate, do as they say, leave them to settle the disagreements, etc.!” This is the vilest strategy and tactics of imperialism and social-imperialism in order to establish their hegemony, to ensure zones of influence, to intimidate the peoples, to suppress them with armed force when the situation is ripe for this and to keep them under the threat of war when they see that they cannot intervene directly.

It is they who create and foster the threat of war for purposes of blackmail, who declare war against peoples, who hatch up intrigues among peoples and tell them: “Do not move, because we are protecting you!” The United States of America and the revisionist Soviet Union do not protect any people, they protect their own imperialist interests and sacrifice the vital causes of other peoples to these interests.

Naturally China must not involve itself in this filthy game. But it stepped into this mire in its meetings with Nixon, so it must step back at once while it is still not too late, because if you give the enemy your finger he grabs your hand, your arm and your head. American

imperialism is not only the most ferocious enemy, but also one of the cunningest. The Chinese thought that by meeting Nixon they would gain face on both sides, but in fact they lost face on both sides, and now they are in a very difficult position. Look at what Nixon is doing. The same as before. Then, will China fight him or will it proceed on the course of friendship with him? You can't dance on a tight rope. Let Tito and others of his ilk, enemies of Marxism-Leninism and servants of a hundred imperialists, play that role.

As regards our stand, we will not waver from our course even if the mountains and the heavens fall on our heads, because ours is the correct Marxist-Leninist course.

MONDAY
MAY 22, 1972

NIXON IN MOSCOW — CHINA IS SILENT

Moscow welcomes the American “hawk,” Nixon, and justifies this shameful tragedy with the so-called policy of Leninist coexistence.

Lenin, allegedly, has taught these new imperialists to form friendships and alliances, to divide and dominate the world with the imperialists, colonialists and the permanent executioners of peoples, the oppressors of their freedoms, the plunderers of the riches and independence of other countries. What perfidy! What betrayal!

Before he left for Moscow, Nixon mined the Vietnamese ports and coastal waters, is savagely bombing Vietnam and is continuing the most barbarous war that could be waged. At the peak of this savage activity, this fascist bandit boarded the aircraft and arrived in Moscow where the Soviet traitors welcomed him at the airport. The anthem of the Soviets, that anthem which led the liberation war, was played for him. The guns which destroyed the nazi beast fired again, this time to salute a second Hitler who has been attacking the heroic people of Vietnam with guns, with bombs, with napalm, with machine-guns, and every type of weapons, twenty-four hours after twenty-four hours, for years on end. This is how far the revisionist traitors, who are shaking hands with and smiling on the hangman, who are eating and drinking with him, who are plotting with him at the expense of the other peoples to divide the world between themselves, have gone in their cynicism.

The murderer of Vietnamese children will certainly visit schools and nurseries of Soviet children, will bare

his teeth at them in his cynical smile, will shake the hands and pat the cheeks of the grandchildren of those heroes who hurled themselves into the fiercest battles which history has known, against capitalism and world imperialism. Now the new Kornilov, the new Denikin with the face of Nixon, strolls in Moscow and the Kremlin, surrounded with honours by the new Trotskyites and Bukharinites.

At the sumptuous banquet in the Kremlin, Nixon spoke "about peace, freedom, coexistence and the friendship between the United States and the Soviet Union." He said, "We are opening a new page for mankind," and did not fail to stress, "We, the biggest states of the world, must ensure that the small states moderate their feelings." It could not be put more clearly: "We must put down the revolution in the world, we must keep the peoples under rein, and they must do what we want and what we order." And Nixon uttered these words in the Kremlin where the great Lenin worked and fought at the head of the Bolsheviks, in the Kremlin where the proletarian revolution seethed.

Now the counter-revolution prevails in this Kremlin and Nixon, linked arm-in-arm with the new Kerenskys, visits the tomb of Ivan the Terrible, the relics of the Tsars, the cellars where the treasures are stored. The Mausoleum of Lenin is silent, but Lenin is not dead, Leninism is alive. Today or tomorrow, it will sweep away all this vileness, too, which will be routed and crushed by the proletarian revolution. The betrayal will be smashed.

With the greatest shamelessness, Podgorny said explicitly in his speech, "We desire that tension in the world should be reduced," that is, that the revolution should die down, that the peoples should not rise for their rights. Podgorny openly demanded from the United States of America: "We must avoid war between the two of us; as for the other things we can regulate

them and reach agreement between ourselves.” Clearly this means division of spheres of influence in the world between the United States of America and the Soviet Union. Podgorny asserted openly that “up till now the Soviet-American collaboration has been in favour of peace,” hence, the war against individual peoples on the part of these two superpowers is not important, because for them this is a normal and necessary thing.

Meanwhile the friend of the Soviet revisionists, Nixon, openly threatened the peoples with the atomic bomb, saying, “We, the great powers, must exercise self-restraint in the use of the nuclear weapons, because we might come to the point of a head-on clash.” This means: “You other peoples restrain yourselves in your demands, listen to us, the great powers, take us as your arbiters, make us your judges to settle your problems, and don’t raise obstacles that will make us take off our wigs, because in that case we shall destroy the whole world.” Such is the threat that Nixon and the Soviet counter-revolutionaries are making to the peoples of the world.

“A new century is being ushered in,” said Nixon about the present Moscow meeting. This is the challenge which world capitalism, headed by American and Soviet imperialism, is throwing down to the proletariat, the peoples and the revolution. The peoples, the Marxist-Leninists, the revolutionaries will fight on to total victory over the enemies.

And while Nixon and Brezhnev are plotting tête-à-tête in Moscow, China is saying nothing at all about these problems, but is maintaining a policy of total silence, while the Vietnamese are continuing their offensive successfully. Bravo to the Vietnamese heroes!

SATURDAY
JUNE 3, 1972

WE MUST DENOUNCE AND OPPOSE THE COUNTER- REVOLUTIONARY SOVIET- AMERICAN ALLIANCE WITH ALL OUR MIGHT

I talked with Ramiz about the article* which is to be published in the newspaper *Zëri i popullit* tomorrow denouncing the agreements which were concluded in Moscow between American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism.

Amongst other things, the article says:

The Moscow talks are the result of a long process of Soviet-American contacts and collaboration, of major political, ideological and economic concessions of the Soviet revisionists and of extending a helping hand and support for the revisionist line of the restoration of capitalism on the part of the American imperialists. The agreements concluded in the Soviet capital are the result of setting aside many rivalries on concrete international questions and are reached for the sake of their common imperialist interests and to assist their hegemonic ends.

During Nixon's visit to Moscow it was noticed that everything had been orchestrated in advance and that only the public performance was put on there. This was further evidence that there is not only rivalry and collaboration between the two superpowers, but also unity

* Published in Enver Hoxha, *Against Modern Revisionism, (Collection of Works) 1971-1975*, Alb. ed., "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1980, p. 251.

of imperialist interests, the promotion of which calls for joint action.

Of course the agreements announced in the Soviet capital do not reflect the whole truth and the outcome of tens of hours of talks in the Kremlin was much more than was made known to the public. Soviet-American relations have now been raised to a much higher level, for the first time they have been publicly legalized and placed on a broad juridical basis. "The basic principles of the mutual relations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" which were incorporated in a special document and presented in the form of a treaty, constitute a clearly defined political and military platform the aim of which is to place all present-day international relations under the imperialist control of the two superpowers, to place the entire world under their orders and dictate. They reflect the aim and will of the two superpowers to put their narrow imperialist interests and great-power selfishness above any international law or moral standard.

The main result of the visit of President Nixon and his talks with the chiefs of the Kremlin is that they cleared the way for new imperialist deals, more threatening and dangerous to the peace and security of the peoples.

With "The basic principles of relations..." the revisionist leaders of the Soviet Union, among other things, are making a monstrous attempt to rehabilitate American imperialism in our eyes, to present it in the most peaceful light, as a defender of the peoples and opponent of aggressions, which sacrifices itself for the freedom of others. Anyone who reads this document is bound to ask: What has become of that American imperialism which in a thousand and one party and state documents, in speeches, books and articles of the Soviet revisionists, was called "the gendarme of international reaction," "the enemy of the proletariat and national

liberation wars,” “the pillar of the world capitalist system,” etc., etc. What has become of that American imperialism which until one day before Nixon’s visit to Moscow was an aggressor against the people of Vietnam, oppressed Africa and exploited Europe? According to the speeches that the revisionist chiefs made in praise of Nixon and the documents they signed with him, this imperialism no longer exists. Allegedly this imperialism has now been tamed and under Nixon’s signature has even undertaken to apply all the principles of “peaceful coexistence” point by point, “to encourage and defend the peace, freedom and independence of the peoples.”

The spreading of such opinions and illusions about imperialism is another betrayal of the cause of the proletariat and the revolution by the Soviet revisionists. In order to smooth the way for imperialism, they are trying to convince the peoples that an American imperialism which is killing and maiming in Vietnam no longer exists, that neither other imperialisms, nor German revanchism, Japanese militarism, Indonesian reaction, fascism in Spain, King Hussein, nor the racist regime in Rhodesia exist any longer. They want to make the world believe the demagogy and hypocrisy of Nixon, who pretends to be shocked when he learns the story of little Tania who died during the nazi siege of Leningrad, while he himself has just ordered the blockade of the DR of Vietnam so that all the Tanias and children of Vietnam will die. “Imperialism does not exist, therefore there must be no class struggle, there must be no attempts to make the revolution, to win freedom and independence” — this is what the Soviet revisionists, those saboteurs and zealous extinguishers of the fire of revolution and peoples’ liberation struggles, want to say.

But the demagogy, cynicism and hypocrisy of the Soviet revisionists and their American friends, however

abundantly and frequently employed, do not have the magic power to deceive the entire world, as those in Moscow and Washington may think.

The American imperialists and the Soviet revisionists have dressed up the document “The basic principles of relations...” as well as the other documents which were signed in Moscow in a phraseology which seems to be inspired by the well-known principles of peaceful coexistence and the United Nations Charter. But if this demagogic veneer is removed, it turns out that it is nothing but a code of savage imperialist rules, of mutual assurances and pledges to preserve their respective zones of influence and to rule the world.

They also mention there the century of the atom and “peaceful coexistence” as its imperative accompaniment. This is a well-known refrain and it is not difficult to understand in what relationship they want to place the atom with peace. Under the threat of atomic blackmail, the American imperialists and the Soviet revisionists want to impose on the world the concept of unconditional and fatalistic submission to the two superpowers. For the sake of preserving “peaceful coexistence” between the two superpowers, they want the peoples to sacrifice, partly or completely, their supreme national interests, their freedom and independence, their right to judge and act according to their own will in the international life, on the altar of the atom.

In their speeches and in the Moscow documents, the Soviet and American leaders declared that they adhere and will adhere strictly to the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other states, that they will do their utmost to avoid causing conflicts and increasing international tension. If the policy which the two big powers pursue in practice and their daily activities were not known, perhaps someone might believe this. But when the imperialists and revisionists speak about non-interference, they do not have in mind their own

chauvinist and hegemonic activity and practice at all.

For them, of course, the aggression in Vietnam is not interference, just as the occupation of Czechoslovakia is not interference. The imperialists organize scores of coups d'état and this is allegedly permissible for them, just as it is natural for them to prop up reactionary regimes in various countries with money and weapons. The American imperialists and the Soviet revisionists, who are the biggest neo-colonialists, plunder the wealth and exploit the working people of other countries, but they do not like this to be called brutal interference in the internal affairs of others, oppression and enslavement of the peoples.

In the context of the Moscow documents "non-interference" must be understood as a mutual pledge to recognize each other's zones of influence and not to undertake any action which might cause disturbances. It must be understood as the recognition of the right of each side to do what it likes in its own zone and with its own clients.

Nixon frequently described the present state of Soviet-American relations as "the end of the era of confrontations and the beginning of the era of talks." Translated into ordinary language, this means that the period when the communist Soviet Union fought and opposed the United States of America as the main imperialist power in the world and when anti-communist America fought against and wanted to destroy the first big socialist state, has ended. Now that these bases and motives have been eliminated, the era of talks, i.e., of deals to divide and rule the world, has begun.

The bourgeois and revisionist propaganda is advertising the Moscow talks as an attempt by the two superpowers "to find ways for the solution of international problems." The fact is, however, that Nixon and Brezhnev have discussed and taken decisions on all the questions which are of vital interest to the majority

of peoples of all continents behind the high walls of the Kremlin, in the greatest secrecy, without first seeking and receiving the approval of the peoples. Here we have to do not with a question of procedure, but with a renewed emphasis of the old tendency to monopolize all the problems of the world and to settle them according to the interests of the Soviet-American alliance.

However much the Soviet and American leaders may try to convince world public opinion that the agreements they have concluded do not affect the interests of others, they can convince nobody. The wording of the "joint communiqué" has been chosen precisely with the aim of covering up these plots, deceiving the peoples and blunting their vigilance. Nixon did not go to Moscow to hear from Brezhnev that "the Soviet side is in solidarity with the just war of the Vietnamese people." He went there to strike bargains over the blood of the Vietnamese people with the Soviet leaders; he went there so that the Soviets would help him to get out of the Indochinese impasse.

Before the Moscow meeting, many of those who still hope that the big powers may settle their present squabbles in the world thought that the United States of America and the Soviet Union would find a way to settle the Arab-Israeli conflict.

However, the reality showed that the American imperialists and the Soviet revisionists, who are directly responsible for the existing situation, do not want the conflict to come to an end and are not interested in restoring to the Arab peoples the rights of which they have been robbed. On the contrary, as it turns out from the Moscow communiqué, both sides want to exploit the tragedy of the Arabs to preserve and extend the strategic positions they have captured in that zone.

It is true that there is Soviet-American rivalry in the Middle East, but it is deliberately exaggerated by both sides in order to justify their presence in this zone and

make themselves arbiters of the situation. Therefore the conflict in the Middle East is not just a conflict between the Arabs and the Israelis, but also a conflict between the Arabs and the two superpowers. If the latter are not ousted from the Middle East, the Arab question cannot be solved, and the freedom and independence of the Arabs will be constantly threatened and in danger.

The maintenance of the status quo, which Nixon and Brezhnev are seeking to sanction, is another blow dealt by the two imperialist powers to the Arab peoples and their just struggle.

In the joint communiqué there are many words about Europe and its problems. After the major concessions that the Soviet Union made in favour of Bonn and which were concretized in the agreement on Berlin and in the "treaties of the East," the United States of America gave its consent to the holding of the conference on the so-called European security so greatly desired and long awaited by the Soviet revisionists.

Through sweet-looking but really poisonous demagogic slogans, such as "security of Europe," "guarantee of borders," "encouragement of economic collaboration," "extension of cultural, scientific and technological exchanges," etc., they want to create a feeling of obligation and subservience among the peoples of Europe, an eternal submission to the two "great benefactors."

Through this "security" the two superpowers want to secure their respective zones of influence, to ensure that they exert a permanent influence on the affairs of Europe and become arbiters of its problems. They want to keep Europe in economic and political subjection, so that it lives in the shadow and at the mercy of the two almighty powers.

The visit of the President of the USA to the Soviet Union was concluded with the signing of the Soviet-American treaty on the limitation of strategic weapons. Now all the floodlights of the imperialist

and revisionist propaganda have been focussed on this treaty. "This treaty shows what can be done in the future," says Nixon. "This is a great success on the road of restraining the armaments race," Kosygin replies.

The imperialists and revisionists have long been deliberately mystifying nuclear weapons in the same way that they have inflated the myth of disarmament. Now they want to convince the world that the Moscow agreement on strategic weapons is a great success without precedent in the field of disarmament, a liberation from the heavy burden of fear of atomic war, a restraint on the armaments race, a tendency for the relaxation of tension, etc., etc.

In reality all this loud publicity is a cruel hoax, intended to placate public opinion and deceive the peoples, to give the impression that the superpowers are disarming and to divert the peoples' attention from the aggressive policy of force of the superpowers, so that the world will not see what sinister plans they are hatching up against the freedom and independence of the peoples.

It must be said at the outset that the treaty of Moscow marks neither a restriction of the armaments race nor a limitation or ban on atomic weapons or other kinds of weapons. All the two superpowers have done is to agree that neither will go ahead of or lag behind the other in the armaments race. Now they have established order so as to make better use of their forces and means in this race and to increase their efficiency. The fact is that both countries are free to make improvements and qualitative changes in their strategic weapons systems, a thing which can increase their power much more than a simple numerical increase in these weapons.

The convention on offensive weapons contains no restrictions in regard to the two countries' squadrons of strategic bombers, their so-called orbital nuclear bombs or their number of nuclear warheads. The fail-

ure to set a limit to the number of nuclear warheads leaves the problem of multiple-warhead missiles untouched and, as a consequence, each country is free to increase their number in each missile. Likewise, there are no limitations on medium range missiles.

The Moscow agreement on strategic weapons defines the military balance between the two superpowers, but, at the same time, it shows that they have defined the distance that the two of them jointly will keep ahead of the other countries. The importance of this treaty lies in this, and its dangerous consequences can and will arise from this. The maintenance of this distance from the other countries also obliges the two powers to decide on a common political and economic line towards third parties, a common code of behaviour and a clear set of rules on prohibitions and restrictions.

The joint struggle to safeguard their monopoly of modern weapons, which was further incited with the Moscow agreement, also makes inevitable the struggle to maintain their joint control over the internal and external activities of other countries. It makes essential the combination of the American and Soviet military power and the beginning of efforts for the establishment of armed control by the two biggest powers over the entire world, the establishment of a joint international regime for the preservation of their political, economic and military balance, and their joint management of world issues.

Among the many agreements which the American and Soviet leaders signed during the visit of the President of the USA to the Soviet Union was one called the agreement "On cooperation in the study and exploitation of outer space for peaceful purposes." It passed without much ado, but observers did not fail to notice that it had to do with the occupation of the earth rather than the heavens. Like the agreement on mutual exchanges in the field of science, technology, education

and culture, this agreement, too, is an expression of a common line which has been worked out for the establishment of a technological monopoly, not only in the field of weapons, but also in the main spheres of modern science and technology, for the establishment of a Soviet-American technological colonialism in the world.

The final aim of all these agreements, both open and secret, is the division of spheres of influence, the monopolization of the markets of big and small countries. Their purpose is to increase the wealth and profits of the superpowers and to plunder and exploit the peoples.

This joint Soviet-American strategy will hit the poor and unarmed peoples and countries, those that in the past have been the prey of neo-colonialists, first of all. But the developed countries, the allies of the United States of America and the Soviet Union, will not escape this danger, either. The reduction of the armed forces of the European countries, which the Americans and Soviets want to include in the "European security," and which is intended to deprive the European countries of the ability and power to defend themselves, also, must be seen from this aspect. The two superpowers think that, in this way, they will have weaker partners on whom they can impose their laws more easily.

The Soviet-American alliance, reinforced with the new treaties, will dictate its conditions to these countries, because the economic potential of the two superpowers, backed up by their military potential, is bound to make itself felt on the others. This is where the main danger of these agreements lies. This prospect also explains the present euphoria in Moscow and Washington over the agreements they have reached.

At the Soviet-American meeting in Moscow the foundations were laid for close economic cooperation and trade exchanges amounting to 5 billion dollars a

year. It has been envisaged that American capital will pour into the Soviet Union and huge amounts of Soviet raw materials will cross the ocean.

But this is not the fundamental thing. Nixon and Brezhnev set up a joint Soviet-American economic commission. It will not engage in the conclusion of an ordinary economic treaty or a simple trade agreement. This top-level commission was set up to discuss in what zones American and in what zones Soviet capital will intervene, how they will cope with the objections and competition of their allies who will feel themselves threatened. This, we think, is the most complicated and dangerous problem for American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, because on top of the inevitable contradictions that will emerge between them as the two plunderers they are in implementing their global strategy, their open and secret agreements, they will also encounter the opposition of all peoples and indeed of their allies, too.

The two superpowers which want to play god almighty and are in agreement over everything are not much concerned about the interests of others. But will the different states, and the world allow them to gamble with their destiny? We foresee that they will not. The euphoria of Moscow and Washington will not last long. The contradictions will grow sharper. The peoples cannot accept the Soviet-American political dictate and economic exploitation. They will revolt against the two superpowers, as well as against those ruling cliques which do not react in defence of national interests but sell the wealth, the honour and freedom of their countries. But it is not only the peoples who will revolt; the governments of many countries, Britain, France, the Scandinavian countries, the countries of Latin America or the Far East, cannot be indifferent. In one way or another, they have expressed their doubts and are wary of the two-fold Soviet-American domination.

These governments are beginning to worry about the fact that their big friends not only consider each other as the only partners worthy of discussing major world problems, but also reach secret agreements over questions which have to do directly with their countries. They are especially worried over the fact that the SALT talks and agreements from which all of them have been excluded are being transformed into a joint American-Soviet strategic line, into a major global agreement to which all the allies have to submit obediently and humbly.

Now the policy and activity of the two superpowers affects the interests not just of one country or a few separate countries. It affects entire zones and continents; therefore entire peoples are united by revolt and opposition to it in a common anti-imperialist and anti-social-imperialist front.

The peoples of the world are now facing a new, all-sided attack by the American and Soviet imperialists. This attack can be repelled by exposing and opposing the reactionary content of the Soviet-American alliance and its plans for oppression and plunder with all our might. It is particularly necessary to reject the pacifist illusions, the imperialist-revisionist lies and deception with which they are flooding the world.

The peoples of the world must oppose the counter-revolutionary unity of the two superpowers with their revolutionary unity, with their resolute blow for blow struggle, in order to foil the new superpower plots against the freedom and independence of the peoples and to undermine and destroy the entire Soviet-American global strategy.

DURRËS, WEDNESDAY
JULY 5, 1972

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM AND SOVIET REVISIONISM — RESPONSIBLE FOR THE GENOCIDE IN VIETNAM

Mankind must condemn the American imperialists as war criminals for the genocide in Vietnam.

The American imperialists are continuing their barbarous war against the heroic Vietnamese people with the utmost fury. The American barbarians have divided the roles with the puppets of Saigon. For years on end the latter have been using the sons of the people of South Vietnam as cannon fodder for the American slaughter. They are being chopped to pieces in the battles on the ground. Nixon's theory of the "Vietnamization" of the war has long been in operation although the puppets of Saigon have not won a single victory. The American fascists, on their part, are fighting with their air force. The aim of the Americans is to kill as many Vietnamese as possible and to completely burn and destroy North and South Vietnam. Hitlers' aims and methods of operation were no different. Fascists and racists are nothing but imperialist barbarians. And so are the American imperialists.

The entire American air force is bombing North and South Vietnam day and night with all its might. For years on end the most up-to-date bombers have been making two to three hundred sorties a day, dropping their bombs on everything, on civilian targets, on cities, on factories and hospitals, on dams and forests, on schools and populated suburbs. The number of bombs dropped on Vietnam up till now greatly exceeds the total number of the bombs dropped during the Second

World War by all the belligerent powers. The biggest aggressive power of the world has hurled itself against a small state and people! But this small people is resisting, fighting heroically and has placed this imperialist aggressor state in a difficult position, in a position of defeat.

This terrible tragedy is being perpetrated while the world looks on. American imperialism is hatching up intrigues everywhere, indulging in demagoguery and blackmail, making threats, buying from and selling to all, buying the consciences of all who are for sale in the markets of betrayal. There are many, many such people who shed crocodile tears over the crimes being perpetrated in Vietnam. They weep by day while at night they talk and canoodle with the American fascists. And all these betrayers of the peoples say that they do these things in order to save the world from war. They claim that they are saving mankind from death at a time when war is raging and people are being blown to bits by bombs. These traitors and executioners of peoples are filling the atmosphere with their phoney slogans about peace, accompanied with bombs, dollars and rubles. They are competing with one another to make proposals for open and secret meetings and talks, proposals for conferences and treaties on "European security," "Asian security," "African security," "security" everywhere! But there is and there will be no security anywhere. The mania for big movements led by various leaders of states of all colours and shapes has spread all over the world. All these movements are set up with the aim of giving the impression that something is being done, that something will come out of them! "Peoples, be patient, do not move, do not revolt, because everything will be put right! Have faith in this or that leader, have faith in that conference which is being prepared, in that top-level meeting!" But the mountain labours and brings forth a mouse! The chains for the peoples

are being forged and the screws are being tightened.

The Soviet fascists are in agreement with the American fascists. There is only one difference between them, the American fascists are bolder, while the Soviet ones are more cunning, because they want to disguise themselves. They have the same aim although they operate with different means. The American fascists bomb Vietnam, the Soviet fascists try to make it capitulate. The former are open enemies, the latter disguised enemies... History shows what kind of friends the Soviet revisionists are. Where are the Soviet bombers for Vietnam? Where are the Soviet modern fighter-bombers for Vietnam? Where are the modern Soviet missiles for Vietnam? No, there are no such things for Vietnam! Apparently the skies of Vietnam are to be mined by the Americans! The Soviet skies must be protected, the Soviet soil, wealth and people must be protected! But why must they be protected?! For the final war, for the "preservation of peace"!

"We have great responsibilities to mankind," said the traitor Podgorny in Hanoi when he went there recently to play Nixon's game. "We have responsibilities to prevent the outbreak of nuclear war. The Americans are very well prepared militarily and the United States of America has contradictions with its allies. If we exacerbate matters with the United States of America, then it and its allies will close their ranks against us," etc., said Podgorny.

The traitors have neither dignity nor scruple. In other words, the Soviet revisionists told the Vietnamese: "Surrender, we cannot help you, the Americans are strong. You will have only yourselves to blame if you continue the war!" There is no end to perfidy.

Despite this great betrayal, through the press, the radio, through their "loudspeakers" the Soviets are setting up a deafening clamour that they are helping Vietnam in its war. They, too, are war criminals. They are

not making the slightest effort to break the blockade of the Vietnamese ports. All they know to do is to accuse China. However, it serves China right, because it put a weapon in the enemy's hands. The presence of Nixon in Beijing in the situation that existed in relations between China and the United States of America was condemnable. To welcome the war criminal, Nixon, at a time when he was killing and maiming the Vietnamese, burning and devastating Vietnam, this, especially, is an act which is and will be severely condemned throughout the history of mankind. Of course China may say that it "received Nixon because of major world interests, in order to deepen the contradictions between the two superpowers, to avert an attack by the Soviet Union on China, to conduct trade with the United States of America," etc., etc. The Soviets, too, say all these things in other forms. But Vietnam is the conscience of the world which is fighting for freedom and independence against imperialism, against fascism and barbarity. Are you for this struggle and with this struggle or are you not? This is the big issue, an issue that cannot be dodged.

MONDAY
JANUARY 15, 1973

SOME ANTI-MARXIST STATEMENTS BY ZHOU ENLAI

In these first two weeks of January, amongst others, a delegation of the Italian government, headed by the foreign minister, Medici, and a Congolese delegation (from Zaire), headed by the president of that African republic, General Mobutu, have gone to China on official visits.

The two delegations were received by Zhou Enlai, who, of course, talked with them about political and other questions, made statements and affirmed some of his political and ideological views which, I think, are especially important on account of their "specific" character. This is what impels me to write these notes.

Zhou Enlai had a meeting with the Italian Medici, at which the two exchanged views. However, nothing was reported in the Chinese press apart from the announcement of a "cordial" meeting, whereas the Italian press, radio and television reported the trip and the Zhou Enlai-Medici talks extensively and especially highlighted this statement of Zhou Enlai's:

"China approves the European Common Market, approves and considers correct the creation of a 'United Europe,' which the states of Western Europe have begun to build."

At the official banquet which Zhou Enlai gave for Mobutu, amongst other things, he stated without reserve: **"Despite the form of the regime which is different from that of Zaire, China, of course, like Zaire is part of the third world..."** This is an official statement which has appeared in the Chinese press.

In regard to Zhou Enlai's statements to Medici, it

could be supposed that the Italian press is interested in concocting things, by distorting these statements. Such a thing might well occur, but since there has been no official denial from China, these statements must be true. We recall that the Chinese ambassadors in the countries of Europe have expressed such views about the Common Market and “United Europe” to our comrade ambassadors. **Hence, in this case we have to do with a political directive issued from the centre, from Beijing, with a line and a directive issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and the Chinese government. Thus, this line is being applied without hesitation. Not only are we not in agreement with this line and these orientations in any way, but on the contrary we are opposed to them, because they are wrong in principle and practice, because they are not on the Marxist-Leninist line but in opposition to it. These are revisionist-opportunist views and do not assist the revolution, the awakening of the peoples and their revolutionary struggle against imperialism, capitalism and the reactionary bourgeoisie.**

Let us be more explicit. How do the Chinese comrades, especially Zhou Enlai, the protagonist of this line, justify these key political attitudes stemming from this line? Only with the “exploitation of contradictions which exist between American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism”? **“We must struggle to deepen these contradictions,”** says Zhou Enlai. **So far so good. But in whose favour do we deepen them, and are these the only contradictions, known or unknown, which we must discover and struggle to deepen in the interest of the economic and political freedom, the sovereignty and self-determination of the peoples, in the interest of the revolution?**

What is the cause of these contradictions which exist and are becoming more and more severe each day? What is the source of them, and are they simple

or complex? Are they merely contradictions between the two superpowers, or do they extend further, more deeply? Should we Marxist-Leninists confine ourselves merely to being interested in deepening the contradictions which exist between imperialist America and the revisionist Soviet Union, and forget the contradictions which exist and must be deepened between the United States of America and its "allies," between the revisionist Soviet Union and its "allies," between these two superpowers and the states of the "third world," which are included in their respective spheres of influence? **Should we forget the major class issue, the struggle of the proletariat, that is, the solution of the great contradiction between the proletariat and the capitalist bourgeoisie, between capital and the proletariat, between the proletariat and the people, on the one hand, and the capitalist oligarchy and its state power, on the other hand? Should we forget that the state power of the bourgeoisie must be destroyed through struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat established in its place, that the bourgeois capitalist order must be replaced by the socialist order?**

If we neglect or forget these things, or use formulae as a smokescreen and in reality act differently, then we do not see, do not judge and do not carry out things like Marxists.

Let us take the issues one by one. It is true that contradictions exist between the United States of America and the Soviet Union and that we must deepen them. What is the source and basis of these contradictions? They have their source in the very character and the permanent aims of capitalism, in the merciless exploitation of the proletariat and the enslavement of the peoples. Imperialism, the final phase of capitalism, is in the process of decay. It is fighting with guns, causing bloodshed, as well as with policy and ideology to keep the peoples enslaved, to suppress the revolutions and to

attack the rivals which confront it in the international arena. Its decisive enemies, who in the end will wipe it out, are the peoples, the world proletariat and the revolution.

History proves that the rivalry between the capitalist groupings of one country and the capitalist groupings of another country, or between the capitalist groups of a number of countries and the capitalist groups of some other countries, to rule the world, to create and extend their colonial empires, to divide up the spheres of influence and markets, has created conflicts and hurled the world into bloody wars, which have been great crises for mankind. Their aim has been the exploitation and oppression of peoples, of nations, of the weaker states by the more powerful. The demagoguery of warmongers and enslavers has deceived individuals and peoples, exploiting their sound aspirations, but despite this, nothing could extinguish their sentiments for freedom, independence, liberation and the revolution. The strength of these sentiments and aspirations has steadily increased. The oppressed and exploited working masses have become the decisive motive force towards progress, the sternest opposition force to enslaving capitalism, against imperialism. Neither the transformation of the Soviet Union into a capitalist country, nor the transformation of a series of states of people's democracy into bourgeois capitalist states, has altered this trend of development in any way. The revolution is marching ahead, socialism is ceaselessly proving its vitality, while American imperialism, the head of a series of capitalist states, and Soviet social-imperialism, the leadership of a series of revisionist states, are in a deep political, ideological, financial and economic, cultural and military crisis.

It is the revolution, which is seething everywhere, as well as the peoples' liberation struggles, in all the forms and at all the stages of their development throughout

the world, the strikes, protests, etc., which bring these great death-dealing crises to this decayed, declining world. **This is the basis of our struggle against imperialism and social-imperialism, these are the decisive weapons which we must use in order to overcome these enemies. The strategy and tactics of our struggle must be built up in a correct way around this great aim and, in order to deepen the contradictions between the enemies, we must base ourselves on these principles and not on phantasies, adventures or opportunist stands.**

As everyone knows, American imperialism emerged during the Second World War strong and with an aggressive economic and military potential. It took upon itself the role of international gendarme and worked to revive all the capitalist reactionary forces in Europe, Latin America and elsewhere. American imperialism was confronted with the great camp of socialism and all the peoples of the world that aspired to and fought for liberation.

Within a few years the United States of America revived Bonn Germany, Italy, the French and British capitalist economies, etc., but for every change that was made in those countries, it took good care to protect its own "ration," that is, to ensure that it got the lion's share. The United States of America "relieved" these countries of their colonies, which it made its own with new methods. In allegedly reviving these states, the American imperialists strengthened their hegemony in the world and harnessed their "allies" to their chariot with all kinds of military and economic treaties. All these things served to strengthen American hegemony, first of all, to strengthen the reactionary bourgeoisie in each country, to suppress any people's movement and aspirations in these countries and in the world, and to create an iron bloc against the socialist Soviet Union and communism. The cold war, the local aggressive wars and the threat of the United States of America

to use the atomic bomb never frightened the socialist countries or the peoples of the world.

The great betrayal by the Soviet revisionists weakened the socialist camp, but it was unable to halt the advance of the world revolution or to eliminate socialism as a socio-economic order and as Marxist-Leninist ideology; and likewise it was unable to quell the desires and aspirations of the peoples to fight for socialism. Marxism-Leninism is immortal and always triumphant.

But what happened? With the betrayal by the Soviet revisionists, could it be said that all the contradictions of our time in all their complexity were eliminated? Not at all. They were increased both for the United States of America and the Soviet Union, and for their allies, regardless of the treaties, agreements, diplomatic accords, etc., etc. **The contradictions the American imperialists and the Soviet revisionists have with each other can never be diminished or die out, on the contrary, they are increasing and extending. Their source and basis always lie in what I expounded above. At present, despite the contradictions they have, the two superpowers are in alliance to fight the true socialist countries, to fight the Marxist-Leninist communist parties, to fight the people's aspirations for freedom, self-determination and sovereignty, to combat and suppress peoples' just wars. In all these directions they are in agreement. Thus, they are in agreement to fight socialism and communism.**

The United States of America is fighting to maintain its hegemony in the world; the Soviet Union is fighting to establish its hegemony. Hence, there is rivalry over the division of spheres of influence and the superpowers try to undermine each other's alliances. This is part of the game for spheres of influence and, of course, it has created and will create new contradictions, serious frictions and possibly even armed frictions. Up till now the atomic bomb has served as a means of intimidation to prevent the outbreak of conflicts between the

two superpowers.

American imperialism and its European allies want and are struggling to bring about the total weakening of the Soviet imperialist power, so that it no longer poses a threat, not just ideologically, but, if possible, is made dependent on them economically, and its aggressive military strength, of which the United States of America is afraid, is weakened and the other allies are in agreement on this. Therefore, their aim is to liquidate the dependence of the Warsaw Treaty countries on the Soviet Union. In this direction, they have scored many successes and will certainly score others, because the satellites of the Soviet Union in Europe, from Romania to Poland, have turned their eyes to the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany, France and Britain. Backroom deals of secret diplomacy are on the agenda. The imperialists are terribly afraid of the peoples.

Despite their economic revival, the capitalist countries of Europe are in a great crisis, and the peoples who live in them are oppressed by the local oligarchies. Everywhere there are strikes, demonstrations, armed clashes, up to the level of war, as in Northern Ireland. What does this show? The decay of capitalism and the rise of revolutionary forces. But apart from the oppression and exploitation by the local oligarchies, these countries are also under the savage heel of American imperialism. In this situation even these states want to escape the domination of Americans. But how? De Gaulle's breaking away from NATO, the creation of the independent atomic striking force by France, **the creation of the European Common Market and the idea launched, and the continuous struggle which is going on, for the creation of the "United States of Europe," do not have escape from the American dictate as their only aim. This is one aspect. The other aspect shows that the bourgeoisie thinks that the uniting of big monopolies of**

these countries will create a compact economic, political and military power, which will be more capable of suppressing the popular revolts and revolutions, which, already, have caused insurmountable problems and which later, because of chronic crises, will be even more ominous for it. But all these reactionary plans will solve nothing for it. The oligarchies of these states want to preserve NATO, that is, to maintain the military aid of the United States of America, since thus they are guaranteed against the danger which comes from the Soviet Union. Here there are a series of contradictions: the United States of America will maintain NATO but does not want the European Common Market to become a barrier to itself, or even worse, the "United States of Europe" to become a great power. Among the states which will unite in this organization, which will dominate? France, West Germany or Britain? Thus more rivalries, new "alliances," continual quarrels are being aroused, which we Marxist-Leninists must analyse correctly, must foresee correctly and must maintain correct stands towards them.

Now let us come to Zhou Enlai's statements, to clarify which I have been obliged to write these notes, perhaps rather lengthy, but still incomplete.

The Italian press and radio are writing and speaking enthusiastically about the attitude of the Chinese, who, through the mouth of Zhou Enlai, are calling on Europe **"to find its unity in all directions."** According to what Zhou Enlai said (again on the basis of the Italian press), **"the process of European integration constitutes an essential element in achieving a real easing of tension."** According to the same source, Zhou Enlai stressed that **"this process must not be restricted to the economic sector but should affect the fields of policy and defence."** It couldn't be clearer. Since there has been no denial, Zhou Enlai has said these things.

These views of Zhou Enlai's are anti-Leninist and

reactionary, contrary to Lenin's well-known theses on the question of the "United States of Europe." Thus, these views of Zhou Enlai's are in line with those of European reaction.

Zhou Enlai is in favour of European integration in the interest of cosmopolitan big capital, that is, for its political, economic and military domination over the peoples of Europe, in favour of the iron law of capital ruling the peoples of Europe. With his theses, Zhou Enlai (who poses as the theoretician of the exploitation of contradictions) completely ignores the major insurmountable contradictions between the proletariat and the peoples of Europe, on the one hand, and the reactionary bourgeois regimes of their countries and the capitalist oligarchies, on the other, and likewise he also overlooks the contradictions between these oligarchies themselves. Hence, Zhou Enlai is calling for the class struggle to be extinguished, calling for European integration, calling for the contradictions of European capitalism not to be deepened in favour of the proletariat. Hence, the reactionary press is quite right to exalt Zhou Enlai and has every reason to do so.

The Italian proletariat is on strike almost every day. The Italian bourgeoisie wants to escape this pressure. Italy is a base of the United States of America, but to no effect. Italian reaction is using the club of the police but cannot stop the strike wave. The bourgeoisie is fighting for European integration, for the creation of the "United States of Europe," and it is self-evident what the bourgeoisie expects from this and what evils await the workers and peoples of Europe. **And here the bourgeoisie is being assisted by Zhou Enlai, who recommends to the peoples and the proletariat of Europe that they should follow its leaders meekly, instead of saying to them: "Workers of all countries and oppressed peoples, unite!"**

However, what impels Zhou Enlai to come out so

openly against Marxism-Leninism? He proceeds from another idea and thinks: "We must encourage this European reactionary bloc, because it confronts the American bloc, but especially the Soviet bloc. In this way, we deepen the contradictions between the imperialist blocs in favour of socialism." But the question arises: In favour of what socialism are these contradictions allegedly deepened when calls are made to the workers and peoples not to move, to integrate themselves like a flock of sheep in the pen of the capitalist shepherd? In this case socialism is reduced to China alone, which is inspired by such ideas of Zhou Enlai.

Zhou Enlai should be consistent in his ideas. Since he calls on the European states to integrate themselves under their capitalist oligarchies, then he ought to accept both the Warsaw Treaty and the occupation of Czechoslovakia.

Zhou Enlai declares that he is against Soviet hegemony over these states, indeed in this instance, he is in favour of "disintegration." Here he shows lack of consistency, or he is consistent in it that the satellites of the Soviet Union in Europe should break away and integrate themselves with the other "united" Europe, for the creation of which not only the monopoly bourgeoisie of Europe, but also Zhou Enlai, are appealing.

Zhou Enlai is not working to raise the peoples in revolution, to weaken the different links of the capitalist chain, is not helping to burst the weakest links of this cruel chain for the peoples, but without expressing this openly, is preaching the creation of different blocs to bring about a balance of forces in favour of China, but not in the Marxist-Leninist, revolutionary way. We must all fight in favour of China, but this we must do only for a socialist China and in the Marxist-Leninist way.

Zhou Enlai and the Chinese leadership say that they are fighting on the two flanks: against American imper-

ialism and against Soviet social-imperialism. However, the struggle on their part against the United States of America has been toned down. And when? Precisely when it is waging its barbarous war against Vietnam and continuing its aggressive struggle elsewhere. At such a time Zhou Enlai pretends that “the revolution is knocking at the door of the United States of America.” At these moments of crisis for American imperialism, to give it a hand, as China has done and is doing, not only is wrong, but means to help it. Can it be said that Zhou’s theses that “these things are done to deepen the contradictions between the two superpowers in favour of socialism,” are confirmed in this way? Does Vietnam or the Middle East gain anything from them? Were the links of the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists weakened because China accepted Nixon’s visit? None of these things came to pass. **Apparently, the Chinese policy is for the creation of closed blocs, which, of course, will be in rivalry with one another and will be eroded by great contradictions.**

A few months ago Ji Pengfei, the foreign minister of China, made more or less this statement: “China, Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos and the other countries of Indochina are one big family...,” etc. Here, naturally, the words “blocs,” “camp,” “socialist countries” did not appear, but there is a flavour of a “yellow family,” an “Asiatic grouping,” which is not Marxist-Leninist. Hence, today they are calling for “United Europe,” for “one big family,” and the “third world,” and tomorrow they may be calling for integration of the countries of Latin America or the “black peoples of Africa.” This is the tendency which is apparent in the Chinese policy, and this is not Marxist-Leninist, not revolutionary. It means to divert the peoples’ attention from the genuine revolutionary struggle...

THURSDAY
JANUARY 25, 1973

PANORAMA OF THE CURRENT POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN EUROPE

I talked with the Foreign Minister about the events which are taking place in our old Europe and about the many intrigues and deals which are being hatched up by the American imperialists, the Soviet social-imperialists and the other capitalist states of this continent.

Two events dominate the political scene at present in this part of the world, events accompanied by a deafening racket of American jazz and the alluring sounds of the Russian balalaika. These two kinds of music are being played in Helsinki and in Vienna. In the former capital city they are prattling about "European security," while in the latter there is palaver about the "balanced reduction of armed forces" in Central Europe. The performances are being staged in those two cities, but the numbers are prepared and the star performers and the extras are coached and rehearsed in their roles in Washington and Moscow. As is known, we did not and could not take part in this dirty farce, not because we are afraid of fighting, but because we prefer to fight with drawn swords outside vicious circles. We state and will always state our opinion openly, fearlessly and without running any risk of getting "our clothes" torn in the brambles or stained in the mud of Vienna and Helsinki. All those who took part in these conferences eagerly desired us to go there so that they could compromise us in their rounds of talks. But these desires were not fulfilled. At these meetings they discuss the hegemonic interests of the two big powers and those of the capitalist cliques and not the interests of the peoples

of Europe and the world. That is why we do not take part in these meetings but expose and fight them more effectively from outside. When the meetings are truly of the peoples, against their rulers, then Albania will always take part in them.

At these meetings the Romanians pretend they are fighting on both fronts. What a disgusting farce!...

I instructed the minister that he and his staff must closely follow the proceedings of the conferences, draw conclusions and write articles. They must keep in mind the following questions:

Faced with the great crisis which has beset the capitalist world and America itself, American imperialism wants to free itself of its great military expenditure, but at the same time does not want to withdraw its armed forces from Europe. The United States of America wants to keep NATO on its feet, not only to oppose the Warsaw Treaty, but also to keep its own allies under pressure. It is trying to make these allied states pay more, both for the maintenance of the armies the United States has there, and to finance the dollar in other ways, i.e., wants them to export less and import more and thus eliminate the huge deficit in the American balance.

NATO asked Russia for a meeting at which they could talk about the "balanced reduction of armed forces in Europe." The Warsaw Treaty countries gave them a positive reply that "this reduction must affect only the foreign forces which are deployed in Europe." This was done to open the way for the meeting on "European security." Nixon and Brezhnev took the decisive step in this deal in Moscow, so that both meetings would be held at the same time.

The endless talks over procedure began in Helsinki at a time which was not favourable to the Soviets because not only Romania was backing away from them, but Poland, too, had begun to move. Then meeting af-

ter meeting, pressure after pressure, the Romanians tried to nuzzle up to France, but it had its own plans and advised them not to get too “skittish” with the Soviets. The crestfallen Romanians became somewhat more amenable. The Soviets wanted to end this conference, which they themselves had sought, as quickly as possible, with a general declaration to keep up appearances. They foresee many difficulties.

The Americans and the Westerners want to carry the question of weakening the Soviet Union through to the end, and not just to weaken it economically, by investing their capital in the Soviet Union and its satellite countries, not just to weaken it militarily, by demanding the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Europe, but also by demanding that it open its borders to their ideas, their press, propaganda, tourists, etc. The picture is clear. They want to wean the satellite countries away from the Soviet Union and its influence (they themselves are ready for this) and harness them to their chariot.

In this way the hinterland of the West is extended and the borders of the Soviet Union are pushed back to where they were before the Second World War. This is not in the interests of Soviet social-imperialism, which wants to keep its satellites under its domination. That is why the Soviet Union proposed that the talks in Vienna should be about the reduction of national forces and armaments, while the reduction of foreign forces should be relegated to second place. Of course the Soviets made this proposal with the aim that the talks would be dragged on endlessly and to give the impression that they were “democratic” talks and not talks between two blocs or between the United States of America and the Soviet Union only, as was the case with SALT, but talks in which other countries, from each bloc would take part. This, of course, will give rise to another question, to the demand that “neutral” states, i.e., Austria,

should participate and the Vienna meeting will become like that of Helsinki, if not broader, and any decision will be postponed indefinitely. The palaver must go on while matters proceed as the United States of America and the Soviet Union decide behind the scenes.

Thus, it is clear that all these questions are being manipulated by the two superpowers in order to balance their economic and military potentials in Europe, to preserve and consolidate their positions in the spheres of influence and, at the same time, to give the impression that they are fighting for "European security."

It is clear that by raising the question of the reduction of forces, they want to achieve the disarmament of the peoples, to weaken their defence potential and to impose the dictate of the superpowers easily on the countries of Europe so as to keep them under the blackmail and threat of nuclear missiles. The two superpowers will do nothing to reduce their forces or potential. On the contrary, everything is intended to conceal this while the disarmament is to be carried out to the detriment of others.

Even if these two superpowers make some small, symbolic concession in this direction, it is known that their mechanized means, their paratroop detachments, their naval missile forces, etc., have a wide range of rapid action from one country to another. Therefore, this small symbolic gesture does not in any way affect the American-Soviet capacity to strike in all regions of Europe.

In these conferences everything is centred on these principal aims. Of course, as the situation evolves there will be problems and each side will have its own tactics. And there will be a reason and aim behind each of these tactics. Therefore, without losing our bearings, we must follow the events, must analyse and explain them to our people in the first place, and as far as we can, also to

those who listen to us or are interested in knowing our opinion. And this interest is by no means small in the world. Likewise, with the passage of time our political stands are being confirmed and approved.

**FRIDAY
FEBRUARY 9, 1973**

A SHAMELESS ATTEMPT OF THE SOVIET REVISIONISTS

A “friend” of ours from Vienna went to our embassy in Austria and, on behalf of the Soviet representative to the Organization of Atomic Energy, proposed that “secret talks should be held” in Vienna between us and the Soviets in order to improve relations, etc. Our ambassador replied to him in the blunt terms he deserved. What villains they are! The secret diplomacy of the Americans is being applied extensively by the modern revisionists.

MONDAY
JUNE 4, 1973

NATO IS SHOWING INTEREST IN OUR COUNTRY, WHY?

It seems that NATO, at its last meeting held in May in Brussels, discussed Albania and according to information received the following was said:

“In considering the position and situation of Albania, the members of NATO have come to the conclusion that the situation in Albania is stable, unity exists and there is progress in the economy. Albania has a strong geographical position in the Mediterranean, but its policy in regard to this sea is in our favour. It opposes us but also opposes the Soviets. Therefore, we must not upset Albania and aggravate relations with it, but, on the contrary, must try to improve them. The United States of America and Britain should try to establish diplomatic relations with it, but without haste and without pressing the issue.”

This is the information. Time will show how true it is, but very likely it is true, not only because of the reliability of the person who gave it to us, either from his own desire or urged to do so, that is not important, but also because of its content; it seems that this could have been the conclusion reached in the discussion of this organization, if it took up the question of Albania. And it is very probable that they have talked about Albania.

I discussed this question with the comrades of the Defence Council and the Foreign Minister, analysed the information, and gave them instructions for action.

Ours is a consistent, resolute, socialist, Marxist-Leninist policy. Far from being to the liking of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, this policy and our stand are in firm opposition to their aims. Each of these two imperialist

groups would like to have Albania on its side. Since it is impossible to attain this without an adventurous armed attack against our country, for the time being they prefer “not to encroach” on the freedom, independence and sovereignty of Albania and, in fact, like it or not, they accept the status quo. These two groups want to preserve the armed equilibrium between them.

Both NATO and the Warsaw Treaty are striving for rapprochement with us, showing themselves “moderate and benevolent”; Moscow has done its utmost to re-establish diplomatic relations with us; Washington has made advances in the same direction. Quite rightly we turn a deaf ear to them. As regards Britain and West Germany we have made our stand clear. Britain must return the stolen gold to the Albanian people, while the Federal Republic of Germany must pay reparations for the damage that German nazism inflicted on us during the War.

The United States of America is not in a hurry on this question, and this seems to confirm the information given us about the NATO meeting. The Soviets, for their part, are in a hurry, because they want to emerge on the Adriatic and the Mediterranean, but we resolutely oppose this predatory imperialist aim of theirs. This is to the liking of the NATO member states, therefore, according to the information, they say that the policy of Albania in the Mediterranean is in their favour. However our policy is equally irreconcilable and resolute against the American imperialists’ presence in the Mediterranean.

This great interest of the two sides in Albania shows, on the other hand, the strategic importance of our country for both the one and the other, indicates the great contradictions between them, and shows, likewise, that in the war plans of the two groupings Albania is intended to be a battlefield to be attacked and occupied as quickly as possible by one or the other.

This confirms the accuracy of our predictions about an eventual attack on our country and the need for defence of the Homeland from all directions.

Everyone knows what is taking place in Europe at present, the plans of the Soviets and the Americans, of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, which we are following with great vigilance. Likewise we are attentively following the relations of the superpowers for the accomplishment of their world strategy and their separate interests in the division of spheres of influence between them at the expense of small peoples. This whole complicated situation is developing amidst a great economic, political and military crisis which has engulfed the United States of America, the Soviet Union and all the countries allied to them, as well as the so-called third world, which has become totally involved in this infernal dance.

The frictions and contradictions are increasing at present. By "harmonizing their actions," the two superpowers are striving to dominate their smaller partners and ensure their own hegemony, in order to avert a war between them as far as possible in this way. But there is a limit to this, because the contradictions will not only increase, but will also become the cause of local wars, which are the prelude warning of the breaching of the so-called peaceful equilibrium.

Will Yugoslavia disturb the existing equilibrium after Tito dies? In recent times the Soviets have been trying to interfere there in a "peaceful way." Tito, the friend of the Americans and allegedly of the third world, is leaving them free to operate, indeed even in the Adriatic ports. He pretends to be opposing them and trying to maintain the equilibrium. The Americans and the Westerners pose as if they are not worried. Why? Is it because they feel secure in Yugoslavia, or has Tito signed some secret agreement with the Soviets that "they will never intervene with arms in Yugoslavia" and

that “Yugoslavia will remain a friend of the Soviets and the Americans even after Tito’s death”? This is “a sort of sphere of influence” common to the Soviets and the Americans and “blessed” by Tito. It is possible that the Americans and the Soviets have an agreement between them about this, and just as possible that this hypothesis is unfounded. However the danger of armed intervention by the two groupings, NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, against the Balkan countries remains imminent. For us the danger is always present, and anything can be expected from the Soviets and the Americans...

In regard to this, as always, we are vigilant and ready to defend our socialist Homeland from any danger, from the West or from the East...

THURSDAY
JUNE 28, 1973

THE NEW SOVIET-AMERICAN AGREEMENTS — A GRAVE CHALLENGE FOR ALL THE PEOPLES

Today we sent the newspaper *Zëri i popullit* the article entitled: "The New Soviet-American Agreements — A Grave Challenge for All the Peoples."* It is one of the articles which will be published in our press to denounce Brezhnev's visit to the United States of America.

Amongst other things the article stresses:

The Americans are known for their tendency to establish records for everything, records for who can eat the most, who can go on talking longest, or who can tell the biggest lie. The press and statistics register all the records achieved, including those to do with industry, horse racing, or the numbers of ex-husbands of Hollywood film stars. Thanks to these strange American customs, the world has now learned of the records established by the president of the United States and the secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union during a week of tête-à-tête talks. Hence, it was made known that never before had the American president travelled 4,000 kms together with a foreign leader, received a non-American statesman in his Californian residence, or signed so many agreements within a few days, etc. Likewise, never before has such a high-rank-

* Published in: Enver Hoxha, *Against Modern Revisionism (Collection of Works) 1971-1975*, Alb. ed., "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1980, p. 396.

ing representative of a foreign country begged so hard for American businessmen to invest their capital in his country.

But what the American journalists did not say was that Brezhnev's visit to the United States of America established another new record, the record for hypocrisy, political cynicism, demagoguery and unscrupulous deception, the record for intrigues and plots of such proportions that they leave no continent or region of the world untouched.

The challenge which American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism are making to the peoples of the world is immense and extremely revolting. The chiefs of the two superpowers are striving to make their arbitrariness in international relations a law, to make all others accept their political dictate as a supreme order, so that world issues are decided and settled in Washington and Moscow. The agreements concluded in the latest Brezhnev-Nixon meeting, as well as those which are still kept secret, are another expression of the aims of the superpowers which want to get their clutches on and strangle everything revolutionary and progressive in the world, to invade and dominate all countries.

Now the United States of America and the Soviet Union are demanding public recognition of their self-assumed right to strangle any revolution, liberation struggle or popular uprising, which in the judgement of the two superpowers is a danger to their tranquillity, and this has been written into one of the clauses of the agreement on the so-called prohibition of nuclear war. Article 4 of the aforementioned agreement states that the American and Soviet governments should consult together and undertake joint action whenever they think that this or that action of another country, these or those relations between other countries, have reached such a point as to present a threat of a nuclear conflict, or any other sort of conflict. Translated into ordinary

human language, this means that the two superpowers will consult together and take joint measures to intervene wherever their power and domination are threatened, wherever their imperialist interests are affected.

Such a canonization of international arbitrariness can be compared only with the "Holy Alliance" of the feudal emperors of Europe at the beginning of the last century. The new Soviet-American treaty, which for purposes of demagoguery and deception they called an "agreement on the prohibition of nuclear war," will remain in the annals of international relations as a savage and diabolical attempt to elevate their interference in the internal affairs of other states to a norm of international law, and to call their trampling underfoot of the rights of others a virtue of international behaviour.

But, however hard the authors of this treaty try to give this ugly product of their aggressive and hegemonic policy a false lustre, they will never convince others that the new Soviet-American nuclear agreement helps to strengthen world peace and security. In all the agreements which were concluded recently between the Soviet revisionists and the American imperialists, they show themselves to be aggressive, arrogant and arbitrary in all directions, against the peoples and against their own partners. They are not disarming at all but, on the contrary, are maintaining their entire military arsenal, and by means of this arsenal they intend to crush any opposition to their dictate.

The leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union declare, without any pang of conscience that the purpose of the agreements reached between them is to prevent the emergence of international crises, to avert military confrontations, to avoid the creation of situations which aggravate the relations between states, to reduce the threat of war, etc. However, the question we ask today is the same as that we asked yesterday and the day before yesterday. Who is threatening world

peace, who is causing the crises, who is preparing for war and aggression? And the answer is still the same: the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists. It is they who are keeping entire zones of influence under their domination and seeking others, it is they who are carrying on the furious armaments race and threatening the peoples of the entire world with nuclear blackmail, it is they who maintain military bases in foreign countries and have filled the seas and skies with warships and military aircraft, it is they who impose neo-colonialism on the peoples and exploit them economically. There is no end to the black list of their aggressive policy, plots and intrigues. Was it because of the lack of a treaty such as this which was recently concluded that the United States of America launched the war in Korea and kindled the aggression in Vietnam, intervened in Cuba and sent its army to Santo Domingo, incited Israel against the Arabs and strangled the revolution in the Congo? Can it be that the Soviet tanks entered Prague and the armed provocations on the Chinese border were committed because at that time the two superpowers were not convinced that "peace must be strengthened" and now they are convinced of this?

Both with agreement and without agreement, the aggressive and expansionist policy and aims of the two superpowers, which result from their system, remain unchanged. What is new here is that now they aim to establish a joint international counter-revolutionary dictatorship, that they want to sit in judgement together on any popular revolt and revolutionary stand of the peoples to seize power from them or their satellites, that under the pretext of a threat to peace they want to take upon themselves to intervene to quell the flames of the revolution wherever they break out.

The American imperialists and Soviet social-imperialists also created a kind of special apparatus for the elaboration of this common reactionary policy and

for their joint administration of world affairs. They decided to create a kind of biarchy which will find practical application in the repeated meetings of the president of the USA and the general secretary of the CPSU. According to them it will be precisely at these meetings that they will sum up international relations and allocate the new fields towards which the activity of the two superpowers will be directed in the future.

From the American capital, which represents the centre of open anti-communist reaction, the centre of the most vicious and barbarous imperialism known to mankind, Brezhnev, who holds the title of secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, issued the call, "Let us boldly break down any obstacle from the past, let us advance on the road of strengthening the peace, reducing tension and developing collaboration." However he said nothing about whether or not there was class struggle in the world, whether there are peoples who are still fighting for freedom and independence, whether the working people of different countries have revolutionary aspirations and are struggling for them, whether there is colonialism and exploitation. He did not speak about these things because to him the revolution, socialism, national freedom and independence allegedly belong to that time when people were "slaves to old tendencies."

The revolutionary movements of the peoples for freedom and democracy, the internationalist solidarity of the working class are contrary to the imperialist interests of the two superpowers, which intend to suppress them by force on the basis of the agreements concluded. What the Soviet revisionists are interested in now is the reduction of tension with their American rivals and their mutual commitment not to interfere in each others' spheres of influence, to avoid friction and conflicts between them. They want to create an equilibrium so that the world will keep its mouth shut and

their domination will not be disturbed by anything.

This policy and this tendency were also reflected in the new agreements between the two superpowers which, on the question of the division of spheres of influence, left each other's hands free to operate effectively in their respective zones so that the equilibrium established is not disturbed. The Middle East is a clear example in this direction. That region is pregnant with revolutionary struggles. Such a situation is dangerous for both superpowers, which, on the one hand, have established their influence there, and on the other, are trying to protect their interests at all costs. Therefore they will not allow the Arabs to recover the lands taken from them by Israel, under the pretext that allegedly such a thing would cause a world war. For this reason the situation "neither war nor peace" was reconfirmed at the recent Brezhnev-Nixon meetings. The same can be said about the other zones, too.

However, the Arab peoples understand the plots which their enemies are hatching up and will not put up with this dictate of the imperialists and social-imperialists.

The new Soviet-American agreements have been received with mistrust and undisguised concern by the allies of the two superpowers as well, who feel that now their most vital interests are being affected. The agreements recognize American imperialism's full right to establish order within its military alliances, when it considers that its will has not been carried out. Likewise, if a state which is favoured by American imperialism becomes a threat to the interests of other NATO members, the threatened state does not have the right to and must not object.

The same thing can be said of the members of the Warsaw Treaty, too. The official Soviet spokesmen made it clear again now, during the signing of the agreements with the United States of America, that the Brezhnev

doctrine on “limited sovereignty” will be applied in the future just as rigorously and relentlessly as hitherto.

Brezhnev’s visit to America was fresh evidence of how far the Soviet revisionists have deviated from Marxism-Leninism, how completely they have betrayed the cause of the October Revolution and the work of Lenin and Stalin, how much they have lowered the authority and respect which the Soviet Union enjoyed in the past in the world as the first country of socialism, how severely they have damaged the prestige and lofty reputation of the Soviet peoples. The impression and conviction that the first secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union created in America, even among the ultra-reactionaries and anti-communists, was that the American public was faced with a real businessman who was as far removed from communism as the managers of the New York banks or the oil kings of Texas. And truly, who could believe that “it could occur that while the red flags were flying in Pennsylvania Square, the leader of the giant communist state would be talking in a room packed to capacity with capitalist millionaires”? — as one American news agency reported. The American press pointed out with great satisfaction that, in the course of all his long speeches, toasts and interviews with journalists, Brezhnev did not use what it calls “communist terminology,” did not say one word which could refer to socialism or Marxism. This “moderation of language by the Soviets,” or “the absence of communist rhetoric,” as Rogers called it, was hailed in America as fresh evidence of the final breaking of the leaders of the Kremlin with the revolutionary and socialist past of the Soviet Union.

The only time that Brezhnev mentioned the name of Lenin was to present him as if he had allegedly laid the basis of the present Soviet-American collaboration which Brezhnev and company realized. They pretend to base themselves on Lenin in selling raw materials and

granting concessions to the American capitalists. It is as clear as daylight that here we have to do with a distortion of Lenin's ideas and his stand towards American imperialism. However, the revisionists are not ashamed to make such distortions. One distortion more or one less of Leninism is now no cause for concern to these who have turned the whole of it upside down. Nevertheless, the bosses of the Kremlin cite the odd thesis of Lenin in order to conceal and legalize their betrayal. It is true that Lenin spoke about trade with the capitalists, but in an entirely different sense, and moreover, for a purpose entirely different from that which the revisionists give the present Soviet-American collaboration. Lenin was for trade which had to serve and defend the revolution and help to break the blockade which the entire imperialist world of that time had established against the first socialist state. He regarded it as a means to split the interventionist bloc of imperialist countries, to create new contradictions in the capitalist world and exploit the old ones. Lenin's principle in this whole problem was "We engage in trade, but we do not make political and ideological concessions, do not renounce the revolution, do not renounce our solidarity with and support for the revolutionary movement." Lenin's stand towards American imperialism was entirely principled and consistent, and no matter what efforts the present revisionist leaders of the Soviet Union may make, they cannot distort or interpret it as they wish. Lenin said that blood drips from every American dollar, and he was the first to point out with unrivalled perspicuity the aggressive, predatory character of the imperialism of the United States of America. More than once during his revolutionary activity he called for vigilance and uncompromising struggle against the biggest and most dangerous imperialism which world history had ever known.

Lenin was against secret diplomacy, which he de-

nounced and unmasked as one of the most despicable methods which the bourgeoisie uses to cover up its reactionary actions against the freedom and sovereignty of the peoples. The Soviet revisionist rulers' return to bourgeois diplomacy is another proof that shows how far they have departed from Lenin and Leninism.

Now after destroying the theoretical heritage and revolutionary work of Lenin and Stalin, the Soviet revisionists have reached that point that they worship the dollar and sell the titles to Soviet territories just as oriental monarchs grant concessions to capitalist trusts to exploit their lands.

In his pleas to the American businessmen to invest as much as possible in the Soviet Union, Brezhnev personally, and after him the entire Soviet propaganda, are trying to prove that both countries benefit equally from the Soviet-American political and economic collaboration and that neither side has the possibility to create any superiority over the other. But no profound analysis is needed to see that in the recently signed Soviet-American agreements the United States of America gains more in all fields. Above all, America conserves and increases its attack forces, all doors are opened to it to exploit the Soviet Union from the economic aspect. The American imperialists gain more, not only because they invest their capital there, but also because they become arbiters to decide the extent to which the economy of the Soviet Union should develop, which branches should be supported and which discouraged.

But above all, the Americans introduce their influence and ideology, and this is their main victory in this major sell-out. It is worthy of mention here that this surrender of the Soviet revisionists occurs at a time when, in many capitalist countries of Latin America or of Europe, a rising tide of anti-American feeling and greater opposition to American imperialism can be seen. Meanwhile in this stand the so-called Soviet

communists are a long way behind De Gaulle, who had understood the danger of the infiltration of American capital and challenged it openly in his time.

The inflow of American capital and the extension of American influence in the Soviet Union will also create a new situation in its relations with its allies. At present the Soviet Union is bankrupt itself and cannot aid them to the necessary extent. From now on, however, it will give them even less aid. The peoples of those countries are faced with two options, either to rise in struggle against social-imperialism and the revisionist cliques in their countries to take state power into their own hands, or to surrender and accept two-fold bondage to social-imperialism and to American imperialism.

The incessant process of the Soviet-American rapprochement and collaboration, the ever greater coordination of the counter-revolutionary activity of the two superpowers, the ever greater violation of the interests of the peoples and the ever greater inclusion of new objectives towards which they are stepping up their expansionist and hegemonic actions, prove once again in practice the correctness of the revolutionary thesis and stands of the Party of Labour of Albania, which were stressed at its 6th Congress, that both American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism must be combatted and exposed to the same extent, because both are cunning and both are dangerous. Time is proving that, despite all the inevitable contradictions, rivalries and competition between them, the United States of America and the Soviet Union are now lined up in a common front against the peoples, and support and incite each other in their predatory and aggressive aims. Both the one and the other have the same features, they are sworn enemies of the revolution and the peoples, both of them are working and fighting to strangle socialism. Therefore, in this situation, the struggle on the two fronts against both imperialisms remains one

of the fundamental conditions to withstand the pressure of their counter-revolutionary alliance, to oppose their diabolical manoeuvres and to triumph over their aggressive plans.

**DURRËS, SUNDAY
JULY 15, 1973**

THE SMALL MUST BUILD A POLICY OF THEIR OWN

...Our influence in the international arena is connected with our revolutionary stands. The opponents of capitalism, of the governments and cliques in its service listen to us, understand us and support us, because we express their thoughts and sentiments and fight for their rights. Bourgeois diplomacy has got itself into a great quagmire. It is trying to drag us, too, into this mire but we have always avoided it.

The United States of America and the Soviet Union are appealing to us to establish contacts with them and are ready at the smallest sign from us. The capitalist states want us to lower the flag which we are holding high. The only reason they are “smiling” at us is in order to lure us into a trap and then through a deafening propaganda tell the world: “See, Albania has joined our dance,” despite the fact that we have not and never will join their dance. They want to put us at that political round-about where thousands and thousands of politicians exchange visits with one another, hatch up intrigues and buy and sell the interests of their peoples and countries, etc. We must never make a wrong move, never be hasty. This does not mean that we shall sit idle. No, we must establish contacts with them, but at the proper moments, so that we benefit and not they...

Precisely these positions of ours make the West and the East “respect” us, reluctantly of course, nevertheless, they do respect us! With our correct stands we are free to fight and we do not stretch our hand to anyone, but the neighbours round-about us have gained confidence from our stands. If we act hastily, the enemies

will exaggerate our “contacts,” will hatch up intrigues and provoke us.

Our interest has been and is to steadily strengthen the positions we have. The big states have no consideration for the small states, therefore the small must build a policy of their own and this policy of ours is correct, since it is always based on Marxist-Leninist analyses.

MONDAY
OCTOBER 1, 1973

THE TRAGIC EVENTS IN CHILE — A LESSON FOR THE REVOLUTIONARIES OF THE WHOLE WORLD

Today we sent the newspaper *Zëri i popullit* the article “The Tragic Events in Chile — A Lesson for the Revolutionaries of the Whole World”* so that it can be published tomorrow.

After speaking about the causes of the counter-revolutionary events in Chile and about the falsity of the revisionist theories on the “peaceful parliamentary road,” among other things, the article stresses:

In the stage of imperialism, both at its commencement and now, too, the danger of the establishment of a fascist military dictatorship whenever the capitalist monopolies think that their interests are threatened always exists. Moreover, it has been proved, especially from the end of the Second World War to this day, that American imperialism, British imperialism and others have gone to the assistance of the bourgeoisie of various countries to eliminate those governments or to suppress those revolutionary forces which, in one way or another, offer even the slightest threat to the foundations of the capitalist system.

As long as imperialism exists, there still exists the basis and possibility for, and its unchangeable policy of, interference in the internal affairs of other coun-

* Published in: Enver Hoxha, *Against Modern Revisionism (Collection of Works) 1971-1975*, Alb. ed., “8 Nëntori” Publishing House, Tirana, 1980, p. 437.

tries, counter-revolutionary plots, the overthrow of lawful governments, the liquidation of democratic and progressive forces, and the strangling of the revolution.

It is American imperialism which props up the fascist regimes in Spain and Portugal, which incites the revival of German fascism and Japanese militarism, which supports the racist regimes of South Africa and Rhodesia and keeps up the discrimination against the black people in its own country. It is American imperialism that helps the reactionary regimes of South Korea and the Saigon and Pnom Penh puppets, which has instigated the Zionist aggression and helps Israel to maintain its occupation of the Arab territories. All the furious winds of anti-communism, national oppression and capitalist exploitation blow from the United States of America. Throughout Latin America, with some rare exceptions, American imperialism has established tyrannical fascist regimes which mercilessly suppress and exploit the people. On that continent, all the weapons used against demonstrations, the weapons which kill the workers and peasants, are made in the United States and supplied by it.

The fascist military coup in Chile is not the deed of local reaction alone, but also of imperialism. For three years on end, during the whole time President Allende was in power, the Chilean rightist forces were incited, organized and encouraged in their counter-revolutionary activity by the United States. Chilean reaction and the American monopolies took revenge against President Allende for the progressive and anti-imperialist policy he followed. The undermining activity of the right-wing parties and all the reactionary forces, their acts of violence and terror were closely coordinated with the pressures exerted from outside by the American monopolies, with the economic blockade and the political struggle the American government waged against Chile. Behind the military junta was the CIA. the same

criminal hand that had carried out many coups in Latin America, in Indonesia, Iran, etc. The events in Chile once again revealed the true face of American imperialism. They proved once more that American imperialism remains a rabid enemy of all the peoples, a savage enemy of justice and progress, of struggles for freedom and independence, of the revolution and socialism.

But the counter-revolution in Chile is a deed not only of the avowed reactionary forces and the American imperialists. The Allende government was also sabotaged and savagely opposed by the christian-democratic and other factions of the bourgeoisie, so-called radical democratic forces similar to those together with which the communist parties of Italy and France claim that they will advance to socialism through reforms and the peaceful parliamentary road. The Frey party in Chile does not bear only "intellectual responsibility," as some claim, because it refused to hold talks or collaborate with the Allende government, or because it was lacking in loyalty to the legal government. It bears responsibility also because it used all possible means to sabotage the normal activity of the government, because it united with the forces of the Right to undermine the nationalized economy and to create confusion in the country, because it perpetrated a thousand and one acts of subversion. It fought to create that spiritual and political climate that was the prelude to the counter-revolution.

The Soviet revisionists, too, were implicated in the events in Chile. A thousand threads link the Soviet leaders in intrigues and plots with American imperialism. They did not intend or desire to help the Allende government when it was in power, because this would have brought them into conflict and damaged their cordial relations with American imperialism.

These stands of the Khrushchevite revisionists towards Chile and the theory of revolution had been con-

firmed before the Chilean events. They had been confirmed in the repeated tragic events in Iran: while the local reaction attacked the Tudeh Party several times, while it was killing and imprisoning hundreds and thousands of communists and progressive revolutionaries, the Soviet revisionists did not lift a finger, let alone sever diplomatic relations! These stands were confirmed in the shocking events in Indonesia, where about 500,000 communists and progressives were killed and massacred. Once again the Soviet revisionists did nothing, took no action and did not consider withdrawing their embassy from Djakarta. These stands of the Soviet revisionists are not accidental. They testify to the existence of a secret collaboration with the American imperialists to sabotage the revolutionary movements and to put down the people's liberation struggles.

This stand sheds light on the demagogic character of the much-publicized severance of diplomatic relations with Chile now.

Such is the reality. Their fine words about their alleged solidarity with the Chilean people, like all their other demagogic catchcries, are simply to deceive public opinion and to conceal their betrayal of the revolution and the peoples' liberation movements.

The events in Chile once again revealed all of the grave tragedy the peoples of Latin America are experiencing.

We believe that the events in Chile, the fascist attack of reaction against the democratic victories of the Chilean people, the brutal interference of American imperialism and its support for the military junta will encourage all the peoples of the world to be vigilant, to resolutely reject the demagogic slogans of the imperialists, revisionists and opportunists of every hue, and mobilize all their forces in courageous defence of their national freedom and independence, peace and security.

SATURDAY
DECEMBER 15, 1973

**THE SECRET DIPLOMACY OF
THE TWO SUPERPOWERS —
A GREAT DANGER TO THE
FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE
OF THE PEOPLES**

I had a final look at the article “On Secret Diplomacy.” It has been sent to *Zëri i popullit* to be published tomorrow under the title “The Secret Diplomacy of the Two Superpowers — A Great Danger to the Freedom and Independence of the Peoples.”*

The article says:

If you listen to the propaganda of the United States of America and the Soviet Union and to its echo from their satellites, you will gain the impression that the sole and main preoccupation of Washington and Moscow now is allegedly to ease the tension between states, to settle quarrels between nations, to secure peoples against any aggression or intervention, and to establish peace, once and for all, throughout the world. The newspapers and magazines, the radio and television of the American imperialists and the Soviet revisionists, thousands and tens of thousands of propagandists, priests, spies and zealous spielers are shouting to the world that the American and Soviet diplomacy cannot sleep in their anxiety to achieve this “peace” and “eternal security” which mankind has never known since its creation. And the American and Soviet leaders have

* Published in: Enver Hoxha, *Against Modern Revisionism (Collection of Works) 1971-1975*, Alb. ed. “8 Nëntori” Publishing House, Tirana 1980, p. 490.

given up their personal comfort in order to travel to all the capitals of the world in search of the “promised peace.” After them, ministers and ambassadors, envoys and agents of all sorts, levels and categories are running from one place to the other in order to find some path over which the “American-Soviet peace” can travel without hindrance and flow over the whole world.

However, this is a smokescreen of demagoguery with which the big bosses of the United States of America and the Soviet Union want to cover the dirty backstage deals of their secret diplomacy. As early as 1908 Lenin exposed the hypocrisy of this diplomacy.

*“The diplomats are in a flurry,” he said. “There is a shower of ‘Notes,’ ‘Reports,’ ‘Statements’; ministers whisper behind the backs of the crowned puppets who, champagne-glasses in hand, are ‘working for peace.’ But their ‘subjects’ know perfectly well that when crows flock together there must be a smell of carrion about.”**

And who can believe that the Soviet and American chiefs gather together in private with the sole aim of renouncing weapons, returning peace to Indochina and the Middle East, securing Europe and Asia, helping starving Africa, saving mankind from pollution of the atmosphere, opening the channels of world trade and guaranteeing the freedom of the peoples? Already there are hundreds of thousands of facts which prove that they do not meet to find ways to disarmament and peace, but to find ways to increase their armaments and occupy new zones, ways to expand their spheres of influence, to protect and strengthen their imperialist interests in foreign countries. They meet not in order to avoid quarrels or to settle international conflicts, as they claim,

* V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 15, Tirana 1961, Alb. ed, p. 208.

but to take the opportunity to interfere in the affairs of others, to step up their expansion and establish their hegemony.

Secret diplomacy is the offspring and instrument of imperialism. Lenin exposed the essence of it and its methods, showing that it represents one of the filthiest and most ferocious and barbarous activities of imperialist governments against freedom, independence, and national sovereignty of the peoples. The very first act of the Soviet government, the Decree on Peace, besides proclaiming the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, also proclaimed the rejection of the secret diplomacy, which had brought the peoples no less suffering and misfortunes than the imperialist war.

In 1918, when Soviet Russia published the secret treaties, including the secret Treaty of London on the partitioning of Albania, the peoples learned of plots, intrigues and terrible injustices which they had not heard of before, although they had suffered the grave and barbarous consequences of them to their sorrow. They had seen millions of men sent to be killed in the slaughter of the First World War in fulfilment of the secret treaties of Entente and the Central Powers to accomplish the redivision of the world, which monarchs and presidents of republics, ministers and industrialists had arranged in advance, in the greatest secrecy, deceiving the peoples.

The exploited proletarian and peasant masses discovered the terrible reality that they had been slaughtered at the front, not "in order to save the homeland," as the poisonous imperialist propaganda had told them, but for the interests of the bourgeoisie, for the capture of colonies and new markets, for domination of the seas and the subjugation of the peoples, according to predatory plans and schemes drafted in advance by the European chancelleries in secrecy from the peoples.

The Japanese aggression in China, Italy's inva-

sion of Abyssinia and the fascist rebellion of Franco in Spain were not carried out without the knowledge and secret consent of the other imperialist powers, just as Hitler did not launch the Second World War without the secret plot of Munich, without the blessing of Chamberlain, Daladier and others, who urged him to attack Central Europe, the Balkans and the East.

Secret diplomacy is still the preferred method of all bourgeois-capitalist governments, of all imperialists. But now it has become a method of the Soviet revisionists, too. Having rejected the teachings of Lenin and the October Revolution, they have returned to the secret diplomacy of the Tsars who, together with the other monarchs of Europe, divided the Balkans and partitioned the Orient, carved up and partitioned states as if they were wedding cakes. This is also further proof of the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, of its going over to social-imperialism, further evidence of the transformation of the Soviet revisionists into quellers of the flames of the world revolution and peoples' liberation wars.

Today the leaders of the two superpowers, the leaders of their allies and satellites, ministers, envoys and diplomats, meet so often that it is not possible to remember the number of their meetings. When these meetings are over, they all hasten to announce to the world that theirs has been an "historic" meeting, "a great contribution to the elimination of wars and the establishment of lasting peace in the world," and other such palaver. The participants swear to all the gods they have that they will apply the principles of the UNO Charter to the letter, that they will never interfere on any occasion, either directly or indirectly, in the internal affairs of the other states, that they will defend the freedom and independence of every country, etc., etc. However, all these bilateral and multilateral communiqués and statements of imperialist, bourgeois and social-imper-

ialist states are false and are made in order to conceal the plots which have been hatched up to deceive the peoples. We are not referring to remote history but will mention some examples from our days. Didn't the communiqués and statements of the meeting of the leaders of the revisionist countries in Dresden and Bratislava contain many assurances and pledges about the freedom and independence of the peoples, non-interference in internal affairs, and equality and justice? But while Brezhnev was signing these statements which occupied the entire front pages of the newspapers, he was also signing the order for his tanks to advance on Prague.

The secret Pentagon documents, published recently in the United States of America, on the war in Vietnam, as well as those which told of the CIA's preparations for the coup d'état in Chile, revealed that never before have the hypocrisy, cynicism, plots and intrigues of American imperialism behind the scenes reached the level they have today, that never before have those who have been at the head of the USA engaged in such large-scale public demagoguery to mislead their own people and the whole of world opinion.

Johnson and Nixon kept secret from their country and the American people, and the world public opinion that they themselves had organized the provocation in Tonkin Bay as a pretext to start the bombardment of the DR of Vietnam. And while Vietnam was being burned and devastated by an aggression of unprecedented barbarity, while the American soldiers were leaving their bones in the jungles of Indochina, the White House and the State Department organized tens of "meetings," "visits" and "talks" between all sorts of government and private delegations, allegedly to establish peace in Vietnam.

Therefore, the communiqués and statements issued after summit and sub-summit meetings of imperialist, bourgeois, social-imperialist and revisionist powers,

which, for external consumption, end up with platitudes about “good will” but which conceal the quarrels between snarling wolves that hatch up plots and intrigues at the expense of the peoples, have become really intolerable and sickening.

What was Kosygin after in Cairo at the climax of the war between the Arabs and Israel? It was said that he had gone to Egypt “in order to talk about peace,” “in order to save” the world from the threat of a general war, etc. But the facts proved that he went there to put pressure on the Egyptians so they would halt their offensive and stop the war. The clamour about the danger of an American-Soviet complication on account of the war in the Middle East, the alarm about the undermining of the trend to the reduction of international tension were employed as a means of pressure on the Arabs so that they would agree to a ceasefire, whereas these “theories” were peddled to public opinion as arguments to prove that the Arab sacrifices were a valuable contribution to saving world peace.

The Soviet revisionists have never wanted victory for the Arabs. Kosygin, Kuznetsov and others hurried to the Arab countries so as to quell the liberation armed struggle as quickly as possible, because if it were waged with success, it would lead to the settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, and also to the elimination of any need for the Soviet presence in this region. At all costs they needed a return to the situation “neither war nor peace,” which gives rise to a continuous instability on which the hegemony of the two superpowers can be based and advance.

As soon as Kosygin left, Kissinger hurried to the Arab countries. The world was told that he had gone there with a “peace plan,” indeed with “offers” and “proposals” to settle the twenty-five-year-old conflict of the Middle East once and for all. However, Kissinger went to the Arab countries neither for peace, nor

to settle the conflict. Nixon's special adviser hurried to the Arab capitals because American imperialism was very afraid of the prospect that the unity of the Arab peoples, which was manifested with a new force during the war, might be strengthened.

The United States of America was especially afraid of the prospect of the revolutionization of the Arab liberation movement, which the continuation of the war made a natural process. The American bourgeoisie began to fear a development of the war which would have to do not just with Israel but would also include the question of oil and the fabulous profits that the Arab oil wells bring the American monopolies. Since Israel is waging a total war, the Arabs will respond with a similar war. These were the motives which obliged Nixon and Kissinger to smile at the Arabs, to be unsparing with their flattery and promises.

Secret diplomacy is in the very nature of such blocs as NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, with their councils and committees. The foreign ministers and heads of state, chiefs of staff and army commanders meet behind locked doors. All the communiqués from these meetings speak of peace and defence, but all their actions speak of pressure and blackmail against free and independent countries, speak of intervention and plots in the undeveloped countries, speak of efforts to extend expansion and neo-colonialism. They keep it secret, but everybody knows that in the staffs and councils of these aggressive blocs atomic wars are planned and operational plans are drafted for armed occupations against these or those countries in this or that contingency.

The representatives of other countries, too, have joined the dance of secret diplomacy. Thus the pretext of clarifying the situation in the Middle East is used to justify the tête-à-tête talks with the Soviet leaders.

However, the peoples are interested in and have the

right to know what is being done in these meetings because, although some may have illusions that the chiefs of Moscow have been tamed and no longer constitute any danger, the peoples are convinced that the Soviet social-imperialists are hatching up plans against their freedom and independence, and trying to create the conditions for new acts of aggression.

There are some who declare that they do not recognise spheres of influence and are opposed to those who are striving to extend their hegemony. As a statement this is a positive act. But how can such statements be reconciled with their approval of Soviet policy in the Middle East? Can it be that the Soviet Union pursues the policy of spheres of influence only in Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia, and does not do this in the Middle East, the Mediterranean, the Adriatic or other regions?

At this time of intrigues and plots, the Soviets are in great need of publicity and homage paid to them as the “champions of peace and of the Arab peoples.” They need this especially now after the meeting of the “non-aligned” in Algiers, at which many countries criticized and exposed the expansionist and neo-colonialist policy of the leaders of the Kremlin.

Perhaps in such cases the intention is to take advantage of the rivalry between the superpowers and exploit the moment to extract some favour. But history has proved that the policy of the balance of power constitutes a very great danger. It has also proved that the big imperialist powers cannot be softened by pleas or deceived by “clever tricks.”

In any case, one thing is well-known: even if some favour is gained from them, neither the Soviet leaders nor the American imperialists give anything without taking something in return. The credits or weapons provided by them represent a heavy debt for whoever accepts them, a debt which is a burden on the freedom and independence of his country, chains which link

him, even against his will, to the actions of Moscow and Washington as they pursue their adventurist policy.

Imperialism and social-imperialism continue to publicize and use the others or their envoys as intermediaries to hatch up intrigues at the expense of the peoples. The peoples do not trust such people, nor do they trust those diplomats and chancelleries who turn to them allegedly to settle the affairs of one country or the other.

The United States of America, which is in difficulties to assert its hegemony in the world, has opened its purse of credits. Leaders of the bourgeois-capitalist countries as well as the Soviet social-imperialists and leaders of the other revisionist countries are lured to these credits like flies to a pot of poisoned honey. So eager are they to gain something, to ingratiate themselves with America, that they do not fail to throw bouquets at American imperialism, going so far as to tell the world publicly and in official documents that the USA "is contributing to lasting peace in the world, based on freedom, equality, justice and respect for human rights." They claim that renunciation of the threat or use of force, respect for territorial integrity and the inviolability of borders allegedly constitute the fundamental principles by which the USA is guided in its relations with other countries.

These friends of imperialists and social-imperialists, who open the doors of their countries to American capital and prettify imperialism, not only place the freedom and independence of their own peoples in great danger, but also undermine the revolutionary and liberation movements of the peoples.

The revisionist parties in the capitalist countries, too, the leaders of which have now begun to shuttle from one country to the other, are misleading the peoples and doing their utmost to conceal the intrigues and plots of the imperialists and social-imperialists from

them. They hinder the masses from gaining a correct understanding of the dangerous situation created by the expansionist and aggressive policy of the two superpowers. The genuine communists who still remain in their ranks bear very grave responsibility for the pacifist social-traitor policy which these parties pursue.

International events not only in the Middle East but almost all over the world show that the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists have raised secret diplomacy to the highest level and made it their only method in their agreements about expanding their spheres of influence and plundering the interests of different peoples. The Brezhnev-Nixon meetings have been the culmination of this savage and barbarous diplomacy. Intrigues and plots, which have not yet come to light, have been hatched up there. The speed with which the United States of America and the Soviet Union came out with a joint stand about ending the fighting in the Middle East, which this time was expressed quite openly in the resolutions of the Security Council, shows that Washington and Moscow have drawn up secret plans and prepared ready-made solutions for similar situations in other countries, too.

No one knows what was said and what was decided in the top-secret Brezhnev-Nixon talks in San-Clemente, what is transmitted and decided between them on the "hot line." No one knows what was said and what was decided at the recent meetings in Moscow between Kissinger and the Soviet leaders about the Middle East and other regions of the world. But no one doubts that major deals and bargains have been struck between them. The American-Soviet treaty on atomic weapons, which was signed in Washington, together with the notorious Article 4, as well as the other agreements which are locked away in the strongrooms of the two superpowers and which have not yet come into effect, contain many unknown and unexpected things, and also many

unimaginable and incalculable dangers for the peoples.

If the peoples of the world, and first of all the proletariat of all the countries, were acquainted with the real contents of such meetings and secret talks, if they were to know what is hidden behind the misleading statements issued on these occasions, they would see that they are facing aggressions, imperialist wars and nuclear catastrophes, which none of the chiefs of imperialism or social-imperialism, but only the peoples and the world proletariat can prevent.

The Albanian people think that the time has come, and indeed it is passing, for all to rise in revolt against this terrible plot and blackmail of the secret diplomacy of the imperialist powers, which has caused world wars in the past, which later caused the wars in Korea and Vietnam and now in the Middle East, and which may set the whole world ablaze again tomorrow.

The fear that has seized the countries of Western Europe because of the secret and undeclared agreements of the two superpowers shows that even the privileged allies of the USA have begun to feel the heavy burden of the American-Soviet secret diplomacy.

The West Europeans have noticed that now, following the Brezhnev-Nixon meetings, their countries have been subjected to greater and more frequent pressures. The "new Atlantic Charter" proposed by the United States of America at a time when it is strengthening its all-round relations with the Soviet Union seeks to deprive the participants in it of some of the inalienable attributes of their national sovereignty and of rights to take part freely, independently and on equal terms in international questions. The countries of Western Europe are displeased that Nixon has undertaken to discuss world issues, indeed even those which pertain to the European continent, with the Soviet Union alone, leaving out such big countries as France, Britain, Germany, etc.

They are noticing, likewise, that following the Brezhnev-Nixon meetings the two superpowers have stepped up their efforts to turn the Mediterranean into a Soviet-American sea, and avoid consulting them or telling them about what they do in the Middle East. The countries of Western Europe do not know what is discussed and decided in the SALT talks and are informed only when they are required to approve the decisions taken in the top-secret talks between the two superpowers.

The American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists are brandishing their atomic weapons and threatening the world with them. But now Britain, France and China also possess such weapons.

History has exposed and condemned with all its force the secret diplomacy of imperialists who, as Stalin said, try to cover up their preparations for war by clamouring for and singing hymns to peace. Just as in the past, the aim of this diplomacy, which the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists are applying with such zeal and consistency, is to prepare the division of the world between themselves, to buy and sell the interests of other countries, to open the way to aggressions, behind the backs of the peoples and safe from the eyes of public opinion. The more actively secret diplomacy is pursued, the greater become the dangers to peace and general security. Therefore, today just as in the past, secret diplomacy must be combatted, as it was combatted in the time of Lenin, for the same reasons and to avoid the same consequences.

Its exposure and destruction is a duty and an obligation for all the peace-loving peoples, a service rendered to liberation and anti-imperialist struggles, the efforts of all those who are fighting for the strengthening of freedom and national independence, against dictate and for equality in international relations.

The peoples have the right and ought to know what

is done and what is decided at the top levels of international policy and what is being done in the meetings and talks between the Soviets and the Americans, what is being done in Washington, Moscow, etc., where secret diplomacy is practised to the detriment of the peoples. The questions discussed there are not private questions, but problems that have to do with the interests and destinies of peoples, with the future of states and the security and general peace.

In the terrible fog created by secret diplomacy, all these diplomats are like dangerous worms which burrow under the skin, causing erythema and endangering the life of the peoples, and cover themselves with false slogans. Can the proletariat and the peoples of the world accept such a situation? If they accept it, they accept death. But the peoples and world proletariat do not agree to die without a struggle, they know that they have to fight to suppress these worms.

From the time the Party was founded and the people's state power was born the Albanian people have been engaged in polemics with such persons and states and will continue this stern struggle, fearing neither blackmail, pressure, nor armed intervention. Let all those who dare attempt such steps or actions with the Albanian people rest assured that they will get the worst of it and will suffer ignominious defeat. We are not alone: hundreds and hundreds of millions of people throughout the world are thinking about and fighting for the same things that we Albanians proclaim, for the things we are thinking about and fighting for.

SATURDAY
DECEMBER 14, 1974

THE PRESIDENTS HAVE PROBLEMS

The presidents have problems and are rushing around frantically because they can find no peace of mind.

“President” Brezhnev (who is the sole big noise because neither Podgorny nor Kosygin carries any weight) rushed off to Vladivostok to meet another president, Ford, who has just crawled, pale and weak, from the mire of Watergate. What did they do there? Nothing has emerged except a feeble communiqué. Apparently they wanted to say to the world: “See, we are here!” And China saw that they met close to its borders. The two peripatetic friars promised that they would meet again. Both of them needed this publicity for their peoples, because neither Ford nor Brezhnev is firmly established.

Then, since he returned from Vladivostok empty-handed, “President” Brezhnev hurried off to Paris to meet another president, Giscard d’Estaing. The latter has problems because President Ford is putting pressure on him. “President” Schmidt, likewise, is putting pressure on him. So Giscard welcomed Brezhnev in order to put counterpressure on Ford and Schmidt. At all costs Brezhnev had to get “new technology” and a kindly word about his “European Security,” which has turned into world insecurity. Giscard gave him these things and Brezhnev, as though fearing it would vanish, grabbed the document from Giscard’s hands before the ink was properly dry (we saw this on TV) seeming to say: “I got what I wanted, because I have great needs.”

And Giscard smiled his sarcastic smile as if to say to Captain Leonidas: “And I got the gas and oil I need-

ed, because this problem has been strangling me, while as for your 'European Security,' we have time to talk about that: *verba volant.*"

And the presidents are still sitting uneasily upon volcanoes.

TUESDAY
FEBRUARY 25, 1975

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM AND SOVIET IMPERIALISM ARE PREPARING THE THIRD WORLD WAR, BUT ARE ALSO AFRAID OF IT

American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism continue to arm themselves openly and arrogantly, disregarding world public opinion. Each is ready to fly at the throat of the other or of any other rival, one after the other. Their arming continues and the frenzied psychosis of war becomes clearer with every passing day. The two superpowers have everything in readiness and have set their armed forces in motion on the seas and oceans, at their different ports and the naval bases of third countries, rented or seized by force. As soon as a surface or submarine fleet of one superpower appears on any sea or ocean, the fleet of the other superpower immediately turns up there. These fleets are in rivalry, but they also pursue the gunboat policy against those third countries, the leaders of which either want to escape from the clutches of these two savage enemies, or try to throw off the chains of one in order to fall under the chains of the other which gives them more dollars or rubles. These aggressive naval and air fleets on the seas and in different bases are like the *charognards** which hover over the corpses on battlefields. They are ready to back up the aggressive policy of the respective governments, awaiting the signal for action from the diplomacy of aggression, which is accompanied with unrestrained espionage as well as with deals to

* Carrion-crows (French in the original).

buy and corrupt those who are corruptible in different countries, whom it uses to exert its influence there, for intrigues, corruption, “civil war” and plots.

The two superpowers have turned into traffickers in such terrible weapons that, compared to them, the Armstrongs, Mausers and Basil Zacharovs of the past seem like traders in children’s toys. But they sell these weapons, of course, each on its own account, in order to defend its own strategic interests and to set the buyers of these weapons at war with one another.

Let us take one of the battlefields: the Middle East. Here a number of Arab states are quarrelling and are in open disagreement with Israel. In reality, however, it is the two superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, which are quarrelling in this region, quarrelling over zones of influence, over oil, over ensuring routes for imperial access, over penetration into the continents of Africa and Asia in order to secure markets for exploitation, for the destruction of civilizations and the enslavement of peoples. They sell only arms to the governments and reactionary cliques of these countries, worked on by their diplomacy of aggression, and rob the peoples of their daily bread. There is a race over who will demand more weapons and who will sell more of them! The governments of the oil-producing countries are wallowing in dollars and with them they buy weapons from the Soviet Union, the United States of America, France, Britain and anyone who has them to sell. But for what are they buying these weapons? In order to suppress their own peoples, to attack other peoples and for each to assist his own patron. Sadat is trying to walk the tight rope. He links up with Brezhnev and gets weapons from him, then he becomes annoyed with him and links up with his “brother” Kissinger who is also a brother to Israel which is at war with Egypt. Thus Kissinger manoeuvres with both of them. Russia is “on good terms” with Syria

to which it supplies weapons, and has fallen out with Egypt, which is on good terms with the King of Saudi Arabia who, for his part, gets on none too badly with the United States of America, which protects Oman and has built bases there. Oman is friendly with and protected by the Shah of Iran, which is in conflict with Iraq which is pro-Soviet and anti-Jordanian. Jordan is pro-American, anti-Egyptian and against the Organization for the Liberation of Palestine, and so we could go on and on. All this is a real reflection of the political situation in the Middle East.

What is occurring in the Mediterranean?

The same thing. The colonels in Athens, incited by the CIA, carried out a putsch in Cyprus. They and the Americans failed. The Soviet Union “defended” Cyprus and “encouraged” Turkey. The latter attacked Cyprus and established itself there. Greece was very angry but could do nothing about it. It threatened to leave NATO and took some half-measures in this direction. The United States of America became annoyed with Greece, Russia abandoned Turkey and turned its face to Greece with a cynical smile. Fearing that the Russians might gain a foothold in Greece, the United States senate took the decision to cut off supplies of weapons to Turkey. “We’ll provide you with weapons,” the Russians told Turkey. But, since the United States of America is endangered in both these tableaux, recently, through the CIA, it organized a new, “minor” putsch against Karamanlis and pro Papadhopoulos, to serve as a warning. This putsch failed, but others must be expected later, because there is no calm, no stability in the Balkans, there are countries in which this or that superpower, which is armed to the teeth and has the fever of predatory war, intrigues, oppression and aggression in its blood, is dominant.

The world is simmering like a volcano about to erupt and only the staunch resistance of the peoples can

save mankind from the menace of these two monsters
and their intrigues.

TUESDAY
APRIL 8, 1975

ANOTHER DE PROFUNDIS FOR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The United States of America has washed its hands of Cambodia. Together with their puppet, Lon Nol, the Americans killed and maimed Cambodians, burned cities and villages and now, being unable to continue with their atrocities, they have removed Lon Nol and the war criminals and sung the *de profundis* over Cambodia.

The Americans are washing their hands of South Vietnam, too. One after the other three or four American presidents dropped more bombs, more napalm and more defoliants on Vietnam than were used during the Second World War! The numbers of killed and wounded, the amount of destruction and devastation are incalculable. History describes the Huns as very barbarous, as they were in fact, but the Americans have outdone them in barbarity to such an extent that we would not be wrong to describe the Huns as “humane” in comparison with the Americans! But the Americans, too, have had their “Catalaunian Plains.”*

The noose has tightened around the neck of Thieu, their puppet in South Vietnam, and is strangling him. Facing defeat, he is screaming to the Americans to help him. But Ford has turned a deaf ear to him because the last smoke is rising from a new “Dien Bien Phu” called Saigon, where the American general does not wish to suffer the same fate as General de Castries.

Now Ford has launched a “humanitarian cam-

* The battlefield where Attila was defeated.

paign” for Vietnam. He is evacuating the “orphans” caused by his atrocities, 100,000 Vietnamese refugees, among whom he prefers as many young men and women as possible. These are the new colonists whose skin, unlike that of the slaves who were bought in Africa in the past after their teeth and muscles had been examined, is not black but yellow. The new slaves are coming from Asia, although once again their teeth are examined and those whose teeth are not in order are thrown into the sea. The Americans need such reserves of slaves, and that is why they launched the operation to “rescue the Vietnamese refugees,” an operation which will be blessed by Pope John Paul VI and “wept over” by American old women who will give each of the refugees, “these victims of communist barbarians,” an old nylon shirt to wear.

Yesterday, after a meeting with Ford, Kissinger sang another *de profundis*, that over Vietnam. “All we have,” he said, “is 150 million dollars in aid which will be used for the rescue of refugees,” i.e., for the above-mentioned operation and for the preparation of some compromise. The arrogant United States of America has sought the aid of France or some other country (read the Soviet Union) to do something to save the face of the American aggressors, and in return, the United States of America will give a bone to those who come to its aid.

The bells of defeats for the United States of America are ringing out everywhere. They are not yet tolling its death knell but announcing great and fatal defeats.

These political defeats are the result of the grave economic crisis which has had the capitalist-revisionist world in its grip for years causing deep disturbances which have weakened its strength and constantly exposed the manoeuvres and intrigues of the imperialists and revisionists. The Middle East is another “furnace” for American imperialism. Through its “pistol,” Israel, the United States of America has spent billions of dol-

lars in this region. Why? To get hold of the oil of this zone. However, the myth of the "invincibility" of Israel was dispelled and the American plan did not produce the desired results. Kissinger's intrigues to gain domination by means of Israel have failed. That is why another American plan is looming on the horizon: why should the USA not act as if it will leave Israel in the lurch and turn to "friendship" with the Arabs? The policy of hostility towards the Arabs and friendship with Israel brought nothing but the oil crisis. Therefore it seems a new phase is beginning: "wooing" the Arabs and "anger" with Israel. In fact the United States of America will never sacrifice Israel, but it will engage in great demagoguery as if it is for the "containment" of Israel, even for its "return to its former borders," while telling the Arab peoples that "we are your friends." Another *de profundis* for the aggressive American policy, an alleged return to the road of "peace" and "friendship," which will please Pope John Paul VI very much. The friend of the Americans, the Shah of Iran, is working in this direction. He "embraced" Al-Bakhr, though only yesterday they were slashing at each other on the border. The aim is: to oust the Soviets from this region, to tip them out of Afghanistan and to support Bhutto with weapons against India, where the Soviets are doing what they like. Thus, with this turn which they were forced to make because of the defeats they are suffering, the Americans aim to clear the terrain of the Soviets, who want to rove freely over the pastures of Egypt, Syria, Lebanon and everywhere in the surrounding regions. Thus, it is clear that American imperialism is in a deep crisis.

Its partners, too, have got themselves up to their necks in this mire. Their voices have all become hoarse, they are writhing, trembling, taking hesitant steps. NATO is being rocked by earthquakes but is still on its feet: France says it has left it but is still in it. Gis-

card d'Estaing is reeling this way and that like a drunken man without personality and without any clear-cut policy. He poses as if he is on the side of the Arabs, pokes his finger in there and withdraws it again, pokes his finger into Greece and hastily withdraws it, puts in a good word about Turkey somewhere, gives two smiles to Russia, a handshake to Germany, a smile to Britain, and so on with the others... France is allegedly against the Americans but the reality is not so. Britain is at the bottom of the barrel or rather at the bottom of the sea. It is even dealing with Shelepin!* West Germany is saying nothing but is certainly working undercover.

Russia is in a crisis just as colossal as that of the United States of America. In the face of the American crisis, it is sitting still like a lapdog. Why? Will it not attack when its big partner is in difficulties? No! The Soviet Union is aggressive but has an internal, political, economic and military crisis itself. It is in economic decline, its industry is outdated, it wants to modernize it, therefore it is seeking huge credits from American imperialism which does not provide them without exacting some concessions. The satellites of the Soviet Union are moving. They are kept in the Warsaw Treaty and in Comecon by force and are likewise compelled to hold party meetings and to issue joint declarations by force.

And although all this crisis, all this decay of imperialism and social-imperialism is evident, efforts are still being made to hide it, to cover it up. How? With what? With the psychosis of general and local wars. This psychosis is created by the two superpowers and fostered by their agencies.

“Cyprus!” — a big noise: “The Mediterranean in

* At that time he was expelled from the Political Bureau of the CC of the CPSU and relieved of his functions of chairman of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union.

danger!” The Greek colonels acted, the Turks counter-acted, the Soviets moved, the Bulgarians did the “touching up,” Tito “howled,” Giscard “prattled on” and the United States of America goes on increasing and strengthening its military bases. The imperialist and social-imperialist powers act in this way because they are afraid of the peoples of the world, because they want to get out of the grave crisis which has gripped the Soviet Union, the United States of America and the anti-popular cliques in the various countries, without major injuries.

A general feature of the anti-popular capitalist cliques in various countries is the efforts they are making to avoid aligning themselves closely or openly with either superpower. This is not because they are for a policy independent of the superpowers but because they are uncertain as to how they will emerge from the crisis. Under pressure, they keep their old connections, but when need be they also bridle against them, pose as if they are defending “the national interests,” whereas in fact, the trusts and concerns which run those countries are totally cosmopolitan, completely under the control of the superpowers.

The countries of Western Europe want liberation from the yoke of the Americans but cannot do without them because they are afraid of the Soviets. They fear a departure of the American forces from the continent because they are well aware that if the Americans come to their aid, in an eventual war with the Soviet Union, they will do so only after the eleventh hour, just as they did in the two previous wars. However, according to some, the United States cannot return to “isolationism.” That is true, but it was precisely this game of “non-isolationism” that it played both in the time of Wilson and in the time of Roosevelt. It may very well play it again under another president. This can be called a “small manoeuvre” to weaken the opponents in a bloody war

so that the USA can join in later and eat the chestnuts which the others have pulled out of the fire for them.

I am of the opinion that in this situation, the two superpowers, both the United States of America and the Soviet Union, are in a great crisis, therefore, the struggle against them must be continued sternly on both fronts. We cannot come to or agree with the conclusion of some who say that "Soviet social-imperialism is more dangerous than American imperialism," therefore "we must intensify our struggle against the former and weaken our struggle against the latter."* This means to help one, American imperialism, and unite with it in the struggle against the other, Soviet social-imperialism. "We are deepening the contradictions," they say. In whose favour are they deepening them? If they claim that they are deepening them in favour of the proletariat and the peoples, then they must fight both superpowers equally.

I am of the opinion, too, that those views according to which the European Common Market, which is nothing but an offspring of world capitalism, must be defended, are likewise mistaken. Why should it be defended? Allegedly to cope with the pressure of the United States of America and the Soviet Union. But in whose hands is this Common Market? In the hands of capitalists and international monopolies to oppress and exploit the peoples. Consequently, those who defend these theses accept that the power of the European bourgeoisie over the peoples should be strength-

* These mistaken, anti-Marxist views, which the Party of Labour of Albania sternly criticized from principled positions as soon as they were manifested, were spread and defended by the leadership of the Communist Party of China. As time proved, it wanted to justify its own political course of rapprochement and collaboration with American imperialism and world capital against socialism and the peoples in this way.

ened. This means that instead of promoting progressive people's revolutions against national and cosmopolitan capital we should encourage oppression and exploitation, encourage imperialist world war. We communists are for just wars and not for unjust wars and if an unjust war is launched by world imperialism, we must sabotage it and turn it into a revolutionary war.

As far as the Party of Labour of Albania is concerned, it will continue to implement its correct line without the slightest vacillation. The line of our Party is revolutionary; therefore we help the revolutionaries, the communist parties (Marxist-Leninists) which are in revolutionary positions and progressive individuals. Our Party's aid to them is modest but they help and support our Party and people in the international arena. Albania must assess this help it receives from outside correctly. This aid has made it possible not only for the bourgeois-revisionist encirclement of socialist Albania to be broken, but also for the policy, history, development and progress of our country and Party to become known everywhere. We must take this aid into account in both good and bad times. Therefore we must constantly extend our work with our foreign friends on the Marxist-Leninist road, must always pay attention to and provide material for our propaganda for foreign countries.

The small countries and small peoples need one another; they must support one another in the struggle against the diabolical aims of the superpowers. This does not mean only that they must be vigilant towards alliances which the bourgeois or revisionist chiefs who oppress their own peoples hatch up together, but that they must create and activate progressive revolutionary opinion to defend the cause of all peoples in general and of each individual people in particular.

Of course the times are very dangerous. The peoples must realize that the two superpowers are now prepar-

ing a third world war, which will break out when the contradictions between the two superpowers become extremely exacerbated, when both imperialists have expended all the “peaceful” means of pursuing their policy and continue to pursue it with other means, with war. But both sides are afraid of this war because it will be a devastating war with nuclear weapons, in which there will hardly be victors or vanquished. Therefore the two superpowers are making their preparations for this war not only by competing over which will arm itself more heavily, more quickly and to the teeth for the day of the “terrible clash.” That is one aspect. The other aspect is that in their policy the superpowers are blackmailing each other over the division of the world markets and developing the process of the colonization and exploitation of other peoples. Part of this process is the arming of the cliques which rule these peoples. These cliques are oppressors of their own peoples and “allies” of the superpower which offers them more. This gives rise to regional conflicts which lead to the general world conflict.

Thus, before the last “tragic game,” the two superpowers are playing their game of chess, by using their pawns: Israel against the Arab countries, the Vietnam of Thieu against North Vietnam. They are inciting the differences between Greece and Turkey and tomorrow will incite the peoples of Africa against one another, something they have already begun with Ethiopia and Somalia, etc. Regional wars might spread to Latin America, too. After Bangladesh, a war between India and Pakistan, or between Pakistan and Afghanistan, might begin. The war between North and South Yemen is continuing and this is how things will go on until the flames of the war spread to Europe.

This is the method being pursued by the two superpowers in their contest for world hegemony. Before the First World War and disguising themselves more

carefully after it, the Big Powers dispatched their armies and gunboats to colonize the peoples. They did the same thing after the Second World War, but this time in different forms. Various countries, as is the case with Europe, have been occupied *de jure* and *de facto* by the superpowers with their armies and atomic bombs. These military forces have been kept there intact and have been steadily increased since the war with Hitler was won. Instead of being liberated, the peoples of Europe have been subjected to a three-fold, political, economic and military enslavement. With the exception of Albania, all the other states of the world are, you could say, subject to a three-fold occupation: politically some have become appendages of the two superpowers, others have become their colonies economically and others again have been turned into military bases, where the cliques in power are supplied with weapons to keep the peoples in bondage.

These tactics, this lethal strategy of the two superpowers, must be exposed and combatted. This is a common cause of all the peoples; therefore all the peoples must wage a stern struggle. The struggle against the two superpowers and their satellites all over the world is a tremendous, serious and complicated undertaking which cannot be fully successful unless all the peoples rise to their feet. In this struggle the peoples of the world must have their own strategy and tactics and these must be revolutionary. We do not say that only the true communists must organize and wage this struggle. No, that would be a mistake. The struggle against the two superpowers and their allies must be waged not by a minority, but by the majority, provided that the minority, the Marxist-Leninist party, does not lose its identity, does not do as China does when it declares that it is “a third-world country,” or that “we must fight against only one superpower,” etc. Socialist Albania is not a member of the so-called third world and does not accept this an-

ti-Marxist concept. Albania helps all those peoples and states who revolt against the two superpowers, who foil their aggressive and enslaving plans, who weaken them with their blows and arouse the revolutionary fighting spirit to go on to the complete victory of the peoples. Albania will be on the side of these forces without being in either the “second world” or the “third world.” Albania belongs only to the socialist world, and is fighting for this on the Marxist-Leninist road.

MONDAY
APRIL 21, 1975

AN ANALYSIS OF THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION IN THE LIGHT OF DRAMATIC EVENTS FOR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The United States of America has received a sound thrashing, has suffered an irreparable defeat in Cambodia. First, the whole world has seen very clearly that despite its military and economic potential, American imperialism cannot impose its will even on a very small people who are determined to resist and fight it with weapons. The United States of America threw its modern weapons, advisers, generals, armies and incalculable economic supplies on the balance of Cambodia, brought a handful of traitors headed by Lon Nol on the scene, organized mercenary armies and staked its "prestige" as a great superpower, but despite this the balance tipped to the side of the Cambodian people.

What lessons do the peoples draw from this colossal defeat of the United States of America? They learn that imperialism is in decay, that the empire of the United States of America is cracking in its foundations, its organization and in the policy on which it is built. It has to use wars, weapons, puppets, military bases, credits, exploitation and blackmail to keep the peoples under domination. But everybody knows the blood-stained character of the dollar. The puppets are used to the last to support their patron, they shed the blood of their own peoples, but in the end, they are smashed to smithereens by the people's war. A most recent example are Lon Nol and Van Thieu who are at their last

gasp. Therefore the demagogy that the “democratic” United States of America is fighting together with its “democratic” friends, Lon Nol and Van Thieu, for the “freedom and democracy” of the peoples, has no basis on which it can stand.

That means all-round political, military and economic defeats for the United States of America. Understandably the “confidence” of the allies in the United States of America is at a very low ebb. The former confidence of the cliques and puppets in their “powerful” patron has vanished. In fact, now more than ever before, the cliques and puppets think that their patron has become dangerous, is working only for itself, uses them as murderers of their peoples and leaves them in the lurch whenever it is defeated in battles against the peoples of the world. It is not only the cliques and puppets like Lon Nol and Van Thieu or the Chilean fascists who think like that, there are even officially declared “major allies” who have long been having doubts about this rotten alliance which is dominated by an imperialist superpower which, despite the treaties, has the same aims towards them and is acting and will act with them in the same manner it is acting with the cliques and puppets.

This real distrust in their perfidious ally is becoming evident from the forms of blackmail they are exerting on it. “National” feelings and “national” defence have begun to appear in the “alliances.” Even if they don’t say so, the “allies” have begun to think and move: “How are we going to defend ourselves? Nothing is certain with the United States of America: it leaves you in the lurch for its own interests.”

For its part, Soviet social-imperialism is experiencing a similar major crisis. Nobody believes its demagogy, because every action it takes shows the peoples that its policy, objectives and ambitions are identical with those of American imperialism: world hegemony,

division of markets, while doing its utmost to avoid confrontation with the other superpowers. But the struggle for markets does not prevent these two superpowers from having cliques and puppets, from playing them one against the other in order to draw the chestnuts out of the fire for them. The “allies” of Soviet social-imperialism are extremely dissatisfied with their patron: their countries are occupied and cannot be liberated without war. But this they cannot undertake. Up to a certain point, they can do some trade with the capitalist countries and obtain some credits from them to the extent the patron finds it advantageous to allow them. But if they pull too hard at the leash the patron jerks them back into line with stern brutality.

Romania is an exception to this state of affairs, but apparently the Soviets have allotted it special tasks, so that it can kick out a bit against the patron, but in the long run it has to be completely in its service. All the activity of the Ceausescu group allows one to suspect this, because while it shouts that it is being threatened by the Soviets, it makes no move to withdraw from the Warsaw Treaty. This means to be inside while posing as if you have one foot outside.

In the patron-satellite relations, the satellites of the United States of America have greater freedom to manoeuvre and resort to blackmail, whereas the satellites of the Soviets are kept under a tight rein. The United States of America threatens its allies with the Soviet menace, whereas the Soviets cannot threaten their satellites with the American menace because they beg for ties with the USA and want the American “freedom.” But both superpowers speculate with the threat of a world war. Meanwhile the so-called non-aligned countries are under a double threat — of a general war and a partial war.

Nevertheless, in this general framework, the myth of the big powers which can do what they want without

being punished or suffering defeats is steadily waning. The Americans are suffering such political, economic, military and other defeats. The Soviet Union has not yet suffered military defeats. It suffered a major political defeat in Czechoslovakia from which it still has not recovered. So far it has guarded against committing aggression where it foresees it might encounter armed resistance, because it will certainly suffer political and military defeats. It is taking great pains to keep up a certain reputation through demagogy, but if this veil is torn from it, then it is finished from every standpoint. With this tactic the Soviet Union wants to preserve the "myth" that the Soviet army is an "invincible monster." It needs this myth and doesn't want to shatter it, because that would bring its terrible slide to disaster. The Soviet strategy is to preserve this myth and continue the hegemonic policy of social-imperialism.

American imperialism has suffered defeats, but the Russians do not appear to have done so. This is an illusion, because both of them have suffered defeats and both are manoeuvring for a new strategy and new tactics. Ford issued a blunt warning, "let nobody try to fish in troubled waters against the United States of America." The "troubled waters" are Cambodia, Vietnam, the Middle East. This "nobody" is the Soviet Union, in the first place.

Faced with defeats, the United States of America is not failing to consider and prepare a kick for the Russians if they dare make a move. What form could this kick take? Suppositions: first, it refuses to grant credits which they need so badly; second, it drives Russia completely from the Middle East, the Persian Gulf and Africa. The latter measure involves vital economic and strategic issues.

He who has influence in the Arab and African countries shuts Russia up in a cage. The United States of America will try to do this; it will defend Israel but it

will not sacrifice its “friendship” with the Arab countries...

The Soviet Union is left only with the positions it has in Europe. Some are spreading the rumour that the United States of America will proceed in its policy according to the “Monroe Doctrine.” No, it will not withdraw into complete isolationism, but may adopt semi-isolationism, if it is unable to establish its complete hegemony over its NATO allies. The United States of America has interests in Europe which it will continue to defend. Hence, in principle, it is the “shield” of Western Europe against the “Soviet danger.” However, “American isolationism” may be expressed as: “I will help you, but you must help me out of these two colossal crises, because in this way you are helping yourselves.”

We see that France is moving in this direction, giving the impression that it is becoming a world power whose opinion must be sought. Tomorrow Federal Germany, which is not being heard much at present, will take this course. Brandt’s policy was a failure. Its main aim was “to bring about the unification of the two German states.” This he failed to achieve, but this does not mean that German imperialism has laid down its arms. One morning it will wake up and its main aim will be against the Soviets. Britain will follow this same course. Hence, a new strategy should be given consideration: the Soviet Union should be isolated in Europe and its advance halted everywhere, the United States of America should remain the main gendarme, but other gendarmes who have been treated with contempt, should be revived, thus Tamerlaine and his allies will defeat Bayazit Yalderem — the Soviet Union, shut it up in a cage and drag it around to exhibit it like the bear in a fair.

We don’t know how true it is that the Westerners have “agreed” that the first stage of the meeting on “European security” should be ended and that they “do

not insist strongly on the free circulation of ideas and people.” Apparently, both sides want to sign a worthless scrap of paper. Why? Do they want to give a “satisfaction” to the pro-American group of Brezhnev, in order to gain time until the United States of America can recover from its defeats, mend its broken vases, regain its lost credibility and prepare for the coming presidential elections while its western allies assist it and assist themselves to consolidate a certain independence and greater power in the alliance with the United States of America? We must watch this development, because it is taking place, although in what forms and directions is not yet clearly defined. It is important that the decline of the two superpowers should continue, that their hegemony and arrogance should be undermined, their intrigues stopped and combatted, that the psychosis of fear which the two superpowers are keeping alive should be combatted, that the sentiment for the defence and the national dignity of the peoples and independent states should be strengthened and the revolutionary spirit and international unity of the proletariat and the peoples all over the world should be enhanced and tempered.

The defeats of the superpowers must be exploited to the maximum and in all possible ways. We must make our contribution to this struggle as we have always done and more than ever before.

**WEDNESDAY
APRIL 30, 1975**

SOUTH VIETNAM HAS BEEN LIBERATED

The whole of South Vietnam has been liberated. Saigon was taken by assault and not on the basis of the Paris agreement. With the fall of Saigon one of the most protracted and barbarous wars the world has seen during the 20th century came to an end. American imperialism had taken the place and played the role of Hitlerite fascist imperialism, while the valiant Vietnamese people fought heroically and relentlessly against the French, the Japanese, against the French again and against the Americans, for 35 years on end. From its duration, the war of Vietnam is like the Hundred Years War and the Thirty Years War of by-gone centuries, but the war waged by American imperialism in Vietnam far outstripped the Second World War in its ferocity, the barbarous atrocities committed, and the quantity and variety of means employed.

Nevertheless the fraternal heroic Vietnamese people fought arms in hand, resisted and triumphed. The greatest world power, American imperialism, suffered the most sensational, ignominious and costly defeat. The United States of America poured 150 billion dollars into the war against Vietnam to earn disgrace and the hatred of all the peoples of the world. The friends and allies of the United States of America, also, suffered the greatest disillusionment and they are terror-stricken over this victory of the people of Vietnam and Cambodia.

This war confirmed the Leninist thesis that power is won with the rifle, through fighting. Wild pigs on the rampage must be shot. American imperialism, Soviet

social-imperialism and the reactionary bourgeoisie must be fought arms in hand. Only in this way can the peoples liberate themselves. There is not a single example to show that the people and the working class can take power by the parliamentary, reformist road. The revisionists loudly advertise this road, indeed they stress it as the only road, because they are against the revolution in general, and against the proletarian revolution, the liberation of the peoples, in particular. They are for the conciliation of the proletariat with the capitalist employers, for reforms which give the proletarians the crumbs from the capitalists' well-laden table, for the "historic compromise" of the Italian revisionists. This is the road which the Soviets support everywhere in order to dominate others. They even employed this tactic with the Vietnamese... The Paris agreement was the offspring of this dirty Soviet-American compromise at the expense of the Vietnamese. The Paris agreement prolonged the existence and domination of the American and the Saigon bandits for another two years. The Vietnamese had to continue to fight to achieve their complete liberation, which, in fact, they did. We told them openly what we thought about the Paris agreement. We told them that unless they threw it in the wastepaper basket they would never secure their liberation. And so it turned out.

Even now that Vietnam has been liberated the Soviet and American intrigues will continue, the fierce struggle will continue with other means...

SATURDAY
JUNE 21, 1975

CHINA IS GETTING CAUGHT UP IN THE POLITICAL GAME OF THE TWO SUPERPOWERS

China is showing itself in favour of and supports the European Common Market and "United Europe."

What is China's strategic aim and is it based on Marxist-Leninist principles? In order to determine this, we must define the aims of these organisms which China defends or supports.

When it was created, the European Common Market had as its aim the development of economic and commercial relations between its members, which were six at first, and then became nine. The aim of this institution was to enable the capitalist bourgeoisie of each member country to make the maximum profit, as well as to strengthen the capitalist economy of each separate state and all of them in general. Of course, together with the regulation of the problem of customs conventions, a series of other problems, such as prices, currency and bilateral and multilateral relations, were tidied up, too.

At first the European Common Market could not avoid reckoning with the powerful American economy and taking its steps allegedly separate from it, but, in fact, coordinated with the steps of American imperialism. Immediately after the Second World War, the latter contributed to the economic revival of Western Europe with the "aid" it provided, but at no time did it forget its own interests which were and became major ones. Hence, with the creation of the European Common Market, on the one hand, the efforts of American imperialism to dictate its economic policy to this institution continued, and on the other hand, the efforts

of the members of the European Common Market to liberate themselves from American tutelage also continued. In this way, contradictions, which grew steadily deeper, arose between them.

The so-called cold war concealed these contradictions to some extent, because even though the members of the European Common Market began seriously to display their economic independence, from the angle of defence, they were obliged to live under the American atomic umbrella. Naturally, the United States of America knew how to exploit the feeling of fear of a war with the Soviets, which emerged in the member countries of the European Common Market, to its own advantage.

The Khrushchevites' betrayal freed the capitalist bourgeoisie from their fear of the revolution and communism, **assisted world capital and gave it breathing space. The Khrushchevite betrayal split the revolutionary forces of the whole world, put off the proletarian revolution, fostered nationalist manifestations and gave the capitalist bourgeoisie time and the possibility to strengthen its weak internal position at the expense of the proletarian revolution, to undertake other activities and enter new combinations among states in the international arena.** Filled with nationalist sentiments, the Khrushchevite social-imperialists aspired to turn the Soviet Union from a socialist state into an imperialist atomic superpower, and they worked until they achieved this aim. Thus, two superpowers competing for world hegemony were created. **The law of both of them, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, is the law of the fight for plunder, the law of the enslavement of the peoples. This law is associated with the achievement of monstrous "alliances," with the capture, through disguised force, of strategic points to be used for the preparation of war, with their arming to the teeth, and the build-up of ever more modern atom-**

ic weapons, is accompanied with the plunder and the economic and political gobbling up of many states by means of intimidation, blackmail, credits and “aid” and subversion.

In these ever-changing situations, Western Europe took more courage. France under De Gaulle developed a policy more independent from the Americans and the Anglo-Saxons in general. De Gaulle left NATO, respecting only the treaty. Of course De Gaulle, too, dreamt of a European Common Market and a “United Europe” in which, without neglecting Adenauer’s Germany, France would dominate. De Gaulle was filled with a great nationalism, a thing which he sought from his other partners, but channelled to such a Europe as he dreamt of. Of course De Gaulle’s aims could not be achieved because his partners had their own aims, ambitions and fears. Not all these states conceived the role of the United States of America in Europe and in the world in the same way. West Germany, first of all, at present divided from the rest of the country, prefers to make certain concessions to the United States of America in other fields, without following the course of France of breaking away from the American defence. Germany and the other partners place little value on the “atomic strength” of France or of Britain, or indeed of Britain and France taken together. They consider this strength a “dwarf,” compared with the Soviet or American nuclear strength.

All these imperialist powers, whether the two superpowers, “United Europe” or Japan, aspire to hegemony. Since the time that the grave crisis of the dollar began, and the American military defeats in Southeast Asia — in Vietnam, Cambodia and elsewhere, “United Europe” has begun to reinforce its internal political positions and to aspire more strongly, as a self-contained organism, to turn into a new capitalist and imperialist superpower. This, then, is the “United Eur-

ope” which the China of Mao Zedong encourages and assists. The France of Pompidou and later of Giscard, also, encourages and assists this “United Europe.” Not only is France trying to preserve and further develop its nuclear strength, but it has begun to revive its old colonialist policy more actively under the neo-colonialist cloak, in French-speaking Africa, the Middle East and the Far East. Its economic strength does not permit France to compete with the others, but to the extent that it can, this is what it is doing. The stand of France towards the United States of America is no longer like that of the time of De Gaulle and Pompidou. Now this stand is somewhat softer. Despite this, however, its independence is apparent. Britain, too, is continuing to strengthen its lost economic influence in the Commonwealth countries to some extent, while Bonn is intervening economically in Central Europe, in the Balkans (apart from Albania), in Turkey, and wherever it is able around this region.

All these efforts of theirs may increase their joint economic potential which is a necessary factor in order to be a superpower. However, in order to become a superpower, this factor alone is not sufficient. This “United Europe” lacks the nuclear strength which the two superpowers have. **On the other hand, in this “United Europe” there are such great political and economic contradictions between the states which comprise it that it will not be able to attain the political and military potential which the United States of America has, even for dozens of years.** From many viewpoints, the “United States of Europe” is not like the United States of America. It is difficult for these European states to become assimilated as those states of the American continent from which the United States of America was formed have been assimilated. Each state in Europe has its own individuality as a nation, formed historically through the centuries. Each of them has its own

history, its own social, economic and cultural development, different from the others. Within each capitalist and revisionist European state there are strong class contradictions, which make not only external unity, but also internal unity, difficult.

Hence, to support a course of European capitalism which aspires to hegemony, aspires to become a superpower, as China is doing, is wrong in principle. To act in this way means to leave the road of the revolution in oblivion and to become caught up in the political game of the two superpowers, struggling and manoeuvring from the standpoints of their policies, while overestimating the manoeuvres of the superpowers in the changing situations of the contradictions which they have, underestimating the world proletarian revolution, and underestimating the struggle of the peoples against the superpowers and the capitalist bourgeois states. China is wrong when it preaches that “the main enemy is the Soviet Union, while the United States of America is less dangerous.” It is true that the United States of America has suffered defeats, but it remains an imperialist power. To weaken the struggle against it means to weaken the revolution and assist American imperialism. The Chinese will be making the same mistake if the United States of America starts “to show its wolf’s teeth”; then China will begin to say that the “Soviet Union is less dangerous, whereas the United States of America has become more dangerous.” China is wrong when it puts itself in the position of Don Quixote towards the old capitalist Europe, allegedly because it will become a counterweight to the Soviets, on the one hand, and the Americans on the other, while “China will benefit,” since it supports “United Europe.”

The contradictions between imperialists must be deepened and exploited in our favour, but only from the class positions, from the positions of the proletarian revolution. China is not doing this but doing the op-

posite by telling the peoples of Europe, America and the “third world”: “Support your capitalist and imperialist bourgeoisie, because the main enemy is Soviet social-imperialism.” This road is not Leninist, does not encourage the revolution, but defends that opportunism which the Second International advocated and Lenin exposed. We cannot agree with this strategy and tactic of China. For us, the main struggle against the imperialist superpowers and world capitalism is the peoples’ struggle, the proletarians’ struggle, the world proletarian revolution. From this angle, and while supporting these just struggles, we must manoeuvre and benefit from the situations that develop by helping to deepen the contradictions.

The contradictions and crises within imperialism, social-imperialism and world capitalism have their source in the oppression of peoples by the capitalists and in the struggle which these peoples wage against capitalist oppression and exploitation. Then, either you must encourage and assist the struggle of the peoples against the capitalists, or you must assist the latter to manoeuvre, to fatten themselves and to wage war on one or the other imperialist by telling the peoples, “Go and get yourselves killed for me.” The Marxist-Leninists **must encourage and assist the peoples’ struggle and unite their forces with it, with the struggle of the proletarians against the imperialist superpowers and world capitalism. This is the road which our Party of Labour has followed and will continue to follow.**

Mao’s mistaken foreign policy in this direction gives the impression that it is simplistic. In this policy the Chinese not only do not proceed from proletarian class positions, but without saying so, indeed while denying this in words, they are proceeding on the road of a great power. China is not a superpower, but its influence in world affairs is and can be great. **China can and will play a role in the world on one of two roads: either on**

the Marxist-Leninist road, the road of the revolution, or on the bourgeois-capitalist road, with a new revisionist nuance. Only by militating on the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary road will China win the trust of the peoples who want and are fighting for the revolution.

At present, China is trying to convince the capitalist countries that “the threat to them comes from the Soviet Union.” As if China were teaching the capitalists of the world something new! But the capitalists consider communism and the revolution their main enemies. If China proceeds on the revolutionary road, its statement that the “revisionist Soviet Union is the main enemy” will convince no one, while all the capitalists of every shade will aim their blows at China. **If they are not afraid of China at present, there are several reasons for this: either because China is communist only in words and not in deeds, or because it is still weak economically and militarily, or because it is an anti-Soviet factor which they want to exploit to the limit to weaken the aggressiveness of the Soviets against themselves.**

The aim of the policy of both the Chinese and the Americans is to combat the Soviet Union, but while the Chinese want to set the Americans fighting the Soviet Union, the United States of America and its allies want to set China fighting the Soviet Union. Both sides are developing this *chassé croisé** from the same positions and with the same hopes. However the Soviet Union is not sitting idle. It is trying to avoid war with the United States of America, to dominate the peoples whom it can oppress itself, to break up the NATO alliance, to isolate China and, if possible, to subjugate it. And all these aims it is pursuing under the disguise of socialism.

World capitalism and European capitalism, in particular, has gone through a series of world wars which

* Reciprocal change of places between two parties (French in the original).

have had their source in the savage nature of capitalism. Thus, the “United Europe,” the France of Giscard d’Estaing or West Germany are not easily hoodwinked by the policy of Zhou Enlai and Deng Xiaoping. They will not go to war with the Soviets on Deng Xiaoping’s urging. No, they are trying to avoid the collision with the Soviet Union, since they consider it stronger than themselves, trying to weaken the fortress from within, and then prepare the assault. All of them — the United States of America, Britain, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, etc., are trying to weaken the Soviets in the alliances they have with Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia, etc., but they are not proceeding in the way China wants them to. The old wolves are well acquainted with the tactics of attack, therefore it is hard to lead them on to those paths which suit you, because they themselves have used and are still using such plans, also, in the direction of China itself. No doubt, the president of France has turned a deaf ear to the tale of the “Soviet danger.” **Without doubt Giscard d’Estaing has told Deng Xiaoping that the French want to develop their friendship with China, but not against the Soviet Union, because they want to avoid the conflict. On the other hand the d’Estaings and company indirectly urge Deng to move against the Soviets, to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for them while they look on.**

The European bourgeoisie is an old intriguer. It is experienced in trickery and intrigues. Only the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and the peoples gives it its deserts. In the fight on this terrain, it is exposed and smashed, and its intrigue and trickery loses its force. This is the terrain from which China should fight, proceeding from the principles that diplomatic recognition and trade with the capitalist countries of Europe should serve a sound revolutionary strategy, and it should not try to incite Western Europe to fight the Soviets. In the past Britain and France used this wrong

course which China is using today to incite Hitler against the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Union against Germany. We know the outcome of those manoeuvres. Stalin did not fall into those errors, did not fall either into the positions of the Anglo-Americans or those of the Hitlerites.

By taking a firm revolutionary stand, you are better able to exploit the contradictions among the enemies and to weaken the most dangerous of them, first of all, without forgetting those which, though weakened for the moment, could revive. If you judge events and situations from the revolutionary positions, you see clearly that your basis of support is not a temporary factor, but that you have a very powerful and lasting potential in the struggle against capital, you have the proletariat of each country and the international proletariat as a whole, as well as the peoples who want freedom and the revolution. The revolution must be made by fighting both the United States of America and the Soviet Union.

THURSDAY
JULY 31, 1975

THE HELSINKI CONFERENCE — A HOPELESS INFERNAL GAMBLE

The Helsinki Conference on “European security” was opened yesterday with great pomp, “beating the drum without the sacrament,” notwithstanding the fact that the Vatican’s Cassaroli is guiding it on behalf of the “Vicar” of Christ. The councils of Worms, Prague and the orgiastic liturgies are being repeated in discourses like those of Pope Aleksander Borgia VI. Only this time Tito has not taken his “Vannosa” along, or at least the press has made no mention of her. The world press is committing “mortal sins” when it enumerates the “great” leaders who are taking part in this meeting and puts Tito at the bottom of the list. What a crime! The Italian radio mentioned Tito at the end, just ahead of Makarios.

Naturally the Helsinki Conference is proceeding “successfully,” but behind the scenes, in the hotels and residences of Ford, Brezhnev, Giscard and others, private talks are being held, the whisky is flowing and everything is being decided prior to the plenary meeting of the Conference. At this conference the only thing lacking is a ball like that at the Congress of Vienna at the time when Napoleon escaped from the island of Elba and marched on Paris. At the Helsinki Conference the “dance” lasted for more than two years, but the “mountain laboured to bring forth a mouse.” It produced a document of more than 200 pages that says nothing. It commits nobody to anything. It requires the heads of delegations only to put their signatures to it.

The much-advertised meeting was not yet open

when the article of *Zëri i popullit*,* the voice of the only country in Europe which is not taking part in this conference and which exposed this sinister manoeuvre of the two imperialist superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, was circulating in the corridors of this conference. The journalists in hundreds jumped upon the article of *Zëri i popullit*, the organ of the Party of Labour of Albania, and served it up right away to the world public. The waiters in the hotels served it on silver trays to Brezhnev, Ford, Tito, Ceausescu and the others in the morning before they spoke.

It is interesting to analyse the aims of this conference. In reality it is the Soviets who insisted on its being held. The western press complained that Brezhnev wanted it “for personal prestige,” “to give a lustre to his personal policy of peaceful coexistence.” All this is rubbish!

The American and western imperialists pretended to be displeased, to be reluctant to take part, while their message boys, Tito and Ceausescu, clamoured that they wanted it allegedly not for “the aims of the Americans and the Soviets,” but for “the lofty aims of peace.” All these are fairy tales to put people to sleep.

Then what are the true reasons for this conference? In my opinion both the Soviet Union and the United States of America wanted this conference, and it was precisely these two big imperialist powers which manipulated and organized it. This conference created illusions among some people about subsequent aggressive actions, about the division of the markets in the world and the creation of their spheres of influence. All the reactionary cliques that are ruling in Europe, except in the proletarian state of socialist Albania, were

* The article “The Conference of Insecurity in Europe,” published on July 29, 1975.

to put their signatures to these evil aims.

But let us take the issues one by one.

In my opinion, the Soviet Union is trying to avoid a nuclear confrontation with the United States of America, trying to continue the dialogue with it, in rivalry but also in collaboration. As the great imperialist power it is, the Soviet Union is seeking economic and political expansion at the same time. It has become a neo-colonialist power in competition with the United States of America. Both these competitors have great military potential, but in comparison with the United States of America, the Soviet Union is weak economically. Both for its internal development and for the hegemonic role it wants to play in the world, the Soviet Union needs time, needs the current "status quo" in order to capture a strong economic position and to modernize its obsolete and unprofitable industry and agriculture. If it is to attain these possibilities, it has to make concessions, because it needs aid from abroad. But this aid the Soviet Union has to get mostly from the United States of America as well as from the other wealthy countries of Europe. Then *donnant, donnant* as the French say, "you give to me then I'll give to you." This is the illusionist basis of the Helsinki Conference.

The two great world wars began in Europe and then spread to the whole world. They began as imperialist wars of plunder and ended in national liberation wars. With the exception of the People's Republic of Albania now all the capitalist and revisionist states of Europe are dancing to the "tune" which the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists play.

Two blocs confront each other in Europe. Will the third world war, the nuclear war, break out in Europe or elsewhere, in Asia, on the borders of China? The "mighty" are making their calculations. The Soviet Union is striving to "reassure the Europeans that it is not going to attack them," that they should not fear

present-day Russia. But the Europeans want proofs and guarantees, they also want "room to expand" and to have their own friends, including the Soviet Union among them. They want the satellite countries of Eastern Europe, linked with the Soviet Union, and even the Soviet Union itself, to throw their doors wide open for people and ideas to go in and out without restriction, that is, to decay completely from within. At Helsinki the Soviet Union is trying to create the illusion that it is making concessions in these directions. Of course it is making some concessions, from necessity, because it has to gain time, to obtain credits and modern technology, must free its hands to some extent in order to extend its activities on other continents apart from Europe. In the Europe of wolves it has nothing to gain except bites. Let the revisionists and their friends operate in Europe, let them collaborate with the capitalists. On the other hand, since the Soviet Union itself is going to get credits and modern technology from the United States of America and the West, it cannot prevent its satellites from doing the same thing, only it has to keep them under military occupation. The Warsaw Treaty serves as the shackles which the Soviet Union is riveting tight. However the satellite states like Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria have become capitalist countries, degenerate from every viewpoint. This is of no consequence to the Soviet Union. It has become such a country itself. All of them are heading for disaster.

This is how things stand in the Soviet fold. All the satellites of the Soviets with the possible exception of the Bulgarians want to break the shackles of the Warsaw Treaty, but they cannot. Then their only hope is that which the Helsinki document allows them, that is, to strengthen their friendship with the United States of America and the West, to seek investments from them in the form of credits and imports of their technology

without any restrictions, to allow the church to occupy its former place, to deepen the moral degeneration, to increase the anti-Sovietism, and the Warsaw Treaty will remain an empty egg-shell. "We must have the treaty, but at the same time we must be with the others," this is what the Giereks, Ceausescus, the Husaks and the Honeckers dream of and hope for. The Americans and the Westerners also are pursuing this aim, that is, to make the *glacis** between them and the Soviet Union their own. The Americans and the Westerners are competing to attain their goal in these directions, while the Soviets are trying to restrain their satellites as far as they can and the latter are doing all they can to escape from the Soviet grip.

This is what Helsinki is all about, these are the illusions, the hopes, the sleight of hand tricks, this is what the dinners and lunches put on by Brezhnev, Ford, Tito, Giscard and others are intended to achieve. A hopeless infernal gamble! The Soviet Union and the United States of America are watching them closely to see which way they move in the dance.

"Nuclear weapons, economic strength, blackmail, fear are the basis and the key positions," while the objective is: "we must achieve a certain disengagement in Europe in order to interest ourselves elsewhere." "We must fight, but not in Europe, if possible we should wage war through other peoples, we must use every means to crush those countries which hinder us, the capitalist countries of Europe, from competing on other continents" and the law of the jungle will continue to reign more fiercely than ever, the law "the big fish eats the small fish" will be on the order of the day. The Helsinki Conference opens this prospect to the Soviets and the Americans, a gloomy prospect for the peoples, full of dangers, hardships and imperialist wars of plunder.

* French in the original.

Brezhnev and Ford are holding special meetings on financial coordination, armaments, the SALT agreements and many other problems which are connected with their domination of the world and preparing for the coming Ford-Brezhnev meeting.

Brezhnev, Ford, Giscard and Schmidt are holding meetings on "West Berlin," but this is the "finger" on which the Westerners seized when the Soviet Union made them the notorious concessions, in order to grab the arm, the unification of the two German states. At this meeting the three told the fourth: "What we gained in relation to West Berlin we must not only safeguard but also extend further on the basis of what we are signing at Helsinki." All the lunches and dinners which the other "heads of states" are putting on, are simply monkey-tricks, in order to talk for the sake of talking, to imply that they, too, are doing something behind the scenes. Nevertheless, their role is merely to "propose toasts" at the wedding organized by Ford and Brezhnev. These are the aristocrats who hold the "bomb and the purse-strings," the others loiter around the corridors and the hotels dressed up to the nines but with no more importance than waiters and bellhops. Not only Ford, but also Giscard and Wilson openly said that the things they declared and decided upon at Helsinki are not obligatory, but "principles" which "ought to be applied," in other words, that the Soviet Union should "apply."

While the Conference at Helsinki was going on, the manager of the British news agency *Reuter* sent a letter to Gromyko and the Conference in which he said that his correspondents in the Soviet Union were being persecuted and expelled, were not allowed "to work" in peace. *Reuter* made this protest known to all the delegates at the conference. This is the prelude which was orchestrated at Helsinki and which Ford conducted. The "grandiose" tunes will be heard later. The articles

we wrote about this conference had great echo in the world because they pointed out openly and courageously what the others are unable to say, because in them we revealed everything that was being concocted by the two superpowers and everything that would occur later.

Returning to the motives which impelled the Soviet Union to seek the holding of this conference we must say that it did not do so because it wanted to create troubles for itself. No, it gives ground in one direction to gain it in another. Apart from "submitting" to the conditions of the United States of America in order to obtain credits and new technology, the Soviet Union also wants to develop its domination in the Middle East, Pakistan, India, Indonesia, Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand, Burma and elsewhere. Its purpose is to establish Soviet neo-colonialism in those countries, to establish its hegemony and the military, political and ideological encirclement of China. At the same time, of course, this will mean waging a struggle against American imperialism, which has not in any way or for one moment renounced the aim of establishing its hegemony in those countries. It will oppose the Soviet Union in these aims. And China will not sit idle.

As we are seeing, bourgeois France, too, has undertaken certain roles in the Mediterranean basin, in the countries of Africa and Indochina, in order to regain some of its lost advantages, to oppose the Soviet Union and, in this direction, to tell the United States of America that as its partner, it too, wants a small place in the warm sun. As it seems, West Germany remains one of the main powers of Europe to oppose the Soviet Union, to bring about the decay of its satellites in Europe, indeed even of the Soviet Union itself. Its main aim is to achieve the unification of the two German states.

MONDAY
MARCH 1, 1976

NOTES ON THE DENUNCIATION OF THE 25TH CONGRESS OF THE CPSU

I discussed with Ramiz that we must commence the study of the materials of the 25th Congress of the CPSU and, as always, prepare a serious article* which will denounce the treacherous anti-Marxist line of the Soviet social-imperialists from every standpoint. Our article must point out the Soviet revisionists' permanent concern to disguise themselves with allegedly Leninist slogans. They try to show that their course of betrayal is a "consistent continuation of the theory of Marx and Lenin," and want to say that, "If there is no proletariat in our country, this is because we have passed beyond the phase of socialism and are in communism"; if "the party is a party of the entire people," this is because "classes have disappeared in our country"; if "the state is a state of the entire people," this is because "in communism there is neither dictatorship of the proletariat nor class struggle," etc.

For what does all this serve the Soviet revisionists? To disguise the fact that their regime today is an imperialist, social-chauvinist regime, that their state is a dictatorship of the fascist, capitalist new bourgeoisie, because it crushes everything and anybody who does not obey this bureaucratic fascist bourgeoisie. A large majority of the "party of the entire people" is made up of people from the unlimited bureaucracy, men in the

* This article, entitled "The Congress of the Soviet Revisionists — A Congress of Demagoguery and Social-Imperialist Expansion," was published in the newspaper *Zëri i popullit*, March 12, 1976.

service of the police, the security forces, and especially from the big, aggressive army. In the party, workers take second place to officials, but these “workers” in the party are from the “worker aristocracy,” lackeys in the service of the revisionist new bourgeoisie and the Soviet espionage network, the KGB.

Basing ourselves on information published by the Soviets, we must point out in the article that, despite the manipulation of figures, the Soviet capitalist economy is experiencing a very grave, catastrophic crisis. That economy is caught up in the great world crisis and, in striving to get out of it, the Soviet Union has placed itself more inextricably in the clutches of American imperialism and world capitalism by accepting immense foreign credits. Its agriculture is bankrupt and its industry likewise. By means of Comecon, in which it makes the law, the Soviet Union savagely exploits its satellites, while the aggressive Soviet army is gobbling up vast sums from the budget in order to turn into an army of the Hitlerite type by means of which it intends to dominate the world.

The Soviet revisionists want to cover up these defeats, this decay and degeneration, both at home and abroad, through the scandalous pomposity of their appearance, puffed up like turkey cocks. For the first time in history the army greeted the 25th Congress of the CPSU (a congress only in appearance), the delegates to which displayed their chests covered with decorations. “Handsome” officers, dressed in carefully tailored uniforms and their chests covered with medals, came to the rostrum to speak. With this the revisionists declared to the congress of the party that “the army dominates over everything and everybody, therefore both you at home and you abroad should be afraid of us!” The floor quaked under the martial tread of officers, and the new bourgeoisie, the aristocracy of the regime, present at the Congress rose to its feet in enthusiastic applause. It

felt itself secure, and secure in the wealth it has appropriated.

The article must also bring out that the Soviet revisionists had invited to this congress all sorts of filth, all those whom the Khrushchevites needed to impart “majesty” to their congress, to say that Moscow “is the centre of the communist world,” and this whole revisionist world is singing hymns of praise to the Khrushchevites! Of course, the Party of Labour kept itself far removed from this cesspool and it continues to expose the disgrace, the blackmail, the treachery and revisionist hegemonism of the Soviet social-imperialists.

Our article must point out, also, that the French Communist Party, the Italian Communist Party and the Communist Party of Spain created a “diversion”; they did not “synchronize their watches” with the Kremlin. It “criticized them,” but with kid gloves and not by name. It had to do this, because otherwise its false disguise would have been torn from it completely. But these revisionist parties, allegedly dissident from Moscow, are telling the Kremlin through their statements and programs: “What have you to worry about? We begin where you left off, we begin from your betrayal, you rejected the dictatorship of the proletariat, and that’s what we are doing; you have a party of the entire people because there is no class struggle in your country, and we are going to socialism (in dreams) without class struggle, through reforms and together with all the parties of capital, including even the cagouards* and the new Fiery Crosses, so you have no reason to be upset.”

The article must show that the two sides are pretending to be upset with each other, because this is in the interest of both the revisionists of the East and those of the West. The latter want to prove to the bourgeoisie

* Members of a French terrorist organization (1932-1941).

of their countries that they have renounced the revolution, therefore they are demanding a place in the sun, and on the other hand, want to demonstrate that “we have broken with Moscow, we are free, independent.”

It pleases the Soviet revisionists that this revisionist water is being mixed with the capitalist bourgeois wine, because they hope to have a fifth column within those Western states (if the bourgeoisie swallows this potion). So they pretend to quarrel, pretend to criticize each other, but both sides want to emerge, and in fact have emerged, on the same course. However, there is one thing the Soviets do not like: they do not like these pseudo-dissidents to trumpet loudly that they have broken with Moscow, because this is not good for either side and nobody believes it, anyway.

We can guess what is going on behind the scenes at the 25th Congress, what farces are being played out, what blackmail, threats, bribery and promises of credits are being made. The main leadership of the Kremlin has placed all the delegations under observation with eaves-dropping devices and battalions of officials who are attached to these delegation. The “lobbying” goes on all day at tables laden with fabulous quantities of food and drink in order to deceive. This is a means to illustrate the fraud of the plenty that the revisionists want to prove exists in the Soviet Union, where the reality is quite the opposite. It has been decided in advance where each delegation will go and what it will see, who will speak to it and what they will say, because those who will welcome the delegations may not know anything at all about the country from which the guests come. The Agitprop thinks, the deception operates, and the threats, the rubles, the stick and the carrot, likewise.

MONDAY
NOVEMBER 1, 1976

THE 7TH CONGRESS OF THE PARTY OPENS

The 7th Congress of our glorious Party was opened in Tirana today.

The *Skanderbeg Square* and the streets around the Opera and Ballet Theatre, where the Congress is being held, were filled with people. The hall was packed with delegates and guests and echoed with an indescribable enthusiasm...

Speaking about the international situation and the foreign policy of Albania, in the Report which he delivered at the Congress Comrade Enver Hoxha pointed out:

The People's Republic of Albania does not accept and publicly exposes the so-called theory about the need to preserve the "balance between the superpowers" as a condition or a basis to avoid war and defend peace. It rejects the imperialist concepts on the preservation of "spheres of influence" as alleged factors for stability and security, the concepts of "limited sovereignty" and the "interdependent world," of "bipolarization," the policy of blackmail, etc. These so-called theories and doctrines invented in Moscow and Washington are meant to create a capitulationist opinion that no state or nation can live outside the domination and tutelage of one or the other superpower.

The history of Europe has proved that the "balance of forces" among the big powers has always been a weapon in the hands of the exploiting classes to suppress the national liberation and revolutionary movements. Intervention has always been a weapon of the

system of balance, to restore it when it is upset or to guard against its being upset.

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

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

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

Consistent in their Marxist-Leninist line, the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian people have been and are against the two superpowers, against predatory imperialist war, against the monopoly bourgeoisie and international reaction. Therefore, in the future, too, they will spare no effort and will fight together with all

the other anti-imperialist and anti-social-imperialist peoples, with all the Marxist-Leninist parties, all the revolutionaries and the world proletariat, all progressive people, to foil the plans and manoeuvres of the enemies and ensure the triumph of the cause of the freedom and security of the peoples.

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

VLORA, SATURDAY
MARCH 5, 1977

CHINA IS AIMING TO BECOME A SUPERPOWER

For us there is no doubt at all that China is in alliance with the United States of America. It seems that there is a secret agreement between these two countries on their joint struggle against Soviet social-imperialism. **Hence, China, which has built its strategy, or to put it better, which has altered its strategy, has taken no account of the interests of the world revolution and the peoples' liberation, but has reckoned only to strengthen itself as a great social-imperialist state.** In this framework, these two states aim to achieve the weakening of Soviet social-imperialism. This policy of China is expressed in its efforts to ensure that all the communists, the Marxist-Leninist parties and the national liberation movements in the world should consider Soviet social-imperialism, not only from the strategic aspect, but also from the tactical aspect, the main enemy, or the only enemy, which must be fought at all costs.

China has received and is receiving aid from the United States of America and from other capitalist countries of the world, both from those of Europe and from Japan. Especially now, at the start, this aid is military aid. The United States of America in the first place has supplied China with powerful computers and will supply it with more later. However, the Soviet question is restraining the United States of America in its pro-Chinese course because the Americans do not want the Soviets to become more antagonistic in their attitude towards the United States of America. **This means that American imperialism wants to have in hand "both the stick and the carrot."** It has not cut off the

carrot to the Soviet Union but has given it large credits. It is known that these large credits are not granted to the Soviet Union with no strings attached by American imperialism. With these credits it has certain definite aims and, first of all, that the Soviet Union should not be aggressive against the United States of America. This does not mean that there are no contradictions between Soviet social-imperialism and American imperialism. No, there are big contradictions between them, indeed major ones, which we must exploit. But we cannot say that agreements and understanding between these two superpowers do not exist. This is the phase of the division of the world, the division of markets. Hence, there is bitter contest in the relations between them, but there is also agreement, because otherwise there is no sense in all this great aid which the United States of America and all the other capitalist states are giving the Soviet Union, states which, as China says, are under the daily threat of a sudden, lightning attack by the Soviet army.

As the Chinese themselves say, the Soviet Union is keeping about a million soldiers on the border with China. To keep a million Soviet soldiers on the border with China means to weaken the European front, which China considers the most dangerous front in case of some attack by the Soviets.

The Communist Party of China wants all the Marxist-Leninist communist parties and the peoples of the world to adopt its strategy, the author of which is Mao Zedong. This is similar to what Khrushchev and the Khrushchevites did when they sought to impose on us the theoretical, political, economic and military theses of their 20th Congress, etc. for the strengthening of Soviet social-imperialism. Now China, too, is doing the same thing in an anti-Marxist way and for non-revolutionary aims, for its own interests as a great state. It is precisely for such aims that it seeks to impose on the Marxist-Leninists of the world a new strategy which ob-

viously cannot be called a revolutionary strategy.

When it decided to give China credits in armaments, in industry and other directions, the United States of America calculated not only the great financial profits in this, but also major political gains, because China, with its weight and influence, carries on propaganda in favour of American imperialism, presenting it as a non-aggressive power. In this way China is bringing about that the peoples, who are suffering under the economic and military domination of American imperialism, are blind to this oppression, or accept it in the face of another great danger. However, this other great danger is no greater than that with which the peoples of different continents are already saddled. It is for this reason, too, that American imperialism is financing China and will finance it in the future, too. **As long as China carries on its support of the imperialist and hegemonic interests of the United States of America, as long as China exacerbates its own conflict with the Soviet Union, and in this direction the United States of America is trying to deepen the contradictions between China and the Soviet Union, precisely the aid of American imperialism serves to fuel the flames of these contradictions.** It is for this reason that we say that the war that may be waged in Europe could also be waged in Asia, because war is the offspring of imperialism and social-imperialism. Soviet social-imperialism is a power which is inciting war, which is preparing for war, just like the United States of America, which likewise is preparing for war.

China has become entangled in the activities of these two superpowers in order to attain the objectives it has set itself to become a superpower, too. Naturally, its efforts to incite a third world war result from this, and no one knows where this war will break out, whether with this course that China has taken it will break out in Europe or in China. In any case the United

States of America will use others to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for it.

If China were a genuine socialist country guided by the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, and carried out a revolutionary policy, then it would fight on the two flanks, against the two imperialist states, but in fact it is proceeding on the opposite course. With the alliance which it is forming with the United States of America, China is courting war between itself and the Soviet Union, between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. Why do I say this? Because we can judge that at present it is the two superpowers which are fighting for hegemonic positions in the world, fighting for markets, to absorb the wealth of other peoples, but on this course on which China has set out, it too will not fail to become a third partner in these aims and this policy.

As Marxist-Leninists, we must not follow the counter-revolutionary and anti-Marxist course of China, but must follow our own Marxist-Leninist revolutionary course. By fighting for this course, we have defended Marxism-Leninism and its purity, have defended the interests of our people, the interests of other peoples, their liberation, and have tried to undermine the imperialist atomic war which may burst out amongst these three partners that are fighting for hegemony while relying on one another. The support of these states for one another is always to the detriment of the world revolution, the socialist countries and the peoples' liberation.

As Marxist-Leninists, we are against predatory, imperialist wars, whether launched by the Soviet social-imperialists, the United States of America or China, which is transforming itself into a social-imperialist great power. Therefore, as Marxist-Leninists we shall struggle against these predatory wars because such wars are always to the detriment of the lofty interests of the peoples, their liberation, independence

and self-determination, to the detriment of the triumph of the revolution and socialism in the world. Therefore, being against predatory wars we are against aggressive powers, against those who aspire to become superpowers, we are with the peoples, whom we must encourage to struggle to stop the wars, and if this main objective cannot be achieved, then they must turn them into liberation wars. The alliance of the Marxist-Leninists with the democrats and progressive patriots of each country today is based on their unity against the imperialist and social-imperialist warmongers. There is no other course, no other strategy...

TUESDAY
SEPTEMBER 27, 1977

THE MULTINATIONAL COMPANIES — A NOOSE AROUND THE NECKS OF THE PEOPLES

People of our trade organizations, the economists and all the leading comrades must acquaint themselves more thoroughly with the international situation, especially in connection with trade relations, with the import-export trade between different capitalist countries and the capitalist-revisionist countries on the one hand, and between them and our socialist state on the other hand. Now China, too, has entered the ranks of capitalist states and will aim to trade with us in capitalist forms. We mustn't have the slightest illusion about this.

We must understand that the multinational companies, which are colossal trusts, have entered into cooperation with one another, have captured markets, have toned down the competition between them to some extent and have invested their capital especially in the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries, in the countries of Africa and Asia and now also in Hua Guofeng's China. **This is a noose around the neck of the revisionist states, from the Soviet Union to Mao Zedong's China, and every year this noose is being pulled tighter.**

The revisionist states have now turned into capitalist states ruled by the powerful dictatorship of capital, which allows no protest, but imposes its decisions on the working class and people of its own country. In these countries the labour power is cheap but also the import-export trade of these countries in general is small, it is not more than 15 per cent, or 20 per cent of the total national product. In these conditions they set up joint

companies, trusts, in open or secret cooperation with the capitalist countries which hold 49-50 per cent of the shares. Hence, we may say that the capitalist trusts have captured vast markets of those self-styled communist countries. In the Soviet Union the investments of these big capitalist multinational companies are deeply implanted. Rockefeller, Shell and others have cooperated with the big oil trust of the Soviet Union in Siberia, and so on.

These countries have left the introduction of new technology and the modernization of plants and factories in the hands of these big capitalist concerns, because they are not able to pay for them with hard currency. We have seen in the press that the Soviet Union has several times tried to sell gold on the market in order to gain hard currency, dollars or convertible currencies of other states but the selling of gold on the international market has only lowered its price. Therefore, the Soviet Union is unable to buy the hard currency it needs with the amount of gold it puts on the market; hence, it has been obliged to stop the sale of gold at once and to continue to enslave the country to the foreign capital of supranational companies by accepting credits, one after another. These companies have control over Soviet factories and plants, know the cost of the goods produced and have reached agreement on the prices at which they are to be sold in the countries which have made investments for the technology, etc. These trusts have the right to sell the goods produced wherever they want to.

This activity has caused unemployment in the Western capitalist countries, for example, in the United States of America and elsewhere. Unemployment is increasing there, because these capitalist states which are under the control of these big trusts secure greater profits from investments abroad. The Soviet Union, for example, will repay these investments with high-quality

goods on the basis of pre-determined prices, while the investors, France or the United States of America, for example, have the right to sell these goods on the world market at international prices, which they themselves set and, in this way, make a double profit, a very small portion of which they pay out as dole to deceive the working class which they throw out on the streets and leave without work. China has begun to do the same thing.

When our Party declared that you could not rely on one imperialism to fight another imperialism, it had in mind precisely this enslaving capitalist line which China has begun to follow. China says that American imperialism is not aggressive and is for the status quo. Why does it say so? **Because the United States of America withdrew from Vietnam in disgrace, but the decision to make this withdrawal, which was the result of the fight put up by the Vietnamese people, was taken not by Nixon but by the big trusts of the Rockefellers and the Duponts to which broad prospects of profits were opened up both in the Soviet Union and in China.** The purpose of the visit of Nixon and Kissinger to China, the visit of Brezhnev to the United States of America and all the comings and goings of others was precisely to prepare this situation which is developing now.

It is precisely the powerful multinational companies which dictate the policy of capitalist governments and which are interested to some extent in preserving the "peace," because war ruins their plans for the exploitation of the peoples, the credits they have advanced are lost and they are not sure who will come to power after the war.

To a certain degree American imperialism is sure about the treacherous leadership of Brezhnev. It has also been studying the Chinese leadership for many years, and it is sure, and becoming more so day by day, that this leadership, too, is predisposed to favour invest-

ments of capital in China, thus American imperialism can make profits, in other words, can invade China economically just as it has invaded Yugoslavia and other countries of the world. **But, of course, this is not a calm situation for imperialism, because the peoples, the proletariat and progressive individuals see what is happening, see the scandalous colossal profits of the big capitalist owners, on the one hand, and the poverty of the masses, on the other hand, therefore, day by day they are trying to get organized against these leeches which have attached themselves to their bodies and are sucking their blood.** And the day will certainly come when quantity turns into quality. In the West workers' strikes are erupting furiously. They are powerful expressions of protest, which if given proper political direction, are bound to cause capital irreparable damage. But, in the revisionist countries and in present-day China, too, the forces exist which will overturn the situation when the peoples see more clearly that they are being led on a course of betrayal and the integration of their "socialist" states into the sphere of world capitalism.

Likewise, it must be understood that the question of the compromise in the Middle East is linked with this situation, because a war in that region of the world endangered the big multinational trusts and their states. The war of the Arab peoples was of major importance, and that is why the United States of America came to agreement with the Soviet Union and suppressed it.

The clamour about Angola, Mozambique and Portugal is a natural result of the struggle for the division of markets. But if the peoples do not organize themselves to throw off this yoke, a certain stability will be reached in this division of markets between the big imperialist powers and the multinational companies. **What, then, is the road that must be followed? The road which must be followed is the road of the political and ideological struggle, including armed struggle, of all the peoples**

and the progressive and revolutionary forces against imperialist powers, against world reaction, against capitalism, against the big multinational companies...

The contradictions between the imperialist powers in the international arena exist and will become more and more profound, the four contradictions of the present epoch* defined by Lenin and Stalin will grow deeper. These contradictions will result in the destruction of imperialism, capitalism in decay, by the revolution. We always keep them in mind and our Party fights with all its might in this direction in order to explain its correct policy to the peoples of the world.

* The contradiction between the two opposing systems — socialist and capitalist; the contradiction between labour and capital in the capitalist countries; the contradiction between the oppressed peoples and nations and imperialism; the contradiction among the imperialist powers.

FRIDAY
DECEMBER 9, 1977

THINGS THAT WE MUST KEEP THOROUGHLY IN MIND IN THE FIELD OF THE ECONOMY IN THE PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

Today I spoke with the comrade secretaries of the Central Committee of the Party about how I see some very important current economic problems of our country. They were:

1. — The fulfilment of plans, especially export plans.
2. — The world monetary crisis.
3. — Why the Chinese want to use the Swiss franc in their transactions with us.

We must devote even greater attention to the development of the economy of our country and the fulfilment of plans. We must stress this with special force at present, because the whole of our economic and cultural development is being accomplished with our own forces. But it is important that everybody understands clearly that self-reliance does not mean autarky. By pursuing the course of self-reliance in the development of the economy, we have reached that situation in which we have greater possibilities to export goods and products to other countries in such quantities that we secure more and more income in foreign currency with which we buy goods, machinery and equipment which we need but still do not produce ourselves. Autarkic development of the economy is completely different. Autarky means that you neither sell nor buy. But to develop the economy without selling things abroad you have to produce everything within the country, which would be

pure fantasy. Foreign trade through self-reliance, with our exports, is essential...

Another problem is that of the real meaning which must be given to the isolation, which the imperialists and revisionists try to impose on us. In my opinion, we should not fear a political and ideological isolation on the part of our enemies, the imperialists and revisionists. Our enemies are not in a position to impose such an isolation on us and cannot do so. If they impose or try to impose isolation on us, this they will do in the field of the economy, and precisely in the field I mentioned earlier, to hinder our import-export trade. But today we have all the possibilities to overcome this type of isolation and we must overcome it. How?

First, through the fulfilment and overfulfilment of plans, and through the production of commodities and other articles for exchange with foreign countries.

Second, we must produce, as we have always said, goods of those types and that quality which are in demand in the world abroad. The better our goods are, the more the possibilities of our country to conduct exchanges with the other countries will increase and the more widely the good name of our products will be spread.

Third, while taking account of the real pressure of the capitalist-revisionist countries, we must always bear in mind the fact that between those countries there are contradictions that we know about. Besides this, there are also contradictions between them over the question of Albania, and this is in our favour...

We must pay close attention to the present international political situation so that we are thoroughly acquainted with it. This must help us to forge ahead also in increasing trade exchanges with other countries...

Although I have read the report which the leading comrades of the Ministry of Foreign Trade have made on the insistence of the Chinese that our side agree to

use Swiss currency in our transactions with them, to tell the truth, I am still unable to understand this question, despite the discussions we have held on it. The Chinese are not raising the question of the currency for nothing. Therefore, it seems to me we must delve more deeply into this matter. If we think that this is being done by the Chinese simply for ease of accounting, since they have all their accounting in Swiss francs, this is not right. It is not simply a question of ease of accounting for the reason that in its current and future trade China cannot limit its accounting to Swiss francs alone.

The question of currencies seems to me rather complicated. I have done some study on this problem, especially since the severe monetary crisis, which has engulfed the whole capitalist-revisionist world today, began. It is known that in recent years there has been a gold standard and a hard currency standard. As a rule, the gold standard means that you can have a volume of paper money equal to your fund of gold. The Central Banks, which are national banks and have other private banks under their dependence, issue reserve currencies. They have an external exchange rate and an internal value. However, the Bank of France, for example, has cancelled the right to exchange paper money for gold. Thus, if, say, a Frenchman takes the notion to exchange the paper money he possesses for gold, as was practised in the 18th century by those who possessed money, today the big banks do not permit such a thing. Other countries have taken a similar action. The Central Bank of France maintains the parity on the foreign market, that is, it has to place in circulation a volume of francs equal to the gold it possesses. However, it happens that this Central Bank, compelled by the crisis, issues more paper francs than the quantity of gold it possesses. Then, what occurs in this case? Within the country prices begin to rise and, likewise, the attack from abroad begins, the exchange rate of the franc falls

because a parity has long been established in relation to the other currencies.

Now the countries of the European Common Market are trying to create a common monetary unit. These efforts began and are continuing, following the grave crisis which affected the American dollar. Nevertheless, this cannot stabilize the problem of the currency and its many fluctuations in the capitalist world. In this field there will still be attacks and counterattacks. Thus, for example, with the devaluation of the franc, from the sale of a commodity in France a West German, instead of getting three francs, gets seven francs and with them buys there the goods which are advantageous to him. The Frenchman can raise his prices if he likes, but in this way the established balance is further disturbed and endless difficulties are created. Therefore, the currencies in the capitalist-revisionist countries must not be regarded simply as a means of circulation in the internal or the external market. They have links with the prices in the countries which have issued them, and also with the prices of other countries with which the issuing country maintains commercial and economic links. In the capitalist-revisionist countries money plays a very important role in the exploitation and robbery of the broad working masses by the bourgeoisie of a particular country and of other countries.

Before the Second World War, a super-bank was created and imposed because the national bank of one country could not be allowed to emerge as superior to the national banks of other countries. For instance, the national Bank of France could not emerge as superior to the Bank of Germany or Bank of England. They had reached a certain agreement with one another and exchanged the paper money of each of them for gold. During the Second World War, the bulk of the gold was transferred to the United States of America because the combatant countries of Western Europe were ob-

liged to pay the United States for the armaments they received. However, matters reached the point that the banks of Europe and other countries had extremely great payment difficulties. In order to overcome this situation, in July 1944, a meeting was held at Bretton-Woods in the United States in the time of Roosevelt and an international agreement, which was called the "Bretton-Woods international monetary system" was reached, on the basis of which the gold standard was replaced with the paper dollar. This meeting set the exchange rate of 35 dollars for one ounce of gold. As a result, the other currencies, such as the pound sterling, the franc, the mark, the lira, were left behind. The United States of America benefited from this agreement, because it not only accumulated even more considerable reserves of gold from the other countries, but it also bought from them many shares in industrial monopolies and obtained all sorts of concessions in Europe and other countries thanks to the issuing of large quantities of paper dollars.

When the other countries gradually grew stronger and began to recover from the economic standpoint, they could no longer reconcile themselves to this situation. Stop, they said, where are we going? Thus, they demanded that the United States of America return to them the gold which it had taken, in exchange for dollar notes. The United States refused, saying that it did not have the gold. This conflict caused a fall in the value of the dollar so that the official price of one ounce of gold was set at 42.2 dollars instead of the previous 35 dollars. However, the devaluation of the dollar proceeded rapidly from the time when the United States of America was relieved of the obligation to convert dollars to gold. Today the dollar has no fixed gold basis, because the price of gold on the free market has risen to 70, 80, 90, 100, 110, 120 up to 170 dollars for the ounce. This is an indication of the heavy devaluation of the dollar on

the free market of currency exchanges, while between banks, the value of the dollar did not show any great decline. The “allies” of the Americans were not obliged to revalue one or more times their currencies in relation to the dollar, that is, to always set new parities which they were committed in advance to respect on the exchange markets. On the free market, however, the law of competition did its work.

Following the devaluation of the dollar, there were falls also in the currencies of other countries, such as the French franc, the Italian lira, the German mark, etc. In fact, as a result of the crisis, the “Bretton-Woods system,” with its exchange rate for the dollar, has collapsed.

But can it be said that the reign of the dollar as a reserve currency has ended? And will this role pass to another reserve currency? For this to occur all the central national banks of states must leave the parity of currencies completely free to float. But, if the dollar continues to fall, in order to avoid a major revaluation of currency, it will be necessary to intervene again to defend the American currency, and then the risk will be greater.

The United States of America has no obligation in regard to the parity of the dollar. In March 1973, the “allies” demanded that the United States of America take part in the defence of the dollar, but it replied “with what?,” because the links between the dollar as a reserve currency and the gold standard had been severed earlier. Thus, the “allies” would in no way agree that these links should be re-established.

Then, what will happen with the other currencies? The Americans will say to the Europeans and the Japanese: if you want us (the Americans) to take part in the defence of the dollar, then you must give us credits in your currencies. This, of course, is a loss for the Europeans and the Japanese, although the more serious

newspapers are shouting that the Europeans scored a “victory” over the Americans. In the final analysis, the dollar is still the only currency which can permit major manoeuvres at the level of international trade, but its reign cannot last forever. Why? Because the United States’ balance of payments may continue to go further into deficit if the central banks of other countries do not withdraw more dollars from the quantities which the United States of America leaves. Because of this deficit, the value of the American currency will suffer further falls on the international exchanges, and this means that the other currencies will be stronger rivals with the dollar.

Likewise, it is known that the fluctuations in the value of the paper currencies of various capitalist countries are important not only for the *bourse d’échange*,* but they are linked closely with credits, the sale of commodities, and many other factors, and are accompanied with grave consequences, both internally and abroad, for every capitalist-revisionist country.

Thus, at present, the “socialist” countries in general have great shortages and are in conditions that they absorb a large part, but not all, of the global overproduction of the capitalist countries. On the other hand, what is called aid to the “third world” and the credits which are provided for the revisionist states by the countries of the West are precisely for the aim of financing this absorption of the capitalist overproduction. But this absorption is partial. The remainder of this capitalist overproduction is so large that it causes unbalance and disorganization in the plans and prospects which each capitalist state seeks to achieve. For this reason, although compromises are very possible, when the so-called United Europe and the Asiatic empire dominated by Japan or by China become entities powerful

* Stock exchange (French in the original).

enough to balance North America, these compromises may no longer be possible and the final fracture of the capitalist world will be caused.

Of course, these are some incomplete, simple, general notions which I have in connection with the question of money, its role and fluctuations in the national and international market, and of the banking manoeuvres of the capitalist states. But the comrades of our bank who are engaged with the financial aspect, with the questions of the *Bourse*, the comrades of the foreign trade organizations who are engaged with the problems of international prices of various commodities, must go into them more thoroughly, must delve deeply into these problems, have a thorough understanding of their movement and the aims which the various capitalist and revisionist states with which we have trade relations are pursuing in connection with these movements...

At present the Chinese have begun to cheat, to blackmail us and are trying to impose their financial and commercial views on us. We must watch these things with great care and have no illusions. Naturally we must keep cool heads, but we must be able to understand their aims, to combat them, to state and defend our views in order to checkmate them, or to find a middle way, a way of economic and financial benefit both for us and for them, because one-sidedness in commercial relations cannot be permitted either by them or by us.

As to the question of why the Chinese want to go over to the use of the Swiss franc in transactions with us, it seems to me that this matter should be studied carefully, and the reasons found for why they are insisting on this. It is known that in the trade that others will do with China they will say that we want to buy this and that commodity and sell this or that commodity. Now let us reckon both your goods and ours at international prices.

The question arises: at the concrete present juncture which currency is falling, and which is rising? If, for example, the French franc is falling, then prices in France go up. To recover dollars France sells goods to China which, for its part, can sell them to whoever it likes, including Albania. If it buys them cheaply, China will do this and will try to sell them to us more dearly, while for our part, we must try to get them as cheaply as possible.

In this case then it is important for us to carefully determine the average of international prices and which prices we can accept. China, which plays this game, is fully informed about prices because of its large-scale trade. It knows more or less the level and stability of the prices of goods, that is, more or less recognized international prices, such as for chromium, copper, bitumen, oil and other raw materials which we export, but for many other goods which we import from China, the international prices are very variable, have no stability, especially at this moment of the crisis of overproduction. Having trade relations with many states of the world which, to avoid increasing inflation or devaluating their currencies, produce great surpluses and dump goods on the markets at cheap prices, I am speaking of bulk goods and not retail goods, China buys these. These states may sell the Chinese these large quantities of goods even more cheaply than at international prices and China, for its part, tries to trick us to make more profits and at the same time to obtain from us allegedly at international prices those goods which it needs and are valuable to it. Therefore there must be vigilance in this direction because now China is in a hostile position towards our country.

For all these reasons we must insist that the buying and selling prices are set jointly, taking the international fluctuations into account. We must know these prices well both for the goods we want to buy and for those we

want to sell. After this, before the contracts are signed, we must carefully calculate how much x or y commodity costs. X commodity costs, say 3 dollars, the other 5 dollars, a third costs 7 dollars, etc. At these prices our state buys 20 of x commodity, 10 of y commodity, 7 of z commodity, and so on. As to how you who agree to sell these goods want to make your calculations, that is your affair, do it in whatever currency you like, but these quantities of goods which I need at these average international prices come to so many thousand leks. If you want to convert them into dollars, for example, they are worth 2,000 dollars all told. If you want to convert them into Swiss francs they amount to 6,000 francs of that country. That is no concern of mine.

Why are the Chinese exerting this pressure? Can it be for ease of conversion?

It seems to me they are not doing this for this reason. They are not worried about making their calculations more rapidly with the Swiss franc, on the contrary we have to do here with definite political and economic aims. It is clear that the Chinese want to make the maximum profits out of us, to sell to us dear and buy from us as cheaply as possible. Now they are operating like capitalists, and there can be no thought of an internationalist stand on their part in relations with us.

Therefore, the situation in our relations with China is not easy. On the contrary, it is very difficult, and we must go into this matter seriously because our sales and purchases with that country make up an important part of our import-export trade. We have difficulties with the others, too, because they are all the same. The revisionists try to get the better of us either on prices or on the quality of goods, "to sell us soap for cheese" as the people say. Now China is doing the same thing as the others.

Hence, the imperialists and the revisionists are incapable of imposing isolation on our country from the

ideological and political standpoint, while they have possibilities to damage and hinder us from the economic aspect. Therefore, we must try to cope with any difficulty they will raise for us. We must thoroughly understand the importance of the fulfilment of plans, especially in the existing conditions. There is no cut-and-dried recipe for this, but it requires deep thought, sweat and the accomplishment of tasks in time, in quality and quantity, and we must make savings everywhere. We will never proceed towards autarky; it would be crazy of anyone to think of such a thing. We must work so that we can sell and create possibilities to buy, naturally to the extent that we have the possibilities. We see that the others all accept credits and are up to their necks in debt, binding their countries hand and foot to the creditors. No one buys stones because everybody has them, but they do buy chromium, refined copper etc., because they all need them. Therefore, the Party and all the cadres must be thoroughly acquainted with the situation through which we are passing and realize the tasks which emerge for each of us...

MONDAY
JANUARY 2, 1978

CARTER'S POLICY OF OUT-AND- OUT DEMAGOGY

I am reading the interview given by President Carter in Warsaw.* To a question in connection with the relations of the United States of America with the Soviet Union he replied: "During the past few months the United States and the Soviet Union have made great progress on a number of important issues, the most important of which is control over the deployment of strategic nuclear weapons." Carter also expressed the belief that the SALT would be concluded this year.

Naturally, many problems remain to be solved, admits Carter, but "during recent months we have made good progress" in this direction. Then he speaks about a number of issues, on which, generally speaking, he takes a positive view. Thus Carter says, "We have made progress in establishing principles on the basis of which nuclear tests may be prohibited altogether in the future." And he makes this declaration after both sides have conducted all their tests and have built up stockpiles of all kinds of weapons. Carter goes on, "We have made progress in regard to banning the setting up of further supplementary military bases in the Indian Ocean." And he says this after the United States of America has completed the installations it needs to dominate the Asiatic subcontinent. He goes on to say, "We (i.e. the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists) have begun talks on reducing the sale of conventional weapons to other countries," a thing which will never be realized, because it is clear to all

* On December 30, 1977, the American president Carter, who was on a visit to Poland, held a press conference.

that the business of selling arms to others in order to have them as “friends” and cannon fodder brings in colossal profits. This business is their life’s blood. Likewise Carter did not hesitate to say that in the talks with the Soviets they hoped to attain good results “regarding the prohibition of the use in the future of chemical and bacteriological means of warfare.” Everything Carter said about these things is out-and-out demagoguery.

This interview by the chief of American imperialism is, so to say, a slap in the face for the Chinese with their policy of inciting savage hostility between the United States of America and the Soviet Union. And this not from any lack of contradiction between the latter, but Carter and Brezhnev are heaping praises and flattery on each other, giving each other hope, and are not proceeding on the course advocated by Hua Guofeng, the disciple of Mao Zedong, and Deng Xiaoping, the disciple of Zhou Enlai.

In regard to relations with Sadat’s Egypt, in this interview the American president said: “Our relations with the Arab countries, including Egypt, of course, are very good and develop in harmony.” There is not the least doubt that this is so because Sadat has placed himself totally in the service of American imperialism.

Carter was lying when he said that the United States of America “does not support any Israeli military solution in the Gaza Strip or the West Bank of the Jordan River.” But the American president once again confirmed that Israel is a U.S. satellite when he said that the United States of America does not accept the creation of an independent Palestinian state, but only of a “Palestinian entity,” which would be included in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

Carter, this fascist who is shouting about human rights and poses as a defender of them, is not only trampling underfoot the rights of individuals but also denying the rights of a whole nation which for tens of

years has been existing miserably in refugee camps outside its homeland. Of course, these are the perfidious stands and villainous actions of that enemy of the peoples and rabid warmonger, American imperialism.

To a question regarding the right of the Polish people to live free and independent from the Soviet Union, Carter replied in a “democratic” way, saying that Poland, like all other countries, must be a free, independent and sovereign state! “The Polish people,” said Carter, “have remained very close to the Soviet Union since the Second World War and they belong to a military alliance, the Warsaw Pact.” With this he implied that it is up to the Polish people to decide whether or not to join NATO.

Later he did not fail to point out that “there is great religious freedom” in Poland.

Carter poured extravagant praise on Gierek and the Polish people for their heroic deeds during the war, for their great contribution to the freedom and independence of the American state in their War of Secession and mentioned a number of Poles who had fought in the United States of America, and so on and so forth in this strain.

He prattled on, also, about the question of the Helsinki Charter, enumerated, one by one, all those “rights” and “duties” that must be applied on the basis of this Charter and, especially, in connection with human rights, of which Carter and American imperialism are the greatest violators of all.

In other words, on this occasion, too, Carter expounded that same policy of out-and-out-demagogy that he has expounded in his various speeches, statements and interviews in Washington about Europe, NATO, Warsaw, Helsinki and the peoples of all continents. This policy of Carter’s is nothing but the imperialist policy of the United States of America presented in a style of high-flown demagogy and an allegedly be-

nevolent religious spirit.

The American president wants the “Pax Americana” to reign everywhere but concealed behind this “Pax Americana” lies imperialist war, the deception and gobbling up of nations, the exploitation of the sweat and blood of others. The exposure of this policy must be done actively and thoroughly. Therefore the support which the Chinese leadership gives such an aggressive policy of American imperialism, such demagoguery which is preparing even greater suffering for the peoples of the world, but which is couched in the honeyed words of a baptist, a religious zealot, who worships the dollar and violence as his god and is guided by the principle of enslaving and shedding the blood of the peoples for the benefit of the wealthy, the American magnates and their multinational companies, is a crime.

WEDNESDAY
JANUARY 25, 1978

ATTEMPTS AT CAPITALIST “STABILITY”

In the interview he gave in Beijing, Raymond Barre pointed out that China was concerned about the danger posed by the Soviet Union, but now, he said, it has changed its stand somewhat, and it no longer thinks that the Soviet Union will start a war quickly, and likewise it does not think that the Soviets will attack Europe for the time being.

Hence, we can draw some conclusions about the instability of the Chinese policy, which we have pointed out on other occasions. The policy of the Chinese leadership is anti-Marxist, pragmatic, a policy determined by passing circumstances. Even the Chinese themselves see the absurdity of their thesis that the Soviet Union is preparing to attack Europe and declare a world war. They realize that if such a thing were to occur it would involve the United States of America, too, in an atomic third world war.

This thesis of China is not finding the approval of the big Western states of Europe and the United States of America, nor is it supported by the states of the so-called third world. The United States of America has declared that it is against the exacerbation of relations with the Soviet Union. The main leaders of the capitalist countries of Western Europe, which take part in the “United Europe” and the European Common Market, also, have declared that they are in favour of détente, of agreement with the Soviet Union, and are working in this direction. These states are interested in developing economic relations with the Soviet Union and the other less developed countries of the West, on the one hand,

and on the other hand, are doing everything possible to weaken and disrupt the Soviet Union. While this policy of world capitalism is clear, the Chinese revisionists defend the thesis that the Soviet Union will attack Europe and the capitalist world, today or tomorrow, in order to establish its hegemony.

Though this thesis of the Chinese revisionists is absurd, as we have pointed out on other occasions, its purpose is to draw the forces of the Soviet Union to Europe and thus ease the situation on the border with China. Hence, the Chinese want to take the Soviet military pressure off themselves. However, the revisionist Soviet Union, as a new and powerful imperialism, is aggressive, it wants to dominate, to create markets, but at the same time, is trying to avoid the outbreak of a nuclear war.

If the Soviet Union is going to make war, it will launch it at the weakest link, so it will attack China first, and then might hurl itself against Europe and the United States of America. If the Soviet Union attacks China, the intervention of the United States of America is questionable, while if it attacks Western Europe, that is, NATO, American intervention is certain, because the USA is in NATO, a member of this bloc. Hence it is clear that if Western Europe is attacked, NATO, that is, the United States of America, is attacked.

Now Deng Xiaoping's policy aims to raise the low level of development of the economy of China and to equip the Chinese army with the latest weapons, to make it a modern army. In order to achieve these aims of his policy, Deng Xiaoping needs modern technology, time, credits and funds. China will obtain these funds and credits from abroad, but also from inside, from the sale of the country's assets.

The United States of America, the capitalist states of Western Europe and Japan are the developed capitalist countries that might provide China with credits and

invest there. For these credits and investments both the United States of America and the other capitalist countries, of course, demand guarantees and the best guarantees for them are the Chinese market, the spheres of influence in China and the subjugation of China. So, the existing façade of socialism in China will disappear. **The base and superstructure in China will assume the appearance of a capitalist socio-economic formation.**

The maintenance of a large army will bring as a consequence the backwardness of China, therefore either it will have to maintain a large number of soldiers and have a backward army or maintain an army with a reduced number of soldiers and set about its modernization. In order to achieve this, the tension with the Soviet Union, the tension on the Sino-Soviet border, will have to be eased. **Hence it is possible that China will crawl like a lizard towards a détente with the Soviet Union, that is, slide towards a certain rapprochement and improvement of relations with it.** This might be done in order to ease pressure on its border, to reduce the large number of soldiers it maintains, and possibly, also to obtain credits from the Soviet Union for the construction of the capitalist economy and the modernization of the Chinese army. So, even in such a situation, even in such a condition, China becomes the counterbalance between the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

The anti-Marxist, bourgeois and pragmatic Deng Xiaoping might very well follow this political orientation. From this point of view we can understand the conclusion expressed in the interview of the French prime minister, Raymond Barre, that China does not see an immediate war in Europe.

But why has China begun to alter its opinion? This change in the Chinese policy results from what I said above, from its aims and the course it has found for their achievement. Nothing in all this surprises us.

In the speeches he delivered, Raymond Barre did not approve the main points of Deng Xiaoping's policy and he did not fail to express his disagreement openly. He was not for the exacerbation of relations between Western Europe and the Soviet Union, but opposed to it, while Deng Xiaoping raised the problem as if relations between them are already exacerbated. However, although Raymond Barre did not approve the main points of the Chinese policy, Deng raised the question of strengthening the European Common Market, a thing which is advantageous to France, as well of strengthening friendly and commercial relations between China and France, because the latter wants to occupy an important place in the Chinese market. France will make efforts in this direction.

France is interested in China's making propaganda noises against the Soviet Union, because this propaganda, however absurd it may be, to some extent creates problems for the Soviet Union and compels it to ease the situation in Europe. Indeed, if Maoist anti-Marxist capitalist China does not perform a *volte-face* as is its custom, possibly France would like the Soviet Union to withdraw its military forces from Europe to deploy them on the border with China.

The present policy of China is adventurous. In this political chaos into which the present revisionist clique of Hua Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping has plunged it, China is trying to find a capitalist "stability."

SATURDAY
FEBRUARY 18, 1978

THE CENTRES OF THE WAR FOR PLUNDER ARE MULTIPLYING THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

True, the war with weapons has stopped in the Middle East, but now a feverish diplomatic struggle is going on there between the United States of America, Israel, Egypt, the Palestinians and other Arab countries and, behind the scenes, the Soviet Union.

Egypt's Sadat has reached agreement with Carter and each has made concessions to the other. It is said that Carter has issued an "ultimatum" to Begin that Israel must give up Sinai and remove the Jewish colonies settled on some of the occupied Arab territories. Begin seems to be kicking against this. Dayan goes to Washington as a lackey, but he, too, appears to be kicking a bit against it. Meanwhile Carter is engaged in a major game. He is supporting the governments of Saudi Arabia and Iran, obviously for the oil of those countries, trying to prevent the return of the Soviets to Egypt, trying to keep Sadat on his side and to guarantee the independence of Israel, etc.

The interests of the United States of America require a greater concentration of the weapons and diplomacy of the American government in Africa, where hot wars are going on, such as the war between Somalia and Ethiopia, etc. These are unjust, predatory wars. The Soviets are predominant in Ethiopia. They send their weapons and Cuban mercenaries who are fighting to occupy the territory of Ogaden and possibly the whole of Somalia. Somalia was formerly under the wing of the Soviets, but the United States of America intervened, of course indirectly, and Somalia let the Soviets

down and occupied the provinces of Ogaden and Harar. Fierce fighting is going on there now, but the United States of America does not like this situation. It wants Somalia under its control because it dominates the entrance to the Red Sea. Hence, the Horn of Africa, as they call it, is a strategic point and the United States of America has, so to speak, issued an ultimatum to the Soviets who are in Ethiopia, that they must not allow the Abyssinians to pass the Somali border and the Somalis must withdraw from Ogaden.

Meanwhile the situation in southern Africa remains the same as it has been. The United States of America and Britain support the reactionary, racist government of Ian Smith in Salisbury, Rhodesia, and are allegedly manoeuvring for a kind of independence and freedom, for seats in parliament for the native people, etc. Nevertheless, it is clear that Anglo-American imperialism is trying to keep these regions, especially Rhodesia, South Africa, Mozambique, etc., firmly in its clutches.

Another centre of hot war exists between the POLISARIO* Front, supported by Algeria and indirectly by the Soviet Union, and Morocco and Mauritania, supported by the United States of America and France. Hence, Africa is seething, the two superpowers are trying to establish their hegemony and dominate there.

In all these countries of the so-called third world or non-aligned world, the cannons are roaring, and the muse has been silenced. The psalm-singing of the Chinese and the Titoites has ended in fiasco, while the reality is just as our Party has defined it. None of those states is truly independent and sovereign because they are headed by cliques sold out to one imperialism or another that make the peoples shed their blood. Therefore the peoples of these countries must rise in strug-

* The Popular Front for the Liberation of Western Sahara, formed on February 27, 1976.

gle, in revolution against the local reactionary cliques and against the two imperialist superpowers and others who follow their course. Hence, life is confirming that the line we are pursuing is a correct, Marxist-Leninist line, and the Titoite, Soviet and Chinese revisionist line is a fraud.

Recently, a grave situation has been created in Cambodia and Vietnam. Those two countries are engaged in bloody fighting, and neither will give way...

We see that now China is trying to strengthen its links with Japan and extend its influence in a number of other countries. Yesterday, China and Japan signed a 7-year trade agreement which envisages exchanges amounting to 20 billion dollars.

A short time ago, Deng Xiaoping went to Burma to strengthen the friendship with Burmese reaction and to strangle the struggle of the Communist Party of Burma. He also visited Nepal in order to strengthen relations with that country, so that it will serve as a barrier for the defence of Tibet in case of an attack by the Indians. Deng will certainly go to Pakistan, also, to refresh the old friendship with Ali Bhutto. For his part, Li Xiannian toured Iran and Afghanistan to see how things are going there, because the Soviets are firmly established in those countries. Li Xiannian is to go to the Philippines soon to strengthen China's influence there. The fact that the Soviet Union has started to poke its nose into and advance credits to that country has impelled him to make this visit.

Hence we see that the Chinese policy is to try to spread China's influence quietly everywhere in the Far East. Of course this is done where the United States of America permits and China is in agreement with the USA, so that together they can resist the other imperialist superpower, the Soviet Union. But China is proceeding with its policy in Western Europe, too. It has signed trade agreements with the capitalist European

Common Market, with the big western capitalist monopolies and concerns. That was a victory for western capitalism, powerful assistance given this capitalism so that it remains on its feet and sabotages the revolution...

WEDNESDAY
FEBRUARY 22, 1978

A COORDINATED SINO- AMERICAN NEO-COLONIALIST TACTIC

The Sino-American neo-colonialist tactic is coordinated especially in Africa. The aim of these two international robbers is to consolidate their positions wherever they have them and to occupy new positions in those countries where they have nothing. Both these partners in crime against the peoples poke their noses wherever local wars between African peoples are being waged, wars incited by imperialism and social-imperialism.

Tito, the old agent of the United States of America, has washed his hands of the African continent. He no longer has any credit either in Egypt, or Algeria, let alone in Libya and Tunisia. For example Boumediene's meeting with Tito* was unsuccessful, because he asked Tito to support the struggle of POLISARIO. But Tito will not do this, because he does not want to fall out either with the Americans or with the Soviets.

The leadership of China has taken Tito's place in Africa. But Tito is known as an intriguer, as the advocate and father of the system of self-administration, the spread of which American imperialism has encouraged in Africa and will employ in other countries as well to patch over the great splits and consolidate imperialism and world capitalism. The new Chinese social-imperialism, likewise, will use this system in China and other countries, wherever it can spread its influence.

China is trying to penetrate into Africa for two aims:

* On January 14-15, 1978, the former president of Algeria, Houari Boumediene, visited Yugoslavia.

first, to sabotage the interference and establishment of the Soviets and to spread its rug to squat there itself, and second, to strengthen the positions of American imperialism there. Whereas the Soviets and Americans go to Africa under their true colours as neo-colonialists and imperialists, China goes dressed in flowery robes and with Marxist phraseology...

Is the United States of America afraid of the policy of the Chinese in Africa? For the moment no, because China does not have that economic potential, that cavalry of the dollar and Saint George to really capture the hearts of the Mobutus, Bocassas and others, but it could become dangerous to the United States of America later. Therefore, now and in the future, the USA will keep a careful eye on the extension of both China and the Soviet Union to new countries and zones. As soon as they show their claws the United States of America will cut them off, and it has always had sharp scissors for its rivals. It has the guns, the missiles, the economy, the dollars, the credits and the new technology which the Soviet Union and China need, beg for and want to possess, and so they are afraid of the United States of America.

Therefore, for the time being, the United States of America is riding both horses. Naturally one "horse," Soviet revisionism, is a bit fractious, while the other "horse," Chinese revisionism, is a lazy palfrey. It will be worked lean, too, and then the whip will crack more loudly over their backs or between them, but the revolution will whip the three of these bandits who are gambling now at the peoples' expense.

The peoples of Africa and the peoples of the world are passing through phases that are making them conscious of the need to fight all those who try to fleece and exploit them, internal and external enemies of every hue, whether American, Soviet or Chinese. The aim of all the latter is to plunder these peoples and to destroy

their autochthonous cultures, to crush them so that they cannot rise, cannot advance economically or from the cultural standpoint, and cannot raise their well-being in freedom and independence and under genuine sovereignty.

Hence, we face the task of waging a stern struggle to expose the anti-revolutionary, anti-popular aims of the two superpowers and China. We the Marxist-Leninists, our genuine Marxist-Leninist parties, in every country must coordinate our actions. We must try to make the voice of the Marxist-Leninist truth heard in all countries. We must work in such a manner that people think about our views, about the aspects of the genuine Marxist-Leninist policy of our parties. We should do everything possible to ensure that progressive representatives of different peoples come to our country to see how socialism is being built in Albania, how our economy is progressing, how our culture is being developed, how the socialist patriotism and consciousness of our people are being built up and strengthened amidst this great mire of political, ideological, economic and moral degeneration which surrounds us. We must accomplish this. This is a question of great importance.

SATURDAY
MAY 20, 1978

THE USE OF MERCENARIES ON THE AGENDA

The big imperialist powers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, as well as the French, British and other imperialists, always use mercenaries to protect their assets, or rather their companies, which exploit the former colonies that have now been transformed into neo-colonies.

It is known that the French Republic has long had a detachment which has become “famous” and is called *Légion étrangère*.* This detachment has served in Africa, in Mexico and wherever it has been needed to occupy colonies, to put down the revolts of natives and to maintain law and order in the colonies.

As is known, the French “Foreign legion” is made up of paid “volunteers,” volunteers of a new type, criminals. That is, all those foreigners who are members of this legion are delinquents, persons who have committed crimes of various kinds, adventurers, *desesperados*** who sell themselves by contracting to serve for terms of 5 to 10 years and are commanded by French officers, or foreign officers who emerge from the ranks of the legion itself.

In times gone by, most of the legionnaires were Germans, Italians, Austrians and others, drug traffickers, pimps and murderers. Since the legion was made up of such men it is obvious what morality it has upheld, what ugly acts it committed and what methods it employed wherever it was dispatched. Further explanation is unnecessary.

* The Foreign Legion (French in the original).

** Spanish in the original.

The French “Foreign legion” still exists. Indeed only two or three days ago, the President of France Giscard D’Estaing took the decision and dispatched 800 members of this legion to Katanga of Zaire allegedly because there are French citizens there, experts employed in the mines, who must “be defended” from the so-called Katangan gendarmes who have entered the country from Angola to liberate Zaire, beginning from the Shaba province. This province is the former domain of Chombe, where there are mines rich in uranium, diamonds, etc. American, British, French and Belgian companies have established themselves there, too. In other words, Katanga and the whole of Zaire is under the domination of big imperialist powers which are exploiting it.

This is the second attack on Katanga by the so-called Katangan gendarmes. Who are these Katangan gendarmes? They are nothing but mercenaries who are trained in Angola by the Soviet social-imperialists and the Cubans, and are certainly accompanied by officers of these two states. They undertake these interventions in Zaire in order to topple Mobutu and transform Zaire into an allegedly democratic, or even a “socialist” country, as they may call Ethiopia tomorrow, and place it under the suzerainty of Soviet social-imperialism.

Hence, there are Belgian and French mercenaries in Zaire at present, but Moroccan mercenaries, who were there once before, may also be dispatched there. So far the Americans have not sent their mercenaries to that country, but Carter declared that he will send means, armaments and other material assistance to General Mobutu. Likewise, China is assisting this “famous” general, and the *Xinhua* news agency and the newspaper *Renmin Ribao* are shouting about this, because China, too, is hungry for markets.

The United States of America did a similar thing in the time of President Kennedy during the attack he

launched against Cuba at the Bay of Pigs, where he sent in Cuban mercenaries trained in Miami, but on that occasion these mercenaries were defeated.

The Cuban army has now become a “Foreign legion” of the Soviet Union and is being used as a mercenary army especially in Africa, in Ethiopia against Somalia. There the Cuban mercenary troops are leading the Ethiopian troops and, at the same time, fighting to liquidate Somalia, in other words, to create a new Soviet colony there. They achieved this in Angola, where the Cubans, assisted by the Soviets, supported Neto, brought him to power, and maintain a considerable number of mercenaries there to this day to fight Neto’s opponents, that is, the tools of the Americans and the other former colonizers, in order to firmly establish the Soviet influence in that country and turn it into a Soviet market.

Similar situations are developing in Rhodesia, Zambia and in the Sudan. **The use of mercenaries has become fashionable today.** World capitalism uses mercenaries to fight the peoples who rise to win their freedom and national independence, to throw off the yoke of foreign imperialist exploiters and their local allies. The mercenaries are described as liberation armies that “defend” the sovereignty and freedom of the respective peoples. There are mercenaries, such as the Albanian mercenaries in the United States of America and elsewhere, whom our enemies are training for use at the moments they consider favourable. They are bloodthirsty elements from the ranks of Balli Kombëtar and scum from some other traitor organizations who collaborated with the Germans and the Italians during the war, and now feed from the American trough and engage in propaganda and are trained against our country. But the imperialists and social-imperialists will never get away with this in our country, either with mercenaries or even with their regular armies, if they dare to in-

fringe the independence of the borders of our socialist Homeland.

Hence, the use of mercenaries is a means which is being developed to defend neo-colonialism and to disguise the direct intervention of the armed forces of capitalist states in different countries of the world, or to conceal their aims for the redivision of markets and the occupation of territories of allegedly independent states which, in fact, are under the influence and exploitation of another imperialist state.

That is why the peoples who are endangered by the armed intervention of foreign imperialists and by the various forms of diversion now employed by foreign imperialists in collusion with the internal oppressors, must be vigilant and understand the character of the pseudo-uprisings incited from abroad with citizens and subjects of their countries. They must understand thoroughly that these political fugitives, in general, are included in the "Foreign legions" of the imperialist powers. It cannot be ruled out that some may have changed their opinions and be trying to adopt good stands but, in general, they are overwhelmed by the evil overall purpose, which is the will of that imperialist power which uses these individuals or groups to subjugate a people, to topple one leadership and replace it with another, in other words, to gain a market or regain a lost one. Therefore the people and the revolutionaries of a country like Zaire or any other, such as Angola, Ethiopia, Somalia, the countries of Asia, etc., must clearly distinguish an internal uprising hatched up by the elements of reaction and directed by the foreign powers from the uprisings carried out by the people, the true revolutionaries, the militant elements from the ranks of the people, to whom the freedom and independence of their own country is dear and who are ready to make the supreme sacrifice to win it.

The basic issue here lies in the correct political

orientations which must be given to the internal movement for liberation. The most correct and precise orientation is the Marxist-Leninist orientation. Only a genuine Marxist-Leninist party can give and apply this orientation properly.

TUESDAY
AUGUST 29, 1978

THE TRIANGLE OF SUPERPOWERS

The question of China will always concern us, because through its policy it is threatening the world with a new, predatory, imperialist world war. China has set out on this hostile course against the peoples, and without concealing its aims in the slightest is taking all the necessary measures to create the triangle of superpowers, the United States of America, the Soviet Union and itself, so the three of them will lord it over the states and peoples, suppress any revolution and national liberation struggle of the peoples and dominate the world from every point of view. This is China's aim which its leaders, from Mao Zedong to Hua Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping, have expressed openly. **Mao Zedong said that the Chinese must dominate the world.**

This view is already clear. In its policy China today is following the course of the great state, the great power, for world hegemony in the way, with the policy and with the measures through which this objective can be achieved, that is, by combatting Marxism-Leninism and socialism, and eliminating one of the superpowers.

The two superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, of course, do not like the elevation of China to the same level as them, but this does not mean that one of these superpowers, the United States of America and world capital, will not carry on their plans regarding China. They are financing China to accomplish its plans to become a capitalist power, a capitalist bastion against the proletarian revolution and national liberation struggles. Such a thing will sharpen the contradictions between China and the Soviet Union,

which have begun and will increase in the future, for the reason that the United States of America is assisting both the Soviet Union and China simultaneously. **This means that American imperialism and world capitalism provide aid to them in measured doses.** For it Soviet social-imperialism is a great imperialist power, with a powerful modernized army and industry, whereas at present China is powerful only from the standpoint of its population, because from the economic and military standpoints it is lagging far behind. And these imperialist powers, namely American imperialism and world capitalism, which are assisting China, know very well that China's program of becoming a superpower within this century will not be realized because of its great backwardness.

China, of course, will become powerful, but not to the extent that it intends and aspires to. The other capitalist powers will also become powerful during this period, provided that the policy goes smoothly for the two contenders. Marxist-Leninist science, dialectics and the historical materialist development of society teach us that situations do not develop according to the desire of imperialism, which is the final stage of capitalism. **There is no doubt that such a thing will bring about deep contradictions between the superpowers themselves and between them and the other states and peoples that are exploited by these superpowers.**

Therefore the policy of these superpowers constitutes a great danger to the world at present, because they are striving for domination over each other, of course, at the expense of the weakest capitalist states and all the peoples of the world, in general.

China is openly undertaking initial actions of a broad character for two purposes:

First, in order to ensure credits, to acquire modern technology from wherever it can, and to ensure the development of culture and education so that such tech-

nology can be employed.

Second, in order to conduct propaganda in its own favour, in favour of its American allies and the world capitalist bourgeoisie, and to provide effective aid, in this field, in favour of them and against the Soviet Union. That is why we see that China is dispatching its envoys all over the world for these two purposes. Hua Guofeng himself is doing the rounds for economic aid and for pro-Chinese and pro-American propaganda...

SATURDAY
OCTOBER 21, 1978

THE TWO SUPERPOWERS AND THE OTHER PRETENDERS FOR WORLD HEGEMONY ARE ENDANGERING THE PEOPLES

We see that the various imperialists, and in the first place, American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, Chinese social-imperialism, Japanese militarism and German revanchism are engaged in feverish activity. These imperialist powers are consolidating their strategic positions, giving importance to sophisticated armaments and the development of their economy and technology, that is, to their preparations for war with modern weapons while simultaneously preparing their support bases.

Therefore a race to make deals is going on between them. **The division of spheres of influence, or the more concrete definition of the spheres of influence of these main imperialisms, has begun and, at the same time, they are grabbing from one another, or trying to neutralize, certain zones like Africa, the Middle East, Asia, the Pacific, etc.**

We see, also, that **contrary to the Chinese view, which is a false, reactionary view, American imperialism is on the offensive, while in the existing circumstances Soviet social-imperialism is more on the defensive. Therefore American imperialism, which is dominant economically and militarily, is playing the main role in the world at present in the transactions I mentioned earlier. Likewise, this imperialism is trying to preserve its old alliances and form new ones in its favour and to the disadvantage of Soviet social-imperialism or other imperialists or militarists who could threaten Amer-**

ican imperialist power.

Of course the United States of America has great military, political and economic potential and influence in NATO. Despite its unity, however, we see that within this organization differentiation is occurring from the point of view of the influence of one state over the others.

The Federal Republic of Germany is growing stronger within NATO year by year. Its economic and political strength and its arms trade go beyond the bounds of the European Common Market and we may say that West Germany is ever more openly seeking to establish its own spheres of influence. Naturally this is not to the liking of either Britain or France, the two main partners of the United States of America in NATO.

The Federal Republic of Germany is developing very close relations with China, in particular, and it occupies the main place among the capitalist countries of Western Europe in regard to links with China. These links are not in the economic field alone. West Germany is also China's greatest and most powerful supplier of credits, technology and modern sophisticated armaments.

Britain and France, likewise, have interests in China, therefore they are developing relations with it, although China as a loyal partner of the United States of America is more interested in links with Bonn. Thus Britain and France see the Federal Republic of Germany as a danger within the alliance, because it may become even more dominant over the other partners in the alliance. Therefore we see that both the British and the French governments are speaking about friendship and relations with China, but they do not fail to stress that they want further development of their economic and friendly relations with the Soviets, too. Indeed, contrary to the Chinese view, they are saying openly that war between the Soviet Union and the United States of

America in Europe, that is, between the Soviet Union and NATO, is only a remote possibility. With this they want to tell the Soviet Union that they have no reason to attack the Warsaw Treaty countries. On the contrary they want to continue their friendship with them. Bonn is saying this, too, but it is rapidly developing its relations with China, which is presented as the main enemy of the Soviet Union. Thus the Soviet Union does not see Federal Germany in the same light as it sees France and Britain. On the other hand, in all its strategic game, the United States of America is not exacerbating its relations with the Soviet Union. It is continuing the SALT talks with it, despite Carter's declaration that he will produce the neutron bomb. Nevertheless a tendency to preserve the status quo between the United States of America and the Soviet Union can be seen.

Hence, in this direction we see that the USA and NATO are trying to preserve the status quo with the Soviet Union, of course, despite their contradictions with one another, but these contradictions are far from sufficient to justify the Chinese predictions that war is imminent in Europe.

At the same time American imperialism is supporting China so that it becomes stronger militarily and economically. In other words, **American capital is pouring into China, where many investments are being made with credits from the big American banks, and from the American state itself. At present China is receiving credits not only from the banks but also from the governments, and not just from Japan and the United States of America, but from all the big industrialized capitalist states.**

The United States of America is playing the card of China very cautiously. Likewise it is continuing to play the card of its world strategy with Japan and wants to keep the waters calm with that country, while the aid between them should be reciprocal. According to the

Americans, Japan must be strengthened and become an Israel in the Far East, in the Pacific and Southeast Asia, and why not, eventually even against China.

In this situation China signed the Treaty of Friendship and Collaboration with Japan.* But this Sino-Japanese Treaty of Friendship is and will continue to be fraught with an immense, many-sided danger with hideous consequences for the fate of the world. This will come about because an economic-military unity will be established between Japan and China, with the aim of creating separate or joint spheres of influence, especially throughout Asia, in Australia and in the Pacific basin. This unity, naturally, will begin under the umbrella of the alliance with the United States of America and will be publicized as being against Soviet social-imperialism. The truth is that this Sino-Japanese alliance has as its main aim the strangling of Soviet social-imperialism and its liquidation in Asia, Siberia, Mongolia and elsewhere, as well as the elimination of its influence throughout Asia and Oceania, and in all the ASEAN countries.

This is the grand strategy of American imperialism, but at the same time, also of Chinese imperialism and Japanese militarism. The United States of America will try to keep the balance of Chinese and Japanese power, which is building up, in its favour, but one fine morning this balance will slip from the hands of the Americans. Thus the imperialist, militarist Sino-Japanese unity will become a danger both to the United States of America and to the Soviet Union, because the interests of Japan and China, those two big Asian imperialist countries, for domination of this huge sphere of influence and the simultaneous weakening of both American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, coincide. Hence, we shall see a relatively rapid development of many chan-

* In August 1978.

ges in this zone...

The United States of America is trying and will go on trying to assist China and Japan with the aim of keeping them under its direction, to strengthen its alliance with them and hurl them against the Soviet Union. This is one possibility. But there is also the other possibility that one day the diabolical, hypocritical imperial policy, which is unprincipled and in the imperialist-militarist spirit, of these two great powers, which were helped to revive, will turn against the USA, just as Weimar Germany did in the past, when, after becoming a terrible fascist power in the time of Hitler, it attacked the allies of the United States of America and the USA itself. These two "superpowers" that are being created in Asia are a similar danger to the United States of America. Likewise, we shall see mounting contradictions among the ASEAN countries, as well as between Japan and China, together and separately, between those two and the United States of America, between those two and the Soviet Union.

With the aid of the Soviet Union and the United States of America, India, which is a huge country with colossal human potential, will try to become a superpower with the atomic bomb. It will try to further increase its military and technological potential in the rivalry between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, and will be an important objective for both superpowers which have their separate and common interests for the future in the course of possible changes in the alliances.

At present China has no influence at all in India. On the contrary. However it wants to begin to have somewhat better diplomatic relations with that country. On the other hand, India has major pretensions in regard to Tibet. India will fight to liquidate even what slight influence China may have in Pakistan, because Pakistan, too, is a strategic country bordering on Iran

and Afghanistan, and that is where interest in the great Middle East oil basin begins. Of course American imperialism is dominant in the Middle East, while China has just begun to poke in the tip of its finger, but it is unlikely that it will penetrate there. It will pursue a policy against the interests of the Arab peoples and in favour of American interests. The United States of America will help China to become, together with such countries as Iran, Saudi Arabia, etc., a powerful barrier against Soviet political-economic and military penetration in this zone which is vital to American imperialism and European imperialism, since we may regard "United Europe" linked with NATO as a new imperialist grouping in the course of creation, despite its many internal contradictions.

As a conclusion, we may say that **at present American imperialism exists and likewise Soviet social-imperialism exists, but there is also "United Europe" linked through NATO with the United States of America.** The imperialist tendencies of the countries of "United Europe" are not concentrated but separate, and like the other imperialists, impelled by necessity, they could become a threat to the world from the political-military aspect.

On the other hand, we see **Chinese imperialism which is rising and Japanese militarism which has already risen. These two imperialisms are joining together in an alliance in order to form an imperialist power in opposition to the others and then, in the future, India, too, will rise** and have its pretensions for the others' spheres of influence, particularly in Asia. In these conditions the great danger of a world war will be increased.

The current alliances exist, but they will continue to develop or shift. They will continue to shift in the sense of change of direction, but not in their content. Until they are wiped out altogether, the imperialist powers

I mentioned above will remain imperialist and war-mongering and will go on trying to embroil the world in a great atomic war.

At present social-imperialist China is striving in many directions. First, in the internal direction, in order to create a fascist unity and to ensure the domination of the Chinese capitalist bourgeoisie over the Chinese people, and it is trying to do this through violence and oppression. It will give this unity a false democratic form after it has unified the army and its support base to serve its plans of invasion and oppression.

The current tactic of the imperialists is to deceive progressive mankind, to deceive the peoples and to spread the fear of a new, bloody war, to crush any resistance among the people, any national liberation struggle under the pretext that any revolutionary act is allegedly an act of gangsters, a terrorist act which disturbs the “peace” and “tranquility” and is a breach of democracy, naturally, bourgeois democracy. They base this theory of theirs, also, on actions instigated and organized by the espionage agencies of the imperialist countries, such as the CIA, the KGB, the Chinese “security service,” the Japanese “security service,” etc. All these offsprings of capital organize bands of terrorists who kill, maim and persecute revolutionary elements of the peoples, the Marxist-Leninists in order to discredit and attack them.

All the imperialists, jointly and individually, have found various forms to keep the peoples in bondage, to suppress and discredit the revolution, the Marxist-Leninist theory and, particularly, Leninism which is the true Marxist theory in action in the present epoch of imperialism in decay, in the epoch of proletarian revolutions.

It is clear to us and to all the peoples that the road of revolution is not easy. Many regressive forces are operating against it in the world. In every country

these forces, both external and internal, have disguised themselves and are in unity and divergence with one another. They are in unity to keep the peoples in bondage to world and local capital but are in divergence to extract the maximum profits for themselves from the sweat of the peoples and the enslaving loans which the most powerful advance to the weaker.

It is true that this global strategy of world imperialism is being followed by great powers with mighty economic-military and political-demagogic potential. But our glorious strategy of the revolution, the great theory of Marxism-Leninism, also exist. **The fire of the revolution is burning everywhere in the hearts of oppressed peoples who long to win freedom, democracy, true sovereignty, to take power into their own hands and embark on the road of socialism by destroying the imperialist powers and their local lackeys.**

We Marxist-Leninists who are in the forefront of the revolutionary struggle which is being waged today between the proletariat and the oppressed peoples who aspire for freedom, on the one hand, and the savage greedy imperialists, on the other hand, must thoroughly understand the aims, tactics, means and forms of struggle of our common enemies and the particular enemies of each country. We cannot see this properly if we do not rely on our Marxist-Leninist theory of the revolution, if we do not see that in the present situation and the situations that will develop in the future, there are a series of weak links in the world capitalist chain. The revolutionaries and the peoples, separately and simultaneously, must carry on uninterrupted activity, wage a courageous, relentless organized struggle to break the links of the chain one after the another. This, of course, requires work, struggle, sacrifice and self-denial. The peoples and courageous individuals, guided by the interests of the revolution seen from the standpoint of our Marxist-Leninist theory which opens to the peoples the

way to the fulfilment of their aspirations, can and will face up to these mighty forces of imperialism and reaction that are rising, joining with one another in new alliances, and seeking solutions to the difficult situations that are being created for them. The difficult situations for these regressive forces are created by the peoples, by the exposure of the various imperialist theories and actions, by the Marxist-Leninists in all countries and on all continents.

Therefore, we must carry out our actions and express our opinions openly, fearlessly, without hesitation, regardless of the sacrifices. In this way we contribute to that great struggle which the peoples are waging and must wage against their capitalist-imperialist oppressors, whom we must never for one moment allow to do what they like and concoct plans and intrigues to the detriment of the peoples of the world.

The Soviet, Titoite, Chinese and Eurocommunist modern revisionists are playing a Machiavellian role in aid of imperialism and world capitalism. Therefore we must expose them, too, with the same force, relentlessly, in every action of theirs. Nothing must seem too much for us to do in our struggle and we must not proceed from the mistaken idea that, since we are a small country and Party, we should not speak out and tell the truth because others will call us conceited. Certainly they will call us conceited, because the truth and the correctness of the ideas expressed by the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian state are not to their advantage. They have many arrows in their quiver to throw at us, but we have a very strong shield against their poisoned arrows and our shield is and always will be the unity of the Party, the unity of the people with the Party and Marxism-Leninism which always guides us in our titanic struggle.

SUNDAY
OCTOBER 22, 1978

A POLISH POPE AT THE HEAD OF THE VATICAN

A new Pope in the Vatican. He is a Pole, the former cardinal of Cracow, the famous centre of Polish Catholicism. As everyone knows, the Church has exceptionally great influence in Poland. Poland is second only to Italy in matters of religion. The Polish cardinals, headed by Wyszynski, have stood up to all the pseudo-communist, pseudo-socialist governments in Poland under Ochab, Gomulka, Gierek, etc., etc., and have gained great privileges. Recently, Gierek has given them a completely free hand: Wyszynski makes the law in Poland. The state there has not only left the believers free to fill the churches and cathedrals, but it pays for the building of new churches instead of halls of culture.

Therefore, the advent of a new Pope to the head of the Vatican is not only of great importance for the Roman Catholic religion, but it has to do with a specific political aspect. The new cardinal, Wojtyla, who took the name John Paul II, will pursue a Roman-Christian international policy. Now, for the first time in four centuries, the Pope elected to head the Vatican is not an Italian, but precisely a Pole. I think the advent of this Pope to the head of the Roman Catholic Church is the work of the CIA, the United States of America, of Brzezinski, this Pole who is actually adviser to the American president on national security.

His predecessor, John Paul I, the former cardinal of Venice, was found dead in his bed one morning only one month after he was elected "unanimously," as they say, by the conclave. They said he "died suddenly," but it is possible that neither his election nor his death were

normal. This might have been a cleverly arranged manoeuvre, because the deceased was not very old and did not suffer from heart disease. A tactic was employed so that his election would seem in order, very satisfactory, without opposition, but then they secretly sang *de profundis* over him in order to bring the new Polish Pope, the Pope appointed by the United States of America to the head of the Vatican, the man who, with his policy will serve American imperialism first of all. The election of this new Pope will have an influence in many countries of Europe and the world, especially to build support for imperialism and to deceive the proletariat and the peoples. This event will exert a major influence in Poland as well as in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and France, where the bourgeoisie is pleased that the Roman Church is not headed by an Italian cardinal. On the other hand the Italians are very disappointed, especially the Christian Democrats and the whole bourgeoisie of that country, all the different parties of the Italian bourgeoisie and the Italian Catholics, because the Pope is no longer theirs, a Pope from the Italian Church, but one of Polish citizenship who has the backing of the United States of America...

SUNDAY
DECEMBER 31, 1978

ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION DURING 1978

Tomorrow begins the new year. This is the last day of 1978 so we can sum up the situation of world strategy in general and of the superpowers in particular.

The two major nuclear powers, American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, are continuing to arm themselves. Regardless of some agreements they have signed and some SALT projects which are not being realized, the fact is that these two superpowers are trying to consolidate their international positions and forestall the danger of a nuclear war. Naturally, neither the Soviet Union nor the United States of America wants this war, but the deepening of the crisis will bring about such a situation. The war could start with conventional weapons but turn into a nuclear war later.

Therefore, besides increasing its armaments, the Soviet Union is trying to consolidate its "alliances" with the countries of "people's democracy" through the Warsaw Treaty and COMECON. In fact those countries are occupied by the Soviet Union which considers them as a *glacis* between it and Western Europe. Today the Soviet Union is a social-imperialist revisionist country. The laws of a socialist state do not operate there. Irrespective of what they say, the Russians, the "White Russians," dominate in the Soviet Union. Hence the consolidation of the Leninist-Stalinist Soviet Union, the unity and solidarity that existed in the war against the Hitlerites, cannot and do not exist any longer in that country in the face of a new world war. There is unrest in all the republics of the Soviet Union, indeed, in time of crisis they may not go to war against a possible in-

vader in unity. It is revisionism which has caused this possibility of division. That is one aspect.

The other aspect is that the Soviet Union is facing many dangers today, but especially on two fronts: on the front of Western Europe, NATO, in unity and military and economic alliance with the United States of America; and in the East, on the Sino-Japanese front behind which the United States of America is lurking again.

Thus today the Soviet Union finds itself between two fires, especially in Asia. Now China is arming very rapidly, aiming to attack the Soviet Union, provided, of course, that the situation continues as it is, because we may also see a change in the Chinese policy towards the Soviet Union, that is, the creation of a situation in which the issues will not be presented as they are today.

Nevertheless, the signing of the Sino-Japanese Treaty and the close rapprochement of China with the United States of America, with the countries of the European Common Market and world capital make the threat of war against the Soviet Union on the Asiatic front more imminent. Therefore the Soviet Union must smash this front now, while it is not yet consolidated and has not become dangerous for the outbreak of a frontal war. For this the Soviet Union may take advantage of the present weak state of China and the inability of the United States of America and the countries of Western Europe to make the law everywhere. It has begun to gather round itself a number of states linked with it in one form or another, with the view to extending its domination to other countries, just as its rivals want and are attempting to do.

We observe that the Soviet Union is trying to penetrate into Africa, the Middle East, Afghanistan, Pakistan and possibly also into India. Likewise we see that it is strengthening its links with Vietnam and Laos at the moment. This constitutes another Soviet *glacis*, but

also a point for an eventual attack against China from Southeast Asia.

Despite the words being said, if the situation is studied in detail, it emerges that neither the United States of America, the Soviet Union, nor the states of "United Europe" are able to make the necessary investments on the African continent. According to statistics, "United Europe" ought to invest at least 15 billion dollars a year in Africa as a whole, while it is able to invest no more than 3 billion dollars. France, which is pursuing a policy of closer links with Black Africa, invests most on that continent. This is because of its old colonial links with those countries, which are publicized as allegedly cultural, social, economic links and so on. And France tends to influence the European Common Market and together with it to create the Euro-African bloc since Africa is a continent of great importance, not only to them, with a sparse population and immense amounts of raw materials. In general Africa is little exploited, nevertheless Southern Africa supplies Europe with many materials, indeed with important strategic materials.

But the problem remains that the present level of investments by "United Europe" is very low, therefore the tendency of the states of "United Europe" is to establish links between Northern and Southern Africa and to prevent both the Soviet Union and the United States of America from getting their clutches on the African continent. This is causing contention between the two superpowers and the states of "United Europe," jointly and separately.

As regards the investments of the Soviet Union in Africa, they are minimal, but recently it has begun to get a military foothold there, is seeking naval bases, and has also intervened with its armed forces, as in Angola together with the Cubans, in Ethiopia and Eritrea, in Somalia, in Aden and elsewhere. Thus the Soviet

Union is acting in two directions: to create a Soviet *glacis* and breach the militant unity that is being forged and developing on both its flanks. The Soviet Union will do a similar thing both in Europe and in Asia Minor. And in fact it has set about this task, although it has suffered some defeats. At present, however, the Mediterranean assumes great strategic importance for the Soviet Union because there it hampers NATO, could endanger the army of this pact in a conflict with it, and at the same time, bars the way for "United Europe" to bring about an eventual Euro-African unity.

Thus, by insinuating itself in many ways, with investments (but, as I pointed out, these are small), with propaganda or diversion, the Soviet Union, for its part, is striving to have Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan, if not completely, at least three quarters, on its side; the problem is that these countries should not be dangerous for it, but its allies in a war against the East, that is, in a war against the three: China, Japan, the United States of America, or to be able to create a great *glacis* in all this zone, including the Persian Gulf, Pakistan and India and weaken the encirclement around it.

Meanwhile the United States of America, for its part, is trying to finance and arm China in order to have it as a permanent threat to the Soviet Union, which will try, at least, to defend its empire, Siberia, Mongolia and Central Asia, or "to withstand" an attacker, of course, strengthened with great military and economic potential by having super-industrialized militarist Japan armed to the teeth, on its side.

In its conflicts with the Soviet Union, the United States of America will also try to protect the Indian Ocean, to have India and Burma on its side and prevent the infiltration of the Soviet Union either into Oceania or, by land, into all that belt which leads to the Persian Gulf and Central Asia.

Hence the present situation looks like this: Feverish

war preparations; the imperialist states, first of all, the United States of America, the Soviet Union and China, are continuing to arm themselves. The contradictions among them are becoming more acute and, in order to avoid a general nuclear war, they incite local wars. The Soviet Union is trying to reach a *détente* with the European Common Market and NATO, and also trying to tone down its contradictions with the United States of America, and pursuing a policy of splitting fronts. Likewise Europe, to which the Soviet Union poses a great danger, does not want to get burnt. It is ready to urge others, especially the Sino-Japanese eastern front, to clash with the Soviet Union and pull the chestnuts out of the fire for it. That is why we see that the investments and trade exchanges between the European Common Market and the Soviet Union are not hampered; they are developing, not only with the Soviet Union, but also with its allies, the eastern satellites, members of the Warsaw Treaty.

Meanwhile in Africa the situation is still unclear because the “free” and “independent” African states are ruled by the cliques of the big bourgeoisie, the big chieftains and feudal lords linked, naturally, with those who give them most. And these, first of all, are the British, the French, the West Germans, the Americans, and then the others, while China gives them nothing at all. Hence it has scarcely gained a foothold there. It needs a long time to penetrate into Africa. In that zone China plays the role of the gramophone record for all. It supports the United States of America and “United Europe,” and begs them to help it with whatever they can, and not to give the Soviet Union credits so that it is weakened. Indeed the Chinese have declared this.

Thus it seems to me that now, on the eve of the New Year 1979, the current situation is fraught with dangers, is turbulent, but at the same time it is revolutionary, that the policy of the big imperialist-revisionist powers

is not acceptable to the peoples, who are kept under their bondage and dictate with force. The peoples understand their intrigues, manoeuvres, strategy and tactics and are not sitting idle. The people's liberation movements are building up and bursting out openly but are still weak. These outbursts may be momentary, may be short-lived, but still they are outbursts which serve to weaken the great powers and prevent the outbreak of a new world war.

We must work and struggle in this direction to extend our contacts with the broad masses of the peoples of the world as much as possible. By linking ourselves closely with the Marxist-Leninist parties, with progressive individuals and, through them, directly with those peoples, we will carry to them the opinion of socialist Albania and the Party of Labour of Albania.

SATURDAY
MARCH 3, 1979

IMPERIALIST PLANS AND TRICKERY

The war against Vietnam is continuing, indeed it is becoming fiercer.* For the first time the Chinese issued a communiqué and showed a three-minute telefilm for the whole world to see. They transmitted this telefilm for the Chinese people, too. It was terrible to see it! It seemed as if they were fighting against German nazism. Fire poured from the barrels of heavy guns and rocket launchers, turning the sky to flames. These were the artillery shells of Deng Xiaoping's China which were being poured upon Vietnam to kill its people and destroy the country. Meanwhile the Chinese communiqué with the vilest hypocrisy that could exist in the world said that China had no motive other than "to teach Vietnam a lesson" (with artillery fire on the Vietnamese people!) and that allegedly it has no need for even an inch of its territory.

On the other hand, China says that it is ready to hold talks with Vietnam and sign an agreement, but naturally it wants to do this while keeping its troops in Vietnam, that is, to impose its conditions on Vietnam through force of arms. To this end the Chinese government has sent a note to Vietnam, which has replied that it is willing to come to terms with them, on condition that all the Chinese troops down to the last soldier are withdrawn from Vietnamese territory. But the Chinese hypocrisy is like that of the Americans who on the one hand continued the war to bring Vietnam to its knees, while on the other hand launched test balloons, saying

* On February 16, 1979, China began its aggression against Vietnam.

that they were ready to sign the ceasefire. Johnson did this, Nixon did this, and this is what Deng Xiaoping is doing at present.

However, no one believes China's words. China is reinforcing its troops on the border and in the regions it has occupied in the north of Vietnam. There are rumours that the Chinese have captured the town of Lang Son...

Anything could happen with the great Chinese adventurer, Deng Xiaoping. As I have said before, he is trying to incite a major world war, which might break out in Southeast Asia, and then spread to Western Europe. This, of course, is a plan coordinated with the Americans. For the moment their plans are for hotbeds of war in various regions of the world, which might one day lead to world war. The Americans think that an involvement of the Soviet Union in a war with China would ease matters for them on the Eastern front and if the Soviet Union were to attack Western Europe, too, then it would be easier to defeat it, because in a world war the Soviet Union would find itself encircled.

However, it seems the Soviets did not fall into the trap. In the speech Brezhnev made to the electors he condemned China in just two or three lines, saying that it must withdraw from Vietnam immediately. Brezhnev said nothing about the United States of America, but he declared that the Soviet Union proposes to sign a treaty of collaboration, non-aggression and peace with Western Europe. In this way he is telling the European states that the Soviet Union does not intend to attack Western Europe as the Chinese and world reaction say in their propaganda. On the other hand, Brezhnev said that he is ready and willing to meet Carter in order to sign the treaty on the SALT-II, describing it as good, although not as complete as they would like. Thus Brezhnev isolated China with this policy.

This Soviet manoeuvre has also frustrated the plans

of American imperialism which has given its approval to the attack which Deng Xiaoping made; indeed it has urged it with the aim of angering the Soviet Union and making it much more hostile in its relations with China. The United States of America wants to become China's greatest supplier of modern weapons and to embroil the Soviets and the Chinese in war with each other during which they will be weakened so that the United States will remain the only superpower to make the law in the world. Likewise, the United States of America thought that weakening the Soviet Union in an eventual conflict with China would make it unable to open a second front in the West, that is, in Western Europe, and then the Americans would have their hands free to penetrate into the Central and Eastern Europe with allegedly peaceful means and liquidate the power of Soviet social-imperialism in that region.

If China continues its war against Vietnam for long, then in its present circumstances it will suffer the greatest defeat ever suffered by a world imperialist state.

If the United States of America, Japan and the countries of Europe continue to urge China not to stop the war for the occupation of Southeast Asia, then this presents dangers for American and world imperialism, because, although they rely on American aid, the ASEAN countries want to preserve the "independence" of the countries that comprise this organization, hence will not allow the Chinese expansion. But even the capitalist countries, headed by the United States of America, will not want any further Chinese expansion because, if China continues this predatory war, then it is possible that the Soviet Union will create major disturbances in Iran, a thing which would be a major catastrophe for American imperialism and world capitalism because of the oil. If this happens the entire oil basin, that is, the Middle East, will be involved in disturbances and revolt, or in a conflict that could not be easily settled.

In this case, American, British and other imperialisms would have to go to war against the Soviet Union.

Perhaps the Soviet Union will not move into Iran with military force, but it is possible that through Azerbaijan, with the Azerbaijanis, the Kurds and the “Tudeh” Party, it will create great difficulties for Ayatollah Khomeini, indeed it might tip him out and seize power as it did in Afghanistan. In this way a unified bloc of states: Iraq, Iran and Afghanistan, in favour of the Soviet Union will be created.

India, naturally, is opposed to China’s actions. It will rely heavily on the Soviet Union, but also on the United States of America, provided the latter does not continue to help China in its plan to occupy other territories in Southeast Asia and does not allow it to move towards Burma, Bangladesh and India to emerge on the Indian Ocean.

Therefore Deng Xiaoping’s adventure, a fascist venture of the Hitler type, is now in an impasse. China must either withdraw from Vietnam in disgrace or it will continue to commit brutal provocations as a big imperialist state. In reality it is an imperialist state, in its aims, but does not possess the means, and when you lack the means you cannot realize the aim, thus it will suffer the most ignominious defeat.

SUNDAY
MAY 13, 1979

AN AGREEMENT WHICH DOES NOT PROHIBIT THE CONTINUATION OF THE NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS RACE

The two biggest imperialist powers of the world, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, are raising a loud clamour in connection with disarmament, especially in nuclear weapons.

Finally it was announced that the SALT-II agreement, which had been talked about for a long time, had been concluded in Washington between the representatives of the United States of America and ambassador Dobrynin of the Soviet Union. After being signed by Brezhnev and Carter, this agreement has to be ratified by the American Senate and the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union.

Brezhnev is tongue-tied and can hardly speak, Carter is singing but, in any case, both imperialisms are keeping their eyes and their gullets open and have taken all measures to ensure continued production of their nuclear armaments, irrespective of such agreements. Both Carter and Brown, the U.S. State Secretary of Defence, as well as Brzezinski, have declared that with the signing of the SALT-II agreement nothing has changed, because the United States of America has taken all measures allegedly to defend itself against Soviet social-imperialism. In other words, they have stacks of nuclear weapons, just as the Soviet Union has.

As these leaders of the United States of America repeat at press conferences, the essence of the matter is that the American Senate ought to approve this agreement, should be content and not complain about it, be-

cause such a thing is in the interests of the United States of America. Carter says that, of course, the SALT-II agreement does not fulfil all the desires of the United States of America, but it is better than nothing.

The purpose of the SALT-II agreement is to maintain the balance of nuclear power between the two superpowers, i.e., they should proceed parallel with each other in their atomic and nuclear armaments, as well as in sophisticated secret weapons. That is why they signed this agreement, so as to have the right to conduct observations, either inside the respective country or from the adjacent bases that both of them have, in the territories of other neighbouring states, hence, to control from the air, sea and land whether one partner or the other invents or creates a new weapon, or increases the number of weapons it already possesses. As to how effective such a thing will be, this we shall see, but this does not prevent either one or the other from violating this agreement, openly or secretly, and when this violation is discovered, both of them have the means, the methods and the technology ready for the production of the same weapon. The two superpowers are working night and day to this end.

Why was the SALT-II agreement signed? In the first place, it was signed to deceive the peoples who have risen and are struggling in various ways against American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and all those who possess atomic bombs, demanding the destruction of these weapons. However such a thing can be achieved only through the revolutionary strength of the peoples, through uprisings in every country, a thing which will not be achieved everywhere at the same time. But the world is coming to the boil and in different countries “the lid of the pot” will be blown off one day.

The great world crisis which is all-sided, political, military, financial and a crisis of overproduction, com-

pels the two superpowers to restrain their military expenditure to some extent... This restraint may be temporary, because as yet there is not the slightest sign of any easing of the crisis visible on the horizon. Indeed, the contrary is occurring in all the capitalist countries. The problem of energy has become a very acute problem, so much so that all of them, individually or collectively, in the European Common Market, in the United States of America, in South America, etc., etc., are holding meetings and taking decisions to reduce the consumption of energy, that is, of oil.

Hence, oil is a very dangerous weapon for capitalism, the imperialist states, the “modernized” states which have a high level of technology. Without energy, i.e., without liquid fuel, everything will be brought to a halt.

In Iran the people overthrew the Shah and with their strikes the workers ensured that oil no longer flowed to the United States and the other capitalist countries in the quantities they used to receive in the past. The reduction of oil supplies from Saudi Arabia and the whole Middle East in general has compelled the United States of America and the European states to take measures. The Soviet Union, also, is taking measures to make savings and increase its profits. It has turned off the taps to its satellites and a drop of oil is a drop on their heads, for which they have to pay dear. The Soviet Union is holding on the reserves for bad times and is not greatly concerned whether its satellites or the other countries its supplies are short of oil.

Thus, throughout the world a great number of factories have been closed down, millions of cars have been locked up in garages, while buses and trains have been put in circulation. This solution, however, has brought about another crisis, the coal crisis. Coal, which had been neglected hitherto, is somewhat in demand again. The producing countries are selling it at a high price.

As to the response to the signing of the SALT-II agreement, we can say that some like it, and some do not like it. For example, the French government did not like this agreement. In the time of De Gaulle, France developed its own atomic deterrent to avoid remaining under the American umbrella or even in close collaboration with it, as Britain did. De Gaulle knew that in case of an eventual war in Europe France would be unable to take any initiative, because the United States of America would press the button to drop the atomic bomb, and then only when it saw that its interests were threatened, regardless of the interests of France. Hence, De Gaulle broke away from the United States of America and France continued to develop the atomic weapon independently.

Now Jean-François Poncet, foreign minister of France, has declared that France will not adhere to the SALT-II agreement, it will develop the atomic weapon outside this agreement for its own interests and defence. In other words, Giscard D'Estaing and his government do not agree to wear the shackles of the two super-powers which have extremely large stockpiles of atomic weapons and bombs. On the other hand, West Germany, through its chancellor Schmidt, has approved the SALT-II agreement.

It is clearly apparent that the United States of America and West Germany are closely linked with each other. The United States considers West Germany as its outpost in Europe in case of a nuclear war with the Soviet Union, Britain has not yet declared its attitude to the SALT-II agreement, but the new conservative prime minister, Margaret Thatcher, implies that Britain is going to develop its own atomic weapon... Thatcher gave the reason that Britain wants to have its own weapon in order to defend itself against any eventuality.

Of course, the peoples of the world are not deceived by the SALT-II agreement. Those who signed this

agreement will certainly eulogize it in flowery terms, but lurking behind it there are other secret agreements and numerous protocols which testify to the bargain struck between the United States of America and the Soviet Union on many questions to do with nuclear and conventional weapons.

Carter is worried and points out that the relations between the United States of America and the Soviet Union will be greatly embittered if the American Senate does not ratify the SALT-II agreement on the limitation of secret and strategic weapons. Carter claims that this agreement is the best that could be achieved, although, of course, it is not perfect. According to him, if the senators do not accept this agreement, such a thing will have the most disastrous consequences for their country and for peace in the world.

WEDNESDAY
JUNE 13, 1979

A FORMAL PARLIAMENT

The European Parliament was elected after a feeble propaganda campaign. The participation in the election was a real fiasco, because in all the West European countries which form this common European Parliament, the percentage of electors who cast their votes was very low.

The highest percentage of electors who voted, 65 per cent if I am not mistaken, was in West Germany but it was still far from the percentage of electors who voted in the general elections for the Bundestag, which was as high as 90 per cent. In France about 55 per cent cast their votes while Britain had the lowest percentage.

The general impression created is that there is very little interest in this parliament and it is only of formal importance. As to what competences this parliament will have over the various countries, that we shall see later, but as far as we can see these competences consist in the increase in the number of members from 200 to 450. They increased the number of deputies to this European Parliament so that it would suit "United Europe" and the so-called government of "United Europe"!

Of course this parliament will assume some general competences of no great consequence and will not impose any opinion or action on any member country. Each of these states has its own parliament and government which take orders from the capitalist bourgeoisie of their own countries, from the trusts and concerns of the particular country and from the joint companies on the basis of the shares they hold, which exert their influence on the individual parliaments and governments of each state of "United Europe."

There is no doubt that this organism called "**United**

Europe” has a reactionary character and the efforts of this union are based on eliminating the competition between member states to some extent, if this is possible, opposing the development of one country in advance of the others, and on each country capturing foreign markets, regardless of the decisions they have taken to act in unity, because, in fact, this unity must be understood as a great disunity, and so on.

“United Europe” is a political-organizational-economic organism of the big concerns and joint companies of those states. These concerns and joint companies, in other words, the capitalists or the big sharks, are making deals and will go on making deals using the organisms of “United Europe” as means of struggle for domination. This is precisely how the cooling which is observed on the part of France in regard to “United Europe,” the European Parliament, etc., can be explained, because France sees that this “United Europe” is dominated and will be dominated by Federal Germany, and France does not like this domination. American imperialism, on the other hand, does not like “United Europe,” the Parliament and the government of the “United Europe,” or the European Common Market, because, in any case, any “unity” of these joint companies, of these concerns, regardless of the fact that the Americans are deeply involved in them, will cast some slight shadow over the American expansion. In West Germany and in the European countries, individually and perhaps jointly, too, the United States has powerful rivals, and this does not please it, either.

But like all the other imperialist states, the USA pursues the policy of “divide and rule” because if these states are divided it can out-manoeuvre them more easily than if they are united. So the United States does not want another not yet consolidated power, such as “United Europe,” to be built up as an opponent or a rival to challenge its policy and its political and eco-

conomic potential.

And of course, during these parliamentary elections we saw that Carter took draconian measures in regard to oil, something which has dismayed and angered the Europeans. Indeed West Germany sent Schmidt in person, and France sent François Poncet, to the United States of America on this issue. Apparently the actions of the United States of America in regard to oil and energy cause greater damage to Bonn than to France. This can be seen from the level of the delegations sent to discuss the problem with Carter. We shall see how things will develop later, but in any case, if the United States of America applies the measures it has adopted the contradictions will be deepened.

The Soviet Union, too, does not find the European Common Market to its liking not from the ideological aspect, of course, because the present-day Soviet Union is just as capitalist as the member states of this market are, but it, too, sizes things up and sees that now it is facing a Europe which is more united and not divided, therefore its manoeuvres will be of two kinds: smiles to and negotiations with “United Europe” and also with each individual member country. Of course the Soviet revisionists pose as if they are fighting this “European union” from allegedly Leninist ideological positions. Nevertheless, in general, it must be said that such an organism is not to the liking of the Soviet Union.

Hence, as a conclusion, we shall see that, irrespective of the contradictions between individual countries, contradictions will emerge also between groupings, between imperialist forces such as American imperialism, the imperialism of “United Europe,” Soviet imperialism and Chinese and Japanese imperialisms in the Far East, etc.

It has also been reported, although, according to the news agencies only by one European newspaper or a Chicago banker, that the United States of America,

China and Japan are going to set up an American-Asian common market. Of course this is not true. Such a common market may be set up, but I cannot see it being done, because the highly developed United States of America cannot join forces in such an organism with an undeveloped China. On the other hand, neither can Japan place itself in such a straight-jacket under the direct control of the Americans, with only weak China, which will beg it for credits and new technology, on its side. Then neither the United States of America nor Japan need such an American-Asian market to exert their economic and strategic influence in the Far East, Southeastern Asia, India and other regions, because they are able to do this for themselves, with no need for China, and at the same time, to engage in a fierce competitive struggle or even wage war against other big imperialists if they threaten their interests.

Thus, the elections to the European Parliament were a soap bubble, just to create illusions, to deceive the peoples and the proletariat. In the countries of the Common Market, there are 7 million totally unemployed, not to mention those working half-time or just one hour a day and who amount to several millions more; prices are going sky-high, the competition is fierce both inside and outside this European Market, outside this "United Europe." In reality, **nothing of benefit to its peoples is coming out of this "United Europe,"** their misery continues, And these peoples must continue their fierce struggle against the internal capitalism and against this "unity" of the capitalists and their concerns, against this false unity the purpose of which is merely to slightly reduce the catastrophic effects of the great crisis which has engulfed European and world capitalism and to soften the contradictions or the fierce competition. But there is nothing which can heal these permanent ulcers of capitalism which have become extremely serious at present.

**POGRADEĆ, TUESDAY
JULY 17, 1979**

PRESIDENT CARTER'S HOAX

The United States of America is in such a deep and grave political-economic crisis that President Carter was obliged to go on TV to address the people. He spoke about oil, but together with this he also mentioned the crisis which the American nation is going through. Carter said that he had held a meeting at Camp David, where for 12 days on end he had talked with "men of the people," that they had "criticized" and "advised" him but had also "taught" him. All this, his claim that, "See, I go outside the White House to take decisions of vital importance to the country and consult with the people over these decisions," is nothing but a hoax of the American President, intended to help him dodge any personal blame for this great crisis and to prepare for the coming election campaign. But these people whom he says he has consulted were only his governor friends, plus the odd ordinary citizen. As is customary for American presidents, the views he laid on the table there, allegedly to seek their opinion, were his former views, that is, the opinions of the trusts he represents. And in order to throw dust in the eyes of the American people he added that he had rejected the speech he had prepared in advance and was to deliver on television, because he had drawn "conclusions" from the talks at Camp David.

Carter said that the men who had gone to Camp David had spoken frankly to him. He cited a governor from the South, who had allegedly told him: "Mr. President, you are not leading this nation. You are merely administering the government," while another visitor had told him that he should not declare that "the problem of energy would be solved in a way similar to war,

and then issue men with toy rifles with which to fight it.”

Carter declared that the American nation is threatened by a crisis of confidence. “This,” he said, “is a crisis that attacks the heart, the soul and the spirit of the will of our nation. The erosion of our confidence in the future threatens to destroy the socio-political structure of America.”

Hence, Carter seeks to convince his listeners that only now has he become aware of this situation, this spirit and this will of the nation which is in crisis, but he said nothing about the huge profits which the American oil trusts and companies have made. In other words, regarding energy Carter said that the nation could not go on consuming 20 per cent more energy than it produces. “When we import oil,” he pointed out, “we also import inflation and unemployment.” He went on, “We have been accustomed to using as much as we have” and “we have stuck our head over the fence, while OPEC is on the other side, with the knife in its hand.”

Hence, Carter’s speech is also a threat to the oil-producing countries, members of OPEC, a threat to the Middle East, the producer of oil, the countries of which he is threatening with war if they continue to raise the prices or to reduce the extraction of oil. This is great and direct pressure which the United States of America is exerting on these countries, because it has accumulated enormous wealth from the exploitation of their oil.

Carter said, also, that from now on, not even a single drop of oil above the 1977 level would be imported. In that year the United States of America imported 8 and a half million barrels of oil a day. This, too, is another threat to the Arab countries to choose between the two roads: they must either continue the extraction of oil, or the United States of America will no longer buy oil, and therefore, Carter calls on the American

people to make savings. To this end he gives a series of advice: that imports of oil must be reduced to the levels set by the government, that energy must be used economically, and he ordered the companies that use oil to reduce its consumption to a considerable degree and use other fuels, especially coal, from which they should also produce synthetic oil. Likewise, he demanded that investments should be made in solar energy, proposed that an extra 10 billion dollars should be spent over the next 10 years in order to improve the means of public transport, and called for the creation of a national solar bank which, Carter said, "will help us achieve the decisive objectives to meet 20 per cent of our energy requirement about the year 2000." This, of course, is a consequence of the great crisis which has engulfed the capitalist world.

The energy crisis, and the oil crisis in particular, has put not only American imperialism, but also all the other capitalist countries of the world in a tight spot. The other capitalist countries of the world have put and are putting great pressure on the United States of America. Meetings have been held in Paris, Tokyo, Brussels and elsewhere. At these meetings the other states have demanded that the United States of America reduce its use of oil. In other words, these capitalist states are saying, "If we are for savings, and savings must be made, they should not be made at our expense only, but must be made at the expense of the United States of America as well." And, in fact, immediately after Carter's speech, the Japanese, French and West German leaders gave interviews supporting the measures he proposed for essential savings in the use of oil and energy.

This is a major contradiction which is developing between the other imperialist powers and American imperialism, the domination of which is being shaken in many fields, in the military and economic fields, and now also in the field of energy.

Of course this crisis will continue for a number of years and measures are being taken everywhere to ensure that industry which works on oil will work partly on coal and partly on nuclear or solar energy. On the other hand, there is no lack of pressure, blackmail and threats on the oil-producing countries to make them produce the maximum quantity of oil and to sell as much as possible to these states at the lowest possible prices. This could lead to political disturbances, attacks and coups d'état, and even to local wars which could mark the beginning of a major world war.

Oil is the "blood" of the capitalist body, and everybody knows that, if it runs out of "blood," imperialism will run out of economic and military strength. Therefore the peoples whose countries possess oil must take a firm revolutionary stand in defence of their assets, freedom and sovereignty against the imperialist predators and warmongers, against the oppressors of the peoples of the world.

**POGRADEČ, MONDAY
AUGUST 13, 1979**

GREAT OSCILLATION IN THE POLICY OF IMPERIALISM AND REVISIONISM

Never before has such great oscillation been noticed in the policy of imperialism and modern revisionism. This powerful oscillation has been caused by the great general, economic, monetary, political and military crisis, by the broad movement of the peoples against oppression by monopoly capitalism, whether Western or Eastern, and has been caused also by the profound crisis in China, the countries of Southeast Asia and the Middle East.

Africa is moving. The African states are restive. The class struggle is developing there, both internally and on the external plane, against the metropolises which dominate those states by means of the neo-colonialist policy.

Let us begin with the situation in the United States of America and the Soviet Union.

The United States of America is experiencing a major, internal and external crisis. This situation has forced President Carter to take draconian measures to cope with the energy crisis. But the energy crisis is nothing compared with the loss of confidence of the American people in the so-called American democracy. The prestige of the United States of America in the international arena is at a low ebb, the American dollar is falling day by day. Within the country inflation has increased. In these financial circumstances, the United States of America has plunged into a major economic-financial crisis, and consequently, into a political crisis, has incurred huge debts to Japan, Federal

Germany and the other capitalist countries. Thus, the current deficit in the balance of American trade is unprecedented.

This extremely difficult situation compelled Carter to change many of the horses in his team, retaining only the key figures in the American imperialist government. These changes in the Carter administration affected the interests of some American trusts and monopolies, causing great dismay and arousing their opposition. Obviously, these trusts do not agree that Carter should strengthen the position of his party and the trusts he represents at the expense of their profits.

More than one third of the oil that the United States of America uses is imported. In order to forestall unpleasant eventualities, the American president is trying to replace natural oil with synthetic oil produced from coal. But this replacement requires investments through additional taxes which are levied on the trusts and monopolies, too, therefore they are dissatisfied.

All these difficulties have led to great confusion in American domestic policy and Carter's position as president has been greatly weakened. Although Carter is calling for maximum production from American industry, if the present confusion continues, the chances of his re-election as chief of the American executive in the forthcoming elections will be even slighter.

But the mess is not confined to the internal policy of the United States of America alone. It is clear that confusion reigns in the foreign policy of the USA, too. In this situation in which the American administration finds itself, the USA wants to preserve the present status quo with the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union wants this, too, because it is in the grip of an equally profound political and economic crisis within the country and in its relations with its satellites and with the other countries.

The Soviet Union, like the United States of Amer-

ica, is in crisis over the appointment of the main leader of the party and state. According to news agency reports, Leonid Brezhnev is seriously ill. From time to time we see him on television looking as though he can hardly stand on his feet. Even if Brezhnev does not die soon, he must be replaced with another, more active person. As is known, Brezhnev is a great opportunist among opportunists, and that is why American imperialism and the Western world fear his replacement with men of a hardline revisionist wing. Because of the economic crisis, the all-round internal crisis which I mentioned earlier, and the political crisis in the revisionist leadership, the Soviet Union will want a relatively long period of peace.

For these reasons, the current policy of the United States of America and the Soviet Union, as two big superpowers, is to preserve the status quo and to avoid disturbances and peoples' liberation wars for as long as possible. In other words, they want to reach a temporary agreement so as to prevent the occurrence of major disturbances, like those which are now occurring every day.

In Nicaragua the dictator Somoza, who was supported by American imperialism, has been liquidated after more than 40 years of dictatorial rule. He was driven out by force of arms, by war... The news agencies also report that, fearing the outbreak of revolts and uprisings against dictators in the countries of Central and Latin America, the Secretary of the Department of State of the USA, Vance, made a speech on August 11 in Quito, where he attended the ceremony for the investiture of the new president of the Republic of Ecuador, Roldos, in which he spoke about the return of "democracy" to Latin America.

According to the AFP news agency, the heads of governments of the states that took part in that ceremony talked for two days on end about the return of

“democracy” to Latin America, following the example of Ecuador which put an end to many years of dictatorship. The movement against fascist dictatorships on the American continent has greatly embarrassed the United States which, in order to safeguard its political influence and invested capital, and in an effort to prevent the cliques of the other Latin American states from suffering the fate of some cliques of Central America, is recommending to the dictators that they should soften their policy towards the broad masses of the people to some slight degree.

The heavy oppression of capital and the blood-stained jackboot of American imperialism are encountering the resistance of the peoples of Latin America. In these conditions Carter urgently wants to ease the situation. His aim is to defuse the present revolutionary situation which is developing in these countries and maintain the status quo in favour of American capitalism, of the trusts and monopolies that have got those countries in their clutches and make the law there.

In the Middle East the Americans are taking a firmer stand as supporters of the alliance of Egypt with Israel. The American imperialists do not want to make contact with the PLO (Palestine Liberation Organization), which, through Arafat, is persistently seeking to take advantage of the existing situation to make contact with the United States of America and gain its recognition. This means that the USA should intervene with the Israeli government so that it will allow the PLO a strip of land on which it will create an “autonomous” government. It is not yet known how far Carter will go in opposing the PLO, but one thing is certain, that the stand of all the Arab states will play a major role in this matter. Those states are conducting a policy which shifts like the sands of the Sahara before the strong winds that blow by day and by night, creating mounds of sand today and blowing them away again to-

morrow. Nevertheless, under those sands, under those deserts there is oil. Oil is the life's blood of American imperialism and the Western countries.

Naturally, wherever there is "thunder" in the air, the Soviet Union intervenes with its agents to stir up troubles to its advantage.

This is the situation which has gripped these two superpowers at present. Both of them are in difficulties, and together they are trying to breach old agreements and reach new ones, each trying to grab the biggest share for itself and to soften the contradictions as much as possible. In the first place, their aim is to placate world opinion and avoid the confusion caused by the great impoverishment of the masses of the people, because they know that this causes rebellion.

In the existing revolutionary situations the decay of the capitalist-revisionist regimes can be seen more clearly. This is occurring with the Titoite regime, too. To keep up appearances and continue on its course of deception, this regime is relying on its *dada*,* the so-called non-aligned countries, which are allegedly the great force of the "third world" which can stand up to imperialism and social-imperialism.

This force is "non-aligned" only in name, because in reality it is a mishmash. The preparation of the Havana meeting is an utter fiasco. Although the meeting will be held and many speeches will be made there, it will be completely abortive. It will bring the peoples of the world nothing of benefit.

In Havana there may even be clashes and opposition from the supporters of the Soviet Union, which wants to emerge as champion of the "non-aligned world." In fact the newspaper *Pravda* is raising a big fuss about this meeting, saying that this force of the "non-aligned countries" is important and must be strengthened.

* Hobbyhorse (French in the original).

The official rag of the country which heads the Warsaw Treaty, and which exerts its savage domination over the member countries of this Treaty, is appealing to the Titoite “non-aligned world” to safeguard its “unity” and remain “non-aligned!” In other words, the revisionist Soviet Union is calling on this “world” to join with it, to abandon China’s “third world” and not link itself with the United States of America. In the long run, the Soviets are asking this “world” to preserve the status quo. In support of this propaganda *Pravda* is publishing leading articles to convince others that the Soviet Union has allegedly given “the non-aligned countries” large amounts of aid and is allegedly building about 430 major enterprises there, etc., etc. This loud publicity is an expression of the bad habit of big powers, which, when it is in their interests, are so shameless as to boast about those penny-pinching credits they provide to keep the undeveloped countries in poverty and under their domination.

Another issue which has now emerged on the scene is the “modernization of China.” That country with a huge population is in ever greater disarray. There are profound differences in the ranks of the Chinese leadership. Deng’s policy in the international arena is an ignominious failure. The capitalist countries are not as confident about the “development” of China as they were at first. Deng’s “triumph” was a flash in the pan. Now the imperialists and capitalists, who have seen the economic and political reality of China, think differently of it...

In this unstable situation, internally and abroad, China is seeking some kind of stability. Naturally, it is seeking aid, too, and it has received and will receive aid from American imperialism, Japan, Federal Germany and the other imperialist countries.

To counterbalance its failure in its aim to cause war to break out between the Western powers and

American imperialism, on the one hand, and against the Soviet Union, on the other hand, the treacherous Chinese leadership is now turning its eyes to the Soviet Union, too. We have said that the Chinese policy has swung from left to right and back again like the pendulum of a clock, and it will always do so. In the autumn the Chinese and the Soviets will exchange government delegations to improve their strained relations. First the Chinese deputy minister of Foreign Affairs will go to Moscow for talks with his Soviet counterpart, then the latter will go to Beijing to continue the talks. The Soviet Union wants to ease the situation with China in order to counter the American and West European influence in that large neighbouring country.

Hence, in order to counterbalance its defeats China is beginning its flirtation with the Soviet Union again. Despite these political steps it is taking, China has not overcome the difficulties it has to cope with. Major problems, such as the question of relations with Vietnam and the other countries of Southeast Asia remain unsolved. The aim of the present leaders of China in making approaches to the Soviet Union is to make the latter influence the Vietnamese to soften their stand...

All the big powers are re-examining their internal and external positions, their allies, friendships and animosities. This is the epoch of "wife swapping." A shameful economic, political and military defeat for capitalism will emerge from this unhealthy situation.

The peoples of the world, the revolutionary Marxists-Leninists and progressive individuals, must take advantage of this situation.

For our part, we must analyse these situations in the light of Marxism-Leninism, must maintain correct stands towards all these things which are occurring and reveal the truth, which we must make known as much as we can to all those who have the possibility to hear and understand us, to all the peoples. The peoples of

the world must put up their great resistance to the situations which are developing today by rising in national liberation struggles against local ruling cliques and against American, Soviet, Chinese and any other kind of imperialism or social-imperialism, regardless of how it is disguised. The mask must be torn from them, but this alone is not enough. The peoples who suffer oppression and exploitation at the hands of the big imperialist powers and the cliques in their service must rise in strikes and demonstrations, on the barricades of the class struggle, in revolution. **The revolution will strike down all who seek to keep the peoples in bondage and misery.**

MONDAY
DECEMBER 31, 1979

THROUGH ITS INTERVENTION IN AFGHANISTAN THE SOVIET UNION IS CARRYING OUT ITS IMPERIALIST STRATEGIC PLANS

In the international arena, the year 1979 is closing with a revolutionary situation which is the result of peoples' uprisings against the yoke of world imperialism and capitalism. An event of special importance took place last week in an Asian country, Afghanistan, where a coup d'état overthrew the pro-Soviet regime of Amin, which had replaced the equally pro-Soviet regime of Nur Taraki, also through a coup d'état. Now the pro-Soviet Amin has been replaced with the pro-Soviet Karmal. All three governments have been and are agencies of the Soviets and at the same time secret agencies of the Americans, too.

The fact is that through their military intervention, the Soviets killed the first and the second and brought the next, the third, from Czechoslovakia, where he was ambassador, and installed him as head of state.

It is rumoured that the Soviets have intervened in Afghanistan with two or three divisions of tanks and aircraft in the same way that they intervened in Czechoslovakia in 1968. Now under the pretext that Amin was a traitor and an agent of American imperialism, which might be true, they are making the law in this country and saying that they have intervened on the basis of the Treaty of Collaboration and Friendship they have signed with Afghanistan.

As is known, there are many insurgent movements in Afghanistan led by patriots who want neither the Soviet yoke nor the yoke of their agents, but they are de-

scribed as Muslims and their anti-imperialist patriotic movement is described as an Islamic movement. This is a common label which world capitalism uses to revive religious animosities and strife and to give liberation movements the medieval meaning of religious wars. There is no doubt that the Afghan liberation fighters who have risen against the yoke of imperialism, social-imperialism and the monarchy are Muslim believers. Afghanistan is one of those countries where religion is still alive and active. However, it is not just their religion which makes these people rise arms in hand against the occupiers of their homeland. Of course they are not Marxists, but they are patriots who want the liberation of their homeland, they are representatives of the democratic bourgeoisie. They do not want to live under the yoke of foreigners, regardless of the fact that their views are still far from those revolutionary bourgeois-democratic views which result in deep-going reforms in the interest of their peoples.

But the struggle they are waging is of great importance, not only for Afghanistan, but also for the other peoples. It is evident that, with its intervention in Afghanistan, the Soviet Union is fulfilling its imperialist strategic plans to secure key military positions in those countries and especially to extend its imperialist domination to the heart of Asia and the Middle East. It is known that Afghanistan borders on China and Pakistan. So the Soviet Union wants to consolidate its strategic-military positions against China and pro-American or pro-British Pakistan. On the other hand, it is known that Afghanistan also borders on Iran, and indeed the Afghan insurgents present themselves as friends, well-wishers and co-fighters of Khomeini. Hence, if the Afghan insurgents triumph over the Soviets and their tools, this would be to the advantage of Khomeini. This, of course, is not an easy task, nor one that can be accomplished in a matter of days, never-

theless, the people of Afghanistan who are brothers in religion with the Iranian Shiites, are creating problems for the imperialists and the social-imperialists.

With their military intervention in Afghanistan, the Soviets are encircling Iran from the north and the south, and if the United States of America intervenes in Iran with armed forces, then the Soviet Union, too, will commence its operations in that direction, of course, in order to capture part of Iran, but not, I think, to confront American imperialism in an armed struggle as yet.

Therefore, the Soviets are preparing for an eventual war which might be waged in the big oil-bearing zone, the Middle East. Syria, where the Soviet influence is more apparent, has not yet condemned the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan, but the other Arab countries, including Saudi Arabia and Egypt, have done so. Thus all these countries have spoken out against the Soviets over their barbarous actions in Afghanistan and their aims to dominate it. So, in this situation, the Arab countries cannot accept any intervention by the United States of America with armed forces in Iran.

Thus, all world opinion has been aroused against the actions of the Soviets and, as the foreign news agencies report, Moscow has been forced to declare that it will withdraw its troops from Afghanistan as soon as the situation is stabilized. This is the same old refrain which the imperialists always resort to after they have intervened with military force and occupied countries and peoples. But the reaction of world opinion against the Soviet intervention makes an American intervention in Iran less possible or more difficult. In other words, the world is realizing that the imperialists and social-imperialists are aggressors, that they are oppressors of the peoples and exploiters of their wealth.

Naturally, the two superpowers reach secret agreements over the division of spheres of influence between

them, but this division also gives rise to great opposition, causes a fierce militant revolutionary reaction on the part of the masses of the people who suffer the consequences of these agreements; this situation impels the peoples to revolt against the internal and external oppression of local and world capitalism.

**WEDNESDAY
FEBRUARY 13, 1980**

PANORAMA OF THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

...The situation was threatening even before, but now, following the events in Iran and after the Soviet aggression against Afghanistan, that is, after the occupation of that country by the Soviet Union with tanks and armed forces, the threats and preparations for local wars, or a general war, are assuming more definite form.

As I have said at other times, the Middle East, the great oil-bearing zone, has become a hotbed of war in the world today. It is that part of the globe where the political-economic-strategic predatory interests of the great powers, first of all, of the United States of America and the Soviet Union, and also those of China, the capitalist countries of Western Europe, Japan, etc., are colliding and coming to grips with one another. Uprisings of those peoples who are living under the double oppression and exploitation of the big multinational oil companies and cliques, kings, sheiks, feudal lords, emirs and the local capitalist bourgeoisie are taking place in that region.

The energy problem in the world, which is linked with the production and distribution of oil which holds first place as a source of energy, has become very acute. This has brought about the further deepening of the worldwide general economic crisis.

The overthrow of the Shah, naturally, created major problems inside Iran and abroad. The positive aspect of the uprising of the Iranian people, irrespective of who is leading it, is that it brought about the overthrow of the Shah, a lackey of American imperialism,

and further threatened the oil supplies of the United States of America. Besides this, the United States of America suffered another great political blow, because the Iranian people and students stormed and took the American embassy in Teheran, are still holding captive the entire personnel of this embassy and have seized all the documents of the embassy which are proof of the criminal actions of the CIA and the Shah.

The United States of America tried to escape unscathed, politically and economically, from the events in Iran, therefore it threatened an armed attack, dispatched its naval fleet to the vicinity of the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean and is keeping it there. President Carter proclaimed a number of economic and other sanctions against Iran. In fact it proved impossible to apply these measures with the effect desired by their authors. Nevertheless, they provided the pretext for which the Soviet Union was waiting, and had long been preparing, to intervene in Afghanistan where the puppets it had brought to power were endangered by the Islamic “popular” uprising. I say “popular” because, in fact, the Afghan people have risen against the Soviet puppets, but the Chinese, the Americans and the Pakistanis are trying to manipulate and exploit their struggle for their own ends. It was precisely this turbulent situation and the threats of Carter against Iran, as I said, which provided the Soviets with the opportunity to send their tanks into Afghanistan.

Naturally this aggression and occupation created a dangerous situation in the world and made the Middle East a very delicate zone where the superpowers are directly confronting each other in a state of cold war which threatens to turn into a hot war at any moment.

Nevertheless, following the open aggression of the Soviet Union against Afghanistan, American imperialism has somewhat lowered its bugles against Iran, but this does not mean that it has given up its manoeuvres

and plots within the country, neither does this exclude efforts to reach certain compromises with the current Iranian leadership in order to avert the outbreak of war in the oil zone. Notwithstanding this, the United States of America is keeping its warships and has increased the number of detachments of marines in this region, is strengthening the military bases it has in the Persian Gulf such as those in Saudi Arabia, the United Emirates and Oman, and is trying to establish other bases in Somalia and North Yemen in order to counterbalance the important strategic points which Soviet social-imperialism has occupied in South Yemen, Ethiopia and, especially, in Afghanistan.

In Afghanistan the Soviets encountered resistance. The men of the American government exploited this quite openly, came to terms with the reactionary leadership of Pakistan and declared that they would provide, and did in fact provide, economic and military aid to Pakistan so that it can defend itself against an eventual Soviet attack and the USA can make use of the Afghans' guerrilla war for their own interests.

As is known, the meeting of Muslim countries was held in Islamabad. There it was decided that all the Muslim countries should help the Afghan people and the so-called Committee which is directing the war against the Soviets inside Afghanistan. We see that China is active in these open actions and subversive manoeuvres, declaring that it is helping the Afghan refugees in Pakistan with arms and ammunition and also giving them economic aid. Hence, we can say that a new confrontation has emerged around the borders of Afghanistan, within which the Soviet troops are stationed, on the one side is the Soviet army which is fighting against the Afghan insurgents, and on the other side, Pakistan and China, and behind them the United States of America, which are trying to use the war of the insurgents to their own advantage. Thus, in this zone there is an open local

conflict between the Soviets and the Afghans, and a disguised conflict between the Soviets and the Americans behind the scenes, and the present Afghan officials and the Chinese likewise behind the scenes.

In the other countries of the Middle East at present there is, so to say, a certain status quo in which, in fact, a shift can be seen in the positions of various countries of this basin in defence of the Iranian revolution and the Afghan people, and efforts of some to link up more openly with the Soviet Union and others with the United States of America.

In other words, the allies of Washington in this oil-bearing zone are trying to strengthen their friendship with the United States of America in the first place, and on the other hand, to bring the Iran of Khomeini to terms with American imperialism. For their part, the Soviets are trying to prevent Syria and Iraq slipping from their grasp and becoming friends of the USA and to keep them "friends and well-wishers" of the Soviet Union.

Thus the situation in the Arab world remains as before, with the one difference that Egypt and Israel are continuing to strengthen their alliance and friendship under the American umbrella, to watch the development of the popular movement in Iran closely and with hostility, to barrack for and incite the United States of America to take measures towards the Soviet Union more coercive than those of boycotting the Olympic games, etc. We see also that Qadhafi's Libya has begun to intervene in Tunisia by sending its commandos to Gafsa and causing a riot which, naturally, was suppressed but brought another factor, the French factor, into the arena of this zone. France, in fact, sent military aid to Tunisia. Thus, it is becoming ever more clear that France is making military preparations to defend the so-called independent and sovereign Francophone states where French capital has major exploitative in-

terests. This is precisely what impels France to avoid involvement in the American-Soviet conflict and to adopt political stands which are contrary to those proposed by Carter, as for example: the proposal for the boycott of the Olympic games and the other proposal for the summoning of a meeting of foreign ministers of the countries of Western Europe and the United States of America to discuss the Soviet aggression against Afghanistan and the measures proposed by Carter. West Germany, too, is not fully in unison with the United States of America over this question.

Thus, we see that contradictions exist between the United States of America, France and Germany over major international problems. These contradictions stem from the fact that these two European developed capitalist countries with highly developed big industries need the oil of Iran and the oil of the OPEC member countries, that is, other countries of the Middle East, some African countries and Venezuela. Thus, they do not want to get involved in the infernal machinations of American interests, but want to stand aloof from the actions of the Carter administration, in other words, they are unwilling to play the game of the CIA. Hence, we see that in order to defend their vital interests on the question of oil, these two countries, France and West Germany, do not want the aggravation of the situation, but want continuation of the "détente" between the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

This is why both Paris and Bonn condemned the entry of the Soviet military forces into Afghanistan, though in a low voice, a thing which gave rise to a contradiction between the policy of America and that of these two states. Of the countries of Western Europe only Britain is showing itself to be a more aggressive "hawk." Nevertheless, while following the United States of America, it still does not forget to do what it has always done, or to continue to pursue its policy

of balance, to lean sometimes towards the West, sometimes towards the East, to keep an eye both on America and on Europe, hence, also on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

In regard to the countries of Eastern Europe, the satellites of the Soviet Union, they owe the Western countries billions of dollars. As a consequence the Western capitalists, who have major interests in these countries are not deteriorating matters with the Soviet Union and its satellites. So the Western powers have markets in those countries, make investments there and, therefore, they desire and are working to avoid a further exacerbation of relations between them and the Soviet Union, like that which is occurring between the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

The policy of our country in regard to all these political events and stands on a world scale is correct. We analyse the situations and take our stand on the basis of conclusions we draw from the development of events. The fact is that our political stands, expressed in our articles and books, find a large response in the world, are liked and approved. Various diplomats from many states of the world, with whom our diplomats have contact, approve our policy and express this in good words, saying: Although your ideological views are contrary to ours, we approve your stands. All this has created a favourable situation for our country among the broad masses of peoples who hear the voice of our Radio and read our press and literature.

Depending on the occasion and circumstances, our political stands find response, also, among many bourgeois governments. Why do I say this? Because when we condemn Soviet social-imperialism for its bloodthirsty adventures, when we expose American imperialism for its aggressive actions, our correct stand is approved also by people in the governments of many states which are members of the NATO bloc or of countries of Asia,

Africa and Latin America.

We notice that in Greece, especially, both among the people and in government circles, among intellectuals and the members of different parties, our policy is finding a widespread positive response. Every political, cultural or ideological event of our Party and country is mentioned, indeed, is given an extraordinary amount of publicity in virtually all the Greek newspapers, a thing which has created a very favourable opinion about our country and Government in Greece.

Our stand of goodwill towards Greece, expressed in our public declarations that no harm will come to Greece from our country, indeed, that we shall come to its aid if any misfortune befalls it, shall help to defend it from any aggression from whatever direction it may come, has won the Greek people's approval and praise for our policy.

The same thing is happening in Turkey, too. Progressive Turkish opinion is making great propaganda markedly in favour of Albania. There, too, almost all the newspapers write positively about our country, in conversations with comrades of our embassy Turkish officials speak sympathetically, indeed often with admiration, of the independent policy of our state...

In Italy the situation is extraordinary disturbed, terrorism is becoming widespread. The Italian fascist party, which bears the name "Movimento sociale italiano, destra nazionale," has proposed that the military should take over the Ministry of the Interior and the death penalty should be introduced. This is a further step which Italian reaction wants to take towards the restoration of fascism...

With Italy we continue to have trade relations and we can say that they are increasing. The Italians are interested in buying from us goods they need and selling us goods we need. In this direction we can say that a more favourable situation has been created.

On the basis of this panorama of the international situation revolutionary vigilance must always be on the order of the day for us and it must be strengthened with the further political and ideological uplift of the broad masses of the people, of the communists, first of all. This means that the situations which the world and our country are going through must be explained systematically and be thoroughly understood by all and, bearing this in mind, the defence of the country must be strengthened from every aspect...

THURSDAY
FEBRUARY 28, 1980

**THOUGHTS ON THE INTERVIEW
GIVEN BY ZBIGNIEW
BRZEZINSKI***

In an interview he gave to the American magazine *U.S. News and World Report* of January 7 of this year, Brzezinski admits openly that the United States of America is an aggressive colonial force of the new type, which is facing two main challenges: "The first challenge is in regard to its geo-strategic position in the world, and the second has to do with its relations with the two thirds of the world, which, during the last two decades, have experienced a sudden awakening of their political consciousness." In other words, this means that the position of American imperialism in those countries has been shaken and is being challenged, or that "two-thirds of the world" are fighting against the yoke of American imperialism.

The spokesman of the American enslavers asserts in this interview that his state, which aspires to world hegemony, is threatened by a potential rival, and this rival is the Soviet Union which also aspires to world hegemony. Apart from this, Brzezinski is obliged to admit that the unexpected emergence of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America on the world scene has had an influence, upsetting the status quo so greatly desired by the United States of America. According to him, this means "the end of the Eurocentric period in international problems."

For Brzezinski, Iran, where the great neo-colonialist interests of the United States of America have

* At that time National Security Adviser to President Carter.

been seriously endangered, is included in this sphere of disturbance. This disturbance, or disequilibrium, has come about because American policy has not been active in that country and in the international arena (!). That is what he says, but in fact the opposite is true. The policy of domination, oppression and exploitation, and even armed warfare, as in Vietnam and elsewhere, of the United States of America, has been active continuously in that region of the world and in the international arena. Precisely the barbarous acts of domination, oppression and exploitation of American imperialism have aroused the opposition of the peoples whom it attacked or exploited and whom Brzezinski includes in the two-thirds of the world which has allegedly experienced "a sudden awakening of political consciousness!" Now, in his interview, Brzezinski says that "we (i.e., the United States) must make greater continuous efforts for the development of more meaningful relations with those countries which," according to this servant and rabid defender of American imperialism, "hitherto have not been active in the international arena." This means that American imperialism, and concretely the present American government, should revise its tactics, without changing its strategy. In his interview Brzezinski expresses himself textually as follows: "I hope that the ever-greater commitment to a policy of support in order to cope with an entirely new world in a constructive way" will ensure that "the wrath is diminished" so that the United States of America and its aggressive policy will be more acceptable to the peoples (!).

As Brzezinski himself explains, this means that the American strategy will continue to pursue "the increase of American power" through the increase of the production of the most sophisticated weapons, the growth of economic power, the protection of spheres of influence and continuation of the policy of subjecting them to many-sided economic, political and military

control, while at the same time manoeuvring with the familiar demagogic tactic of “the carrot and the stick” in order to “calm the anger” of the peoples, as in Iran and elsewhere.

In this interview, while referring to the Iranian crisis and subsequent events, Brzezinski confirms that the policy of force and armed intervention remains unaltered. This is how this spokesman of American imperialism expresses this policy, “... I have no doubt that the use of American power and the readiness of the President to employ it in case of need are not unimportant considerations either to our country, or to the countries of the other side.” Here the American cynicism, with which the “anti-democratic” policy, the defence of “the sovereignty of the peoples,” the defence of “human rights,” so loudly trumpeted by Carter, are treated, is quite obvious. The peoples of the world are openly threatened with attacks by the “American power” if they infringe the interests of the United States and the zones of influence of the dollar, likewise established by means of force in different regions of the world.

Carter’s adviser on questions of American national security, that is, of the United States of America and its spheres of influence in different continents, states in the clearest Machiavellian terms, that in these zones of the world “American power is the central source of the existing stability,” and he goes on to add that “those countries which support a moderate policy (that is, do not encroach on American interests)... are aware that the future of their external security, and as a consequence, their internal security, also, is greatly dependent on the American power present in the region.” This is his conclusion which, at the same time, is a warning in the form of an ultimatum and threat to the peoples who have risen or are rising for their national and social liberation against the oppression and exploitation of imperialist and neo-colonialist superpowers.

In this interview Brzezinski says nothing new but simply re-affirms the permanent policy of American imperialism. However, through his affirmations, American imperialism expresses its fear of the people's uprisings which are mounting so that it does not feel at all secure; therefore, it is forced to grind its teeth and tell the cliques of those countries which are threatened by their peoples that their remaining in power depends on their reliance on American military force. To give heart to his vassals, Brzezinski says that the United States is present with its fleet in the Persian Gulf, that it will watch developments in that region, and he ensures them that the Americans "will not allow interference from outside"!

Thus American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism themselves announce in advance that Washington or Moscow has a finger in the plots to sabotage and crush peoples' uprisings everywhere. The people who fight in these uprisings to win the freedom, independence and sovereignty, of which the imperialists and social-imperialists and their puppets have robbed them, are a factor which does not exist for them. With this outlook they want to conceal their policy of domination, exploitation and intervention with arms, intrigues and demagogy to the detriment of other peoples and countries.

American imperialism foresees turmoil in the future and is engaging in demagogy in order to conceal this reality. Thus, while demanding the building of a policy which is appropriate to the time and circumstances, Brzezinski claims that the countries of the "third world," which make up the majority, "support" the policy of the United States of America, and tries to find confirmation and backing for this lie in a vote in the Security Council of the United Nations Organization, saying that "in the confrontation with Iran we have unanimous support, as is reflected in the 15 to 0

vote in the Security Council.” Fortunately, however, people’s revolutions do not follow the results of voting in the Security Council, but follow the course opposed to those who vote in this organ of the UNO for resolutions of no value to the peoples of the world.

For American imperialism, it is imperative that the present great crisis which has gripped the world, and the mounting revolution of the peoples should be suppressed, dominated. But the United States of America does not feel strong enough to do this, so Brzezinski launches the idea that NATO “remains the main alliance in relations with the United States of America, but it operates in a world in which our interests of collective security have extended further than in the past. Today there are three interdependent central zones of security: Western Europe, the Far East and the Middle East.” Hence, it is true that the United States of America is defending Western Europe, but Western Europe must not wash its hands, so to speak, of the events in Asia, Africa and elsewhere. To Brzezinski these events and interests are interdependent, so Western Europe should not leave the United States of America on its own in the role of the international gendarme. It is necessary that all of them become gendarmes both in defence of Western Europe and in defence of the American interests outside Europe. In other words, the United States is telling France and West Germany not to be so “independent” in their decisions on the policy they are pursuing in the oil basin, in Africa and towards the Soviet Union. American imperialism is demanding that these bourgeois-capitalist states of Europe should not step out of line, but should march in step with Carter, as China under Deng and Hua is doing at present.

Undoubtedly, American imperialism does not agree with the interview which the president of France, Giscard d’Estaing, gave some days ago, in which he raises his voice and says that “the name of Europe should be

heard in the world,” and not drowned out by “the two giants.” In other words, France is advocating closer cooperation with Federal Germany in order to protect their economic and political interests on the other continents and in their zones of influence, or in those which they will try to create. Hence, France and Germany do not want to leave all the “prey” to the two “lions,” the United States of America and the Soviet Union. Later the Chinese, who at the moment are all hypocrisy and humility in their behaviour towards the Americans, will develop this appetite, too. Militarist Japan, for its part, is arming, growing stronger, waiting for the prey to appear and does not fail to “fire a shot” from time to time in the stands it takes towards the situations created on different continents of the world.

Brzezinski tries to prove that the people’s uprisings against foreign imperialists and their internal allies, especially in the oil-bearing zone, are not of a social and liberation character, but of a “religious” character, are completely idealistic, “Islamic” uprisings. He is obliged to admit that “the Islamic world is experiencing a political and religious revival,” but, in his opinion, these revolutions, which he calls “spiritual manifestations,” should not be turned into “negative” ones. Brzezinski declares that Islam is “an independent faith,” which is practised by 800 million people. “Let us not turn Islam into an enemy of the West, and especially of the United States of America,” he declares. Thus Brzezinski wants these 800 million people to submit themselves to American imperialism and to imperialism in general.

Hence, according to the imperialist enslavers, the revolutions against them, and especially those of the Muslim peoples, do not have a national and social liberation character, but a religious character. The Islamic religion is confounded with Christianity and the peoples’ awakening to free themselves from social bondage is considered only a revival of their religious

belief. Hence, according to them, the “xenophobia” of the Muslim peoples has its source in their religion. The demagoguery of imperialists and their attempt to deceive these peoples goes so far that Brzezinski says: the Islamic countries “have greater confidence in themselves; they are no longer under the tutelage of the British, the French, or others.”

Of course, according to this statement of Brzezinski’s, “the United States of America has no people or country under tutelage”!

Brzezinski admits that the efforts to protect spheres of influence may also lead to confrontation between the two imperialist superpowers in the zone of Muslim countries. According to him, however, irrespective of the fact that “there exist ever greater disagreements” between the Muslim world and the United States, its relations with the Muslim world will improve, because “we are interested in the independence of all Muslim countries: we respect their religious beliefs,” etc.

These are parts of Carter’s “new theory.” The United States of America believes in religion, the Soviet Union does not. The United States rules through its agencies installed in those countries by the CIA, rules through capital investments, through banks, joint companies and multinational companies, and all these are reinforced with military bases, powerful fleets and the most sophisticated air-force, while the Soviet Union, according to Brzezinski, “exercises direct physical rule over some tens of millions of Muslims.” “The Muslim religion has much in common with Christianity,” therefore, says Brzezinski, “everything unites the United States with the Muslim countries, while everything separates them from the atheist Soviet Union”!

This is the whole deduction of this arrogant imperialist who takes others for fools and considers himself the discoverer of something new in which the crises and political-military and social confrontations have their

source. And, in order to deceive the Muslims, Brzezinski says among other things: "... If I were an ordinary Muslim, I would ask myself the question how could I link myself with a country which denies other Muslims their religious rights."

The peoples of the world, and especially the peoples of those hot and very hot zones that exist today in the world, should understand, on the basis of events, facts, political stands and military activities which are quite clear, that the two imperialist superpowers and their allies, organized in blocs or linked with and dependent on them, are gambling with their fate, and this will have tragic consequences for them. Every activity and every action that they organize, they undertake solely for their own interests, to the detriment of the vital interests of the peoples and peace.

The big imperialist powers are fighting with every means to protect the markets and zones of influence they have in the world today. When one of them loses a market in a given zone, it tries to secure it in another zone at the expense of his rival or rivals. This gives rise to disturbances of the balance, to the birth and deepening of contradictions and disagreements which reach the point of armed confrontations, and this gives rise to the armaments race, to local wars which are fanned up to embroil mankind in a general imperialist war of plunder.

The imperialist powers, both the big ones and the smaller ones, think, act and theorize as though they hold the fate of the peoples and mankind in their hands, and, on this basis, they seek to subjugate the peoples. These aggressive powers underrate the dialectical development and strengthening of the liberation struggles and revolutions. Their vision has been blurred and they do not want to understand that every step of the peoples towards opposition to the two-fold oppression and enslavement, internal and external, is a breach which will

be widened in the wall of the capitalist prison.

The awakening of the peoples of the world is an incontestable fact. It has come about contrary to the desires of the various imperialists and capitalists. The awakening of the peoples and their struggle for victory in the political and social fields have not been brought about either by religious beliefs, or by enslaving theories in the service of capital. Irrespective of what orientation the subjective factor has had in a people's uprising, this uprising has been a significant minus for the former ruling regime, and this minus for reaction turns into a plus for the further development of the people's revolution and for the strengthening of the progressive subjective factors which carry the popular revolution on to proletarian revolution.

Our Marxist-Leninist theory teaches us that **the deepening of crises within the capitalist world is the beginning of the death agony and coma of this world.** Therefore, world capital is making desperate efforts to escape from this terrible grip which has it by the throat and is strangling it. But escape is impossible, because it is the capitalist system itself which gives birth to this crisis, which fosters it and intensifies it to the highest degree. Capitalism has created its own gravedigger, the proletariat. The struggle of the proletariat and the peoples has given imperialism "bad fevers." The temporary or relatively long-term treaties and agreements between imperialists are only palliatives, they are built on sand.

If Brzezinski considers the situation in the Soviet Union out of balance, then why should the United States of America be afraid of it? Brzezinski considers the United States of America consolidated. This, too, is untrue.

The two superpowers are equally aggressive, while the weakening of them is steadily increasing.

The struggle of the peoples, the struggle of the pro-

**letariat against their enemies, must advance in this
great crisis which has world imperialism in its grip.**

SUNDAY
MARCH 16, 1980

THE POLICY OF “NON-ALIGNMENT” — A CASTLE BUILT ON SAND

The Yugoslav foreign policy is just as confused and vacillating as its internal policy. The “war horse” of the Titoites is the policy of “non-alignment,” but this “horse” is lame in two legs and with the death of the ageing knight-errant Tito, it too, will die.

Indeed this policy, if it can be called a policy, is a fiction, a castle built on sand, but not without definite purposes. It is a *modus vivendi* invented by world capitalism to preserve its neo-colonialist empire by deceiving the peoples that allegedly the policy pursued by the leaders of these countries which are called “non-aligned” but which, in fact, willingly or unwillingly are all satellites, to some extent, of American imperialism and other capitalist powers, is an “independent policy outside blocs.”

Naturally the two imperialist superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, could not include the countries of their spheres of influence in the military blocs of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty because then the superpowers would be in danger at all times of being involved in military or economic conflicts which would no longer have a local character, because they would be turned into spheres of influence for the other members of the blocs, too, and they would incite not only local wars, but also a world war.

These countries which call themselves “non-aligned” or which, as the Titoites claim, pursue a “non-aligned” policy, or the countries of the “third world,” or, more exactly, those of the spheres of influence of

one or the other industrialized capitalist country, are, you might say, floating states, states which have continual vacillations in their economic policy, because their policy is an appendix at the mercy of the great surgeon, who operates on it or does not operate on it according to the circumstances which develop.

All these countries and their states are hopelessly in debt hence their economy is a sick appendix of big world capital which makes the law in these countries, dictates their policy, maintains or brings down the cliques which lead them, according to the needs and the policy of joint companies of big finance capital.

The peoples of those countries suffer from every standpoint. The big capitalist powers have built such a structure and infrastructure there that they can ensure the oppression and exploitation of peoples whom they deceive by means of the slight-of-hand of an allegedly democratic parliamentary game, creating among them the impression that they are free, independent and sovereign.

In Gjirokastra the people say: “The sheep and goats of Zere, the fame of Hasan Qere” (one does the work, the other gets the credit). This is what occurs with the policy of “non-alignment,” too. This policy is **applied and financed by American imperialism, is approved in general by its allies and trumpeted by Tito**. Earlier it was trumpeted by Nasser, Nehru, Nkrumah and Sukarno as well, but with their death or departure from the scene, only one “Trojan horse” is left, he who was allegedly the leader of the policy of “non-alignment.” This was Tito of Yugoslavia. In reality throughout all his activity Tito has never been anything but an agent of American imperialism, which kept him on his feet for predetermined aims, and his Yugoslavia was nothing but an example of “a socialist” country independent of Moscow, an element “of importance” on the international chessboard and an example for the countries

newly created after the Second World War, which had changed their former overlords and had placed themselves under the influence of new colonizers, the American imperialists, who had emerged powerful from the war, in order to be shown what course they must pursue in order to live on the crusts which U.S. imperialism would provide for them.

The investments made by the Americans, the British, the French, the Germans and others in Yugoslavia have been very large and fruitful for the capitalists, both in the economic and political fields and also from the standpoint of strengthening their military positions. For American imperialism and world capitalism Yugoslavia was a political bastion against the Soviet Union and the former people's democracies and, at the same time, a military *glacis* between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty. I say it was a political bastion because this capitalist state, created during the post-war period, by pretending that it was building a specific socialism, was to serve as an urger and subversive element among the satellite countries of the Soviet Union, was to be a disrupter of the "unity" of the revisionist Soviet Union with its satellites and with the other revisionist parties of Eastern and Western Europe.

Hence Tito, with his "non-aligned" policy, invented by American imperialism, together with the other leaders of the policy whom I mentioned above and who are now dead, was supposed to create a flock of sheep, with no head and no feet, but with a label reading "the non-aligned" countries, with a specific policy which allegedly distinguished them from and put them in opposition to the policy of blocs. All those countries which were allegedly non-aligned but were under the economic and political influence and the protection of imperialism and capitalism, nurtured the illusion that in their repeated meetings they allegedly expressed their "great" will and opposition to the policy of big powers and

blocs.

In this game of international policy, however, the Soviet Union did not lag behind the United States of America. It, too, had its spheres of influence which comprised allegedly independent states on various continents, in which not only the policy of the Soviet Union, but also its economic investments, played an important role. These states were permitted to take part in this "world" and to develop a pseudo non-aligned policy. What was there to lose? Neither the Soviet Union nor its satellites lost anything because this "non-aligned" world did not take any commitments. In relation to the country on which each of these states was dependent, each one of them and each clique which ruled in them pursued that policy which ensured them the biggest profits, and when they found the favourable moment they could go over to another dependence, that is, become part of another sphere of influence. Naturally this gave rise to frictions, a thing which became apparent in the voting in the United Nations, where previously the votes had been divided according to blocs, while later they began to vacillate from side to side. Irrespective that these votes had no importance, the game was played behind the scenes between the big powers. In the United Nations the voting machine is similar to that in the parliaments of bourgeois- democratic countries.

In these "non-aligned" countries, however, it is not only the influence of blocs which was felt, as Titoism claims when it says that there cannot be "complete freedom" as long as blocs exist, but also the influence of individual members of these blocs, which had both political and economic contradictions within the blocs and each sought to safeguard and increase its sphere of influence at the expense of its allies, whether in NATO or in the Soviet bloc. Thus the policy of "non-alignment" did not hinder France, Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany and other states from spreading their influ-

ence widely once they had strengthened their political and economic positions after the Second World War and especially in the recent decades. In connection with the spheres of influence, NATO did not operate as a military bloc, but each member of this bloc operated in its own zones as a separate economic-political power.

Naturally the contradictions within NATO are manifested outside it. NATO does not see the interests of its members from the angle of its monolithic "unity." This is quite apparent in the opposition which is developing between the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States of America, between the United States and France, between France and Britain, etc., indeed matters have gone so far that Brzezinski is demanding that the NATO member countries should assist the American policy to safeguard the economic-political-military influence of the United States, not only in the zone of Europe, but in all parts of the world where American imperialism has invested its economic means and has spread its political forces.

The American policy has suffered defeats in the world and this has been reflected in the so-called policy of the "non-aligned" countries. Thus, at the Havana conference opposition was displayed among participating countries which are allies of both blocs. The pro-Soviet countries like Cuba, Somalia and others supported the policy of the Soviet Union, while the group which allegedly follows the policy of Belgrade defended the American policy under the camouflage of the "non-aligned" policy, the policy "outside blocs and in opposition to the blocs."

This whole meeting, like the former ones, was a masquerade and those that will be held in the future will be the same, too, because **every capitalist state, large or small, which is part of the "non-aligned" world pursues a foreign policy in tune with that of the power that finances or supports it and with which the fate of**

the governing clique is linked.

At present, seeing the weakness of the American policy in the world, the France of Giscard D'Estaing and West Germany have begun to make a powerful display of their policy of economic, political and military expansion, and both these states, not to mention Japan and Britain, have their zones of influence and have under their dependence states which are called "non-aligned," which pursue the policy which is dictated to them by these powers. Thus the Titoites can prattle about their theory of "non-alignment," thinking that allegedly they have found the much desired formula to safeguard the power of American capital and other industrialized capitalist states, but this no longer carries any weight even as a fiction.

The last "horse" of this bandwagon invented by American imperialism is dying and this *dada* of theirs will die with them. The Yugoslav "collective" leadership will no longer be able to wave this banner of "non-alignment" and deceive the peoples and, in fact, they have never deceived them. Even the vassal cliques of world capitalism have never regarded Yugoslavia as anything but a valet of American imperialism. With the death of Tito, this valet will disappear and that will be the end of this joker which world capital has brought into play at any moment.

WEDNESDAY
APRIL 30, 1980

ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

Following the military invasion of Afghanistan by Soviet social-imperialism and the intervention of military commandos of American imperialism in Iran, allegedly to rescue the hostages that are held in the American embassy in Teheran, the international situation is becoming more and more turbulent and aggravated, from day to day. Now we see that the social-imperialist Soviet Union is operating openly and brutally with military forces and with subversion in Afghanistan and in other regions of the Middle East, in Africa and elsewhere.

We see also that, faced with this expansionist policy and acts of aggression of Soviet social-imperialism, American imperialism is in a dilemma over whether it, too, should act like Soviet social-imperialism, that is, undertake similar aggressive steps. But the question presents itself in this way when both American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism have been gripped by a great economic and political crisis.

Naturally the United States of America has extended its spheres of influence, but now it has to keep them free of encroachers and even strengthen them. Now, however, it is less capable of doing so as it was before. As we know, after the Second World War, American imperialism achieved a great victory over its adversaries, or its "allies" and succeeded in becoming the leader of world capitalism. With its economic strength, which was greatly increased and extended, invading the markets of the French franc, the British pound, the Japanese yen and the German mark, the United States succeeded

in imposing its own military, political and economic laws on the countries which represent these markets. Thus the great American companies and monopolies infiltrated and installed themselves everywhere in the capitalist countries, in West Germany, France, Britain and their former colonies, in Japan and elsewhere and, through NATO, became the “protector” of the whole capitalist world. Consequently, this extension gave the American military industry the possibility to work at high rates in order to develop more sophisticated armaments on such a scale that the United States of America was able to harness all the members of NATO to its chariot and become the main supplier of weapons in the world. This, of course, could not go on forever. Thus a time came when the NATO member countries, which had obligations towards the United States of America and had the smallest bowls at the “common table,” developed an increased appetite and, after having organized and strengthened their economic potential, they extended it outside their countries, became stronger militarily, too, and set to work to create a new reactionary organism, the European Common Market.

As time passed, the European Common Market grew steadily stronger from the standpoint of its organization, the division of roles, economic contributions and a certain stability or agreement about the reciprocal exchange of goods which were produced with some degree of planning, and its relative monetary stability in comparison with other currencies. The tendencies of this grouping were to balance, or, rather, oppose the American dictate as far as possible in economic affairs in Europe, to restrain the American expansion to the markets of member countries of the European Common Market, to compete on the American market, and to expand their markets and spheres of influence, both as a whole organization and as individual member states of this Market.

All this political and economic organization was done contrary to the desires of the American economic power. Indeed, it is clear that such an organization, fraught with contradictions, was not to the liking of the United States of America from the political standpoint either, and that is why it tried to hinder the creation of this new union.

In this direction and in this process we see that the contradictions are increasing between the United States of America and "United Europe," all the countries of which, individually and also as a group, have their own separate aims and objectives, both towards one another and towards the United States of America.

The United States operates against the European Common Market from within and from without. As events show, Britain plays the card of the United States of America to weaken the European Common Market and its aims from within. In fact the meeting of prime ministers of the member countries of the European Common Market, which was held in recent days in Luxemburg, suffered fiasco precisely because of the refusal of Britain to pay the quota allocated as its contribution by the other partners of the European Common Market.

Besides this, following a period when a certain understanding, not to say close collaboration, existed between France and West Germany, now we see a certain coolness between them and on some questions, it is clear that the Federal Republic of Germany is siding more with the Americans. It is known that the Federal Republic of Germany is the most powerful member of "United Europe" from the economic aspect and possibly also from the military aspect. It was Bonn, for example, which in the great world crisis and especially in the dollar crisis came to the rescue of the American currency, while France has begun to display more independence from the United States of America.

The France of Giscard is the most wayward “child” of the European Common Market. We cannot say that it has no influence in this market. But the disagreements and the contradictions of “United Europe,” the European Common Market, are not only in the field of the relations of this group with the United States of America. Now each of the states which make up the European Common Market has begun to recreate and strengthen its own spheres of influence, on an extensive scale. Indeed France, for its part, is very actively sending soldiers and commandos to Africa, especially to the French-speaking countries. France keeps these countries under its leadership and economic and military control, not only by means of finance and investments, but also by means of the cultural basis it has there, its stratum of intellectuals in the leadership of these countries. So, the links of these countries with France are not only economic and military, but also cultural and spiritual.

For its part West Germany, which has great economic and military potential, is on the scene everywhere, with fists full of marks from the sale of factories and of technology wherever it can find markets, and it finds plenty of markets because all the so-called non-aligned countries are holding out their hands to all sides and take from all.

Italy, too, invests, but it does not have the power of the two countries I mentioned above, nor that of Britain, which, likewise, is trying to re-establish its sphere of influence in the world, though as a partner it has always been and still is three quarters in the pocket of the United States of America.

As for the military side, the countries of “United Europe” that are members of NATO, with the exception of France, which is a member of it but is not militarily engaged in it and has nuclear weapons of its own, safeguard their alliance with the United States

of America and, under the umbrella of this alliance, which has splits in it but “protects” them from the rain and the hail and the Soviet thunderbolt, are working to strengthen it as a whole and to strengthen their own military potential as separate countries.

The United States of America is aware of the double game of the European Common Market and the NATO members in this situation, and this double game is not to its advantage, therefore it is demanding of the NATO member countries that they obey Washington, or, to put it better, acknowledge the American leadership both in NATO, that is, in the military field, and in the European Common Market, that is, in the economic field. In other words, the countries of “United Europe” should pursue an economic policy which does not damage the interests of the United States of America. On the contrary, they should be subservient to American interests, which they should bear in mind in the markets which they are penetrating. This also for the reason that the United States of America has more advanced technological and material potential, a thing that allegedly is of consequence in “the defence” of the West from the striking force of Soviet social-imperialism. But the law of the jungle operates in the world of capital regardless of the desires of one side or the other, so the contradictions become deeper. Thus we can say that the capitalist reactionary European Common Market has begun to emerge as an economic, political and military power within NATO, in ways not so dependent upon and not so obedient to the American leadership.

At present we see that American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism are facing the mounting peoples’ movement for national liberation. We see also that “United Europe,” too, is facing the national liberation movement and struggle of the peoples for freedom, democracy and sovereignty which is becoming stronger.

At these moments, American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, the new Chinese imperialism and “United Europe” are rubbing shoulders with one another all over the world. The contradictions and crises amongst these capitalist-imperialist-revisionist blocs are becoming deeper. The crisis of the dollar, the franc, the mark, the ruble and of all the other currencies of the capitalist countries, is caused by the great economic and political crisis which has engulfed these countries.

Now we see that Soviet social-imperialism, confronting the old imperialism, is becoming more aggressive every day and is intervening with arms in different countries of the world, in markets and spheres of influence claimed by American imperialism and world capitalism. Therefore this invasion is encountering the opposition not only of the peoples who are the victims of Soviet aggression, but also of American imperialism and “United Europe.”

The truth is that, faced with acts of invasion by Soviet social-imperialism, American imperialism finds itself in difficult and weak positions. This also because it has contradictions with its partners of “United Europe.” The latter do not accept the adventurous warmongering policy of the United States of America and refuse to obey the Americans blindly in actions planned in Washington and especially in actions against Iran and other countries of the Middle East. Precisely in these two latter instances the American government has reproached its allies of “United Europe” and others for not supporting it, telling them bluntly that we, the United States of America, will help you in case of an attack by the Soviets, so you ought to help us to defend our spheres of neo-colonialist influence in the world.

We observe that the Western powers support the insanely aggressive actions of the United States of America, only in words. In reality, in essence, they have pulled out and left the Americans in the lurch. We saw

a concrete instance of this in the lack of support for the Camp David agreements that were reached between Israel and Egypt under the patronage of the United States of America; we see it in the refusal of the demands for economic and political sanctions against Iran, in the refusal of the demands of the American government for a boycott of the Olympic games which are due to be held this year in Moscow, etc. In this situation we see that France is strengthening its positions not only in Africa, but also is clearly implying that it does not agree with the American policy in the Persian Gulf and the Middle East, where it sent president d'Estaing recently on an official visit. In other words, France is displaying open rebellion against the status quo established at the time when the Americans as the leader made their policy the law in those countries and in other countries of the world.

At the same time we see that the European Common Market, that is, the nine of "United Europe," despite some differences in their stands, do not want to exacerbate matters with the Soviet Union. Here, too, France stands out. It is more prominent than its "United Europe" partners in the efforts to reduce the tension with the Soviet Union and continue the dialogue with that country. Chancellor Schmidt of West Germany, also, is proceeding on this course, with somewhat less intensity, while Britain is proving just as intransigent as the United States of America itself.

These considerations show that the United States of America is not only confronting the other imperialist power, the Soviet Union, but is also faced with increasing disagreements and contradictions with its partners of "United Europe," a thing that puts it in a difficult position and prevents it from having a showdown with the Soviet Union.

American imperialism and world capitalism have invested billions of dollars in the Soviet Union and the

other former people's democracies, hoping not only to secure great economic profits, which, in fact, they have secured, but also to impose on the Soviet Union and the countries of the Warsaw Treaty their views and their policy, to weaken the Soviet policy of hegemony and aggression and to strengthen the American hegemony.

But the Soviet Union has been able to obtain credits and modern Western and American technology, first of all, to strengthen its industry and modernize its technology, to improve its armaments industry, to increase its weapons and their firepower, hence, to strengthen its aggressive army. As a result, today the Soviet Union is in a strong military position and has a militarized economy.

Although it has contradictions with its allies of the Warsaw Treaty, and although it has allowed them to obtain Western technology through innumerable credits, the Soviet Union keeps them firmly under its control. In case of a worldwide conflagration or a confrontation with the United States of America, the members of the Warsaw Treaty will march together with the Soviet Union under the Soviet bludgeon, while NATO will not march so compactly under the American bludgeon. Nevertheless, at the moment, and until that confrontation is reached, "United Europe" is putting up some opposition to American imperialism.

Finally we can come to the following conclusion: **today the social-imperialist Soviet Union acts without asking leave of anyone and it encounters weak adversaries in its aggressive actions, while American imperialism is trying to enforce obedience on its NATO allies by military threats and economic pressure, but is unable to act as freely as the Soviet Union does with its submissive allies.** Here is the American "Achilles' heel," because the aims, desires and individual actions of American imperialism are aggressive to the extreme and leading towards an imperialist world war. It cannot win other-

wise and cannot evade a situation which brings it death. Before it dies, sooner or later it will have to clash with Soviet social-imperialism, whether the allies in NATO or in the Warsaw Treaty like it or not. **The NATO allies and those of the Warsaw Treaty are striving to cling to a policy of balance as they teeter on the brink of a world war but this will not save them from danger in an eventual war that may be caused by American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism.**

So, the United States of America is striving to gain firmer control over its European allies and, on the other hand, together with the clique of Deng Xiaoping is trying to consolidate and to compensate for the weakening which comes from Western Europe, through the Chinese-Japanese alliance. If we view future developments from this angle, the Chinese-American alliance assumes great importance for the imperialist strategy, because China is a weaker partner than the other partners of "United Europe." It is eager to obtain armaments and technology to accomplish "the four modernizations" and, moreover, is hostile to the Soviet Union. Thus, for the United States of America, **for the American strategy, the best and the most advantageous pawn in the present situation on the chessboard, is China** and together with it Japan, though the latter has much greater economic and military potential and is more advanced than Deng Xiaoping's China.

These are the waters, this is the situation, this is the corrupt policy in which the rotten administration of Jimmy Carter is wallowing at present.

It is our duty to exploit these situations. To the extent we can, we Albanian communists, in full unity with the peoples who are fighting and with the communists in the world, must fight with all our might and means to attack mercilessly and unmask completely the aims, the actions and the aggressive plots, the fascist, pseudo-socialist, pseudo-democratic policy of all the

imperialist states that are writhing in the last agony of dying world capitalism. We must prevent war by fighting against them. We must be vigilant, but vigilant not in apathy and remaining idle onlookers but in action, in activity and in struggle to take advantage of every breach. The true Marxist-Leninists, the revolutionary forces, the freedom-loving peoples, must understand that, although the situation is very dangerous, at the same time it is very favourable for the peoples, for the revolution.

TUESDAY
JULY 1, 1980

THE GREAT WORLD ECONOMIC CRISIS IS INTENSIFYING

The great world economic crisis which has a stranglehold on the two imperialist superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, as well as on the industrialized countries, Japan, Federal Germany, France, Britain, Canada, Italy and others like Maoist China, Titoite Yugoslavia, the member countries of the Comecon, etc., is getting deeper and deeper every day. It is fraught with grave consequences for all the states dependent on international capital.

This major economic crisis is **a crisis of overproduction, of the industrial boom*** but, at the same time, it has caused a profound crisis in production. In fact, in all the capitalist and revisionist countries it has led to increased unemployment, inflation, price rises, etc. This means that, at present, production has fallen and the struggle has begun to clear stocks of goods. However, the capitalist bourgeoisie does not clear these stocks of goods by reducing prices, but by turning the workers out on the streets, that is, by slowing down production. So, since capitalist industry no longer functions at its former level of productivity, the crisis of raw materials emerges. This crisis, likewise, is very grave and is accompanied with the colossal inter-imperialist struggle for markets. This struggle, sometimes open and sometimes subversive, is accompanied with an increase in military budgets and sophisticated conventional and atomic-nuclear weapons to levels incomparably higher than ever before.

The United States of America, the Soviet Union,

* English in the original.

China and other imperialist powers have become the most frenzied inciters of a new imperialist world war. Their hegemonic policy, their eagerness to preserve the existing imperialist status quo on the one hand, and to redivide the spheres of influence on the other hand, have deepened and aggravated the contradictions among the great powers themselves and between them and their partners in crime in their exploitation of other peoples, and so has created new conflicts.

The economic, political and military relations in the various imperialist and revisionist groupings have been shaken. The members of these groupings are striving to cause, to find and to exploit various splits and in this way to formulate excuses for refusing to adhere to commitments, treaties and agreements which exist among them.

At present the struggle of the peoples who are oppressed and exploited by world capital in crisis has assumed proportions and a variety of forms never seen before. This is precisely the true source of the great economic crisis which has engulfed the capitalist and revisionist world. On the surface, it seems as if the armed conflicts, the conflicts in the field of economic-financial relations, the great energy crisis and so on are only between capitalist states, but in fact the origin of these conflicts is more deep-seated and is eroding the bourgeois capitalist state which is striving to defend itself, to stay alive, to heal its numerous wounds, etc. **The force which is eroding the bourgeois capitalist state is the struggle in all forms and at all levels that the peoples of the world are waging.** In one way or another, here with greater there with lesser intensity, the working class and all the exploited are aware of and fight against all forms of the capitalist regime, either local or international, which is exploiting, impoverishing and oppressing them economically and morally. Hence there is great discontent and revolt among the peoples

of the world.

In almost all the capitalist countries today strikes involving millions of people are taking place, there are fierce clashes with the force of law and order, there are armed revolts, but also military putsches, acts of terrorism and anarchism organized by the ruling bourgeois capitalist governments, there is a colossal amount of smuggling and theft organized on a national and international scale, there is an unlimited and monstrous development of political, moral and physical corruption. Thus the way is being prepared for fascism to come to power.

Today we are living in the period of the decay of capitalism, of the weakening, disintegration and bankruptcy this system, this degenerate society. There is no way out of this chaos, this filth other than the revolution, the surgical removal of the rotten tissue, the seizure of state power by the working class, which has the mission to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. What Lenin said about this process is being confirmed and it will certainly take place.

American imperialism with its chief, President Carter, is facing major difficulties in its policy, in the economy, in its alliances and colonies. American imperialism does not know which way to turn, how to cope with the dangers which are threatening it and increasing day by day. Thus it finds itself seized in an iron grip from which it is trying to free itself by applying an insane policy of intimidation, blackmail, economic and political pressure, open military intervention and subversive activities, etc.

In regard to current events it must be said that the struggle of the Iranian people during these last two or three years against the Shah and the United States of America is a heavy blow to American imperialism. **The crisis of Iran is the crisis of the United States of America.** Before this the peoples of the world were ac-

quainted with the barbarous policy of the United States of America and its savage methods of domination and plunder, but in Iran they saw them still more clearly. The tool of the American imperialists in Iran was the Shah and his clique, murderers of the people. For decades on end, the external robbers in alliance with the internal robbers, the murderers of the Iranian people, the Shah's government and administration under the direction of Washington through the American embassy in Teheran, made the law in Iran in full accord with one another.

In the end, however, the Iranian people rose in revolution, swept the Shah from the face of the earth with the iron broom, and captured and imprisoned all the spies of the American embassy who operated under the cloak of diplomats. For more than nine months now, the so-called diplomats of a great power which makes the law in the world have been in prison. *O temporal O mores!* This could not happen in earlier times, but it has happened now, and it is happening also to others besides the Americans in other countries.

The United States of America suffered a major political defeat, which it is unable to repair either through diplomatic channels and economic blackmail, or through military intervention, as it attempted to do and failed with its air commandos in April at Tabas. In Iran the United States of America lost one of its most important sources of oil and energy and colossal profits. It lost the confidence of its Arab "allies" of the Persian Gulf, the American-Egyptian-Israeli agreement reached at Camp David was shaken, *zizanies** and open and underground disagreements with its NATO partners emerged.

In these situations the Soviet Union whets its teeth and bites. It occupied Afghanistan and is driving wedg-

* Quarrels (French in the original).

es into NATO, etc. At the same time the contradictions between the Soviet Union and the United States of America are being deepened. Outwardly the Warsaw Treaty seems “monolithic” while cracks are showing up within NATO, “United Europe” and the European Common Market. The cracks are just as great within Comecon and the Warsaw Treaty, but there the Soviet Army has a stranglehold on the “allies” of the Soviet Union, while the United States of America is losing its former influence over its “allies,” especially over France and Federal Germany. “Meté, Meté, every man for himself,” our people say. When it wins, the United States of America wants to be the greatest, to take the lion’s share of the profits, while when it loses it wants the “allies” to pay for the losses, that is, to share its misfortunes and defeats.

But the law of the jungle operates; the capitalist will see you hanged but will not come to your aid.

The France of De Gaulle and d’Estaing is in NATO and not in NATO. It removed the NATO bases, that is, the American bases, from French soil, strengthened its army independently, built the atomic and hydrogen bomb and now recently the neutron bomb, too, and does not submit to the American dictate on this question. The current French policy proceeds from the position “better to prepare to defend myself first than wait for the United States of America to defend me late in the day.” This constitutes a breach between France and the United States of America. In recent months the United States of America and Carter have done their utmost to ensure that France and Federal Germany, especially, are united with them in all their actions against Iran.

Paris and Bonn condemned in principle the holding of the American diplomats as hostages by the Iranians, but they did not agree with the economic sanctions proposed by the United States of America against Iran, hence, they left it in the lurch. This is another breach

between the United States of America and France and Federal Germany. The United States of America condemned the occupation of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union. China and NATO also condemned this occupation. We condemned it, too, but not from their positions and aims. Tomorrow they will come to terms with the Soviets over this question, while we will never do such a thing.

As a sanction against the Soviet Union over the question of Afghanistan, President Carter declared a boycott of the Olympic games, which are to be held these days in Moscow, and demanded that all the others boycott them, too, but a majority of states including France and even Italy which sent an allegedly unofficial team of athletes to Moscow, left him in the lurch once again.

France went even further. Completely ignoring the United States of America, President Giscard d'Estaing met Brezhnev in Warsaw. Giscard made official visits to several countries of the Middle East where, in public speeches, he expressed doubts about the American-Egyptian-Israeli Camp David compromise and presented some flabby alternative formulations about the rights of the Palestinian people. This is another breach between the United States of America and France.

Even after these defeats Carter proposed that the United States of America should deploy some new "Pershing-2" and "Cruise" nuclear missiles in Europe for the "defence" of Europe and NATO.

This proposal which Carter tried to impose was rejected both by Giscard and by the German Chancellor Schmidt. Why? Apparently from fear that if the United States of America deploys its new missiles in Europe, the Soviet Union will match this by deploying its new "SS-20" nuclear missiles in the countries of the Warsaw Treaty. For this reason Schmidt is to go to Moscow

soon and it is said that he will demand from the Soviets a moratorium for three years on the question of the deployment of new missiles in Europe. Carter was angry and wrote to Schmidt telling him not to go to Moscow to discuss the question of the deployment of new missiles. But Schmidt was unmoved and responded negatively to Carter's letter. Indeed, in regard to this letter Schmidt made the following declaration to the American newspaper *Washington Post*: "For 20 years it has been my custom to express my opinions without asking leave of anybody else," that is, I have no intention of asking leave of Carter now. This whole issue speaks of "unity" between France and Federal Germany and of rifts between them and the United States of America.

"United Europe" is no longer united in itself. The quarrels, rivalries and opposing interests of each state of this so-called European Community are increasing to the extent that its very existence is in jeopardy. Britain, the most faithful ally of the United States of America, is refusing to pay the quota allocated by the European Common Market. Naturally neither Bonn nor Paris like this. France agrees that Greece should be readmitted to the military structures of NATO and become a member of the European Common Market, but it is against the admission of Spain and Portugal. Giscard knows that the admission of the Iberian states to the Western fold will bring difficulties for the sale of French agricultural products. On the other hand the Iberian Peninsula which, in reality, is an American military base, if admitted to the NATO, becomes a new ally of the United States of America in Europe, on the side of Britain...

The contradictions between the United States of America and the industrialized European states were unfurled in the meeting of the heads of state and government of the main industrialized countries of the world which was held at the end of June in Venice. In the mid-

dle of the meeting, which was held in a monastery in an island of the Lagoon of Venice, a “small diplomatic meteorite” for Giscard and some others arrived from Moscow. Moscow announced that it was withdrawing a division of soldiers and 100 tanks from Afghanistan, leaving there 10 other divisions, if not more. Thus Moscow tossed a pebble into the stagnant pool, but the ripple it caused soon died away. It was a diplomatic manoeuvre, but short-lived. Cossiga asked Moscow to withdraw the remainder of its troops from Afghanistan, too, but it uncovered its batteries and showed its teeth, replying that far from withdrawing more troops from Afghanistan, it might, if need be, send other troops there.

Soviet social-imperialism is mounting arrogant attacks on the enemy camp which finds itself in difficulties. The Soviet leaders intend to use Giscard and Schmidt for this purpose, but to what extent and for how long, this remains to be seen. It is true that the Soviet sword is long but the others, too, are keeping their daggers drawn. **In this great cauldron which is boiling, in this big fire which is burning world capitalism, the national liberation struggles, the objective and subjective factors are increasing, mounting, expanding in quantity and rising in quality. The peoples of the world are moving.** Irrespective of the manipulations of the various ideologies in the service of capital, the world proletariat is fighting and leading the class struggle.

Viewing the situation as a whole with a Marxist-Leninist eye, it can be seen that the class struggle is being waged in every corner of the world in classical and non-classical forms. Everywhere the peoples are extremely anxious and worried. Their discontent and anger at the oppressive forces, whether national or foreign, are increasing, mounting, taking specific material shape. Regardless of who is leading the national liberation armed struggles of the peoples, the blood of the peoples fighting for their freedom and independence

reflects their hatred and wrath against local and foreign capitalist oppression, and in the course of these struggles the peoples distinguish the anti-popular stands of individuals or groups, and form alliances with the most progressive and most revolutionary forces. In every movement, in every demonstration or strike, in every public, political or economic manifestation, it is impossible not to protest against the destructive effects of the grave crisis and not to put the finger on the persons responsible for the exploitation and oppression of the peoples, the forces which want the destruction of mankind.

In the capitalist and revisionist countries with one pseudo-communist party, with two or more pseudo-democratic parties, despite the efforts of these parties to lay the blame on each other, and despite the bourgeois states, separately or in groups, trying to put the blame on one another, nothing is changing; the oppression of the peoples continues, but their anger and revolt continue to mount as well. This anger and revolt are hitting the capitalist and revisionist bourgeoisie in various forms and with different intensities.

The peoples see that predatory imperialist war is threatening them. They understand who is preparing this war, who pays the cost of it and who profits from this war. Two phenomena stand out in this situation: there are some who are still afraid of imperialist war, there are others who fight against it. In the final analysis, however, in various forms, the peoples are joining in the struggle of active resistance, in the initial stages of the national liberation war, in sabotaging and stopping the imperialist war and, in the end, are hurling themselves into revolution. The movements of opposition which are taking place in the world must not be judged from the standpoint of bourgeois governments and their parties which try to manipulate the peoples; it is necessary to see the essence of the problem, the re-

sistance and the fundamental direction of the peoples' political or economic demands, which force the capitalist bourgeois leaderships either to take draconian repressive measures against these movements, or in order to restabilize their already shaken situation, to shift sometimes in one, sometimes in another direction and rely on one or the other superpower.

The Marxist-Leninists must master historical materialism and apply it in practice. They must see the development of the world and the changes occurring in it from the angle of Marxism-Leninism. He who upholds the occupation of Afghanistan by the Soviet social-imperialists and considers it a just and necessary action cannot be considered a Marxist; he is an anti-Marxist. Those self-styled Marxist-Leninists who try to "argue" that the Afghan people and the elements of the middle and even of the top bourgeoisie who fight against the Soviet occupiers should not be described as patriots cannot be called Marxists, they are anti-Marxists. He who thinks and acts in this way has understood nothing of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on alliances, on national liberation fronts and struggles. Likewise the thoughts and actions of some "communist" comrades abroad who fail to see the anti-imperialist aspects of the struggle of the Arab peoples, the Iranian people and the Muslim world cannot be called Marxist-Leninist thoughts and actions. To underestimate these anti-imperialist moments, to fail to make the most of them and display "orthodoxy" by demanding that these peoples in revolution abandon belief in their religion, and the customs and habits which derive from it almost at once, shows at least Marxist-Leninist ideological immaturity.

As the events in Iran prove, the masses of the people play an important and decisive role in carrying out the revolution. It was they who placed themselves in the forefront of the fight, overthrew the feudal monarchy of the Pahlavis and dealt powerful blows at imperial-

ism. However, we cannot say that they have triumphed and their struggle can be carried forward with the blind medieval fanaticism of the Ayatollahs. The communists must support and help the revolutionary masses and the progressive forces in their struggle. The struggle they are waging at present creates conditions for the communists to go among the masses, to work for their correct education, to deepen their own Marxist-Leninist ideological world outlook, to rely on the revolutionary people and on the working class in the first place and to be able to make use of every situation favourable for the revolution.

This is how the process of the development of the struggle of the peoples must be understood and followed. It is a grave error to confound and identify the sentiments of the peoples, whoever they are, with those of the bourgeois capitalist groups in power in a particular country. The people of Egypt, for example, cannot and must not be identified with Sadat and his clique, who until yesterday were in the service of the Soviets and have placed themselves in the service of the Americans today...

The Marxist-Leninist communists must be able to make correct analyses, to determine the proper strategy and tactics, to form alliances in favour of the revolution, to undertake correct revolutionary actions and not adventures and see all these from the standpoint of the Marxist-Leninist theory, because only in this way can one serve the liberation of the peoples from capitalism and make revolution.

National liberation wars are just wars. They break out when the objective and subjective factors exist and have matured. The Marxist-Leninists themselves must help in the creation of these factors. The Marxist-Leninists must never sit idle and not take part in the just wars, either as parties, or as groups when they are not yet organized as parties, or as individual fighters. They

must never stand aloof from the masses who are fighting for social and national liberation, but while fighting in their midst, they must confirm their communist convictions, organize themselves and place the working class in the leadership. Even when they are not organized, they must emerge in the vanguard of the masses through their struggle and sacrifices, so that the national liberation war advances towards its minimal objectives, and then goes on to its ultimate objectives.

The creation of conditions for the outbreak of national-liberation wars does not depend on the will of one or the other personality. It is the objective and subjective situations that cause the outbreak of the national liberation wars which are a high-level form of the class struggle. That class which emerges in the forefront and leads the national liberation war is the most progressive, the decisive factor. The working class is the most progressive of the progressive classes. It must assume the leadership of the liberation war. If at the outset of the war it has not ensured its leading position, it must stand in the forefront of the fighting and sacrifices, because only in this way can it take over the political and military leadership, ensure the fulfilment of the objectives of the national liberation war and realize its own desires.

In the situation developing in the world today, the Marxist-Leninist parties, the working class and its possible allies, the broad strata of the peasantry and the progressive intelligentsia, must not only see clearly the danger of a new imperialist world war, but also organize themselves and assert their will in a thousand forms, in order to stop this destructive war, to expose the demagogy and falsity of the “democratic” slogans of enslaving capital and to free themselves from the restrictive chains of the various pseudo-democratic and pseudo-popular parties set up by the bourgeoisie.

At all times it is necessary to study carefully, on

the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, every situation that is created in each country and in the ranks of each people, to draw conclusions and come out with revolutionary progressive joint actions. Nothing must escape the revolutionary eye of those who fight for the great cause of their own people and all peoples. The Marxist-Leninists must utilize every development of the situation. This is a struggle which must be waged every day, because in this way the great avalanche of the revolution will sweep away the enemies of the peoples, and bring freedom, progress, and socialist society and eventually communist society.

Therefore, in this great economic crisis of world capitalism, the Marxist-Leninist communists, wherever they are in the world, must clearly define their line and stands and know how to apply this line in practice. In these highly complicated situations in which there are clashes of the interests of classes which are not separated by clearcut divisions, but are interlinked and interdependent, only a genuine Marxist-Leninist party can see clearly where the advantages and where the disadvantages lie, distinguish enemies from friends, know with whom to unite, against whom and how they must fight and carry this war forward, etc.

THURSDAY
AUGUST 14, 1980

IMPERIALIST FRICTIONS

I have written before about the differences which have emerged between "United Europe," especially France and Federal Germany, and the United States of America. These differences have manifested themselves more openly in the recent times, when the American President Carter sought to impose his dictate on the states of "United Europe" in connection with the stands they should adopt towards certain international political problems and events.

We see that at present, the differences between the United States of America and France and Federal Germany are becoming deeper and more pronounced, especially after the meeting between Giscard d'Estaing and Brezhnev in Warsaw and that between Schmidt and Brezhnev in Moscow. After these talks, in continuation of the meetings for the bilateral exchange of opinions, a tradition established by De Gaulle and Adenauer in their time, Giscard paid an official friendly visit to Federal Germany. The talks he held on this occasion with Chancellor Schmidt, in general, ended in a political and economic understanding between France and Germany, the two main states of "United Europe."

The meetings and talks between the French President, Giscard d'Estaing, and the German Chancellor, Schmidt, demonstrated the existence of a unity between these two European republics, which is more profound and stable than before, a more resolute stand, although without coming out openly in opposition to the United States of America. We see that now the German Chancellor, Schmidt, is making statements in which he stresses his intention to continue the talks between West Germany and the Soviet Union, that is, to

continue the “Ostpolitik” inaugurated by Willy Brandt, former chairman of the German Social Democratic Party now in power in Bonn.

Following his meetings with Brezhnev, the Chancellor of Bonn has stated that soon he will meet Gierek of Poland and Honecker of East Germany, two states which in the Warsaw Treaty occupy a place of importance second only to that of the Soviet Union. In my opinion, the purpose of Schmidt’s talks with these two eastern revisionist leaders will be to discuss the “aid” which Bonn Germany, that is, West German capital, will give these two countries, which are faced with great economic and political difficulties. Of course, this aid from Federal Germany is in favour of the Western powers and to the disadvantage of the Soviets. The Soviet social-imperialists are obliged to accept this situation, because the state of affairs within their own country and that within the ranks of the Warsaw Treaty member countries is not prosperous.

East Germany and, in particular, Poland are in the grip of a grave economic crisis, so that they are in great need of the innumerable credits which they have received and are continuing to receive from Bonn Germany. At present, in Poland the workers are staging big strikes every day, protesting against the shortages of meat and other foodstuffs and demanding increased wages. With their strikes, the workers have put the Gierek government in an extremely difficult position politically, too. Of course, these strikes are causing difficulties, also, for the Soviet Union and the whole revisionist camp.

The Soviet Union is not only failing to supply its “allies” with the necessary amounts of essential raw materials, especially oil, electricity, gas, etc., but it is imposing on them new modern weapons which it sells them at high prices, just as it does with the other materials which it has contracted to supply to these states.

Therefore, Poland, East Germany and the other vassal countries of Eastern Europe have long incurred colossal debts, not only to Soviet social-imperialism, but also to American imperialism, and in particular, to West German imperialism.

Today the Federal Republic of Germany has a powerful economy, and it and France are challenging even the United States of America to some extent. Their challenge is based on their refusal to accept Carter's policy in regard to political and economic sanctions against Iran, the Camp David Agreement on the Middle East, and the deployment of "Pershing-2" and "Cruise" missiles in their countries at the pleasure of the United States of America, etc.

Therefore these issues have caused friction between France and Federal Germany and the United States of America. The Americans, of course, are trying to prevent their NATO "allies" from going too far, especially in their talks with the Soviet social-imperialists. Thus, apart from exerting its own direct and indirect pressure, Washington has impelled Italy to oppose the course of the policy of Paris and Bonn for talks with the Soviet Union.

In an article published a few days ago in the newspaper *Repubblica*, the Italian foreign minister, Emilio Colombo, criticized France and the Federal Republic of Germany for the separatist policy they are pursuing within "United Europe" in regard to the Soviet Union. He criticized them because allegedly they speak in the name of "United Europe" without the prior consent of the other members of this community. Besides other things, Colombo says that, when there is talk about "United Europe" and its policy, it must be understood that it is closely linked with the United States of America.

Colombo pointed out that the "Franco-German understanding" is necessary to Western Europe, add-

ing that “Italy is not resentful” about that. “But,” he went on, “if the other members of the European Community are faced with accomplished facts and efforts are made by individual countries to decide the general lines of the European policy, then we are not in agreement with this.” He went on to point out that complete unity of opinion does not exist between France and the Federal Republic of Germany, and that “there are differences in connection with their joint defence.” With this last phrase he wants to inform the world that there are contradictions not only between France and Germany, but also between those two countries and Italy.

Here, the whole question boils down to the fact that Italy fully supports the actions of the United States of America...

Nevertheless, in recent days Schmidt once again reiterated his policy of the soft approach to the Soviet Union and the other countries of the Warsaw Treaty. Hence, it is clear that Bonn and Paris not only do not want to burn their bridges with the Soviet Union, but on the contrary, want to keep tempers cool, because they know that a conflict between the Soviet Union and the capitalist countries of Western Europe would result in a bloodbath catastrophic for Europe, and that, as always, the United States of America would make great profits from this. France and Federal Germany want to escape these consequences.

Likewise, Schmidt gave hopes that the policy of Bonn towards the East will have positive effects, also, on the coming Madrid Conference on “European security and cooperation.” At this meeting, the United States of America, which will take part although it is not a European country, will seek to raise the issue of the occupation of Afghanistan by the Soviet army, while the Soviet Union is opposing this. Therefore, Helmut Schmidt and Giscard d’Estaing will try to find a *modus vivendi* on this issue, that is, to avoid falling out with

either the Soviet Union or the United States of America, in a word, they will try to “sit on the fence.” Thus, they want to present themselves, to some extent, as uncommitted to the hasty actions of the United States of America, which have had an electoral character, too. As is known, Carter undertook these actions partly because he had crashed head-on into big rocks, jeopardizing his authority as president, and had at all costs to demonstrate to the world and American opinion that he was a “strong” president, but in fact it was obvious what he was.

Hence, France and Federal Germany think that, when the United States of America has a new president, it will follow another, more flexible policy towards the Soviet Union and naturally also towards its own allies and partners, especially France and Federal Germany.

In this situation Bonn and Paris are able to blackmail Washington, and are doing so, strengthening their own positions in this way. It is understandable that, as these two countries grow stronger economically and politically, they want to make the law in NATO and manage, in their own way, to oppose the American plans, while on the other hand, trying to maintain the status quo from which they benefit. Federal Germany and France present the issue in this way: Should they continue to follow this course, this policy towards the East, or engage in bloody conflicts with the Soviet Union when during all this time they have invested huge sums in that country and the other countries of Eastern Europe, and when this policy has brought about grave differences in the ranks of the Warsaw Treaty countries?

The great world economic crisis has severely affected the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty countries. This general crisis of capitalism has affected Federal Germany and France, too, but it can be said that these two are superior to the East-European countries included in the Warsaw Treaty. Here I am referring to

the economic aspect, because from the military point of view, in an eventual European conflict the Soviet Union and its “allies” are stronger than France, Federal Germany and NATO if the United States of America does not intervene.

Hence, with this policy France and Federal Germany are telling the United States of America and its ally — China: if you want a conflict with the Soviet Union, have it in the Far East, in Siberia, and not in Europe, not in the Near or Middle East, where the oil wells which supply energy to Europe are located. Here the hegemonic imperialist policy of the United States of America is running into great opposition from the other capitalist and colonialist policy of France, Federal Germany, and to some extent, Britain, which is not raising its voice as loudly as the other two European partners are doing. Britain was knocked senseless long ago and has become, so to say, a docile, silent ally of the United States of America.

MONDAY
SEPTEMBER 1, 1980

WHAT LIES BEHIND THE WORKERS' STRIKES AT THE POLISH BALTIC PORTS?

As I have written previously in my Political Diary, since the beginning of July, a strike movement of dockers and workers of other sectors commenced in Poland, especially in the Baltic port cities of Gdansk, Gdynia, Szczecin, etc. These strikes assumed large proportions during the two last weeks of August.

Right from the start, the development of events in connection with these strikes showed that, although called by workers against the economic difficulties they have encountered, they were inspired and manipulated from abroad and by the all powerful Polish Catholic Church. Hence, in essence they were reactionary, of a counter-revolutionary character, and were directed against the existing anti-popular government in Poland.

By following the day-to-day development of the events in Poland during the last two months we can come to certain conclusions.

It was natural that the strikes in Gdansk, Gdynia and Szczecin would lead to some developments and results. First of all, they caused new difficulties for the Polish revisionist leadership and, at the same time, made the political situation all over the country more tense. Besides this, as was expected, confronted with the difficult situations which were created, and internal and external pressures, on August 31, the Polish government was forced to sign in Gdansk an agreement with the strike committee capitulating to its demands and making concessions. Among other things it agreed to the setting up of "independent, self-governing trade

unions” in the ports of Gdansk, Gdynia and Szczecin, and recognized the workers’ right to strikes and to hold elections by secret ballot. This result was, of course, attained against the wishes of the Polish counter-revolutionary party and government and also against the wishes of the Soviet revisionists.

The setting up of these new “independent self-governing” trade unions is a new attack by the bourgeoisie, international reaction and the modern revisionists on the Leninist theory about the trade unions of the working class as transmission belts to link the party with its class, as voluntary unions of the working class to defend its state power, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and as schools of communism. They are completely the opposite of what V.I. Lenin advocated:

*“The trade unions must collaborate closely and constantly with the government, all the political and economic activities of which are guided by the class-conscious vanguard of the working class — the Communist Party.”**

The setting up of these new trade unions in Poland now means that there will be two types of trade unions in that country, first, in the three above-mentioned cities, because their influence may spread rapidly over the country, although it may be liquidated in different ways and by means of measures taken from time to time: “the independent self-governing trade unions,” and the trade unions led by the United Workers’ Party of Poland. For the sake of appearances, the agreement that was signed in Gdansk between the delegates of the government and those of the strike committee says that these “independent self-governing trade unions”

* V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 33, Alb. ed., Tirana 1957, pp. 202-203.

recognize the leadership of the party. But according to news agency reports, many strikers were not in agreement with their leaders on this question. They wanted these trade unions to be completely independent, so they could impose their will on the Polish party and state, not only on the question of setting the prices of industrial and food products, but also on other general issues. But it seems that this was not fully achieved and the leader of these strikes, Lech Walesa, told the workers that for the moment we must be content with what we have achieved, and he pointed out to the Polish vice-premier, Jegielski, who signed the agreement on behalf of the government, that the Polish government must respect the terms of the agreement, otherwise the strikes will start again. In a word, the so-called strikers are threatening the Polish government.

These are the facts we know so far. But I think that all this so-called strike of the workers in the Baltic ports was not caused simply by the shortages of food, and especially of meat, on the market or by the price increases. On the contrary, it had a political character. The strikes were not spontaneous but organized. They were organized from outside by the capitalist-imperialist countries and from inside by Polish reaction, by the Church and by the Gierek clique itself.

Let us explain this analysis and these conclusions and back them with facts.

It is natural for these strikes to be a consequence of the revisionist line of the so-called United Workers' Party of Poland itself and of the all-round subjugation of this country to the revisionist Soviet Union. As a member of the Warsaw Treaty and Comecon, Poland is occupied militarily, exploited economically and dependent politically on the Soviet Union. Besides this the Polish people generally have always been opposed to the Russian influence and domination. Reaction and the Catholic Church have made continuous use of all

the means of propaganda and exploited all the economic and political difficulties to deepen the animosity to the Soviet Union, to intensify the contradictions with that country.

On the other hand, the pseudo-socialist system in Poland has always been in more advanced capitalist positions than that of the other so-called people's democracies. Socialist agricultural cooperatives were not formed and do not exist in Poland. There are some state farms, but in general, private ownership prevails there. The Polish squires of today, naturally with other titles, possess large areas of land which they work with hired wage labour.

Thus, in the Polish countryside the capitalist agricultural system prevails, a system that is fostered and reinforced with anti-socialist, anti-Soviet religious feelings, by Western capitalist propaganda and by the Vatican through the Polish Church, which are allowed to operate freely. A similar situation prevails in the Polish cities, too, hence also in the factories. Since liberation, except for the period when Boleslaw Bierut was in power, the Catholic Church has played a very important counter-revolutionary role. It has maintained, strengthened and developed its reactionary ideological positions and continues to exercise a profound political influence among the peasantry and the working class, not to speak of its influence on the Polish intelligentsia, which retains and develops idealism and other reactionary ideologies. Gomulka and Gierek gave the Catholic Church this important role and, willy-nilly, the Soviet revisionists have tolerated it, too. Hence it is clear that the Polish Church influences and has its finger in the strikes that are now going on in Poland.

The Polish revisionist leadership of both party and state gives the impression that it is in alliance with the Soviet revisionists, but in reality it is anti-Soviet. Only Poland's geographical position and its membership

of the Warsaw Treaty and Comecon compel it to give the impression that it is in unity with the Soviets. The Soviet revisionists are aware of this situation, but they can never allow Poland to slip from their hands. Why? Because were such a thing to happen, then the Soviet hegemony over all the other countries of the revisionist camp would be at risk, because, after the Soviet Union, Poland is the main and most active member of the Warsaw Treaty, and if Poland is lost, the Soviet Union has lost East Germany, Czechoslovakia and Hungary, not to mention Romania and Bulgaria, from the military standpoint. In other words, such a thing would lead to the destabilization of the strategy of the Warsaw Treaty in Europe and, of course, in that case the Soviet social-imperialists could in no way sit idle.

Naturally, Poland, like the Soviet Union itself, has very highly developed economic and political relations with the capitalist countries of Western Europe and also with the United States of America. These relations have developed continuously. In the economic field Poland has obtained large credits from the capitalist countries. According to recent information, these credits amount to 20 billion dollars. Naturally this has put Poland in great economic difficulties. It has obligations to its creditors that must be met, that is, it has to repay the credits in installments and also pay the interest, therefore it has been obliged to increase its exports. But to repay the credits in full Poland would have to use the whole of its export income for two successive years, a thing which is impossible in practice.

In recent years economic development in Poland has declined and besides this, the floods of this year have forced it to import millions of tons of grain. Thus Poland is short of grain for the population and fodder for the livestock. This has brought difficulties and shortages on the market, especially of meat, although Poland

is one of the greatest exporters of *bacon*,* as they call it in England and elsewhere; the black market and speculators have become more active, and as a result, the discontent of the masses of the people and the workers has increased. The difficulties have become even greater because Poland's "allies," headed by the Soviet Union, that supply it with many raw materials, have raised the prices of their goods and do not deliver them on time and in the quantities they have agreed upon. This shows that the relations within Comecon have been becoming difficult for some time, and not just with Poland, but with all the members of this pseudo-socialist economic organization.

In order to improve the situation, some 5 or 6 months ago the Polish leadership changed the prime minister, discharged Jaroszewicz and appointed in his stead a certain Babiusz of whom it was said at the time that he would improve the economic situation of Poland. This was just a tale because the existing difficult economic situation was caused not by one person, but by the capitalist revisionist line of the Polish party and state. Babiusz and Gierek thought that by raising the prices of meat and other daily necessities they would be able to improve the situation without any great difficulty. In fact, however, they did not succeed either in surmounting the internal economic difficulties or in liquidating the obligations towards the Western capitalist "allies" and "well-wishers."

So, it was in this internal situation that the strikes of the workers of the Baltic ports began. But we must look at the strikes in the Baltic cities and the Polish question in general in the context of the imperialist-revisionist, global strategy, of the developments of the current policy of the two imperialist superpowers. Thus, before the strikes in Poland, there were profound

* English in the original.

contradictions between the United States of America and the states of Western Europe, especially France and the Federal Republic of Germany, over a number of issues, such as Iran, the deployment of “Pershing 2” and “Cruise” missiles on the territories of the NATO member countries and of “SS-20” missiles by the Soviet Union in the territories of the Warsaw Treaty member countries, over the Camp David agreements between Israel and Egypt, in other words, over the question of Palestine, the rights of the Palestinian people, etc., over the Olympic games which are to be held in Moscow, etc...

The Soviet Union, for its part, finds itself in economic and political difficulties, and indeed, in military difficulties, following the invasion of Afghanistan *manu militari*. Hence, in these circumstances the Soviet Union, too, is interested in maintaining the “détente” and cooperation with the United States of America, and if that country continues to make threats, at least it is interested in splitting the front of NATO by pursuing a policy of “détente” with France and Federal Germany.

The other countries of Eastern Europe, the satellites of the Soviet Union, also, are pursuing this policy. In no way does the Soviet Union want these satellite countries to slip from its grasp, but it is impossible for it to prevent them from getting into debt to Federal Germany, France, the United States of America and to other Western capitalist countries...

As I have written in the other analyses I have made of them, the strikes in the cities of the Baltic coast are reactionary, counter-revolutionary, are led by Polish capitalists and are directed against other Polish capitalists, the revisionists who are in power. These strikes have an anti- Soviet, pro-Western character. The strikers are in the service of reaction, of internal Polish capitalist and the Catholic Church.

Two suppositions can be made about the fact that

these strikes were launched under the influence of internal and external reactionary forces, but not at a very suitable time to achieve the desired results. First, they may have been launched without careful calculation of the moments and the predisposition of Western capitalist reaction. Second, it may be that the latter wanted a counter-revolution against the counter-revolutionaries in power in Poland, but one that would not go too far, that is, a restrained counter-revolution.

In other words, it is very likely that, through these strikes, France and Federal Germany wanted to put pressure on the Soviet Union, but not on Gierek and his clique, not to go so far as to endanger the positions of this Polish clique, otherwise their whole policy of "détente" towards the East would be compromised. They knew that if things went too far on this question (and this could happen, because the conditions for a counter-revolutionary coup against a group which is equally counter-revolutionary, but which is in power in Poland, have long been prepared), this would cause the armed intervention of the Soviet Union.

So, we can say without any doubt that the West has had a finger in this counter-revolutionary Polish movement, and did not fail to pour petrol on the fire, but just enough to get it started, to give it its first taste of opposition, especially opposition by the working class to the Soviet oppression, and this not in a severe, but in a moderate form. I think that the Gierek clique was aware of this orientation and wanted such an action in order to show itself "more independent" from Moscow. Gierek is pro-Western. Of this I am convinced. The Western capitalist states, too, including the United States of America, want a Polish government with Gierek, Babiusz or one of their ilk at the head. But to a certain degree, the Western capitalist countries in particular want "to roast the meat without burning the spit." In other words, they want the Polish workers and people

to gain some allegedly democratic rights, more than they have now, which means that the Polish revisionist authoritarian regime must be relaxed, must take new steps towards liberalism, but, at the same time, should not go beyond certain limits.

But what about the United States of America, does it have a finger in all this? Maybe it does, maybe it does not. Its non-involvement is relative, because the United States of America is interested in any situation that arouses the Soviet Union to anger and harsh actions which cause friction in Moscow's relations with its allies of Western Europe, so that Carter will be able to accomplish his hegemonic plans in Europe and weaken any opposition to these plans from France and Federal Germany. But there is another possibility: perhaps the contradictions of France and Federal Germany with the United States of America were a diplomatic game on a large scale to bring about the strikes in Poland or to go even further.

I think that this version could not be to the advantage of France and Federal Germany. This was clearly obvious in the stand taken by the Western press, which gave sensational publicity to the workers' strikes at the Polish Baltic ports, but, for their part, the French, German and British governments, and even the American government, were very reserved about them. Moreover, they advised the workers of Gdynia, Gdansk and Szczecin to be prudent in their demands. Even the Pope of the Vatican, and consequently the Polish Catholic Church with Wyszynski at the head, told the workers that they agreed with their demands, but made public appeals to them to do everything in a "peaceful" and "orderly" way, to "bear in mind" the conditions of Poland, of the Polish state, etc., etc.

In other words, the West was afraid of military intervention by the Soviet Union, and so, as I wrote at the start of this article, an agreement on ending the

strikes was signed at Gdansk between representatives of the government and representatives of the strike committee. At the moment armed intervention in Poland by the Soviet Union would not be advantageous to West Germany, France, Britain or the United States of America. Nevertheless the inspiration for the strikes in the Baltic ports was a Western inspiration, but at the same time restrained and prudent, in order to avoid what happened with Czechoslovakia and Dubček, who thought that he could go to the extremes dreamed of by capitalism without any dangers from the Soviet Union.

As for Gierek and his clique, he, too, was afraid that the strikers would go too far, which would cause the intervention of the Soviet Union and thus the whole clique and its plans would be endangered. Hence the Gierek clique which, in my opinion has a hand in these strikes, intended through them to tell the people and the workers of Poland: make the Russians understand that you object to dependence on Moscow, but carefully and prudently. At the same time, in order to tell the workers that the allegedly socialist regime in Poland has gone bankrupt, before the Polish people, before the strikers, Gierek made a “frank” scandalous self-criticism in the Central Committee, admitting that grave economic and political mistakes had been made in Poland, especially in recent years, that regular supplies of goods have not been available, the rights of the citizens have been violated and there have been a number of other mistakes which have caused great discontent among the workers and the people.

After this self-criticism the Gierek clique promised that it would reconsider the strikers' demands and would approve some of them, but under the leadership of the Polish United Workers' Party and within the Constitution and laws of the Polish state. Gierek laid the blame for everything on the new prime minister, Babiusz, who had come to power only a few months before, after the

fall of Jaroszewicz. Babiusz and a number of other ministers were dismissed and replaced by some men who had been expelled from the Political Bureau and the Central Committee of the Party and dismissed from the cabinet of ministers at the time when Jaroszewicz fell. Thus Babiusz and the others were made the "scapegoats," while the fault did not lie with Babiusz alone. Faults he had in plenty, but they have their source and cause in the Gierek clique which is reactionary and capitalist. Therefore, if someone had to be removed from the leadership of the party and the state in Poland, Gierek and his clique should have been the first.

As for the social-imperialist Soviet Union, during all these disturbances it said nothing, but kept its ears cocked, like a cat watching a mouse and, without moving any regiment, because it had them inside Poland, kept its weapons ready for any danger that might threaten it. The Soviet revisionists undoubtedly maintained contact with Gierek and his clique and were certainly not in agreement with all that was happening in Poland, with the Gierek clique, with Gierek's self-criticism, and with the decisions which they were preparing to take. On the contrary the Soviet revisionists were openly opposed to all these things. Only when the Gdansk agreement was signed did Moscow briefly report the events in its press and mention something from Gierek's speech. This was the attitude which the Soviet Union maintained during the development of these strikes, and this attitude frightened the United States of America, France, Federal Germany, and even Gierek himself and the Polish Catholic Church.

At present we observe that both France and the Federal Republic of Germany, as well as the United States of America, through their main official spokesmen are singing Gierek's praises over the way he solved the crisis. Thus Brzezinski, adviser to President Carter on security questions, and Poniatowski, a former minister

of the Interior of the French government, called Gierek “a mature man” “of great experience,” and an “ardent patriot” who was able to find the best solution to the disagreements between the striking workers and the government and the Polish United Workers’ Party. But the fact is that for the moment the Western Powers want things to be left as they are, while the victories achieved in the strikes at the Baltic ports are consolidated and spread to all the work centres of Poland. They want the so-called independent self-governing trade unions to be consolidated and turned into a political party in opposition to the so-called communist party of Poland.

The press of these countries writes openly that “the victory achieved by the Polish workers is a historic victory,” because this occurred in an allegedly socialist country, where, in fact, the communist regime has gone bankrupt and where pluralism of parties does not exist. Hence, world capitalism considers the so-called independent self-governing trade unions, which were born from the compromise of the Gierek clique with the counter-revolutionary strikers of the Baltic ports, as a future political party, which has already gained its independence from the Polish United Workers’ Party...

We must regard the creation of “the independent self-governing trade unions” in Poland as a springboard to go over from an anarcho-syndicalist system of the structures and superstructures of revisionist countries to a completely capitalist system. What happened in Poland has similarities with what happened earlier in Yugoslavia, the work of Tito’s traitor group. But Yugoslavia, which passed through the phase of a pseudo-socialist regime after the war, definitely broke away from the socialist camp and, after some ups and downs, adopted the system of self-administration. In Yugoslavia the role of the party as a communist party was eliminated. The role of the trade unions was eliminated, too. State centralism and democratic centralism

were eliminated and replaced with economic decentralization while, allegedly, retaining a political centralism and a common federal administration.

Now restrictions of various types are being placed on self-administration in Yugoslavia. Why? Because as the anarchist system it is, it cannot withstand the great economic crisis that has engulfed Yugoslavia and the capitalist countries which give it aid. With the investments, credits and the loans which they provide, the capitalists of the West and American imperialism want to secure profits from Yugoslavia. For a time, until the end of the stage of completely breaking away from the alleged socialist system, self-administration served their aims. Now it is no longer of any value and the world capitalist bourgeoisie aims to ensure another system for Yugoslavia, that of bureaucratic centralism.

Meanwhile in Poland, Polish revisionism, like the revisionism in the Soviet Union and the other member countries of the Warsaw Treaty, retains the old forms of the structure and the superstructure, that is, centralism is still retained there in the economy and in the organization of the state. The Polish United Workers' Party is in the leadership; the trade unions play the role of the transmission belt to carry the policy of the revisionist party to the working class, etc., etc. The Western capitalist bourgeoisie has to find a way to further weaken this state system which, as it knows, is pseudo-socialist and completely under the influence of the Soviet Union. Hence in order to weaken the capitalist-revisionist systems in the countries allied to the Soviet Union, Western capitalism and American imperialism have to act, but naturally, with prudence, because any open interference on their part could cause events like those in Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan, from which, presumably, they have drawn lessons.

Hence, in order to infiltrate into these countries more deeply, they, that is, the Westerners, are not only

trying to bring about the degeneration of the society there and to continue to invest their capital, which brings them profits and, at the same time, also erodes the military, economic and political power of the Soviet Union in those countries, but are also not overlooking the need to work for the degeneration of the system that prevails there at present. And the best means to bring about the degeneration of the system of the revisionist countries is self-administration, which was applied in Yugoslavia, is being applied in China, is now advocated by the Eurocommunists, by the French and Italian revisionist parties, etc., and now ought to be applied by the countries of the Warsaw Treaty.

The world capitalist bourgeoisie has thought, and from the standpoint of its own interests it has not thought badly, that for the present it could not make such an attempt in Hungary, the German Democratic Republic or Romania, so it found Poland. Why? Because the revisionist system that prevails in Poland at present has been weakened, the Catholic Church is a dominant force and Gomulka and Gierek have given it this force and the important role that it has. Like it or not, the Soviet revisionists, too, have tolerated it. So, in Poland the world capitalist bourgeoisie has the support of the Catholic Church, which constitutes a major force within the Polish state itself, where the so-called communist party is rotten and seeking ways to liquidate the elements which are trying to keep the present situation going.

The world capitalist bourgeoisie is relying, also, on the great anti-Sovietism of the Poles, as well as on the fact that, irrespective of the formal aspects, the Gierek clique is not completely obedient to the Soviet revisionists. The anti-Sovietism of Gierek and his clique consists in their encouragement of secret aspirations for independence from the Soviet revisionists.

In this situation, those who stand behind the strikes

in the Baltic ports are trying to give the newly-formed trade unions a “free, self-governing” character, with the aim of forming an opposition to the Polish United Workers’ Party and then applying the self-administrative system gradually to the economy, too, as was done in Yugoslavia. We must also bear in mind the fact that these “striking workers” inspired by the capitalist bourgeoisie and by the Catholic Church will undertake activities in the Polish countryside, and the “independent self-governing trade unions” will try to rally under their leadership all the small enterprises or workshops which exist there, “in order to self-administer them” economically and politically. The new trade-union organizations will undoubtedly extend their political activity and consequently also their economic activity. In the state enterprises in which the “right” to strike and all the other “rights” included in the 21 points will be introduced, things will reach the point that their decisions will be imposed on the government and the Polish United Workers’ Party by means of strikes.

So think the Western capitalist bourgeoisie and those who led the strikes of the workers of the Baltic ports, with which the Gierak group, which is throwing the stone and hiding its hand in order to gain ground in reformist ways and to avoid the intervention of the Soviet Union in the internal affairs of Poland, is indirectly implicated. Will they achieve this aim? This is questionable. I have expressed my opinion above and I repeat that it would be very *hasardeux*,* as the French say, very bold of them to carry matters further. It is hardly likely that the Soviet revisionists and the other Warsaw Treaty countries or the cliques which rule in those countries will allow the Western bourgeoisie and Polish reaction to accomplish their aims completely. The Soviet Union is determined to maintain its power

* Hazardous (French in the original).

in all the countries of Comecon and the Warsaw Treaty, that is, to keep both the political system, the state forms, the pseudo-socialist structures and superstructures, and present economic and military systems unaltered. To this end the Soviet revisionists created the so-called theory of the limited sovereignty.

I think that the compromise reached between the strikers and the Polish government is only a *modus vivendi*. The social-imperialist Soviet Union will not allow another ultra-revisionist clan to grow within its revisionist clan. And it is clear that, despite the great political, military and economic difficulties it has within the country and in the ranks of the Warsaw Treaty, the Soviet Union still has sufficient forces, and indeed has them concentrated in the vassal countries of Eastern Europe, to prevent such a threatening activity from spreading and becoming dangerous to it and to the cliques in its service which are in power in those countries.

On all these matters, it is particularly important that the international working class does not make the mistake of considering the strikes in the Baltic ports of Poland as revolutionary activity. In no way should they be considered as revolutionary activity. They have a counter-revolutionary inspiration and are directed against a leadership which is equally counter-revolutionary. They have the aim of releasing Poland from the clutches of the Soviet social-imperialists, but by turning it into an instrument of world capitalism.

The Polish working class itself must understand this. It should understand that the true road to salvation requires the Polish working class, under the leadership of a genuine Marxist-Leninist party and inspired by Marxism-Leninism to arouse the Polish people and to lead them into battle to overthrow the internal capitalist-revisionist cliques, to get rid of the yoke of the revisionist Soviet Union, to shake off the yoke of world

capitalism and liquidate the destructive influence of the Catholic Church. The working class and the Polish people must understand that their present anti-Sovietism is not based on the Marxist-Leninist ideology, but is an anti-Sovietism inspired by the chauvinist ideas of the Polish bourgeoisie.

As for our people, through the press and the other means of propaganda, they should analyse and gain a correct understanding of the circumstances in which these events are taking place, should analyse and understand them in the light of Marxism-Leninism and not draw wrong conclusions from the fact that allegedly those who rose in revolt were workers and that those workers were against the Gierek clique and against the Soviet Union. Whether they knew it or not, those workers were not on the road of the revolution, but on the capitalist road. They were against Gierek, but not for the overthrow of the revisionist system, they were against the Soviet Union, but not for freeing themselves by force from the Soviet social-imperialist jackboot, were not for marching on the revolutionary road, for decisive changes, for the genuine construction of socialism in Poland. The Western capitalist bourgeoisie and world reaction are able to use them to weaken their rivals and to strengthen their own positions. In order to create new difficulties and disturbances, and there are more than a few of them already, to strengthen their own positions and weaken those of their opponents, the world capitalist bourgeoisie and, especially, the European and American capitalist bourgeoisie will continue to work with these methods, not only in Poland, but also in East Germany, in the other so-called countries of people's democracy and within the Soviet Union, too. In fact, now that the strikes in the Polish ports have ended and work is said to have started again today, the West German capitalist bourgeoisie, Bonn, has again begun to push the issue of the meeting and

the talks which had been put off, with Honecker, and even with Gierek. The press is saying, also, that West Germany has allocated Poland a new credit of 500 million marks "to help it" overcome the difficulties it has. France will do likewise. Appeals are being made to all the developed capitalist countries "to help" Poland in this situation. So the sugar-coated poison is still being served out in order to strengthen Gierek's shaky position, to encourage Polish reaction and the Catholic Church to continue their subversive work, to increase the resentment and hostility towards the Soviet Union, etc. For its part the Soviet Union is undoubtedly working to create a new team favourable to it, and when it has done so it will topple Gierek and replace him with a more reliable pro-Soviet Gierek.

For the time being, however, Gierek seems to have saved his own skin and escaped the Soviet intervention. Nevertheless the troubled situation in Poland has not come to an end. It is developing and will develop. I think that the Soviet Union will tighten the screws on Poland.

MONDAY
JUNE 1, 1981

ON THE SECRET SOVIET-GREAT-SERB COLLABORATION

Theses for an article*

The Soviet revisionists have not said a word about the tragic events caused by the Great-Serb clan of Belgrade in Kosova,** as if nothing had happened.

Their Bulgarian lackeys have kept their mouths closed, too. The whole world spoke, published reports and comments, while the Soviets and the Bulgarians remained silent. Why?

Because they want to tell the world:

a. "We are not the sort who meddle in the internal affairs of others, as you are continually accusing us."

b. "Let the Albanians and the Yugoslavs settle their own problems."

These are two formal aspects, for appearances' sake, of the stand of the Soviets and the Bulgarians, which impelled Yugoslavia to shut its mouth against them. But this makes us Albanians tear the mask from them. This stand of the Soviets is a fraud, but a badly disguised fraud. When their interests require, they interfere in the internal affairs of others, not only with words but also with armies. The present chiefs of the Kremlin have demonstrated over and over again that they are not distinguished for tact and correctness in

* "The Events in Kosova and the Secret Soviet-Great-Serb Collaboration" was published in *Zëri i popullit*, June 5, 1981.

** Reference is to the demonstrations of the Albanian students and workers which took place in Kosova in the spring of 1981, and which were violently suppressed by the Great-Serb chauvinist clique of Belgrade.

international relations.

One cannot and must not judge the current Soviet policy from its tactical stands, but from its expansionist and hegemonic strategic objectives, to which all their actions, their diplomatic silence and the rumble of tank tracks, the pacifist slogans and their undercover plots, are subordinated.

What is the reality which we must expose?

1. The Soviets are greatly interested that the relations between Yugoslavia and Albania should be exacerbated, to the maximum if possible.

2. Such a situation would bring the Soviets a series of advantages: it would further weaken the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia, which is disintegrating and in the grip of profound national, economic, political and state contradictions; it would harm the People's Socialist Republic of Albania, which is an unyielding bastion against Soviet modern revisionism, American imperialism and world reaction; it would upset that present stability which has been established in the Balkans and threaten the Southeastern flank of NATO with disturbances and insecurity.

3. In this secret game the Soviets are supporting the Great-Serb clan of Belgrade against the Albanians of Yugoslavia and against the People's Socialist Republic of Albania.

They are saying nothing about what is occurring in Kosova in order to support the Great-Serb clan and avoid weakening Serbia, so that it can impose its hegemony over the rival Croat-Slovene clan, which is pro-Western and pro-American.

4. The Great-Serb clan is for bureaucratic centralism. The Croat-Slovene clan is for Titoite self-administration. The self-administration system has weakened the Great-Serb clan both economically and politically. Ranković and his clan were liquidated. The Soviets supported the clan of Ranković in his time and went so

far as to describe this “singer of the Soviet anthem”* as “more positive.”

After the death of Tito, the Serbian clan is seeking revenge against the Croat-Slovene clan. Profound contradictions, which are growing even deeper, exist between the two most powerful clans. The Soviets are together with the Great-Serbs in the plot. Soviets’ silence over the suppression of the Albanians by the Serbs assists the Serbian clan to weaken the Croat-Slovene clan and transform the self-administration system into a unified bourgeois bureaucratic system. The Soviets are keeping a tight rein on the Bulgarians and the Macedonian question. They use the Bulgarians as pawns which they advance or withdraw according to the circumstances which are created.

We must expose this big savage Soviet-Great-Serb plot. It is fraught with the greatest danger for the People’s Socialist Republic of Albania and the Balkans.

World opinion in general and the chancelleries of the world are pro “the Republic of Kosova” and approve our stands, are opposed to this plot, are for the current status quo in the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia and against Serbian hegemony. The “Republic of Kosova” weakens savage Serbian chauvinism, strengthens the status quo of the Yugoslav Federation and ruins the strategic plans of the Soviets.

* This is what the Soviets called Ranković who, during a drinking bout with Soviet “comrades” in Moscow, sang the Soviet anthem.

POGRADEĆ, WEDNESDAY
JULY 15, 1981

REFLECTIONS

We Albanians, as a people, a Party and state have always been and are against imperialist wars, against any unjust war which is aimed at the enslavement, slaughter and exploitation of the peoples. This has its own concrete historical reasons. Throughout their existence the Albanian people have suffered greatly as a result of such wars which have been directly detrimental to their freedom, territorial integrity and national independence. All these wars without exception have brought our people bloodshed, exploitation and the fragmentation of their territory. This is an undeniable reality.

Our people have faced up to these wars heroically and have fought with unflinching determination against savage enemies in defence of their freedom, independence, integrity, culture and their very existence, in defence of what has been and is theirs. At the same time, in the course of these wars our people have learned how to fight better, have gained experience enabling them to understand the problems that faced them, the aims, tactics, plans and plots of external and internal enemies and, on this basis, they have been able to build the tactics of their resistance in order to withstand the evil-doing of the enemies. This, too, is a reality. To be able to distinguish friends from foes, false friends from true friends, is a question of experience. "Mistakes are often the best teachers," our people say. They also say: "The waters may sleep but not the enemy." These two sayings, these two great teachings, have emerged from the profound philosophical thinking of the people, from our people's great experience of life, and have guided them throughout the ages of their history.

The struggle of a people for national existence does

not and cannot depend on the combinations and diplomatic intrigues of other states, be they big or small. It depends on the consciousness of the people themselves, when they attain understanding of what their rights and true interests are, have confidence in their own strength at any moment and in any situation, and know how to defend these rights and interests with iron will, sound logic and revolutionary struggle. Only then the strength of the people becomes invincible, is multiplied a hundred-fold and bursts out like an irresistible hurricane.

We Albanians have proceeded on such a course. History proves this, otherwise we would not exist today, the invaders would have assimilated us or the enemies would have wiped us out; otherwise we would not have succeeded in building a more advanced society, socialist society, in which the people are in power. Under the leadership of the Party and with this rich experience of struggles and wars for freedom, our people fought, achieved victory and succeeded in building the new society. Moreover they are determined to develop this society still further and will never allow their freedom, independence and the victories attained to slip from their hands or be stolen from them by any enemy, great or small, old or new.

We know that there are individuals and alien forces who cannot stand Albania and its people and do not want them to exist, who do not want the Albanian people to build their life in the way they themselves have decided, who are displeased that small Albania exists as a socialist state amidst an ocean of capitalist states with various labels.

But they can do nothing to socialist Albania. The times and the ratio of forces have changed greatly in favour of our people and Albania. Yes, they may attack the People's Socialist Republic of Albania from outside, and we never forget or neglect this possibility, but we shall defend ourselves and we know how to defend

ourselves and win. Throughout their history the Albanian people have known how to defend themselves. Our Party of Labour has further enriched and tempered the unity of our people in the war for defence. Marxism-Leninism teaches us that the peoples who fight to defend their freedom and independence wage a just war, hence they are invincible. And the Albanian people are invincible. They may try to divide us, to take the fortress from within, but this will not occur as long as the Party of Labour of Albania remains a genuine Marxist-Leninist Party at the head of the Albanian people. Our fortress is not like the fortresses of their dreams. We have built it with our own hands on our own soil, through the bloodshed and toil of the sons of this land. There are no cracks or breaches in its walls, and it has not been built with rotten materials. It is able to withstand all the waves of war just as it has withstood those that have crushed upon it in the past. The imperialist, social-imperialist and other enemies may try to make our Party deviate as they succeeded in doing with other parties, but this will never occur with us because never for one moment will the Party of Labour of Albania deviate from the Marxist-Leninist theory and the Leninist norms of the life of the party at any time or on any question. It is precisely this resolute stand, this steadfast loyalty to Marxism-Leninism that keeps our Party pure and makes it strong. The Party is closely linked with the people, it exists, lives and fights in the interests of the people who gave birth to it, who are the daily witnesses of the great leading role of the Party in the progress of the country and the raising of their economic well-being, and social and cultural level.

So, it is clear why the Albanian people are against predatory imperialist wars. They have suffered the terrible grave consequences of such wars on their own backs. That is why our people and the People's Socialist Republic of Albania are for peace between nations. The

experience of the Albanian people over the centuries and our Marxist- Leninist ideology which guides the Party of Labour of Albania in every action, are evident proof of their correct stand on this great problem, irrespective of what those who, in fact, are opponents of peace between nations say.

Our people have never attacked other peoples, they have never coveted or laid even a finger on what belongs to others, on the contrary, although the Albanians have been the victims of the evil and predatory aims and ambitions of some of them, they have gone to their aid. This, too, is a reality which cannot be concealed by any kind of propaganda or demagogy. Some may present historical events in books and in the press the other way round, but they cannot do so with real history, because it is perpetuated in the bosom of the peoples themselves, by the peoples themselves who hand it down from one generation to another.

However we are very clear about the fact that peace between peoples cannot be achieved without the just revolutionary struggle of the peoples themselves against those who do not want this peace, who do not want the freedom and sovereignty of peoples, do not want the peoples to free themselves from the heavy chains of enslavement and savage exploitation with which the capitalist powers have shackled them for centuries. This is precisely where the peoples who want complete freedom and their imperialist oppressors and plunderers reach the parting of their ways. This is a class struggle both internal and on an international plane. In this struggle the enemies of the peoples, the capitalists of all hues and calibres, strive to preserve their plunder and domination of the peoples, while the latter fight to win their rights and put an end to the exploitation of man by man once and for all.

In their unjust predatory war against the peoples, the capitalists are guided by their own ideology, but the

peoples, too, have their ideology, Marxism-Leninism, the immortal ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, which guide them towards liberation from capital.

This is the source of the contradictions and struggle between two systems which represent two different societies, capitalist and socialist, which have completely opposite aims and interests, in struggle with and diametrically opposed to each other in regard to the ways of the development of mankind in the future. This is also the source of the policy of states with different systems in the world. The policy of capitalist-revisionist bourgeois states serves the interests of the bourgeois class which rules in those countries. It exercises this rule through a structure and superstructure which oppresses and exploits the working class, the peasantry and the other working masses of the country. This rule is exercised also through all kinds of alliances which the capitalist-revisionist bourgeoisie forms with that of the big capitalist, imperialist and social-imperialist states.

The strength of the infrastructure of various states with capitalist systems and with nuances in the form of the state and what it is called varies depending on their different levels of socio-economic potential to which their unequal development gives rise. The efforts to eliminate these different levels and their consequences cause contradictions within the ranks of the bourgeois class in power, different strata and representatives of which, through demagogic political manoeuvres strive to ensure that state power never slips from the hands of their class. They disguise these deceptive manoeuvres, which are very dangerous for the peoples, with the so-called democratic freedoms of the capitalist system, with the struggle each of their parties wages from its own positions “for the rights of electors, the working masses,” with the struggle which parties of various descriptions wage even in parliament. But there is nothing

democratic about these parties and what they represent. The “struggle” between them is a struggle between financial-political clans, a struggle of words, a struggle conducted in corridors and drawing-rooms in the interests neither of the working masses nor of the electors. On the contrary, as soon as they get into parliament, the representatives of these parties, the deputies elected “through free, democratic ballot” approve laws which are completely in favour of the bourgeoisie, to protect its immense capital, i.e., to prolong the existence of the rule of the bourgeoisie over the working masses.

In capitalist society the opposition between political currents and the economic reforms proclaimed by the various bourgeois parties serve only to ensure their power or to share it and the colossal profits among themselves, at the expense of the masses. Only the illusion is created that they are allegedly fighting in the interests of the masses, whereas in fact and in essence they are fighting for the relentless impoverishment of the masses, for the exploitation of their blood and sweat.

Thus in capitalist-revisionist bourgeois society, the polarization into oppressors and oppressed, into exploiters and exploited, is deepened. Similar class relations exist also among capitalist and revisionist states. The biggest states, those with the greatest economic and military power, impose their law in various ways on the smaller capitalist and revisionist states. The economic dependence which is imposed on the small states by the big ones undoubtedly brings all-round political dependence and submission. The independence of these states is fictitious and serves only to embellish their constitutions and deceive the peoples. It is an irrefutable fact that today a number of capitalist-revisionist states are dependent on and aligned with the imperialist superpowers and their policies through a thousand interconnecting threads, and not only through such military organisms as NATO and the Warsaw Treaty,

or monopoly economic communities such as the European Common Market and Comecon. Even the other capitalist-revisionist states, which are not members of these blocs, are by no means independent from or non-aligned with the big powers and the imperialist and social-imperialist superpowers. These so-called independent states have got into permanent debt to the big capitalist powers. Consequently, and there can be no doubt about this, their political independence has no solid basis, because everyone knows that there can be no political independence without economic independence. Past and present international practice confirms this. If this unwritten capitalist law did not operate in an inflexible way in the relations of subjection between the provider and the receiver of money or commodities on credits or loans, the all-round pressure of the bigger on the smaller, of the very rich and the rich on the poor and the very poor would not exist, the instability in the policy of states would not exist, the struggle for markets, neo-colonialism, the interference of one state in the internal affairs of another state, which has become a common occurrence all over the world and even develops into bloody local armed conflicts, would not exist. The general crisis itself determines the economic-political dependence of the capitalist-revisionist states on one another.

To conceal this situation of economic-political subjection from the peoples, to fail to show the reasons for and the sources of this general political instability in the world, to fail to make clear to them who oppresses and exploits them, to use all sorts of anti-social and anti-revolutionary political formulas to conceal the great and uninterrupted arming of the superpowers and the imperialist powers as well as their frenzied preparations for war, is a great and unpardonable crime against mankind.

There are plenty of wordmongers who create “paci-

fist organizations,” who gather and shout about problems of disarmament and peace, who divide the nations into “non-aligned,” into many “worlds” or “undeveloped countries,” but none of these things prevents the imperialists and social-imperialists, who defy every international forum or conference, from going ahead with their hegemonic and expansionist policy. They continue to rule over other peoples and countries, to divide their spheres of political, economic and military-strategic influence, to make colossal profits from the imposed sale of stockpiles of goods and weapons of all kinds and to throw a few crumbs, in the form of credits and investments, to certain states and support those governments which are more inclined to obey their imperialist policy, keep the peoples of their own countries in bondage and give the superpowers and the developed capitalist states the maximum concessions for the exploitation of their national wealth. Thus they are totally dependent on the credits which the imperialist powers give them.

In the world today many contradictions are developing, becoming more profound and increasing in scope and intensity. There are profound and acute contradictions between the superpowers, between the superpowers and the industrialized capitalist countries, between them and other countries of the world with different systems and strange descriptions such as “developing countries,” “undeveloped countries,” “backward countries,” “poor countries,” etc. All these things make the general situation more dangerous. At the same time, the entire capitalist-revisionist world is wallowing in an unprecedented economic, political and moral crisis.

The capitalist and revisionist bourgeoisie are making all-round efforts to unload the catastrophic consequences of this crisis on to the backs of the working masses and peoples of their own or other countries

and to keep their profits intact. Therefore the burden of crisis falls, first of all, on the working masses, who, although it is they who produce the material blessings, are oppressed by the exploiting class.

This tendency of the bourgeoisie makes its class contradictions with the proletariat and the working masses even deeper, widens the gulf between rich and poor, aggravates the inter-imperialist contradictions, those between the “allies” in the capitalist and revisionist groupings, and between the metropolis and the colonial and neo-colonial countries.

Today the biggest and most acute contradiction is that between world capitalism and the working class and working masses of all the countries of the world. This contradiction cannot be resolved in the capitalist-revisionist regime. In this field concrete struggles are being waged for national liberation, for social liberation and for reforms, and there are strikes and demonstrations of a political-economic character. All these things have shaken the foundations of the world capitalist bourgeoisie and are shaking them more and more each day, building up to revolutionary situations and the outburst of revolutions.

In the international arena, different forms of struggle are being developed by the two sides. The use of violence, the baton and the capitalist-revisionist demagogy has increased in frequency and brutality. From its arsenal of weapons, the capitalist bourgeoisie, frightened by the rising tide of revolutions, has made extensive use of the corruption of cliques, both secret and in power, while spreading intellectual and moral degeneration with all the means of propaganda. The bourgeoisie is also using its favourite weapon in times of crisis, terrorism, by means of which it tries to arouse revulsion among the people against the burning desire for liberation from the shackles of capital, and by identifying terrorism with the activity of the genuine revolution-

aries, to frighten the masses, to turn them against the revolution, to preserve its order of oppression and to emerge without great pain from the grave lethal crisis.

The world of labour, the world which demands social and national liberation, is fighting with its own means against these savage measures of struggle and violence of the capitalist bourgeoisie.

Amidst this chaos created by their economic, political and moral crisis, the imperialist and revisionist enemies are making a great ado about the “isolated position and situation” of our country. But is Albania isolated from the foreign world, as the revisionists of all hues and the various imperialist enemies claim and want it to be?

The answer to this question depends on the class and political standpoint from which one views this question.

From our state, ideological and political standpoint, the People’s Socialist Republic of Albania has never been, is not and will not be isolated. We have diplomatic relations with the majority of the countries of the world, and there is nothing to prevent us from having such relations with the remaining ones. With the United States of America and the Soviet Union, however, we do not want such relations, whereas Great Britain and the Federal Republic of Germany have unpaid debts to the People’s Socialist Republic of Albania, the former for the stolen gold and the latter for war reparations.

This is how things stand, also, in regard to our mutual trade relations with many capitalist-revisionist countries. The trade between us and these countries is conducted with clearing or *cash*.* In this field, too, there is no isolation.

* English in the original.

When it is politically advantageous and when the other party agrees, we also establish and develop cultural relations with many capitalist countries, exchange experience in the fields of education, culture and technology. For our part, the extension of activities in these fields depends only on the material possibilities. Hence, in this field, too, there is no isolation.

In regard to the development of tourism, we do not do this on that scale or in those forms that the capitalist and revisionist countries do, or with their aims of making profits and spreading degeneration. We permit tourism for friends and well-wishers of socialist Albania, for honest people from countries and states which maintain friendly and correct stands towards our country. Tourism in Albania is not an industry and a means of corruption or hooliganism. And because tourism of that kind is not permitted in our country, the enemies say that the People's Socialist Republic of Albania "is a closed, isolated country." But when, if ever, have our imperialist and revisionist enemies spoken well of the Albanian people and of Albania? When have they not slandered our policy, our ancient and modern history and our victories? However this has done Albania and the Albanian people no harm. On the contrary their prestige and authority have been raised higher and higher. Hence, from our standpoint and the standpoint of the truth we are not and never will be isolated. We have told the imperialists and revisionists, and we tell them once again, that Albania is not an inn with its doors wide open for pigs and sows to enter. In the cities, the mountains, the plains and the shores of our socialist Homeland there is and will be no room for their ugly, degenerate way of life and thinking.

We know that the revisionist states (Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union, etc.) and the capitalist states call our country isolated from the world because it has not entered and will not enter their orbit, because it is not eco-

nomically dependent on them, does not accept credits from or get into debt to them, because it is not politically dependent on them, does not allow its independence and sovereignty to be violated and alters neither its state order nor its Marxist-Leninist ideology. This is how it has been and how it will be in the future, too.

In the opinion of some of these states, the independent policy which the People's Socialist Republic of Albania pursues in all fields and in all circumstances is something of an anachronism. We can understand why they have this opinion. For them it is an anachronism that our state of the dictatorship of the proletariat is not in a crisis, that it is not influenced by the great world crisis, that our state has political stability, that our economy is developing year by year, that there are absolutely no price rises for any goods, that there is no unemployment, economic and political emigration, economic strikes or political demonstrations, as there are in the capitalist-revisionist countries all over the world.

But we can say that Albania, with the social order it is building, is a case isolated from the various states which are in a political, economic and moral crisis. On this count and because of the very good, sound situation in our country, yes, they are right to say that we are "isolated" from them and the evils of their social order and policy.

Therefore, with its principled and independent policy, with its courage and the tangible results it has achieved, small as it is, Albania plays a dual socio-political role in the international arena — on the one hand it exposes the capitalist-revisionist order and its policy, on the other hand it plays a constructive revolutionary role, encouraging the peoples of the world who are fighting for their liberation from the yoke of capital.

It is from the prism of this great role that the question of whether or not socialist Albania is isolated must be judged.

Socialist Albania and the Party of Labour of Albania which leads it, love, respect and defend all the peoples of the world, while they, on their part, are in unity with us. Little socialist Albania has become a great example in which the working masses place their hopes. In these conditions and circumstances, then, there can be no talk of isolation of Albania. It is the capitalists, the revisionists, the imperialists and social-imperialists, that are isolated, discredited and hated by the peoples. And it is precisely they who try to present the People's Socialist Republic of Albania as isolated, who strive, without success, to distort its correct opinions and its victories, and in the final analysis, this is part of their efforts to isolate the Marxist-Leninist theory itself, to call it outdated and anachronistic. In this context they try to prove that "socialism can be built" guided by any kind of reformist, opportunist or even fascist ideology.

In the "strict" sense, the capitalist-revisionist states are not worried by the existence of a small country and people like ours, but in a broader sense the ideology which guides our people, the genuine socialist society which is being built successfully in our country, where there are no political or economic troubles and a sound culture is being developed, worry them a great deal. That is why the enemies of the peoples try to present the sound moral-political situation of our people in a distorted way and to belittle the great and uninterrupted socio-economic progress of our country.

The struggle of all enemies of the peoples against our socialist country proceeds from the same class positions but with variations in intensity. This comes about because, while it is true that there is unity between capitalists and revisionists as enemies of socialism, there are also differences, struggles and feuds between them. There are struggles and feuds also between big and small states, between highly developed, less developed and totally undeveloped countries.

In the present epoch of the great crisis of capitalism, the capitalist-revisionist states are politically and economically dependent on one another. Of course the strongest and the biggest are less dependent on the weakest and the smallest, but all of them are sensitive to and affected by the contradictions between them which are becoming more and more acute. These contradictions have their political and economic effect and are expressed in the stands of every state, internally and in the international relations between various states.

The present epoch can be called the epoch of the total destabilization of capitalism, of instability in politics, of general insecurity and gloomy and unclear prospects for the future. The idea of war predominates, because the world is being impelled in that direction through the unjust imperialist wars, although still localized, which are instigated by the imperialists and social-imperialists. They think that the profound and acute contradictions which are eroding them will be resolved by means of war.

The peoples cannot and must not put any trust in the policy of the capitalist-revisionist states and in the demagogy of this policy. What the peoples must clearly discern from the concrete facts, through the dense fog with which the superstructure of the capitalist-revisionist regime obscures their vision, distorts the reality, deceives the people and tries to blacken the road of the revolution, is not the external forms of the structure of capitalist-revisionist states, but the content, the essence of this structure, whose hands wield this weapon and which class it serves.

This is a great, serious problem which is difficult to understand and solve but it is not insurmountable. The forces which oppose the capitalist attack are larger and more powerful. But they must be fully awakened, their consciousness tempered. These forces must be organized on a national and international scale. The device

on which the strength of capitalism is based is its “divide and rule” policy. By this means capitalism crushes the weakest and keeps him unable to object, binds him with a thousand threads so that he will always be a slave as an individual, a people or a state, exploits him to the maximum and creates the illusion that he is living in a “free democratic world,” in which he ought to be content with the miserable life he leads, for which he should be grateful to his overlord. The peoples must oppose this device with the glorious slogan of Marx: “Workers of all countries, unite!,” a slogan which has terrified the capitalist bourgeoisie at all times.

In this chaotic and unequal development no progress can be made without all kinds of efforts and without struggle between oppressors and oppressed, between exploiters and exploited. The capitalist states vie with one another for supremacy. In most cases, because of their different interests, this contest between them develops in discord. Whoever comes out on top, he who manages to trip his rival and make him fall, who succeeds in making the law and in imposing his policy of domination, is presented as the cleverest, the most successful politician. However his ruling position is not everlasting, because he creates two kinds of opponents: individuals from his own class who are rivals for ruling positions and capitalist profits, and the great opponent, the working class and the broad working masses who, through various forms of class struggle, erode the capitalist order from within, causing splits and bringing defeat after defeat upon it.

Impelled by the lure of illegal gains, its tendency to enslave peoples and engage in unscrupulous speculation at the cost of their blood and sweat, the capitalist world will never find stability in any field of life. Although the great advances achieved are the result of the toil and sweat of the working masses, they are excluded from any benefits from them. The masses have

been polarized on one side, and as such, are permanent opponents of the inhuman exploitation by the capitalist bourgeoisie.

In this eroding reality of defeat and political-economic instability, the capitalist-revisionist states are trying to find a temporary solution for the most acute and dangerous problems. However the solutions they offer cannot be satisfactory, because they are one-sided in their aim and applied in a terrain which is quaking as a result of the popular upheavals. The great antagonisms within the ranks of capital and those between the bourgeoisie and the working class and masses of working people make these anti-popular solutions ineffective.

Seen from this class angle, the present development of the capitalist world leads to a more realistic understanding of the policy which capital follows to prolong its existence, of the methods and tactics of its struggle against the peoples.

The various countries of the world, whatever their social order, have their own foreign policies. This is based on certain principles which have a class character, which represent and serve the class in power and are adapted to the political circumstances existing within the country and in the relations with other states, i.e., in the international arena. Among these states there are some which, at certain moments and in certain circumstances, come out with a policy "independent" from others, differing temporarily in certain aspects or circumstances, with the aim of getting certain political, economic and military concessions. These differences in form and sometimes even in content reflect the strength or the weakness of the bourgeois class in power in a given state and the influence of one state over the other, an influence which is determined by the decrease or increase of their economic and military potential.

The principle of gain and domination, the stability or instability of the situation of a capitalist-revisionist country, make the policy of these states unstable and inclined towards the strongest, the most powerful. This leads to economic and political dependence of one bourgeois state on another bourgeois state, or to the grouping of a number of states against the grouping of other rival states. Irrespective of the contradictions they have with one another, these bourgeois states have common denominators which compel them to support one another, although they also have other opposing factors which erode the relations between them from within, which cause disturbances, economic instability and political revolts, which consequently weaken their general and bilateral links. At present these inter-state phenomena in the capitalist countries have assumed an unrestrainable development, and it is very difficult to coordinate, harmonize or stabilize them. Hence, the great crisis in the capitalist order is not only economic but also political.

The relations of production and the policy which supports these relations in all capitalist states, taken separately or in the relations between them, are undergoing continual catastrophic transformations. Whatever happens in any of these states inevitably influences the other states. The metamorphoses, the changes, the economic and political crises which occur in a powerful capitalist state cannot fail to have repercussions in all the other states which are dependent on that power, even though they present themselves as allegedly independent of it. To justify these phenomena, this chaotic development, a specious language has been found, using all kinds of different theories which vary according to the circumstances, countries and tendencies. All these theories are labelled “democratic” or “revolutionary” and, in practice, are accompanied by the creation of all kinds of organizations to give the impression that

a struggle is being waged against the evils of the time. In fact the world today is faced with the fact that the evil are fighting the evil and rivaling with one another. Thus, all are arming and, at the same time, all are fighting allegedly for disarmament, all say they "are against war," but each of them is struggling with his own means and in his own way, and frequently with joint means, to undermine peace; all of them speak of non-interference in the internal affairs of others, but in one way or the other they all interfere brutally in the internal affairs of others by means of weapons, politics, diplomacy and the "influx of dollars" and all kinds of credits. The bourgeoisie has also created its own method of presenting all these criminal and condemnable acts, a peculiar ethic about the expression of opinions and open and hidden aims in politics and in practice. Whoever deviates from the form and content of this ethic is a "heretic," is "undesirable," is an enemy of the "civilized world"!

Every individual, person, people, state or class not in power must willy-nilly proceed on the road determined by the "all-powerful" capitalist oligarchy, which alone is capable of finding "a correct solution" for every problem vital to states and peoples. Imperialism, social-imperialism and world monopoly capitalism are trying to preserve this absolute hegemony, and to make it permanent in theory and practice.

We think that this hegemony should be combatted and destroyed mercilessly. The world must break out of this vicious circle of modern spiritual, economic and political enslavement. This modern enslavement is a cruel deed of the bourgeois capitalist class and the economic and political order which it has created. The working class of every country, the broad masses of the working people who are oppressed and exploited, are the destroyers of this capitalist hegemony. Marxism-Leninism must guide all these masses in the revo-

lution for the new, genuine socialist life without exploiters and exploited.

Socialist Albania is the offspring of the proletarian revolution. Guided by the Marxist-Leninist theory it has built the new society, socialist society. The Party of Labour of Albania has always based itself on the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, has applied this theory without vacillations or deviations, fearlessly and in opposition to and uncompromisingly struggle with the capitalist-revisionist ideologies.

The foreign policy of our state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, too, is a policy guided by the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. It is principled and unchanging in its strategy. This policy supports the revolutionary movement of the working class and world proletariat for liberation from capital, hence it is against the latter, against its policy of oppression and exploitation, against its structure and infrastructure, it supports the struggle of the peoples for freedom, independence, social progress and socialism and relies on their solidarity. It is against any form of aggression and military intervention of one state against another, is against colonial exploitation, against any form of tutelage, dictate and hegemony, national oppression and racial discrimination. It upholds the principle of the self-determination of peoples, the exercise of complete national sovereignty and the equality of all countries in international relations.

Hence the crucial orientations of the foreign policy of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania are: support for the liberation of peoples from any bondage and exploitation by reactionary internal or external forces, struggle against imperialist wars and any other unjust war, struggle for genuine disarmament and peace, struggle for friendship between peoples and the denunciation of all enemies and every means they use

to sabotage this friendship and understanding among peoples.

The reactionary capitalist and revisionist bourgeoisie and its states are acting against the People's Socialist Republic of Albania, but Albania acts against them, too. The bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist states consider the correct, revolutionary policy from the firm positions of our theory as interference in their internal affairs, while their own policy of plots and sabotage against peoples they consider not interference in our internal affairs, but a correct and normal policy already accepted by world opinion. But this is not true. World opinion, the broad masses of the peoples, do not accept the bourgeois revisionist world outlook which covers up the deception, oppression and exploitation. The masses who hear about and understand our political stands on many international problems reflect, make comparisons about the state of things presented, weigh up our arguments and those of our opponents, and approve, support and adopt our stands. This is precisely the real major reason why the anti-Marxists and the modern revisionists of all hues are so worried. Otherwise they would not concoct slanders against the correct political stands of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania and the Party of Labour of Albania. They do so because our policy, proceeding from the positions of the working class and based on Marxism-Leninism, exposes their pseudo-Marxist policy which proceeds from capitalist positions. Also thanks to this exposure, the broad working masses realize that, irrespective of external appearances, the structure and superstructure of the revisionist states are identical with those of other capitalist states. In practice, their content, essence and results are in unity.

Precisely because the Party of Labour of Albania and our state expose and fight the exploiting order (under both names, capitalist and revisionist), both pol-

itically and through the positive example of the successful construction of socialism in Albania, they have an honoured name in the world, not only among the ranks of the working class, but also among progressive elements of the bourgeoisie, the youth and intellectuals.

The modern revisionists are greatly worried by the powerful voice of the Party of Labour of Albania, because both in policy and in theory it is opposed to their efforts to pass revisionism for “renovated Marxism” and suitable for our time, when, according to them, capitalist society must be rescued from destruction, private ownership of the means of production must be preserved, and the proletarian revolution, i.e., the seizure of power by the working class, must be avoided. The modern revisionists do not want the Marxist-Leninists to expose their work of sabotage. Therefore the modern revisionists call the exposure which our Party of Labour makes of their anti-Marxist theories, of the state-economic order of the modern revisionists, and of their pro-capitalist internal and external policy interference in their internal affairs. But we are not concerned about what they say about us.

Not just today, not only now, but ever since they were founded, our Party and proletarian state have declared publicly that they will apply an open, principled foreign policy, a policy of good neighbourliness and relations with all states on the basis of equality, respect for sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs and mutual benefit. And they have adhered to this policy without the slightest deviation. However they have also made it clear to anybody who cares to listen that such a policy does not mean concessions or giving up the resolute struggle for the defence of our guiding ideology, Marxism-Leninism, the struggle against greedy imperialism and capitalism, or support for the just struggles of the world proletariat for social liberation and the national liberation struggles of the peoples against col-

onialism and neo-colonialism.

No one and no force can stop the Party of Labour of Albania and the Government of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania from voicing their own opinion, not only on the problems and political events in which our socialist Homeland, the People's Socialist Republic of Albania, is directly interested or which have to do with its supreme interests, but also on other general world problems and events, because these, too, are the concern of all and not just of some.

In persistently following this policy, our Party and state do not proceed from interests of the moment, to please or to serve this or that foreign power, big or small. They are not urged to this policy by any of these powers, but they never lose sight of the principles of the basic strategy of defence of the freedom and interests of the peoples, of the cause of the world proletariat and its revolution. They do not alter their strategy according to the changing circumstances. The stability of our policy and the correctness of our stands result from this.

We do not impose our foreign policy on anybody. Nevertheless, there are many people around the world, even various diplomatic chancelleries, that seek information about our policy and stands, because in them they see something original which does not exist in the policy and stands of other countries (either capitalist or revisionist): truthfulness, maturity and the courage to voice one's opinions openly. No capitalist-revisionist state can follow such an open, correct and well-considered policy, because of the complexity of the political and economic dependence, religious influences and the class contradictions to which they are subject. Socialist Albania does not suffer from any such complex of restrictive and inhibiting factors and precisely this is the basis for the strength of its influence. There are others who find it very difficult to understand our policy and position, who wonder how such a small country as

Albania can follow such a policy which, according to their judgement and in their own words, contains good points and truths which only the Albanians, but none of the others can proclaim.

The Party of Labour of Albania is a strong party not because of the number of its members, but because of the Marxist-Leninist ideology which inspires and guides it. Likewise the People's Socialist Republic of Albania is a powerful state not because of the size of its territory or population, but because it lives in, fights for and builds the new socialist society, because the Party and the people are in complete unity, conscious of their actions, where they are going and how they will get there. The main, cardinal problems of life are clear to them: they must build a secure present, without forgetting the past and foreseeing and preparing the future.

Someone might think that pursuing such a course of development is something temporary, abnormal, unorthodox, linked with the life and activity of certain leaders and that "there can be no departure" from the line of development which bourgeois capitalist society and its *sous-fifres*,* the modern revisionists, have established. On this issue, too, they are gravely mistaken because they cannot see and do not want to see the great strength of socialism and our triumphant doctrine, Marxism-Leninism, which destroys the old society and builds the new one, do not know either the Party of Labour or the Albanian people, do not recognize and cannot understand the steel intellectual, spiritual and material unity between them.

The great instability of capitalist society foundering in all-round crisis is a result of the struggle of the discontented peoples against the enslaving system, and undoubtedly, of the inspiration they gain from the revolutionary ideology, Marxism-Leninism, to find the

* Underlings (French in the original).

genuine right road in the darkness of the modern epoch.

We Albanian communists are conscious of the difficulties we encounter and will encounter on our road, but at the same time we are fully convinced that we shall overcome them, because we are on the right road. We take each cautious step with confidence, after weighing up the issues and making careful calculations, we are clear about the period we live in, watch the changes and developments in the world with a critical Marxist-Leninist eye, and try, not without success, to assess these developments correctly, defining their positive and negative aspects, and benefiting from the former while combatting the latter. We build our tactics, which are neither unprincipled nor momentary, in conformity with and to strengthen our unwavering revolutionary strategy.

We Albanian communists, sons and daughters of this people, whose joys and sorrows we know very well, are the main basis of all the victories which the people and the Party of Labour of Albania have won together. This is where the solid foundations of our political, economic and cultural achievements lie. Socialist society in our country has been built by a people who have ancient traditions, but at the same time, have plenty of will, wisdom, courage and the vigour of youth. History has taught them to fight for their freedom, for a good life, for justice. History has taught them to distinguish the peoples from their evil, oppressing and cunning leaders; it has taught the Albanian people to love the other peoples, never to harm them but only help them, never to become the instrument of anyone to oppress others, but to fight for their own rights and the rights of others. The Party with its Marxist-Leninist ideology implanted these lofty virtues more deeply in their consciousness, strengthened them, made them even clearer and more understandable so that they flow in the bloodstream of every Albanian.

Our people are modest, industrious people who are not in the habit of boasting to anybody about anything. They have understood that their independence and the victories achieved must be defended as they were won, arms in hand, even with their blood if need be, and must be further consolidated with their own strength and resources, through struggle and efforts. Some think that this cannot be done, that loans and credits from the capitalists and revisionists are indispensable. This is not true. When true freedom and independence are understood correctly by a people and developed correctly by their leadership, they bring well-being, develop them and make them conscious of their own destiny. Foreign loans and credits have never been and are not in the interests of the peoples. They bring all kinds of misfortunes upon the peoples. For them the loans and credits are a noose around their necks. Daily life in countries nearby and remote from us proves this very clearly.

The brilliant road of the Albanian people is the road of all peoples who fight for national and social liberation, for socialism. And the peoples of the world, who fight with all their possibilities and in all forms, are the powerful allies of small but invincible, socialist Albania. This strengthens the positions of our correct Marxist-Leninist policy and enhances the authority of our country in the international arena. In this context we must ceaselessly strengthen our Party of Labour and our People's Socialist Republic, make our economy more powerful, raise the well-being and cultural level of the working masses and continue the successful construction of the new society, socialist society.

FEBRUARY 1982

ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

Panorama

From the present international situation we must draw some conclusions which will help us to keep up to date and, at the same time, to take measures when and where necessary.

At its 8th Congress,* the Party analysed the international situation, correctly forecasting the ways in which it would develop, and the consequences of and the reasons for these developments. Life, the events

* The 8th Congress of the PLA held its proceedings from November 1-7, 1981. In the report he delivered to this Congress, Comrade Enver Hoxha, exposing the aggressive line and aims of American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, among other things, said:

“This line is also expressed in the new ‘doctrine’ of Washington, begun by Carter and further developed by Reagan, that allegedly peace in the world and the security of peoples can be achieved by means of the ‘increase of the American power and superiority.’ In reality, this ‘doctrine’ incites general imperialist war and brings it closer...”

“Today the hegemonic and expansionist policy for the establishment of world domination, the adventurous course for the preparation and incitement of war also characterize Soviet social-imperialism, the global strategy of which, and especially the ways in which it is applied, have likewise become more aggressive.

“Beginning with the occupation of Czechoslovakia, the policy of the Soviet Union has gradually assumed a pronounced militarist character which is expressed in the use of military force to realize its expansionist aims.” (Enver Hoxha, *Report to the 8th Congress of the PLA*, Eng. ed., “8 Nëntori” Publishing House, Tirana 1981, pp. 169-170.)

which are occurring, vindicate the correctness of this analysis, and the correct, principled political stands of the Party of Labour on the world problems and the foreign policy of our state.

The diplomatic information, the many different, and we may say, favourable articles of the world press, etc., show that the proceedings of our Congress have been awaited with great interest everywhere by friends, progressive people and the working masses, but also by enemies who have read the report of the Central Committee. This is a great opportunity and advantage to further consolidate the international positions of our Party and country. The external world is seeing once again that, like it or not, the policy of our state, in every situation, is an unwavering, resolute, principled policy. The world appreciates that the People's Socialist Republic of Albania is an independent country which pursues an independent policy, uninfluenced by others, is the only country in the world that does not accept credits from any state and is building socialism with its own forces, that on this course it has achieved successes in all fields and is always prepared to defend itself from any aggression. In other words, the foreign policy of our Party and state has had positive repercussions throughout the world, is considered a serious policy, and therefore it arouses respect among the people. We must further consolidate this favourable positive position through our correct political stands, our penetrating Marxist-Leninist view of events which occur in the world, our correct socialist stands in relations with other states, etc.

The great economic crisis, and consequently, the political crisis, too, are growing deeper with each passing day, engulfing all the continents and states of the world. The only exception is Albania. To us this is something real and not at all surprising, while for others it is an astonishing, unbelievable phenomenon. Neverthe-

less, there are small states and progressive people in the world who know and understand the People's Socialist Republic of Albania and want to take it as an example.

The present situation in the world is explosive and fraught with grave dangers for various peoples and states. The two superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, are in a deep political and economic crisis. In this situation each of them is striving to gain supremacy over the other in vital fields, such as armaments, but also trying to avoid a war between them. At the same time they have never ceased their preparations for the outbreak of a new world war. These feverish preparations which cost them colossal investments and further deepen the economic crisis in those two countries, among their allies and other states, maintain the psychosis of war and intimidate their respective allies, a thing which assists the two superpowers to impose their policy on them and others.

At present the United States of America and the Soviet Union are struggling to retain and extend their spheres of influence, to strengthen neo-colonialism. Local wars, which are incited by these two superpowers and their allies, are on the agenda today. Now there are many such hotbeds of local wars all over the world: in Africa, Asia, Central and Latin America, the Middle East and elsewhere.

Another reality of our days is the fact that, while the superpowers and world capitalism really are mercilessly exploiting and plotting against the peoples, occupying them militarily and in other forms, they do not feel themselves secure and do not have the profits they want to have, are not managing to create the situations they want to create. Through armed struggle, political and economic strikes, or through open or undeclared hostile stands, the peoples in all parts of the world are creating troubles for world capitalism. Seen as a whole, this unrelenting resistance in a variety of forms of ac-

tivity is a mounting force against neo-colonialism and the imperialist-revisionist aggressive forces. Hence, not only are the rear areas of the United States of America and the Soviet Union insecure, but their military-economic alliances, too, are in deep crisis.

The grave international situation, the innumerable crises and dangers in the world, have aroused vigilance, the sentiment of self-defence and resistance among the peoples and increased their ceaseless demands against those who govern, oppress and exploit them. Therefore, the capitalist-revisionist world today is faced with great and steadily mounting pressure from the working masses. This situation is reflected in the political moments in which we are living. Neither the United States of America, nor the Soviet Union can establish its world hegemony. At present both are trying to escape from the crisis by means which cannot eliminate it. On the contrary, these means are deepening and aggravating the crisis and may lead to the outbreak of a world conflict.

It is characteristic that these two superpowers are doing their utmost to shift the burden of the grave economic crisis which has their countries in its grip on to other states, regardless of whether or not they are allies, members of the Warsaw Treaty or NATO. Such an action destabilizes the alliances themselves, creates deep contradictions within each alliance and causes political, economic and military disequilibrium within them and between these two aggressive alliances, NATO and the Warsaw Treaty.

The economic crisis has also brought political and military crisis to the two opposing camps. Today we are witnessing the well-known, natural phenomenon of capitalism that the stronger tries to impose its will and laws on the weaker, the smaller, the others. Concretely we see that in this unstable situation the Soviet Union is striving to establish its complete hegemony over the Warsaw Treaty countries, while the United States of

America is doing the same thing in NATO. It is difficult for either of them to realize its objective, but less so for the Soviet Union and more so for the United States of America.

There are profound economic, political and military disagreements between the United States of America and its European partners. These disagreements exist, both in the joint framework of "United Europe" over economic issues and in NATO over military issues. But disagreements exist also with the individual European partners and allies. Therefore, it is understandable why the Reagan government, in order to intimidate them, almost openly threatens the countries of Western Europe with the danger which the Soviet military superiority presents to them. Under this slogan the United States of America is demanding the deployment of "Pershing-2" and "Cruise" nuclear missiles in Europe, and that the European member countries of NATO undertake more military expenditure. West Germany, which is a state with very great, if not the most important, economic and military potential in NATO, is not submitting either to the will or to the policy of Reagan.

On the other hand, the Bonn government in particular, in opposition to the American policy, is saying openly that it is not the Polish question, but the high interest rates of the United States of America that are causing the present crisis. Therefore, although it has a finger in this question, Bonn does not accept and is not participating in the economic sanctions taken by Reagan against either Poland or the Soviet Union. These contradictions between Bonn and Washington are serious and have consequences in the policy of the European Common Market, which is being eroded by the crisis and the disagreements between European states. Such opposition also has its profound consequences within NATO.

In its relations with the United States of America,

“United Europe” has profound political, economic and monetary contradictions. At present it is developing into a capitalist grouping, naturally with the contradictions that exist between the participating states, in opposition to the United States of America. In view of this situation, the United States of America has urged Italy to propose a kind of political-economic treaty between the European Common Market and the United States of America. But following the recent talks held between Haig and Colombo, no more has been heard about this Italian proposal. This means that the disagreements between “United Europe” and the United States of America are deep.

In fact, the American policy in Europe, in the Middle East and Latin and Central America is not properly in tune with that of the West-European allies, who have their own aims, separate from those of the United States of America. The European allies are clinging to NATO as a counterweight to the military-political pressure of the Warsaw Treaty and also maintaining their economic relations in the complicated tangle of the great crisis of the capitalist economy and the multinational companies, but at the same time they have pronounced differences with the United States of America.

The Polish problem, created by the political-economic bankruptcy of the Polish revisionist state, by the oppressive Soviet policy and the crisis in Comecon and the Warsaw Treaty, created a field of operation for the United States of America, the Western states and for all the reactionary forces in the world and, first of all, for the Vatican and the Polish catholic church. On this problem we may draw the following conclusions: by means of the Polish church and “Solidarity,” the Polish problem developed into an acute crisis which brought the establishment of martial law in that country, the temporary silencing of “Solidarity” and to some extent limited the omnipotence and openly hostile activity of

the church; the Pope of Rome became a foreign minister of the cause of the Polish church and world reaction; the efforts of the Americans to incite the Soviet Union to intervene *manu militari* in Poland, as it did in Czechoslovakia, so that the Soviet Union would be discredited and involve itself in military and political adventures, failed. On the basis of the Warsaw Treaty, the Soviet army was in Poland, but the Soviets hid their hand and it was the Polish army that showed its fist. The propaganda and big strikes in Poland, the daily homilies of the Pope, the threats and sanctions of Reagan, did not bring the desired result, and the countries of Western Europe avoided committing themselves totally to the American policy in Europe and refused to take the concrete measures demanded by the United States of America. They stuck to their policy of talks and not breaking off relations with the revisionist countries of the East, and maintained and even increased their economic relations with them and the Soviet Union. The countries of Western Europe and, in the first place, the Federal Republic of Germany have made heavy investments in those countries, advancing large credits and loans to them, therefore they do not want to lose either their profits or the influence they exert there by means of the investments, loans and credits which they have provided.

One wing of the American extreme right tried to intimidate the “disobedient” Europeans by threatening them with the “Monroe doctrine.” But American isolationism is nonsensical in today’s complicated relations of world capital. In the consumer society of today American isolationism would mean certain death for the United States of America and for its partners.

Very great and incurable contradictions exist within Comecon also. Its total collapse is prevented only by the presence of the Soviet military force, which makes the law in the member countries of the Warsaw Treaty.

The Soviet Union and its allies are up to their necks in debt to the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany and other capitalist countries. The economy of the Comecon countries is utterly bankrupt and in deep crisis. There, too, as in the West, inflation and unemployment are increasing, prices are going sky-high, and there are not enough consumer goods to meet minimal daily needs. Both NATO and the Warsaw Treaty are shaken internally. In the former the instability is more evident; in the latter it is silent for fear of the Soviet sword of Damocles.

The treaties and agreements are falling apart because of the circumstances created by the clash of the two superpowers and their partners. The truth about the Helsinki meeting has become clear to all and life is proving that those of us who condemned it long ago were right. Like the recent meeting of Madrid, the theory of Tito and the Yugoslavs about the “non-aligned world,” etc., that meeting proved a disgraceful fiasco. As our Party has said, everything is being manipulated by the two superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, as well as by world capitalism, with the aim of suppressing the revolution. Interventions and the military occupations by the superpowers, such as that of the Soviets in Afghanistan and Angola, the American occupation of El Salvador; Israel, the Iran-Iraq conflict, the Polish crisis, the guerilla war in Northern Ireland, the political-economic catastrophe of Titoite Yugoslavia and the coming to power of socialist parties in several European countries, speak of the decay of world capitalism, of the confusion which reigns in the international situation which is seething with revolution. The measures which world capitalism is taking, the terror it employs, the manoeuvres and manipulations undertaken by the parties of the bourgeoisie, including the revisionist parties, which have turned into mere second-rank social-democratic parties, do not re-

duce the anger of the masses who are counter-acting every day with more and more force, up to the use of weapons.

In particular it must be pointed out that Titoite Yugoslavia is completely engulfed in a catastrophe and not on the brink of it. The political and national clashes between clans in that country are obvious and will become even more so. The economic crisis has reached the phase of desperation. Yugoslavia is up to its neck in debts and cannot repay them with more loans. In that country there is immense unemployment, inflation is galloping, prices are going up every day beyond the reach of ordinary working people.

The Great-Serb clan is powerful, but for tactical reasons is obliged to surrender the leadership to the Croat-Slovene clan in order to stabilize the situation through a more complete opening up to the West. At present the West is greatly concerned to see the advances the Great-Serbs are making to the Soviet Union.

The savage oppression of the people of Kosova and other Albanians who inhabit their ancestral territories in Yugoslavia continues. However, the resistance of the Albanians is continuing, and increasing, too. They are defending themselves very well and putting up great opposition to the injustices and terror imposed on them by the Great-Serbs, Macedonians and Montenegrins. Their just resistance has turned the problem of Kosova into a disturbing international problem unfavorable to Yugoslavia. But the terror and the efforts being made there to denationalize the Albanians are continuing. Nevertheless, the Serbs will never succeed in this.

The fairest solution to the problem of Kosova and that of the other Albanians who inhabit their own territories in Yugoslavia is the one that the 8th Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania put forward.* The

* In his report to the 8th Congress of the PLA, Comrade

Great-Serbs and the Federative Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia attacked this solution, while world opinion approved it and considered it correct. The Yugoslavs were denounced both within their country and abroad for their actions against the people of Kosova and the People's Socialist Republic of Albania. They brought great discredit upon themselves with their slanders and the hostility they displayed towards the People's Socialist Republic of Albania. We emerged triumphant because we defended a just cause. The People's Socialist Republic of Albania and the policy of our Party emerged full of dignity on the international arena and our positions were further strengthened. Today the voice of Albania is listened to with sympathy and attention is paid to its policy.

It is very important to us to have sound international opinion on our side; we must strengthen respect for the correct Marxist-Leninist policy of our government among the governments of the various countries of the world with which we have diplomatic relations, and this, too, is very important to us.

The progressive world admires and respects us for our determination, courage, independence and correctness in relations with others, for our honesty and for the Marxist-Leninist course which our people and Party

Enver Hoxha, dealing with the problem of the demand of the Albanians in Kosova for their province to be given the status of a Republic within the Yugoslav Federation, pointed out:

“Only a well-considered solution of the national question,... a solution which is accepted and approved by the people of Kosova, can eliminate this very complicated situation which has been brought about not by the people of Kosova, but by Great-Serb chauvinism... The demand to raise Kosova to the status of a Republic within the Federation is a just demand. It does not threaten the existence of the Federation.” (Enver Hoxha, *Report to the 8th Congress of the PLA*, Eng. ed., “8 Nëntori” Publishing House, Tirana 1981, p. 213).

pursue in the construction of socialism in the People's Socialist Republic of Albania. Therefore, the Party and we, its leadership, must maintain and strengthen this victory, which as the 8th Congress reiterated, is continually consolidated by safeguarding the purity of the line of our Marxist-Leninist Party. Hence, we must work with all our might, intelligently and with great care to further strengthen the situation of our country internally and abroad.

MONDAY
MAY 10, 1982

THE MALVINA ISLANDS BELONG TO THE ARGENTINE PEOPLE AND STATE

I talked with the comrades about preparing an article in which we must take our stand on the events of recent weeks in the Malvina Islands.*

We must come out in defence of the sovereignty of those islands which are occupied by British imperialism, but which belong to the Argentine people and state.

First of all, in the article we must give a stinging rebuke to Britain, pointing out that in the past it has been one of the predatory colonial powers which not only occupied foreign territories, but tampered as much as it wished with the borders and sovereignty of different nations, dividing and distributing their territories among its favourites and those who acted as gendarmes in defence of its interests in the world. We must point out that London was the centre in which the imperialist powers drafted the open and secret treaties for these acts of plunder. With this we strike a blow that will reverberate widely, we hit out against all those who have tampered with the borders and sovereignty of the peoples, including our country and people, by means of occupations and unjust treaties.

Second, I instructed that the article must point out clearly that the three “peripatetic friars” of the Helsinki Meeting, Britain, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, who with great pomp and ceremony signed and sealed the “Final Act for the Euro-

* On May 13, 1982, the newspaper *Zëri i popullit* carried the article, “Argentina Defends Its Undeniable Rights.”

pean Security and Cooperation,” or as some call it, “The Helsinki Charter” which speaks not only about the “security” of Europe, but also the “security” of countries in other continents, have themselves turned this document into a worthless scrap of paper, an act of no value whatsoever for the security of the peoples.

After our exposure of Britain and the United States of America which is supporting Britain politically, diplomatically and militarily on the question of the Malvina Islands, we must point out clearly also that the Soviet Union is talking a great deal about the “defence” of the sovereignty of Argentina at a time when the whole world knows that it invaded Czechoslovakia in broad daylight, subsequently attacked Afghanistan, moving into that sovereign country by force of arms, and is still fighting against the Afghan people. Therefore, the statements which the Soviet Union is making on this occasion in favour of Argentina are nothing but a fraud. Its real aim is to take advantage of these events to achieve its imperialist ambitions against the United States, and to placate to some small extent the anger of the peoples against the terrible crimes it is committing against the Afghan people, etc. Such is the game of the superpowers. They take no heed of any treaty or agreement, but trample underfoot even those which they themselves have signed.

In other words, with this article we must expose both the United States of America and Britain, and the Soviet Union, etc., at the same time...

**TUESDAY
OCTOBER 25, 1983**

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA OCCUPIES TINY GRENADA

This morning more than 2,000 American marines supported by a number of warships suddenly occupied the free and independent state of Grenada, a tiny island in the Caribbean basin. News agencies speak about specialized detachments landed from helicopters and the sea. They also say that the American invaders have encountered fierce resistance from the army and the people of Grenada.

The President of the United States, Reagan, personally announced the occupation of this small country, describing it as an action necessary “to defend the interests of America” in the Caribbean region!

What a great disgrace for the United States of America to claim that a tiny country and a small, peace-loving people, such as the people of Grenada, “are threatening the interests” of one of the imperialist superpowers of the world!

As a pretext to justify its military intervention in the internal affairs of a number of sovereign countries of Central America such as Honduras, Nicaragua, Salvador, Panama or certain other countries of Latin America, the United States of America raises the danger of intervention by Cuba and the Soviet Union or the establishment of their influence in those countries, as well as their efforts to set up bases there against the United States.

It cannot be excluded that Cuba, or the Soviet Union, or rather the latter through the former, is trying to poke its nose in the internal affairs of those coun-

tries in which it wants to find markets and spheres of influence. In the concrete instances, however, we have to do with the intrigues of American imperialist circles to sabotage and attack the liberation struggle of the peoples of Latin America and to come to the aid of monopolies, multinational companies and the financial circles of Washington, so that they will not lose the investments they have made and the assets they have seized in that continent.

**WEDNESDAY
NOVEMBER 30, 1983**

“EURO-MISSILES”

The two superpowers have commenced the deployment of their new medium-range “Pershing-2,” “Cruise,” “SS-20,” “SS-21,” “SS-23” missiles, also called “Euromissiles,” in the territories of the member countries of their aggressive military blocs, NATO and the Warsaw Treaty.

Early this month, the first American missiles were transported, in the greatest secrecy, to the Greenham Common airbase in Britain. Two or three days ago there was talk that American unassembled missile components have begun to arrive at the American naval base of Sigonella in Sicily, to be deployed subsequently at the Comisso airbase. American missiles are arriving, also, at the airbases in Federal Germany. They are expected to arrive in Holland. Thus, as they say, a barrage of 572 new American missiles is being built up against the Soviet Union.

The Soviet social-imperialists have not remained idle. Open threats have been made at the highest levels that they will take the necessary “defence” measures. In fact, some days ago the Minister of Defence of the Soviet Union, Marshal Ustinov, announced that the work necessary for the deployment of the new “SS-20,” “SS-21,” “SS-23” Soviet missiles has begun in the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia. No figures have been given about their number.

Thus, the “Euro-missiles” race, which presents a very great new threat to the peoples of Europe, has begun.

I think we have to do with a further escalation by the two superpowers of the struggle for supremacy in nuclear weapons in Europe and to exert pressure on

each other. Therefore, we must be vigilant, and so must all the other peoples, especially the peoples of Europe. The powerful demonstrations against “Euro-missiles” which have been going on in Western Europe for some days now, as well as the silent opposition of the peoples of Eastern Europe, are very good signs of the mounting awareness among peoples of the very great danger with which the two imperialist superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, are threatening them.

FRIDAY
APRIL 27, 1984

REAGAN IN BEIJING

Today the *Xinhua* news agency reported that the President of the United States of America, Ronald Reagan, with his wife arrived in Beijing for a six-day official visit. He is the third American president, after Nixon and Carter, to visit "communist" China.

Reagan, who is accompanied by a very large number of political, economic and military personalities and experts, journalists and TV correspondents, as well as agents of the American secret service, etc., about 600 people, they say, as well as a great amount of special radio equipment to keep him in permanent contact with the White House and the Pentagon, was welcomed with cheering crowds, waving flags and great pomp and ceremony.

In China Reagan will make his long trips in his presidential aircraft, while within the cities he will travel in his own bulletproof limousine. Apparently, the Chinese have been entrusted with "protecting" him from only those eventualities least dangerous to his life, such as being hit with rotten eggs, tomatoes, etc.

We shall wait and see what the new Sino-American osmosis will bring forth for the Chinese and the Americans themselves, and also for those who are worried about a major Sino-American rapprochement, such as the Soviet social-imperialists and the Japanese militarists. The Chinese are deliberately trying to present Reagan's visit as something "normal," during which the "American president will hold talks with top Chinese officials on the question of Sino-American relations and on international issues of mutual interest." The Americans are a bit more enthusiastic. Before his arrival in Beijing, Reagan himself spoke about the

“good prospects for Sino-American relations,” while the American press reports with satisfaction that there Reagan will see that the inhabitants of Chinese cities now “watch western films and see advertisements for Japanese stereos, European banks and American Coca-Cola and shampoo”!

Outwardly, everything appears to be going smoothly. But this aspect represents only the tip of the colossal mass of the iceberg. In fact, in their tête-à-tête talks behind closed doors, “the two avowed friends — Deng and Reagan” will have to deal with difficult and complicated problems in the relations between these two imperialist countries. They include: the future of Taiwan, which Deng is claiming but which Reagan does not cede; the sale and purchase of Chinese national assets; relations with Japan, the Soviet Union, Vietnam, Cambodia, etc.

Reagan also has another problem: with his tour of China and the success he wants to achieve during this tour, he hopes to increase the number of his supporters and be re-elected president of the United States of America for another four years. And Deng might lend a hand and give him a shove in this direction.

**WEDNESDAY
JUNE 13, 1984**

A GRAVE SITUATION OF TENSION IN THE PERSIAN GULF

For some time a very grave situation of political tension, accompanied with the danger of the outbreak of a large-scale conflict, has been created in the Persian Gulf. This tense situation of crisis affects not only the Arab countries of the Gulf and Iran, but also a large number of industrialized capitalist countries of Western Europe, Japan, etc. The greatest and most open threats are being made to Iran and the Iranian people. In fact, under some pretext, and especially that the balance has been disturbed, the United States of America or the Soviet Union might intervene directly by military means in that country or incite some neighbouring reactionary regime to do so.

Now the whole world knows that it is the United States of America and the social-imperialist Soviet Union which are fanning the flames of war in the Persian Gulf, just as they are doing in the Near East, the Middle East, Africa and elsewhere.

Let us take the Iraq-Iran war which has been going on for several years with colossal casualties and damage on both sides, a conflict which, it seems, will continue for a long time yet. Both superpowers are exploiting this conflict to sell billions of dollars worth of armaments and to test their concrete devastating effect; to ensure the plunder of oil at the cheapest possible prices; to sabotage and undermine the progressive movement of the peoples of Iran and the Arab countries, and suppress their liberation struggle, that is, in order to poke their bloodstained hands into the internal affairs of the peoples of this region.

I have written on other occasions that the vast oil-bearing zone of the Middle East is the focal point of the plots and strategic plans of the two superpowers and other imperialist powers.* They will never withdraw from this region, because they do not want to lose or damage the privileged economic or strategic-military positions which they have secured in these zones. Therefore they will fan up the flames of war in these hotbeds, will keep the local wars ablaze, will help the reactionary regimes with weapons and politically, will pit one people against the other and, before one conflict is ended, will kindle another. This is what occurred last year with the events in Lebanon, where, after the plan for a new heavy blow against the Palestinian fighters was accomplished, the flames of war subsided and the intensity of the Iran-Iraq war and the crisis in the Persian Gulf were increased.

Today, in these brief notes in my Diary, I do not want to speak about the whole Middle East, but only about the grave crisis which has been created in the Persian Gulf, with what this crisis is linked, who is really responsible for it.

As I see it, this war is mainly over oil, which for the time being constitutes the main source of energy for the world economy. The Arab countries and mainly the countries on the shores of the Persian Gulf, or the Arabian Gulf, as some call it, are the biggest producers and suppliers of oil for the overwhelming majority of the industrialized capitalist countries of Western Europe, Japan and several others. Some of these states secure 40-85 per cent of the requirements for oil from the countries of the Persian Gulf, while Japan secures over 90 per cent of its requirements. The known reserves of oil in the Arab countries and Iran are reckoned at 367

* See Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on the Middle East*, Eng. ed., "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1984.

billion barrels, a figure which some consider to be much lower than the true figure, while the annual export of oil does not exceed 15 billion barrels, 4 billion of which are absorbed by the American monopolies. That is why the interests which are linked with the exacerbation of the crisis and the eruption of a large-scale conflict over oil are multifarious and, in most cases, incompatible.

This colossal quantity of oil which is mainly transported by sea in very big tankers, has to pass through the Strait of Hormuz which connects the Persian Gulf with the Gulf of Oman and on to the Indian, Pacific or Atlantic oceans.

How have they increased the tension and are keeping it high artificially in the Persian Gulf?

In the last two years, Iraq, which is supplied with modern armaments (aircraft, missiles, artillery) by the Soviet Union as well as by some other imperialist powers such as France (which supplies it with "Mirage" aircraft and "Exocet" missiles), Great Britain and the United States of America, wanting to force Iran to surrender or to accept the end of the war on unacceptable terms, has bombed some cities where part of the Iranian oil-processing industry is situated, such as Abadan, Bandar-Khomeini and the Kharg Island, and has also hit with missiles a considerable number of ships transporting Iranian oil through the Strait of Hormuz. In defence of its own rights, Iran, for its part, declared that if Iraq did not stop bombing industrial cities and abandon its attempts to hinder the transport of Iranian oil, it would close the Strait of Hormuz and stop the passage of ships.

Application of this measure would result in the suspension of oil supplies to all the industrialized capitalist countries of Europe, Japan, etc., where the consequences of the energy crisis would be incalculable. There is no need for me to explain these consequences at length because it has been proven in the past, it was

proved in 1973 and subsequently, that without oil industrial life in many capitalist countries is brought to a standstill, the phenomenon of the economic crisis reaches its culmination and is accompanied with major, very grave political, economic and social disturbances. Governments and parties are brought down or rise to power over a drop of oil. Scandals involving the top-level personalities of the capitalist bourgeoisie break out over a drop of oil.

Therefore Iran's threat to close the Strait of Hormuz created very great concern, disarray and unprecedented alarm in the capitalist world. The United States of America, which is the chief of world imperialism, took immediate counteraction by announcing that it would protect "its own national interests and the interests of its allies" in the Persian Gulf with all its means. At once it dispatched part of its naval fleet, air force and forces and special detachments trained for guerilla and urban warfare and large-scale landings, to the Gulf of Oman. The chiefs of American imperialism declared publicly that these forces would intervene immediately in Iran if that country closed the Strait of Hormuz. In fact these attack forces have plans and remain in a state of readiness to carry out the orders of the Pentagon for such an intervention, irrespective of how the Iranian people may regard it and deal with it. The Americans should not forget their abortive action at Tabas in 1981, where they suffered ignominious defeat. The people of Iran have awakened, have great hatred for American imperialism and are determined not to permit anyone to interfere in their internal affairs.

Meanwhile Iraq, on the urging of the imperialist powers and of the Soviet Union, whose relations with Iran have steadily deteriorated because of the Soviet interference in the internal affairs of that country, has continued its bombing raids and hit dozens of tankers going to load oil at Kharg Island or sailing loaded

from there to the open seas beyond Hormuz. Ninety per cent of Iranian oil is loaded into tankers at the big terminal at Kharg Island. That is why Iraq has made that island the main target of its attacks. It is precisely these actions which have raised the tension even higher. Several times recently the tension has risen so high that the conflict has been on the verge of turning into a major war in which, besides the superpowers, most of the Arab countries of the Persian Gulf will inevitably be involved. Faced with this danger, urgent meetings of the Security Council have been sought on several occasions, frequent appeals have been made for a "cooling of tempers," etc., etc.

But are all the governments of the capitalist countries whose economies are dependent on Arab oil ready and predisposed for the outbreak of a conflict in the Persian Gulf? I think not. Not all the capitalist governments, and in speaking of governments I have in mind the monopolies and multinational companies which are linked with and dependent on oil from countries of the Gulf, agree that Iran should be placed in such conditions that it is obliged to close the Strait of Hormuz, because, as I have said, such a thing would create a very grave situation not only for their economies, but also for their military forces. Japan, for example, by no means wants the situation to develop into a war and the world press and the news agencies have carried reports and commentaries on this. Apparently, on this occasion the Japanese are opposed to committing harakiri in the Persian Gulf, regardless of what the Americans say and want. And likewise with several other countries of Western Europe. Hence, in this direction there are powerful conflicts of short-term and long-term interests. **This is the first point.**

Second. The great Arabian Peninsula and Iran which lies on the Eastern shores of the Persian Gulf comprise an important military-strategic zone through

which the routes of communication between Europe, Asia, Africa and the great oceans of the world pass. Here we have to do with a delicate balance between the two superpowers. If this balance is upset, they will be obliged to attack each other. That is, if the Americans intervene in Iran or elsewhere, the social-imperialists are bound to act. The two superpowers are watching each other like cat and mouse in the big oil-bearing zone of the Middle East. Thus at a given moment, mankind may be faced with a chain reaction with very great and grave consequences not only for the Middle East, but also for the whole world. Nevertheless, there is something else that we must keep in mind: they have divided up their spheres of influence but each is afraid of the other's perfidy. When their interests require, they come to terms and turn a blind eye. That is why they have perfected the direct links between the White House and the Kremlin through the red and yellow teletypes, by radio, morse code, transmitted pictures, etc. Such a thing can be seen now at these moments of grave crisis in the Persian Gulf. True, nothing has been said officially, but reports are circulating that the United States of America and the Soviet Union have reached agreement to refrain from intervening, to maintain "neutrality," if the Iraq-Iran conflict is extended and the crisis in the Persian Gulf becomes worse, to keep out of it, at least from the standpoint of direct intervention. This means that they have agreed to maintain the state of crisis, to prolong the Iraq-Iran war and, if possible, to kindle some other local conflict. Let the Arab peoples be killed and chopped to pieces, let them be cannon fodder for the superpowers and their predatory interests.

It is up to the Arab people, the progressive and revolutionary Arabs who understand the traps which the American imperialists, the Soviet social-imperialists, the various reactionaries and their false friends are setting for them, to avoid falling into these traps which

have very grave consequences for the freedom, independence, wealth and the future of the Arab peoples.

TUESDAY
JUNE 19, 1984

WHAT IS HAPPENING IN THE SOVIET LEADERSHIP?

In the news agency bulletins I am continually reading reports and comments of every kind on the internal conflict in the leadership of the party and the highest state organs of the social-imperialist Soviet Union. Although these reports come from Western news agencies and the press of the capitalist world, which are highly interested in political sensations in the former socialist countries, still they are not entirely without foundation.

Murmurs about this began long ago, in the time when captain Leonidas was alive, if I am not mistaken. But upon his death, the bugles began to blow loudly: Grave conflicts in the Soviet leadership. The question arose: who would take Brezhnev's place — Andropov or Chernenko, but when Andropov was appointed General Secretary of the Central Committee, and subsequently Chairman of the Supreme Soviet (an election which was hailed by the West), it was said: the star of Chernenko and his clan has waned.

Andropov did not last long. Brezhnev summoned him as his councillor in the other world. Therefore, the bugles continued: Who will take Andropov's place — Chernenko or Gorbachev?

This time the former proved the stronger. The official propaganda in the Soviet Union began at once to praise the figure of Chernenko, his statements began to be published, one after another, the promises of a new epoch began, etc., etc. At the same time, it was implied that this was no longer Andropov's line.

Is this true?

As far as I can see, there is no reason to disbelieve

it. What, in fact, is clearly observable? In the Soviet leadership, in the party and the state, two opposing trends can be seen, both of them proceeding from clearly counter-revolutionary, revisionist and capitalist positions and accompanied with undercover manoeuvres. Apparently, Chernenko represents the temporary compromise achieved between these two trends.

Why do I think and say this?

Andropov stayed in office only 14 months, although he was highly praised for the steps which he took in regard to the organizational questions of the party, and in the economic and political fields. Statues and books were dedicated to him, cities named after him, etc.

The same thing is occurring with Chernenko. Though he came to power only 4 months ago, they are singing him praises, talking about his great abilities in the organizational, political, economic and other fields. Meanwhile, there are signs which indicate a departure from Andropov's line, such as the changes, dismissals, appointments and transfers of higher cadres at the centre and the base. Andropov promoted his own men, and now it seems they are being replaced with Chernenko's supporters.

Whereas in regard to Andropov they say that he was somewhat more flexible in his relations with the United States of America and the other imperialist powers, in regard to Chernenko they say he is more "rigid," more "resolute," etc. Nevertheless, the chief of staff of the strategic air-defence forces of the Soviet Union, who gave the order to shoot down the South Korean civilian airliner when it violated the air space of the Soviet Union, an act about which the United States of America made a great noise, was greatly honoured at first, but was demoted a little later.

These are some of the facts which they mention to illustrate the unstable situation and the abrasive conflict between clans going on below the surface in the

leadership of the Soviet social-imperialists.

To show that we have to do with a transitional situation, because apparently the ratio of forces has not yet tipped definitely to one side, a significant fact is that a man such as Andropov, whose health was unsound, was appointed to the party and state leadership of the Soviet Union, one of the two imperialist superpowers of the world, and after his death, another person about whose state of health there are many rumours that he is seriously ill, with difficulty in breathing, speaking, etc., was appointed. In fact, seeing Chernenko on television, one has the impression of a man who can hardly stand and is completely contracted.

So the question arises: which are the true forces which stand and operate behind such figures as Andropov and Chernenko in the top leadership of the Soviet Union?

It is difficult to envisage, but apparently it involves definite internal forces, without excluding the influence of external forces, and especially the leading military circles and those of the KGB, that terrible weapon of the Soviet social-imperialists.

As to how long this business will go on and how it will end, we shall see, but I don't think it can continue for long. The course on which the revisionist forces have embarked in that country, the grave internal economic situation, the mounting complications and contradictions with the "allies" of the Warsaw Treaty and Comecon, as well as the difficult and grave international situations that have to be dealt with, the continuous pressure exerted by American imperialism and the international bourgeoisie, will undoubtedly have their influence in new, accelerated developments in the Soviet Union. These developments do not presage anything good for the peoples of the Soviet Union.

WEDNESDAY
JUNE 20, 1984

THE TWO IMPERIALIST SUPERPOWERS AND THEIR RESPECTIVE ORTHODOX CHURCHES

Although the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists are ready to stab one another in the heart, they embrace cordially whenever the occasion arises. To this end, they use all the means available, including religion and the churches.

According to a report released yesterday by the Soviet news agency, TASS, a delegation of the National Council of Churches of the United States of America made up of no less than 270 "friends," all of them bishops, priests and nuns, spent nearly two weeks touring the Soviet Union "to acquaint themselves with the life of the Soviet people" and to study "the situation of churches and religious organizations in the Soviet Union." As TASS points out, "the Americans are making a thorough investigation" of this question.

It seems a group of 140 members of this "delegation" also visited the Peace Committee of the Soviet Union, where the Secretary of that Committee spoke to them about the "Soviet stand as a champion of peace," about the "struggle of the Soviet Union to prevent a nuclear conflict in Europe and the whole world." He told them that the Soviet Union has adopted the law on "the prohibition of war propaganda" and that the "teaching of peace" has been introduced into every school of that country, etc., etc. But TASS does not say whether "the secretary of the Committee" said anything about the occupation of Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan, or about leaving the Palestinian people in the lurch.

According to TASS, the “friends” were satisfied, and why shouldn’t they be? One of them declared, “I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the Russian Orthodox Church and the official authorities that gave us the possibility to establish direct contacts with Russian religious personalities.” I add: Through these “friends” contacts are established, also, with the agents of the CIA, the Pentagon, and the imperialist monopolies and multinational companies.

**SUNDAY
DECEMBER 30, 1984**

PANORAMA

...As we have said, the present international situation is complicated, indeed very complicated and grave. We are living at a time of dangerous provocations. The armaments race between the superpowers has been stepped up and has been extended to outer space for the so-called star wars, which is fraught with very great dangers for mankind; the hotbeds of local wars have increased, the policy of armed aggression, and the threat by the United States and the Soviet Union to use the force of devastating modern weapons has been stepped up; the sabotage of the liberation struggles of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America is continuing; the sabotage of the just struggle of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples is continuing; the fascist forces are increasing in numbers and strength, etc., etc. The two superpowers stop at nothing to elbow each other out, even in those cases when millions of people fall victim to bad administration or natural calamities, as is happening in Ethiopia where, on the pretext of the famine which is threatening the lives of millions of people whose urgent needs for food, Ethiopia's "great ally," the Soviet Union, is unable to meet, the imperialist states and, in the first place, the United States of America have interfered to provide "aid"...

As regards the "exacerbated" relations between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, that is, between the two imperialist superpowers which pretend that they and they alone should settle all the problems of the world, should decide everything which is up to other peoples and countries to decide, the end of the year 1984 marked an "improvement." To this end, after the re-election of Reagan as president of the USA

for another four years, “the red and black” teletypes between Moscow and Washington were set in motion to give the world the “glad tidings”: at the beginning of 1985 Shultz and Gromyko will meet in Geneva to reach agreement on the beginning of talks on stopping the nuclear missile arms race “on earth and above the earth,” hence, a “gentlemen’s agreement,” or more accurately, a rouges’ bargain.

The “glad tidings” were immediately accompanied with reciprocal smiles and demagogic propaganda declarations about the “desire and good will” of the United States and the Soviet Union for “peace,” “disarmament,” etc., etc.

However, the peoples today are not easily taken in by these repeated “advances” and “retreats” of the two imperialist superpowers, by the “smiles and snarls” of their top-level representatives. Life has taught the peoples to expect nothing good or favourable from the superpowers, pretenders to world domination.

What is hidden behind the recent diplomatic-political steps of Moscow and Washington? What are the rulers of the United States of America and the Soviet Union hatching up for the world? Why are they going to sit down together for top-secret negotiations in Geneva? Solely to defend the interests of their predatory policy.

Terrified over any superiority that one has already gained over the other in the unrestrained race of conventional and sophisticated weapons, first of all, each will try to worm out of the other some general or specific secret about some kind of weapon or weapons system, of course, to the extent that this will be possible, because, as our people say, the snake never shows its feet. Second, they will strive to exert pressure on each other through the threat to use new weapons for a new re-division of the spheres of their political, military and economic influence. Since the division of spheres of influence between them on earth has been virtually

completed, the struggle has begun to elbow each other out, along with the struggle for the division of spheres of influence, in boundless outer space, to capture this or that planet of the solar system, so that there, too, they can “search for and find” valuable strategic minerals which they need for their war industry, as well as military bases from which they could attack each other.

The superpowers have filled outer space with spy satellites, with missiles and anti-missiles equipped with systems of lethal laser beams, with communications apparatuses, etc. A real chaos, great dangers that they will collide with each other. So, for this reason, too, in an attempt to establish a certain “order,” to achieve a *modus vivendi* in the “administration” of this boundless space, the imperialist-revisionist chiefs will talk in Geneva until the fear of losing the race overwhelms them again.

At the same time, through the demonstration of the strength of their weapons, and through the clamour they are setting up about the danger of these weapons, they are trying to intimidate the peoples of the world who are fighting for their national and social liberation, the revolutionary forces, the proletariat and the other working masses.

Hence, the two superpowers want to maintain the balance of their destructive military forces, so that the two of them are equally strong in armaments, means and troop numbers, so that they can impose themselves on other countries and peoples and cope with the bargaining over the division and re-division of spheres of influence with deals, and avoid the outbreak of a war which might lead to their mutual destruction and liquidation.

Our Party long ago stated its opinion: there is not and cannot be disarmament by the imperialist superpowers. They have neither the intention nor the desire to agree to disarmament, otherwise they would have to give up their policy of the occupation of the world,

relinquish the colossal profits that the armaments race brings them, their incitement and organization of hotbeds of fratricidal wars and their sabotage and defeat of just people's wars and social revolutions. Yes, they do want a certain "disarmament," the disarmament of the freedom-loving peoples, the world proletariat, the working masses, so they can more easily and quickly carry out their detestable plots.

The illusions that the bourgeois and revisionist ideologists want to create and the hopes they try to arouse about the "blessings" to be expected from the American-Soviet meetings in Geneva or elsewhere are very dangerous, fraught with very grave consequences for the future, the freedom and the national independence of the peoples. Regardless of what weapons American and Soviet capitalism possess, their external appearances of military, political and economic power must not intimidate peoples who are languishing under colonialist and neo-colonialist domination and are fighting to win their freedom, must not frighten the genuine Marxist-Leninist forces, the revolutionary proletarians. Capitalism is powerful only if it is not fought hard and with determination. Its "strength" crumbles before the colossal force of the revolutionary and freedom-loving feelings and aspirations of the proletarians and peoples...

Another great problem that became very clear in 1984, which is worrying the two imperialist superpowers and compelling them to be "cautious" and "logical," is the serious situation in their base areas, within the political, military and economic groupings, NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, the European Common Market and Comecon. And here I am referring not only to the opposition of the peoples of the member countries of these groupings to the dangerous political actions and economic pressures and the violation of their national independence and dignity by the United

States or the Soviet Union, but also to the opposition of governments and certain leading circles of these countries. Of course, the opposition of these governments and leading circles is not an expression of an arousing of genuine national feelings, but rather a manifestation of their fear of a further awakening of the revolutionary spirit and actions of the peoples, the working masses of the European countries.

On several occasions we have seen that the dictate of one or the other superpower over this or that “ally” has gone to such lengths as to give rise to open contradictions with the “big patron” which is continuously tightening the screws. It is no accident, for example, that the deployment of “Euromissiles” (“Pershing-2” and “Cruise” by the American imperialists and “SS-20” by the Soviet social-imperialists) in the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Britain, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, was not done without resistance, pressure and many political-diplomatic manoeuvres. Indeed, the governments of some countries, as in the cases of Holland, Belgium and Denmark, are continuing to this day to present conditions and put up opposition to the presence of such missiles on their territories. The “allies” are already clearly understanding that in the coming clashes between the two superpowers, their countries are destined to become battlefields in the thermo-nuclear war. Hence, they are seeing that at any moment, quite without warning and perfidiously, in order to save the territories of the United States and the Soviet Union from reciprocal attacks, Washington and Moscow might create atomic mushrooms with incalculable consequences in the skies over the territory of their countries.

In face of this lethal danger, the heads of state and government leaders of the member countries of NATO have gone to Washington to demand “explanations,” to get “guarantees” and present the opposition of the

European public to these ill-calculated and arrogant acts of the United States of America. Meanwhile the President and Vice-President of the USA, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defence are frequently visiting the capitals of Western Europe in order to convince the “allies” through political and economic pressure and dictate, up to threatening to withdraw the American military forces from Western Europe and leave it under the pressure of a possible aggression by the armies of the Soviet social-imperialists, to accept the *fait accompli*.

The situation in the so-called socialist community has been no more tranquil. Some of the “allies” of the Soviet Union are demanding more freedom to link up with the rich countries of Western Europe, and to carry out economic “reforms” of the Titoite type; some are demanding more rights in the framework of the Warsaw Military Treaty. News agencies, the press in general, are speaking, not without some basis of truth, about “disagreements” within Comecon, about “grumbling” over the very great dependence on the Soviets, and about the “desire” for the non-renewal of the Warsaw Treaty, or at least, for the easing of certain conditions which absolutize the supremacy of the unilateral dictatorial control and leadership by Soviet officers.

There is no smoke without fire. In Poland the smoke and flames have long been coming through the roof. At moments of the exacerbation of the grave economic crisis which has the capitalist-revisionist world in its grip, the Soviet Union has more than once used its economic relations with the “allies” in the Warsaw Treaty as a means of political pressure on some “ally which is disobedient,” or veering heavily towards to the West, and of course, this has caused reactions. Honecker, Ceausescu and Zhivkov had planned to make official visits to the Federal Republic of Germany, with the leading political, economic and military circles of

which they have had traditionally good relations which they are ready to renew at the highest level. None of them denies the fact that the economic strength of Bonn is especially attractive to them. But Moscow interfered and these visits were postponed *sine die*.* One of the “personalities” whom I mentioned protested, raised his voice, showed signs of discontent, stamped his foot petulantly, etc., but was brought to order when the Moscovite conductor tapped his baton sharply.

Hence, within the political, military and economic groupings of the two superpowers there are “prodigal sons.” Some are more determined and some softer, some more outspoken and some more disguised. Nevertheless, life confirms what our Party said years ago, that groupings of this kind are like baskets of crabs which tear at one another without mercy or ceremony.

The perspective, the prognosis is even more gloomy. For the two superpowers the outlook for 1985 is not for improvement, but for overcast weather, accompanied in some places with rain, snow, storms and strong winds!

* Indefinitely (Latin in the original).



**THE NOVEMBER 8TH
PUBLISHING HOUSE**
Catalogue available at november8ph.ca

NEPH would be glad to have your comments on this book, its design, any corrections and suggestions you may have for future publications. Please send them to info@november8ph.ca