

SPIRO DEDE

**The counter-revolution
within the counter-revolution**

(About the events of the years 1980-1983 in Poland)

Publisher's Note

The following edition of *The Counter-Revolution Within the Counter-Revolution* by Spiro Dede is republished from the "8 Nentori" Publishing House, Tirana 1983 edition. Minor edits and style changes have been made for this publication.

ISBN: 978-1-997536-20-8

THE NOVEMBER 8TH PUBLISHING HOUSE
TORONTO 2025

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....1

I

A SHORT REVIEW OF THE SUMMER OF 1980.....6

Feeling the pulse 7

The August heat wave..... 16

Revolution or counter-revolution? 28

II

THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION WITHIN THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION40

Two diametrically opposite stands 40

A peculiar manifestation of the counter-revolution 45

Abandonment of Marxism-Leninism56

The precursors of the counter-revolution..... 58

The premises for the PUWP to slide into revisionism . 62

Before and after an ill-famed congress 76

The first manifestation of the counter-revolution
within the counter-revolution 87

Revisionism at the gallop..... 100

From agreement to confrontation and vice-versa.....121

The Retribution of Dialectics135

The end of W. Gomulka..... 136

The end of E. Gierk 152

The end of the PUWP.....165

Under Alien Flags..... 176

III

THE “INDEPENDENCE OF TRADE UNIONS” — JUSTIFICATION OF CAPITALIST DEPEND- ENCE AND EXPLOITATION.....	202
Were the Polish “Independent Trade Unions” Truly Independent?	205
Why Did Reaction Need the So-Called “Trade Union Independence” in Poland?	216
What “Gains” Did the Polish Proletariat Make From the “Trade-Union Independence”?	230
“The right to strike”	231
“Partnership” with the government.....	240
“Complete religious freedom”	249
“Pay increases”	249
“Economic reform,” “workers’ self-government”	252
The “Surprise” of December 13, or the Logical Result of the Counter-Revolution?	257

IV

THE REVOLUTIONARY ROAD — THE ONLY ROAD TO SALVATION AND VICTORY	265
--	------------

INTRODUCTION

From the moment it burst out openly to this day the Polish crisis of 1980-1982 has compelled attention from the whole of world opinion. From all sides and directions a great deal has been and still is being said, giving the most varied and contradictory opinions, assessments and definitions to it.

All along, the Party of Labour of Albania's assessment of the true character of the recent events in Poland and its stand towards them has been the diametrical opposite of everything that has been said in the bourgeois-revisionist world. Right from the outbreak of the crisis in September 1980, the PLA pointed out that the strike movements in Poland "were inspired and manipulated from outside by the capitalist bourgeoisie of the West, by the all-powerful Polish Catholic Church and internal reaction... *They were aimed against a counter-revolutionary regime and had a counter-revolutionary inspiration.*"*

Subsequent events fully confirmed that the entire recent movement in Poland, both before December 13, 1981 (when the pro-Western counter-revolutionary forces were in full cry and very close to achieving their aims) and after December 13, 1981 (when the pro-Soviet counter-revolutionary forces put down their rival through the use of violence) is nothing but the history of the clash of two groups, one more counter-revolutionary than the other. From this aspect, that is, as the history of the struggle between two rival counter-revolutionary groups, the recent Polish movement is of no interest to us. Let those concerned, the authors of the counter-revolution themselves, write its history if they wish.

Nevertheless, there are a number of other aspects and factors tightly entangled with both the Polish movement of

* "Zëri i popullit," September 7, 1980.

recent years and the ideo-political clamour raised about it, the analysis and examination of which from the PLA's standpoint of Marxism-Leninism is of special importance and interest to the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties and the international proletariat and the progressive forces.

First of all, while showing once again that the strength of the working class *is capable of bringing down a reactionary state* today or in the future, just as it was in the past, the Polish workers' revolts proved at the same time that without the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party the movements of the working class not only do *not lead to revolution* and *are doomed to failure*, but, worse still, are frequently placed *under the control and command of reaction and ultra-right forces* and obliged to play the game of the latter. How and why did it happen, for example, that although the Polish proletariat rose to its feet it could not advance towards the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat? Why were millions of Poles so thoroughly misled that they became a reserve of the counter-revolutionary forces and placed themselves under alien political and ideological banners? What impelled them on this course, what are the "gains" they achieved from participation in this movement, what is the true road which they must follow, etc., etc. — for all this host of extremely acute problems, analysis of the current Polish movement on the basis of the thinking and the stand of the PLA has particular importance.

Second, the international bourgeoisie and the modern revisionists of all hues, through their involvement in many ways and their frenzied propaganda about the events in Poland, have undertaken and are intensifying another furious campaign *against the theory and practice of scientific socialism, against its vitality and laws of development*. All of them base their struggle and accusations on a common denominator: on

the alleged socialism which they claim exists in Poland.

The international bourgeoisie, with American imperialism at the head, is laying all the blame for the things that have occurred and are occurring in the capitalist society in Poland on the socialist system, charging that it is the source of all evils, of the reigning socio-economic chaos and endless injustices from which Poland has been suffering for years. The efforts of the modern revisionists headed by the Soviet social-imperialists lead to the same reactionary conclusion. While doing everything possible to maintain the existing situation in Poland, the capitalist order which has been re-established there for years, they present it as a socialist country. The only result of such propaganda is to sow stupefaction and confusion among the masses, to arouse their discontent towards this "socialism," which allegedly exists and flourishes in Poland. In this way the modern revisionists of all hues discredit the theory and practice of genuine scientific socialism. The chiefs of the Kremlin and their lackeys present the counter-revolutionary events in Poland as a consequence of those shortcomings and weaknesses which the so-called socialist order in Poland allegedly inherited from the past, from the period of "dogmatism" and "Stalinism." According to them, those mainly responsible for this are the top bosses of the Polish party and state, who, after being squeezed dry, are tossed aside and described as the bearers of all evils.

In these conditions, examination of the recent events in Poland, of the causes which led to them and of the bourgeois-revisionist theories about these events, on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist analyses and conclusions of the PLA, has special importance. Above all, handling the problem in this way brings out clearly the truth that once again the whole frenzied bourgeois-revisionist campaign against socialism is based on an absurdity. In reality socialism does not exist in

Poland. It was overthrown years ago, has been replaced by the capitalist order, therefore, it is in vain to blame socialism for the things that have occurred in Poland. The blame falls on that order which has long been established and consolidated there — the capitalist order. In regard to this Comrade Enver Hoxha pointed out some years ago, “Defence of the theory and practice of scientific socialism from the attacks and distortions of modern revisionists of various hues and tints and other bourgeois and petty-bourgeois trends is one of the most important tasks in the ideological struggle today.”*

Third, the events of the years 1980-1982 in Poland took place disguised as and under the banners of *a trade-union movement*, and trade-unionism has been proclaimed by international reaction as the only road to salvation for Poland and the Polish people. Why were these banners employed, what is hidden behind the “independent trade-unions,” how was the Polish proletariat caught up in them and on what dangerous anti-Marxist paths does this old game of the international bourgeoisie and reaction lead the proletariat? The analysis of all these events brings about the many bitter lessons contained in the recent Polish movement, lessons which it is essential to recognize and to learn from.

Fourth, the recent events in Poland are linked directly with the line pursued by the Polish United Workers’ Party. Hence, a correct analysis of these events necessarily requires a look at the treacherous line which this party has pursued during the past 30 years, a line which led to the grave situation, the chaos and confusion in Poland today. Besides *enabling us to find the real causes and factors of the Polish crisis*, this examination of the traitor course of the PUWP is important also in order *to equip the Marxist-Leninists and the masses with*

* Enver Hoxha, Report to the 6th Congress of the PLA, *Selected Works*, vol. 4, p. 766, Eng. ed.

revolutionary experience.

Fifth, the events in Poland are by no means “simply a Polish phenomenon.” The same basic causes and factors which led to the Polish crisis exist in all the other countries in which the modern revisionists have seized power, just as they exist in the whole capitalist world. Hence, the causes exist and it is entirely possible that what occurred in Poland in recent years might spread to or re-appear in other countries, especially in the former socialist countries. We are not referring to the rival counter-revolutionary groups and clans within these countries. They have done and will continue to do their work. The issue is that the proletariat and the masses in these countries must rise in the just and legitimate struggle they have ahead of them under the banners of the revolution and not fall prey to the great and hideous bourgeois-revisionist deception into which whole contingents of the Polish proletariat fell in the movements of recent years.

For these and other reasons, analysis of the recent events in Poland from the positions of Marxism-Leninism and the general conclusions which the Party of Labour of Albania has reached about them have great ideological and political importance.

I A SHORT REVIEW OF THE SUMMER OF 1980

The whole period of more than two years, in particular the period from June 1980 to December 1981, but in fact even after this, saw an unprecedented confrontation of the most varied classes and social-political forces of Poland. Although general chaos was the most characteristic feature of the situation in which this confrontation took place, within this chaos the fierce clash between *two main social-political forces*, hostile to each other and, at the same time, entangled and implicated with each other, has become ever more clearly outlined and concretized. On the one side stand the *forces of the revisionist counter-revolution* linked with the Polish United Workers' Party, the present Polish Government and Soviet social-imperialism, i.e., the forces of modern revisionism in Poland; confronting them stand *the forces of ultra-reaction* linked with Western capital and the Vatican. Although from the class viewpoint both these forces belong to a single class — the bourgeois class, they have hurled themselves into conflict and confrontation with each other, each representing the interests of different groupings of the old and new Polish bourgeoisie. The third force, which in fact is the biggest, most vigorous and active in the present movements in Poland, *the proletariat and the working masses*, in reality is not operating as an independent force for itself. For a series of deep-going political, ideological, economic and other causes and reasons the proletariat and the working masses have been gradually deceived and manipulated by one or the other of the two counter-revolutionary forces and, precisely on account of this, they have engaged in a struggle which not only is not theirs, but which in essence is being waged to their disadvantage.

A panorama of the endless series of clashes, large and small, between these forces during the period under discussion is neither possible nor necessary. The main aim of a study about what has occurred and is occurring in Poland is by no means to present the chronology of events, but to analyse them, to discover the underlying causes of them. Nevertheless, as an introduction to the analysis and to give a more concrete view of the whole, it is appropriate to give a chronology of a fragment of this period. For this we have selected the first part of the movement, from its commencement in June 1980 to the achievement of the so-called "Gdansk Compromise" at the end of August 1980. The chronicle of events of this stage not only gives a clearer idea about the situation which has been seething in Poland, and which brought the whole of the Polish society into the arena, but also throws light on the extremely contradictory and complex character of all the subsequent events, of the forces participating in them, of the aims which these forces had set themselves, of the courses which they have pursued, of the results which they have achieved and will achieve, etc. The fact is, also, that all the events after August 1980 in Poland, including those that occurred after December 13, 1981, are nothing but repetitions, with greater or lesser dimensions and intensity, of events of the summer of 1980, their further development and deepening, the uncovering of those aspects which, for various reasons, remained hidden in the first phase.

Therefore, before we begin the analysis, let us present a brief chronological outline of the events of the summer of 1980 in Poland.

Feeling the pulse

The outbreak of a series of strikes in different regions of Poland in June 1980 was very quickly to convince everybody that this was not that usual outbreak of conflicts between workers and the local administration to which Polish society had long been accustomed.

Certain specific symptoms and reactions towards this conflict foretold of an unpleasant summer.

Not only were the confidence and determination of the strikers to pursue their claims more obvious this time, but even worse for the ruling authorities was the immediate spread and escalation, almost like an epidemic, of hotbeds of the crisis.

The Polish dissident press (a “non-official,” “illegal” press which is published and sold legally and officially in Poland) had been busy for years discovering and publicizing any such movement opposed to the team in power, but at the beginning of the summer of 1980 its voice rang out as never before. It not only gave a whole series of details and facts about what was going on in Poland, but it also fanned the flames from below and issued open calls to give the Polish proletarians “heart and direction”!

The reaction of the revisionist authorities, also, was different from other times, their unexpected “readiness” to fulfil every demand of the strikers immediately and unconditionally (for the time being they were simply economic demands) indicated the “clear understanding” by those “at the top” of the grave situation they were facing, rather than an “understanding” of the demands of those “below.” But that was not all. The Polish revisionist leaders reacted in a way which is rare in history when, as exploiters, they congratulated the exploited and, indeed, “thanked” the workers because, by rising in strikes, that is, by challenging the government in power,

they “have taken a stand worthy of the working class.”*

July became even more threatening. Faced with failure after failure in the economic field, faced with an external debt of about 18 billion dollars, faced with the continuous rise of prices, the shortages of goods on the market and especially foodstuffs, the fall in the value of the zloty, the reduction of productive capacities in industry, the shortage of financial means, etc., etc., the Polish government at the beginning of July 1980 announced its new plan for “economic improvement and regulation.” The most important and effective measure in this plan was the decision to... raise the price of meat.

The reaction was immediate and traumatic. Precisely as if it had been waiting for this, an unprecedented strike movement broke out all over Poland. Those days (and even to this very day) many politicians, sociologists and organs of the bourgeois and revisionist press and propaganda trumpeted loudly that the cause of the mass movement which broke out in the summer of 1980 in Poland was allegedly nothing but this decision to raise the price of meat!

Although such a vulgar and ridiculous treatment of the true, profound and complex underlying causes of great social movements is not even worthy of mention, here we take the opportunity to say just one thing: had the Polish revisionist authorities known and believed that the true cause of those overwhelming disturbances which were to occur subsequently was their decision to raise the price of meat, undoubtedly they would never have taken this step towards catastrophe.

However, one thing is true: chronologically the events in Poland assumed unprecedented vigour after the decision of July 1st on increasing the price of meat. However, although such a decision on its own could never be a true and complete reason why millions of people arose, the fact that the

* PAP, June 26, 1980.

general revolt broke out precisely after this decision is convincing evidence of the existence of a crisis situation which had long been simmering, which was prepared in “secrecy,” which gathered strength and was seeking the opportunity, the *casus belli* to break out.

And look at this disturbing “coincidence”: although this decision was announced on July 1, 1980, the strikes and protests broke out not on July 2 or July 10, as might have been expected, but after July 15. This fact would have no importance had the flare-up of the strike atmosphere precisely after July 15 not taken place on the eve of July 21 — a significant date in the life of the Poland of these past 38 years: July 21 marks the anniversary of the founding of the new people’s democratic Poland. In 1980 the Polish proletariat went to its main national celebration with its arms folded. Even more clear: although the decision of July 1 affected and revolted all Poland, the first great wave of strikes broke out precisely in Lublin. This fact, too, would have no significance had the name of Lublin not been linked with events and documents of importance for the Poland of the last 38 years: the National Liberation Committee of Poland, which from the 21st of July 1944 began to perform the functions of the first government of the new independent Poland, was established initially precisely in Lublin.

Hence, these two circumstances are sufficient for the moment to show that the strikes launched for “purely economic” motives indisputably involved an acutely political terrain. Above all, they were a challenge to the party and the authorities in power.

Life was brought to a complete standstill in Lublin for days on end. This “notable” city of 300,000 inhabitants remained without production, without public transport, without milk or bread.

Alarmed, the government dispatched to the crisis zone the strike-breaker, Deputy Prime Minister Jagielski, in order to reach agreement with the strikers and truck-drivers from other zones of Poland to supply the empty shops in Lublin. Within a few days, however, the Gierek clique was to be convinced that it could not get out of trouble in such ways. The truck-drivers all over the country were to go on strike themselves, while the numbers of the deputy prime ministers, had they been increased tenfold and had they been employed only to settle strikes, would never have been sufficient. On July 20, the strikes broke out in Warsaw, on July 22 in Wrocław (Lower Silesia) and Lubartów, and then in Kielce, Poznań, Włocławek, Horzów-Wielkopolski and elsewhere.

The situation was becoming alarming. The strikers stopped work, rejected the “elected” official representatives of their trade-unions and set up so-called “strike committees” as representatives to talk to the authorities.

On July 23, to get a clear picture of the “geography” of the zones on strike, you would need the map of the whole of Poland in front of you.

In distinction from what happened in the analogous events in 1956, 1970-1971 and 1976, when the strikers’ demands were opposed with the bayonets, the jack-boots, the tear-gas bombs of the Polish revisionist police and army, this time the government authorities hastened to fulfil the strikers’ demands immediately. Although there are many underlying reasons for this “gentleness” of the authorities towards the rebellion from below, at this first phase of the development of events it seemed that the main one was their fear of the proportions which the “epidemic” might assume. Finding itself in a catastrophic situation, shaken to its foundations, but still hoping to remain in power, the Gierek team rushed hither and thither, attempting to put out the hotbeds of the fire

through agreements.

For example, the demands of the printing and distribution workers of the Warsaw newspapers were agreed to on July 20, the first day they opened their mouths. It was much the same with the strikers of all other plants and enterprises. It seemed as if everything was quite simple: the strikers demand — the government agrees! Then, who should bear the blame that, for such a simple thing, a mere “misunderstanding” you might say, all this great disturbance was created? The workers who had not spoken out before, or the government which had not taken the initiative to display such generosity and kindness a little earlier?!

To prettify the picture even more, the official authorities and the organs of the official press continued to speak “well” about the strikes that had broken out, except that they still did not call them by their true name, but called them “complaints,” “legitimate reaction,” etc.

In an editorial article of July 24, the influential daily “Zicie Warszawy” called the strikes “the workers’ right to have their say,” and moreover, “a duty of workers to eliminate the irregularities and bureaucratic obstacles.”

For a moment it seemed as if what was expected had been achieved. At the end of July there were signs that the fever in Poland was dying down. All that had remained for the officials in power was to make up the balance of what was gone. It was a very sorry balance in all directions. From the calculations published in the official Polish press, it emerges that from the strikes that occurred in more than a hundred enterprises during June-July 1980 the Polish economy lost about 3 billion zloty (about 100 million dollars). Its “readiness” to stop the wave of strikes by meeting the demands for increased wages cost the Polish government very dear. The effect of the decision to increase the wages of those workers that went on

strike during June-July, alone, was calculated at about 5 billion zloty (about 165 million dollars) at a time when the state treasury was supposed to gain a sum of about two billion zloty (about 65-70 billion dollars) from the decision of July 1st to raise the price of meat.

Meanwhile, the foreign debt exceeded 18.5 billion dollars and the chaotic situation in the country prodded the government to greater efforts to get new loans from the West.

The Gierek team swallowed these bitter pills in the economic field, comforting and deluding itself that everything — both the protests from below and the losses, were centred in one field only — the economic field. According to the government, now that tempers had “cooled,” further progress would be made and everything would be compensated for. It does not befit the good Catholic to give up hope, even with one foot in the grave.

The forces of the strikers for their part assessed the balance of the first wave of the movement quite differently. In the “softness” of the leaders of the government towards the uninterrupted strikes, both the forces which were mobilizing and arousing the proletariat and the workers themselves discovered much more than the fear of the authorities about what was happening in the country. In this “softness” they saw convincing proofs both of the utter weakness of the ruling order and of the division and the profound contradictions within the revisionist leadership over the way they must behave towards the typhoon which was mounting. The voices of a minority for the suppression of the strikes by force were drowned out by the calls and clear demands for “moderate” stands, for “political solutions,” “agreements” and “compromises” with those in revolt. Moreover, there was no lack of declarations through which various personalities of the revisionist party and government openly expressed or implied

their understanding and sympathy for the revolts which were bursting out. At the same time, thousands of party members and officials of all ranks, of the local and central administration, were openly uniting with the strikers.

Thus, with the government team which was not just shaken and split, but contained "a pro-strike lobby" the, forces which incited and led the strikes were completely confident that they could play the game through to the end without great risk.

The external danger — the possible military intervention of "friends," the Soviet social-imperialists, first of all, remained more threatening. They had the divisions of the Soviet army and of the Warsaw Treaty outside Polish territory in complete readiness, while for years they had had whole contingents of troops armed to the teeth stationed within Polish territory.

However, the rumours about an eventual intervention of Russian tanks in Poland were not justified. The Soviet social-imperialists had their hands stained with blood up to the elbows from the aggression committed six or seven months previously on Afghanistan. Now, like Pontius Pilate, they were trying to wash them with torrents of demagoguery and deception. At these moments a new aggression against Poland which had risen in strikes was a most undesirable thing for the aggressors, although these strikes in essence challenged the Russian domination. But this was not all. The campaign for the organization of the Madrid Conference on the so-called European Security was reaching its climax. The chiefs of Moscow, in rivalry with the American imperialists, were presenting themselves as initiators, burning with ardour for the organization of this conference at which they reckoned on making major gains, amongst other things, for the deception and manipulation of world opinion. Furthermore, these were the moments when the social-imperialists "had" their hands

full as never before, not with guns but with olive branches. On July 15, the Olympic Games were to commence in Moscow. For months the chiefs of the Kremlin had been doing everything in their power to exploit the Olympic Games to improve to some extent the vile and bloody picture which world opinion had of them. Despite their colossal efforts, tens of Olympic teams, representatives of various countries, inspired and incited by American imperialism for its own interests, were challenging the heads of the Kremlin by refusing to take part in the games which were to be held in the capital city of a country which had invaded another country only a few months before. To undertake a fresh aggression against Poland at these moments would mean total defeat, not just in the Olympic Games, but in all the political "games" in which they were involved.

Their calculations went even further and the more cool-headedly they were made, the more they turned into shackles which, at least for the moment, stayed the hands of the Soviet aggressors. They were well aware that the tragedy of Prague on the night of August 1968 could never be repeated in the situation which was simmering in Poland. The Poles were aroused. They would not be taken by surprise by an attempt at a lightning invasion, but would oppose the Russian invasion with arms, and this would create incalculable complications for the aggressors. At the same time, an attack on Poland in the summer of 1980, apart from unheard of losses in all fields, would bring the Soviet social-imperialists face to face with extraordinary problems and difficulties in the economic field, too. The all-round crisis which had gripped the bourgeois-revisionist world for years had gripped them, too. The severe sanctions which the American imperialists and other imperialist powers had placed on relations in general, and especially on trade relations with the Soviet social-im-

perialists after their aggression in Afghanistan, had further increased the difficulties and deepened the crisis in the Soviet Union. The aggression against Poland would be a new weapon in the hands of the Western imperialist powers in the savage fight to drive their social-imperialist rival into new and greater difficulties. Even if they did not reply with arms, that is, with the outbreak of a new imperialist war, the Western powers, headed by the American imperialists, through a total embargo and blockade, would tighten their stranglehold even further on the sick Soviet economy. Moreover, if they did occupy Poland, the Soviet social-imperialists would have to cope with those great economic problems which had been eroding Poland for years and had brought the country to the brink of disaster.

The Polish strike movement had broken out at unsuitable moments, utterly unsuitable moments for them! In the face of this disturbing truth the social-imperialists considered it appropriate to maintain complete silence about what was happening in Poland, to operate behind the scenes with the Polish revisionist authorities and to await better days. This stand gave encouragement and support to the ultra-right reactionary forces which were guiding and organizing the strike movement in Poland. They were convinced that they had struck precisely at the right moment. The first test, feeling the pulse internally and externally, had been tackled successfully. Now they could go further.

The August heat wave

The illusions of the leaders of the revisionist government that the situation had calmed down were smashed in the first days of August. On August 4, about seven thousand textile

workers of Kalisz (Poznan) stopped work and demanded increased wages, regulation of the pronounced disproportions between the pay of workers and that of privileged groups, the improvement of work norms, etc. Simultaneously, ten thousand workers of the "Ponar" automobile plant at Tarnow followed their example. One day later, on August 5, 20,000 workers of the Swodnik works went on strike again: although their demand for increased pay had been met in July now they were demanding "the rest": the wages for the days they were on strike in July! With a team like that of Gierek, shaken to its foundations, in such an explosive situation, the forces which were manipulating the strikes could do whatever they wanted.

As the threatening situation mounted, the central organ of the Polish revisionists, "Tribuna Ludu," in a leading article of August 4, sounded the alarm about what was occurring in Poland and called on the workers to return to work. "The stoppages of work (the official Polish press had not still taken off the kid gloves and the strikes were called "stoppages," although it was admitted that "such events have been taking place one after the other for five weeks") are not getting to the root of the evil, but on the contrary, in some cases they are making it worse," said this revisionist paper. In order to show that they were concerned about and understood the situation, the party and the Polish government admitted openly that among the reasons for the strikes were "the shortages of supplies in the shops and enterprises, the long queues in which people have to wait, the rising prices and cost of living, the bureaucratic delays, cases of putting personal interests above the general interest, bribery, and the existence of a new wealthy class, the members of which are able to secure anything for themselves."* The PUWP hoped that with these

* "Tribuna Ludu," August 4, 1980.

doses of "sincerity" the workers would give way.

The reply from the base was not delayed: the workers of municipal services and transport in Warsaw, those of a series of factories, plants and combines in Lodz, Bierun, Starahowicze, Walbrzych, etc. went out on strike immediately. By August 10, the workers of more than a hundred and fifty enterprises were on strike. In many of these enterprises "genuine representatives of the workers," "strike committees," "workers' commissions," etc. had been or were being set up. Born in the upsurge of the strike movement, these were the first organisms which undertook "to represent" the masses in the talks with the representatives of the enterprises and the labour administration.

Seized with panic the authorities of the party and the Polish government continued to rush around, trying to quell the hotbeds with the former means: the "admission" of a series of distortions committed by "individual persons," many expressions of "regret," and, of course, promises and decisions to increase wages and to fulfil some other demands of the strikers! It was hoped that in this way the heat wave would depart together with August. However, the second ten days of August indicated the opposite.

On August 14, a "heat wave" came from the North: 17,000 workers of the Gdansk shipyard went on strike. They were the workers of those same shipyards which shook Poland to its foundations in 1970 and brought as a consequence the fall of the notorious Gomulka and the rise to power of Edward Gierek. It had taken only ten years for history to repeat itself, but this time with a much greater intensity and extension and a much more complex content. The involvement of an industrial zone like that of Gdansk-Gdynia-Sopot, with a population of more than 700,000, of which 200,000 are workers, raised the Polish crisis to the level of a major political

confrontation.

While the local authorities in Gdansk rushed around in alarm, trying to immediately stop the spread of strikes in the district by means of talks, the top revisionist leadership saw that it could no longer keep the situation in the country hidden. It was losing all control.

On August 14, the Polish government was obliged to give detailed information about the strikes in the country through the official news agency PAP, pointing out among other things: "The many problems which have now become the subject of discussion in the enterprises are being solved by the managements of these enterprises. The other legitimate demands must be thoroughly analysed, while others again, despite their importance, unfortunately cannot be fulfilled either today or tomorrow, because the means to settle them do not exist."

The only thing that was not disclosed was the nature of the demands. This was still kept secret. But what the official press kept quite secret, the "illegal" dissident press brought out quite openly.

On August 15, about 50,000 workers of the Baltic shipyards (Gdansk, Gdynia, Sopot) went out on strike and the situation became extremely tense. A few hours after the return of Edward Gierek from a "holiday" in the Soviet Union, the other Edward, the Prime Minister Babiusz, addressed the nation over the central Polish television service.

"I am well aware of the fact," he said, "that the nation expects a clear answer about what the government is doing and what it intends to do to bring the country out of its economic difficulties in order to eliminate the causes of social tensions."

However, Babiusz "was very well aware" only of the fact that the nation "was expecting an answer," but not of the answer itself. Therefore, his appearance on television was more a

desperate effort to stem the rising tide of strikes. He issued a warning: "We have lived on credit... our country's debts have reached such a level as cannot be exceeded on any pretext." And if such words failed to arouse the "remorse" of the masses, Babiusz knew another language: "The world is watching how we are facing up to the difficult times," he warned the nation. "We have invincible allies, the concern of whom is ours, too."*

The implication was quite clear: the allies, i.e., the Warsaw Treaty and, first of all, the Soviet Union, are "concerned," they are here within the country, and they can strangle everything if we don't settle down to work and accept the situation!

But the words of Babiusz were carried away with the breeze. The "nation" did not listen to him and his colleagues. On August 16, the number of strikers in the Baltic zone reached 90,000 and the demands presented from below were increasing as quickly as the strikes themselves.

That same day, in the disturbed situation in Poland, the countryside began to have its say: the farmers of Zbroza Duza region announced at a meeting they held on August 16 that they were going to stop sending milk to their normal delivery points and would send it to the strikers of Gdansk.

Meanwhile the strikers, sensing the strength of their folded arms, went on to another demand: they announced that they would not sit down to talk with the managements of enterprises or the local authorities, but would talk only with the top authorities of the party and the government. On August 17, the strikers of 21 factories and plants in Gdansk set up the "Joint Strike Committee," vesting this Committee with the attributes of a partner in the talks with the government authorities of the highest level.

The challenge to the Polish revisionist leadership was

* PAP, August 16, 1980.

extremely grave. It was seen more clearly than ever that the problem was not simply economic. The demands were not for some temporary improvements. Indeed, even when the authorities announced as "a preliminary measure" that the increase in wages would include not only the zones on strike, but also the enterprises of all categories with conditions similar to those which were on strike, the tide of strikes from below continued to rise. The revisionist government was seeing from moment to moment that it would no longer be capable of running the country with the former means. What was coming from below was not simply pressure, but a typhoon. Convinced that nothing was to be achieved through concessions in the economic field, the revisionist authorities decided to change their tactics. Since the carrot was having no effect, they brought the threat of the stick into use. Perhaps, a "reminder" of the savage way in which the analogous movement of 1970-1971 had been suppressed would have more effect than pouring all the treasury of Poland into the strikers' pockets. Therefore, in order to establish some control over the alarming situation, the Polish leadership cut off all telephone and telex links between the Baltic strike zones and the other parts of the country, spread rumours that the police and the army were going to intervene, that troop movements were increasing in the bordering zones of the Soviet Union and the "allied" countries, that the strikes were allegedly being settled one after the other, etc.

Moreover, in order to arouse opposition to and dissatisfaction with the strikers, the revisionist authorities took another unprecedented step: over the central television service they gave whole broadcasts from the strike zones, especially highlighting the long queues waiting at the shops, the confusion in the strike-bound urban transport, the complete silence in the ports and shipyards, exhausted women with children

in their arms, completely empty shop windows, long rakes of trucks filled with coal which were sitting idle at the ports and railway stations. All this was done to show the nation: "Look at the state of things the strikers have brought about," they "have caused all the difficulties and irregularities," etc.

The strikers replied to the "quarantine" and pressure of the government in the same coin: the truck- and train-drivers joined the workers of the plants, ports and shipyards. On August 16 and 17 not a truck, train or tram moved in Gdansk. Everything was brought to a standstill in Gdynia and Szczecin, too. The strikers responded to the government's decision to cut off telephone and telex communications by stepping up their demands and, indeed, presenting them in the form of an ultimatum: immediate restoration of communications with the other parts of the country, partnership in the talks to be raised to the top level. Moreover, these talks between representatives of the two sides must be broadcast directly by the means of the information and propaganda!

As to the rumours that "the police and the army are going to intervene," the forces which manipulated and inspired the strike movement found it appropriate to respond to this through the West-German daily "Die Welt." On August 17, Jacek Kuron, one of the heads of the Polish dissidents, "adviser" and "ideologist" of the forces leading the strikes, pointed out openly in an article in the pages of "Die Welt": "The authorities know from bitter experience that they cannot break the strike by force. This has shown the people that they can go on strike without great risk."*

This was truly the case: whole masses of proletarians were rising in struggle and not retreating in the face of demagoguery or threats. Although without great noise and clamour, without slogans and banners calling for insurrection and killing,

* "Die Welt" August 17, 1980.

without bloodshed, without demands for the organization of armed detachments, indeed without considering it necessary to openly launch slogans for the overthrow of the government in power, the strikers through their silence, through their folded arms, were bringing Poland to a complete standstill. Its political and economic life was paralysed.

The party and the government in power were in an impasse. They had shown themselves excessively "ready" to fulfil the initial demands of an economic nature through "understanding." The time had come for this "understanding" to be demonstrated even more generously precisely on the points in which those who were guiding the movement from below were interested. And this was going to be done, willy-nilly. The "hapless monarch" (to borrow a phrase from Engels about an analogous case 140 years earlier),* that is, the "unhappy" First Secretary to whom the financial difficulties and all the economic chaos were the bitterest satire of his pro-Western capitalist tendency, sensed immediately that it was impossible to reign any longer without making further concessions to the general demands from below. He accepted the strikers' demand for partnership in talks and sent a special commission headed by the Deputy Prime Minister, Tadesz Pyka, to the Baltic zones.

But this measure, too, solved nothing. By August 18, 160 economic enterprises in Gdansk, Gdynia, Szczecin, Sopot and other Baltic cities were on strike. Meanwhile, the workers in Southern Poland went on strike, too. That day the number of strikers reached over 300,000, of which over 100,000 were in the Baltic zones.

Edward Gierek personally was compelled to appear before the nation. In a TV address on August 18, he, too,

* See F. Engels, "Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany," Tirana 1970, pp. 31-32, Alb. ed.

tried to cool the tempers a bit. But whereas ten years earlier his face, still not well-known to the Polish proletariat, had seemed somewhat new, and in any case promised something new, now that face had become detested. The strikers listened to him with indifference, some of them with derision, while others, at a time when the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the party was speaking, were busy listening to something else — to the Mass!

“Poland needs internal peace,” concluded Gierek. “If we do not have that, all other problems will lose their significance.”*

Poland replied to Gierek’s appeal for “peace” with a great-
er upsurge of “war.” From a total of 180 enterprises on strike throughout the country on August 18, one day later, August 19, in Gdansk, Gdynia, Sopot, Elblag, Lebork, Ustka, Nowa Huta and Szczecin alone, the number of enterprises on strike amounted to 260; on August 20 this number reached 280, on August 21, 350 enterprises and on August 22, 400 enterprises were on strike.

The speed with which events moved was unprecedented at any time in the last 35 years of the life of Poland. The head of the Polish state, Jablonski, and the head of the Polish Church, Wyszinski, addressed the nation in turn, the official newspapers sounded the alarm, the TV service continued to try “to touch” the hearts of people for pity. But nothing could withstand the storm.

The authorities of the government and the revisionist party who, up till then, had been screaming to convince themselves, Poland and the world that the movement from below was “simply economic,” admitted openly on August 21, “Today... we are facing a stern political struggle.”**

* “Tribuna Ludu,” August 19, 1980.

** Ibid., August 21, 1980.

Now, facing them as partners in the talks was a powerful committee, the so-called General Strike Committee (MKS). And the same government leaders who a few days earlier had refused to talk to this “Committee” because “it does not represent the strikers,” and “non-socialist elements have been introduced into it” (!), revised their opinions on August 22. It was clearly apparent that this “Committee,” the supreme organism prepared in and drawn from the wave of disturbances as the representatives of hundreds of thousands of people on strike, manipulated the masses, the proletariat, the people. Placed at the head of it was a former unemployed worker, an electrician, who until just a little earlier had lived on “hand-outs” from unknown sources — Lech Walesa. The Western press and the Polish dissident press began to proclaim him as a “Messiah,” to pump the idea into the Polish proletariat that in the person of Walesa it had to do with a figure experienced in “opposition” to the ruling authorities, the man who had even accepted imprisonment (the longest time he had been held by the police had not exceeded 24 hours) and who “knew” how to give hard-hitting interviews to the reporters of the “free press,” etc., etc. Nevertheless, the truth is that until those days, to the public opinion in Poland and abroad, this new “Messiah” was nothing but an unknown name. On August 22, this person who had been nothing up to yesterday, sat down face to face with Jagielski, the first Deputy Prime Minister of Poland, to play out the final scenes of the political match of the summer of 1980.

Meanwhile, the top leadership of the PUWP continued its uninterrupted series of meetings and in the absence of “good news” from below, on the evening of August 24, decided to “gladden” the nation with some sensational news. It announced that at its meeting of that day (August 24), the Central Committee of the PUWP had dismissed four mem-

bers and two candidate members of the Political Bureau, including two secretaries of the Central Committee of the PUWP, while E. Babiusz, besides being removed from the Political Bureau, also lost the post of Prime Minister which he had held for less than six months.

Obviously, since the revisionist chiefs were obliged to remove six of the main blocks from the apex of their pyramid of power, the number of dismissals, removals, replacements below must increase proportionally with the increase in the diameter of the pyramid itself. And that day and the following day, on August 25, the top organ of the party and the government, as well as the central and local revisionist organs and organizations, "following the example" of the party and on its orders, began to announce changes one after the other. Anything provided the base was pacified, provided the troubles did not engulf everything!

With this desperate manoeuvre, as well as with new promises and entreaties for "agreement with the working class," for "a radical change in the policy of the party and the state," Gierek thought that he had found "the way out from his dramatic conflict,"* as he put it on August 24, in his speech closing the Plenum of the CC of the Party.

But both the forces which guided and inspired the movement from below and the base of this movement saw even more clearly in this "draconian" act of the revisionist leadership the essence of the truth: the desperate and hopeless situation of the central power, on the one hand, and their own great strength, on the other hand.

This was the result: being unable to mention the endless number of enterprises on strike the authorities in power found it more "economical" to make up the balance from the opposite direction: "In the region of Gdansk, Szczecin and

* "Tribuna Ludu," August 25, 1980.

Elblag, only the shops and the electrical, water and gas services continue to function without great disturbances," was the gloomy announcement of the official Polish news agency PAP on August 25.

When the strikes in the enterprises of the Baltic and other zones of the country were going into their 16th day, the so-called "Joint Strike Committee" had turned into a true administrative organ. Its decisions and calls were acted upon all over the Baltic zone of Poland.

Meanwhile, this "Committee" set up among other things its own "security service." Whole squads of special guards were appointed to protect the chairman, Lech Walesa. The "Committee" set up its press organs, its office for relations with the local and foreign press, etc. More than 30 foreign journalists and 14 Polish journalists had received the necessary authorization to reflect the life and activity of the "insurgents" in the most important organs of the local and world press and television. Inveterate dissidents of revisionist Poland, top representatives of the Polish Catholic Church, academics, writers, economists, legal experts, etc., took part in this so-called "Joint Committee" which presented itself as the "champion of the workers' cause" in the talks with the government.

While the top-level talks were going on amidst the unrelenting tension from below, in protest against pressure from the government side, the number of enterprises on strike, and together with them, the number of demands continued to mount. In the last days of August the situation was completely out of hand. Poland was on the brink of bankruptcy in the full meaning of the word. The strikers did not retreat or give ground even when it was solemnly declared that 15, 18, 19 and even 20 of their 21 demands would be met. They had announced 21 demands and if even one of them was not fulfilled, the other twenty were worthless.

About the content and aim of these demands we shall speak later. The important thing here is to bring out the critical point which matters had reached. Quietly, indeed with order and discipline which was described from all sides as “exemplary,” the masses on strike (still without mentioning those forces which were urging and inspiring them), with their determination and persistence, were proving that the life of a country can be paralysed even without rifle shots and clashes. It was this situation to which Comrade Enver Hoxha was referring when he underlined, “The revolt of the workers in Poland... has shown that the working class has the strength to defeat a reactionary state, whether revisionist or capitalist.”*

Refusing to submit to pressure and blackmail, not contenting themselves for the moment with what had been achieved, stern, revolted and bitterly ironical, the strikers seemed to be determined to carry what they had begun through to the end. A moment had come when it seemed that everything was speaking in their favour. At that time at least, the leadership of the revisionist Polish party and state was showing that it was able to do nothing against this typhoon.

Revolution or counter-revolution?

Although a profound crisis, a crisis from top to bottom, existed objectively in Poland in the summer of 1980, what was happening there could have led to anything except the proletarian revolution.

For the revolution to break out, apart from the objective factor (a factor which is not dependent on the will of particular groups and parties or even of particular classes), the

* Enver Hoxha, Report to 8th Congress of the PLA, p. 186, Eng. ed.

subjective factor also is essential, because the revolution “is born only from a situation when a subjective change is added to the objective changes...”*

What, then, was the state of the subjective factor in the Polish crisis of the summer of 1980, by what ideology was the movement inspired, what slogans had it adopted, what program and aims had it set itself?

Precisely when this is examined the essence of the tragedy of recent events in Poland emerges clearly.

The Polish proletariat, oppressed and deceived by the revisionist chiefs, by the new wealthy class (now the revisionist chiefs themselves were compelled to admit the existence of this class), had the right to be revolted over the catastrophic state to which Poland had been reduced, had the right to rise and struggle for a better life, for equality, for justice, for the freedom and independence of the Homeland, for their livelihood, for a kind of society better than the existing one, for a system in which the working class would truly have its say, in which there would be no room for speculation, contempt, discrimination, unemployment, inflation, etc., etc.

But while all these aspirations, which had been aroused in the Polish proletariat for a long time and now were demanding solution, were totally right, legitimate and necessary in essence, all the other things: the ideology by which the strikers were inspired, the forces which were going to lead them, the alternative which was offered to the existing order, the banner under which they were mobilized, the courses that were to be followed, etc., were completely unclear, confused, false and anti-working class. We shall deal with the reasons why below. Here we want only to point out the truth that the ideology, the leading forces, the means, the ways and methods with which the Polish proletariat was aroused in 1980 were com-

* V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, vol. 2, p. 163, Tirana 1974.

pletely alien to the interests of the proletariat, in particular, and to the workers' movement as a whole.

Concretely:

First, the Polish movement which started in the summer of 1980 and is still continuing to this day is completely devoid of the ideology of the proletariat — Marxism-Leninism.

During this period many ideological banners have been waved by chiefs and ideologists of the movement, but not one word has been said about the essential need for Marxism-Leninism. On the contrary, the current Polish movement was manipulated and guided in such a way that it emerged in the arena and continued also as a reaction against Marxism-Leninism. It is another matter that this movement identifies that line, that reactionary ideology which the revisionist chiefs in power have embraced and have been applying for years with Marxism-Leninism. It is also another matter that it identifies such scum as the Polish revisionists with "Marxists" and moreover "consistent" (!), "Stalinist" (!) Marxists. While the chiefs and ideologists of the "workers' movement" make this absurd identification deliberately, with definite ulterior aims and motives, the working masses in the movement have fallen in for it because of the great ideological and political deception they have suffered. How and why this has occurred we shall see below. Here it is important to point out simply the fact that the Polish proletarians united in a movement with a counter-revolutionary inspiration, that is, they placed themselves under alien ideological banners and not under the banner of Marxism-Leninism, "which is the scientific doctrine that provides the only correct conception of socialism and of the ways to attain it."* It is also true that this masquerade of Marxism-Leninism is a deed of hostile anti-proletarian

* Enver Hoxha, Report to the 6th Congress of the PLA, *Selected Works*, vol. 4, p. 758, Eng. ed.

forces which have been manipulating the Polish proletariat for 30 years, but it is equally true that given sections of the proletariat have been misled and prodded to such an extent that at least up till now they have been blindly applying the ideological line dictated by the reactionary chiefs. Thus, the Polish proletariat aroused in strikes and powerful demonstrations lacked the revolutionary consciousness and the Marxist-Leninist world outlook.

However, without a certain level of revolutionary consciousness it is impossible for the proletariat to rise and even less to triumph in revolution, as Lenin has said. Since this axiom of Marxism-Leninism did not find expression anywhere in the recent Polish movement, this alone is sufficient to prove that the workers took part in a movement which could bring them no benefit.

As we said, however, matters in Poland have gone much further than this. The Polish proletariat has been so thoroughly deceived and brainwashed by reaction that in the concrete instance it demonstrated not simply *its lack of a given level of revolutionary consciousness*, but even worse, *it opposed the revisionist counter-revolution from positions alien to the Marxist-Leninist ideology.*

The ideology by which the entire Polish movement of these years has been guided was and is the bourgeois ideology which, to make it more palatable to the disorganized proletariat, was presented more as a conglomerate of syndicalism, anarcho-syndicalism, Titoite theories of self-management, all-round pluralism, etc.

The main demand which was raised by the manipulators of the strikers in the summer of 1980, for example, was that for the formation of "free, independent trade-unions." In the list of 21 points which was presented to the revisionist authorities, this demand was presented as the most funda-

mental, indeed the workers had been convinced that it was the lever which, once secured, would bring the salvation of Poland! Thus, as far as the proletariat was concerned the demand for “independent trade-unions” became *the main slogan of the movement* in which it took part, and the most that can be said about this movement is that from that day to this it is a movement which *was presented and developed under the banners of syndicalism*.

Although it is still too soon to go into the explanation of the reactionary essence of this so-called independent trade-union movement in Poland, it must be pointed out here that the confining of the whole movement within the bounds of a syndicalist movement means that it was far from undertaking the colossal weight of the revolution. While appreciating the trade-union movement of the working class as one of the forms of its class struggle, the great classics of Marxism-Leninism have always instructed the proletariat not to restrict themselves to the limits of the trade-union movement, but to go beyond them, to the highest forms of the organization and of *the revolutionary struggle*. Only the revolution, properly accomplished, ensures the salvation of the working class, places in its hands the main factor — state power, the dictatorship of the proletariat. A trade-union movement can never do this, even when it is developed and led on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, let alone when it is developed under alien banners, as it was in Poland. Lenin says, “Syndicalism either repudiates the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, or else relegates it, as it does with political power in general, to a back seat.”*

Religious ideology also pervaded this movement from top to bottom. During the summer of 1980 the Polish proletarians resolutely abandoned everything, their jobs, their fam-

* V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 100, Alb. ed.

ilies, the clubs, cinemas, theatres, travel, etc., but not the religious services. Indeed, the revisionist government itself, even when it went so far as to deprive the strikers of all telephone and telex communications, did not interrupt the religious services for one moment. The Catholic priests went in and out of the strike-bound shipyards setting examples of the most merciful self-sacrifice: they agreed to hold Masses and to pray for the salvation of the Polish soul even in the machine-shops and under the cranes of the ports, in the yards or “education” rooms of the plants. Precisely these priests headed by the holy father, Wojtyla, in the Vatican, and Cardinal Wysinski in Warsaw were the “commissars” of the strikers at a time when the historical moment absolutely demanded the legitimate commissars of the proletariat — the genuine Marxist-Leninists. They were missing. And the irony reached its culmination when, in the “Lenin” plant and the “Paris Commune” shipyard in Gdansk, after the portraits of the great leaders of the proletariat were covered with portraits of the “Holy Virgin” and Pope Wojtyla, the strikers listened with great attention while religious messages were read and prayed for “victory”!

This complex twist of events, this profound contradiction in the essence of the Polish movement fills in the picture of the tragic and ironical aspect of this movement. *A movement which was inspired by religion and — that is what and still is!*

Second, apart from lacking the Marxist-Leninist ideology, in the movement of 1980-1982 the Polish proletariat also lacked the bearer of this theory “the force that elaborates it in practice,”* which, says Comrade Enver Hoxha, “...cannot be any party of organization other than the communist party of the proletariat..., the party of the class which... cannot liberate

* Enver Hoxha, Report to the 6th Congress of the PLA, *Selected Works*, vol. 4, p. 758, Eng. ed.

itself without liberating all mankind.”* The Polish proletariat hurled itself into the recent movements in the conditions when it lacked *its own vanguard detachment, its Marxist-Leninist party*, the only conscious, organized force capable of arousing and leading the masses in revolution. Moreover, the blackest reaction held and still holds the reins of the Polish movement. It includes the most publicized elements among the Polish dissidents, pro-Western capitalist elements, heads of the Roman Catholic Church, reactionary intellectuals, all the dregs of Polish political scoundrels and hooligans. This is from the internal aspect.

Western reaction, from the chiefs of American imperialism to the ultra-fascist parties in the different Western countries, immediately came out in support of these forces. Ultra-reactionary and anti-worker publications in the West suddenly “turned” into “pro-worker,” “pro-striker” tribunes, into tribunes from which calls were issued to the Polish people to continue the “people’s movement” to the end! Meanwhile all the Western radio stations and press organs, from the “Voice of America” and the “BBC” to the press organs of neo-fascist and neo-nazi parties and organizations, loudly boosted the “Polish workers’ movement.” Indeed, none less than ex-President Carter “protested” sternly over the jamming of imperialist radio stations by the Soviet social-imperialists with the aim of hindering “the dissemination of the truth about the workers’ movement in Poland”!

Not merely messages of support, but also aid in money and materials began to pour into the strikers, or more precisely, to the forces which were manipulating and organizing the strikers, from the most reactionary trade-union centres of the USA, Canada, Federal Germany, Switzerland, etc. At

* Enver Hoxha, Report to the 6th Congress of the PLA, *Selected Works*, vol. 4, p. 758, Eng. ed.

the culmination of his election campaign the then candidate for the presidency of the USA, Ronald Reagan, had a sensationally publicized meeting with a poverty-stricken Polish immigrant worker, and moreover mounted with him on the platform on which he was to deliver an election speech! He was the father (step-father) of Lech Walesa, of that Walesa who had now been placed at the head of the Polish strikers. The gesture was significant: the future chief of American imperialism, the rabid anti-communist and anti-worker Reagan, openly expressed the “support” of imperialism for the strike movement in Poland, gave the Polish workers “heart and support” for further actions!

Into a movement which had been organized and incited by the reactionary forces, which continues to enjoy the support of the most bloodthirsty imperialism of all times and all international reaction — that is where the Polish proletariat has been pouring its forces and energies!

Third, the alternative which was placed before the regime in power also proves the fact that the Polish proletariat was engaged in a movement the inspiration of which was completely alien to its own interests. The demands of the movement were proclaimed in the “famous” list of 21 points which, taken as a whole, represented a kind of political-ideological platform of the minimum program of the reactionary forces which were guiding the movement. Briefly, what was their content? Apart from a number of demands which had to do with “improvement of the labour laws,” recognition of “the right to strike,” “greater religious freedom,” “freedom of speech and the press,” etc., the main demand, “the ideal” of the movement, as we said above, was the struggle for the formation of “independent” trade-unions. However, taken as a whole or individually, none of these demands have anything remotely related to what is fundamental to a genuine revolu-

tionary movement of the proletariat — the overthrow or at least the preparation of the conditions for the overthrow of the capitalist-revisionist order in power and the setting up in its place of the new state power of the working class.

On the contrary, the demands presented by those who manipulated the Polish movement of 1980 in regard to Poland were aimed only at further strengthening the revisionist-capitalist system which exists there and setting it on the classical road, and at rejecting even those few old patches left over from the so-called socialism. As the PLA pointed out at those moments, the demands of the movement of the summer of 1980 were aimed simply at the “even more fundamental or more radical transformation of Poland into a capitalist country.”*

However, the “21 demands” of the Polish movement also had another long-term aim with a wider range effect — anti-socialism in general. Taken as demands of the proletariat in a country in which capitalism has been restored (and Poland is such a country), some of these 21 demands (for example, those for improvement of the labour laws, for higher wages, the right to strike, etc.) seem useful and justifiable for the initial phase of the workers’ movement. The PLA has always supported such demands of the proletariat in any bourgeois and revisionist country, hence, in Poland, too, but in the case of the concrete movement of Poland, even through these just demands of the proletariat (not to mention those which are openly reactionary) both the heads of the movement and international reaction were fighting to achieve another extremely hostile aim: by deliberately identifying the capitalist order in Poland with the socialist order and the revisionist-capitalist Polish state with the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the manipulators of the movement are aiming

* “Zëri i popullit,” September 7, 1980.

the above demands against the socialist order and the dictatorship of the proletariat! Hence, the right to strike should always exist, especially in the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat; the trade-unions should be independent in theory and practice from the Marxist-Leninist party; in socialism, too, labour legislation should be such as to satisfy petty-bourgeois interests, regardless of the real possibilities of the economy, etc., etc. According to these manipulators, only in this way can socialism be “improved,” be made “real,” an order of “freedom” and “democracy.” *Diversion, new attacks and blows against scientific socialism* — that is one of the fundamental aims of the manipulators of the current movement in Poland.

Another objective aim of this movement was to *separate Poland from its all-round dependence on Soviet social-imperialism*, in particular, and on the so-called “socialist community,” in general. Indisputably, the struggle to throw off the yoke of Soviet social-imperialism is a just struggle and an essential task for all those peoples and countries which Moscow has got into its clutches, just as the same task faces all those countries and peoples languishing under the yoke of American imperialism or any other imperialism. However, while seizing on the profound and legitimate hatred which the Polish proletariat and the whole people nurture for the Soviet social-imperialists, as well as on their anti-Sovietism which was inspired, in fact, by the chauvinist ideas of the Polish bourgeoisie, the reactionary heads of this movement were manoeuvring and doing everything in favour of dependence on other foreign powers. As agents and recruits of Western imperialism, they sought to break the chains of Russian dependence in favour of forging chains of Western imperialism and of American imperialism, in the first place. *Not a movement against any kind of dependence on foreigners, but a movement which was inspired*

by the aim of replacing the dependence on the social-imperialists with dependence on the Western imperialists — that was the character which the reactionary chiefs gave the Polish movement in recent years.

Just these factors and circumstances for the moment are sufficient to prove that, notwithstanding that the strike movement in Poland in the years 1980-1981 was opposed to the revisionist counter-revolution and that whole contingents of the Polish working class were involved in it, it was not revolutionary in its essence and character. Because of the objective conditions created, it should have become the bearer of and the force which was going to restore the violated laws of the proletarian revolution, but instead of this it simply placed itself under the yoke of those who were going to attack and violate those laws even further. It was a tragic farce, a turning back, a complete reversal of the mission of the proletariat. This is precisely what Comrade Enver Hoxha had in mind when he stressed: “The revolt of workers in Poland... has demonstrated that the subjective factor, the political force which leads the working class, plays a decisive role. In the case of ‘Solidarity,’ the working class is manipulated and directed by the Catholic Church and Polish and world reaction which are fighting to establish another capitalist-revisionist regime on a course full of unexpected dangers and tragic consequences.”*

Precisely because the proletariat poured its strength into such a movement, which neither aimed to change the socio-economic order in Poland nor assisted to prepare the conditions which lead to this, it could attain no other aim but that which it did attain: the so-called Gdansk Agreement or the Gdansk Compromise. The proletariat developed the movement, while the two leading clans — the revisionist

* Enver Hoxha, Report to the 8th Congress of the PLA, p. 186, Eng. ed.
38

forces and the pro-Western capitalist forces shared the fruits of the agreement between them, at least for the time being. The pro-Western capitalist forces in particular reaped the greatest victory: by deceiving and manipulating the proletariat they took a great stride towards the realization of their further political aims. We shall speak about this below. The main thing here is to point out that for the Polish proletariat, the movement in which it was engaged was not revolutionary in essence. In those days through “Zëri i popullit” the PLA was the first to express its Marxist-Leninist conclusion about the events in Poland, stating clearly and concisely that “in essence they (the events in Poland — S.D.) were not revolutionary. They were aimed against the counter-revolutionary regime, but had a counter-revolutionary inspiration.”*

This conclusion of the PLA not only gives a precise and correct definition of the character of current events in Poland, but also provides all the objective possibilities for the correct explanation of the causes, reasons and conditions which made this peculiar expression of the counter-revolution possible.

* “Zëri i popullit,” September 7, 1980.

II THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION WITHIN THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION

The manifestation of *the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution* is one of many forms of the development of the stern class struggle within society. Although its essence is the same as that of any other manifestation of the counter-revolution, still it has a series of distinctive features and peculiarities. This results from the time and the historical situation in which it appears, the causes and conditions which make its emergence possible, the forces engaged and those which lead it, the particular objectives it aims to attain, etc. Therefore, in the context of analysing the concrete events in Poland a few words should be said about the character of this manifestation of the counter-revolution in general, the particular situation in which it appears, and some of its more distinctive features.

Two diametrically opposite stands

Even the revisionists of Moscow and their followers have been obliged to describe the present events in Poland, like analogous events in that country (1956, 1970-1971, 1976), in Hungary (1956), in Czechoslovakia (1968), etc., as movements of a counter-revolutionary character. According to them, these movements have been nothing but manifestations of *"counter-revolutionary activities in socialism"* and have had as their aim the *destruction of "socialism" in the respective countries*.

This "assessment," however, confronts its authors with extremely discrediting and self-exposing problems:

How is it possible that, in a country which claims to be "socialist," such counter-revolutionary actions could occur and include under their banners, not just a hundred or ten thousand people, but several millions, not to say the whole society?!

Socialism does not have the counter-revolution in its nature or its essence. Although at the first moments after the triumph of the revolution the possibility exists of the secret organization of remnants of reaction and their launching into acts of counter-revolution, later, the more socialism advances, the more consistently the class struggle is waged and the more the base and superstructure of the socialist order are strengthened, the more the remnants of the old order, i.e., any old basis for the counter-revolution, are wiped out one after the other as a consequence. How then, is the fact explained that, after building socialism (as is claimed!) for 30 or so years, the Poles arose one fine day to destroy it?! What made them annoyed with it, why were they disillusioned by socialism?!

Socialism is the order of the proletariat organized as the ruling class, the greatest victory of the working class, its most beloved and inviolable deed. How then, did it come about in the socialism that is said to exist in Poland that the working class, not just a hundred or a thousand misled individuals, but millions of workers, rose against "their own inviolable order"? By whom, how and why were matters brought to this state?!

Those who support the tattered thesis of "the counter-revolution in socialism" say that it was the doing of a handful of *"dissident, hooligan and counter-revolutionary elements."* Very well then, but where did these elements, this "handful" of hooligans and dissidents, emerge from in 1980?! Did they emerge suddenly, or had they degenerated gradually, step by step, and gathered together and organized over a period?! Of course, they prepared themselves over a period of years. But

can a state which has permitted and has created the conditions for the emergence, the activity and the organization of its own destroyers be called “socialist”?! Further, how were these counter-revolutionary elements “suddenly” able to deceive whole contingents of people instead of the opposite occurring, with “socialist” Poland putting this “handful” of counter-revolutionaries in their place?!

“*The frenzied activity of reactionary, anti-socialist forces of the West*” — is the next “argument” brought up in favour of the thesis that the events in Poland are counter-revolutionary manifestations in socialism. That imperialist reaction has had and still has its black hand in the events in Poland is beyond dispute. Presented in this way, however, the “argument” turns into a counter-argument against those who present it. As everyone knows, the attempts, pressures and interference of imperialist forces against the socialist order have never ceased and never will cease. Hence, the danger of the all-round pressure, interference, etc., by the old bourgeois world is always an imminent danger for the socialist countries. But as the PLA has long proved, when the pressure and interference of imperialist forces are always assessed correctly by any socialist country, when the whole socialist society, under the leadership of its Marxist-Leninist party, becomes a barricade to the imperialist pressure, then this pressure becomes ineffective. The existence or non-existence of socialism in a country does not depend on the desire of the imperialist forces. To accept the contrary means to fall into hopeless pessimism.

External reaction can never “win over” hundreds of thousands of people, citizens of a socialist country, moreover, if the conditions, possibilities and terrain do not exist in that country for the anti-socialist propaganda and activity of imperialism to penetrate and stick. Possibly external reaction can carry out one or twenty acts of sabotage in a socialist

country, can deceive ten or even a thousand individuals, can set its own agents in motion, but it is absurd to think that it can suddenly mobilize whole contingents of people, without *a fundamental internal cause*. Can it be said that the interference, pressure and efforts of foreign reaction to destroy socialism in socialist Albania have ever ceased? Then, how is it that socialism remains unshaken in little Albania?! How did this “astounding” thing occur in Poland? Where were the party of the working class and the dictatorship of the proletariat while the counter-revolution was being organized within “socialism”? What were the underlying causes, what were the special conditions that caused Poland, after thirty years (!) in labour with “socialism,” to bring forth... the counter-revolution?!

After such questions, endless “arguments” touching every aspect of Polish society may be brought up, but none of them brings out the truth because they are all based on the absurd and misleading assessment of the modern revisionists that the present counter-revolution in Poland is allegedly an “outburst of the counter-revolution in the conditions of socialism.”

The defenders of the thesis of the “counter-revolution in socialism” go even further in their “arguments,” talking about “*the bureaucratic stands and actions of a few*,” “*the distortions in the economic and political line made by a number of former leaders*,” trying to explain the reason for the revolt from below in this way. The fact is, however, that not “a few,” but a whole society, has risen against the injustices of the Polish reality. Then, whether the modern revisionists like it or not, it turns out that, not the bureaucratic stands of “a few,” but of *a whole bureaucratized order*, not *the distortions* in the political and economic line made by *a few*, but *a whole distorted anti-Marxist line* made possible the outburst of discontent and the revolt of the whole society. Thus, it turns out that the entire system in Poland today is a bureaucratic system, that it is not

the working class in power there, but the bureaucrats and the technocrats, that “new wealthy class” the existence of which the heads of the government in power themselves are obliged to admit “with regret.” Hence, it turns out that socialism does not exist in Poland, but this is precisely what the modern revisionists never want to admit. They are ready to admit anything — the bureaucratic degeneration of “a few,” even of “all,” they are ready to change team after team, while blaming everything on “the distortions of former leaders,” but they do not want to admit the bitter and incontestable reality that *socialism has not existed in Poland for a long time*. And they cannot admit this. If they admit the destruction of socialism, this means to admit with their own mouths the colossal crime they have committed, not only in Poland, but first of all in the Soviet Union and everywhere else where they are ruling.

The assessment and stand of the Party of Labour of Albania is the diametrical opposite of the stand of the modern revisionists in regard to both the character of the present movements in Poland and the conditions, causes and factors which led to these movements.

While describing the movements of the years 1980-1981 in Poland (as well as the analogous ones there or in the other revisionist countries) *as movements with a counter-revolutionary inspiration*, at the same time the PLA has shown with scientific arguments that such movements are never manifestations of the counter-revolution in socialism.

In reaching this conclusion the PLA proceeds from the fundamental premise that *the order of socialism has long been overthrown in these countries*, that the revisionist counter-revolution has long ago seized power there. A direct consequence of this was the restoration of capitalism in those countries, a capitalism which is distinct from the classical Western capitalism only on account of the patches and a certain “social-

ist” facade retained from the past. Hence, if a new movement with a counter-revolutionary inspiration bursts out within these countries, its aim can never be to overthrow that socialism which in reality has long been overthrown by the revisionist counter-revolution. Thus, the new movement with a counter-revolutionary inspiration is taking place within the revisionist counter-revolution and as such it can be nothing but.

A peculiar manifestation of the counter-revolution

In the long history of the class struggle there have been a series of manifestations of the counter-revolution.

The organized action of the forces of reaction that bursts out in the phase when the revolution has begun and has not yet triumphed, for example, is one of these manifestations. In this case, the forces of the old order which is in danger of being overthrown are organized and thrown into frantic action to prevent the revolution from triumphing, to block the way to it and to safeguard the old order of oppression and exploitation. Without going further back in history, the fact is that all the bourgeois revolutions of the past century were confronted with the counter-revolution organized by the forces of the older feudal order. This is what happened with the bourgeois revolution in England, France, Germany and elsewhere. The clash between the forces of the old order and the new became even more furious in our epoch, especially after the triumph of the October Socialist Revolution. Although during many of the revolutionary outbursts in various countries of Europe, such as Hungary, Germany, etc., in the years 1918-1922, the proletarians wrote whole pages of glory and were even close to

victory, in the end they were suppressed by the united forces of the internal counter-revolution with the support and aid of the foreign imperialists.

The open, violent counter-revolution which bursts out in the conditions after the triumph of the revolution is the organized action of remnants of the overthrown classes, who unite their forces and try to overthrow the new order which has just been created and to regain their lost paradise through the use of savage violence. In the main, this type of counter-revolution, which is characterized by *open violence*, is possible (from the standpoint of the reasons why it occurs) only in the first period, in the moment immediately after the overthrow of the old order. When a new order which has just begun to take its first steps has still not completely settled accounts with the overthrown classes, when the remnants of the bands and forces of the old order are still operating secretly, when private property still exists as a form of property heading for gradual extinction, when the consciousness of the new order has just started to become established, when foreign reaction comes to the aid of, incites and supports the remnants of internal reaction as never before, etc. — in this period the organization of open counter-revolutionary movements by the forces of the old order is possible and to be expected. There were such manifestations, to a greater or lesser extent, in all the countries in which socialism was established immediately after the Second World War. It is also a fact that, here radically and without hesitation, there “regretfully,” “gently” and “through agreement,” such open counter-revolutionary outbursts were suppressed or, at least, reduced to complete quiescence. Faced with the growing strength of socialism, with the vigour and enthusiasm of the working class and the masses who had carried out the revolution at the cost of blood and sacrifices, at those moments the counter-revolution was obliged to reckon

its accounts carefully.

The progress of the new socialist order, the Marxist-Leninist consolidation of its positions in all fields, in the base and the superstructure, through the consistent waging of the class struggle in all directions, through iron necessity eliminates and eradicates any basis and possibility for the outburst of the counter-revolution in its classical form as an open, violent counter-revolution. The experience of these past 30-35 years, however, has proved that even after “relinquishing” the classical forms of the counter-revolution, the internal and external enemies have not laid down their arms. In this case, as the PLA has shown, “pseudo-Marxism, the revisionist counter-revolution, is their favourite weapon to overthrow socialism.”*

The emergence of counter-revolutionary phenomena and elements is not due to the nature of socialism, but the danger of their emergence exists. “This comes about not only because the new socialist society still preserves traditions, customs, ways of behaviour and concepts of life of the bourgeois society from which it has emerged, but also because of certain economic and social conditions which still exist in this society in the early transitional phase.”**

While proving and stressing this truth, at the same time, the PLA and Comrade Enver Hoxha have shown that *the existence of this danger which threatens socialism does not mean that it will inevitably come about*. “The emergence of revisionism and return to capitalism are not decreed by fate,”*** points out Comrade Enver Hoxha. Where socialism is built on the basis of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, when the party is

* Enver Hoxha, Report to the 7th Congress of the PLA, p. 109, Eng. ed.

** Ibid., p. 110.

*** Ibid., p. 111.

continuously in the leadership and the people on the alert, when every alien manifestation is resolutely and relentlessly attacked and a stern and irreconcilable class struggle is waged against every negative phenomena and stand, etc. — there the road its blocked and the paths closed to the danger which threatens socialism. The emergence of the counter-revolution in a country which still calls itself “socialist,” ten, fifteen, or thirty years after socialism has come to power there, this fact alone is an unshakeable argument to prove that socialism has never been established in that country or, after being established, has been undermined and rotted from within in a peaceful way, has been betrayed and alienated “on the quiet.”

This is what occurred in the Soviet Union and the other former socialist countries (with the exception of Albania). Without violence and bloodletting, without noise and clamour, the Khrushchevite revisionists made possible the realization of that dream which the overthrown forces of the counter-revolution were unable to realize on the classical model.

In this case we have to do with another manifestation of the counter-revolution — *the revisionist peaceful counter-revolution*. The Party of Labour of Albania and Comrade Enver Hoxha have made a complete and all-embracing diagnosis of this manifestation of the counter-revolution, have disclosed the causes and the conditions in which it emerged and took place, the bitter consequences and the damage it brought wherever it had established itself, and have also defined the ways and means to cope with it and nip it in the bud.

Although these types of the counter-revolution have distinctions from one another in regard to the time, the stage in which they appear, the ways and methods they employ, etc., taken as a whole, all of them have the same aim and essence: they are actions organized and led by the sinister forces of

internal and external reaction in order to block the way to the revolution, to destroy socialism when it has triumphed, and to prolong the existence of the system of oppression and exploitation.

The other type of counter-revolution, *the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution*, has the same final aim.

It emerges and bursts out in given conditions and situations, and precisely in the conditions when, in one or the other former socialist country, following the betrayal by the Khrushchevite modern revisionists, the power of the proletariat was usurped and the revisionist counter-revolution began to consolidate itself. *The direct outcome of this counter-revolution, a permanent accompaniment and further continuation of it, is the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution.*

It is the *outcome of the revisionist peaceful counter-revolution*, because the revisionist betrayal enabled the creation of conditions necessary for the enlivenment, consolidation and organization of those forces which are interested in openly capitalist radical actions in the respective countries.

It is an *accompaniment and further extension* of the revisionist counter-revolution, because both these manifestations of the counter-revolution have identical fundamental aims (the destruction of everything socialist, the struggle against Marxism-Leninism, the proletarian revolution, etc.), supplement, foster and support each other. What the one is unable to do (in order to safeguard its own position) the other does to boost its own interests.

While they are the same thing in essence, in the forms, means and ways employed, between these two fellow-travelers of reaction there are distinctions and, at given moments, even contradictions.

First, whereas the revisionist counter-revolution, especially in its first steps, is interested in preserving a certain grad-

ualness and “calm” in carrying out counter-revolutionary changes (its exponents know that they would suffer immediate defeat through any hasty, open and immediate act), the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution aims from the outset at the rapid overthrow of everything. Indeed, that is why it emerges as an “opposition” within the revisionist counter-revolution: to drive the counter-revolutionary process rapidly ahead. It is for immediate, open and profound changes towards the restoration and consolidation of capitalism in the former socialist countries.

Second, along with destruction in essence of all the victories of socialism, the revisionist peaceful counter-revolution strives at all costs to retain the allegedly socialist camouflage of the former order, to preserve the facade, i.e., some of the previous forms and slogans, etc.

Likewise, the revisionist chiefs in the Soviet Union and other countries, in their own interests, also try to preserve a series of “old” forms of the former socialist structure and superstructure such as bureaucratic centralism in the economy and the state, the “centralized” leadership of the revisionist party, the mass organizations as “transmission belts” of the policy of the revisionist party and so on. The counter-revolution within the counter-revolution is against even this formal reliance on “what existed previously.” Its leading forces are for a “free” capitalist anarcho-syndicalist system, for decentralization in the leadership and the economy, for open pluralism, etc. Hence, it is for a naked capitalism of the classical Western type in content and form, in practice and theory.

“A question of camouflage and slogans!” In appearance, this seems to be something simple and unimportant for something so terrible as the counter-revolution. However, it must not be forgotten that the revisionist chiefs have committed a whole bureaucratic state apparatus, all their propaganda,

their whole spirit, to the protection of that “camouflage,” the “forms” and “slogans” of the former socialist order. “The revisionists, both the rightists and the leftists,” says Comrade Enver Hoxha, “conceal their anti-Marxist, anti-party, anti-socialist line, not only when they operate as a fifth column, but also when they succeed in seizing power.”* They put up this defence not merely for purposes of demagogy, i.e., not only to throw dust in the eyes of the masses, that allegedly they still “adhere to Lenin,” and that allegedly “it still remains socialism.”

For example, the revisionists in power “criticize” and oppose the demand for “free trade-unions” for demagogic purposes also to show that they are “loyal” to the Leninist theory on this problem (!) (they are even shameless enough to write how the great Lenin presented the question), but always taking Lenin out of the context, that is, hiding the truth of the radical overthrow of the socialist order which has occurred in the countries where they rule. At the same time, they combat the creation of the “free trade-unions” also with the aim of keeping the whole proletariat of their countries under the control of the ruling pseudo-workers, pseudo-communist party, under the command and violence of the capitalist-revisionist state, hence, undivided and unmanipulated by others. Likewise, they are “champions” of the single-party system, not only for demagogy, to show that the party is still allegedly communist (!), but also to ensure that *they alone* rule and *run* the country, without permitting other parties that might compete with them or drive them from power, to be legalized and share the spoils. This is even more obvious when it comes to such demands as the “right to strike,” “increased wages,” etc., etc. “Ours is a socialist country and there is no place for strikes in socialism!” declare those who through their betrayal

* Enver Hoxha, “Reports and Speeches 1972-1973,” p. 395. Alb. ed.

have created all the conditions for the outburst of bitter social conflicts. In all this breast-beating their main concern is to rule without disturbances from below, to milk the proletariat without permitting it to dare rise against the capitalist order which exploits it! In brief, the retention of the “socialist” camouflage, along with the all-round violence, is vital to the revisionists in power and to their line.

Naturally, while rising strongly against any “socialist” disguise of its predecessors, at the same time the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution itself comes on the stage with other refined and deceptive slogans. Without them it cannot take a single step forward, either for the escalation of the struggle with the heads of the government in power, or, especially, for deceiving given contingents of the working masses and arraying them under its own banner. Thus, as the events of the past 20-25 years and the present events in Poland show, the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution opposes the revisionist slogan about “the leading role of a single party” with the slogan of “pluralism,” a multi-party system, opposes the slogan of “democratic centralism” with the decentralization of state power and the whole life of the country, opposes “the planned and unified management of the economy” with “reforms of self-management,” opposes “the leadership of the mass organizations by the ruling party” with “free,” “independent organizations,” etc., etc. As we shall see, while the former are slogans of a “socialist” hue which the revisionist counter-revolution needs to remain in power, the latter, the alternatives put up in opposition to them, are likewise the slogans of the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution, which in words declares that it is not seeking power, but allegedly wants the “democratization of the state,” “liberation of the state from the chains of totalitarianism,” “dogmatism,” etc. In essence, all these are ways to

seize power.

Third, the restoration of capitalism in the former socialist countries, under the guidance and “supervision” of Moscow, was carried out in such a manner that these countries were placed under all-sided political economic and military dependence on Soviet social-imperialism. Whether through the policy of smiles, economic “aid,” etc., or through the threat of tanks and guns’ (and when required even through the brutal use of them), this aim was achieved. Hence, *the revisionist counter-revolution harnessed the former socialist countries to the chariot of Moscow*. The leading forces of the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution have the *opposite* aim. It is true they rise against the dependence on Russia, against the Russian occupation, but their inspiration, orientation and aim is *to replace the Russian yoke with the Western yoke at any cost*. The capitalist West suggests and dictates its phoney independence to the current Polish movement only in regard to “independent trade-unions,” but never in regard to an independent line in the economy, policy or the whole life of Poland. As Comrade Enver Hoxha points out, the bourgeoisie of the revisionist countries of Europe “could not exist apart from the Soviet bourgeoisie. And even if it detached itself from this savage social-imperialist big bourgeoisie, there is no doubt that it would soon come under the domination of the bourgeoisie of the developed capitalist states of Western Europe and U.S. imperialism.”*

Fourth, the vital interests of a whole group of chiefs and loyal servants of the revisionist counter-revolution are closely linked with the course pursued and the achievements of this counter-revolution. Without its structures, forms and specific features, this group of people, that is, that part of the Polish bourgeoisie which is linked with these structures,

* Enver Hoxha, “Imperialism and the Revolution” p. 225, Eng. ed.

at the best would lose its privileges and at the worst would have to expect more severe measures and losses. Therefore, the revisionist chiefs and their most obedient tools are doing everything in their power to preserve the situation of the revisionist counter-revolution within their countries. However, *the loyalty of this group of people to the situation established by the revisionist counter-revolution becomes an obstacle to the achievement of those aims which its rival, the Western counter-revolution, seeks to attain.* Automatically the conflict between the two wings of the counter-revolution becomes exacerbated, and in particular cases even takes extreme forms irrespective that both these forces represent the interests of a single class, the bourgeois class. This is a struggle between different groups of the local bourgeoisie, each relying on the rival external forces; it is a struggle for power between two clans of the counter-revolution within the country and a struggle for spheres of influence and markets between external forces, and especially between American imperialism, on the one hand, and Soviet social-imperialism, on the other hand. In view of the interests of the proletariat, obviously such a struggle is nothing but an effort to change the team of bosses, but never to change the coach — the system.

Fifth, however much it tried to conceal its reactionary aims and plans, sooner or later the revisionist counter-revolution was bound to arouse the discontent and the revolt of the masses, just as it did. Thus, the possibility existed that the masses, first of all, the proletariat of those countries, by producing from its ranks a communist Marxist-Leninist party, would understand the great betrayal which was being perpetrated against socialism and come out on the battlefield to carry out the revolution again and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Faced with this danger, the counter-revolution within

the counter-revolution came to the aid of its fellow-traveller, the revisionist counter-revolution, in Poland and elsewhere. Taking advantage of the treacherous line of the modern revisionists and the bitter consequences of the process of the restauration of capitalism, which was always proclaimed as “socialism,” the representatives of the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution skilfully increased the doses of poison in the direction of the deception and the ideological degeneration of the masses. All this furious crusade which was carried out by the two sides under the slogan of “a better,” “liberal order,” bemused or deceived whole contingents of the proletariat to varying degrees. Although only temporarily, the possibilities of the outburst of the revolution were blocked completely. This was a victory for the two associated manifestations of the counter-revolution. But the day was bound to come when the Polish revisionists would have to pay the counter-revolutionary tribute for this aid they received from their rivals. True, ever greater contingents of the masses deviated from the road of the revolution and arrayed themselves under the banners of the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution. The latter had long been working in its own interests, and the day was to come when it would oppose the state which gave birth to it, not only with its own forces, but also with whole masses of misled proletarians. No other outcome was possible.

* * *

In very broad outline, this is the nature of the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution and such are its features and aims. Of course, it must be borne in mind that whereas the antagonism of the revolution with the counter-revolution has in its essence the struggle for two diametrically opposed

socio-economic systems, the antagonism of the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution with its rival fellow-traveller is not an antagonism between classes or opposing socio-economic systems. The former relationship is between two opposing systems, the latter is within the context of one system — the capitalist system, as are the contradictions on the international plane between capitalism and modern revisionism, or between American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, for example.

For this reason the term “counter-revolution within the counter-revolution” is used deliberately to show that conflict which is created and bursts out within a counter-revolutionary system between different groups of the bourgeoisie and local reaction, and which has as its aim not to change the essence of the existing socio-economic system, but to change the form, the type of capitalism, and consequently, the counter-revolutionary team in power, and its orientations, connections and external imperialist-revisionist patrons.

Hence, just like the revisionist peaceful counter-revolution, the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution, too, is in open, fierce antagonism with the revolution and socialism.

If all this seems rather general, the development of events in Poland provides a complete illustration and unshakeable confirmation of the correctness of the analyses and conclusions of the PLA on the causes and factors which make possible the emergence of the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution, about its character, features, aims, etc.

ABANDONMENT OF MARXISM-LENINISM

Amongst the many complex internal and external economic, political and ideological factors which have led to the present situation in Poland, the PLA has stressed that the most fundamental and important *factor* is the *party*, or more precisely, *the revisionist line pursued over the last two to three decades by the PUWP*. The leading article of “Zëri i popullit” of September 7, 1980 pointed out, “The anti-Marxist policy pursued by the Polish revisionists reduced Poland to its present catastrophic situation.” The same conclusion was re-emphasized at the 8th Congress of the PLA in November 1981. In this report Comrade Enver Hoxha said, “... The recent events in Poland are... consequences of the line pursued by the Polish revisionist party for the re-establishment of capitalism...”*

The only way to give an unbiased, objective, materialist explanation of events is to take this conclusion as the starting-point. In the slide of the PUWP into revisionism, in its abandonment of Marxism-Leninism, in the violation and distortions of the fundamental laws of socialist construction — that is where all the things that have been occurring in the past two to three decades have their source and beginning. The deeper this party sank into the mire of anti-Marxism, the more it deviated from Marxist-Leninist science, the closer Poland was brought to the catastrophe.

Therefore, a brief summary of the history of the line pursued by the PUWP in the last three decades is more than necessary because it brings out clearly both the main causes of the counter-revolution in Poland and the process of the birth and development of this counter-revolution.

* Enver Hoxha, Report to the 8th Congress of the PLA, p. 186, Eng. ed.

The precursors of the counter-revolution

“The Soviet revisionists opened and led the great dance of betrayal.”

ENVER HOXHA

The birth and development of Khrushchevite modern revisionism in the first half of the '50s and its official adoption at the 20th Congress of the CPSU (February 1956) was the heaviest blow, with the bitterest consequences, which the cause of revolution, socialism and the liberation of the peoples has ever suffered.

Through their traitorous conspiracy which gathered speed after the death of J.V. Stalin (March 1953), Khrushchev and his followers began, step by step, to alienate all the great victories of the first socialist country in the world. Without violence and bloodshed, in a peaceful way, the chiefs of the Soviet party and state carried out that criminal act which the bourgeois-capitalist counter-revolution had been unable to carry out for whole decades. Marxism-Leninism was attacked in all directions and replaced by a jumble of revisionist theories and schools; the state power of the dictatorship of the proletariat was usurped and replaced by the forces of the revisionist counter-revolution; through ceaseless “reforms” the socialist economy was put back on the rails of the capitalist economy; the party, the organizations of the masses, propaganda, education, culture, science, literature and the arts, the whole superstructure of the society, lost their former socialist character, led to the degeneration of the economic base of socialism and were placed in the service of the new capitalist-revisionist base. The revisionist counter-revolution triumphed in all fields and directions of the life in the Soviet Union. This

was an extremely grave and heavy loss, not only for the Soviet Union, but also for the whole world revolutionary process.

However, the criminal deed of Khrushchev and company was not confined in the Soviet Union only. The Khrushchevite plot comprised a whole strategy, the counter-revolutionary strategy of turning the Soviet Union not merely into a big capitalist country, but also into a great superpower, into an empire which would include the maximum number of countries and peoples in the world under its domination. Comrade Enver Hoxha says, “The aim of the Khrushchevite revisionists of the Soviet Union was to compel the revisionist parties of the different countries to follow them in the policy of establishing their social-imperialist hegemony over the whole world.”*

Obviously, to realize this global strategy, if the first step was taken within the Soviet Union, the next step would be taken against those communist parties, those socialist countries, which for years had closely linked the common cause of revolution and socialism with the CPSU and the Soviet socialist state. The socialist camp became the target of the Soviet Khrushchevites.

However, for the communist parties and all those countries to be turned into Russian provinces, first of all, they would have to change colour, the revisionist counter-revolution would have to develop and triumph there. This would suit the long-term aims of the Khrushchevites. How the respective parties of these countries would react and what they would do “with their own forces,” “off their own bat,” in face of the ideo-political platform which was presented and dictated to them by Moscow, is another matter.

As to what ways, means, forms and methods were em-

* Enver Hoxha, “Eurocommunism Is Anti-Communism,” p. 104, Eng. ed.

played by Khrushchev and his clan to accomplish their enslaving plan towards other parties and countries, we find a wealth of facts, arguments and conclusions about this in the Documents of the PLA and the Works of Comrade Enver Hoxha. In this direction the work "The Khrushchevites," in particular, is a vivid portrayal. Regrettably, with the exception of socialist Albania, the other former socialist countries fell prey to the Khrushchevite plot. In these countries the new counter-revolutionary line offered by Khrushchev either was embraced with enthusiasm as something long-awaited, or was imposed by all kinds of pressure, trickery, machinations and plots hatched up in Moscow, and proceeded towards its consolidation. Khrushchevite modern revisionism took power in all these countries, one after the other. This was another very great, very heavy loss which Khrushchevite revisionism inflicted on the revolution and socialism on an international level.

However, when Marxist-Leninists speak about the spread and embracing of a given line, either revolutionary or counter-revolutionary, by this or that party of this or that country, they always put in the proper balance *the role of the internal factor and the role of the external factor* in that process, always *giving priority to the internal factor as the main and decisive one*.

While always forcibly stressing the extremely harmful counter-revolutionary role which the birth of this variant of revisionism played and is still playing, at the same time, the PLA and Comrade Enver Hoxha have pointed out that the spread of it to the communist parties of other countries is never something irresistible about which "nothing can be done." True, the birth of Khrushchevite revisionism was a great evil, a great threat and danger to every communist party and to every socialist country, but in the final analysis, this re-

visionism, as an ideological current, represented only *a danger and a possibility* to the other parties, but *not an inevitability*. It is not decreed by fate. It does not stem from the essence of Marxism-Leninism, is not in the nature of socialism, hence, from this aspect, it is, as you might say, an "external" factor. Modern revisionism can penetrate quickly into one party or another only when it finds the appropriate seeds of opportunism within it, and then it becomes the inciter and supporter of the whole process of further degeneration. So, whether or not modern revisionism triumphs in a party depends, first of all, on the internal factor, on the quality of that party itself, on whether or not it stands on the Marxist-Leninist line, whether or not it wages the class struggle in the conditions of socialism, in which the "emergence of negative phenomena alien to its nature can be greatly restricted"* . The example of the Party of Labour of Albania, its heroic stand in defence of Marxism-Leninism, is a complete expression of the truth. It has never considered the slide into revisionism and the process of capitalist restoration as "inevitable," "decreed by fate," but has fought with determination against all manifestations of modern revisionism. Day by day the PLA has done and is doing what it is the duty of every genuine Marxist-Leninist party to do.

While giving proper importance to the harmful and destructive role which the precursors of this process, the Soviet revisionists, played, while pointing out forcefully that, "he Soviet revisionist traitors opened and led the great dance of betrayal,"** at the same time, when it comes to analysing the responsibility for the penetration of revisionism into the

* Enver Hoxha, Report to the 7th Congress of the PLA, Tirana 1976, p. 110, Eng. ed.

** Enver Hoxha, "Against Modern Revisionism 1968-1970," p. 170, Alb. ed.

parties of other countries, the PLA points out that *the main responsibility falls on the parties of those countries themselves*. They are responsible to the peoples of their own countries and the burden of the responsibility for the betrayal falls on them. This applies to the Polish United Workers' Party, too. The main blame falls on it for permitting the penetration and development of modern revisionism in its ranks and in all the life in Poland.

Obviously, when we say "permitting," this is not a mechanical process, a special act or decision taken within a day to "open the borders" of Poland to revisionism. No. To be infected by an external disease you must have the "internal terrain" ready for that disease, must have the necessary conditions which encourage its penetration and development. It is putting it mildly to say that this terrain and conditions were not lacking in the Polish United Workers' Party.

The premises for the PUWP to slide into revisionism

The Polish United Workers' Party came to the leadership of Poland *without a solid past*. Rather than a consistent continuation of a single trunk it was *an amalgamated party*, the fruit of a number of *amalgamations and mergers of several predecessors*.

While not mentioning here a number of former workers,' socialist, social-democratic and other groups and parties (they had operated as early as the previous century, and in their own time, along with major shortcomings and mistakes, also had fighting merits), a moment which must be pointed out is the creation of the first Workers' Communist Party of Poland

on December 16, 1918.* It emerged as the result of a decision to merge two Polish workers' parties: the Social-Democratic Party of the Polish Kingdom and Lithuania (SDPK and L) and the Polish Socialist Party-Left (PSP-L). The revolutionary enthusiasm which the historic victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution aroused in the world, the dauntless struggle of the revolutionary Polish proletariat, the moments when it emerged, and the aims which the WCPP set itself to lead the working class towards the revolution, were hopeful factors for the party. But, apart from other things, the fact that it emerged and was built as an amalgamated party was a powerful influence to its detriment. Despite the consistent struggle of some determined elements of this party, despite the aid and repeated criticism and admonition of the Comintern, it was unable to cope with the difficulties and obstacles. Apart from elements lacking formation and consistent revolutionary aims that came into the party from its two predecessors, after some years a whole series of other alien elements — Trotskyites, opportunists, and even fascists, managed to penetrate its ranks.** They gradually destroyed the party. Fallen completely into the hands of enemies, this party did not defend and represent the interests and the struggle of the Polish proletariat for class liberation. On the contrary, its leadership played the game of the reactionary Polish bourgeoisie. For these reasons the Polish Communist Party was dispersed in the summer of 1938.

In 1942, in the heat of the war against the nazi hordes, a war in which the revolutionary proletariat and people of Poland poured out torrents of blood and made a valuable contribution to the victory, the Polish Workers' Party (PWP) was formed. It was made up mainly of elements from the former

* Since 1925, according to the decision of its 3rd Congress this party assumed the name of the Polish Communist Party (PCP).

** Materials of the 1st Congress of the PUWP. Fund 14, File 1, CAP.

Communist Party dispersed in 1938, plus leftist elements of the Polish Socialist Party. The newly created party undertook the mission to lead the Polish proletariat and people in the struggle, not only towards the victory over fascism, but also for radical transformations in the socio-economic order in Poland after the war. The victory was achieved in 1945. Although new and without a solid past, in the years of the heroic war the PWP gained many of the qualities and features of a genuine workers' party. Above all, in the course of the war it won respect and trust in the ranks of the Polish proletariat and people and thus it occupied the main place in the multi-party system in Poland,* the place of the party to which the role of leader of the life of the country belonged.

In the struggle ahead of it for the socialist construction of the new Poland, especially in the favourable conditions created as a result of the triumph of socialism in a number of other countries in Europe, this party had all the opportunities, provided it consolidated itself further, settled accounts with any harmful heritage from the past and defined and pursued a consistent Marxist-Leninist line in all directions, to perform its historic mission with honour. Precisely at those moments, however, it made another wrong move: on December 15, 1948 it agreed to a merger with the Polish Socialist Party.

In the conditions of post-war Poland, when both these parties proclaimed that they represented "the interests of the Polish working class," naturally, the question of unification and leadership of the Polish proletariat by a single party of the working class was a problem which demanded solution. Speaking about this problem, Comrade Enver Hoxha has said, "Perhaps such a thing was necessary," but "the Polish

* In 1945 the main parties in Poland were: the Polish Workers' Party (PWP), the Polish Socialist Party (PSP), the Social-Democratic Party (SDP).

party was formed through a mechanical merger of the existing party with the bourgeois, so-called, workers' parties."* At the founding Congress of the PUWP in December 1948, for example, of the 1,526 delegates who took part there, 281 of them came from the ranks of the pre-war PSP, which up till the occupation of Poland by fascist Germany in September 1939 had been isolated from the Polish working class, had been transformed, in fact, into a party which served the interests of the pre-war Polish bourgeoisie. Some of these delegates were even elected to leading forums of the PUWP from the time it was founded. Thus, from these moments the members of two parties were called members of the *Polish United Workers' Party* (PUWP). It was precisely this creation of unity from above, the PUWP, which a few years later was to be faced with Soviet modern revisionism. What stand would it take? Brought up in the spirit of "cooperation" with other parties (especially in the years 1945-1948) and educated to display "generosity" towards any kind of tendency, current or party that accepted the terms "democracy," "socialism," etc., hence a party inclined to "unifications" and "mergers," faced with the new revisionist current, the PUWP would not forget its old tendency.

Moreover, in the year 1945, just three years after its formation, the Polish Workers' Party had 150-200,000 members in its ranks. Three years later, in 1948, although it had purged tens of thousands of enemy elements from its ranks, this party went into the merger with the PSP with 1,012,000 members.** Nearly a million new "communists" in three years! One million "communists"! Think what endless work: to find and choose from millions the one million best, to check up on their past and the situation when they were admitted, to know

* Enver Hoxha, "The Khrushchevites," p. 291, Eng. ed.

** Materials of the 1st Congress of the PUWP. Fund 14, File 1, CAP.

the convictions, predispositions and aims which they had, to prepare them for the major step they were to take, to prove in practice whether they were really ready for and convinced about being communists, etc., etc.! And all this in three years, in the first three years, the most difficult and the most tense with troubles and problems. Consider all these things and you have to ask: was this genuine communist work, serious work? This was a matter of one million party members on whose activity the whole life of the party and the country was going to depend. Even the simplest logic says that this was one of the most fatal mistakes for the future of the PWP.

As early as 1905, J.V. Stalin wrote: "If the autocracy tries to corrupt the consciousness of the working class with 'trade-unionism,' nationalism, clericalism, etc. and the liberal intellectuals seek insistently to strangle the political independence of the proletariat and put it under their tutelage, we must be very vigilant and must not forget that our party is a *fortress*, the doors of which are open to those who have been tested."* Although the situation in Poland in the years 1945-1948 proved at every step that the bourgeoisie, toppled from power but still not completely expropriated, the reactionary intellectuals, the Church, etc., supported and inspired by Western imperialism, were doing everything to take power from the hands of the working class, the PWP, for its part, did the opposite of what Stalin advised about admissions to the party, making it not a fortress only for those who had been tested, but a club which anybody could join — that is what the PWP looked like from this important aspect at this period. The anti-Marxist distortions of the Yugoslav Titoites in regard to the relations between the party and the Front, the role of the party in the Front, etc. had taken root in a number of opportunist leaders of the Polish Workers' Party headed by

* J.V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 1. p. 69, Alb. ed.

Wladislaw Gomulka, and as a result the party and the Front were regarded as almost the same thing. Another distorted anti-Marxist factor made this mistake even worse: the competition which burst out between different parties in Poland in the first years after liberation. Each of these parties, wanting to strengthen its own positions in order to predominate in the future of the country, began the campaign to recruit the maximum number of members. It became a real race, more feverish than the election campaigns in the countries with multi-party systems. The PWP not only did not condemn this harmful race, but took part in it itself with all its might. In this situation, in order to be a "Polish communist" only one condition was required: to declare that you were with the PWP!

Obviously, among the million admitted to the party there was no small number of elements who wanted communism and joined the party through conviction. The bravery and courage of the communists during the war, the new life which had just begun to develop in Poland, the rise of the working class and the working people to power, the first measures for the overthrow of the old relations of production and the establishment of socialist relations (especially in industry), the first steps for the creation of a socialist culture, art and literature, the broad vistas which were opened to the country on the road of socialism, the mounting authority of the PWP as the main leading force in this process of transformation, etc., could not fail to influence the soundest forces of the Polish proletariat and people to come closer to the PWP. Therefore, for the ranks of the party to be increased by the best and most devoted elements, of whom there was no lack in Poland among the Polish proletariat, this was a good and necessary thing. But *est modus in rebus*,* especially when it comes to

* There is a measure in all things (Lat).

admissions to a communist party, to the vanguard of the vanguard. Not only did the PWP take no account of this norm, but it violated it gravely.

Its policy of open doors and windows gave the green light to a hotchpotch of individuals and trends: even those who were simply sympathizers of communism, but had no knowledge or conviction about its principles, norms, demands and program, were called “communists”; likewise those who joined the party simply for personal and careerist interests, to profit from being in the party, were called “communists.” A whole series of elements also joined the party with ulterior aims and motives: to destroy from inside “in the name of the party” anything good which this party might have inherited from the past, to capture the key positions in the base and the leadership and to turn the party in an anti-party, just as they did. This was the most evil, most dangerous stratum of reaction, its fifth column within the PWP. The first act which resulted from pursuing this wrong course was the abandonment by the PWP of the aim of leading the life of Poland itself. From competition with the PSP it came to agreement to merge with it, and did merge with it mechanically.

And as if these one million or so “communists” in Poland were not enough, on December 15, 1948, by a stroke of the pen, through an agreement, within one day about 300,000 other “communists” were added — the whole membership of the PSP. About 300,000 socialists of December 15, 1948, now members of the PUWP, woke up “communists” on December 16, 1948!

We spoke above about how freely all kinds of elements alien to the cause of the party and socialism could enter the ranks of the party, which was called and proclaimed itself the Polish Communist Party. As an illustration we mention two or three further facts: merely from an act of simple verifica-

tion which was carried out in the period between the 1st Congress (December 1948) and the 2nd Congress (March 1954), it was disclosed that 160 former agents of the secret police of the overthrown regime, 700 former gendarmes, 1,500 former cadres of the fascist occupation apparatus, 3,000 members of enemy police organizations, including senior officers of the SS divisions, criminals, cadres of the anti-popular press of the past, etc., were hidden under the name of the party and some of them had been made “cadres.”*

But neither their discovery and expulsion from the party, nor the expulsion of 165,700 others during the years 1948-1954 for alien ideological views, breaches of discipline, etc., nor the voluntary withdrawal of 110,900 others,** nor the “loss” without trace of tens of thousands of others who had suddenly become “communists” one fine day, and just as suddenly decided to abandon the party some other day, none of these minor “operations” restored or was capable of restoring the enormously inflated body of the PUWP to health. Indeed, in order to compensate for these “losses,” between its 1st and 2nd Congresses the PUWP admitted no less than 413,449 new members entirely in the same old way.*** This was the party, with this membership, which found itself face to face with Soviet modern revisionism at this period. Could such a party oppose Khrushchevite modern revisionism which was coming out on the arena?!

Further: The right opportunism of the PUWP, even before 1948, that is, when the PWP operated as an independent party, had been manifested and had seriously damaged the party and socialism which had just begun to be built. The

* Materials of the 2nd Congress of the PUWP. Fund 14, File 3, CAP.

** Ibid.

*** Ibid.

most pronounced, the most widespread and the most typical manifestation of this opportunism was represented by *the right nationalist deviation led by Wladislaw Gomulka*. Without going deeply into history it should be said that as early as the spring of 1944, when Stalin's army was striking nazism crushing blows and when the PWP was leading the struggle of the Polish people for the liberation of the country and the seizure of power, Wladislaw Gomulka (at that time general secretary of the party) and his opportunist group, just like Tito and *Šubašić* in Yugoslavia, made feverish efforts to share power with the reactionary government formed in exile (London), to take the leading role in the National Front from the Polish working class, to merge the PWP in the Front and, moreover, to disarm the working class and divert it from the decisive battle to take power into its own hands. Thanks to the resolute struggle of the sound elements in the leadership of the party, headed by the outstanding revolutionary, Boleslaw Bierut, these efforts of W. Gomulka and his group were defeated. True, a little later, Gomulka was to be dismissed from the task of general secretary of the party, but remaining in the top ranks of the leadership of the party, he was to find the possibility and terrain to continue his opportunist activity. The deviationist trend headed by him had adopted the entire opportunist line of Titoite revisionism and struggled to apply it in "the conditions of Poland."

As a result of the great pressure which imperialism and the remnants of the overthrown classes exerted even in the main leadership of the party, a fierce struggle of views took place over such problems as the functions of people's power, the class struggle in socialism, the stand towards the Soviet Union and the CPSU, etc. As B. Bierut pointed out in his report to the congress, to some degree the opportunist views of W. Gomulka and his collaborators had managed to pre-

dominate in the party and its leadership. The 1st Congress of the PUWP pointed out that the party had not been brought up in the spirit of class struggle. On the one hand, it was inflated with unprepared and unverified elements and, on the other hand, it was overwhelmed with the ideas of nationalism and unlimited bourgeois "democracy." At this period many of the elements of the bourgeoisie, especially the middle and petty bourgeoisie who had been very little affected by the reforms, appeared "to support" the people's democracy, because they considered this type of democracy a bridge for conciliation between imperialism and socialism in the international arena and between the bourgeoisie and the working class in the internal arena. Under the influence of the deviationist group of Gomulka, the party had not only tolerated these views, but had permitted them to become established in its own ranks, pointed out the congress.* From this resulted such great mistakes as: the policy of open doors for mass admissions to the party; the soft stand in "agreement" and "collaboration" with the national bourgeoisie and the other political parties in the country ("people's democracy — democracy for all"); failure to wage the class struggle ("there is no need for it in socialism"); the policy of "tactical silence (!) towards the Soviet Union, the CPSU and J.V. Stalin ("reaction criticizes us for being pro-Soviet!"); unprecedented tolerance and freedoms for the Catholic clergy and Church (until 1948 the church was not divided from the state in Poland), etc., etc. All these opportunist stands and concessions occurred at a time when imperialism, with American imperialism at the head, had launched and was intensifying the struggle to put its anti-communist, counter-revolutionary strategy into practice. They proved in obvious ways that, in Poland as in Yugoslavia, this strategy of imperialism was having its effect. There is no

* Materials of the 1st Congress of the PUWP. Fund 14, File 1, CAP.

other name for all the mistakes we mentioned above, but concessions and submission to the all-round pressure which imperialism exerted on Poland, as everywhere else, in the hope of further arousing and activizing all the vacillating, deviationist and opportunist forces, and through them, bringing about the degeneration and destruction of the whole communist party and sabotaging the road of socialism on which Poland had set out. But whereas the counter-revolutionary offensive of imperialism yielded its full results in this period in the leadership of the CPY, in the Polish Workers' Party and its leadership its consequences were manifested mainly in a restricted group headed by W. Gomulka.

The exposure of Titoite revisionism by the Information Bureau, the discovery and denunciation of secret and open links between this current and international imperialism, the special internationalist aid of the Information Bureau and the CPSU for the PWP in this period, and the contribution of the sounder part of the party headed by Boleslaw Bierut, etc. brought about that in 1948 the right deviationist trend was attacked and restrained to some extent. Once again, however, the operation was extremely superficial and gentle. This situation was expressed in the 1st Congress of the PUWP. W. Gomulka's stand in the face of many criticisms made of him was this: "I have nothing to add, I stick to my views which I have expressed previously."*

This is how B. Bierut, in his speech closing the congress, describes Gomulka's stand: "What Wladislaw said at this congress sounded badly out of tune. There is no doubt that under the mask of general justification, a nationalist, anti-party content is hidden under his words. This means that Gomulka has chosen the course not with the congress, but

* Materials of the 1st Congress of the PUWP. Fund 14, File 1, CAP.

against the congress."*

Nevertheless, it was considered reasonable that this opportunist, nationalist and anti-party element, W. Gomulka, should be re-elected a member of the CC of the PUWP! Why? "Because he was an old comrade," with "experience," "the party holds out a helping hand to him because he has worked for the party," "because he has influence in the party and his removal would harm the cause,"** etc.. etc. The bores had long been at work and the trunk of the PUWP was hollow. Neither the subsequent measure expelling Gomulka and a number of other deviationists like Kliszko, Sovinski, Spychalski and others from the leadership and the ranks of the party, nor the jailing of some of them in 1951 brought, or was capable of bringing, any obvious result to improve the situation.

Gomulka and a few others were removed, but their opportunist deviation remained alive. They had long been working for this day and knew that even if a hundred thousand opportunists were condemned, opportunism would remain alive and hundreds of thousands of other opportunists from the base to the top of the PUWP would carry it further. Therefore, while the right opportunism which was seething in the ranks of the party did not raise its voice openly for a period (1950-1952), this did not mean that accounts had been settled with the opportunists. True, some of their leaders like Gomulka and company were attacked, true, opportunism was declared to be "the most dangerous enemy in the ranks of the party and socialism," true, a number of measures were taken with the aim of pursuing a correct line, but all these measures were neither radical nor adequate. The opportunists were not purged from the ranks of the party and the roots of

* Ibid.

** Ibid.

opportunism were not uncovered and eradicated. Hence, the "silence" of this deviation for a certain period was nothing but a tactic on its part. It was a withdrawal before the attack, a temporary retreat to await "abetter days." They were not long in coming.

A vivid expression of the mistakes and distortions in the general line of the PUWP during this period was the inconsistent policy of half-measures decided upon and pursued for the socialist construction of the country. Following a series of measures and reforms of a democratic and socialist character (expropriation of big landowners, the agrarian reform, the nationalization of industry, the establishment of a state monopoly in foreign trade and, to some degree, in internal trade, etc.), in 1948 the 1st Congress of the PUWP approved the directives for the planned development of the Polish economy. In the first six-year plan (1949-1954) priority was quite correctly given to the socialist industrialization of the country and in this direction obvious results were achieved. However, while the law of the socialist development of the country, of course, gives the first and leading place to socialist industrialization, this in no way means that the development of other branches of the economy can be neglected, and this is especially true of the development of agriculture on the socialist road. This was a grave mistake which made itself felt more than anywhere else in the life of the country. By 1954, while industry had developed at a very high rate in comparison with 1949 (about 128 per cent), the rate of development of agriculture over the same period was very low about (10 per cent). In 1954 production of bread grain had increased 5 per cent and production of vegetables only 2 per cent over the level of 1949.* Moreover, this small increase in the field of agricul-

* Materials of the 2nd Congress of the PUWP. Fund 14, File 3, p. 3, CAP.

ture was due mostly to the private sector. The state sector of agriculture was extremely restricted, and to say that the collectivization of agriculture had been completely neglected is to put it mildly. The pressure of the opportunist deviation in the party, of the kulak stratum and the landowners as well as of the Polish Peasant Party as "partners" with the PUWP for the "progress of Poland," etc., had had their effect. The shortages and weaknesses in the supply of the market and industry with agricultural-livestock products began to be felt more and more acutely during 1953-1954 in Poland.

While the mistakes and distortions in the political, ideological and organizational line of the party constituted the premises making it uncertain and vacillating in its positions, the mistakes and distortions in the economic field shifted the problem to a material terrain in which the interests and future of a whole society were more directly involved.

Here we mentioned only some of the premises of the PUWP to slide into revisionism, those which, you might say, were more "specific" and "particular" in its life. Entangled with them as causes or consequences of these harmful premises, at the same time, were a number of other causes and premises typical of all the parties which embraced Khrushchevite revisionism, such as: the inadequate efforts to study and assimilate Marxism-Leninism; the failure to settle accounts with bureaucracy and the gradual transformation of a number of functionaries of the party and the state into apparatus bureaucrats; the inadequate and feeble struggle in the ideological field to eliminate the old ideology and to temper the revolutionary consciousness of the party and the masses; the liberal stand and tolerant policy towards religion and the reactionary clergy, etc., etc.

These were the moments when the PUWP needed to be seriously shaken up. These were the moments when, more

than ever, it needed real internationalist aid from the sister parties and, first of all, from the CPSU. Above all, it needed this aid in order to appreciate the situation in its own ranks correctly, to decide on and pursue a correct Marxist-Leninist line in all fields and to proceed resolutely towards further radical measures to attack opportunism. A consistent stand by the other communist parties in the defence and application of Marxism-Leninism in their own countries, the experience they had gained over many years and their direct assistance and backing at those moments would have been an invaluable aid to the PUWP to ensure that it considered the struggle which it had apparently begun against opportunism correct and carried it right through to the finish. Waged consistently in all directions on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, this struggle would have saved the party and socialism in Poland.

However, when the soundest forces of the PUWP had greater need than ever for this aid, the opposite occurred. Khrushchevite modern revisionism was emerging on the scene. Immediately after the death of J.V. Stalin, Moscow began to give the green light to all the hidden or declared opportunists in the other parties. The Polish opportunists, who had long been waiting for this, were among the first to respond to these signals. They had the terrain ready to ensure that the new variant of revisionism was embraced.

Before and after an ill-famed congress

Keeping their ears pricked towards what was occurring in the Soviet Union (the sudden great changes among the cadres of all levels from the day J.V. Stalin died; N. Khrushchev's sudden climb to the head of the CPSU; the turning of attention towards economism; the first signals about "the free

expression of opinions," "the re-establishment of collective leadership," etc., etc.), hence, closely following all that retrogressive process a vivid picture of which is given by Comrade Enver Hoxha in the work "The Khrushchevites," the Polish revisionists made no mistake in sensing that the long-awaited moment was approaching. It is no accident that the Polish opportunists were the first, in the second half of 1953, to raise their voice demanding "re-examination of the previous line." That campaign, which was later to be proclaimed "the movement for democratization," commenced. The Polish revisionists did not raise their demands for "re-examination" and "democratization" in secret meetings or round corners, but directly in the 3rd Plenum of the Central Committee of the PUWP. Although such voices, raised "impatiently" as early as 1953, were kept "secret" for a certain period (their existence was acknowledged officially only in 1957),* still they had their effect: as a result of the pressure from "below" and "above" W. Gomulka and company were released from prison in 1953 and left free. Under the pretext of the "free exchange of opinions" inside and outside the party, snide attacks began on the line of the party, on earlier collective decisions and on everything of value which had been achieved in the past. The soundest elements of the party, who were described as "dogmatic," "sectarian," etc., were made the target of these attacks.

These descriptions were applied not only by the forces outside the party, but especially by the forces within the party, by all that mass of members who got into the party precisely for this purpose. One after the other many of those who had been condemned earlier gained their freedom and "rights"; more and more voices were being raised demanding re-examination not only of the trials held after 1948, but also

* Materials of the 9th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP. Fund 14, File 6, p. 1, CAP.

of those before 1942. The implication was clear: to re-examine the trials in the period after 1948 (the condemnation of the deviation of Gomulka, etc.) would mean to re-examine the Information Bureau; to re-examine the trials before 1942 (the dissolution of the former CPP) would mean to re-examine the Comintern!

A little later even this was achieved. In March 1956, in a statement signed by the Central Committees of the communist parties of the Soviet Union, Italy, Bulgaria, Finland and the PUWP, the decision of 1938 on the dissolution of the CP of Poland was rejected. All those accused and condemned at that time as fascists and enemies of the party were rehabilitated.*

Thus, the Polish opportunists were mobilizing their forces to launch the all-out attack on everything socialist inside and outside the country.

This "new spirit," which was asserting itself more and more in Poland and in the other former socialist countries, was welcomed gleefully and supported by imperialism and international reaction with all their batteries. It was clearly apparent that the strategy of American imperialism, which, as Comrade Enver Hoxha says, "assumed a more pronounced counter-revolutionary and anti-communist character, especially after the Second World War, as a result of the alteration in the ratio of forces in favour of socialism and the revolution,"** after nearly a decade of efforts, pressures and all-round interference was yielding its destructive fruit. In order to give a fresh impulse to this process, besides increasing its pressure, international reaction stepped up its blandishments to encourage this change which was occurring in the former socialist

* T. Gede, 40 Years of the CP of Poland, Moscow 1969.

** Enver Hoxha, "Eurocommunism Is Anti-Communism," p. 17, Eng. ed.

countries, as well as its efforts "to build bridges of friendship and coexistence," for the exchange not only of "opinions," but also of people, "ideas," "experience," etc. From this aspect Poland occupied an important place. From the ranks of the Polish emigrants, old and "new" (from the time of the end of the Second World War), especially from the ranks of the millions of Poles who lived in the USA, an ever increasing number of envoys, secret agents and spies of the capitalist West began to go to Poland "to visit the homeland," to "unite with the relatives," to see their "relations" or other properties. Not only were they to work directly for the strengthening of old links and the creation of new links with all the elements of the pre-war Polish reaction and the bourgeoisie, but at the same time they were to work and did work to give inspiration and heart to the opportunists who were taking power in the Polish party and state.

The Yugoslav revisionists headed by Tito played an especially appreciable role to accelerate the counter-revolutionary process in Poland and the other former socialist countries. They welcomed the changes which were occurring in Poland with enthusiasm, publicized them loudly and immediately placed themselves in the vanguard of the inspirers and inciters of the Polish opportunists. In this way, on the one hand, the Yugoslav revisionists performed the mission which had been allocated to Titoism "in the overall strategy of imperialism in undermining the socialist countries from within,"* and, on the other hand, they tried to exploit the counter-revolutionary transformations which occurred in Poland and elsewhere in public as evidence of the "correctness" of the line which they had pursued for years, i.e., to rehabilitate their name and figure as far as possible after years of being described and ex-

* Enver Hoxha, "Eurocommunism Is Anti-Communism," p. 49, Eng. ed.

posed by the international communist and workers' movement traitors to Marxism-Leninism.

It is a fact also that apart from Western imperialism and Yugoslav revisionism, the Polish opportunists had not only the encouragement, but also the ever greater and all-round support and direct backing of Khrushchev and company for their efforts. Apart from other things, at the beginning of 1954 Khrushchev undertook to rescue the Polish opportunists from a major obstacle — B. Bierut. During a special “visit” to Warsaw he did everything possible to remove B. Bierut from the post of general secretary of the PUWP in order to give this task to “a more competent and able comrade,”* as he himself put it. As we know, Khrushchev failed in this attempt. However the revisionist mafia, which had begun to stir, was thinking about all ways and possibilities,” says Comrade Enver Hoxha. “It was creating its spider’s web. And although Bierut was not removed from the leadership of the party in Warsaw, as Khrushchev wanted and dictated, later he was to be eliminated completely by a sudden ‘cold’ caught in Moscow!”**

In the context of the “renewal” of the criticism of mistakes of the past (especially from 1948 on), not only the party, but the entire base and superstructure of the society became the targets for attack. Everything that had been achieved in Poland, from questions of the organization of the state to the running of the economy and questions of culture, art, literature, the way of life, etc., came under attack. However, while opinions were expressed freely and open attacks made in all fields of life from “below,” “at the top” the main organs of the Polish party and state, beginning from the second half of 1953, concentrated their attention mainly on the economy.

* CAP, Fund 14, File 23.

** Enver Hoxha, “The Khrushchevites” (Memoirs), p. 40, Eng. ed.

Following the example of Khrushchev in the Soviet Union,* economism became the current fashion in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and elsewhere.

The aims of the modern revisionists, who in the first period of their counter-attack firmly seized on economism, were completely political in character.

First, by concentrating on the “economy,” by emerging with the slogans for “a radical change in the material level of the masses,” for “the fulfilment of the increasing demands of the masses,” etc., etc., the modern revisionists presented themselves as the “new leaders” who were going to bring “plenty,” “the great blessings of socialism,” who did not engage in “empty talk” and “propaganda,” but got down to the “fundamental” problems, etc. In this way they tried to win political credit for themselves to deceive the masses and gain their sympathy in the course of their struggle to power.

Second, by concentrating on the “economy,” they indirectly, and later quite openly, attacked the former line as a line which allegedly had not devoted due attention to “the life of the people,” and attacked the former leadership as one which stood “remote from the people,” remote “from the people’s daily needs.” Thus, whether by throwing mud at the past or cynically misusing the understandable difficulties of the first years of socialism, they played on the feelings and opinions of the ordinary people with the aim of making them hate everything of “the past.” Thus the terrain was being prepared, not only for the overthrow of every victory achieved by socialism and for the return to capitalism, but also for the struggle against the socialist system as a whole, against its universal

* Khrushchev began his career as number one of the CC of the CPSU with his report, “On the Development of Agriculture and Improvement of the Material Level of the Masses,” delivered to the 3rd Plenum of the CC of the CPSU in June 1953.

laws of development, etc.

Third, by concentrating mainly on the “economy” the modern revisionists tried to divert the attention of the sounder part of the party and of the organs of the state from the great range of problems of their life and activity, to “tie them up” in the economy so that the revisionist maggot could go on untrammelled with its undermining work below. If you carefully examine the main official documents of the top organs of the Polish party and state in this period (especially up to 1956) you will see at once that the problems raised and discussed in the leadership of the party were mainly economic. The problems of the “continuous improvement of the material and cultural conditions of the working people and their continuous well-being, the rapid development of agriculture” were in the epicentre of the 2nd Congress of the PUWP (March 1954), thus neglecting the acute political and ideological problems that were causing concern in the country. Likewise, the plenums of the CC of the party raised and discussed mainly problems of the “economy.”

Undoubtedly the problems of the economic policy are among the most cardinal problems for any communist party, and the party must deal with them continually at its congresses and at its plenums between congresses. For the PUWP (and the sister parties) in the period of which we are speaking the evil lay elsewhere. On the one hand, by “seriously” taking up economic questions the modern revisionists were attacking all the laws of the economic development of the respective countries, were opening the way to those forms and reforms which would very quickly put the economies of those countries on a capitalist course. On the other hand, under the disguise of “concern about the economy,” the other problems of their life and activity, which were simmering, building up and becoming ready to burst both “below” and “above,” were deliber-

ately neglected. While the top forums of the party brought out directives, instructions and programs one after the other about “the great development of the economy,” “the progress of agriculture,” about “whether the question of collectivization had been pursued well or badly,” at the same time, outside the forums, the opportunists, the Church, the corrupted intellectuals, the dregs of the overthrown former classes were breathing freely and attacking strongly in all directions.

The voice of these profoundly anti-socialist forces was desirable and welcome at this stage (and later) to the revisionist forces which were taking power. With this voice, which vented its spleen against everything socialist, the modern revisionists confounded “the voice of the masses” and all this masquerade they called “the support which the masses are giving the new line of the return to correct positions.” Thus, the betrayal which was being perpetrated above received the seal of “approval and support from below.”

The working masses, especially the Polish working class, lacked the necessary preparation and tempering to be able to oppose the betrayal that was being perpetrated. Not only had their political and ideological preparation been done with great shortcomings and mistakes, but the 7-8 year period that had passed was too short for the masses to have achieved that level of socialist consciousness and revolutionary outlook which would have enabled them to see the great betrayal clearly. The demagogy with which the essence of the peaceful counter-revolution was covered up, as well as the understandable difficulties of the first phase of socialist construction, plus the distortions which had been made in the economic policy in the period 1949-1954, provided the revisionist crusaders with an effective weapon to get by “unnoticed.” The shortcomings and difficulties were disclosed, inflated and exaggerated so that the counter-revolution could advance under cover

of them without opposition and disturbances.

Up to the end of 1955 all this retrogressive process took place, as you might say, “outside the official line” of the party, but within the basic organizations, within all those great freedoms, concessions and possibilities which the “anti-opportunist” official line had created for opportunists of all kinds and every rank.

At the beginning of 1956 matters changed radically. In February the 20th Congress of the CPSU was held. At the beginning of March B. Bierut suddenly died from the “cold” which he caught in Moscow. The mourning for the loss of the outstanding revolutionary and leader of the Polish proletariat and people in no way spoiled the atmosphere of “enthusiasm” and general “rejuvenation” which the revisionist platform of the 20th Congress had aroused, and as though ironically, the last farewell to B. Bierut was accompanied with a sensational publication in those days, which was sold wholesale from the newsstands in Warsaw. It was Khrushchev’s “secret” report delivered at the 20th Congress against the figure and work of J.V. Stalin. Thus, Poland was saying farewell not only to its devoted son, Bierut, but also to the name and outstanding figure of the great Stalin.

The unprecedented slanders of Khrushchev’s “secret report” were not only monstrous accusations and slanders against J.V. Stalin. They were attacks and accusations fabricated against Marxism-Leninism and the theory and practice of scientific socialism. By making these slanders public, those who drafted this report provided further weapons for all the enemies to make more slanderous attacks against socialism and one of the terrible sources of disillusionment, confusion and deception for the workers and the masses.

However, the “merits” for this ill-famed report belong not only to Khrushchev and company who drafted it. No small

“merits” belong to its publishers, the “Polish comrades.” A copy of the “top secret” report was stolen precisely in Poland from the office of the general secretary of the PUWP and not by any ordinary safe-breaker, but by a thief of a special kind — the assistant to the general secretary of the CC of the party! The revisionist mafia of Gomulka and company had been working for a long time, had known whom to place in such delicate and important jobs, had known with whom to surround and deceive B. Bierut and keep him under surveillance.

Here we are not talking of one or five enemy agents who had managed to capture key posts in the leadership of the Polish party and state. The agents of the enemy, the opportunists, had captured key positions from the base to the peak of the pyramid. Although de facto the genuine Polish communists had long been encircled by the opportunists and were in the minority, from now on even de jure they were described as “harmful” elements, “dogmatists,” “bureaucrats,” “murderers” or responsible for the “great injustices” of the past.

Now these communists would really have to pay for the fatal mistakes which they had permitted in the past, but not those “mistakes” of which they were accused by the opportunists. They would have to pay for their inconsistent line, all the concessions and softness towards the bourgeoisie and internal and foreign reaction, would have to pay for the generosity shown towards those enemy elements who, like it or not, they themselves had allowed to increase and grow stronger within the party and who one day would destroy the party and socialism. Engels’ famous statement, that dialectics would not fail to punish all those who abandon it, now found a complete and bitter confirmation among the Polish communists.

The wave of releases from prison and the rehabilitation of the enemies of the party and the people mounted more

quickly in Poland than anywhere else. At the end of May 1956, the Polish opportunists were able to boast that they had done more than their ideological and political brothers for the bourgeois “democratization” of the country. Matters had advanced so “far” there that when E. Ochab* announced in a consultative meeting of leaders of the countries of the former socialist camp that the prison doors had been opened to all the ex-political prisoners in Poland, the precursors of this movement for “democratization,” the Soviet leaders themselves, were frightened and criticized the Poles for “excessive haste.”** Polish reaction was filling its ranks not only with the elements released from prison, but, as we said above, also with the great influx of political emigrants who had fled in the years after liberation and others, and who now, after being brainwashed and thoroughly prepared by Western reaction, were returning in droves to their homeland. The Polish press of that period was filled “heart-rending” news and reports about this return of the “prodigal sons” to their ancestral homes!

The line of the 20th Congress was trumpeted and quickly embraced as “a line of salvation.” A few months later W. Gomulka was to declare, “The 20th Congress of the CPSU was the impulse for the change in the political life of the country. Its vigorous and sound current moved the masses of the party, the working class and the whole society. People began to straighten their backs.”*** Pjeter Jaroszewicz, another element condemned in the period of “hardline socialism” (1948-1953), now completely rehabilitated, had this to say in October 1956 about the turn which events were taking: “We

* After B. Bierut’s death, for the period April-October 1956 he had the function of the General Secretary of CC of PUWP.

** Materials of the “Joint Consultation of the Leaders of the Socialist Countries,” Moscow, June 1956. CAP.

*** Materials of the 8th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, October 1956, Fund 14, File 6, p. 22, CAP.

can say without exaggeration that the period from the 20th Congress of the CPSU to the present (the 8th — S.D.) plenum of the CC can be called an epoch in the sense of the speed of change.”*

Thus, the peaceful counter-revolution of Poland was taking over the reins. It was the joint deed of the Polish revisionists and their inspirers and supporters, the Soviet revisionists, who capitulated in face of the all-round attacks and pressures of imperialism and, from those moments, placed themselves alongside international reaction against the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism. All of them, under the banner and slogans of “genuine socialism,” “the renovation of socialism,” etc., were destroying everything socialist that had been achieved in the past.

The first manifestation of the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution

All the attention of these socio-political forces (modern revisionists) who were taking power in this period was concentrated on settling accounts with “the past,” with those forces in the party and state who were most closely linked with this past, that is, with the honest communists and cadres who were now described as “dogmatists,” “sectarians,” “Stalinists.”

In the context of this “epoch” of liberalization, i.e., in the context of the peaceful counter-revolution which was taking power, *a third category of socio-political elements, forces and groups* could not fail “to show up.” These were the elements of the blackest reaction: remnants from the overthrown former ruling classes, ex-officials and servants of the state organs

* Ibid., pp. 23-24,

of pre-war and wartime Poland, other elements degenerated in the post-war years, elements discontented with socialism, ordinary vagabonds and hooligans, open or disguised agents of the secret services of the Western capitalist countries, etc. Some of them had just been released from prison, some had returned from emigration, while others, through the “generosity” of the party and the Polish state, had taken advantage of “democracy” and managed to live in freedom waiting for these days to come.

Revived by the “epoch” which the 20th Congress opened, enthused by the great possibilities and freedoms which the modern revisionists were giving them, with their bourgeois intuition, they sensed that now the question was not one of a few changes of personalities, or “corrections” of socialism. The way events were developing, the possibilities existed to change the entire nature of the socio-economic system of socialism in Poland, i.e., to realize their permanent dream and aim, the restoration of capitalism. And this long-awaited gift was coming from none other than the Polish communists themselves, communists of a “new type,” and “a new line.” Therefore, this “third force” immediately created its own links and, right from the outset, lined up shoulder to shoulder with the revisionist peaceful counter-revolution, supporting it with all its might in the struggle against “the past,” the “dogmatists,” the “Stalinists.”

They were precisely those forces of the bourgeoisie and reaction who, especially from April 1953 onwards, had raised their voices more than anyone else in support of the “new line” and whom the modern revisionists had confounded with the “masses of the people.” Their initial “support” had been gradually stepped up and now turned into real pressure exerted on the revisionist counter-revolution to advance more rapidly in the destruction of socialism.

Behind this counter-revolutionary force which was gaining strength, grouping and organizing itself, stood *imperialism and international reaction, headed by American imperialism*. Applying its anti-communist strategy during the whole period from the advent to power of Khrushchev and company until the 20th Congress of the CPSU, this external reaction had mainly pursued the tactic of blandishments, of support for and “congratulations” on the “new line” which was becoming established more and more thoroughly in the former socialist countries. This was also the orientation which it had given Polish (as well as Hungarian and other) internal reaction on the way it should act in this first phase of the emergence on the scene of modern revisionism. When the 20th Congress of the CPSU sanctioned and codified the revisionist theories and course of N. Khrushchev, however, in the confusion and disorientation which burst out openly in a number of countries of the socialist camp as a result of this, imperialism judged that the moment had come to attack sternly and openly in order to deepen the counter-revolutionary process, if possible, to break up the socialist camp and to bring these countries; one after the other, into its own sphere of influence and dictate. As is known, the biggest and sternest effort to achieve this objective was made in Hungary in October-November 1956. There “in the euphoria of the advent to power of Khrushchevite revisionism, but at moments when it had not yet consolidated its positions, world capitalism, its Titoite agency and the reactionary internal Magyar bourgeoisie launched the armed counter-revolution against the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Workers’ Party of Hungary, thinking that this was the weakest link in the chain of socialist countries.”*

* Enver Hoxha, “Against Modern Revisionism — 1968-1970,” p. 59, Alb. ed.

At this period, the internal forces of Polish reaction, inspired and supported by foreign imperialist reaction, the Titoite clique and the Catholic Church, tried to make similar efforts with the same objectives and aims. As we said above, these ultra-right forces, strengthened and invigorated as a consequence of the revisionist counter-revolutionary process, presented themselves, up to the middle of 1956, as the most ardent supporters of the line of betrayal which the modern revisionists were pursuing, rather than as an opposition.

While the ultra-reactionary forces were united with the modern revisionists in many of their main aims, in other aspects and aims they had “dissatisfaction” and disagreements with them. For example, they could not agree with the speed and methods with which an end was being put to the past — too slowly, through “closed” meetings, almost secretly and fearfully. Moreover, they could not reconcile themselves to the fact that the new people who were taking power and completely rejecting the socialist past of Poland, at the same time talked about and demanded a “better kind of socialism.” No, this third force, the force of open enemies of socialism, was for quick and open, immediate, radical actions. The counter-revolutionary elements did not want “improvements,” but a complete and open overthrow of socialism. They demanded an immediate and complete settling of accounts with whatever still remained of socialism and they did not want to be left out of this settling of accounts. Since their order was being restored, the pro-Western forces could not agree to remain in the minority and, even less, in the shade. They wanted both to help to speed up the counter-revolution and to receive their due reward after the victory.

Linked by outlook, tradition and their class position with Western capital, over the years these forces had built up their old hatred for the Soviet Union a hundredfold. In this hatred

their anti-socialist class sentiments were combined with their nationalist anti-Russian sentiments. Their anti-Russian and anti-Soviet blindness prevented them from seeing that now the Soviet Union itself was degenerating into a capitalist state and that the new Soviet leadership was bringing them these “fine days.” No, they were rabid anti-socialist, and equally rabid anti-Russian and anti-Soviet. Hence, they could not accept the line of the Polish revisionists who, true enough, were destroying socialism in Poland, but, willingly or by compulsion, were maintaining their links and friendship with the Soviets. This anti-Soviet hatred was made even more acute and aggressive at these moments because of the fact that behind the ultra-right Polish reaction stood international reaction and American imperialism. The latter was to exploit the chauvinism and anti-Sovietism of Polish reaction and channel it, like everything else, to achieving its objective to split the former socialist camp and turn Poland, among other countries, into a sphere of American influence.

Likewise, the forces of ultra-right Polish reaction were not satisfied with the economic policy, the stand towards the church and religion, etc. The new people who were running Poland seemed very slow-moving and “vacillating.” The process of the counter-revolutionary transformation had to be speeded up and pushed ahead boldly. According to them, the time had come “to destroy everything which still remained... from socialism, the dictatorship of the proletariat and Marxism-Leninism.”*

Their inspiration and guidance by international reaction, their old hatred for socialism and impatience to carry out counter-revolutionary transformations quickly, impelled these pro-capitalist forces to take to the streets. The Poznan riots of June 1956 broke out. In the streets groups organized by in-

* Enver Hoxha, “The Khrushchevites” (Memoirs), p. 279, Eng. ed.

ternal reaction demonstrated their discontent and their old hatred, shouted profoundly anti-socialist slogans and demanded radical transformation of everything in the life of Poland! A little later, in the summer and autumn of that year, the riots in Poznan were accompanied with other anti-socialist demonstrations in the streets of Warsaw. It must be said that in the riots of Poznan, in particular, certain contingents of workers took part and, on this account, they were subsequently dubbed by the modern revisionists as “movements of workers” who were “complaining about mistakes made in the past”! As to why and how contingents of misled workers with a low level of consciousness placed themselves under the banner of counter-revolution in 1956 (and in 1970, 1976, 1980 and 1981), we shall speak about this below. Here we want to stress that the participation of workers in this or that movement is not the basic criterion to determine the character of the movement. What ideology guides it, what forces lead it, what flag it carries, what slogans it issues, what program it seeks to carry out — these are the things that determine the true character of the movement. From this viewpoint there was nothing socialist about the “Poznan riots.” They erupted as an expression of the impatience of ultra-reactionary forces to speed up the counter-revolutionary process which the chiefs of the PUWP themselves had started, and in essence they were an open expression of the most extreme anti-socialism and Polish bourgeois nationalism.

The Catholic Church and the bourgeois ideology provided the inspiration for those riots through which much more than revenge for the blows which reaction suffered from socialism during the period from 1945 on was demanded. With initial dimensions, but extremely significant in content, those revolts presaged what was to occur in Poland in 1970-1971, 1976 and 1980-1981.

In essence, these riots, which erupted in the suitable conditions which the revisionist betrayal, the revisionist counter-revolution, created for them, were a direct consequence of this counter-revolution and the most extreme expression of it. They were the open counter-revolution, with the gloves off, and without “socialist” phrases, that is, they were *the first manifestation of a counter-revolutionary movement which emerged and developed as a consequence of the revisionist counter-revolutionary process.*

With their sudden savage outburst the riots of 1956 brought out more than anything else the filth of “the new line” which the revisionists were propagating at full volume. Openly and unhesitatingly, this manifestation of the counter-revolution smashed to smithereens the demagoguery of the modern revisionists about their mission allegedly to “correct the past,” to “improve socialism,” to “rejuvenate it,” etc. As the logical continuation and deepening of the revisionist peaceful counter-revolution, the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution shattered the integument which covered the truth and brought out the naked truth: “the new line” of the modern revisionists was not for a “rectification” of socialism, but for its destruction.

But to bring out the truth about the modern revisionists openly at that turning-point would mean to reveal their plot, hence, to bring the end of them. Of course, those who were doing everything to seize all power could not accept such an end, therefore they were bound to oppose this threat. At the same time, apart from unmasking and bringing to light the betrayal which was being committed by the Polish revisionists, the ultra reactionary forces that organized the Poznan riots committed another “sin”: they openly proclaimed their anti-Russian and anti-Soviet hatred and called for breaking the links with Moscow! For Khrushchev and company this

was an alarm signal. The chiefs in Warsaw had to be given orders to take urgent action.

The leaders of the peaceful counter-revolution immediately sensed the danger which the socio-political "third force" which was emerging in the arena represented to their scheme. Therefore, they were obliged to oppose this force. The June riots in Poznan were "put down," like the counter-revolution in Hungary a little later. Speaking about these events Comrade Enver Hoxha says, "The counter-revolution was suppressed, here with Soviet tanks, there with Polish tanks, but it was suppressed by the enemies of the revolution."*

The revolts of Polish reaction had burst out prematurely. The peaceful counter-revolution was still building up, had not yet consolidated its positions, therefore, more than ever it had to use demagoguery, to appear prudent and, indeed, "determined" to condemn such openly anti-socialist attempts.

While the counter-revolutionary riots were suppressed, they were not suppressed in favour of socialism and the revolution. No, as the PLA has pointed out, "This counter-revolution was suppressed by the counter-revolutionaries who restored capitalism, but in more camouflaged ways retaining their colour and disguise, as the Soviet Khrushchevites did in their country."**

The leading forces of this counter-revolutionary movement, which erupted in the course of another counter-revolutionary process, *had still not created adequate internal and external links*, were still not completely clear on their aims and the steps they were taking, the tactics which had to be pursued, etc. This was precisely the reason that their movement failed, as it did.

Socialism, as a new socio-economic order, and the former

* Enver Hoxha, "The Khrushchevites" (Memoirs), p. 322, Eng. ed.

** Ibid., p. 307.

socialist camp enjoyed profound authority, respect and sympathy in the eyes of the masses, of the world proletariat, and all progressive mankind at that period (1956). Although the revisionists were destroying the socialist system from within, in those countries where they managed to penetrate, it was still too soon for the healthier forces inside and outside the party in those countries to understand what was going on and to "see" the peaceful counter-revolution which the revisionists were carrying on "on the quiet." But while the essence of the peaceful counter-revolution "was not seen," was skilfully and carefully covered up, coming out with "pleasing," attractive slogans (and in this way, it took place without opposition from below), its most extreme manifestation, the open anti-socialist counter-revolution, was easily recognized for what it was, because it came out openly against the dictatorship of the proletariat. The working masses, the working class of the socialist countries, were bound to react against it immediately and condemn it, just as they did.

The fact is, however, that the modern revisionists themselves condemned only their rival, i.e., the consequence of their betrayal, but not the cause, not the basis on which that betrayal emerged and developed.

Possibly these were the most suitable moments when such a profound radical action could have been carried out, but it was not done. Although imbued with great revolutionary traditions, the Polish working class found itself without leadership and betrayed once again, as in the past. Even that minority of the communists who were for a Marxist-Leninist line wavered and backed down under the attacks and accusations which internal and external reaction levelled against them as "dogmatists" and "Stalinists" who were "to blame for what was occurring," etc. Instead of going on the counter-offensive and denouncing the true instigators of the counter-revolution,

they thought it better to “defend” and “justify” themselves for the former line. Faced with the trend of betrayal, they bowed their heads and, by so doing, themselves became party to the regressive process which was developing in the country.

Within the party at this time, there was also not a small number of elements which up till then had embraced and supported “the new line,” not because they were enemies, not because they were aware of what they were doing, but because “they did not see” or “understand” the great betrayal that was being perpetrated. These communists had supported the former line because it was considered the line of the party, the line of socialism. After 1953-1954, they supported “the new line,” because they were told that it was “better,” “more promising,” “more democratic,” “more just,” “more in favour of socialism” than the line they had supported previously.

Lacking sound formation and communist convictions, they were ready to embrace any “official line” which claimed to be in favour of the party and socialism. These elements were part of over a million Polish “communists” who had joined the party through their votes, but without sinister, evil aims. Now, after jumping from one line to the other, when the moment came for “the new line” to openly display its anti-party essence, this was the time for these “communists” to reflect and understand what was going on and to speak up forcefully for the first time, but this did not occur, either. Having entered the party through an opportunist door, knowing nothing of Marxism-Leninism, lacking the experience of a vigorous, militant life in the basic party organizations, uneducated in the rigorous principles and norms of the life of the party, and under unrelenting pressure from the revisionists, at these key moments these “sincere communists” were incapable of doing anything but lining up “sincerely” beside the revisionists. Moreover, the “blow” struck at the revolts

in Poznan extinguished any glimmer of doubt which might have emerged in them. “If you are mixed with the bran, the chickens will eat you,” says an Albanian proverb. This is what occurred with these “sincere communists,” too. From now on, they identified themselves with the worm-eaten body of the PUWP and became participants in the revisionist counter-revolution. Therefore, they, too, condemned only the open, visible counter-revolution, but not its basis — the revisionist peaceful counter-revolution. Hence, the blow struck at the counter-revolution in June 1956 in Poland (and a little later in Hungary) was a half-measure, or, more precisely, it was a smack on the bottom which the peaceful counter-revolution dealt its own offspring which wanted to act as a “grown-up” while still in its swaddling clothes!

Apart from these internal factors, *the external factor also exerted an influence for the suppression of the counter-revolution in Poland.* In the Poznan riots, the reactionary forces came out openly, not only with anti-socialist slogans, but also with anti-Soviet slogans. Khrushchev and company saw a twofold danger in these riots: *as uncontrolled movements*, they exposed and brought to light the essence of the secret plot which the revisionists were trying to carry out “on the quiet” in many countries; *as anti-Russian and anti-Soviet movements* they threatened the Khrushchevite strategy for the creation of the Russian empire. Therefore, the Soviet pressure had to be exerted, as it was, with full force to ensure that this phenomenon (the open counter-revolution) was strangled at birth.

Thus, the complex reasons and factors which led both to the outburst and to the suppression of counter-revolutionary riots in Poland (and in Hungary) in 1956, amongst other things, brought to light for the first time that phenomenon which, as the years passed, would become ever more evident and more dangerous: the fierce rivalry which existed, along

with the alliance, between imperialism headed by American imperialism, on one hand, and modern revisionism headed by Soviet Khrushchevites, on the other hand. These two sides were equally savage enemies of the revolution and socialism, and at the same time, savage rivals and enemies of each other whenever it came to the preservation and extension of their own domains at each other's cost. The events of later decades were to prove with endless facts that precisely this rivalry, this counter-revolutionary policy of the superpowers, was one of the basic factors which would lead to the chaos and confusion which swept Poland and other countries.

The stand of the other Khrushchevites who were seizing power in a number of communist parties in socialist and capitalist countries towards the events in Poland in 1956 was more or less the same as that of the Soviet Khrushchevites: in undertones they condemned the appearance, not the essence, not the causes and conditions which led to those counter-revolutionary manifestations. As for the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, it was enthusiastic about the Poznan riots and described them as "efforts prompted from below" for "democratization" and for a "true, specific socialism." The Titoites could not act otherwise; they had long been trained as agents of imperialism, as inspirers and supporters of every anti-socialist activity, open or clandestine.

The only party of the former socialist camp which was then kept remote from the events in Poland was the Party of Labour of Albania. Khrushchev and company went everywhere to exchange opinions and coordinate their stands, but they tried to keep the nature and the character of events in Poland as secret as possible from the PLA.

They acted in this way because they knew that in its judgement of events the PLA would never express itself for "solidarity for the sake of unity." The PLA would state its

opinion forcefully. And that is what happened. As soon as it was acquainted with the truth, some months later, it expressed its principled opinion boldly, not only condemning the counter-revolutionary events in Poznan and Warsaw, but more importantly, putting the finger right on the sore spot, on the true causes of the situation and those who had brought it about. As the main cause, the PLA stressed the course of the PUWP which, as Comrade Enver Hoxha pointed out, "is not a correct Marxist course..."*, and laid most of the blame for this on the main leaders in the PUWP, describing them as "social-chauvinists, social-democrats, i.e. not Marxists and not internationalists."** Right at that time the PLA informed the Soviets and the Poles about these correct conclusions through party channels and also found appropriate ways and forms to make its opinion public.

Thus, the first phase of the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution in Poland came to an end. It was doomed to failure and it failed. In this initial phase the events were more an expression of the haste and impatience of the ultra-reactionary forces to realize their old dream. But while the revolts of these forces failed, while they were put down, this does not mean that they were extinguished. In the context of the revisionist counter-revolution they were becoming a common phenomenon. As long as a situation favourable for the revisionist counter-revolution was in existence, the basis for the pro-Western counter-revolution would be in existence, too. As we shall see, these two manifestations of the counter-revolution were to advance in concert, supporting and supplementing each other for the sake of their common strategic purpose, and opposing and attacking each other over a series of particular aims and purposes.

* Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 14, p. 170, Alb. ed.

** Ibid., p. 171.

Revisionism at the gallop

“It is clear to us that those who are now in power in Poland, such as Gomulka and company, are counter-revolutionaries.”

ENVER HOXHA

Immediately after the suppression of the Poznan riots, the modern revisionists in Poland threw themselves into the final attack to take the reins of the country completely into their hands. In August, the 7th Plenum of the CC of PUWP was held. It stands to reason that its proceedings should have focused on the acute political problems disturbing the country — the assessment of the leadership of the party of the events in Poznan, the reasons why they occurred, etc. But no, the theme on which the plenum focused was... the economy. A report on the economic policy pursued in the past and the measures for a new economic line was delivered and discussed.

Those main cadres of the party and the Polish state who were linked with the former line and who de jure were still in power were openly accused at this plenum of being to blame for the crisis which the country was experiencing. They themselves lacked the courage to put the finger on those really to blame for the crisis. Instead, they tried to justify themselves for the mistakes in the economic policy over the past period (and there were such mistakes), that is, they tried to adapt themselves to the strong opportunist current which was setting the tone. In this way, they judged at least they would save their heads, even if they could not save their positions.

The modern revisionists sensed this deplorable position of the “dogmatists” and immediately called for radical trans-

formations in the main leadership of the party. The names of Gomulka, Spychalski, Sowinski, Kliszko and others were raised on all sides. These elements, expelled from the leadership of the party years before and condemned as enemies of the party and socialism, did not take part in this plenum. Through their collaborators in the leadership of the party, however, it was they who manipulated all the proceedings of the plenum from outside. It was obvious that the time had come for their final rehabilitation.

Announced and started as a plenum about “economic problems,” the 7th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP was transformed into a meeting to officially legalize modern revisionism in Poland. The way was opened completely for what was subsequently proclaimed with fanfares as the “Polish October,” “the Polish line for socialism,” etc. The reference is to the 8th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP which met from the 19th to 21st of October 1956 and de facto and de jure crowned the triumph of modern revisionism in Poland.

The conditions and ways in which this ill-famed plenum met and conducted its proceedings and the whole spirit of it are a real tragi-comedy.

On October 19, the First Secretary of the Party, Edward Ochab, took the floor at the plenum: “I have an important announcement to make,” he commenced, “the Political Bureau has decided to propose to the 8th Plenum of the Central Committee that, before the report is delivered on the draft decision of the CC about the current tasks in the economy and the political line, Comrades Gomulka, Spychalski, Kliszko and Loga-Sowinski should be co-opted to the Central Committee so that these comrades can take part in the discussion as members of the Central Committee...”

“Likewise the Political Bureau has decided to propose to you that Comrade Gomulka should be elected First Secretary

of the Central Committee of the Party.”*

While the hall waited impatiently for the issue to be put to vote E. Ochab continued:

“We are informed that the members of the Presidium of the CC of the CPSU — Khrushchev, Kaganovich, Mikoyan and Molotov, have arrived unexpectedly from Moscow and want urgent discussions with the Political Bureau of our Party. The Political Bureau thinks that we should adjourn the proceedings of the plenum till tomorrow, after the talks with the Soviet comrades.”**

The hall expressed agreement with “the opinions of the Political Bureau,” but with slight amendments: before the meeting with the Soviet comrades, “let us discuss the first point on the agenda and co-opt the comrades mentioned” and “add to them Comrade Komarov as a comrade expelled from the Central Committee under the influence of provocations by Beria” and, finally, “Comrade Gomulka should be appointed a member of the delegation which will talk with the Soviet comrades.”

No sooner said than done. There was no need for discussion, the way had been completely cleared. The former traitors and sworn enemies of the party and socialism were completely rehabilitated, absolved of their sins within a few moments, and there and then placed at the head of the country.

The main one among them, W. Gomulka, had to recommence his career that very day in a first clash with the head of Soviet modern revisionism, N. Khrushchev. And as though to make the spectacle more complete that same day movements of troops began. Suddenly tanks appeared in the streets of Warsaw. Detachments of Polish and Soviet troops with

* Information Bulletin of the 8th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, Fund 14, File 6, CAP.

** Ibid.

full battle equipment were moving in mysterious directions through the provinces.

The following day, October 20, as soon as the 8th Plenum resumed its proceedings the questions were raised: “What is the meaning of this sudden visit from the Soviet comrades? What did they want? Why are the troops moving and why the display of tanks in the streets?” They were told that the visit of the Soviet comrades was “in the context of a normal working consultation” (!) and the troop movements were carried out “in the context of normal military training” (!).

But that was not the truth. The Soviet leadership was fully informed about developments in Poland. It knew that elements who were not only revisionist, but also sworn anti-Soviet elements, were making ready to place themselves at the head of the party. Gomulka was the most advanced among them. As we said, as early as 1944, but especially in 1948, at the 1st Congress of the PUWP, it had been asserted openly that Gomulka represented and headed the current of right opportunism and nationalism within the party. While the right opportunism of this current had to do with all the opportunist currents, “old” and “new,” including Titoism, its nationalism had to do especially with keeping alive the old anti-Russian sentiment and cultivating it inside and outside the party. Now the throne was being offered to this proven anti-Russian. This was occurring at moments when demonstrations of “vagabonds and hooligans” with open anti-Russian and anti-Soviet slogans had burst out in the streets of Warsaw and elsewhere. Hence, it was possible that events could get out of hand in Poland, just as they were threatening to do during those days in Hungary. This danger had to be blocked. Gomulka could assume the throne only if he would exchange his anti-Sovietism for pro-Sovietism!

Khrushchev and company knew, also, that Gomulka real-

ly was a dyed-in-the-wool revisionist, but, as we said, hitherto he had expressed himself more as a partisan of the Titoite variant of revisionism. If he were to be placed at the head he would have to embrace and defend the new, Soviet, variant of revisionism. Therefore, the Soviet leadership saw that they had to bring the Polish comrades into line! It had to reach agreement with them and, especially, with Gomulka. Otherwise the army would be brought into play. Precisely for this reason, backing up the squad of members of the Presidium of the CC of the CPSU the tanks and battalions were deployed in the streets of Poland. Only bloodshed was lacking to make the spectacle a complete tragedy. However, it could not be shed those days. Opportunism had turned it to water. In exchange for his promise to maintain "the bonds of friendship" with the Soviet Union and the disguise of socialism, at the airport Soviet approval was given for Gomulka to be elected to the Political Bureau and as First Secretary of the CC of the party.

The proceedings of the 8th Plenum of the CC resumed under his chairmanship. As was expected, he began the attack on the 7-8 year period when he was not in the party. "That period has gone never to return," stressed Gomulka at the outset. "Many evil things were done in those years. The consequences which this period brought the party, the working class and the people... are extremely bitter."*

Gomulka's whole "opening salvo" at this plenum was a frontal attack on the party, its leading role, the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and the socialist system in general. But... "what can you do, the day has come! Throw dirt on the law!"** The whole 8th Plenum of the CC of the

* Information Bulletin of the 8th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, Fund 14, File 6, p. 18, CAP.

** Aeschylus, "Oresteia," first Tragedy — "Agamemnon."

PUWP took place under the direction of the leader of Polish modern revisionism.

The revisionist platform of this plenum is now well known. There the former line of the party was officially attacked and condemned as a "sectarian" and "dogmatic" line; apart from those mentioned above, all those other enemies condemned in the past "under the influence of the Information Bureau, the conflict with Yugoslavia and the Rajk trial," as it was put, were rehabilitated; a number of members of the Central Committee and the Political Bureau who were accused of being defenders of the "hard line" and "the cult of the individual" were attacked and removed from the leadership of the party; there was open opposition to the leading role of the party; there was talk about the "democratization" of the state and it was decided that the use of the term "the dictatorship of the proletariat" should be given up; the socialist system and, especially, the cooperativist system for the development of agriculture were attacked; the former line for the industrial development of the country was condemned; it was decided to adopt and apply "workers' self-management" in the economy, according to the Yugoslav example; it was decided to extend the private sector, especially in artisan production, services, trade and the production of building materials; it was decided to adopt a policy of collaboration and agreement with the church; to introduce the teaching of religion in the schools; to encourage "the democratic flowering of literature and the arts"; to recognize and take account "of the specific features of Poland in the kind of socialism which we are going to build," socialism which "could be Soviet or Yugoslav, but could also be Polish"; "to strengthen links with foreign countries, with our friend, the Soviet Union, and other socialist countries," but also to take "greater steps in the direction of collaboration

and coexistence with the Western countries,”* etc., etc.

In broad outline this was the content of the 8th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP. This was the platform of the so-called “Polish October.” Poland was to “advance” on the basis of this platform. In the end, however, the plenum pointed out that “this is still insufficient. This still does not guarantee that the ship will sail on a new course and at the proper time.” Therefore, instructions were issued that further efforts must be made “to bring about the maximum changes in the basis of management so the ship would no longer pitch and roll.”

The 9th, 10th and 11th Plenums of the CC of the PUWP which were held during 1957 completed everything the 8th Plenum had left out.

The “Polish October,” a cynical allusion to the Russian October of 1917, was carried out completely. In its entire essence and content, however, it was a parody of October 1917, its opposite, a tragi-comedy of the revolution. It was opening for Poland the phase of the triumph of a new and peculiar kind of 18th Brumaire. This was not the 18th Brumaire of Napoleon the 3rd, but of first secretaries of the so-called Polish Communist Party. Saboteurs of communism, the heads of the new Polish bourgeoisie, were to disguise themselves under their allegedly communists “suits” just as under the “socialist” cloak of Poland the old capitalist order was to be totally restored and consolidated. From this view-point, what was occurring in Poland was both something “new” and something old.

The modern revisionists welcomed the “Polish October” with fanfares as a “new development of roads to socialism,” as a concrete confirmation of the line of the 20th Congress on the “creative development of Marxism in conformity with the

* Information Bulletin of the 8th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, Fund 14, File 6, CAP.
106

national conditions.”

The Yugoslav and Italian revisionists, in particular, found in their Polish colleagues close collaborators, not only for the attack on socialism as a system (a thing which was being done by the revisionists of the other parties) but also the first collaborators for the great confusion which had begun to show up and would erupt within the ranks of the revisionist herd.

The only party which raised its voice at that time against the course events were taking in Poland was the Party of Labour of Albania. On October 13, 1956, before the 8th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP began, Comrade Enver Hoxha pointed out in the Political Bureau of the CC of the PLA: “Our opinions about the course for the triumph of the revolution and the construction of socialism are the opposite of those of the Polish party...”*

A few days after the 8th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, on November 3, 1956, again in the Political Bureau of the CC of the PLA, Comrade Enver Hoxha described the newly elected Polish leadership in this way: “...It is clear to us that those who are now in power in Poland, such as Gomulka and company, are counter-revolutionaries... The Polish leadership is launching demagogic slogans with the aim of deceiving the people and the politically unclear communists, and strengthening their positions... Let Gomulka continue in this way if he wants to, we shall proceed on our own course.”**

Furthermore:

“The course which Poland has followed and is following is not a correct and Marxist course, but is nationalist... That an allegedly Marxist leadership should come to power with ultra-democratic slogans, which in reality are anti-socialist, on the pretext that the people have allegedly lost their freedom

* Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 14, p. 54, Alb. ed.

** Ibid., pp. 68-69.

and sovereignty..., this is hostile. Therefore, in our opinion the present Polish leadership is anti-Marxist, not internationalist... They are making peace with internal and external reaction and heading for the degeneration of the socialist order. They are social-chauvinists, social-democrats, hence, not Marxists or internationalists.”*

These truths, which are now clear to everybody, the PLA said not in 1966 or in 1976, but as early as 1956, at a time when these things were still “not plain” to many people, the time when the revisionists were doing everything under a smokescreen of demagogy and with extremely great caution.

Here we presented only two or three passages, mostly conclusions, from a whole series of documents which reflect the profound Marxist-Leninist analyses which the PLA made of the international situation and of the communist and workers’ movement in particular at that time. Comrade Enver Hoxha’s report, “On the International Situation and the Tasks of the Party,” delivered at the 3rd Plenum of the CC of the PLA on February 13, 1957, especially, is a brilliant document in this direction. It speaks of the unwavering adherence to principle of the PLA, of its ability to recognize and explain events on a sound materialist basis, of its courage to say things openly just as they are, of its determination and loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and its ardent internationalism to assist the sister parties with its opinion and experience.

Regrettably, however, the voice of the PLA was the only Marxist-Leninist voice which was raised at that time against the ominous threat of revisionism. The euphoria about “the new line” of the 20th Congress of the CPSU had impaired the judgement of the Polish party, therefore, like the others, it identified the voice of the PLA with the voice of “dogmatism” and “Stalinism.”

* Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 14, pp. 170-171, Alb. ed.

In those days the radio station “Free Europe” eulogized Poland as “the hope of the world” and for the Polish revisionists this voice was more soothing and pleasant than any other.

Modern revisionism triumphed completely in Poland. Anything good from the past was finally wiped out.

The *Polish United Workers’ Party* ceased to be the vanguard of the Polish proletariat. After a few ineffectual writhings in the first months after the 8th Plenum, the sound communist forces in the PUWP were virtually silenced and regrettably nothing more is being heard of them. The 1948 condemnation of the “right nationalist deviation” and subsequent decisions connected with this were officially rescinded; even those expelled who had not thought of returning to the party, since they had forgotten that they had once been Polish “communists,” were readmitted to the party. The process did not cover only the period from the “Cominform on.” It went further back in history. The time came for the Comintern and the resolutions of the Communist International in which the repeated deviations of the former Polish Communist Party (1918-1938) were condemned, to be described as unjust, in the same way as the decision of 1938 on the dispersal of the PCP, which had fallen into the hands of Trotskyites and of the fascists, was described as “unjust” and “harmful.”

The process of the further degeneration of the party developed so rapidly that only a year after the 8th Plenum the Polish revisionist leadership itself had to sound the alarm about the situation created. In the wave of embezzlements and thefts which were thriving all over Poland in 1957, Gomułka and company were obliged to admit that included in this wave were “a large number of party members who take no account of the cause of the party..., hypocrites and careerists, clergymen under vow..., who commit scandalous acts, demagogues, work-dodgers, drunkards, demoralized, indifferent

and passive individuals...,”* etc.

Those same days, that is one year after the 8th Plenum which crowned the “Polish October,” Gomulka had to admit regretfully: “The unity of our party has been seriously undermined and as a result of this the Party cannot perform its functions.”** This situation “arose first of all from the ideological corruption which can be seen among a considerable number of activists of the party at all levels,” continued Gomulka and as though to allow no equivocation he said explicitly that “this corruption was introduced into the party... at the time when it formed its new political line...”***

Obviously the offensive of modern revisionism was not confined within the party alone. Serious corruption began in the organizations of the masses. In 1956 at the plenum of trade-unions and at the national conference of the youth there was a great deal of talk about the independence of the mass organizations from the party.**** The confusion and the destruction of the unity within the party was reflected immediately on the unity between the party and the people. The distrust of the working masses in the party began to increase more and more. This distrust, which quickly turned into an open hatred, was fully warranted for a traitor party like the PUWP. But the regrettable thing is that the discontent and the revolt from below were expressed only spontaneously, in a completely unorganized way. The Polish working class and people had been left without their leading staff.

From those moments another painful negative process, the

* Instruction of the CC of the PUWP addressed to all instances and party basic organizations, November 1957, Fund 14, File 2, pp. 3-4, CAP.

** Report by W. Gomulka in the 10th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, October 24, 1957, p. 3, CAP.

*** Ibid., p. 4.

**** Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 14, p. 261, Alb. ed.

bitterest consequence of the restoration of capitalism, began in Poland: the ideo-political corruption, the confusion of the Polish proletariat and working masses. Left without its vanguard staff, the Polish proletariat was exposed to the poison of the Catholic Church, of the modern revisionists in power and of Polish reaction at home and abroad. In the consciousness of certain contingents of this proletariat doubts and distrust gradually began to take root, not only in regard to the party in power which called itself “communist,” but also in regard to the socialist order which was confused from every aspect with the restored capitalism in the process of consolidation in Poland. The degeneration of the party was very soon to exert its influence on the degeneration of all sectors of life.

Carrying through the work for the destruction of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which was labelled “democratization of the state,” beginning from December 1956, decisions and instructions began to come out, one after another, on the decentralization of the state power, “giving the greatest possible competences to the base” in deciding the policy of the plan, the budget, distribution, labour power,* etc. According to the instruction of the 8th Plenum that all those who were rehabilitated “should be placed in the positions due to them in the party, state, economy and institutions,”** many of the former cadres were replaced with degenerate new elements and former enemies now brought to power.

One of the most important counter-revolutionary measures which Gomulka took after his ascent to power was the dispersal of the youth organization, “The Union of Polish Youth — ZMP,” thus throwing mud at the course this or-

* Speech by W. Gomulka in the 9th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, May 1957, pp. 25-26, CAP.

** Information Bulletin of the 8th Plenum of the PUWP, Fund 14, File 1, pp. 20-21, CAP.

ganization had followed from the liberation of the country to 1956. He arbitrarily summoned the congress of this organization and compelled its leadership to proclaim the dispersal of the organization and the formation in place of it of two organizations, "The Union of Polish Socialist Youth," which was to operate in the cities, and "The Union of Peasant Youth." As Comrade Enver Hoxha has pointed out, in the series of arbitrary changes imposed by Gomulka, "the whole leadership of the trade-unions was removed and replaced with new leaders. Many proven officers were dismissed from the army... and many others began to be rehabilitated, including old officers, who had fled abroad or had served in the British Air Force (RAF)."^{*}

Gomulka and company now had the opportunity to propagate and openly apply as the official line of the party all the bourgeois and Titoite theories about "the great evils of the dictatorship of the proletariat." Cloaked as the struggle against "bureaucracy" and "Stalinism" and served up with vows that only abandonment of the dictatorship of the proletariat would really bring the working class to power (!), these hostile actions of Gomulka's were peddled to the public in 1956-1957 as a "creative" application of Marxism! The Yugoslav leadership, headed by Tito, which had assimilated and applied these anti-Marxist theories many years before, had no reason to be displeased that the main role in this "creation" was now passing to Gomulka in Poland, Khrushchev in the Soviet Union or Kadar in Hungary! The Titoites were more interested in ensuring that these bourgeois and revisionist theories about the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and about socialism in general were disseminated and applied. As for their "creation" the Titoites knew very well that the merit belonged neither to Khrushchev, nor Gomulka, nor to

^{*} Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 14, pp. 234-235, Alb. ed.

Tito and Kardelj. At the most, their only merit was that they were the first to assimilate and apply those theories which the bourgeoisie and reaction had concocted long before.

Only one Party sounded completely out of tune with all this. It was the PLA. "Those who revise the Marxist theory on the dictatorship of the proletariat under the banner of the struggle against 'Stalinism' and 'bureaucracy,'" pointed out Comrade Enver Hoxha, "reject the whole of Marxism-Leninism; in reality they betray the proletariat and go over to the bourgeoisie."^{*} The allusion was more than clear. This was a direct accusation aimed against W. Gomulka and his line as well as against all the others. Only a short time later, this conclusion which Comrade Enver Hoxha reached in 1957 and which was described by the revisionists at that time as an expression of "dogmatism" was to be proved correct and far-sighted by endless facts from the reality. We shall speak about this below. We are still in the phase when Gomulka was demonstrating all his "creative" fervour in all fields.

Under his care the doors began to open everywhere to bourgeois ideology and religious ideology in particular. In May 1957 Gomulka boasted to the 9th Plenum of the Central Committee about the great possibilities and favourable conditions which had been provided for the spread and propagation of religion, saying that "the situation created in our country is unrivalled in the other socialist countries or even in such capitalist countries as France or the USA."^{**} And he went on: "Undoubtedly believers and non-believers, the Church and socialism, the people's power and the power of the Church will be living side by side for a long time... We arrive at this conclusion proceeding from the premise of the indispensabil-

^{*} Ibid., p. 270.

^{**} Speech by W. Gomulka in the 9th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, May 1957, p. 38, CAP.

ity of coexistence.”*

In the context of this policy, Gomulka began to make reforms in the *economy*, one after the other. Although the fundamental laws of socialist construction had been neglected or applied with major shortcomings and defects in Poland before this, from now on they were abandoned violently. The restoration of capitalism in Poland was taking place at rates never seen before. Indeed, even at the first moments, when the other revisionists like the Czechs, the Bulgarians, etc., were hesitant and wary about making direct attacks on socialism, Gomulka proved to be the standard-bearer. “No one should be concerned about the situation in Poland and the course we follow for the construction of socialism,” he said at the 8th Plenum and continued, “this course could be Soviet or Yugoslav, but it could also be Polish.”**

A few months later, boasting the so-called “Polish road to socialism,” at the 9th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, Gomulka said, “The practice of the construction of socialism in different countries has not created a universal form of the construction of socialism... There is not and cannot be a universal form...”***

By theorizing about the existence or non-existence of a “universal socialism,” what Gomulka was aiming at, of course, was the rejection of the universal laws of socialist construction. The Polish “socialism,” like the Yugoslav “socialism,” was going to be far removed from the universal laws of socialism. Concretely:

In the field of agriculture Gomulka and company had no

* Speech by W. Gomulka in the 9th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, May 1957, p. 38, CAP.

** Information Bulletin of the 8th Plenum of the PUWP. Fund 14, File 6, p. 31, CAP.

*** Speech by W. Gomulka in the 9th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, May 1957, p. 3, CAP.

need to make much effort for the restoration of private property. This sector in Poland in 1955 owned about 85 per cent of the arable land compared with 1 to 2 per cent owned by nearly 10 thousand agricultural cooperatives. Hence, Gomulka had to make only “a modest” contribution to the deepening of this disproportion in favour of the private sector. In 1956 the private sector in agriculture covered over 86 per cent of the total area compared with about 1 per cent which “remained” at the disposal of agricultural cooperatives.* Under Gomulka’s instructions some thousands of cooperatives were broken up, but not all of them, because otherwise the counter-revolution would be very obvious. Thus, from about 9,800 agricultural cooperatives which existed in Poland at the end of 1955, in 1970, the last year of Gomulka’s reign, only about 1,100 agricultural cooperatives were left, and even these had been radically transformed and were dominated by the kulak stratum and the Polish squires. However, not content with this “modest” contribution which he had to make in this direction, as early as 1956-1957 Gomulka demonstrated that he was a sworn enemy of socialism in other, more important directions:

First, he openly attacked the cooperative system in agriculture. Comparing the kulak farms with the agricultural cooperatives at the 8th Plenum of the CC, he reached the conclusion that the picture of the agricultural cooperatives showed nothing but “a bitter prospect, with poor results in production and high costs of production, while as for the political aspect, I am not touching that problem.”**

From that time on, the cooperative system in agriculture was destroyed in Poland, just as it had been in Yugoslavia

* The 3rd Congress of the PUWP, March 1959, p. 104, CAP.

** Information Bulletin of the 8th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, Fund 14, File 6, pp. 20-21, CAP.

years before, and it was never mentioned again. If a few agricultural cooperatives remained, this exception to the “general rule in Poland” was permitted for purposes of camouflage and demagoguery: “In Poland there is freedom for everything, indeed... even for agricultural cooperatives”! Later, like the whole Polish economy, even these “oases of socialism” were to be turned into collective capitalist associations in which the corrupted managers, the new capitalists, made the law. Things went on in this way until 1981, when mobs of kulaks and private farmers attacked the territories of Gomulka’s cooperatives and, like the squires of earlier times, seized whole areas, taking personal possession of them.

As for the state sector in agriculture, the efforts of Gomulka and Gierek in favour of “socialism” after 25 years of labour brought forth a mouse: about 1 to 2 per cent was added to the 12 per cent of the total area covered by the state farms in 1958.

Second, from the first moments of his advent to power Gomulka took all the necessary measures, not only to perpetuate the system of private property and inheritance of land, but also to ensure that the kulaks and the big landowners had unlimited possibilities and complete freedom to enrich themselves. “In order to strengthen the sense of ownership among the peasants,” he declared at the 8th Plenum, “it is necessary to remove the restrictions on the purchase and sale and the right to inheritance of land, including the lands given to the peasants under the agrarian reform.”*

These directives were put into practice immediately. The buying and selling of land became an everyday phenomenon in the Polish countryside and the number of private farms with 5 to 10 times the “average” area of land allowed for pri-

* Information Bulletin of the 8th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, Fund 14, File 6, p. 23, CAP.
116

vate ownership increased steadily. The machine and tractor stations began to be broken up and the machinery was sold to or left in the hands of private owners.

Hence, a kind of society with one leg private and one “socialist” — this was the image of the Polish society in 1956-1957. Gomulka called this the “Polish road to socialism”!

The truth is, however, that the so-called socialist leg of the Polish economy was to be completely subjected to profound operations through Gomulka’s reforms.

Compelled to stick to the Khrushchevite model, Gomulka did not demand that the state economic enterprises, which included more than 99.7 per cent of all the enterprises in the country in 1957, should be returned to private owners. Although, as an old opportunist, his inclinations were more towards the Western model of capitalist development, still he could not act differently from the flock. Therefore, according to the Soviet example and under the dictate of the Kremlin, the previous state forms of ownership and administration in the economy were retained in Poland, too. As in the revisionist Soviet Union and the other former socialist countries, however, there too, the socialist essence of this property was transformed. It was turned into state capitalist property, the economic base of the new revisionist bourgeoisie.

Besides being a Khrushchevite, indeed before coming under the control of Khrushchev, however, Gomulka had been a convinced Titoite and branded as such. Now that he had taken power he could not forget his old love. Therefore, besides their Khrushchevite basis, Gomulka’s reforms in the economy also have strong Titoite overtones.

Gomulka expressed this tendency at the 8th Plenum of the CC when he declared that Poland would advance by following “the Yugoslav model of workers’ self-management.”*

* Ibid.

Directives were issued there that Polish delegations should go to Yugoslavia “to study the experience of self-management on the spot, and not only in the economy, but also in the other sectors.”* On the basis of these directives and the experience gained in Yugoslavia, the decentralization of the policy of planning, production, the budget, investments, distribution, prices, and so on, began to be carried out. The so-called “workers’ councils” began to be set up in Poland, just as in Yugoslavia. By September 1957, i.e., less than four months from the 9th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP at which the formation of these organisms was decided, “workers’ councils” had been set up in 4,316 of the 10,800 state enterprises which operated in Poland.**

Profit became the prevailing motto. There was propaganda about making profit everywhere: it replaced any other stimulus or means to encourage production. “Numerous material stimuli should be applied,” stressed Gomulka at the 8th Plenum of the CC, and, to make this clearer, he brought up the example of the mining enterprises. “The stimulus,” he explained, “will consist of the fact that for every ton of coal extracted above the plan, the profit will be divided amongst the workers of the respective enterprise and the state administration... For example, it is possible that a certain number of workers might want the surplus extracted by them to be sold outside the state and to gain foreign currency to buy special goods. Others might want the profit to buy houses or something else and even to create small private economies of production...”***

* Information Bulletin of the 8th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, Fund 14, File 6, pp. 26, CAP.

** Report by W. Gomulka in the 10th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, October 1956, File 5/B, p. 35, CAP.

*** Information Bulletin of the 8th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, Fund 14, File 6, p. 23, CAP.

A little later, at the 10th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, Gomulka did not forget to stress the following: “The profit which the enterprise makes (after deducting the part that belongs to the state) passes completely into the hands of the collective... In the division of the profit the leadership ought to be in privileged positions.”*

This is not the place to dwell on what the essence of “self administration” represents, as this is well known. As to what “benefits” this self-management brought the Polish working class, this we shall see below. All that I want to stress here is the fact that after Gomulka’s reforms in the field of the economy, “Polish socialism” assumed completely capitalist characteristic features. From now on it would proceed on both legs — agriculture and industry, on the rails of capitalism.

At the same time, within the great “creative” possibilities which “Polish socialism” opened up, Gomulka went even further. As early as the 8th Plenum he advocated the extension of the number of private enterprises in production, services and trade. “By removing the administrative difficulties and creating suitable conditions for each of them,” pointed out Gomulka, “small-scale private production can be developed... by anyone, and this must find support in the political line of the party and the state.”** As a result of this, between November 1956 and June 1957, the number of private enterprises in production increased, while the number of workers in them was doubled. During the same period about 32,000 new artisan workshops were added and in June 1957 there were more than 180,000 private artisans in Poland.***

* Report by W. Gomulka in the 10th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, October 1956, File 5/B, p. 46, CAP.

** Information Bulletin of the 8th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, Fund 14, File 6, p. 23/1. CAP.

*** Materials of the 10th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, October 1957, p. 43, CAP.

This growth of the private sector did not satisfy Gomulka, therefore at the 10th Plenum of the CC he stressed: "We have criticism of the state authorities over the fact that they are not following a policy... of concessions towards private industry."* He went on to say: "Within the limits set by the economic policy of the party and the government, we are trying to create the best possible conditions for the development of artisan services, private production and trade. We do not determine the limits of the income of private enterprises... From the private enterprises we demand only that they respect the law and pay their taxes."**

In broad outline, this is the "Polish socialism" put forward at the 8th, 9th and 10th Plenums of the CC of the PUWP in the years 1956-1957. It was proclaimed with fanfares as "a kind of socialism" which would lead Poland to "peace and plenty"! But like its architect, the PUWP, this "socialism" was and is nothing but an amalgam of capitalism in content and socialism in phrases and forms of the superstructure. Comrade Enver Hoxha has pointed out that "The socialist and communist disguises in which they (modern revisionists — S.D.) garb their party and state are merely to deceive the people, because the character of the state or the party is defined neither by the label it bears nor by its social content alone, but first and above all by the policy pursued, whom it serves and who benefits from it."***

Socialism ceased to exist as a socio-economic order in Poland. The corrupt officials of the Polish revisionist party and state seized power in all sectors.

* Materials of the 10th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, October 1957, p. 43, CAP.

** Ibid., p. 45.

*** Enver Hoxha, Report to the 6th Congress of the PLA, *Selected Works*, vol. 4, p. 766, Eng. ed.

The revisionist peaceful counter-revolution triumphed in Poland. This was the first result of the so-called "Polish October." After this, to follow the subsequent line of the PUWP in detail is of no particular interest. In regard to the official line of the party, the whole subsequent period is a continuation and repetition of the 8th Plenum of the PUWP, with some minor retouching in content and a diversity of forms and, of course, with graver consequences. Even as a result of the line adopted, Gomulka was toppled from the throne and replaced by Gierek, and when the latter suffered the same fate as his predecessor and was replaced by Kania and a little later by Jaruzelski, from the standpoint of the line of the party no essential change took place. Only the name of the Polish Louis Bonapartes changed, while each of them stuck to the prototype of the first one — Gomulka. None of them did anything other than embrace the ready-made platform and struggle to reap the fruits of the "Polish October" of 1956-1957.

At the first moments it was thought that, as a suitable means to satisfy both those who aspired to capitalism and those who aspired to socialism (especially the proletariat and the masses), this kind of "socialism," the fruit of the peaceful counter-revolution without bloodshed or violence, would bring peace and plenty to Poland and its people. A new phase began in the life of Poland, the phase of the advance and consolidation of the counter-revolution.

From agreement to confrontation and vice-versa

We left unmentioned another "contribution" of Gomulka and his 8th Plenum: the counter-revolutionary stand towards the counter-revolutionary movement of June 1956 in Poznan.

After the slap on the bottom they received, the Polish

counter-revolutionary forces were momentarily staggered, but were not pacified and did not sit idle. Realizing that it was too soon to take a decisive revenge, for the time being they were interested in preserving the situation that had existed in the country before June. This would mean new possibilities for further manoeuvres on their part. In this direction W. Gomulka's mounting the stage would be a major victory for the forces of this wing. They were well acquainted with Gomulka's nationalist sentiments, his anti-Sovietism, his pro-Western inclinations, his views about integral democracy in "socialism," etc., etc. At the same time they counted heavily on the hostility which Gomulka had built up towards that line and those people who, some years earlier, had attacked him, had discredited him and had even imprisoned him. These are some of the reasons why the forces that organized the Poznan riots willingly embraced that ugly campaign in favour of W. Gomulka which burst out especially after June 1956. Within the party the revisionist forces led this campaign, while outside the party this was done by the forces of pro-Western reaction. Thus, immediately after the first confrontation, the agreement between the two wings of the counter-revolution was reached spontaneously.

Wladislaw Gomulka was to play the role of the moderator between the two wings. Faithful to his anti-Marxist line, at the 8th Plenum he did everything possible to bring about a reconciliation of the "angry" and the "impatient," came out openly in defence of them and even described the counter-revolutionary riots in Poznan "valuable lessons" for the party and "socialism" in Poland.

"The effort to present the painful tragedy of Poznan as the work of imperialist agents and provocateurs was great political naivety," he said. "The reasons for the tragedy of Poznan lie amongst us, in the leadership of the party and govern-

ment."*

And to leave no possible misunderstanding, Gomulka stressed that the participants in the June riots rose in protest "against shortcomings," teaching "the leadership of the party and government a painful lesson. By demonstrating they said 'enough,' 'things cannot go on like this.'"

This was how the head of Polish modern revisionism rewarded the sinister forces of society for the aid they had given him to seize power. These forces expected compensation and reward from the new head of the party, but that he would go so far as to make such statements, this could not have failed to please them. The savage desire for an open return to capitalism was immediately revived in the inspirers of the counter-revolutionary movement and they were not content simply with the political justification and the moral satisfaction which these welcome statements gave them. They immediately demanded that matters should be carried through to the end, that is, that any "remnants" from the past — both the phrases and slogans and the old forms and structures, should be rejected without any hesitation. The Polish press, from the magazine "Poprostu" to "Tribuna Ludu," were flooded with articles openly denouncing everything socialist. A little later, Gomulka himself was to rank especially the Polish Union of Writers and the broad strata of the intelligentsia among the impatient inciters and supporters of the open anti-socialist activity.

All these forces, inherited from the past or degenerated gradually, and filled with hostility towards socialism, could

* Information Bulletin of the 8th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, Fund 14, File 6, p. 22, CAP.

** Ibid.

*** Report by W. Gomulka in the 10th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, October 1956, File 5/B, p. 21, CAP.

not reconcile themselves to what was called "Polish socialism," regardless of whether or not it was what it was advertised as being.

In opposition to these forces, however, the working class and the working masses, who were interested in ensuring that "the new line," "Polish socialism," would bring the things it had promised, placed themselves in defence of this "socialism." Finding themselves so quickly and suddenly placed between two diametrically opposed currents, Gomulka and company had to manoeuvre. They strengthened the slogans supporting and defending "Polish socialism," and even issued some criticism of the ultra elements. Disillusioned, the latter took to the streets again, this time not in Poznan, but in Warsaw. Whole gangs, whom Gomulka described as "vagabonds and hooligans," turned out in demonstrations and ironically carried nothing but big slogans, "October in danger!," "the party is deviating from October," "Defend the Polish October!"* With the cold logic of the counter-revolution, these elements demonstrating in the squares and boulevards under the banner of Gomulka's own creation, the "Polish October," were telling him and his associates: "You handed us this flag, so come on then, let's go on to the end openly under the inspiration of it!"

Right at this time, there was a great upsurge of thefts, embezzlement, acts of sabotage and crime all over Poland. Thus, step by step Gomulka's "Polish socialism" was revealing what it was. With its great "freedoms," it could not fail to awaken all the dormant scum of society. Organized or not, from now on this scum was turned into a reserve of the counter-revolution. Only a year after assuming power, Gomulka admitted: "Crime can be seen on a major or minor scale in almost all

* Report by W. Gomulka in the 10th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, October 1956, File 5/B, p. 6, CAP.

fields of life. At many levels in the party and among many members of the party who have leading posts in the administration and the people's economy... indifference and inactivity towards crime prevails."* Even worse for the Polish revisionist leadership was the fact that more and more members of the PUWP were going over to the side of the "ultras." As Gomulka himself stated at the 10th Plenum, many of these "communists" were among those who shouted, "October in danger!," along with the hooligans. "Our Party has lost many of the qualities of the vanguard detachment," admonished Gomulka. "It has been partly split and has dissolved in the mass of non-party people."**

In order to cope with this wave of crime which, with the rates of its growth and the pressure which it exerted, was not only discrediting and exposing the modern revisionists, but also weakening their state power, they did not spare their reproaches or their vows that "Polish socialism" would continue on its course. Indeed, a series of "instructions" and "circulars," which the CC of the PUWP sent out all over the country in the last months of 1957, called for putting an end to "the activity of corrupt and criminal elements," as well as "cliques in the party and the organs of the state which are hindering the uncovering of crimes,"*** "spreading the theory of integral democracy..." and "blindly praising and idealizing everything which comes from the West..." etc.****

It seemed as if, with these "firm" stands, Gomulka and company had found the road of "confrontation" and "irreconcilability" with the ultra-right elements. Precisely at these

* Ibid.

** Ibid., p. 10.

*** Instruction of the CC of the PUWP addressed to all party instances and party basic organizations, November 1957, p. 1, CAP.

**** Ibid.

moments, however, amongst many factors there were two, in particular, which exerted an influence to *turn the confrontation into agreement again*.

While chaos was seething in Poland the Meeting of the communist and workers' parties of the world of November 1957 began its proceedings in Moscow. Why and how this meeting was organized is well known. In his major work "The Khrushchevites," among many reasons, Comrade Enver Hoxha stresses: "The line of 'freedom' and 'democracy,' bombastically proclaimed at the 20th Congress, was now boomeranging back on the Soviet leadership itself. The ranks had begun to disintegrate. However, the Khrushchevites needed to preserve the political-ideological 'unity' of the socialist camp and the international communist movement at all costs, at least in appearance. In this direction and for this aim the Moscow Meeting of 1957 was organized." *

At this meeting the Polish revisionists headed by Gomulka presented themselves as the most advanced wing of the revisionists and strove to give the meeting their tone. However, they were so unrestrained and hasty that they aroused the anger of Khrushchev and company. The precursors of the revisionist counter-revolution were also masterly tacticians. Gomulka, Togliatti and company had to adapt themselves to their tactics, otherwise, there was a danger that the evil deed that was being hatched up in the bosom of socialism and the communist movement would be aborted at its first steps.

Hence, for many reasons and especially "in the face of the struggle which was waged in the meeting against opportunist views on the problems discussed, the revisionists retreated...

"At this meeting, revisionism, right opportunism, was defined as the main danger in the international communist and

* Enver Hoxha, "The Khrushchevites" (Memoirs), p. 326. Eng. ed.

workers' movement."* A brief phase in the process of the revisionist counter-revolution, a phase which Comrade Enver Hoxha has described as "a temporary retreat in order to take revenge,"** commences. This was reflected in Poland, too.

The "lessons" which Gomulka and company got in Moscow as well as the tense situation which existed in Poland obliged them to be more "prudent" in their anti-socialist activities at the end of 1957 and, in this context, to strengthen the doses of "criticism" and "warnings" to the ultra-right elements. However, no "painful" intervention was required to calm the situation. Now the ultra-capitalist forces who were acting within the revisionist counter-revolution had more "experience," and they chose retreat rather than confrontation which was fraught with consequences for them.

They sensed that if they went too far, either Gomulka himself would deal them a heavy blow, or others, Khrushchev and company, would order Gomulka to deal them this blow in order to rescue the revisionist counter-revolution, its offspring — "Polish socialism," its internal and external links, etc.

Apart from this, there was also another important factor of which neither the forces linked with the peaceful counter-revolution nor the ultra-capitalist forces could fail to take account of: *the proletariat and the working masses*.

Contrary to the desire and will of Gomulka and his team, it took less than a year for the "Polish line of socialism" to be compelled to reveal itself in another very touchy direction: he was not in any way fulfilling the promises which he had made to the masses, especially in the fields of production, distribution, prices, housing conditions, etc.

Such a situation was bound to arouse disillusionment and

* Ibid., p. 337. For further details see, pp. 317-341, of this book.

** Ibid., p. 323.

indignation among the masses. Gomulka himself was obliged to admit this situation when he pointed out that: "The working class, the working people of physical and mental labour, have been obliged to tighten the belt to the limit. The mistakes in planning, the baseless promises... instead of linking the working class and masses more closely with socialism, brought a widespread feeling of disillusionment."*

The discontent of the masses was very obvious and the counter-revolutionary forces sensed that the further continuation of negative phenomena, let alone any increase of them, would make the problem extremely complicated.

Inclined towards socialism as a socio-economic order, linked with it through the blood they had shed and the aspirations they had nurtured, committed to a course which they had been told would lead to the realization of these aspirations and disillusioned by the results, the proletariat and the masses of Poland might in the end detect the betrayal which was being committed and rise again in revolution. This would mean the end, not only of the revisionist counter-revolution, but also of the forces that were fighting for capitalism with the gloves off within this counter-revolution.

Hence, *one of the main objectives of the ultra-right forces was to avert the possibility that the masses would rise in revolution again*. At the same time, this was also *the main objective of modern revisionist in power*. The two sides were in agreement on this and, to this end, they would support and back each other, that is, would enter the phase of agreement, of compromise.

For the ultra elements, the "retreat" at these moments was more suitable also for another reason: quietly, in the framework of the freedoms and great possibilities of "democratic

* Report by W. Gomulka in the 10th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, p. 30, CAP.
128

socialism," the forces of the pro-Western counter-revolution would consolidate themselves and develop better within the revisionist counter-revolution. Working from within, they would erode "Polish socialism," and, when the moment came, they would come out in the streets, in open confrontation with the ruling authorities.

Thus, from confrontation to agreement, and vice-versa, this was to be the road of the two counter-revolutionary fellow-travellers.

This whole process of alternate agreements and clashes between the internal counter-revolutionary forces, which was to go on for decades, was also to be *a reflection, a direct consequence, of the agreements and clashes between the imperialists and revisionists on the international plane*. In particular, this process of the development of contradictions in Poland would be a reflection and a bitter fruit of the alliance and permanent rivalry between international imperialism, headed by American imperialism, on the one hand, and modern revisionism, headed by Soviet social-imperialism, on the other hand.

Both sides were equally active and in alliance to cause disorganization and confusion among the Polish proletariat and working masses, but it must be pointed out that, within their counter-revolutionary alliance, rivalry, the struggle over who would dominate Poland, was always ablaze. Both sides had strong bases there and in the periods of the "peaceful" development of events each would try to increase and consolidate its forces within the country in order to throw them against the opposing forces at explosive moments. And since these internal forces of the counter-revolution themselves had turned into agencies and shock detachments of foreigners, they would be obliged to keep in step with the interests of their foreign patrons, according to the pace of their agreements or fights. The entire development of events in Poland

from 1956 on confirms this with a whole mass of facts and events.

During a “quiet” period of 10-12 years, the two wings of the counter-revolution, working in collaboration, not only restored and consolidated the capitalist order in Poland, but even worse, with their feverish activity brought other, greater, indeed incalculable harm to the Polish proletariat. They loudly publicized and peddled the restored capitalism as “socialism,” and in this way both the ultra-right forces and Gomulka, Khrushchev and all the Khrushchevites of other countries implanted doubts and disillusionment about socialism in the minds of the proletariat, “raised doubts about the vitality of the Marxist-Leninist science in the solution of current problems, about the ability of the working class to bring about the revolutionary transformation of society and about the leading role of the communist party. With all these things the Khrushchevite revisionists provided the bourgeois ideologists with powerful weapons for their anti-communist propaganda. They became a source of all types of anti-Marxist concepts about socialism.”*

In 1968-1970, the fruitful “collaboration” of 10-12 years, especially the joint crusade against socialism, gave way to one of the fiercest confrontations which post-war Polish society had known.

As we shall see below, the legitimate revolutionary revolts of the Polish proletariat, which burst out against the oppression and the grave economic and political situation that had been created in Poland, were exploited for a fierce confrontation between the two wings of the counter-revolution at this period. Proceeding from the fact that in those years the Polish proletariat launched powerful strikes and demonstrations,

* Enver Hoxha, Report to the 6th Congress of the PLA, *Selected Works*, vol. 4, p. 765, Eng. ed.

but without its own Marxist-Leninist party and, consequently, unorganized and without its own revolutionary program, the ultra-right forces strove to profit from this, even though they were taken by surprise by the outburst of the working class. Presenting themselves as “pro-worker,” they tried, in a thousand and one ways, to seize control of the legitimate movement of the proletariat and to manipulate it in their own interest. This time, too, however, the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution failed to attain its fundamental aims and, after a blood-letting for which the Polish proletariat paid the price, the phase of “agreement” was re-established between the two variants of the counter-revolution.

The fact is, however, that after each loss which the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution suffered in one direction, it triumphed over the counter-revolution in power in a number of other directions: more freedoms for its operation and organization, more positions in the whole structure and superstructure of Polish society, more economic “reforms,” more links with the capitalist countries of the West, that is, new chains for Poland through the flood of credits and loans from the West, more concessions for dissident elements, more approaches to and official links with the Vatican, etc.

The revisionist party and state themselves had to keep afloat in all these “freedoms” and “rights” which were wrested from them through confrontation and which were frequently presented as resulting from the pressure “from below,” “from the base.” What was expected to occur was coming about rapidly: the revisionist counter-revolution was more and more losing its positions and the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution was climbing to power step by step. This was an inevitable process which would be accomplished, like it or not. The more the forces of ultra-capitalist reaction

gained positions, rights and terrain within the revisionist counter-revolution, the more they were convinced that the “socialist” integument in which the anti-socialist content of the Polish state was enclosed was becoming an obstacle to the free development of all forms of Western capitalism. On the other hand, this “socialist” integument was linked with the vital interests of the revisionist team in power and its social-imperialist patrons. These two obstacles (the “socialist” integument and the forces which stood behind it) had to be overcome once and for all.

The experience of about 15 years of confrontations and agreements in the revisionist counter-revolution, as well as the unsparing aid and support of Western reaction, had convinced the ultra forces during this period that they would never accomplish anything if they failed to line up the masses, especially the proletariat and the Polish youth, under their aegis. Therefore, in the favourable conditions and circumstances created in a Poland which was capitalist, though with a “socialist” label, by coming out more and more as the “champions,” indeed as the “spokesmen” of the discontented proletariat, the ultra-reactionary forces were able to manoeuvre cunningly and to exploit in their own counter-revolutionary interests the legitimate revolts of the masses, who were more and more openly expressing their inevitable dissatisfaction and anger against the ruling order. In 1970 and 1976 and, even more, in 1980-1981, the confrontation between the two manifestations of the counter-revolution in Poland developed by exploiting the workers’ revolts and even assuming the disguise of a workers’ movement.

At the same time both in the periods of collaboration and in those of open confrontation, the counter-revolution in the counter-revolution managed to win to its side the majority of the rank-and-file of the PUWP and the structures, organs

and organizations linked with them. The more the “base” of the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution gained strength, the shorter the cycle from periods of collaboration to periods of confrontation. Whereas it took about 13-14 years of “collaboration” to reach the first confrontation after 1956, it took only 5 to 6 years to reach the second (1976) and three years after this, the third great confrontation, that of the summer of 1980, erupted.

The period from the end of August 1980, onwards, when the “Gdansk compromise” was reached (especially the period August 1980-December 1981), was nothing but the most typical expression of the more than twenty years’ “contest” between the two manifestations of the counter-revolution in Poland. The cycle from agreement to confrontation, from confrontation to agreement, and vice-versa, during this phase was no longer a matter of years or months, but a phenomenon of weeks and days. As soon as an “agreement” was reached, and it seemed as if tempers had cooled a little, the conflict burst out immediately somewhere else and confrontation again emerged in the arena. Indeed, the intensity of these leaps was so great that there seemed to be no sort of order. Chaos reigned in Poland for two years on end.

The classics of Marxism-Leninism have often spoken of the irony of history. Poland, especially in the years 1980-1981, became an unprecedented object of an all-pervading cruel irony. It seemed as if the conflicts emerged even over ridiculous causes in the general psychosis of confusion and anger. The price of vodka was raised — the ultra-right forces gave the signal and tens of thousands of people went out on strike and in demonstrations. God forbid, to raise the price of vodka on Christmas eve! — this is a sacrilege rather than a blow at the pocket! The price of cigarettes was raised — the passageways and floors of factories were filled with people who

protested for whole hours and days in sit-down strikes; 2 or 3 political dissidents or vagabonds were held by the police for some hours and immediately the forces which manipulated the workers' movement proclaimed that the whole city or the whole country was ready to go on strike.

However, neither the endless series of such "petty" causes nor the other major and very major causes which gave rise to ceaseless conflicts, as a whole, were fortuitous or the expression of some "peculiar psychosis of the Poles," who "like" anarchy and revolt (!), as the sociologists of the bourgeoisie and reaction like to say. No, in essence they were the bitter fruit of that betrayal which the united forces of the counter-revolution — the modern revisionists and the other ultra-reactionary forces, had planted and been cultivating for decades. At the same time, irrespective of the inevitable spontaneous outbursts, the chaos which swept Poland was and still is the staging of a platform carefully worked out by the ultra-reactionary internal forces and Western reaction. By means of this chaos these forces wanted to seize power and were moving rapidly towards achieving this aim. For 25 years on end, they had been nurtured and gained strength within the revisionist "peaceful" counter-revolution in order to arrive at these days. And the fact is that during this process the revisionist counter-revolution in Poland more and more lost its positions until it reached the point when it was almost totally integrated into its most open ultra-reactionary manifestation. Rather than an integration, however, this was more the inevitable development of the logic of the revisionist counter-revolution. As a counter-revolutionary process developed deliberately and consistently, it was unable to maintain its disguise for very long. One day it was bound to throw off this disguise, or it would be torn off and the real features of the revisionist counter-revolution would be exposed.

During this period, the leaders of the revisionist counter-revolution themselves, willy-nilly, were obliged to fall victims, one after the other, to the line which they had pursued.

In all their activity, they deliberately and consistently abandoned Marxism-Leninism, violated and rejected the laws of development of socialism, and embraced an anti-Marxist and anti-dialectical line. After this, however, came the time for dialectics to have its say.

THE RETRIBUTION OF DIALECTICS

"Philosophy avenges itself..."

ENGELS

Up till now our attention has been focused mainly on only one aspect of the problem — the Polish revisionists' abandonment of the universal laws of the construction of socialism.

All the chiefs of Polish revisionism, including W. Gomułka, his successor E. Gierek and the present dregs of the so-called PUWP, pose in words as master dialecticians in the application of a "new socialism," although in reality they derided dialectics and abandoned it step by step. But while they did everything they could to abandon the laws of the dialectical development of socialism, this does not mean that, subsequently, they would exclude themselves from the laws of development or, even less, that they could act according to their desire and will. "Marxism understands the laws of science..." says Stalin, "as a reflection of objective processes which take place independent of the will of men. Men can discover these laws, know them, study them, take them into

account in their actions, use them in the interest of society, but can never alter or eliminate them. Even less are they able to form or create new laws of science.”*

In order to hide the essence of their treacherous deed the Polish revisionists (like all the modern revisionists) for purposes of demagoguery have always pretended an absurdity, that they are allegedly building socialism, but not “in thrall” to universal laws, not as “dogmatists,” but as “creators,” taking into account “the national conditions,” “the new processes and reality of world and national development,” etc., etc.!! Hence, while deliberately abandoning the objective universal laws of socialist development, for purposes of demagoguery and deception, they declared that they were “seeking” and working out “new” and “better” laws of development! In reality this was abandonment of the materialist philosophy. By deliberately abandoning materialism, however, by proceeding contrary to its laws of development, they were quite unable to escape the bitter consequences of the betrayal which they committed consciously. The course which they adopted would inevitably involve them in the maelstrom of the spontaneous action of another set of laws, the laws of society with antagonistic classes. Consequently, this would sweep them away to their end — a thing which it was no longer in their power to prevent. What they had to do they had done. Now dialectics would have its say. It would avenge itself.

The end of W. Gomulka

It took less than a year from W. Gomulka’s rise to power for “Polish socialism” to show that it bore within it the seeds

* J.V. Stalin, “Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR,” 1974, p. 4, Alb. ed.
136

of the insoluble contradictions, antagonism and crisis in all fields. True, it settled accounts with the sound communist forces, but immediately after this it found itself confronted with two other forces — with the pro-Western *ultra-capitalist forces*, on the one hand, and with the *proletariat and the masses*, on the other hand. The former, sensing the phoniness of the slogans and disguises of “Polish socialism” and revitalized by the possibilities which the “October line” created for them, were to demand advance as rapidly and as far as possible on this road for the complete restoration of capitalism in Poland and for its orientation towards the West. The latter, believing the “socialist” slogans and disguises which the disciples of the “Polish October” publicized everywhere, were to demand the concrete application of these slogans in practice, that is, were to demand the freedom, plenty and independence which the “improved socialism” promised them.

However, if there was something which “Polish socialism” could never do without completely destroying itself, this was precisely the fulfilment of these two sets of diametrically opposite demands at the same time.

The first signs of this impossibility were very soon apparent. We spoke above about the corruption, embezzlement and thefts which burst out in Poland during 1957. They were the harbingers of the nature of the new order. After them came the others.

The economic difficulties mounted, the “socialist” market was being emptied and in place of it the free private market and the “illegal” black market were gaining the upper hand. The decisions about the extension of “small-scale” private trade were justified with the idea that this trade would fulfil those needs which the state was unable to fulfil, especially on the outskirts of cities, in the villages, etc. But immediately the green light was given from above, the private shops and

stores very quickly began to flourish, not only in the villages and the “back alleys” of the cities, but in the main streets and squares of Warsaw, Poznan, Lodz, Lublin, etc. In these shops you could find goods of every kind, but at prices two, three, four and more times higher than normal prices. The private traders, in agreement with the managers of the state shops, bought the goods in those shops at very low prices, held them for a time and then sold them in their own shops at prices increased four and five fold.* Gomulka and company called all this “illegal actions,” “corruption,” etc., but the truth is that from then on such phenomena became quite normal. The socio-economic system that was being consolidated, “Polish socialism,” had given them legitimacy.

In return for the trust they had placed in Gomulka’s “socialism,” as early as in 1957 the working class and the working masses in Poland received the first gift from it: prices were raised!

At the 10th Plenum Gomulka tried with great cynicism to justify this by saying that the rise in prices “mostly affects the groups who receive *high and very high salaries* (the underlining appears in the document — S.D.), it has less effect on the budgets of categories with medium or low wages because these families buy very little of the goods of the range which is included in the price rises.”**

What were these “luxury” goods which were not “within the range” of the lower-paid strata?! Gomulka went on explaining this:

“Prices have been raised for services, paper, newspapers, books and furniture. Prices of a series of agricultural products have been raised... We have also raised the prices of butter and

* Materials of the 10th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, p. 44, CAP.

** Report by W. Gomulka at the 10th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, p. 31, CAP.

cheese,” but according to Gomulka this would do no harm because “even before the price rises the lower-paid groups could not buy butter, etc...”*

From this aspect then, this was what “Polish socialism” looked like in the first stages of its legal existence: “a socialism” with “high” and “low” social class strata; a society in which services, paper, books, newspapers and a series of food products were considered a “luxury” for the lower classes, in which these “lower strata” could not buy butter and cheese and now could not even see them.

Gomulka employed demagoguery and deception to deal with the discontent of the masses. Once again he laid the blame for the new negative phenomena on “the influence of the preceding period” and “the unavoidable defects in the first steps of the new line.” Meanwhile, he also took a series of more concrete measures: a loan of 500 million dollars to buy agricultural products was secured from American imperialism and considerable “aid” from Poland’s “best friend,” the Soviet Union; the salaries of those categories affected by the rise in prices were increased; the supply of goods on the market was increased to some degree, etc.

These measures, especially the pay rises and supply of goods on the market, seemed pleasing and for a moment gave the image of a society on the road to recovery. But all these measures were merely fictitious. At the 10th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP it was stated that the following factors “have had an influence on the further increases in pay: *first*, the cancellation of many debts which Poland had to the Soviet Union, the acceptance of new credits and the reduction of expenditure for construction and defence, a thing which released considerable financial means, and, *second*, the powerful

* Ibid.

pressure for pay rises.”*

As regards the increase in the buying power of the market, “this has been achieved, not as a result of our work, not as a result of increased production, but as a result of loans which we have received from other countries.”**

It is said that history repeats itself. In the years 1980-1981 the same phenomena, except that their dimension and force were increased a hundred fold, burst out again in the life of Polish society. However, this was not a simple repetition of something from the past. It was that same past, those same phenomena of the year 1957, but now fully developed and matured. Whereas in 1957 they constituted a fragment of the start towards the catastrophe, in 1980-1981 they constituted a fragment of the catastrophe itself.

A further point: the pay rises in 1957 included those categories of working people who, in the opinion of Gomulka and company, were most affected by the rise in prices, that is, the categories with high salaries. Other decisions taken subsequently were to increase them more and more. Add to this source of corruption and enrichment the decision of the 10th Plenum that “in the field of profit-sharing the leadership must be in privileged positions,”*** add the repeated bonuses, add the endless gains from privileges and “fringe” benefits, which the revisionist state created for these officials and managers at the expense of the masses; add the thefts, the misappropriations, the corruption, the honoraria, the bribes which they grabbed in every direction (in 1981 Gierek personally and the former Prime Minister Jaroszewicz were accused of large-scale theft and embezzlement), and there you have more or less the road

* Report by W. Gomulka at the 10th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, p. 32, CAP.

** Ibid., p. 34.

*** Ibid., p. 46.

of the economic formation of the new bourgeoisie in the Polish state. In 1980-1981 Gierek and his successor Kania were obliged to admit that “a new wealthy class has been created” in Poland. There were open references in the Sejm to those “who live in fabulous conditions,” who own villas, large numbers of cars and flotillas of yachts and boats and even personal aircraft, at a time when the standard of living of the working masses is deteriorating more and more each day.

The anti-Marxist course adopted by Gomulka in 1956 and 1957 was bound to lead to this. At that time, however, it was too early to see the end of the road; only the first symptoms of the incurable ills of the capitalism which had been re-established in Poland were showing up then.

As we said, the deception and demagogy, on the one hand, and the injections of foreign loans and credits and the bombastic promises, on the other hand, had their effect on the proletariat and the working masses. They calmed down for the time being, expecting better days.

This was the start of that period of several years “calm,” when the forces of the revisionist counter-revolution and the ultra-right forces collaborated in confusing the proletariat and the masses, in discrediting the theory and practice of socialism and averting the possibility of preparations to launch the revolution.

During this phase “Polish socialism” was able to cover up its capitalist essence in the field of relations in production with a “socialist” shell, whereas in other fields this essence could not be concealed at all and no attempt was made to do so. In the field of education, in the way of life, in literature, art, culture, etc. the capitalist degeneration displayed itself quite openly. The moral degeneration, the thirst for profits, luxury and amusement, the corruption and ideo-moral dissipation, the spread of decadent bourgeois films, literature

and music, the imitation of the dissipate Western lifestyle and other ills of a society with exploiting classes — constitute the *most characteristic feature of the bourgeois evolution in Polish society at this phase*.

This image, which was advertised from all sides as “socialism,” seemed to be having its effect. It seemed that the masses were content with the endless unrestricted “freedoms” which such a society, open for everything and anybody, gave them. But the moment came when the deception could be kept up no longer. Within the ideological fog, parallel with the church, music, books, films, the pledges, promises, sex, violence and drug addiction, another process had developed and now threatened the whole of the so-called “Polish socialism” with its bitter problems. This was a material factor — an economic factor. The CC of the PUWP sounded the alarm in a “secret” letter sent to all the basic organizations of the party in December 1969. Contrary to the desires and will of Gomulka and company, but “within” the line pursued by them, the Polish economy was heading for catastrophe. If in 1957 Gomulka vented his spleen against “the bitter picture of the socialist collectivization and agriculture,” in 1969 it was his turn to taste “the sweet picture” of the capitalist ownership which he supported and propagated: the shortage of agricultural and livestock products on the market was becoming more and more acute.

In 1963 Poland, formerly an exporter of agricultural products, was obliged to import grain and fodder from abroad and in 1970 the quantity of these imports reached 2 million tons. In industry, foreign trade, etc., the situation of “Polish socialism” was just as “sweet.”

The abandonment of the policy of centralized socialist planning, the irregularities and chaos in investments, the decentralization of the management of the state property, etc.,

etc., had opened broad fields of action for competition, anarchy in production, unemployment, the free movement of prices, the decline of rates of production (“snail pace rates,” they were called in the letter of December 1969 issued by the PUWP), rising costs, falling productivity, etc.

The prospects for the future were even gloomier, and this situation could not be improved with any of the deceptive “freedoms” employed hitherto. Even if all Poland were turned into a church and all the corrupting ideologies of the world poured upon it, these things would neither increase the rates of production or fill the market. Gomulka and company sensed that the operation had to be performed where the wound lay — in the economic field.

To ease the situation a little the Gomulka team chose two main courses:

1) *The increase of foreign debts*. By 1965 the 500 million dollar debt of 1957 had grown to 950 million dollars, while in the years 1966-1969 it reached 1,100 million dollars.* In 1970 Poland had to make a repayment to foreign creditors of 300 million dollars, but it did not have the money. Moreover, it needed hundreds of millions more dollars to keep the existing economy going, to continue the construction of projects started and to cover the great shortages on the market.

Faced with this situation, the Polish leadership considered the existing debts “nothing at all” and held out its hand for a flood of new loans. From now on, not only was Poland to be built with loans, but the loans were to be paid off with loans! Gomulka sensed where this road would lead to, but there was nothing he could do about it. The dictate of the spontaneous laws of capitalism forced him to grasp at momentary solutions which might save him for today, irrespective of where they would take him tomorrow.

* “Zëri i popullit,” March 12, 1970.

2) *Increased exports* was the other course to secure the funds so badly needed to save the situation. However, the products of the Polish economy could not break into the world market. Some of them could penetrate to the East, but this would be no solution. Agricultural and livestock products could be disposed of more readily in the West, but precisely this sector was the weakest, most disorganized, with the greatest shortages, in the Polish economy. Nevertheless, there was no other way. After many efforts, "grasping at straws," in December 1970 Gomulka, faced with mounting difficulties, thought he had found the solution: it was decided to raise the prices of agricultural and livestock products in particular with the aim of reducing internal consumption so that the "surpluses" could be exported to the West.

On December 13, 1970 the Polish government made public its decision about raising prices. The increases were as follows: for meat 19 per cent, fat 33.4 per cent, flour 16 per cent, bread 24 per cent, milk 8 per cent, cheese 25 per cent, fish 19 per cent, building materials 28-67.8 per cent, coal 10 per cent, fabrics 14.5 per cent, footwear 23.8 per cent, furniture 15.6 per cent, etc.

As a result of these increases the costs of each family went up 20 per cent. Commencing from January 1, 1971, house rents were to be doubled.

This was the last straw that broke the camel's back. On Monday, December 14, crowds of young people and workers poured into the streets of Gdansk and blocked the centre of the city. The police used water cannon in their efforts to disperse the demonstrators. On Tuesday the dockers and the housewives joined the demonstrators. The movement extended to Gdynia and Sopot. A state of emergency was declared in Gdansk and communications with the other part of the country cut off. But the demonstrations continued more

powerfully and each day both the ranks of the demonstrators and the repressive measures against them increased. The then Prime Minister, Cyrankiewicz, warned in a speech that the police had been ordered to open fire at any "critical" moment. Troops, tank detachments, etc. had sealed off all the cities within a radius of 60 kilometres.

The dramatic proportions which the confrontation attained, the workers' determination to oppose the ruling regime at any cost, the dauntless spirit of revolt, the lofty proletarian solidarity, etc. indicated the utter failure and exposure of "Polish socialism." At the same time these events were demonstrating that the Polish proletariat, the first among the former socialist countries, had risen to their feet, declaring openly that the regime in power was not a workers' regime, that it was the main source of all evils and, consequently, deserved to be overthrown. Assessing these justified movements of the working class as to their importance both to Poland and to the other revisionist countries, Comrade Enver Hoxha wrote: "The struggle of the Polish working class marks a phenomenon new to the revisionist countries... In December the division was made in Poland between the working class and the revisionist government in power... for the first time the workers, on the one hand, and the revisionists, on the other, confronted each other face to face as two formed antagonistic classes."*

In the character of this movement, however, especially during its final phase, painful contradictions could be seen: along with the International, the religious hymn "God Save Poland" was sung; the counter-revolutionary regime was condemned, but without a clear alternative, without a revolutionary program. Moreover, the counter-revolutionary regime was

* Enver Hoxha, "Against Modern Revisionism 1971-1975," p. 12, Alb. ed.

confounded with socialism by certain elements and strata and the evils of the restored capitalism were attributed to socialism.

The reason for this contradiction lay in a bitter fact: the Polish working class *was the first to differentiate and rise against the revisionist clique* (and herein lies one of its great merits) but *it lacked its own vanguard party*, lacked Marxist-Leninist organization and leadership. It rose because it could no longer tolerate the bitter reality, but immediately after this, forces alien and hostile to the proletariat — the forces of ultra-right reaction, which had strengthened and organized themselves better, rushed to seize the place left empty by the lack of a vanguard.

Well-supported and guided by imperialism and Western reaction, the Vatican and the Roman Catholic Church, these forces had made an attempt to come out in open confrontation with the Gomulka clique as early as 1968. They demanded greater liberalization of the internal life, the all-round strengthening and extension of relations with the West, open support for the Israeli aggression in June 1967 against the Arab countries, etc. "The reactionary Polish intelligentsia, guided by world capitalism, the Christian and Jewish clergy, is not satisfied with the revisionist clique of Gomulka and wants to get rid of it,"* wrote Comrade Enver Hoxha at those moments. Those who emerged on the scene in March 1968 were mainly the students who organized powerful disturbances in the University of Warsaw, "while the leaders of the plot," as Comrade Enver Hoxha pointed out, "kept in the background."**

After these events, especially after the severe blow which

* Enver Hoxha, "Against Modern Revisionism 1968-1970," p. 61, Alb. ed.

** Ibid., p. 154.

Gomulka dealt the disturbances of March 1968, the ultra-light chiefs of the counter-revolutionary plot understood more clearly that their cause and that of their Western patrons could not make any serious advance towards realization relying only on the influence they had among the reactionary Polish intelligentsia and certain contingents of students and hooligans. They could achieve nothing unless they managed to deceive the working class and masses and exploit them for their own interests. Precisely for this reason, the ultra-reactionary forces began to present themselves as "pro-worker," especially after 1968. The Polish reality itself aroused the justified revolt of the masses and, in this suitable terrain, when the working class had been unable to produce its legitimate champion and vanguard from its own ranks, the ultra-right forces cunningly began to present themselves as "defenders of the rights and interests of the workers." And the fact is that by posing as "not connected" directly with the exploiting officials, indeed as exploited and persecuted by "socialism" in power, these forces managed to extend their influence to not inconsiderable contingents of the working class and certain other strata of the working masses, as well as to the Polish intelligentsia and youth. As before, they still kept themselves "out of the public eye" and, in collaboration with the revisionist chiefs, deepened the process of the deception and corruption of the consciousness of the masses for their own ulterior motives.

The legitimate outbursts of the workers of the northern zones at the end of 1970 took these forces of ultra-right reaction by surprise and this explains the fact that in the strikes and demonstrations during December 1970 and January 1971 "there were no reactionary slogans." "This means," as Comrade Enver Hoxha wrote at the time, "that Polish reaction was taken by surprise and could not interfere and disturb

the waters.”* Although they found themselves “left out of the dance,” these forces immediately went into action, put an end to their collaboration with the Gomulka revisionists, came out in open confrontation with them, posed as “pro-worker,” and manoeuvred with the workers’ legitimate demands in order to seize the reins of the movement. That is, the erstwhile ally of the revisionist counter-revolutionaries openly displayed its savage teeth: it was aiming at power. Comrade Enver Hoxha’s definition of the chiefs of the disturbances of 1968: “The Polish counter-revolutionaries... have risen against the Gomulka revisionist counter-revolutionaries,”** was valid also for the ultra-right forces that tried to seize the reins of the movement in 1970.

The Polish proletarians, especially those of the northern zones, constituted the base of this movement. The factors which caused them to rise against the existing situation were mainly objective. But the Polish proletariat went into action unorganized and, even more important, without its own leading staff, the Marxist-Leninist party. Engels says, “...the proletariat becomes a force from the moment when it creates an independent workers’ party.”***

Worse still, both because of the lack of organization of the proletariat on a national scale, and because of the feverish efforts and the fascist actions of the Gomulka clique to isolate and suppress the revolt as quickly as possible, in fact the workers’ movement was not extended to the other zones of the country. Precisely because of this, the lofty act of the Polish proletarians who rose openly against the revisionists in

* Enver Hoxha, “Political Diary on International Problems,” 1970, Central Archives of the Party.

** Enver Hoxha, “Against Modern Revisionism 1968-1970” p. 61, Alb. ed.

*** K. Marx-F. Engels, *Works*, 2nd Russ. ed., vol. 16, p. 69.

power was doomed to failure.

As we said, the pro-Western ultra-capitalist reaction, the Polish Catholic Church and the Vatican, all tried to exploit the legitimate workers’ movements. These forces had two main aims:

First, the powerful movements of the workers of the Baltic constituted a great danger, not only for the Polish revisionists headed by the Gomulka-Cyrankiewicz clique, but also for ultra-right reaction, the Catholic Church and Western reaction. If these movements were to be developed, extended and deepened further, they might wipe out not only the pro-Khrushchevite counter-revolutionaries but all the other groups and groupings of Polish counter-revolutionaries as well. Therefore, by coming out as opponents of the Gomulka regime, the forces of ultra-right reaction tried to identify themselves with the “pro-worker forces,” to unite with the demonstrators, with the aim of putting them under their control, under rein, that is, to block the road to and avoid the possibility, not only of the outbreak of the revolution, but also of the eruption of any movement outside the control of reaction.

Second, the ultra-right forces strove to seize control of the workers’ movement with the aim of using its weight to manoeuvre more effectively in the old struggle to seize power from pro-Soviet revisionist reaction and to link Poland with American imperialism. At those moments Comrade Enver Hoxha wrote, “Everything that has occurred these days in the Baltic cities indicates the decay of the revisionist regime of Gomulka and the resurgence of Polish reaction which will go even further, taking advantage of the all-round degeneration of Poland.”*

From this standpoint, the clash of the ultra-right forces and the revisionist forces was an open expression of the

* Enver Hoxha, “Political Diary on International Problems” 1970, CAP.

counter-revolution within the counter-revolution. However, this counter-revolutionary outburst, too, was doomed to failure.

Apart from internal factors (the ultra-capitalist forces had still not achieved an adequate phase of development, maturity and organization; they were taken by surprise by the workers' movement; their influence was still restricted to small contingents of the proletariat and in the masses, there were still illusions about "socialism" in Poland, etc.), in the suppression of the riots of 1970-1971, the external factor, first of all, the Russian dictate, played a major role.

In the first phase (1953-1956), this external factor played an inciting, inspiring, but not determining role in throwing the PUWP into the arms of Soviet revisionists, while now matters had advanced much further. From 1956 on, either through direct links or through Comecon and the Warsaw Treaty, Poland, like the other countries of the "socialist community," had been placed completely under Soviet political, economic and military occupation. During this period, the anti-Soviet element, Gomulka, had turned into an obedient tool who hastened to approve and apply the dictate of Moscow.

Consequently, Gomulka and company no longer decided and determined what was going on in Poland. The order was issued by Moscow. This was seen clearly in these events.

The events in Poland shook the Soviet overlords deeply: if the Polish workers' movements were further deepened, extended and organized, this would mean that the revolution would break out and be carried through there. And the heads of the Kremlin, all the modern revisionists, and the whole international reaction were more afraid of this than anything else. Therefore, besides putting their military forces in and around Poland on the alert, they ordered Gomulka to un-

leash the "black hundreds" against the workers. Just as the chiefs of Moscow could not accept the victory of the Polish proletariat, however, neither could they accept the victory of the ultra-capitalist forces which were obviously trying to manipulate and take control of the workers' movement. If this came about, it would mean that Poland would break out of the Russian orbit and be included in the Western domain. For the Soviet social-imperialists this would be a loss with catastrophic consequences. Therefore, they stepped up their pressure and dictate more than ever. When no measures of pacification and demagoguery yielded results, Gomulka was ordered to put the army and police in readiness because "the critical moment" had arrived. The revolts were suppressed under the hail of bullets and the tank tracks at the cost of at least 45 people killed (some say more than 150 were killed), most of them workers, and hundreds of others wounded.

The Gomulka tragedy was first staged in October 1956 with a "peaceful" demonstration of tanks and troops, and the curtain was run down on it with 45 dead in 1970. But this was no normal stage drama. The dead would never rise again.

Since the "socialism" of Poland still had to be called "socialism," however, an acceptable end had to be found for everything that had occurred. Now the tragedy assumes the colours of a tragi-comedy.

W. Gomulka, the leader of Polish modern revisionism, the enemy and destroyer of socialism in Poland, was accused of pursuing "hardline," "dogmatic," "Stalinist socialism"! This kind of "socialism" allegedly applied by Gomulka had brought these results!

On December 20, 1970, Gomulka and a handful of his collaborators, including the notorious Spychalski and Kliszko, were dismissed from their functions. When they came to power in 1956, they cynically declared that socialism in Po-

land had been consigned to “a past which will never return.” Now it was their turn to be consigned to the rubbish-bin. The line which they pursued was to consign them there, because, as Lenin said, “...history is a stern mother who does not hesitate when it comes to retribution.”*

Immediately after this, it was proclaimed that the former line must be replaced with a “new line,” with a “new,” “creative,” “democratic socialism” which would bring “peace, unity and plenty.”

The 8th Plenum of October 1956 was repeated in 1970, almost as an exact copy! The same accusations about “the past,” the same platform for the future, the same slogans and disguises for further deception, that is, “Gomulka’s socialism” remained in force but now without Gomulka. Edward Gierek came to the top. Under his leadership “Gomulka’s socialism” was to play the last card of the utter humiliation and degeneration of the whole life of the country, of the base and superstructure of the Polish society.

The end of E. Gierek

The most urgent task for E. Gierek and his team was to build the image of a society which, *first*, would preserve the structures of the Gomulka period, the links with the Soviet Union and the positions and privileges of the revisionist forces in power; *second*, would satisfy the demands of the pro-Western reactionary forces and, *third*, would fulfil the demands of the proletariat and the masses who were in revolt. In short, he had to reconcile the irreconcilable in a single unity — these were the paths on which E. Gierek was obliged to manoeuvre.

* M. Gorky, “V.I. Lenin” (Taken from the book, “Memoirs about Lenin,” Tirana 1977, p. 194, Alb ed.) 162

It was not within his power or his will to act otherwise. He had joined in the dance and, now that he was placed at the head, he had to keep in step with the drum.

To pacify and satisfy the ultra-capitalist forces, the new team in power made all-round concessions:

“*Religious freedom*” was one of the slogans which reaction had placed over the heads of the workers risen in the revolts of 1970-1971, as though this “freedom” had been absent in past and would save them from suffering and social injustice in the future! The PUWP and the Polish capitalist state, which throughout their existence had proved more pro-Catholic than anyone, had no reason to withhold the last reservations: with the advent to power of Gierek the Catholic Church was given the right to approve or disapprove the ascent of one or the other revisionist team to the throne. The position of the Church became dominant.

The approval of the Church would mean the “approval of the nation.” The Vatican, the bourgeoisie and reaction had worked for this strengthening of the power of the Church, but above all the modern revisionists themselves had worked for it. In 1970 Poland had 25 dioceses and 68 bishops as against 20 dioceses and 47 bishops in 1937; the 9,530 priests in 1937 had increased in 1970 to 13,765, while the number of monks had increased nearly 5 fold; from 5,120 churches in 1937, in 1970 their number reached 11,709 and the number of monasteries had risen from 99 to 361. During this period the assets of churches were more than doubled and with the aid of the “socialist” state, 516 churches had been rebuilt and 402 new churches were constructed. The Polish state displayed special care for the training of new priests. In 1970, there were 47 seminaries with 3,805 pupils and 2 Catholic higher schools (the Catholic University of Lublin with 4 branches and 1,500 students and the Academy of Catholic Theology in Warsaw,

with 3 branches and about 500 students), functioning in Poland. Apart from these, in 1970 there were 18,000 Catholic centres (for the religious education of the population), and 5,287 parishes with 27,897 nuns.

Through 52 different religious newspapers and magazines, with the total print of 550,000 copies, through books, special religious studies, etc. the Polish Catholic Church exerted its influence all over Poland.

And since all these were considered inadequate, the Gierek team completed what was missing: by 1976 the number of churches reached 16,000, while the number of priests, monks and nuns increased as nowhere else. During 1976, for example, Poland produced hundreds of new priests at a time when their number in such Catholic countries as Spain, Italy, etc. diminished. Apart from the foregoing, during the Gierek period an average of 300 religious books and pamphlets, totalling 2,600,000 million copies, were published each year, the run of the central organ of the Polish Church ("Słowo Poswieszczenie") was raised from 60,000 to 100,000 copies a day (160,000 on Sundays); a whole publishing house was placed at the disposal of the Church; special broadcasts of the official radio and television service were allotted to the Church and religious education, etc. Subsequently, the ways were opened for the representation of the clergy in the supreme organs of the country. In the legislature of the Polish Sejm which closed in February 1980 there were 12 Catholic deputies, while the Church holds 15 seats in the present legislature. Finally, to ensure that Polish "Christian communism" assumed its full stature, the post of one Deputy Prime Minister was given to a Catholic clergyman.* Despite all this, they dare to call Poland

* PAP, March 12, 1970, June 4, 1979; "The Guardian" October 18, 1978, p. 15; "Süddeutsche Zeitung" October 13, 1978, p. 8; "Le Monde" February 10-11, 1980.
154

a "socialist" country and, moreover, "in a stage of developed socialism"!!

Without going into endless other details, the above facts are sufficient to prove what an important role the modern revisionists have allowed the Church to play in the social and political life of Poland.

"Freedom of criticism," "freedom of speech," "intellectual freedom" — was another demand which circulated everywhere in the movements of 1970-1971. The ultra-capitalist forces, which especially from 1966 on had always had ample "freedom" to express themselves in the name of any ideological and political school or current, now received further concessions from the PUWP and the revisionist state. All the filthiest organs of Western reaction — political, idealist and religious books and newspapers, pornographic magazines propagating sex and violence, were allowed to circulate freely, indeed they were bought by the state with convertible currency and sold at the kiosks for zloty. Furthermore, in order to be more "democratic" than the "democrat" Gomulka, the Gierek team, in the spirit of Helsinki, even allowed the formation of associations and organizations of Polish dissidents. Many intellectuals who had long been corrupt and degenerate, inveterate anti-socialists and anti-communists, representatives of the most reactionary schools and currents in philosophy, science, art, literature and culture, thieves, drug pushers, etc., began to create, one after the other, the "Confederation for an Independent Poland," the "Movement for the Formation of Free Trade Unions," the "Movement for the Defence of Human and Civic Rights," the "Movement of Stars" (the organization which fights for the unconditional release of political prisoners), etc., etc.

These associations and groups of dissidents, the ranks of which grew ceaselessly (what else could be expected with a

dissident, anti-communist party and state!), had and have at their disposal “illegal” printeries to bring out newspapers, leaflets, pamphlets, appeals, etc. Through a specialized service network, these materials filled with the most terrible filth were distributed freely all over Poland. Even an allegedly “illegal” university, the so-called Flying University (its lectures circulated from one zone of Poland to the other) was created by the dissident forces to bemuse the masses with that “knowledge” which the official schools and universities of Poland “were not allowed” to give them. All this was part of the general campaign for the corruption and confusion of the people with the open or silent approval of the ruling authorities. On occasions when “they went too far” (especially when “the loyal allies” — the Soviets, were affected), the authors and publishers of this filth were summoned by the police, held a few hours at police stations or made to pay ridiculous fines, just as if they had accidentally breached the traffic regulations. If it happened that they were held by the police for more than 24 hours, the “Movement of Stars” rose in protest and after this the “stars” shone freely in the dark sky of Poland! And despite this ideological rape, they still dared to call Poland a “socialist” country!

In the movements of 1980-1981, it was this scum that comprised the main forces which guided and inspired the actions of the misled masses and it was these associations and organizations which constituted the foundations of that *political party*, which, although unproclaimed as such, performed the role and function of a real party of reaction. For example, as early as February 1980, the “Confederation for an Independent Poland” took all measures to present itself as an independent organization in the elections to the Sejm and the provincial councils. In this campaign, it presented its own program and candidates.

“*Greater links with the West*” — shouted the ultra-capitalist forces in the movements of 1970-1971, and the PUWP, which for 10 or 12 years on end had displayed the greatest inclination in this direction, now relaxed any restraint. Indeed, both the Gierek team and the Soviet overlords of Poland found in these calls “the support of the public” in begging for loans from Western firms, banks and concerns. Billions of dollars poured in, but together with them, or more correctly, as a prior condition for them, the Western way of life, ideology, and decadent culture and art poured in even more vigorously.

Thus, by making one concession after another, for ten years on end E. Gierek tried to find the way to create the image of a “fine” society “satisfactory” to all.

However, such “freedoms” and “rights,” as those in the fields of religion, ideology, politics, etc., satisfied mainly the pro-Western forces and all the other elements of the revisionist party and state which degenerated relentlessly. In themselves, however, these “freedoms” were nothing but the weapons of revisionism and reaction to further corrupt and confuse the masses, to alienate them even more from the political terrain and make them harmless. The truth is that from this aspect, this crusade was not without effect. The ideological corruption and confusion were spread all over Poland. However, there was another field in which this torrent of “freedoms” and “rights” for everything and everybody was unable to yield any positive result. This was the economic field.

From the first moments of its advent to power the Gierek team, conscious of the economic chaos reigning in Poland, proclaimed the so-called “economic strategy of the ‘70s.” According to them, the basis of the strategy would be the accelerated modern industrialization of the country. This would be achieved through the introduction of Western technology, adoption of Western methods of organization and adminis-

tration, etc. Poland did not have the funds for such undertaking, but at that time E. Gierek was in the first days of his “ascendancy” and the plans of bourgeois politicians in such a phase are unrestrained. Gierek decided to secure the financial means for his “great industrial modernization” through loans and credits from the West and the East. He and his supporters admitted that these loans and credits would be something of a burden on the economy, but after a few years of belt-tightening nothing would be able to hold Poland! The large-scale modern industry would ensure repayment of the debts, large-scale consumption and large-scale accumulation, and an epoch of abundance would arrive, etc., etc.

Both East and West welcomed Gierek’s “strategy” with enthusiasm. Since there is no need to repeat the well-known reasons for this “enthusiasm” of the imperialist and revisionist bourgeoisie, let us simply recall one voice which was diametrically opposed to all the others — the voice of the PLA.

On February 19, 1971, the PLA pointed out, “The new Polish leaders have very little room for manoeuvre, either in the field of the economy or in that of policy. The state of the economy remains what it was in Gomulka’s day and no miracle can occur within a few months or even several years. The aid which they may receive from the East or from the West cannot improve the situation. At the most this aid can serve as an injection to cope with the crisis of the present moment. However, the foreign debts, the credits and loans will add to the oppression and exploitation of the working people.”*

The months and years which followed completely vindicated this prediction of the PLA.

Beginning from 1971, Poland’s imports from the Western countries increased at an average annual rate of about 40 per cent (45 per cent in 1972), while the imports from the East

* “Zëri i popullit,” February 19, 1971.

increased at a rate of about 11 per cent.* In the first years, the imports consisted mainly of Western technology and equipment and were financed with loans, also from the imperialist West.** Poland’s links with the West-German, French, British and other big firms and concerns, in particular, increased very rapidly during this period. The USA did not lag behind, either. During the years 1972-1973 Polish-American trade increased threefold and, to give a further impulse to these links, a special centre for the development of trade with the USA was created in Warsaw along with branches and subsidiaries of Western banks.***

Meanwhile, the formation of joint companies between Polish and Western firms and concerns began and the number of them steadily increased. The doors were flung open for the penetration of multinational companies into the Polish economy. In 1979, more than 30 such companies, 10 of them American, were operating in Poland.****

Until the mid-‘70s this process of linking the Polish economy in every way with the West proceeded at headlong pace and, as it was said, Poland was ranked among the 15 most industrialized countries.

In 1976, however, this “headlong” gallop suddenly brought the rider to the brink of the first disaster. Whereas the first part of Gierek’s “strategy” — *the need to get the maximum loans*, more than fulfilled expectations, the second part of this “strategy” — *the ability to repay the debts and ensure profits*, was showing no sign of life. After gobbling up billions in loans “the large-scale industry” was yielding no profits. One could have guessed that the industrial West, which

* “The Economist,” October 5, 1974, p. 51.

** Ibid.

*** “The New York Times,” October 21, 1974, p. 53.

**** AFP, May 26, 1980.

"itself had set up" this industry, had done so in such a way that it would have virtually no need for its products. Let the Polish products go to the East, but the dollars so essential to a debtor of the first order could not be secured from the East. Gierek felt the first powerful attack of his line. Facing disaster, he decided to moderate its pace. Amongst other things, in order to cope with the inflation which was mounting rapidly, he re-applied the policy of raising prices. In the context of this policy, in June 1976 the Gierek team was obliged to raise the prices of all agricultural and livestock products. The masses, disillusioned by the long wait for the promised plenty, now rose in revolt. Workers' strikes broke out immediately in Warsaw, in the Ursus plant and Radom. Although not of the same proportions as those of 1970, these strikes, too, ended in bloodshed. In order to calm the situation the Polish revisionist leadership "corrected" itself within the day. The decisions of increasing prices were annulled. Nevertheless, all the causes which impelled them to take these decisions remained in force. Gierek was obliged to change his "method," to find new ways to manoeuvre.

After 1976, the rapid pace of industrialization declined. Contrary to Gierek's will, however, although the rate of industrialization was reduced, the rate of increase of Poland's debts was not falling but rising. Whereas total debts in 1976 amounted to 10 billion dollars (i.e., an average increase of 1.5 billion per year from 1971), in 1978 they reached 15 billion dollars (i.e., an average increase of 2.5 billion per year).

This phenomenon was bound to occur because: a) "the large-scale industry" had been built with loans and now the interest and instalments of the loans had to be paid off; b) this industry was based mainly on foreign raw materials which had to be bought every year with dollars, moreover in circumstances of galloping price-rises; c) the uncompleted projects

had to be carried through to the end and further millions of dollars were required for this.

In 1971-1972, whether or not to take an adventurous step for the development of Poland with loans depended to a large degree on the will of Gierek and company, but in 1977-1978 it was no longer within their power or will to put an end to the anti-Marxist undertaking which they had begun, or even less, to avoid their obligations to foreign creditors. The time had come for dialectics to settle accounts with those who had abandoned it. The general decline of the economy began. According to the official figures of Comecon, the rate of growth of production in Poland fell steadily from 9.3 per cent in 1976 to 2.8 per cent in 1979.

The sector of agriculture, in particular, the weakest, with the greatest deficiencies and the poorest prospects in the Polish economy, at this period began to take "retribution" more powerfully against those who through their anti-Marxist policy had expected great success from "the outburst of private enterprises." Like Gomulka, Gierek had done everything possible to consolidate and strengthen the private sector of Polish agriculture. One of the main measures in this direction was the sale of state land to private farms. According to official figures this process increased continuously throughout the '70s. Thus, in 1973 90,000 hectares of state-owned land were sold to private farms, in 1974 82,000 hectares, in 1978 91,000 hectares, and in 1979 150,000 hectares.* Neither the great increase of credits for private farms nor the repeated experiments for the introduction of all kinds of Western methods into Polish agriculture gave the results desired by Gierek. The phenomenon of the migration of the labour force from the countryside to the city increased as never before (between 1971 and 1975 more than 938,000 people left the countryside,

* "Nowe Dragi," No. 6/1979, p. 61.

while still retaining their small-scale property in the countryside); the area of land left uncultivated increased ceaselessly; regardless of what the government required, the small proprietors in the countryside cultivated mostly those crops which brought them the most profits (especially vegetables, flowers and fruit), etc., etc. While there is no need to list all the evils which flourished and “were cultivated” in Polish agriculture as a result of the anti-Marxist policy of the PUWP, it must be said that it declined further and further.

Comprised of 3,500,000 private farms, 4,500 state farms and about 1,600 agricultural cooperatives,* this sector not only did not fulfil the needs of the country, but, on the contrary, made the deficits greater from year to year. Although Poland had been obliged to import hundreds of thousands of tons of grain every year from 1956 on, in the ‘70s the quantity purchased reached unprecedented proportions. In the years 1975-1977 Poland imported about 15 million tons of grain, while in 1976-1979 it bought more than 31 million tons,** spending for this almost all the convertible currency earned from the export of coal (Poland is one of the world’s biggest exporters of coal).

This occurred at a time when the Gierek team, after gaining no benefit from its “industrial strategy” had turned its eyes to “the agricultural strategy.” Like W. Gomulka 8-9 years earlier, E. Gierek, too, decided to increase exports of Polish agricultural and livestock products to the West as the only way to secure the life-saving dollars. For the next two or three years Poland was engaged in a ridiculous game: it exported its livestock and agricultural products to the West and imported agricultural and livestock products also from the West! Gierek and company were spinning helplessly like tops

* “Izvestia,” June 6, 1974.

** “Nowe Dragi,” No. 3/1979, p. 22.

as a result of the anti-Marxist course which they had adopted and applied zealously.

The year 1979 brought real gloom to the economic life of Poland. For the first time since 1945, in 1979 total national production declined 3 per cent in comparison with the previous year, inflation was running at more than 10 per cent, investments were reduced 7 per cent and the grain harvest was 16.9 per cent less. The debts to the West reached 18-19 billion dollars and in 1979 the Poles were obliged to pay 3.1 billion dollars* simply as interest on the debts. Grain imports in 1979 reached the figure of 8 million tons while in 1980 Poland would have to import up to 10-12 million tons.

On the market there was plenty of religion, plenty of dissidence, every kind of idea and political and ideological trend, many schools of decadent art and literature, etc., and for 7-8 years on end, all these had been doing their work to disorganize and deceive the masses in order to leave the ruling revisionists “in peace” to carry out their “strategy.” But now that there were more and more acute shortages of agricultural and livestock products on the market so that meat and eggs could be secured only on the black market; now that prices were rising at galloping rates, while the ranks of the unemployed were increasing even more quickly than the debts; now that the class differentiation and social injustices were more obvious than ever — now these seductive “freedoms” and “rights” no longer had any effect to improve the positions of the team in power.

Gierek’s “strategy” to build a “socialism of plenty” had not improved the position of the masses, but, on the contrary, had made it even worse. The general discontent and disillusionment was again rising to the point of revolt. The moment had come for the ultra-reactionary forces to take the

* “Relazioni Internazionali,” No. 33-34, August 30, 1980, p. 740.

bit between their teeth. Now the crusade pursued for many years for the ideo-moral degeneration and corruption of the masses had to work in their interests. As on all the previous occasions, the ultra-capitalist forces put aside their agreement with the revisionist forces, lined up “beside” the discontented masses and, indeed, became the most fiery spokesmen of the seething discontent. More than anyone else, it was these forces who, exploiting the bitter consequences of the restored capitalism, raised their voice “in defence” of the rights of the workers and the masses, of course, while screaming that all these evils were the offspring of the “socialism” which allegedly existed in Poland! The justified and inevitable movement of the masses against the revisionist counter-revolutionary regime was being rapidly caught on the hooks of another counter-revolutionary force.

In 1980 the Gierek team were suffering new shocks which threatened to toss them from the throne. Not only the anti-socialist forces but also the proletariat and the masses were against them.

In their final desperate effort to escape their doom, neither the abject “self-criticism” of Gierek at the 8th Congress of the PUWP held in February 1980, the so-called “minor palace revolution,”* nor the promises of a radical “turn” and change had any effect.

The scorching summer of 1980 was approaching. Precisely at these moments Gierek and his associates in misfortune remembered to send a telegram of greetings to the “outstanding revolutionary” W. Gomulka on the occasion of his 75th birthday. At the same time, as an expression of their reverence

* They were also discharged from all their functions in the state and in the party and replaced with other members considered as “brilliant technocrats.” The foreign press described this as a “minor palace revolution.”

and respect, they decided to copy the final act of their predecessor: they decided to raise the prices of agricultural and livestock products, fuel, etc., etc.

Their aim was the same as Gomulka’s aim 10 years earlier: to restrain the rise of inflation to some extent and reduce internal consumption and thus raise the quantities for export! Discontent was mounting, chronic strikes were occurring one after the other and the alarm bells were ringing. Nevertheless, even in the grave situation of mounting discontent, the revisionist politicians, overwhelmed with misfortunes, were still compelled to continue with their activities. When the whole of Poland was shaking under the protests about the great shortages, especially of agricultural and livestock products, the dockers of the northern ports discovered that metal drums labelled “chemicals,” destined for the Soviet Union, contained not chemicals, but meat and other food products! These activities in which the revisionist rulers were forced to engage filled the cup to overflowing. The furious riots of 1980 burst out.

There was nothing left for E. Gierek and his team to do, but hand over the three envelopes.*

The end of the PUWP

This time the removal of Gierek and his whole team could not serve as a manoeuvre to calm the situation. Now the pro-Western ultra-reactionary forces felt themselves strong

* According to a joke that circulated in Warsaw, every new leader of the PUWP was given three envelopes in the beginning of his career. The first envelope contained the message, “Blame all the responsibility for distortions on your predecessor”; the second one, “Promise reforms”; and the third one, which was to be opened at the most difficult moment, contained the message, “Hand these three envelopes to your successor.”

and organized. Moreover, they had the overwhelming majority of the masses with them, had seized the reins of the strike movement and in a situation which continuously gave rise to discontent and revolt, having the masses with them meant that the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution would advance more confidently.

The end of the PUWP was approaching.

It could see disaster looming from the summer of 1980. Millions of people, who were openly demonstrating and declaring their scorn and hatred for the "leading party," had risen or were rising against it. One after the other, Gierek and his successors were obliged to admit the fact that the party had lost the confidence of the masses. Simply on this account there was nothing left for the PUWP to do except perform the final, the only "honourable" act of the past 25-30 years of its existence: to admit its bankruptcy and declare itself dissolved.

However, it could not do even this. The betrayal which it had committed was so great and complex that it could not absolve its betrayal with a painful, immediate end. On account of what it had done, the PUWP was obliged to die inch by inch, was forced "to remain on its feet" even when it no longer had either the strength or the brazen face to continue to operate and lead.

Some of its members (more than 400,000 people, i.e., more than 10 per cent of the total membership) expressed their distrust and hatred of the PUWP and its leadership by resigning voluntarily from the party, thus breaking any connection with or obligation to this treacherous and oppressive force.*

The others remained "with the party."

Born and brought up amidst opportunist concessions of

* Materials of the 9th Congress of the PUWP, July 1981, CAP.

every kind and dimension, with the party degenerate in every aspect, abandoned by the masses and totally discredited and exposed, a good part of the PUWP could not abandon its course of betrayal half-way and went over openly to ultra-capitalist reaction.

The events of 1980-1982 have proved this over and over again. More than a million Polish "communists" were "militating" shoulder to shoulder with the counter-revolutionary forces which guided and inspired the movements of the years 1980-1981 and with the organisms which were created during this period! They were in the forefront of this movement with counter-revolutionary aims and inspiration, shoulder to shoulder with their ideological and political blood brothers, such rabid anti-communists and anti-socialists as the Mysznicks, Kurons, Bujaks and Walesas, shoulder to shoulder with the Catholic clergy, with the scum of the streets and the hooligans and the agents of international imperialism.

Apart from this part which disintegrated and openly joined the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution, *the remaining members of the party were obliged to remain within the former structures of the party* and consequently to keep what they still called the PUWP on its feet. The situation of this party as a political force, which de jure, at least, was supposed to lead the country, was now like a dramatic agony. It was in power, but from day to day it saw that power was slipping from its hands and it was quite incapable of stopping this process with its forces and its former means.

Faced with two very powerful pressures — *the pressure from below*, especially from the "Solidarity" organization which demanded that the PUWP should not simply make concessions, but should concede all its power, and the other pressure, especially *from abroad* (Soviet social-imperialism and the Warsaw Treaty) which demanded the opposite, i.e.,

that the PUWP tighten its grip, the party saw itself caught in a dangerous whirlpool with no way out. These two savage and threatening pressures exerted upon it accentuated as never before its always contradictory physiognomy, with internal struggle and factional activity which has characterized the Polish party. It was being eroded and was disintegrating rapidly. In the years 1980-1981, all kinds of groups and factions of the most varied colours and tendencies such as the so-called "Forum of Poznan Communists," the "Movement of Szczecin Communists," the "Forum of Katowice," the "Warszawa Club-80," the "Club of the Party 'Ursus-81,'" the "Initiator Group of Communists of Lubelsk," etc., etc. were formed within the party. In the city of Warsaw alone the members of the PUWP were grouped in 4-5 such "clubs" and "forums." Each of these "clubs," "forums" and "movements" presented its own platform and demands opposed to those of other factions and indeed in struggle with the others. Some of them, the so-called liberals, were in favour of continuation of the course of compromises and concessions to the opposition organization "Solidarity"; others, the so-called hardliners, were for putting an end to concessions, settling accounts with "Solidarity" and further strengthening the chains of dependence on Soviet social-imperialism; a third trend, in which the so-called moderates took part, faced both ways, supported concessions and also "tightening up," i.e., wanted to satisfy both forces of the counter-revolution. In short, the degenerate body of the PUWP, which had long since fallen apart from the standpoint of its political and ideological line, was now openly fragmented and disintegrated from the organizational standpoint. All that united them was the common "roof"; all the fragments were gathered under what was still called the PUWP, while each "club" or "forum" demanded that the party should be reorganized according to its own platform.

But this paradoxical situation was not considered a split. "It is not good," declared Gierek's successor S. Kania, after assuming power,* "to make a distinction between members of the party who joined the strikers and those who stood apart. Which of these members are good or bad?"** The question contained its own answer. They were all the same! The wing of the party amalgamated with the recent counter-revolutionary movements, for example, enjoyed the same rights and privileges as before and perhaps rather more than the wing which remained officially "within" the party. The representatives of this wing, although they were opposed to the existing situation in Poland, had seats in the highest forums of the party and the state, and at the 9th Congress of the PUWP a large number of them were elected to the CC and even to the Political Bureau of the CC of the PUWP!

This was the inevitable result of its traitorous course. By leading Poland deeper and deeper into the capitalist mire it was bound to sink into the mire itself.

In this situation the members who remained "loyal" to what continued to be called the PUWP were obliged to face a torturing quandary: if they threw in their lot openly with the pro-Western forces the first thing they must expect was the merciless violence of the Russian invasion; if they remained blindly loyal to the interests and dictate of the occupier that would mean they would be under the merciless threat of the ultra-capitalist forces that had taken the bit in their teeth. Neither one way nor the other — this was the impasse in which the PUWP found itself, not through a turn of fate, but through its own betrayal. Now it was obliged to do what the

* Stanislaw Kania was dismissed from the function of the First Secretary of the CC of the PUWP to leave his place to W. Jaruzelski, in the 2nd Plenum of the CC of the PUWP in September 1961.

** "Tribuna Ludu," September 16, 1980.

overlord ordered and what the moment dictated, was obliged to pay the full price for the betrayal it had committed against Marxism-Leninism. And Marxist dialectics is merciless towards whoever deviates from or abandons it.

Well aware of the hopeless position, the disintegration and split in the “leading party,” the ultra-capitalist forces stepped up their attacks and demands. In October and November of 1981, in particular, the calls for the removal of the PUWP and structures linked with it from the scene in Poland were being raised ever more strongly. The party was told openly that not only had it lost any shred of credit in the eyes of the masses, but the period of more than one year since the emergence of “Solidarity” had proved that it was no longer capable of regaining even the most minimal trust and authority. Even the leaders of the Polish party and state themselves realized the truth of this. Nevertheless, the PUWP was “obliged” to remain on the scene.

This absurd and ridiculous situation came about as a result: *first, of an internal factor*. Closely linked with what was still called the “Polish socialist state,” with the party, the government and all the existing structure and superstructure in Poland, were the vital interests and positions of a no small number of revisionist functionaries and leaders. It was that part of the new bourgeoisie, created as a result of the restoration of capitalism, which due to the positions and circumstances in which it had worked, continued to be more directly linked with the line pursued by the PUWP, with those conditions and structures which the party had created, with those foreign alliances and treaties in which it was involved and with those slogans which it had employed. In all these aspects which were now the target of attack, this section of the party was more compromised and for this reason was obliged to show itself “more conservative,” in regard to retaining the for-

mer situation, than the rest of the officials, leaders and other categories of the Polish bourgeoisie.

For the “conservative” officials the changing of the structures created by the revisionist counter-revolution would mean the loss of everything. This is why these officials and leaders of the Polish party and the state were concerned and did everything in their power to retain the previous forms and status of Poland and, hence the “existence” of the PUWP. But in the conditions when the internal situation was ripe for the advance of the ultra-right counter-revolutionary forces, when the PUWP itself was shaken to its foundations, when most of its members had thrown in their lot with the ultra-capitalist forces or were predisposed to do so immediately, the role of the internal forces interested in retaining the structures of the revisionist counter-revolution had been too greatly weakened to be able to do this with the former means.

The removal from the political scene of virtually the whole Gierek team during the period July 1980-July 1981, the failure of more than 90 per cent the former members and candidate members of the CC to gain re-election to the new plenum of the CC of the PUWP, the replacement of almost all the first secretaries, the chairmen of the executive committees and the people’s councils of the districts, the repeated cabinet reshuffles, etc., etc., were not removals and transfers carried out simply for a demagogic manoeuvre. Underlying the continual changes was the internal struggle of the revisionist party and the state, but mainly they were the result of the pressure exerted by “Solidarity.” The 9th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, held in the spring of 1981, confirmed this quite openly. “Solidarity’s’ going on the offensive showed that the party melted like butter,” was reported to the plenum. Nevertheless, although it “melted” like butter, the PUWP was doing everything in its power to avoid disappearing completely,

like butter had disappeared from the market!

It seemed that, de jure, the forces interested in keeping the party in existence had the power in their hands (the army, police, the court, the prisons, etc.), but to what extent this power would come to their aid de facto was extremely doubtful. The organs and institutions of power in a Poland in a state of crisis and chaos could not be different from the general situation prevailing there. From the host of facts which testify to this we shall mention only one: in September 1981, when the proceedings of the "Solidarity" congress in Gdansk showed clearly that this was the congress of a political organization and not simply a trade-union organization, the tension, pressure and antagonisms increased greatly all over the country. In order to protect their own positions, but more especially, under the pressure of Soviet social-imperialism and the Warsaw Treaty, the government of General Jaruzelski (he had not yet become First Secretary of the Central Committee) issued "strong" statements against "Solidarity." There was open talk about the country's being on the verge of the proclamation of a state of emergency.

Precisely at these moments the riot of the Warsaw police, demanding the right to form "independent police unions," broke out! Tens of thousands of police demonstrated in favour of their demand and called on the "Solidarity" congress for mutual support and solidarity! The representatives of the police riot declared openly that by winning the legal status of "independence" their hands would be free to avoid becoming involved to the detriment of "workers" in case of the outbreak of a conflict between the government and "Solidarity."

The other means and institutions of the state power also could hardly stand aloof from such an internal atmosphere.

On the one hand, this situation terrified the forces faithful to the revisionist counter-revolution and, on the other hand,

it gave courage and confidence to the pro-Western forces. In their assessment of the situation, however, the ultra-right forces were wrong in their calculations. Convinced that the PUWP had been abandoned by the masses, they thought that it would automatically and readily abandon its own interests and objectives. They forgot that, when the ultimate moment arrived, the forces linked with the PUWP would not hesitate to take any step in the defence of their own interests; they forgot that for decades on end, along with positions and privileges, they had also created loyal means to defend those positions and privileges. More important still, they forgot or failed to understand that, while it is true that the forces of the PUWP had been compelled into that endless series of concessions and compromises, in the final analysis they did this to safeguard their own interests. Just as the reactionary forces of "Solidarity" were ready to do anything to seize power, the forces of the PUWP were ready to refuse to allow power to slip completely and finally from their hands.

Second, apart from this internal factor, *the external factor, the Russian dictate*, must be mentioned. As is known and as we pointed out above, during the past 25-30 years the PUWP had bound itself and Poland hand and foot to Soviet social-imperialism. Irrespective that for a number of economic, political and other causes and reasons the Soviet social-imperialists had been obliged to agree to the opening up of Poland to Western capital, at the same time they had operated in such a way that the relations, or more correctly, the economic dependence of Poland on the Soviet Union were preserved and indeed strengthened. Apart from other things, in the volume of Polish foreign trade the greatest part had always been with the Soviet Union (about one third of the total volume). Moreover, Soviet social-imperialism has long had monopoly control of key sectors and vital branches of Poland. For

example, all the crude oil, natural gas, pig-iron and asbestos which Poland imports has always come from the Soviet Union. No doubt the strikes with the participation of several millions seriously disturbed and damaged the economic life of Poland, but Moscow need only close the oil valves and the vassal country would find itself in an extremely critical situation even if not a single worker went on strike!

However, it was not only the economic chains with which Poland had long been bound that had to be kept inviolate. Poland had to remain dependent on the Russians, regardless of what "Solidarity," the West and the Vatican demanded, because otherwise not only would a link in the chain of Soviet domination be damaged and broken, but a bad example would be set and the conditions created to endanger all the other links of the chain. Poland, with its army second in size only to that of the Soviet Union in the Warsaw Treaty, remained vital to Moscow's military strategy. All the lines of communication, such as the railways, roads, gas pipelines, air corridors, telephone and telex links between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia and East Germany passed through Poland. About 100 military aerodromes, or half the air bases used by the Warsaw Treaty, were located in Poland. For these and other similar reasons, for Soviet social-imperialism both in 1970 and in 1980-1981 the chains around Poland and any other country in its sphere of influence were considered inviolable. These chains were also defended by the divisions of the occupation forces within Poland and by other divisions around its borders. Hence, the Russian interests required that Poland *should not break out of its orbit*, and since the internal and external circumstances were not suitable for a violent change of the status quo, like it or not, Poland had to remain a "socialist country."

According to the rules, however, a "socialist" country, moreover a member of the "socialist community," has to have

a "communist" party in power, in the leadership, irrespective of whether or not it has the support of the masses, or is in a position to lead. Therefore, even though the PUWP had lost any power and credit among the masses, even though it had totally degenerated, even though it was on its death bed, it had to be "kept alive" and be called the "leading party" of a "socialist" country. Indeed, as long as the state of occupation existed, even if it came about that the PUWP was completely dissolved, a "party" would quickly be set up in place of it and be raised in the leadership. This is what "the rules" required, that is, this suited the interests of the overlord.

Subsequent events, especially those of the late autumn of 1981 prove completely not only that the working class and the masses no longer took any notice of the PUWP, but also that the counter-revolutionary forces linked with it themselves had lost any confidence in its ability. The decision on the military coup of December 13, 1981, for example, was taken outside the party, without any need for the Central Committee or the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the party to be called together or consulted. The army took over and, with the exception of the chairman of the "Council," General Jaruzelski, no member of the top leadership of the PUWP was a member of the "Military Council for National Salvation." How matters reached this point we shall speak about below. Here we want only to point out the ignominious end of the PUWP, an end which was inevitable.

Although it had long lost any effective power, after December 13, 1981 it was quite obvious that from now on the PUWP would be a kind of "queen" of "modern" times, like the queens of England and other capitalist countries, in the life of Poland. Like the Elizabeths and Beatrices in the developed capitalist countries, "Her Majesty" the PUWP too, would continue to be called a "workers' party," although it

had totally betrayed the positions and interests of the working class, and as such would remain on the throne as a symbol of an “ancient tradition,” would be honoured with all the court ceremonial, however, in place of the sceptre, it would of course wield the stick “in defence” of the working class. Nothing else could be done. Since Poland had to remain within the “socialist,” i.e., social-imperialist influence and empire, “tradition” required that the throne of the leading “communist party” should be kept “inviolable”!

But the evil is not that the PUWP was to come to such an ignominious end. It would receive what it deserved from history. The evil lies in the general catastrophe which the treacherous line of the PUWP and all the internal and external reactionary forces in alliance with, or in opposition to it, brought about in Poland during these 20-25 years.

The disorganization and the confusion among the ranks of the working class and the working masses of Poland, in particular, the placing of their revolutionary forces and energies under counter-revolutionary control and inspiration, was and is one of the bitterest and most dangerous consequences of the modern revisionists’ great betrayal.

UNDER ALIEN FLAGS

“In the case of ‘Solidarity’ the working class is manipulated and led by the Catholic Church and Polish and world reaction which are fighting to establish another revisionist-capitalist regime through a course full of dangers and tragic surprises.”

ENVER HOXHA

In regard to social movements and especially mass movements which include millions of people, Marxism-Leninism always makes a clear-cut distinction between that which *objectively incites and arouses the masses* against the existing order and *the ideology, slogans and political program* which, for one reason or the other, inspire and guide these masses. This holds good also for the current strike movements in Poland.

The usurpation of power by the modern revisionists and their transformation of Poland into a capitalist country inevitably brought about that the contradiction between labour and capital, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, became more and more exacerbated and profound. As a result of the operation of capitalist laws, the situation was to become ever more onerous for the Polish proletariat. The day was bound to come when the workers could not tolerate the economic catastrophe which affected the country, the increasing poverty and shortages on the market, the great class differentiation, the major socio-economic injustices which were perpetrated openly at their expense, the spiralling prices, the chronic unemployment, the high level of inflation, catastrophic debts, the continual decline in the total national product and the standard of living, etc. The prospects for the future were gloomy. Apart from all these negative phenomena, the protracted state of dependence on the Russians made the situation even more intolerable.

These and other phenomena, typical of a country in which relations of oppression and exploitation exist, taken together, constitute *the basic objective factor which aroused the Polish masses*.

Hence, the “reasons” advanced by the ideologists and chiefs of modern revisionism, who to explain why the workers rose refer to such factors as the “ideological diversion of imperialism,” “religious inspiration,” etc., etc., are nothing

but an idealist treatment of the problem in theory and banal demagoguery and deception in practice.

Undoubtedly both the ideological diversion of imperialism and reaction, and their propaganda in general, religious ideology, etc., exploiting the freedom of action they found in Poland, have played and are playing their great and damaging role both for the degeneration and corruption of the people's consciousness and for rallying whole contingents of people under the banners of a counter-revolutionary opposition. These factors, however, have to do mostly with the ideological and political aspect of the movement and play a decisive role especially in the advance of the movement in its development under the banners of counter-revolution. When we are talking about the factors which cause the masses to rise, however, what impels them to revolt and protest against the ruling order, then it is the material factors, the socio-political factors which emerge as primary. Comrade Enver Hoxha says, "It is not religious inspiration which causes the revolts and the revolutionary awakening in peoples, but the social and political conditions, the imperialist oppression and plunder, and the poverty and suffering imposed on them."*

Therefore, the act of the Polish proletariat and people of rising against the counter-revolutionary regime in power is and remains a legitimate action.

The misfortune of the movement lies elsewhere — in the fact that it was manipulated by the right-wing forces, by the Catholic Church, the Vatican and imperialism. Hence, the Polish proletariat rose under alien banners.

How then did it come about that the Polish proletariat and working masses were manipulated so badly for decades on end, that they put their legitimate movement under the

* Enver Hoxha, Report to the 8th Congress of the PLA, pp. 269-270, Eng. ed.
178

ideology, banners and slogans of the counter-revolution and reaction?

Even after 1945 the Polish proletariat did not have the possibility or conditions to know, to assimilate and, consequently, to consistently defend *its ideology* — *Marxism-Leninism*.

Although something began to be done for the Marxist-Leninist education of the masses in the first years after liberation (1945-1953), not only was this done in a simplistic, superficial way, with defects and mistakes, but more importantly, the period mentioned was too short for the Marxist education of the masses. After 1953 the revisionists' betrayal occurred and one of the main objectives of this betrayal was to launch a frontal attack on Marxism-Leninism. Obviously, in such conditions, even what positive results may have been achieved now became the target of an all-sided attack. The party of the proletariat, the main factor which has as its mission to make the masses conscious and imbue them with Marxism-Leninism, after the Khrushchevite betrayal, with the inspiration and the dictate from Moscow, placed itself in the forefront of the attack against Marxism-Leninism. In the subsequent period all sorts of bourgeois-revisionist theories about pluralism, pragmatism, self-management, anarchism, anarcho-syndicalism, apoliticism, economism, etc., etc. were poured out on the masses and only Marxism-Leninism did not find the proper place and terrain there to penetrate amongst and especially be assimilated by the masses.

This general assault against Marxism-Leninism in Poland found its most concrete expression in *the savage crusade which has been and is being launched there against the idea of socialism and its essence as a socio-economic order*.

Poland set out on the road of socialism and the truth is that, in the years 1945-1953 along with some mistakes, a ser-

ies of steps were taken in conformity with the universal laws of the construction of socialism. The working class came to power, the expropriation of the big Polish bourgeoisie, especially the industrial, banking and merchant bourgeoisie was carried out; the socialist state sector was set up as the most important sector of the economy; the socialist industrialization of the country began; the first steps were taken for the collectivization of agriculture; some degree of struggle was waged against the current of the right deviation; the Church was separated from the state (after 1948); relations with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries were strengthened, etc., etc.

It was the time when the proletariat and the masses had just begun to learn what their order was and how it must be built. The greatest and most difficult work still lay ahead of them.

Precisely at these moments, when the seeds of socialism had just begun to germinate in the minds of the workers and working masses of Poland, they were subjected to propaganda claiming that the whole preceding period had been a mistake, that the former socialism had allegedly been “savage,” “despotic,” etc. Doubts were raised about the vitality of socialism itself, about its proletarian essence. When the bourgeoisie and reaction issued this anti-socialist propaganda it did not establish itself readily in the consciousness of the masses. Now, however, it was the “communists” themselves, the leading party itself, that were raising doubts about socialism, and precisely for this reason this anti-socialist propaganda was more dangerous and harmful. The game was extremely well hidden. The “former” socialism was attacked and in place of it another type of “socialism” was propagated, a more “human” socialism which was to bring plenty, harmony, and happiness!

This indirect attack could not fail to have extremely grave

and bitter consequences for the unformed consciousness of the proletariat and people. Not the imperialists, not the bourgeoisie, but the leaders of the party themselves declared that there are several kinds of “socialism,” that there is “despotic socialism,” but also “human,” “democratic socialism,” which allegedly brings “happiness,” “plenty” and true “freedom”! “Then, since it seems there are several types of socialism, we want and will support that socialism which brings the most blessings!” — this was bound to be the conclusion of the unformed worker who always sees things from the practical angle.

And the truth is that, at the first moments of the restoration of capitalism, the masses were bluffed by this game and allowed the traitors to usurp power undisturbed. The demagoguery was extremely powerful and the Polish working class was unprepared to face it.

This was the period when Khrushchevite modern revisionism was seizing the reins and consolidating itself in the other countries of former people’s democracy. In face of this catastrophe which was seriously threatening the communist and workers’ parties and socialism in these countries, the Party of Labour of Albania rose with foresight and courage and stated its opinion and conclusions bluntly to these traitors. Comrade Enver Hoxha’s speech at the Moscow Meeting of 81 Communist and Workers’ Parties of the World in November 1960 was an indictment of the revisionist betrayal that was being perpetrated against socialism and the revolution. The powerful principled content of this historic document, the denunciation and exposure which was made there of Khrushchev and the Khrushchevites, the extremely important conclusions which were drawn and the penetrating far-sighted predictions that were made, are now well-known, and practice has completely confirmed them. The reaction of Khrush-

chev and company to this historical indictment is also well-known. Among those who went furthest in their opposition, abuse and monstrous slanders directed at the PLA, the leader of Polish revisionism, Wladislaw Gomulka, was outstanding: "He went so far in his unworthy attempts to distort the truth about the Party of Labour of Albania as to use against it epithets, descriptions and insinuations which are altogether impermissible in the relations among the Marxist parties, and which only the imperialists and Yugoslav revisionists repeatedly fling at us each passing day."* From Wladislaw Gomulka, however, no other reaction could be expected. With his base insinuations against the PLA, he not only expressed his old hatred for Marxism-Leninism, not only demonstrated before Khrushchev and the Khrushchevites that he had turned into one of Moscow's most obedient tools, but more importantly, with his arrogant stand, he rushed in to give the others the orientation that the powerful accusing voice of the PLA must be smothered at all costs. Otherwise, their counter-revolutionary deed would suffer incalculable damage in the international communist and workers' movement and in the eyes of the working class of the respective countries.

They accompanied their travesty of the truth with a campaign of insults and slanders about the kernel of the revolutionary theory of the working class and the essence of scientific socialism. Without doubt, the effects would be poisonous. And the more the revisionist counter-revolution advanced, the more obvious became the apathy from below, the more the revolutionary enthusiasm of the masses melted away and disappeared. The hegemony of the proletariat was replaced by the hegemony of the Gomulka clique, and later of the Gierek clique. In the conditions of a quiet, "peaceful" development, the slogans about a "better" life, greater "victories," "great-

* Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 19, pp. 269-270, Eng. ed.

er freedom," "democracy," etc. deceived the Polish proletariat and made it even more apolitical. The petty-bourgeois ideology and psychology, not only in the Polish countryside, where the overwhelming majority of the population consisted of small landowners, but also in the ranks of the workers, exerted a deep influence and became a powerful support in the whole counter-revolutionary process which the modern revisionists carried out. Now there was great publicity about a "better life," conceived from the standpoint of the bourgeoisie as the dream and aim of the rank-and-file Pole. All this was dished up as "socialism," but, of course, "vital," "true," "democratic socialism," far removed from the "harshness" of the past, etc., etc.

In reality, however, this so-called socialism proclaimed as such everywhere was the complete capitalist transformation of the base and superstructure of Poland. Precisely for this reason, precisely because of this course of capitalism, it could not avoid all the consequences, all the evils, which are inherent in capitalism, to which it gives rise ceaselessly: inflation, unemployment, oppression, deterioration of living conditions, etc., etc. These inevitable consequences affected the masses directly and might awaken them.

In order to forestall this evil, *the revisionist and the ultra-capitalist forces, the Church and the dissidents, the whole of internal reaction and bourgeois-revisionist external reaction, in a common front, hurled themselves into a campaign against socialism.*

"Poland is a socialist country," "socialism exists in Poland" — was the common basis on which all the propaganda of the revisionists and internal and external reaction was built up.

For the modern revisionists this was a very great assistance, because in this way the doubts about what had really

occurred with socialism were removed, the attention of the masses was diverted from the betrayal which had been committed and was being deepened and the idea was injected everywhere that, "good or bad, this is socialism."

Regrettably, the united forces of the modern revisionists and all the other counter-revolutionary reactionaries, achieved their aim. Although the reality was quite the opposite of what it was proclaimed to be, in Poland there was no sincere voice, devoid of any prejudice, which would say as in Andersen's famous fairy story: "But, gentlemen, the king is naked!" The Polish proletarians were unable to understand that socialism had been betrayed and destroyed in their country. More and more each day they became aware from their own experience of the injustices and the deterioration of living conditions. But they laid the blame for this on socialism, which, in fact, no longer existed in Poland.

However, while the revisionist forces and the ultra-capitalist forces had similar aims and followed similar ways up to the point where this objective was achieved, beyond this their ways were bound to part.

The modern revisionists allowed the corrupting propaganda up to this point and told the masses that "there is no other socialism, at the most, we can carry out other reforms and changes, but in essence, socialism remains this that we have."

The ultra-reactionary forces went further in the direction their interest required: "True, the existing order in Poland is socialism. There is no doubt about that, but you should not submit to it because it is not bringing any of the things it has promised." Seizing on the endless difficulties to which the Polish capitalist reality ceaselessly gave birth, inciting and exaggerating them, posing as victims of these evils, and as irreconcilable with them, and at the same time, presenting

them as the direct results of socialism, the pro-Western reaction stepped up its poisonous propaganda which began to take root in the minds of the disillusioned masses. Lenin's famous statement, "Imperialist ideology... penetrates also among the working class. No Chinese Wall separates it from the other classes,"* was finding further painful confirmation, with the bitterest consequences for the future, in the case of the Polish working class in the '60s of this century. In the absence of any other internal force which could oppose the revisionist government in power, certain contingents of working people began to fall victim to the only force opposing this government — the ultra-capitalist, ultra-reactionary, pro-Western forces.

The time had come for profound and decisive reflection. The proletariat was being led up a blind alley at a time when the essential issue was that it take to the battlefield.

Here another important matter must be pointed out: in the second half of the '60s, in particular, the conclusions and predictions of the PLA about the fate of socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat in the countries where the modern revisionists seized power, were completely vindicated. The demagogy of the revisionists could not longer be concealed. The capitalist order which they restored was rapidly arousing dissatisfaction and revolt from below. Now the only road of salvation for these countries was to finally discard any illusion and hesitation and to settle accounts with the revisionist cliques, that is, the working class had to rise in revolution again. Comrade Enver Hoxha's powerful and principled article, "The Working Class in the Revisionist Countries Must Take the Field and Re-establish the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," published in the newspaper "Zëri i popullit" on March 24, 1968, belongs precisely to this phase.

* V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 22, p. 347, Alb. ed.

“The re-kindling and fanning of the flames of the proletarian revolution in these countries is the road of salvation sine qua non...,” pointed out Comrade Enver Hoxha at those moments. *“Only the working class at the head of the masses, only the working class headed by its true Marxist-Leninist party, only the working class through armed revolution, through violence, can and must send the revisionist traitors to the grave.”**

Less than two years were required to vindicate the predictions of the PLA that, irrespective of the demagogy and the pressure, the working class in the revisionist countries would no longer tolerate the existing situation. At the end of 1970, the Polish proletariat rose against the revisionist state power.

In the absence of the Marxist-Leninist ideology, in the absence of a genuine proletarian party, however, ultra-capitalist reaction exploited the discontent of the proletarians. Proletarians began to go into battle, but now reaction had seized control of their weapons of the class struggle. The blood of the proletarians who fell in Gdansk and Gdynia in 1970 served to strengthen the positions of the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution. The hatred for what was called “socialism in Poland” and was publicized as “genuine socialism” (!) became even greater. All the disturbances and sufferings in the country had come about as a consequence of this so-called socialism. In its name, the proletarians were shot down, and the Polish proletariat was told that it must not move for the sake of the “inviolable borders,” the external alliance, and the “orthodoxy” of this socialism! Without doubt, such a “socialism” deserved the greatest hatred and condemnation.

The reins were being taken over by ultra-capitalist reaction, the Polish Church, the Vatican, which vowed more loudly than ever that “socialism exists in Poland,” and consequently, all the evils which occurred there were the con-

* Enver Hoxha, *Selected Works*, vol. 4, pp. 397-398, Eng. ed.

sequences of “socialism”! The counter-revolutionary forces stepped up their fight to achieve their further aims: to rally the deceived masses around themselves in order to use them at the appropriate moments as cannon-fodder in the fight for power.

It may seem surprising how the revisionist chiefs in power gradually relinquished the spiritual leadership of the masses to their political rivals and, indeed, enemies, the pro-Western forces, the clergy, etc. But the course on which they had set out could lead to no other result. Concerned to ensure that the masses did not discover the betrayal that was being carried out by the revisionist counter-revolution, these leaders were ready to leave the spiritual guide of the masses in the hands of the devil, provided only that he, like the “angels,” would confuse the people as thoroughly as possible and make them non-political.

Indeed, the existence of an open anti-socialist opposition could, and did serve the disguised anti-socialists to improve their allegedly socialist image at moments of crisis. By “attacking” the open anti-socialist opposition, time after time, in speeches and statements, the revisionists sought to pass themselves off before the public as “pledged to socialism,” as defenders of “socialism” from the attack of counter-revolutionary forces! In fact, all this was a struggle, or more correctly, a contest between two rivals for counter-revolutionary power. From all this, the proletariat had only further losses, confusion and disarray. Therefore, for years on end, we see that the two wings of the counter-revolution, both in “quiet” situations and in moments of crises, united their forces and means in the furious crusade for the degeneration of the consciousness of the masses. And this feverish crusade did not fail to have its effect on the consciousness of the proletariat.

This was another great loss for Poland, greater than the

first defeat when Gomulka and company destroyed the socialist system and re-established capitalism. At that time socialism was taken from the hands of the proletariat and the masses, but not from their minds and hearts. By advertising Polish capitalism as socialism, however, the business was being carried further and deeper. Among certain contingents of workers, now it was not just doubt that was being cultivated, but dissatisfaction with and distrust of socialism as a socio-economic order. The idea began to be created that socialism is not viable, that allegedly it suffered from great and unavoidable evils!

In all this counter-revolutionary process a major role was played by *the Polish Catholic Church, guided by the Vatican and international reaction*. Earlier we mentioned the policy of concessions, endless freedoms and possibilities, which the chiefs of Polish revisionism, from Gomulka to General Jaruzelski, pursued towards the Polish Church.

When their interest required them to show themselves “communists,” these leaders have always justified the free hand they have allowed the Church and religion in Poland with the “fact” that the Polish people have “deep-rooted religious tendencies”! The capitalist West has always “doffed its cap” to this “religious spirit” of the Poles, which allegedly has been “the most complete expression of the vitality of the Polish nation,” “a decisive factor for the existence of Poland,” “the Poles’ loftiest value,” etc., etc. A whole host of Polish and foreign theologians and sociologists regard religion and its influence among the masses in Poland as a magic ethnic-psychological key to explain the “character” of the Poles and even the character of the social movements in which they have risen ceaselessly.

In reality, all these “theories” are nothing but attempts to hide definite political aims and objectives under the illusory

banners of religion. While this is not the place, nor is it our task to explain how and why the Catholic religion has such deep roots and influence and enjoys such support in Poland, we must point out that in the course of their long history the Polish people, along with “religious spirit,” have expressed the essence of their atheist spirit magnificently, too. It is not accidental that Copernicus and Curie came from this people. Throughout their militant history the Polish people have expressed the vitality of a people who, contrary to the creed of the Christian, have never tolerated subjection, oppression or humiliation for long. Rather than displaying the meek and humble spirit of the Christian, the Poles, throughout history, have been outstanding for the spirit of the irrepressible insurgent.

Irrespective of distortions and great mistakes in their content, the repeated movements of the last two decades in which the Polish proletariat and working masses have been engaged, and especially those of 1980-1981, clearly expressed the profound contradiction between the ancient emblem of religion. “Blessed is the man that endureth,” on the one hand, and the total engagement of the clergy and religious ideology to incite and support the reactionary manipulators of those movements, on the other hand. This really is not a contradiction. It is a reflection of the essence, of the specific role of the clergy and religion as weapons in the hands of ruling classes and disguises to cover up definite political purposes and actions.

History has shown clearly that in the great mass movements developed under the aegis of religion (for example, the crusades of the Middle Ages towards Jerusalem and Byzantium), in the final analysis, religion has been an instrument in the service of politics, a disguise to deceive the masses and rally them to actions which were in the interests of the exploiting classes and cliques.

This is what has occurred and is occurring in Poland, too. Over the centuries, the symbiosis of Catholicism with nationalism has been achieved to a certain extent in that country. The Polish Catholic Church has played a very great and active role, both in preparing and inspiring and leading the masses to rise in defence of Catholicism from the danger of Russian Orthodoxy or German Protestantism. Behind the "Catholicism-Orthodoxy" or "Catholicism-Protestantism conflict," however, there has always been the major problem of getting rid of the enslavement to Russian tsars or German rulers, that is, the solution of the Polish national problem. This has brought about that through the centuries the Polish people have followed the banners of the Church, have believed in them, and have considered the Church as the defender of the national cause. Hence, while it is true that the Polish people have rallied under the banners of religion, which called on them to throw off the Russian enslavement, in the final analysis they did this not simply for Catholicism or Orthodoxy, but for Poland, for the independence of their country. And while the people fought for independence, those same Catholic "saints" who called on them to throw off the slavery of Russian Orthodoxy or German Protestantism, at the same time, burnt incense to bless the "ancient links" with the typically "Catholic" countries of the West, that is, prepared the soil for a new enslavement of Poland. Their true role was to mobilize the masses under the aegis of religion in favour of those political forces which directed the Church itself.

This became especially clear after 1917. Even when, as a result of the triumph of the October socialist Revolution under the leadership of the great Lenin, the enslaving policy of the regime of the former tsars came to an end and Poland was given its independence, the Polish Catholic Church continued and, indeed intensified, its former propaganda and

fight, but now against Soviet Russia. Behind the activities of Polish Catholicism now was the thirst of the Polish capitalists and landowners to extend the spheres of their exploitation and, especially, their old ambitions towards the Ukraine. Catholicism now served mainly to conceal the great hatred of the bourgeoisie of Poland and the West for the new regime established in Russia, their hatred of socialism. Now the Polish Catholic Church was charged with the mission of poisoning the minds of the masses more than ever so that what occurred in Russia would never be repeated in Poland. When this came about, however, after the Second World War, the Polish Catholic Church did everything in its power not only to preserve its own existence, but also to maintain and strengthen its diversionist role amongst the masses. Behind the Church stood the forces of the overthrown regime. Catholicism became identified with anti-socialism. The Church was affected, although a liberal policy was pursued towards it and religious ideology in the first years after the establishment of the new order in Poland. This policy enabled the Church and religion in Poland to maintain many of their positions and recover themselves. Later, the revisionist betrayal was to bring about a "true revival" of the role and influence of the Church among the masses. There were two main factors in this:

First, as a result of Gomulka and company's throwing in their lot completely with the Soviet revisionists, the character of the former fraternal internationalist links between the two countries was totally changed. Poland became a vassal country of the Russian metropolis. This gave the Church the opportunity to raise the ancient banners of nationalism. The Polish masses, ever more aware of the burden of the social-imperialist occupation and lacking their political commissars, were lured by the "resurrection of old saints."

Irrespective of what aims and plans of new enslavement

these “saints” kept concealed, at least, they played on an acute and painful problem, therefore, the disillusioned masses followed them more and more.

Second, as we said above, the Polish revisionist leadership itself was interested not only in winning the support of the Church and the clergy for itself, but also in the enlivenment and intensification of religious activity within the country. If it were won over, the Church would bless the revisionist betrayal, just as it did. On the other hand, the revisionist leadership was interested in the revival of religion in order to further poison and deceive the minds of the people so that the Poles would be more and more involved with religion and less and less involved with politics. The Church was to accept these two tasks with which the clique in power charged it, but as a Catholic Church it was to work and collaborate with the revisionist chiefs in such a direction that its contribution would bring grist to the mill of the ultra-reactionary forces linked with the capitalist West.

Thus, supported and assisted by the line of the PUWP and the revisionist state, *the Polish Church gradually turned into one of the main factors which led Poland to the counter-revolution and catastrophe.*

In “calm” periods, in the phases of collaboration between these two wings of the counter-revolution, the Church blessed the unrestrained demagoguery for the deception and poisoning of the minds of the masses, and for this it presented itself as an ally and partner of the two sides. When collaboration gave way under the impact of the exacerbation of relations between them, however, the Church emerged on the side of the ultra-capitalist forces as the spiritual leader which inspires and guides these forces towards the achievement of their final aims. Its cross has always looked towards the West. This is not simply an expression of the old conflict between the Western

Catholic Church and the Russian Orthodox Church. Politics has always hidden itself behind religious masks. Not links with the typically Catholic countries, but links with the typically capitalist countries — this has been and is the main mission of the Polish Catholic Church.

In the entire counter-revolutionary process that has occurred in the three to four past decades in Poland, an important role in the confusion of the masses has been played not only by the Polish Church, but also by the Polish intelligentsia, especially that part of it which had maintained close links with the anti-popular regimes of the past and which in the line of PUWP after 1956 found support for its venomous anti-socialist campaign.

The reactionary intelligentsia of the past lined up as the right arm and favourite weapon for the counter-revolution within the revisionist counter-revolution. By means of the intelligentsia, through its “unbiased” language, reaction developed that propaganda and ceaselessly incited those tendencies among the masses which neither the old capitalists nor the new bourgeoisie, the new forces of the counter-revolution which the restored capitalism built up, were capable of doing openly.

“But the influence of the *intelligentsia*, who take no direct part in exploitation, who have been trained to use general phrases and concepts, who seize on every ‘good’ idea and who sometimes... elevate their inter-class position to a *principle* of non-class parties and non-class politics — the influence of this bourgeois intelligentsia on the people is dangerous,” says Lenin. “Here and here alone, do we find a contamination of the broad masses that is capable of doing real harm.”*

This, too, has been confirmed in Poland. The bourgeois revisionist intelligentsia became the support and vanguard of

* V.I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. 13, p. 46, Alb. ed.

both the peaceful counter-revolution and the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution. Of course, when we speak of this destructive role of the intelligentsia, of its “work” to deceive the masses, to infect them with the ideas of the counter-revolution, we are not speaking merely of ten or a hundred writers, artists, journalists, jurists of the known Polish dissidents, or of ten or a hundred of their colleagues who have fled to the West and who openly pour out torrents of abuse and accusations against socialism. We are speaking of whole contingents of the Polish intelligentsia, infected with hatred for socialism, of that typically revisionist intelligentsia which has long been struggling for “more opportunities,” for the flowering of all sorts of schools, of that “educated” intelligentsia which is well-acquainted with the East and the West, which “knows what it is talking about,” which poses as “progressive,” etc., etc.

Inside or outside the PUWP, especially within the Polish Democratic Party (a legal party and partner of the PUWP), or organized in the dissident organizations (KOS-KOR, the Confederation of Independent Poland, the Movement of Stars, etc., etc.), this reactionary intelligentsia gradually became the leading centre of the ultra-capitalist forces.

Comrade Enver Hoxha’s conclusion that, “The capitalist bourgeoisie has as its vanguard its old and new revisionist intelligentsia in complete unity of thought and deed,”* finds further complete confirmation in the example of Poland. In the recent movements in Poland and especially in the organisms created from the autumn of 1980, and on, the representatives of this intelligentsia occupied the main soft seats. They constituted the leading staff of the ultra-capitalist forces and did and are doing everything in their power to turn them-

* Enver Hoxha, “Against Modern Revisionism 1968-1970,” p. 60, Alb. ed.
194

selves into the true masters of the capitalist Poland.

In the process of the confusion and manipulation of the Polish masses, *imperialism and international reaction and American imperialism, in the first place*, have played an important and ever increasing role.

The billions of dollars the capitalist West has been providing for Poland with such “generosity” are always accompanied with demands for concessions in all other fields.

Poland became a country open for everything: dollars, goods, drugs, state presidents (during the years 1972-1979 Poland was visited by three presidents of the USA: Richard Nixon 1972, Gerald Ford 1975 and Jimmy Carter 1979), for the Pope of the Vatican, for businessmen, commercial travellers and brothel keepers, mobs of tourists (every year an average of 120 thousand Americans of Polish origin visit Poland, besides hundreds of thousands of other Americans and millions of tourists from other Western countries). The visits of Poles to the West are equally widespread and unrestricted. Apart from economic emigrants, thousands of other Poles go to the Western countries as visitors to learn from the “miracle” of the “consumer society,” without forgetting those tens of thousands of others who go continually to the Vatican as pilgrims to receive blessings from the mouth of the Pope himself. Of course, such a “free exchange” of people must be associated with the free “exchange” of opinions, ideas and the way of life. All this could not fail to poison the confused minds even more thoroughly.

At the same time, the capitalist West has always hastened to do its “duty” through a whole industry for propaganda and information. The bourgeois press and such agencies as “Radio Free Europe,” “The Voice of America,” the “BBC,” etc., etc., were turned into external inspirers and organizers of the right forces inside Poland.

Obviously, the capitalist West, headed by American imperialism, has always made all these efforts, carried out subversive activities with definite aims in favour of a definite strategy. This was and is *the strategy of the counter-revolution, in general, and the strategy of the establishment of the global hegemony of American imperialism*, in particular.

In the case of Poland, the permanent rivalry of American imperialism with Soviet social-imperialism for the division of the world, and for each to expand its sphere of influence at the expense of the other, finds an indisputable example. When, as the result of the joint imperialist-revisionist struggle for the destruction of socialism, Poland was swept by confusion and chaos, international imperialism, headed by American imperialism, judged that Poland was the weakest link of the Soviet sphere of influence and aimed its main blows right there. In order to justify the efforts to turn Poland into a country completely dependent on the West, and especially to gain the “sympathy” of the Polish people, a further imperialist machination was added to the others: a Polish cardinal, Carol Woitila, was chosen as head of the Vatican to replace the Pope of Rome who was “unexpectedly” found dead in his bed! Meanwhile, the leaders of the Polish dissidents and ultra-right reaction began to receive directions and means of every sort from the CIA and other Western agencies to launch themselves into immediate actions. It is not for nothing that from the outbursts of the summer of 1980 to this day, the “Polish question” has been in the centre of attention of the bourgeoisie and international reaction.

Each 24 hours the centres of imperialist propaganda installed in Western countries transmit a total of more than 40 hours of special broadcasts for Poland without mentioning here the feverish activity of the Polish political emigrants represented by such parties as “Free Poland” or the “Polish

government in exile.”

While continually repeating the false idea that “socialism exists in Poland,” all these carry on the most savage subversion, not against the basis of the existing order in Poland, but against the idea of socialism, against its essence as the socio-economic order of the future. Indeed at a time when they violently suppress the strikes that break out in their own countries, when they arrest, imprison and dismiss thousands of workers from their jobs, such chiefs of reaction as Reagan, Thatcher, Schmidt, Strauss and so on, let no opportunity pass without sending “messages of greetings,” “aid,” and “gifts” to the Polish workers (!) and their “independent” organization — “Solidarity.” Millions of dollars in cash, truck-loads of food, even ultra-modern printing machinery and special television stations arrive “illegally” as “gifts” from the capitalist West at the disposal of “Solidarity”!

In the Western press, on the television screens, in the public meetings and contacts of chiefs of imperialism, the events in Poland, especially the activity of “Solidarity” and its step-by-step ascent to power, became the most important theme of the day. For a moment it seemed that everything was proceeding in Poland as American imperialism and Western reaction wanted; for a moment it seemed that through “Solidarity” Poland would be the first country under Soviet influence that would be annexed to the American zone of influence. In order to neutralize Moscow’s support for, pressure on and dictate to, the revisionist team in power in Poland, as far as possible, international imperialism followed every action of the chiefs of the Kremlin step by step and “unmasked” and “condemned” them as “inhibitors of the normal development of events in Poland,” “as violators of democracy,” as “oppressors,” as “occupiers,” etc. Just as imperialism found facts to prove the all-round pressure and interference that Moscow

exerted to restrain the developments and stabilize the situation in Poland in its favour, every hour of the day, so Moscow, for its part, found a heap of facts which proved the direct and indirect implication of imperialism and all the Western agencies in further deepening the process of the destabilization and chaos in Poland. Each of the two rival sides, while posing from opposite positions as a friend of Polish people, in reality did nothing but worsen the already extremely grave situation in the country, driving Poland deeper into the impasse, because their hegemonic interests required this.

Even after December 13, 1981, when it seemed that Jaruzelski with his sudden powerful blow had turned the situation in Poland in favour of Moscow, imperialism, headed by American imperialism, did not lose hope and did not diminish its efforts in favour of the ultra-right forces. On the contrary, even in the new situation created after December 1981, imperialism was making every effort to keep the chaos and general crisis in Poland at boiling point.

For the bourgeoisie and Western reaction, even though they did not succeed in returning Poland to their sphere of influence, the political and ideological gains from this situation were and are great.

First, it is in the interest of the capitalist West that the Polish crisis and the "Polish example" should spread and penetrate as deeply as possible into the other countries of the so-called socialist community. Through the "gains" which the Polish proletariat allegedly achieved (we shall speak below about what these "gains" were) the Western imperialists aimed to add further heat to the crisis situation in the other former socialist countries, to further corrupt and confuse the consciousness of the proletariat in those countries, to split it more deeply from every standpoint and set it in opposition to the ruling authorities, but always under the banners of the

counter-revolution and anti-socialism. Hence, by "directing" the proletariat of former socialist countries to learn from the "Polish example," the imperialists and reaction not only *further destabilize the situation in those countries*, but also try to involve the proletariat in movements alien to its vital interests, *to alienate it to the maximum from the road of the revolution* and to put it under the control of the counter-revolution.

Second, the imperialist bourgeoisie uses the bitter disappointments of the Polish proletariat, in its propaganda, as a "lesson" for the proletariat of the Western countries: "Look what socialism is like, that is where you will get with the revolution for which your Polish brothers shed their blood and made sacrifices in the past!"

In the conditions when the question of the revolution is on the order of the day, the "bitter disappointment of the Polish proletariat in socialism" is an effective weapon in the hands of world reaction to deceive and disarm the proletariat and the masses of those countries. Therefore, for the enemies of the revolution, Poland must sink more deeply into chaos and it must be trumpeted even more loudly as "socialist"! Thus, the idea of socialism becomes further discredited and the demagogic fog becomes more dense and effective.

And when added to this savage attack from the "right" there is the equally savage attack from the "left," from Soviet social-imperialism and the modern revisionists of other countries, the confusion becomes greater. The social-imperialists issue calls and exert pressure "to safeguard the victories achieved," "to protect the existing situation," i.e., to maintain that situation which can no longer be tolerated. In this case the sympathies of the confused Pole lean towards the West, because, at least, it not only "sympathizes with them," but also tells them that they should not endure the existing situation, should rise against the revisionist rulers but, as we said,

under the banners of the counter-revolution.

In all this process which has been going on for decades on end, the united forces of reaction, with unrivalled persistence and cynicism, further misled the misled, deceived the deceived, for an aim quite the opposite of the final aim of the proletariat. Consequently the great misfortune occurred: the proletarians rose against the reactionary regime, but without their natural ideology, without their vanguard party, without their own proletarian banner and program.

Dialectics was proving merciless towards them too. The confused contingents of the proletariat, under the control of pro-Western reaction and the Vatican, went into action to win everything, but were to reap only defeat and disillusionment at every step. They had entrusted the realization of their own historic mission to representatives of an antagonistic class and now the latter were to rob the confused proletariat of the strength, not only of their arms, but also of their spirit.

In such cases, says Marx, “some of the proletariat gets involved in *doctrinaire experiments, joins... worker’s associations — in other words becomes involved in such bourgeois forms in which it abandons the idea of the overthrow of the old world...*”*

This has been fully confirmed in the recent movements of the Polish proletariat.

Indeed, even at these moments, internal reaction employed (and is employing) the weapon of deception and demagoguery: it did not come out openly as an organization or as a party and did not call openly on the workers to rise under its leadership in order to establish the “capitalist order.” No, the open expression of this essence might bring consequences unpleasant to the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution. Calls were issued to the workers to rise “independently” in an

* Karl Marx, “The 18th of Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte” Tirana 1974, p. 22, Alb. ed.
200

“independent” trade-union movement, “with neither one side nor the other,” i.e. to rise in such a movement in which everything would be decided and done by the workers themselves, without any kind of predetermined “ideology or policy,” but simply “in the way that seemed best to the workers in the situation that arose!”

Thus, after three decades of endless deceptions, in the summer of 1980 the Polish proletarians went into action impelled by a new deception, the deception of “independent trade unionism.”

III THE “INDEPENDENCE OF TRADE UNIONS” — JUSTIFICATION OF CAPITALIST DEPENDENCE AND EXPLOITATION

**“We do not defend neutrality, we are enemies
of it.”**

LENIN

The events of the summer of 1980 in Poland, irrespective of the underlying socio-political factors and the true objectives which the various participating forces aimed to achieve, were presented by Western reaction and the Polish reactionary chiefs as a “movement for independent trade-unions.” The main objective of this movement was declared to be the formation of “independent trade-union organizations.” It was said that these unions, “not directed or manipulated” by anybody, by any ideology or political party, i.e., by neither the left nor the right, would solve all the problems which were worrying the Polish proletariat and people!

The movement was so strong that neither demagoguery nor threats proved effective against it and on August 31, 1980, the “Compromise of Gdansk and Szczecin” or the “Gdansk-Szczecin Agreement” was reached. The revisionist party and government agreed to all the strikers’ requests, including the main one: the formation of “free,” “independent,” “neutral,” “self-managed” trade unions. On September 17, 1980 the first general meeting of heads of the “independent” movement was held in Gdansk. At this meeting, in which about 250 delegates took part, it was decided to form the “in-

dependent” trade-union organization which, from these moments, took the name “Solidarity.”

After a gradual confrontation with the ruling authorities over the legalization of this organization, which completely overturned the former structure of the organization of the Polish proletariat, at the beginning of November 1980 the chiefs of “Solidarity” threatened to call a national general strike on November 12. The branches of “Solidarity” all over Poland declared they were ready to go on strike. The government capitulated. On November 10, 1980, this organization, proclaimed to be “independent,” was recognized officially by the Supreme Court of Poland.

All Western reaction and Polish internal reaction proclaimed this act with fanfares as a “great historic right” which the Polish proletariat had won!

“The first breach in the communist system,” ran the banner headlines in the bourgeois press, referring to this “victory,” and the torrent of articles, interviews, statements and comments about it has gone on endlessly.

While world reaction continued its clamour, which now found the opportunity to launch another attack on the theory and practice of scientific socialism, the enrol of workers, officials and intellectuals in the “independent trade unions” continued. According to figures published in the press and statements of the main leaders of the “Federation of Independent Polish Trade Unions,” more than 10 million members were enrolled in these organizations. The registration in the “independent unions” became an epidemic rather than a fashion. One after another, almost all the “official,” “dependent” organizations (those manipulated by the revisionists in power) were dissolved to be replaced by their sisters, likewise official and recognized by law, but now “independent.” Not even the militarymen stood aloof. As the Polish press declared, they,

too, demanded their trade-union organization, of course, “independent”(!) and legally recognized by the government. The students joined in the race, too, and, at the first hesitation on the part of the government, threatened to go on strike and occupy the universities. However... “a great conflict”: “We agree that you should be independent,” the top government organs replied, “but how can you call yourselves trade unionists? You are not workers!” After debates the solution was found: “The independent organization of university students”! And everywhere: the “independent organization of artists,” the “independent organization of jurists”... and the “independent organization of monks and nuns”!

When the entire base of Poland was becoming “independent” how could the Polish landowners in general stand aside without gaining this “independence.” The movement for “independent peasant unions” broke out (!). After some hesitation and friction, and after the intervention of the Polish Church, headed by Cardinal Wysinski even the landowners were given the right to organize in an “independent union,” the “Peasants’ Solidarity.”

In brief, it was claimed far and wide and with great publicity that the Polish proletariat and together with it the overwhelming bulk of the working people of Poland had scored the “great victory”: they gained the right to operate “independently” in their “independent trade-union organizations”!

After about a year of euphoria about the “triumph” of this “independence,” in the winter of 1981 the “independents” were declared illegal through a single act and the “unrestricted freedoms” were shut up in internment camps. Western and Polish reaction wept over the “loss of independence,” and even to this day continue to talk about and treat the “independent trade unions” as one of the “most historic victories” which the Polish proletariat has ever been able to achieve, as an act

which opened a “new epoch” in the “history of socialism”!

Precisely for this reason it is worthwhile to turn back to the “independent trade unions” and examine what they represented in essence and form.

WERE THE POLISH “INDEPENDENT TRADE UNIONS” TRULY INDEPENDENT?

“As long as the class struggle continues in society, no individual, let alone organization, can stand above the classes, above the parties, outside politics and independent of politics.”

ENVER HOXHA

The first questions that arise as soon as one hears all this clamour about trade-union “independence” are:

First, *from whom were the “independent” Polish trade unions independent?!*

Sometimes quite openly and sometimes through implications and disguised phrases, it was said that the new unions were opposed to and escaped from the PUWP and the Polish revisionist government in the role of leaders and manipulators, that is, they won their independence from them.

To break free from and indignantly and firmly reject the leadership of such a revisionist party as the PUWP would be not only a success, but also a duty, which should have been accomplished much earlier by the Polish proletariat.

The classics of Marxism-Leninism have always emphasized the necessity for the proletariat of the capitalist countries to throw off the yoke of “official” unions created and manipulated by the bourgeoisie, reaction and their parties.

Loyal to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, the PLA has consistently stressed that the necessity about which the classics of Marxism-Leninism wrote remains a current task of our days. Comrade Enver Hoxha says, "...to free itself from capitalism it is essential for the proletariat of every country to shake off the yoke of the trade unions dominated by the bourgeoisie and opportunists as well as that of any kind of social-democratic or revisionist organization or party."*

From this standpoint the struggle of the Polish proletariat to reject the leading role of the PUWP and revisionist unions was a necessary action, and carried out consistently, would merit congratulation.

But the feeling of enthusiasm and the desire to congratulate the Polish proletariat is replaced by regret, when, after the second question about who inspired it and under the leadership of what force did it rise to throw off dependence on the PUWP, the whole truth on the "Polish independent trade unions" is disclosed.

To the leaders of the Polish "independent movement" this question would seem a grave insult, if not a sacrilege:

"What leadership?" they would protest. "This is precisely what we rose against. Against a leading force or party! We are free, independent unions, not directed by anybody, not led by any force other than the workers themselves!"

Hence, entirely "independent" unions, that is, the working class organized under the leadership of "nobody"! Hence, organizations "outside" any given ideology or policy! Hence, "with neither one side nor the other," independent, absolutely free, suspended in mid-air!

This is what was claimed to have occurred in Poland! Is such a thing possible? Were the so-called independent Polish trade unions truly independent?!

* Enver Hoxha, "Imperialism and the Revolution," p. 231, Eng. ed.

Writing about the necessity for the continuous extension and strengthening of trade-union organizations, V.I. Lenin frequently used the term "*independent organizations*." He has stressed the need for the creation of an "independent class organization of the proletariat" and this he considered as the "first step" in the organization of the proletariat of town and countryside "*to help itself*."* Lenin uses the same term when he points out, "The fundamental principle and first instruction for any trade-union movement is: don't pin your hopes on the 'state,' rely only on *the strength of your class*. The state is the organization of the ruling class."**

When analysing the Leninist concept about the *independent class trade-union organizations of the proletariat* and the "Polish independent trade unions," one immediately sees that there is an unbridgeable gulf between them, that they are diametrically opposite and incompatible. Why?

First, when Lenin speaks about the *independent* movement of the proletariat and its *independent* organization, in every case he is speaking about that movement which is developed by the proletariat itself *as a class in itself and for itself*, and about those trade-union organizations which are "simply class organizations"*** not manipulated or directed from "outside" (by forces, parties, groups, etc. alien to the proletariat from their class standpoint or from the ideology which guides them or the political aims which they want to achieve).

To leave no room for misunderstanding about this concept, Lenin never speaks simply about "independent organizations" in general, but always clearly defines "*independent class organizations of the proletariat*," "*Simple class organizations*," and issues calls to the proletariat: "rely only on the

* V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 25, p. 134, Alb. ed.

** Ibid., p. 133.

*** Ibid., vol. 13, p. 184.

strength of your class.”

Precisely this clearly defined class criteria was totally lacking in the so-called “Polish independent trade unions.” They were proclaimed as “Workers’ organizations” and the fact is that millions of workers enrolled in them. But even from the aspect of their class content, the workers there played what you might call the role of the “public” or the “gallery.” The leadership and the reins of the organization were in the hands of elements completely alien to the proletariat, the ultra-right capitalist forces, the reactionary intellectuals, the dissidents, the agents of the Vatican and imperialism. At first these forces kept “out of sight,” but gradually began to emerge ever more openly on the scene in the role of chairmen of trade-union branches, members of the “Solidarity” coordinating committee, advisers, publicists, spokesmen, etc., etc. Hence the proletarian base of the union was manipulated and led by non-proletarian forces, indeed by class and ideological enemies of the proletariat.

As to how “independent” and “proletarian” the Polish “independent trade unions” were this was shown, amongst other things, by the 1st Congress of “Solidarity,” which was held in September 1981. Of the nearly 900 delegates to the Congress only about 20 per cent were workers, not forgetting that included amongst this “20 per cent” there were many who were not engaged directly in production, but more particularly from the technical intelligentsia, technocrats and managers linked with production as well as “workers” like Lech Walesa, individuals who had been completely removed from work for years and had turned into professional “leaders” of strikes, demonstrations and disturbances.

Second and more important, the Leninist concept about the independent class organization of the proletariat is indissoluble linked with the need for a given ideology and, precise-

ly, with the ideology of the proletariat, Marxism-Leninism. Without this ideology any organization may be anything and may attach the label “proletarian” to itself a hundred times over, but it will never be the class organization of the proletariat. This was the point Lenin was making when he stressed: “We shall work hard in the trade unions, we shall work in all fields to spread the revolutionary theory of Marxism among the proletariat and to build up a ‘stronghold’ of class organization.”*

What, then, was the ideology which pervaded and inspired the Polish “independent trade unions”?

Not the Marxist-Leninist ideology. This is proved not only by the fact that after Poland was set on the course for capitalism a savage campaign was waged against Marxism-Leninism in all fields, but also by the other fact that among the many different theories and ideological currents which are circulating in that country, including revisionist, clerical idealist, anarcho-syndicalist, pluralist and others, the voice of the Marxist-Leninist forces has not been heard at all. However, there is no need for us to prove that Marxism-Leninism had nothing at all to do with these organizations. The leaders of the unions declared that openly.

Since these “proletarian” unions were not built or guided by Marxism-Leninism, however, undoubtedly there was another ideology which had taken the place of the ideology of the working class. An ideological vacuum cannot exist in society, therefore, in the case of the Polish trade unions, as in any other instance, the problem cannot be presented as one of “dependence” or “independence” from the ideological standpoint, but must be presented as on what ideology were they dependent? And since, in the final analysis, there are only two ideologies in society — proletarian and bourgeois, and since

* V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 13, p. 186, Alb. ed.

the proletarian ideology did not exist there, then the so-called “independent” unions in Poland were built on and guided by the bourgeois ideology.

“The *only* choice is — either bourgeois or socialist ideology. There is no middle course,” says Lenin. “...Hence, to belittle the socialist ideology in any way, *to turn aside from it in the slightest degree* means to strengthen bourgeois ideology.”*

This statement of principle in the field of theory finds its concrete expression in the entire practice of the recent Polish movement, including the activity of the “independent” trade unions. True, the Polish proletariat rose against the economic and other difficulties which it had encountered, but the bourgeois ideology, sometimes disguised as anarcho-syndicalism and sometimes quite openly, was and remained the only banner which inspired both the movement and its main “fruit” — the “independent trade unions.” The banner of the religious ideology, of the Catholic Church, in particular, was waving at every step of these organizations.

The declarations about a boundless, absolute, “independence” are a great deception perpetrated upon the proletariat. By means of them the ultra-reactionary forces strive to hide the bitter fact, that the working class of capitalist Poland is spiritually dependent on an alien ideology, on a class which is hostile to it.

Third, Lenin always linked the concept about the independent class organization of the proletariat with the *leading role of the vanguard party*, with that force which the proletariat produces from its own ranks as the most resolute spokesman and defender of its interests, its ideology and its general activity. This is the Marxist-Leninist party. Only under the leadership and the banner of this party can the movement of the proletariat become a movement “simply of the class,” as

* V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, vol. 1, p. 165, Alb. ed.

Lenin says, and the trade-union organizations of the proletariat became truly “independent class organizations of the proletariat.” That is how Lenin understood the “independence” and “neutrality” of trade unions in the conditions of an exploiting and oppressive society. Precisely for this reason, when he spoke about “independence” he always linked this with the vanguard party, always made this independence “dependent” on the vanguard party of the proletariat. Apart from this “dependence” or leadership, there is and can be no genuine independence. “Trade-union neutrality is not defensible as a *principle*,” stressed Lenin. “The only correct principle is the closest possible alignment of the unions with the Party. Our policy must be to bring the unions closer to the Party and link them with it.”*

Lenin never regarded the links of the vanguard proletarian party with the trade unions merely as ideological links, which must certainly lead to acceptance of the leading role of the party by the trade-union organizations, but conceived them as *permanent, real, all-round* links, as ideological and political links.

In his long stern struggle with all kinds of opportunists and other representatives of capitalism, Lenin always strongly opposed slogans about “*non-party* trade unions,” about the “independent” and absolute “neutrality” of these organizations. There can be no talk of neutrality or non-political unions, said Lenin. On the contrary, the necessity for the establishment of close links between the trade unions and the party and the necessity of strengthening these links has been completely accepted.

Hence, it is clear that from the positions of Marxism-Leninism the problem cannot be presented as “with a party” or “without a party,” “with the party spirit” or “without the

* V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 13, p. 113, Alb. ed.

party spirit,” but as under the leadership of which party, under the banner of which party, does this or that organization of the masses organize and operate? If this party and this spirit, which pervade and guide the trade-union organizations, are the party of the proletariat and the proletarian spirit then alone can there be talk of independent trade union class organizations.

Otherwise, any other kind of “independence,” no matter under what guise or sauce it is dished up, is simply a deception of the working class, an attempt to divert this movement from its own terrain and put it in the service of capital and reaction, i.e., make it dependent on the bourgeoisie.

Did the Polish proletariat, organized in the ranks of “Solidarity” or the other “autonomous unions,” possess the number-one subjective factor to be truly independent, that is, its Marxist-Leninist leading party?

No! Then which party, which organization, led the “free unions” in Poland?!

“No party!” declared the chiefs of the “independent unions” and served this up as an expression of the fact that they were truly “independent.” But this claim was quite unjustified from any standpoint, and in any case is utterly impossible. “So long as the class struggle continues in society, no individual, let alone organization, can stand above classes, above the party, outside and independent of politics,”* says Comrade Enver Hoxha.

The “independence” of the trade unions could not be an exception to this principle and truth, irrespective of what their chiefs declare and the will of the Polish proletarians. The reality of events there proves this to the hilt.

As the classics of Marxism-Leninism teach us, because

* Enver Hoxha, “The Role and Tasks of the Democratic Front,” Selected Works, vol. 4. p. 302, Eng. ed.
212

of the economic conditions the proletariat is outstanding amongst all classes of capitalist society for its great ability to organize itself. This is true of the proletariat of every capitalist country, hence, of the Polish proletariat, too. The “objective ability to organize itself,” however, is not everything, it is only the possibility, the premise, and this premise is not transformed in reality spontaneously or automatically. The maximum ability of the proletariat to unite, says Lenin, “is realized through living people, and only through definite forms of organization.”*

This is what occurred with the millions of Polish proletarians, whose ability to organize themselves was exploited and realized by “*living people*,” that is, *a given force, a given organization*.

In the absence of the Marxist-Leninist party there, another party, not of the proletariat, played this role surreptitiously or openly. Precisely on this account, it was in vain to present the “independent trade unions” in Poland as “independent” and “non-party” unions. From start to finish they were inspired by, and dependent on, bourgeois politics, the politics of the blackest reaction.

It is a fact proven by history that no trade-union movement has remained outside politics and independent of political parties and groups. All trade-union movements up till now have been organized and guided by political parties and inspired by their ideology. V.I. Lenin, unmasking the views about the independent trade-union movement in his article, “On the Tasks of the Trade Unions,” points out, “There can be no talk of any sort of trade union ‘neutrality.’ Any campaign for neutrality is either a hypocritical screen for counter-revolution or a complete lack of class consciousness.”**

* V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 13, p. 107, Alb. ed.

** Ibid., vol. 28, p. 442.

Here, too, there is no need to rely only on one theoretical argument. Day by day the Polish reality itself brought out more and more clearly that behind the “non-party spirit” of “Solidarity” stood bourgeois politics, the political organizations of pro-Western reaction. In order to preserve the appearance of “non-involvement in party politics” these forces “kept in the background” at first, or, at the most, were represented by political groups of the type of KOS-KOR, the “Confederation of Independent Poland,” etc. As time passed, not only the leading structures of “Solidarity,” but the whole organization, began to display the features of a political organization rather than those of a trade-union organization.

As such, it was a conglomeration of bourgeois political groupings and of Polish reaction and of the most varied trends and currents of bourgeois ideology. Its “syndicalism” was and is a means to draw the proletariat into action, a smokescreen to conceal from the proletariat the truth that it had unwittingly been drawn into an organization totally alien to its own aims and interests. The draft-program of “Solidarity,” published for “discussion” in the spring of 1981 and the Gdansk Congress of this organization, held in September 1981, confirmed this reality with many examples. Rather than a congress of a trade-union organization, from start to finish it was a congress of a bourgeois-political organization in the process of consolidation. Therefore, both the calls for “neutrality” in ideology and the calls for “independence” from any political party were and are nothing but the calls of reaction to ensure that the proletariat was confused to the maximum and remained dependent on the parties of the bourgeoisie, as it has done to this day, and on the other hand to hinder its struggle to produce the Marxist-Leninist vanguard party from within its ranks.

Thus, the “independent trade unions” in Poland never

were or could be independent organizations. They were as little “independent” as the existing order in Poland is “socialist.” The only difference between these two deceptions lies in the fact that, while the interests of the revisionist clique in power and its social-imperialist allies are linked with the deception about “socialism,” the deception about the “independence” is linked with the interests of the Polish ultra-capitalist reaction, Western imperialism and the Vatican.

Hence, the “mass participation,” both in the movement with counter-revolutionary inspiration and in the “independent trade unions” in Poland, was a manifestation of the headlong rush of amalgamated mobs, following the petty-bourgeois call and the temporary triumph of socio-political deception. History knows of many such examples in which given contingents of the proletariat not only were corrupted, but in some cases placed themselves in the service of the tragic plans and manoeuvres of the bourgeoisie and reaction of one country or another. Nevertheless, the millions recruited under alien banners have never been a proof of or argument for the justice of the movement or organization in which they have taken part, or of the truth about the reactionary content and character of that movement or organization. The same thing must be said of the participation of a part of the Polish proletariat in “Solidarity” and its activities. In reality, the “mass participation” in “Solidarity” was essentially an inflation of proportions, a temporary victory of the interests and aims of the minority (the exploiting class) in complete and absolute antagonism with the interests of the masses who had been lured into this organization by deception and demagogy. The deception, the lies, the demagogy succeeded to the point that, for a moment, it seemed that what the reactionary leaders of the organization demanded was allegedly in harmony with the interests of the working class and working masses. The ghosts

of Proudhon and his slogan, the golden maxim of opportunism of doctrinaire petty-bourgeois socialism, “we must build socialism without touching private property,” dominated the horizons of “Solidarity” and all Poland. Precisely because the “mass participation” in “Solidarity” was a temporary victory of the interests of the minority, it was and is only a passing phenomenon. As we shall see below, the bitter reality showed the Polish proletarians at each step that they had been led up a blind ally, that the “trade-union independence” was “given” to them with the aim that they should assist the pro-Western counter-revolution, to enact its scenario. The “great cultural revolution” in China was a similar thing. Did not the different clans within the Chinese leadership try to use the millions of “red guards” in pragmatic ways to play the game of the Chinese imperial palace?!

WHY DID REACTION NEED THE SO-CALLED “TRADE UNION INDEPENDENCE” IN POLAND?

“The theory of neutrality is the ideological cloak for... bourgeois tendencies.”

LENIN

By seizing on “syndicalism” and emerging as the “champion of workers’ rights,” Polish ultra-capitalist reaction, supported and inspired in every way by Western reaction, aimed to attain several objectives simultaneously.

Its main immediate aim was and is political — the seizure of power. Although this reaction had been growing stronger

and more organized for two or three decades, still it was quite unable to achieve its aims with “its own forces,” alone.

Now that it had managed to deceive and win over large contingents of the proletariat and the masses, achievement of its aim had become easier. By “merging” itself in the trade-union organizations, by hiding behind them, and at the same time, directing and leading them, pro-Western reaction emerged with the united forces of millions of people as a serious opposition to the revisionist government.

At the moments when the “independent trade unions” had still not been legalized, the PLA foresaw this main aim accurately and in the article of September 7, 1980 wrote, “Obviously the ‘free trade unions’ will strive, first, to exert ‘self-managed’ functions in the enterprises, factories and plants, in a word, to seize economic power. They will not fail to extend their activities to the countryside, too, where they will try to gather under their leadership all the small enterprises or workshops that exist there in order ‘to self-administer’ them. They will also use the legalized strikes to exert pressure on the bureaucratic centralized state and to seize political power.”

On November 11, 1980, the heads of “Solidarity” themselves, welcoming the legalization of their organization, declared, “We are aware of our responsibility to the citizens for the future of Poland.”*

An extremely advanced pretension for a “purely trade-union” organization. However, this statement did not stem from any euphoric naivety. On the contrary, it expressed the essence of the aims of those who formed “Solidarity” as a mainly political organization, with the aim of seizing power in Poland by means of it. Those same leaders of Polish revisionism who, at first, “Welcomed” this organization as a “real force to lift Poland out of crisis,” were later obliged to

* “Tribuna Ludu,” November 11, 1980.

admit that “the struggle of ‘Solidarity’ is not just to put pressure on the government. Now it is the struggle for power.”*

During 1981, this essence became more and more clear and began to be expressed quite openly. Whereas in the first period of the formation of “independent trade unions,” in order to “sweeten up” the workers they came out mostly with demands for momentary economic gains (increased pay, reduced prices and working hours), later the demands of “Solidarity” became more openly political: the right to control the market, the right to “self-administer” every aspect of the enterprises; the right to decide the policy on the appointment or removal of leading cadres of the enterprises, the drafting of new laws with the “approval” of the “independent” trade unions, the calls for a boycott of the Sejm if their demands were not accepted, the calls for throwing off dependence on the Russians, and making Poland dependent on the capitalist West, etc., etc.

Reaction could hardly be so bold as to express these demands “on its own behalf” or as an “independent force” and if it did it would not be successful. But now that it spoke from “the positions” of the working class and “in the name” of the working class, its voice was listened to with awe and “respect” by the clique in power. The deception and the political and ideological manipulation of the masses in the framework of an order which objectively ceaselessly aroused discontent and revolt, reached such a level, especially during 1981, that after every signal or call from the leaders “the independent masses” seemed to be ready, not only to close down the factories and enterprises, but to do anything they were told.

In brief, they served the aims of this group of the Polish bourgeoisie as cannon fodder, as a means of attack to seize

* Report in the 9th Plenum of the CC of the PUWP, March 1981, “Tribuna Ludu,” March 31, 1981.

power from the revisionist clique. And the fact is that, having the support of such contingents of misled people, the more the chaos and confusion in Poland increased, the bolder became the steps and actions of the ultra-reactionary forces to seize power. The period from September to the first ten days of December 1981 provides scores of examples of this. There was no more talk about “Control of market.” Now “Solidarity” demanded the right to control the entire economy through a “committee” vested with authority to cancel the decisions of the revisionist government; previously there was boycott of the Sejm, later there was talk of elections to the Sejm in which “Solidarity” aimed to capture all or the majority of seats; whereas earlier there had been talk of “new laws,” later there was talk of a “new legislation,” etc., etc. Finally, the aim of “Solidarity” to seize power was expressed openly at the session of the so-called “National Committee of Solidarity” on December 11, 1981, in Gdansk, when the inability of the revisionist government to get out of the crisis by means of proposals for “agreements” and “collaboration” was met with the demand for the “formation of a provisional government of experts, and later the holding of extraordinary elections to the Sejm and other organs.”* The final step had been taken. It seemed that a party and a government which for a year and a half had shown themselves so weak that they had conceded everything until there was nothing left to concede, would have to accept the referendum and the special elections demanded by the leaders of “Solidarity.” In such a case the victory would go to the pro-Western forces. They had the masses with them, that is, they had the votes.

It seemed as if the pro-Western reactionary forces had calculated everything carefully and even chosen the moment when they were taking this decisive step perfectly. Coming

* PAP — December 11, 1981.

up was December 14, a date which recalled the bloody events of December 1969 in Gdynia and Gdansk, but while everything ended in defeat at that time, it seemed that December 14, 1981 was going to bring the ultra-reactionary clan to the throne. And the political "Solidarity" set out to seize it. Like the billy goat in the fable, however, who forgot that apart from the "invitation" to become the village priest it had to receive the "blessing" from the wolf, it forgot that the wolf to its last moments, even when one last tooth is left in its head, still remains a wolf, and therefore it would come out and howl furiously, "You will become a priest if ever I allow you!"

The crushing blow of the night of December 13, 1981 fell, but that is another problem. It has to do mainly with the struggle for power between the chiefs of two expressions of the counter-revolution. We are speaking of that part of the Polish proletariat which, in its just revolt against the existing order, was misled into joining the so-called independent trade-unions and thus, without realizing it, involved itself in a struggle for power, not for itself, but for enemies of its own class.

At the same time the ultra-capitalist forces needed the banner of "independent trade-unionism" also as a political banner for the future, for that time when they thought they might take power. Since their regime (provided, of course, the wolf allowed the billy goat to become a priest) in essence would be nothing but the present one, with other people in power and a series of typically capitalist reforms, there would always be a danger from below, from the proletariat and the masses. From this standpoint, keeping the banner of "independent trade unions" waving at that time, too, would serve the reactionary forces, apart from other things, as a mask, as an appropriate invention to "permit" the masses "to struggle" within the limits of bourgeois trade-unionism, that

is, to exhaust their energies in petty efforts to the point when they would find it difficult to organize themselves for major battles to overthrow the existing order.

Hence, apart from its immediate political aim, by means of the fictitious banner of "independence," Polish ultra-capitalist reaction played and is still playing the same game as the bourgeoisie of all times has played: *keep the revolutionary spirit of the proletariat under continuous restraint, confuse and disorganize the proletariat in the interests of reaction*. Polish reaction is well aware of how terribly dangerous the role of the proletariat and the masses can be when they go into action to overthrow the existing order, even in those cases when they are manipulated by reaction.

At moments of decisive victories, the proletariat and the masses, who rise in struggle because they cannot endure the existing situation, may see that those who hold the reins of the movement are just as reactionary as the opposing side, therefore in such instances the victory achieved might make the masses in revolt challenge and reject the new yoke which is intended to replace the former yoke, i.e., in the concrete instance might reject the yoke of the ultra-capitalist forces.

"That is why the bourgeoisie strives with all its might to keep the proletariat satisfied with 'a modest' role..., so that it is as 'blank,' as 'practical' and as 'realistic' as possible and its activity is carried out on the principle that 'lest the bourgeoisie recoil,'"* says Lenin.

The banner of an "independent" trade-union movement is very suitable to this bourgeois principle and aim of Polish reaction.

By keeping the struggle of the proletariat within the bounds of a trade-union movement, by "strengthening" this movement with the idea of "independence," the pro-Western

* V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 9, p. 126, Alb. ed.

wing of the Polish bourgeoisie is simply blocking the way to the general people's revolution and replacing this course with the course of a trade-unionism which it manipulates.

Especially in the existing conditions, when the proletariat of the capitalist-revisionist countries is facing the task of carrying out the proletarian revolution, the bourgeoisie and reaction are giving this manoeuvre great importance. Western reaction can see and feel that, both in the Western countries and in the countries where the revisionists have usurped power, the possibilities of outbursts from below against the ruling cliques are great and to be expected.

Therefore, in a thousand ways, by pulling a thousand secret and open strings, reaction is setting in motion its agents, the "trade-union activists" of the Walesa, Bujak, Kuron and Myszniak type. These agents, seizing on the endless villainies of which the revisionist cliques are guilty, rise before the deceived and revolted workers and undertake to show them the "way to put an end to the injustice"! Everyone knows what road this is: the movement of "independent trade unions," the demands for the "right to strike," for "economic reforms," etc., etc., but in regard to its own interests, the proletariat must act only within the limits of trade-unionism and never outside these limits.

This means to put the trade-union organizations completely in the service of the bourgeoisie, because, as Marx points out, "They have no success... because they restrict themselves to partisan warfare against the existing system instead of working, at the same time, for the transformation of it and using their organized strength as a lever for the final liberation of the working class, that is, for the definitive elimination of the system of wage labour."^{*}

Another objective which Polish reaction aimed to achieve

^{*} Karl Marx, "Wages, Prices, Profits," Tirana, 1972, p. 98, Alb. ed.

and did achieve through the banner of "independent trade unions" was *to further confuse and split the working class and the working masses in Poland.*

Lenin, when reviewing a pamphlet by A.V. Lunacharsky who defended the Marxist view in connection with the "neutrality" of trade unions, pointed out four great distortions dangerous for the working class and its vanguard party from the so-called neutrality or independence of the trade unions. They were:

"1) The 'anarchistic looseness of the organization'; 2) keeping the workers keyed up instead of creating a firm 'stronghold of class organization'; 3) the petty-bourgeois individualistic features of its ideal and of the Proudhonist theory; 4) a stupid 'aversion to politics.'"^{*}

If these words are compared with the situation in the Polish trade unions both in 1980-1981 and today, it seems as if they were said precisely about them. Concretely:

— "The anarchist fragmentation of the organization."

The raising of the banner of "independent trade unions" by reaction finally blew apart the former utterly formal "unity" of the official revisionist trade unions.

The conscious revolutionary proletariat must never reject the yoke of trade unions manipulated by one party of reaction only to replace it with the yoke of other trade unions manipulated by other parties or groups of reaction. The replacement of one yoke by another never brings any advantage and only makes the evils worse. This is what occurred in Poland.

Within a short period the official unions there, manipulated by the revisionists, were abandoned and in place of them, or parallel with them, the so-called "independent" unions were formed. Profoundly shaken by this epidemic the revisionists in power exerted all their strength to salvage what

^{*} V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 13, p. 185, Alb. ed.

could be salvaged. In their speeches they “attacked” the “mistakes” observed in the line of the official trade unions, dismissed a number of chiefs of the new revisionist aristocracy from their posts, proclaimed the re-organization of “socialist” unions and tried to keep some contingents of workers under their control. According to the Polish official press, in 1981 there were reckoned to be 2-3 million members in these “official” unions against 9-10 million members in the so-called independent unions. But the process could not stop at that. Although in their main political aims and objectives the forces of the ultra-capitalist wing which manipulated the so-called independent unions seemed to be in unity, amongst them there were various groupings and currents, each of which represented various interests and tendencies, as is usual with the bourgeoisie and reaction in any capitalist country. This was to show up in the subsequent struggle for the further disruption and manipulation of the Polish proletariat.

Not all the so-called branches of the independent trade unions formed after September 1980 were united in the main organization which assumed the name “Solidarity.” A good part of the “independents” placed themselves under the “Confederation of Autonomous Trade Unions” which, it was claimed, included about 700-800 thousand members, while other contingents of proletarians and workers “were organized” in other groupings.

Thus, just like the workers in the Western capitalist countries, the working class and the workers in Poland were manipulated in six or seven trade-union organizations: “Solidarity,” the “Coordinating Commission of Branch Trade Unions” (with about 2-3 million members); the “Confederation of Autonomous Trade Unions” (with about 800 thousand members), the “Trade Union of Private Artisans of Poland” (with about 40 thousand members); the “Union of Munici-

pal Workers,” the “Central Union of Agricultural Circles and Organizations of Private Farmers,” the “Peasants’ Solidarity.”

Among these, “Solidarity” was the main one. By means of demagoguery and promises, by exploiting the hatred of the Polish working class for the revisionist regime in power and the revisionist Soviet Union, the political forces which ran this organization managed to manipulate the greater part of the Polish working class. “Solidarity” had branches in the 49 regions of Poland, with offices provided by the state, and had more than a million members of PUWP in its ranks. Right from the start it legalized the publication of its big-format weekly organ, the magazine “Solidarity,” which was published in more than 60 thousand copies, apart from tens of other periodicals and about 2 thousand books, pamphlets, manifestos, leaflets, etc., which were published by the “centre” or the regional branches. Meanwhile, especially during 1981, new “aid” and “gifts” from the imperialist West poured into “Solidarity” and its regional branches: ultramodern TV stations, radio and telex stations, which were put into full service publicizing the activity of the organization and its reactionary chiefs, not to mention those special broadcasts which reflected this activity day by day on Polish central television and the official revisionist radio.

When we stress this division we by no means imply that “it would have been better” if all had been incorporated in one or the other of these “trade-union organizations.” Each of them is equally alien to the true interests of the proletariat, each is a tool either in the hands of various groups of pro-Western reaction or in the hands of Polish pro-Soviet revisionists. By creating a situation of such great fragmentation and division, internal and external reaction increased their possibilities to manipulate and confuse the Polish proletariat more easily, to keep it permanently split and to set given con-

tingents of the proletariat in conflict with other contingents according to circumstances and the way things developed. The yoke of all existing trade-union organizations in Poland must be thrown off.

— “*Keeping the workers keyed up...*” The whole past period, especially after the “independent trade unions” were officially recognized, provides hundreds of examples of how the Polish proletariat, divided and lacking its own consistent leadership, was driven into ceaseless imprudent actions of an anarcho-syndicalist character. In fact it gained nothing of what it hoped to gain through these actions. The opposing groupings slapped the “blame” for this on one another. The union leaders blamed the Polish government, the government blamed the “ultra elements” who headed the unions. One side blamed the ceaseless strikes, the other side bellowed for the use of strikes at every step, etc., etc. Thus, the earlier disillusionment developed into desperation, and such a situation ceaselessly aroused anger, quarrels and conflicts, not only between the workers and the revisionist authorities, but also between different groups and organizations of workers.

Thus, the great division in the mass of the Polish workers became even deeper and a barrier to their future organization in purely class organizations, organizations which would reject and have nothing in common with either pro-Soviet reaction or pro-Western reaction.

In the existing conditions in Poland there were greater possibilities for what Lenin called *features of petty-bourgeois individualism* and *the absurd ‘revulsion’ against politics*, to be crystallized more clearly and emerge more on the surface.

As is known, from the time the modern revisionists first emerged on the scene, the pursuit of profits, the struggle for the “easiest possible life,” for “plenty” etc., were publicized and gradually became the ideal of the life and activity of the or-

dinary Pole. The modern revisionists led and encouraged the proletariat to pursue these “ideals” with the aim of diverting its attention from the betrayal which was being perpetrated. This demagogic line of the revisionists had a tranquilizing effect at first, but boomeranged on them later. The restored capitalism began to show that it could not provide what had been served up to the masses as the “sacred ideal” — the promised profit, plenty, etc. For this reason even the “apolitical” proletarians, who did not take to the barricades when the state power was usurped, were to hurl themselves into strikes and demonstrations when they saw that none of the promises had been fulfilled and that, on the contrary, the general situation was becoming even worse. Petty-bourgeois individualism makes such elements extremely sensitive. When their pocket is affected, when prices are raised and the shops are empty. When these things happen they are ready to rock the whole country, but as to why there are no goods in the shops, why their life is being ruined, why there is no sign of the promised plenty, etc., etc. they do not want to know. Such elements do not want to bother about finding the underlying cause which led to this grave situation or the ways and means to get out of it. Let the politicians, the chiefs, deal with those things! They do not want to be “bothered” with politics. Politics “sickens” them. Nevertheless this “revulsion” against politics has never been anything but complete involvement in politics — not working class politics, but bourgeois politics. As Lenin stressed, “Their tactics, which amount to a repudiation of the political struggle, disunite the proletarians and convert them in fact into passive participators in one bourgeois policy or another, since it is impossible and unrealizable for the workers really to dissociate themselves from politics.”*

This is what is occurring in fact: whereas previously some

* V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 10, p. 67, Alb. ed.

of the Polish proletariat with their “revulsion” against politics fell prey to the revisionist policy, later they fell prey to and played the game of pro-Western ultra-reaction. “Independent trade-unionism” was the new banner which was placed at the head of them to lead them towards “profits” and “plenty.” By means of this banner Western and Polish reaction did and are doing everything in their power to penetrate into the other revisionist countries and especially into the Soviet Union in order to create there, on the soil which the revisionists themselves have long since prepared, that state of affairs which is rocking Poland to its foundations.

Using the example of the “triumph” of the Polish proletariat, Western reaction is waving the banner of “independent unions” to the proletariat of those countries which are suffering and seething under the regime of the revisionist bourgeoisie, as the “best” and “most reliable” way to escape from the misfortunes!

Fear and confusion have seized the revisionist authorities in these countries more than ever. From the moment they first came to power they have lived and are bound to live in fear of the outburst of the revolution in their countries, revolution which, regardless of the zigzags, manipulations and the repressive measures which are taken to prevent it, will certainly break out one day. But besides their fear of the proletarian revolution, now the modern revisionists are terrified also, of their pro-Western counter-revolutionary rivals in Poland, because, although they do not aim to overthrow the existing capitalist system, they aim to overthrow the pro-Soviet counter-revolutionary ruling cliques. The “Polish example” was neither an accident nor an “isolated phenomenon.” It was a consequence of the same basic conditions and factors which exist in the other countries where the revisionist cliques are in power. The Polish epidemic might sweep over them too,

therefore, just as they are doing everything in their power to prevent the revolution, they are also striving with might and main to protect the status quo in their countries from the danger of the outburst of pro-Western counter-revolutionary movements. Apart from the unprecedented intensification of the measures of oppression and terror, the modern revisionists have set their whole propaganda machine in action to further confuse and stupefy the proletariat and all working people in the interest of revisionism. The sudden blow which was struck in December 1981 at the Polish “independent unions” was likewise one of the measures which the revisionist reaction took to “save” not only Poland, but also the other countries of the “socialist community” from the “Solidarity” experiment.

Nevertheless the conditions in those countries are such that the Polish phenomenon could spread there and be embraced by the confused contingents of the proletariat and the working masses. But there is another possibility: the Polish experiment could be discredited in the eyes of all those who have illusions about the “salvation” which the cause of “independent trade-unionism” allegedly brings. The blow which was struck at “Solidarity” on December 13, 1981 is increasingly convincing the proletariat of Poland and other revisionist countries that what it embraces under the aegis of “independent trade-unionism” is not and can never be a true road of salvation. For them submission and obedience to the revisionist cliques in power, which both Jaruzelski and Andropov and company are loudly demanding as the “alternative that will save the situation,” will not bring them salvation, either. The only correct and reliable road is to organize and launch the proletarian revolution. The recent events in Poland show that the proletariat was under the control of and inspired by a class alien to it, and this control did not and could not allow it to organize and arm itself with the great art of the revolution.

The fact is that after December 13, 1981 the Polish proletariat found itself disorientated, without leadership or organization, without the most fundamental elements of the correct strategy and tactics which should be followed in such cases.

Moreover, even were the movements in which it took part to be crowned with success (indeed even if the possibility arose for “Solidarity” to be revived and take power) for the proletariat this would still be the road of lost illusions. This is because after the “first enthusiasm” which any illusionary banner or cause brings, automatically, the reality always makes the proletariat ask: What did you gain from the new cause, from the “new banner” under which you have rallied?!

Here we must examine the experience of the Polish proletariat during a period of more than a year in which “Solidarity” “flourished.”

WHAT “GAINS” DID THE POLISH PROLETARIAT MAKE FROM THE “TRADE-UNION INDEPENDENCE”?

“The right of the proletariat to carry out the revolution was exchanged for a mess of pottage, for the present organization permitted by the police.”

LENIN

Regardless of the fact that they were manipulated and controlled by the ideology and forces of reaction, the millions of the Polish proletariat and workers took part in movements and joined the “independent” organizations in the hope that in this way their many legitimate aspirations and demands

would be realized. What, then, did they gain effectively after a year and a half of active participation in this movement and these organizations?!

After the first “victory” — the legalization of the “independent” trade-union organizations, (which, as we saw, are by no means independent), the following was described as one of the major “victories.”

“The right to strike”

Both the ultra-capitalist forces in Poland and Western reaction, including the Eurocommunists, proclaim and are still proclaiming this “right” as a “great” achievement of the Polish proletariat and an “example” to the proletariat of the other former socialist countries. Proceeding from this enthusiasm and this “support” which the most ferocious suppressors of strikes and any workers’ movement addressed to the Polish proletarians, it is worthwhile to dwell a little on this much acclaimed “victory.”

Marxist-Leninists have always been the most ardent and sincere supporters of the strike movement of the proletariat of bourgeois and revisionist countries, have always considered strikes one of the forms of the class struggle of the proletariat and have made their contribution to ensure that they develop in the right way in the interests of fulfilling the immediate and future demands and tasks with which every workers’ movement is faced.

This positive stand of support in principle for the phenomenon of the strike movement, in general, is subject to the strict class criterion in each concrete manifestation of the phenomenon. That is:

First, by what banners, by what ideology, is this concrete

strike movement led, who is leading it and consequently, in whose interests is it taking place.

Second, what is the range of demands that this concrete movement is presenting, to what extent are its economic demands combined with political, ideological and other demands?

On the whole, those who manipulated this movement in Poland closely “combine” the *economic demands* (increased pay, reduced hours of work, reduced prices, etc.) with the *political and ideological demands* (“independent trade unions” and “legal strike rights,” “partnership” in the government, complete religious freedom, political and ideological pluralism, release of political prisoners, lifting of the censorship, etc., etc.). No more than a glance is needed, however, to convince one that none of these demands of a political or ideological character is for the proletariat and in its interest. On the contrary, all the political and ideological demands of the current Polish movement are demands of ultra-capitalist reaction. They have to do with the plans and interests of one group of counter-revolutionaries in rivalry and struggle for power with another group of counter-revolutionaries.

In the current strike movement which it joined, nothing was left for the proletariat apart from the “simply economic” part of the movement which, at the most, could do no more than fulfil some momentary demands, improve the existing situation a little. In no way did it aim to prepare those conditions which would lead to the radical alteration of the socio-economic position of the proletariat.

For their part, Marxist-Leninists always uphold the view that the economic struggle which trade-union organizations wage must be supported because it has importance and is one of the recognized forms of the class struggle, its lowest form. But a genuine trade-union movement must never separate its economic demands from its social and political demands.

On the contrary, only through a continuous political struggle, a struggle which must always be building up towards the final aim of the proletariat, are the conditions created for the economic and social demands to be crowned with success. Otherwise, “in waging only the economic struggle,” as Lenin wrote “the working class... betrays the great principle: ‘The working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves.’”*

Of course, when we say that the Polish proletariat is fighting for “simply economic demands” here we have in mind what is linked with it directly as a class, with its interests in the present movement. We say this because, taken as a whole, the movement in which the proletariat is included is first of all a political movement, but its “political” aspect does not belong to the proletariat, is not developed from the positions of the proletariat or in the interests of the proletariat. It is a political movement of Polish pro-Western reaction and the proletariat is taking part in it as “cannon fodder.” Such being the case, even if the movement were crowned with success, the lion’s share, the political gains, and consequently, the economic and other gains, too, would belong to those parties and that section of the Polish bourgeoisie and reaction which guided and manipulated the strikes, i.e. the Polish bourgeoisie linked with the Western capital and the Vatican.

Third, what place does the concrete strike movement occupy in the series of many more developed forms of the class struggle of the proletariat, to what extent is this form regarded and treated as a first preparatory step for the highest forms of the revolution, is the strike movement combined with the higher forms of the struggle, and if so, how?

Assessed from the positions of Marxism-Leninism, the fact is that in regard to the proletariat, the strike movement

* V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 4, p. 429, Alb. ed.

in Poland both before and after December 13, 1981 remained within the bounds of a simple strike movement, as the only form of the class struggle which is recommended and “permitted” to the proletariat for the “solution” of its problems. Willy-nilly the entire preoccupation of the two wings of the counter-revolution, from this aspect, was concentrated on a common aim: in no way should the proletariat be allowed to go beyond the bounds of the strike movement, i.e., beyond the “modest,” “practical,” “realistic” role in the movement, as Lenin put it.

Indeed, even after the events of December 13, 1981, when not just strikes but any protest action was prohibited by law, those leaders of “Solidarity,” who managed to escape the first wave of arrests called on the proletariat only for “strikes” and “readiness to take part in strike.” This was not because the ultra-reactionary chiefs were worried about the bloodshed, if an open clash should develop with the revisionist army and police. No, the fact is that after December 13, even towards the most “exemplary” strikes the modern revisionist behaved with the same severity and employed the same means and methods which they would employ if stern clashes broke out. The chiefs of reaction restricted the pace of the movement of workers, (of workers only), to strikes, because they were afraid not of bloodshed, but of the “excessive” revolutionization of the proletariat, which, as Lenin says, at moments of important changes frequently becomes extremely dangerous and in the concrete case would be dangerous to the revisionist government and to its counter-revolutionary rival.

However, to engage the proletariat in such a movement, which is described as the “first and the last” step in the movement means that it will see all prospects blocked to progress on its great course, or wear itself out and become lost in activities which, in the final analysis, bring no essential change

to its positions. Marxist-Leninists see the problem quite differently. While appreciating the strike movement as one of the many forms of the class movement, at the same time they point out that this initial form must be carried further, must serve as a school in which, by clashing with the bourgeoisie in power and all reaction, the proletariat trains and organizes itself for the bigger battles of the future. Marx called the strike movement “training for the revolution.” He and his co-fighters and continuers of his work, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, have always stressed the necessity of combining the movement of the most varied kinds of strikes with other forms of the class struggle, of its advance towards higher forms, towards the armed struggle and the revolution. The Polish strike movement lacked this perspective, which was hidden from it and, since the movement was not carried out under the legitimate banner of the proletariat, this perspective is totally alien to its interests.

In the long history of the workers’ movement there have also been instances when the working class has joined the movement, “*knowing very well that from its direct aims this was not its struggle*,”* as Engels says. Nevertheless these battles have been evaluated by the classics of Marxism-Leninism as correct tactical actions of the working class. This cannot be said about the recent movement in Poland in which the proletariat played a special role. Why?

First of all, our time is entirely different from that first period of the development of the workers’ movement to which Engels was referring.

Moreover, when Engels speaks about this phenomenon he points out that the proletariat was well aware that it was taking part in a movement alien to it, while the Polish working

* F. Engels, “The Revolution and the Counter-Revolution in Germany,” p. 164, Alb. ed.

class in 1980 was taking part in a counter-revolutionary, anti-worker movement which it considered its own movement.

Finally, the working class *can take part* in a movement which it *knows very well is not its own*, only when it is pursuing *a given tactic* to achieve *certain important aims*, for example, when it knows that through this movement, which is not its own, it will avoid a series of obstacles in its course towards political domination and social revolution, or when a movement alien to it will clear the ground for the working class to fight for its own interests,* etc., etc. When it joined the recent strike movement, the Polish proletariat had set itself no such aims. For this reason, too, this movement is entirely alien to the interests and position of the proletariat as a class.

However, since it was a movement alien to the interests and aims of the proletariat, it is obvious that in the concrete instance the “great victory” of the legalization of the “right to strike” is by no means a victory for the proletariat.

In the final analysis, the law does not confer on the proletariat the “right” to strike, but the exploitation, the heavy burden of oppression and the socio-economic injustices to which the capitalist-revisionist order ceaselessly gives birth, inevitably confer this right upon it.

Therefore, the legalization in principle of the “right to strike” in Poland was, in fact, a victory for the two wings of the counter-revolution rather than a victory for the proletariat. The “right to strike” gave the forces of the ultra-capitalist wing the possibility to seize one of the main weapons of the struggle of the proletariat and to use this weapon, as they did, in the name of the proletariat, in order to wage the savage game for power.

The whole period of about two years from the outburst

* F. Engels, “The Revolution and the Counter-Revolution in Germany,” pp. 163-165, Alb. ed.
236

of the riots confirms this. As we said above, in its beginnings and in the first period of the legal existence of “Solidarity” the strike movement raised mostly demands of a simple economic character (increased wages, “free Saturdays,” etc.). The more the position of the ultra-capitalist forces was strengthened, however, the more intensively “Solidarity” began to display its real features, not as a trade-union organization, but as a political organization in the hands of reaction. After this the simple economic demands began to disappear from the agenda and ever greater priority was given to demands of a political and ideological character. The “economic” phase of the movement was the bait to lure the proletarians, to “satisfy” them and to feel the pulse of the government leaders and discover how ready they were to make concessions. After this, i.e., after the chiefs had displayed themselves as “pro-worker” and convinced themselves of the weakness of the revisionist government leaders, the time had come for the chiefs to bring out their platform more openly.

The fact is that whenever the pro-Western forces which led the movement encountered the resistance of the ruling order to the fulfilment of this or that political step of the counter-revolution, they immediately brought the strike weapon into action. This is what happened in regard to the official approval of “trade-union independence,” over the recognition of “Solidarity” as a partner of the government in the adoption of “new laws and reforms,” on the questions of “censorship,” of the “Peasants’ Solidarity,” over the “release of political prisoners,” over the removal of revisionist leaders of various ranks from their posts and their replacement with elements approved by “Solidarity,” etc., etc.

“The strike weapon has been used by ‘Solidarity’ as a form of pressure. The tactic of talks under the threat of the strike

weapon is the favourite method which has been applied,”* admitted the Secretary of the CC of the PUWP, K. Barcikowski, regretfully in one of the endless plenums of the CC held during this period.

Thus, by means of the strike weapon usurped violently from the arsenal of the means of the struggle of the proletariat, the ultra-reactionary forces in Poland were galloping towards power. They turned this means of struggle into an “epidemic of strikes,” in this way not only gaining endless concessions in the political and ideological field, but also driving the Polish economy into an unprecedented state of bankruptcy. It seemed as if all that was left for the chiefs of the revisionist counter-revolution to do was to hand over the keys to the chiefs of “Solidarity” and the forces behind them. But this final act was not as simple as it looked.

As we said, the legalization of the “right to strike” was also a victory for the chiefs of the revisionist counter-revolution in power. Through this “concession” (squeezed out of them) they tried to give their unpleasant portrait certain “democratic” nuances. More importantly, through this fictitious “right” for the proletariat the chiefs in power gained the real right to be forewarned of whatever strike might break out, gained the possibility to give their approval or disapproval of the “planned” strikes, so that when they were not capable of annulling them, they could at least, take measures to minimize the danger they caused. In adopting this method of “thrashing out” matters they used the experience of the “democratic” Western capitalists. Nevertheless, the hopes that the revisionist chiefs had pinned on this “right” which they legalized, were not proving justified. After this “legalization” the strikes became more frequent and massive. When matters reached the point that they could no longer be held in check, when

* “Tribuna Ludu,” March 31, 1981.

the chiefs who manipulated the strikes thought that the government had no further support and was expected to declare its bankruptcy, there occurred what many called the “shock”: the proclamation of the state of emergency, the imposition of martial law from midnight of December 13, 1981. In reality, there was nothing “new” or “surprising” about this. It was the confirmation in practice of the well-known Marxist truth: the “democratic” bourgeoisie in power will allow you to “protest” and shout, will give you the “right” to rise in strikes and demonstrations, and allow you to “criticize” it, but if you touch it on a really sensitive spot, if you threaten its power, then it throws off the cloak of the democrat and brings out the dagger and the bullet.

Hence this confirms what Comrade Enver Hoxha has stressed twenty years earlier:

“The bourgeoisie may allow you to sing psalms, but then it deals you a fascist blow on the head and crushes you.”*

Thus, the loudly proclaimed slogan of the “right to strike” in Poland was thrown into the rubbish bin. After a year and a half of “passionate” application of all kinds of strikes (sit-down strikes, stand-up strikes, warning strikes, active strikes, partial strikes, general strikes, etc.), the Polish proletariat now lost this “right” and “gained” another: 15 years imprisonment or shooting on the spot if you try to indulge in this sort of “game”! It was declared that after “calming” the situation the government would “return to the workers their inviolable right to strike.”** And it may even be returned. But what did they gain from it during a year and a half of participation in strikes?! Nothing but confusion and bitter disillusionment. The difficulties and shortages increased from day to day, production declined steadily, unemployment became a terrible

* Enver Hoxha, *Works*, vol. 19, p. 184, Eng. ed.

** PAP, December 14, 1991.

problem, the debts increased to more than 27 billion dollars, prices increased two-to threefold, the confusion and chaos became greater. Catastrophe has long been looming large on the horizon of capitalist-revisionist Poland, and the burden of this falls on the proletariat and the masses more than on anyone else. That is why they may throw themselves into the strike movement again in the future, but in the final analysis, they expect results from it, they expect improvements and not ruin.

“Partnership” with the government

“The workers’ right to have their say in the government,” indeed, the right of “Solidarity” to be a “partner” with the government, was loudly proclaimed as another victory which the Polish proletariat had allegedly achieved.

This is the same old refrain that the representatives of the bourgeoisie had long been harping on about the major fruits of “trade-union democracy,” about “co-administration” and “joint management” of enterprises by the oppressors and the oppressed!

As the classics of Marxism-Leninism have shown, the capitalist (either in the form of the owner of enterprises or the concern, or in the form of the monopoly capitalist state), buys the worker as a commodity in the market, not to make him a partner, but to put him to use in order to appropriate from him that specific feature which no other commodity has — surplus value, the basis of the existence of capitalism. The discussion, agreement, the coming to terms of the capitalist with the worker or of the capitalist state with the worker has to do only with the price: at what price the worker offers his labour power on the market and what price the capital agrees to pay

for it. This is the only aspect on which they “come to terms.” After this, the worker, as a commodity that has been sold, is obliged to serve whoever bought him. There is no capitalism without this bourgeois proletarian relationship and capitalist Poland is no exception to the general rule.

Prior to the creation of the “independent unions,” the labour market in Poland had remained in the hands of the revisionist bourgeoisie. After September 1980, the ultra-capitalist forces which led the “free and independent unions,” took this market in hand. Playing the same role as the bosses of the “yellow unions” in the West, they used this “victory,” not only as a means to seize power, but also for the same aims as their “free” and “independent” Western counterparts. Thus, the “partnership” between the revisionist government and the “independent unions” in Poland is nothing but the same partnership which has long existed in the capitalist West between the owners of multinational companies, trusts and concerns, on the one hand, and the bosses of such organizations as the “International Confederation of Free Trade Unions,” the “European Federation of Trade Unions,” the “World Federation of Trade Unions,” the “AFL-CIO,” etc., etc., on the other hand. Between them, yes, partnership exists, but this is partnership between bosses, between owners.

The reality in those countries has proved over and over again that the rank-and-file of the unions, the workers, gain nothing, apart from the illusory idea of having “reached agreement with the employer.” As for the union bosses, they earn everything: the high salaries and privileges of the bourgeoisie, and quite commonly, seats in the top instances of various state organs.

There can be no talk about “partnership” which the modern revisionists advocate between the workers organized in trade unions and the organs of state power in the conditions

when the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established. The state of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a state of the working class in power, and in this system the trade unions are turned into “schools of communism,” into levers which transmit the line of the party to the masses, and work to educate the masses with the Marxist-Leninist ideology of the vanguard party. This is a fundamental task. Along with this and in close connection with it, the trade unions in the conditions of socialism also have the task of taking up the major problems of work and production, the whole economic policy of the party, making their contribution from the moment when this line is decided up till its practical application. “The fact that the mass organizations are component parts of the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat does not mean that they should be turned into ‘partners’ or ‘appendages’ of the state apparatus, under the disguise of ‘democracy’ and of giving them some ‘state competences,’”* says Comrade Enver Hoxha. Lenin stresses that, “...The trade unions are an organization of the ruling, dominant, governing class, which has now set up a dictatorship and is exercising coercion through the state. But it is not a state organization, nor is it one designed for coercion, but for education...”**

Revisionists and opportunists of all hues propagate an entirely apposite view. After the blow which Lenin struck at these anarcho-syndicalist views of Trotsky and others, in the first years of Soviet power, immediately following the Second World War, when socialism was established in a series of countries, the bourgeoisie found in the Yugoslav revisionists the “new Trotskyites” who became the loudspeakers broadcasting the old anarcho-syndicalism. According to them, the

* Enver Hoxha, “Yugoslav Self-Administration...,” pp. 95-96, Eng. ed.

** V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 32, p. 2, Alb. ed.

“workers’ self-managed councils” of all levels are “partners” of the respective organs and organisms of the state administration. After the Yugoslav revisionists, all the others embraced this “discovery.” The Hungarians, the Poles, etc., proclaim and apply it openly, while the others in disguised ways. And to cap it all, they present this typically bourgeois deception of a typically bourgeois society as a “special feature of socialism,” as indispensable to a “real,” “genuine,” “completely class socialism”!

What does this mean?!

It is known that socialism means that state power is in the hands of the working class, that class which, through its vanguard party, runs the entire life of the country, which has the means of production in its hands, which has created its own state administrative and other organs and organizations with its own people, which are obliged to apply and defend the program, the interests and victories of the working class. Then, what can be said about the revisionist thesis of “the working class in power” and “the working class a partner in the government”?! Partners with themselves — that is where the revisionist logic leads!

However, this is not a momentary aberration on the part of modern revisionists. All their theorizing about “partnership in socialism” is done to conceal a bitter truth: the destruction of socialism in their countries. Faced at every step with the discontent and hatred from below, discontent and hatred to which restored capitalism continually gives birth, the revisionist chiefs borrowed the theories of “partnership” from Western reaction and gave them a “socialist” lustre so that they would deceive the working class with the illusory ideas of “agreements” and “partnership” with the government in power.

This is what occurred with the Polish revisionist chiefs

and their pledges about their alleged partnership with “Solidarity” and its bosses.

The Polish United Workers’ Party and the revisionist government of Poland were obliged to accept the compromise with the “trade-union organization,” calculating that this would give them the possibility, at least for a period, to continue in power peacefully, without traumas and upheavals from below, from the discontented and revolted masses. The members of the revisionist government thought that by giving the union leaders the favours and privileges of bosses, by recognizing them as “partners,” they would be satisfied with the bone thrown to them, would set about the game of Western trade-unionism with enthusiasm and would collaborate with the revisionist government to disorientate and pacify the masses and keep them under their joint restraint. If they performed this mission well, as a “reward” and to further deceive the masses, one or a few of the union chiefs would be given seats in the supreme organs of the party, in the government and in the Sejm. The election during 1980-1981 of some of the “communist” representatives of “Solidarity” to the CC and to the Political Bureau of the CC of the PUWP at the 9th Congress of this party, the appointment of a clergyman, a representative of the Church and “Solidarity,” to the post of Deputy Prime Minister, were proofs of the “readiness” of the Polish bourgeoisie to play the game of “partnership” with “Solidarity” through to the end.

This is, you might say, the *common feature* of the recent Polish movement with the “independent” trade-union movement manipulated by the bourgeoisie and reaction in the Western countries.

Its *peculiarity* has to do with something else, and it is this “peculiarity” which is the main characteristic of the recent movement, frequently called “the Polish trade-union move-

ment.” The most frequently mentioned representative of this movement, “Solidarity,” was not *simply a trade-union* organization of the Western type. Those who formed and led it did not do so simply to play the game of trade-unionism. As the events showed, rather than a trade-union organization, it was a *political organization of ultra-capitalist reaction*, which presented itself as an opposition and alternative to the revisionist government. For this fundamental reason, the partnership between “Solidarity” and the revisionist government was and is more extensive and complex than the partnership between capital and the unions in the West. After the “Gdansk Compromise” of August 31, 1980 this partnership was more like an agreement between two opposing currents — between the chiefs of the revisionist counter-revolution and the chiefs of the ultra-capitalist counter-revolution. From this standpoint each side accepted the compromise, proceeding from the interests of those groups and strata of the bourgeoisie and reaction which they represented, the interests of those internal and external forces which lay behind each of them.

The chiefs of “Solidarity” accepted the compromise with the aim of consolidating the positions they had achieved, organizing themselves better, regrouping their forces and planning further steps.

But united from the standpoint of ideology and their ultimate counter-revolutionary aims and, at the same time, rivals, each ready to overthrow the other, and mortally afraid of the internal and external support which the other had, within the compromise both sides were bound to struggle fiercely for power.

This aspect of the problem of the Polish crisis is very complex, too. There were and are forces interested in developing the compromise towards a “gentle” amalgamation, into a joint whole, but on each side there were also opposing forces

which persistently demanded further steps towards smashing the compromise, the dual power, and the establishment of the power of only one side. This is quite understandable: the fact that the two sides in confrontation constituted branches of the same trunk, the fact that they represented only the interests of the Polish bourgeoisie, the fact that they were guided by the same bourgeois ideology, suggested that the compromise achieved at the end of August 1980 might be carried further and the "two opposites" blended into one. From the day that this "compromise" was signed, however, the splits and contradictions between the two sides were apparent. The subsequent months confirmed that the savage confrontation, always over the struggle for power, was an inevitable accompaniment of the compromise between counter-revolutionaries. Moreover, the confrontation was to be more extensive and complicated than the compromise. Whereas the compromise was an agreement from above, amongst chiefs of two wings of the counter-revolution, other forces, internal and external, supporters of one or the other side, of various currents and groups gathered in each side, were involved in the confrontation, apart from the chiefs. Thus, that internal and external reaction that "found," educated and guided Walesa towards power did not do this for an amusing parade. No, pro-Western internal and external reaction and the Catholic Church made the former unknown Lech Walesa the "famous" Walesa so that he would serve their interests to the end, so that he and those around him would carry matters to the point and in the way that pro-Western reaction wanted.

Otherwise, if the Walesas reconciled themselves to the existing situation, or were content with minor changes and did not work to turn Poland into a country completely and openly pro-Western, then the fate of the Walesas would be more miserable than that of the stars which blaze briefly before they

wane in Hollywood films.

This was one of the major factors which incited the confrontation between the "partners." Moreover, more and more directly involved in the confrontation was a third force, a major force, which irrespective that it was involved in a struggle which was not its own and was grossly deceived from all aspects, still demanded the realization of the things it had been promised. This was the Polish proletariat and people. They were gaining nothing from the "great right" of partnership, apart from the fact that their "representatives," Walesa and company, were equipped with offices and premises filled with all the finest facilities, with suites of advisers and personal guards, with the right to go to top level meetings even with the First Secretary of the PUWP and Prime Minister Jaruzelski, to meet trade-union chiefs, state leaders, to go to audiences with cardinal Wysinski, and after his death, with his successor, Glomp, and on pilgrimages to the Vatican, to the spiritual father Wojtyla, to go for "experience" to the Japanese militarists and for directives to the American imperialists...

Although this part of the fruit of partnership might have seemed pleasant and enjoyable to some at first, it meant nothing at all to the Polish proletariat. Because when the Polish proletariat came out in strikes and demonstrations and "accepted" Walesa and the Walesas as their leaders, they did not do this to give Western television pleasant surprises or simply to satisfy the aims and ambitions of ten or a hundred of Walesas and Bujaks. No, the proletarians did, or agreed to do, what they were told, because they were promised that in this way they would secure the things that they lacked. And they were to demand the fulfilment of precisely those things which they were lacking and not the things that the chiefs were lacking.

In this way the confrontation steadily built up and the

more each of the sides of the chiefs of the counter-revolution undermined the compromise, the more it accused the other side of not being sincere “partners”! The chiefs of “Solidarity,” in particular, proved to be more active on this aspect. By pushing for one “concession” after another from the “partner” in power, they thought that in the end the government would have to declare itself bankrupt.

Precisely when they openly demanded that the “partner” hand over power, however, the latter, with a decision which came into force in December 13, threw all its former pledges about “democracy” and “partnership” into the rubbish bin and sent its “stubborn” and “uncontrollable” partners to the concentration camps. They were told that if they “calmed down,” if they accepted a “socialist Poland,” “radically reformed,” of course, and the main thing, if they agreed to control the workers in revolt, they would be left free and the former partnership would be restored.

After the recent decisions of 1982 about the lifting of the state of emergency it seems that the promises about the re-commencement of the partnership have been forgotten. The “military council for national salvation” under the leadership of Jaruzelski feels that it has the situation in hand and the experience of 1982 has shown that “national understanding” is best achieved, not by endless concessions, but by tightening things up to the limit. Nevertheless, since none of the causes of the crisis has disappeared, perhaps “Solidarity” will be revived and the conditions and circumstances for the revival of the “partnership” could be created.

If the “partnership” is re-established, what will the Polish proletariat and workers gain from it? The answer is obvious: Nothing. Past experience of this is very significant; it is a good lesson for those who were disillusioned and who, after the re-establishment of “partnership,” might ask: What have we

gained from all these “victories”?

“Complete religious freedom”

For the ordinary Polish Catholic this is not a bad thing, but doesn’t amount to much. Moreover, this is not a new “victory” — “thank God!” he has had it all his life, from the time of Gomulka and Gierek. Therefore what else, what else! Because the Polish Catholic, is, at the same time, a proletarian and, as a proletarian, he knows and has experienced for years on end that even if the Holy Seat were transferred to Warsaw and even if all the priests, cardinals, monks and nuns of the world were to pray day and night “Lord, improve the conditions in Poland!” nothing would be improved by the Holy Spirit. The practical logic of the proletarian goes beyond the logic of the Catholic and says, to those he has over him: What else, what else!

“Pay increases”

This is what “independence” and “partnership” brought us, the Polish proletarians were told.

In fact increased wages was one of the demands that was pushed more forcefully, especially in the first phase of the movement. And the fact is that this demand was “welcomed” and fulfilled by the authorities very quickly.

Of course this “victory,” to the extent that it can be called a victory, did not result either from the generosity of the revisionist clan, or from the “valour” of the ultra-capitalist clan. The workers achieved it themselves through their struggle, compelling the revisionist state to buy their labour power a few zlotys dearer.

The act of *increasing wages* in itself still does not mean the improvement of living conditions. Paper money is worthless when the equivalent goods are missing on the market. Not only were they in short supply on the Polish market during the days when wages were increased, but later the shortages became even worse until many of these goods disappeared completely.

According to the report which the last Prime Minister of Poland (from February 1980 until now, crisis-ridden Poland has changed prime ministers four times: Jaroszewicz, Babiusz, Pinkowski, Jaruzelski) delivered in July 1981, that is according to Jaruzelski's report to the special 9th Congress of the PUWP, the money incomes of the population in June 1981 were 23 per cent higher than at the same period of the previous year, while the quantity of goods on the market was 10 per cent less than at the respective period of 1980. Later this ratio became even more acute. From September 1980 until September 1981 supplies of consumer goods for the market declined by a third, or 2.36 billion dollars. During this period, one of every three stores was closed because of lack of consumer goods and the revisionist authorities declared to their "partners" ("Solidarity") that, if they continued their pressure through strikes, "the population will no longer be able to buy footwear and clothing for winter." Chaos and anarchy became characteristic features of life in Poland. In October 1981 the Central Office of Statistics of Poland reported, "The imbalance of supply and demand has become more pronounced. The supplies of meat and meat products in September 1981 were 25.8 per cent less than the figures for September 1980, while for fish and fats they were respectively 31 and 30.8 per cent less. Cigarettes, matches, toilet soap, toothpaste, washing powder, detergents, etc., were in short

supply in September."* One month later the situation became even graver. According to the PAP news agency report of November 14, 1981, industrial production in Poland during October fell 14.5 per cent as against September. During the same period, while average wages had been increased 20 per cent, the market was supplied with 36.1 per cent less meat, 40.5 per cent less fish and 14.2 per cent fewer eggs.

Thus while pockets were filled with paper money, the market was being remorselessly emptied of goods. Inflation became an incurable ulcer. In July 1981, of every three zloty in circulation in Poland one was not covered with goods and it was forecast that at the end of the year this ratio would be 2:1. As the newspaper "Zicie Warszawy" pointed out in desperation on July 28, 1981, for every day in August, 1.5 billion zloty would not be covered with goods in Poland and, according to calculations, at the end of the year this figure would amount to 500-600 billion zloty uncovered with goods, or even about one thousand billion zloty if the ratio became 2:1, as was envisaged.**

Hence, the Polish proletariat might have pockets full of zlotys but empty bellies, because one cannot eat or drink paper money. At those moments, as though ironically, the revisionist chiefs appealed to the workers to deposit in the savings banks their excess cash accumulated as a result of the rise in wages and lack of goods on the market!

Moreover, to complete the custom of the bourgeoisie, that is, to rob the proletarians and the masses with the left hand of what was given to them with the right hand, the Polish government announced repeated increases in prices. They were unheard of increases: from August 1, 1981 the price of bread was raised 300 per cent. During 1982 prices spiralled for all

* PAP, October 25, 1981.

** "Zicie Warszawy," July 28, 1981.

other daily necessities, especially agricultural and livestock products.

Therefore, convinced by the bitter reality that this “fruit” of “partnership” and “independence” brought it no benefits, the proletariat again raised its voice: What else, what else!

“Economic reform,” “workers’ self-government”

— There you have another “victory”! the Polish proletariat was told.

For more than a year, inside and outside Poland a great deal of breath was expended and millions of pages were printed about this so-called “economic reform.” It was proclaimed that it would bring the country out of the crisis, but notwithstanding the crisis extended and became deeper at a greater pace than the discussion and theorizing about it and the “anti-crisis.”

This “reform” the revisionist team in power dug out from the archives of “Gomulka’s self-management reforms” of October 1956, touched up a bit with the subsequent experience achieved by “self-management” in Yugoslavia and the application of this method in accord with the “specific conditions of Poland”! In itself, this “reform” could be nothing but the rejection of the last faded and tattered remnants of that socialism which, the propaganda claimed, existed and with which the Gomulka and Gierek teams tried to cover up and disguise the capitalist content of the socio-economic order in Poland.

It is interesting to point out that a good part of the Polish revisionist chiefs themselves hesitated and, indeed, openly opposed the application of “self-management” on an extensive scale. “We must not make experiments in the economy,” wrote the central organ of the PUWP, “Tribuna Ludu,” on

September 3, 1981. “They can be made on animals, on materials, and only then on people, and the economy is a field which has to do with the people.” Similar hesitation and opposition was expressed openly in the main leadership of the party and the state in the Sejm, the press and elsewhere. The reason by no means lay in the fact that opponents of the “self-management reform” were opposed in principle to capitalism! On the contrary! Neither did the reason for this “opposition” lie in “fear” of a new “experiment” in the economy, as some of the revisionist chiefs declared. No, the reason lay and lies precisely in the fact that this “experiment,” that is, self-management, had been applied for years in the Polish economy and had brought as a consequence nothing but defeats, destruction and disillusionment.

Moreover, at this period, the champion of “self-management,” Titoite Yugoslavia, was displaying more clearly than ever where “the logical” end of all revisionist theories and practice** must lead, as Comrade Enver Hoxha points out. “A debtor of the first order, shaken to its foundations from every standpoint, without any clear perspective, without the necessary means and strength to find the way to salvation, that is what Titoite self-managed Yugoslavia has now become.”** In the face of this complete defeat of the classical country of “self-management,” of course the Polish revisionist chiefs would be hesitant, although they remained quite incapable of finding other ways and methods to save the situation.

Apart from these, there was another cause which frightened some of the revisionist officials when the legislation on the “self-management reform” in the Polish economy was being discussed.

During the years 1980-1981 “Solidarity,” in particular,

* Enver Hoxha, “The Titoites” (Historical Notes), p. 632. Eng. ed.

** Ibid.

came out waving the banner of “self-management.” This organization was in agreement with the revisionists in power about the “need for reform,” but in complete disagreement with them on many aspects of the reform. In particular, the aims which the ultra-capitalist forces based on the “self-management reforms” terrified the revisionists in power. They were openly political: the “self-management reform” was being exploited by the chiefs of ultra Western reaction as the first step towards power. One of the leaders of “Solidarity,” J. Ruwelsky, declared openly, “The strategic aim of ‘Solidarity’ is the seizure of power through self-government and this is possible.”* Bujak declared in a meeting at Krakow: “First we must dominate each enterprise and then, in turn, the people’s councils and the Seim.”**

The stern confrontation in September 1981 between “Solidarity” and the government in power over who should appoint the managers of enterprises — “the workers’ councils” or the government, the repeated strikes for the removal or replacement of thousands of managers of enterprises, cadres of the state administration and even party officials of all ranks, etc., etc., were only some of the efforts of the leaders of “Solidarity” in the application of their strategy to seize power.

While the struggle for power was raging at the top, down below the economy, set on the course of “reform,” was making the situation ever more dramatic.

At the 9th Congress of the PUWP, Jaruzelski declared, “The national income for 1981 will be 15 per cent lower than last year. In the first six months of this year industrial production destined for the market was 12.5 per cent lower than that

* “Tribuna Ludu,” September 4, 1981.

** Quoted from the materials of the 9th Congress of the PUWP, CAP.
254

of the same period of 1980, coal production was 20 per cent lower, exports 17.3 per cent lower, the number of apartments handed over was 30.3 per cent less,” the productive capacities of industry were utilized only 80-85 per cent, agricultural production suffered an unprecedented decline, inflation mounted as never before, etc.

For the proletariat and the masses the “revolution which slides towards power” was nothing but the sliding of a whole mountain of difficulties and sufferings on to their backs. Indeed, to ensure that the “economic reform” was accomplished successfully, the revisionist “experts” put forward further urgent measures: a wage freeze or further reductions of wages, 2 or 3 fold increase of the prices, a complete rationing system.

In the context of the application of the reform it was reckoned that about 700,000 people would be removed from the administration,* apart from 300,000 others for whom the “reformed economy” would have no need.** Where were these million people, replaced or no longer necessary for the existing capacities of the Polish economy, going to go at a time when unemployment there had long been a chronic ulcer?! All they could do was to join the ranks of the tens of thousands of existing unemployed or take the road of emigration, as hundreds of thousands of other Poles have done or are doing...

In brief, for the Polish proletariat and people, the “economic reform,” the “self-management of enterprises” brought only further ruin and disillusionment, as always. Therefore, with the bitter and offensive taste of this “victory” in their mouths, the proletarians have again and again raised their voices: What else, what else!

“We forced the government to erect a lofty monument to those it killed with its own hands in 1970 and 1976” —

* “Tribuna Ludu,” September 5, 1981.

** Ibid., July 27, 1981.

the workers were told.

In the face of this act, the sense of proletarian solidarity and honour is “pacified.” But logic raises its head: the fallen rose together with us to demand those things we are demanding today: freedom, justice and social equality, radical improvement of conditions, an end to injustices, etc., etc. Before monuments are set up to the fallen, the aspirations for which they fell ought to be realized.

Here twenty-one, or two thousand-and-one demands raised during the movement and approved at the moments of endless compromises with the government in power could be listed, but in essence they have not brought, nor could they bring, any improvement or strengthening to the positions of the proletariat. On the contrary, the proletariat and the working masses were placed under the double domination and oppression of the forces of the revisionist government, on the one hand, and the pro-Western forces, on the other hand. Thus the “trade-union independence” ensured for the Polish proletariat more savage and intensive oppression and exploitation. The economic level of the proletariat deteriorated further, while, from the political aspect, it gained nothing concrete, apart from a “reputation” for its “courage,” which was loudly trumpeted in the Western world.

The worst of it is that this so-called trade union independence and everything linked with it made the future for the Polish proletariat even more difficult and complicated, diverted it further and further from the realization of its historic mission. Lenin’s famous statement “The proletariat’s right to revolution was sold for a mess of pottage — organizations permitted by the present police law”*, found its complete confirmation in the “victories” of the Polish proletariat mentioned above. Overwhelmed with the bourgeois idea that now

* V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, vol. 2, p. 202, Alb. ed.

it was acting “independently” it could achieve anything (!) the Polish proletariat was obliged to engage in a long, boring, exhausting struggle from which it hoped to gain everything, but reaped only defeat.

That is why the struggle in which the Polish proletariat took part was a struggle alien to its interests as a class. In the final analysis, it was deceived and placed itself under command to carry the ultra-reactionary forces towards power. At the beginning of December 1981, the latter thought the long awaited moment, prepared for so carefully, had arrived. After a meeting of the presidium of “Solidarity” at Radom, on December 11 the “National Committee of Solidarity” gathered in Gdansk to take the final step towards power. Everything seemed to indicate that the winter of 1981 would turn out summer for them.

**THE “SURPRISE” OF DECEMBER 13, OR
THE LOGICAL RESULT OF THE COUNTER-
REVOLUTION?**

When everything seemed to be in favour of the pro-Western forces which were manipulating millions of people, when many thought that even the main demands of the “National Committee of Solidarity” for the formation of a provisional government and new elections to the Seim would be accepted, when it seemed that the revisionist government could do nothing but surrender unconditionally, the coup of December 13, 1981 took place. Early that morning Jaruzelski threw off the cloak of “democracy” through the decision which he communicated and revealed the political face of himself and the regime which he represented to the nation and the world.

The whole structure of “Solidarity,” root and branch, was

declared illegal. The “heroes” of the organization who had gathered in Gdansk to stage the final act of the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution were caught like rats in a trap. Instead of wishing the workers good morning, the authorities faced them with machine-guns and tanks. The “right to strike” was replaced with Martial Law and compulsory work. According to the decisions of the Military Council for National Salvation, there were two doors left open to the workers: either go to work, or go to jail and concentration camps. Otherwise the machine-guns would speak!

The chiefs of Western reaction, from President Reagan to Berlinguer and Carrillo, called this sudden turn to events the “Polish surprise” and the “shock.” Berlinguer and Carrillo, together with the whole mob of the renegades from the working class, are bewailing the “Polish drama” as a “flagrant violation of democracy” and express amazement that the head of a “spring flower which had just begun to bloom in Poland was cut off so suddenly!”

In reality, there is nothing surprising, nothing outside the logic and laws of the ruling order, in the recent turn of events in Poland. In one way or the other, from one side of the counter-revolution or the other, this end of the road was bound to be reached. And when there is talk about this piece of history neither the “credit” nor the blame for the establishment of the state of emergency belongs simply to Jaruzelski and the 15 generals and colonels around him. It was not they who, of their own will, suddenly took the idea to establish the state of emergency in the country. No, it was those strata of the new Polish bourgeoisie, those external and internal forces linked with them, who, since they had no other means of salvation in their hands, dictated to the representatives in power the only alternative that had not been thoroughly “exploited” — open violence. As a loyal defender of the interests

of those who had placed him in leadership, Jaruzelski and his squadrons did what befits all chiefs of counter-revolutionary regimes to do. It is well-known that in such regimes all kinds of “freedoms” are permitted, strikes and demonstrations, organizations and movements of every ideological and political banner are permitted, all kinds of deals are struck with these movements and organizations, willingly or through compulsion a hotchpotch of agreements and concessions is achieved, but when matters reach the point that the power of the ruling class is seriously endangered, when the dagger strikes the bone, then there is only one name for the response — the strangling of any freedom or form of protest by means of violence.

The events in Poland confirmed this truth once again. From this aspect, this is what capitalist Poland has *in common* with the nature of any other capitalist country.

The *peculiarity* has to do with the fact that the present Polish bourgeoisie is divided into two strata or large groups — one orientated towards the revisionist East and the other orientated towards the capitalist West. The struggle for power was and is being waged between these two groupings. Since it was a struggle of one group to seize power from the other it was bound to be extremely fierce and merciless, even though both sides belong to the same class. The strong dictate of the Soviet social-imperialists in particular contributed to this “turn” of events.

This will be the case until the proletariat enters the arena as an independent force and not as a force under the leadership of others for the interests of others. As a result of the wrong course on which it had set out, after the military coup it was taken by surprise, disorientated, disorganized, abandoned to the mercy of the tanks and without any clear tactics or strategy for the future.

During the 15 months of activity under the leadership of "Solidarity" it had learned only the partial tactics of the counter-revolution, tactics which restricted the movement from below to petty actions so that the proletariat would not be revolutionized more than the aims and interests of those who manipulated it required.

The strikes and battles waged by the proletariat against government troops, especially in the regions of Silesia, Gdansk, Lublin and elsewhere, after the proclamation of the state of emergency, were acts of desperation in response to the terror imposed rather than expressions of an organized movement. They were quickly crushed by the intervention of troops and during the whole of 1982 Poland was "quieter" than for years. A few attempts of those bosses of "Solidarity" who lived in illegality to raise the contingents of workers in new strikes had virtually no success. The reasons for this "pacification" of the revolts from below in an order which ceaselessly arouses discontent and revolt are many and complex. They include the weariness of the proletarians to the point of exhaustion from a movement which gave them nothing, the loss of authority of the chiefs of the movement in the eyes of the masses and the lack, throughout this whole period, of the genuine vanguard of the working class whose duty it is to awaken and mobilize the working class to undertake prudent, correct, well calculated actions in every step it takes, etc., etc.

Among the many reasons for this "pacification" undoubtedly we must count the law on the violent suppression of any protest and revolt, a law which came into force on December 13, 1981. With this "emergency" law Jaruzelski and company simply employed openly in Poland that savage weapon which has been customary for years in the countries of the "socialist community" and has brought the revisionist chiefs "satisfactory results." The use of violence to nip in the bud any pro-

test or movement from below — this has been and is one of the main concerns of the revisionist chiefs both in the Soviet Union and in the other vassal countries. The "peculiarity" of Poland during 1982 was that the army operated openly and made the law in all economic, political and social life, but this was only during 1982. At the end of that year the army was withdrawn to barracks, the state of emergency was suspended and in July 1983 lifted de jure. However, the law of counter-revolutionary violence remained in force de facto.

Nevertheless the present "calm" in Poland, like the "calm" in the other revisionist countries, is completely false. Since the underlying socio-economic causes which ceaselessly give birth to dissatisfaction and revolt have not been eliminated, since the order of oppression and exploitation exists there, there is not and cannot be genuine calm. The revolt is simmering and building up under the heavy weight of violence. The day is bound to come when it will burst out. But the important thing, both in Poland and in the other countries, is that this revolt should not repeat or follow the example of the "Polish movement" of 1980-1981.

The Polish proletariat, perhaps more than the others, is tasting the bitter consequences of the movement with a counter-revolutionary inspiration in which it took part. This is the time for these consequences to become unforgettable lessons.

There is another factor which must not be forgotten: despite the establishment of the law of violence in Poland, the forces of the counter-revolution within the counter-revolution have not laid down their arms. The following facts show what a fierce struggle is raging there between the two wings of the counter-revolution: from the beginning of 1982 up till May 1983 the revisionist authorities discovered and liquidated more than 670 illegal groups which belonged to "Solidarity,"

captured about 1,200 printing shops and printing machines which operated illegally, hundreds of typewriters, more than 737,000 leaflets, 340,000 pamphlets,* etc. Despite this, neither the illegal groups of "Solidarity" nor their means of propaganda, deception and operation have been crushed or silenced. On the contrary, these offspring and fellow travelers of the revisionist counter-revolution will arise even more forcefully in the future and seek to achieve their long-standing aims. The whole of imperialism, international reaction and the Vatican is supporting and backing them.

The violent suppression of the recent movement with a counter-revolutionary inspiration and the removal from the scene of "Solidarity," carried out by the revisionist counter-revolution, are being used by Polish internal and external reaction as a means to keep the proletariat and the working masses deceived and under their control. "If the coup of December 13 had not been carried out, everything would have been settled correctly and victoriously!" the workers are told. The reality shows that the reactionary forces of Poland, incited and supported by the Vatican and the CIA, by President Reagan, Prime Minister Thatcher, the Strausses of the capitalist West and others, have not and will not cease their efforts to resurrect "Solidarity." This is exemplified by the efforts made to arouse the Polish proletariat on May Day 1983 and the following days in demonstrations in which it was demanded that "Solidarity" should be legalized again. In Gdansk, Wroclaw, Nowa Huta, Warsaw and elsewhere, these efforts of pro-Western reaction found some support, but the fact is that the participation in these demonstrations was extremely limited. The Polish revisionist chiefs and Moscow advertised this fact as "Solidarity's" "remaining in a past which will never return," as a confirmation of the fact... that

* "Krasnaya Zvezda," June 24, 1983.

allegedly the Polish proletariat supports the revisionist team in power! For their part, Polish pro-Western reaction and the imperialist world, seizing on those individuals who demonstrated in support of "Solidarity," enormously exaggerated this participation and claimed that the Polish proletariat still remains loyal to "Solidarity."

The support for and incitement of the ultra-right forces in Poland from the capitalist West and the Vatican became even more clear and open during the visit of the Pope in the second ten days of June 1983. Pope John-Paul the Second (alias Karol Wojtyla the Pole) went to Poland, not "impelled by longing for the land of his birth," or simply to pay homage to "the holy virgin," but first of all with political aims. Both in his public speeches and masses and in his official tête-à-tête meetings with General Jaruzelski he spoke openly in support of "Solidarity" and demanded the revival and resurrection of it. Although he did not pose as "a leader of the opposition," the openly political speeches and messages he delivered wherever he went, the great banners with the words "the Pope — Father of 'Solidarity,'" etc., etc., once again confirmed the role of the Vatican in all that has occurred in Poland in the past and the complete commitment of this agency of reaction to keeping the general chaos and confusion going on in Poland and to channelling it in those directions which interest imperialism. Apart from this, the aim of the Pope's visit was more than just to exert pressure on the revisionist rulers to give the "opposition" and "Solidarity" freedoms and rights. Its aim was to use the tool of religion, Catholicism, to appeal to and exert pressure on the Polish proletarians and people to remain loyal to the collapsed but always reactionary structure of "Solidarity." The playing of such a "trump card" as the Pope, his open sympathy with and blessing of the "Solidarity," the presentation by the Vatican itself of this reactionary

movement as a "Christian revolution," etc., etc., are nothing but new manoeuvres of imperialism and reaction to further mislead the Polish proletariat and people, to keep them under imperialist control and inspiration in order to use them to accomplish the strategic plans of this reaction.

However, the reality in Poland is more and more convincing the masses that both the one wing of the counter-revolution and the other are equally enemies of the interests of the proletariat and the masses. Therefore, had the movement in which the Polish proletariat included itself for about two years been crowned with the seizure of power, this would have been the power of those who guided and manipulated the movement, that is, the power of pro-Western capitalist forces. The victory or defeat of these forces in the future will not bring any benefit to the working class, just as the temporary triumph of the revisionist counter-revolution cannot bring any improvement to the working class. Under the rule of either, the Polish proletariat will be left to taste those fruits which the proletariat tastes in the capitalist countries: oppression, exploitation, degeneration, unemployment, continual price rises, decline in living standards, insecurity for the present and the future, etc., etc.

Profoundly disillusioned, the Polish proletariat will raise its voice: "But I had all these things during that time when you told me that I was living in socialism! You told me that socialism is to blame!

"You have deceived me, gentlemen!"

IV THE REVOLUTIONARY ROAD — THE ONLY ROAD TO SALVATION AND VICTORY

"The only road to ensure the development of the economy, the freedom and independence of the country, and the re-establishment of socialism is through the open resolute struggle of the masses of the people, under the leadership of the working class with a genuine Marxist-Leninist party at its head."

ENVER HOXHA

The only thing of value that the subsequent fate of the counter-revolution in Poland will bring the Polish proletariat is what Marx and Engels pointed out about the revolution of 1848-1851 in Germany: the gain of the people was that they lost their illusions.

In face of the bitter reality, the illusions which the Polish proletariat had nurtured towards one or the other side of the counter-revolution are being smashed, one after another. The Polish proletariat are faced with the same primary task as the proletariat and peoples of the other bourgeois-revisionist countries: they must rise, and take to the battlefield themselves to carry out the revolution again *with their own forces*, that revolution which the modern revisionist betrayed and disgraced. Of course, this is no easy task. On the contrary, it is one of the most difficult, but also the most essential task which faces the Polish proletariat and people.

Speaking about the great importance of the subjective

factor for launching the revolution and carrying it through to victory, Comrade Enver Hoxha especially emphasizes two basic components of this factor: a) *the high level of consciousness* and b) *the readiness* of the masses for the revolution.*

In the current situation the Polish proletariat has lacked the first component — a *given level of revolutionary consciousness*, more than anything else. We have seen the reasons for this. The fundamental task which faces it today is precisely the clarification of minds and hearts, imbuing them with the Marxist-Leninist ideology.

“In the preparation of the subjective factor..., the revolutionary party of the working class, its leadership, education and mobilization of the masses plays a decisive role,”** says Comrade Enver Hoxha.

Such a *Marxist-Leninist party* is still lacking in Poland. In the furious campaign they have waged for nearly 30 years against socialism and Marxism-Leninism, both the revisionist forces and the ultra-capitalist forces have worked to avert the formation of this party. However, now that the truth is coming out and even the last disguise of that propaganda which described the PUWP as communist is being thrown off, the Polish proletariat is becoming conscious that there is nothing communist about that party, that it is not its party, the party of the proletariat. Hence, the conditions and possibilities exist for the most conscious vanguard elements of the Polish proletariat to organize themselves and work with a sound Marxist-Leninist line and program to win the masses.

Terrified of the possibility of the formation of such a proletarian party, the revisionist forces, under the dictate of the Soviet social-imperialists, have striven to forestall this. In the process of the fragmentation of what was left from the PUWP,

* Enver Hoxha, “Imperialism and the Revolution,” p. 147, Eng. ed.

** Ibid.

along with the emergence of “dubs and forums” of all shades, the so-called Marxist-Leninist forums sprang up in Poland, grouping those members of the PUWP who were most closely bound to and dependent on Moscow. The “statements” and “programs” of these forums, filled with “Marxist” phrases and demands for a “hard” line towards the counter-revolution, were published in full in “Pravda” and distributed everywhere by TASS and the other means of Soviet propaganda. These “forums” created and directed by the hand of Moscow served a series of aims.

First of all, they served as tools to exert pressure on the Polish leadership to be prudent in the phrases it used, and to preserve the status of a Poland dependent on Soviet social-imperialism in the name of “Leninism” and “scientific socialism.” But while the PUWP was to fall completely and openly into the lap of ultra-right reaction, the so-called Marxist-Leninist forums were to serve as a ready-made base for a “new party” which, allegedly, after rejecting the “revisionism” of the PUWP, would be heir to “everything good” from the time when the PUWP was in “sound positions” and which would continue “to lead” Poland on the socialist road, (i.e., on those rails which were of benefit to the Soviet social-imperialists). Moreover, the creation of these so-called Marxist-Leninist forums was and is of interest to the revisionist traitors as a trap to deceive and draw in those sound elements and forces which are becoming aware that all the misfortune of Poland lies in the systematic abandonment of Marxism-Leninism and the total bourgeois degeneration of the Polish United Workers’ Party. In this way Moscow took the measures to ensure that all these elements would fall into its trap, that is, into those “forums” which are proclaimed by “Pravda” to be “Marxist-Leninist” and which are nothing but groupings of agents of Soviet social-imperialism.

The Polish proletariat has no need for such “forums and parties,” even if a hundred “anti-revisionist” and “Marxist-Leninist” labels are plastered on them. The only genuine vanguard party of the proletariat in any country, in this case of the Polish proletariat, will be one that not only fights the treacherous Polish United Workers’ Party with all its might, but also has no links with any revisionist party or current, and first of all with the CPSU of Khrushchevite modern revisionism, but on the contrary attacks them. Armed with the Marxist-Leninist theory, with a clear militant program and with a strong organization of its own ranks, such a party will be able to lead the working class and the working masses in a class struggle independent of any force or ideology other than Marxism-Leninism.

The great deception by the parties of reaction which hide themselves behind the so-called trade-union movement and “Solidarity” is a bitter, but unforgettable lesson for the Polish proletariat. Marxism-Leninism teaches that the genuine party of the proletariat does not hide its existence from the masses, does not hide the ideology by which it is guided or the revolutionary program with which it comes before the masses. Through a correct scientific line and unrelenting, tireless work, the Marxist-Leninist party has the task of re-awakening and strengthening in the proletariat and people the belief in “the correctness and universal character of the Marxist-Leninist theory, which indicates the true road to the seizure of power by the proletariat and the other oppressed masses.”* That great collection of facts about the political-ideological machinations and filth which is simmering in Poland serves as “raw material” in the hands of the Marxist-Leninist party to expose the falsity of bourgeois-revisionist reaction and the disaster to which it is leading the Polish proletariat and

* Enver Hoxha, “Imperialism and the Revolution,” p. 164, Eng. ed.

people, even more effectively than it has served reaction for the deception of the masses.

The Catholic Church and religious ideology in general is a powerful bastion in the hands of reaction with great influence among the Polish working masses. The Marxist-Leninist party cannot fail to take this bastion into account in its struggle to win the support of the masses and prepare them for the revolution.

Convinced that the Church and religious ideology have never been and cannot be anything but sworn enemies of the revolution, but aware, at the same time, that the elimination of the religious ideology from the minds of the masses can never be one of the immediate tasks of proletarian revolution, the Marxist-Leninist party must be prudent in making the proper distinction between the proletarian as a revolutionary and the proletarian as a believer. Just as it is not the religious ideology which arouses the masses in the revolution, likewise this ideology, however inhibiting it may be, cannot permanently divert the masses from the revolution. The Marxist-Leninist party must be skilful enough to win over the masses, both believers and non-believers, while taking over from the Church the banner of the “traditional” defender of national independence, without mixing its banners or program with those of the Church, for the sake of a great and immediate mission — the seizure of power and liberation from economic and political bondage to internal and foreign capital. After the accomplishment of this major deed, for the working class now in power the question of other types of bondage, especially spiritual bondage, is an internal question which cannot be solved through violence or a single act, but which must not be left to spontaneity, either. As the rich experience of our Party of Labour and socialism in Albania shows, the continuation of the revolution, its development in

all fields, ceaselessly convinces the masses in power of what hinders and what enhances their forces and energies, what they should reject and what they should embrace of their own will in the society which they themselves will build and enjoy.

This, however, is a question which belongs to the period after the seizure of power. The immediate task in Poland now is to awaken the dulled and confused consciousness of the masses and *unite the broad masses under the leadership of the proletariat headed by a genuine Marxist-Leninist party, in a united front* which will firmly counter all the attempts and machinations of the counter-revolution.

As to what a united proletariat is capable of doing, this, apart from endless examples from its own history and the history of the revolutions in other countries, the Polish working class is seeing in the experience of the last two years. If the Polish revisionist government was obliged to make concessions in every direction, if the forces of pro-Western reaction were strengthened and captured position after position on the road to power, this came about because several million workers went into action. The workers are the weapon, the irreplaceable force for the accomplishment of every change or transformation. The misfortune of those millions of people is that they were united and went into action under alien banners. Precisely on this account, the result of their struggle could not be other than complete defeat, its violent suppression. Day by day, experience is teaching the Polish proletariat that it has no need for such unions under the control of reaction.

Undoubtedly the difficulties are and will be numerous and great. As a result of the treacherous line of the PUWP, Poland has long been turned into an arena in which the *interests of many foreign imperialist and revisionist powers and, first of all, the two superpowers*, are closely entangled and in conflict. Each of the superpowers has its own support bases

within Poland and tries to manipulate, strengthen and use them in its own political, ideological and economic interest. Each of them poses as if it is doing everything in its power to “rescue” Poland and the Polish people from the misfortunes which have descended upon them, but, as we pointed out above, these imperialist powers and superpowers are among the main factors which brought Poland to such a state. From the first days after the outburst of the recent crisis in Poland the Party of Labour of Albania raised its internationalist voice and, among other things, pointed out: “In the complex situations which have been created in Poland, the Polish proletariat, which is characterized by a lofty spirit of revolt and determination, needs more than ever to see clearly the speculations which are being made with its struggle and the gains which the revisionists, the social-imperialists and the international bourgeoisie want to achieve. Therefore it must not be deceived by Gierek’s ‘self-criticism,’ or the advice of the Soviet social-imperialists, or the false solidarity of the American imperialists and the West German militarists, or by the blessings of the Vatican.”* This clear-cut stand towards the policy and aims of the international bourgeois and revisionist reaction in Poland must begin by opposing, in the first place, the internal forces which are contingents of one or the other superpower and playing the game of foreign overlords.

Without reconciling itself to either side of the counter-revolution, the Polish proletariat, led by its Marxist-Leninist Party, will know how to *clearly distinguish its internal and external enemies and its natural allies in the revolution*. Hitherto, the Polish proletariat has relinquished its leading role to one or the other party of reaction. After decades of efforts and defeats it is time for the bitter mistakes of the past to become a great lesson to it.

* “Zëri i popullit,” September 7, 1980.

In the future revolutionary movement, it will certainly rise, not only as a great fighting force, but also as the leading force in the revolution, without leaving this role in the hands of, or sharing it with, any other force. "The hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution is decisive for the solution of the fundamental question of the revolution, the question of political power, in its favour and that of the masses of the people,"* stresses Comrade Enver Hoxha.

Together with its natural allies, first of all, the working peasantry, the proletariat must rise both against the revisionist clan in power and against the ultra-capitalist clan and all their internal and external supporters.

Between the two big groupings of Polish reaction, between the two fires which each side has kindled for its own counter-revolutionary interests, the proletariat and the masses will find their salvation only when they rise as an independent force and kindle the fire of the revolutionary struggle.

As the PLA has pointed out, the Polish proletariat and people must adopt the same stand, also, towards the foreign reactionary forces which are doing everything possible, each on its own account, to deceive the Polish people. Hidden behind the "Solidarity," which the most reactionary circles of the capitalist West are displaying with the present Polish "movement," are the snares of a future enslavement to Western imperialism, just as hidden behind the "concern" of the Soviet social-imperialists and their lackeys are their feverish efforts to maintain the former oppression and dependence. All the "attacks," "quarrels" and "contradictions" over the "Polish question" amongst the external allies of each side of the counter-revolution in Poland are only squabbles as they haggle over which side will dominate Poland, who will suck the blood and toil of the Polish proletariat.

* Enver Hoxha, "Imperialism and the Revolution," p. 220, Eng. ed.

Faced with the threat of the revolution, the parties and groupings of the bourgeoisie and reaction put aside their contradictions and squabbles and unite for their fundamental aim — the suppression of the revolution.

But this does not and will not frighten the Polish proletariat, which is outstanding in history for its revolutionary traditions. The cause for which it will rise is just, and this is the greatest guarantee of its victory over any enemy and the united forces of internal and external enemies.

Comrade Enver Hoxha pointed out at the 8th Congress of the PLA, "The way for the working class and the people of Poland and of all the other revisionist countries to escape capitalist exploitation and foreign oppression is not through reconciliation with the revisionist regime in power and with Soviet social-imperialist slavery or through uniting with Western capital and reaction. The only way to ensure the development of the economy, the freedom and independence of the country and the re-establishment of socialism is through the open and resolute struggle of the masses of the people, under the leadership of the working class, with a genuine Marxist-Leninist party at its head."*

Marxism-Leninism teaches us that for the preparation and mobilization of the working masses for the revolution, *the rejection of bourgeois-revisionist theories and practices on trade-unionism*, the smashing of trade unions manipulated by capitalist-revisionist reaction and the organization of the proletariat *in new revolutionary trade unions, in class trade unions of the proletariat*, led by the Marxist-Leninist party, has great importance today.

The "creations" of recent years, the so-called independent unions, have brought about greater confusion, deception and division in the ranks of the proletariat and working mass-

* Enver Hoxha, Report to the 8th Congress of the PLA, p. 187, Eng. ed.

es in Poland. In the great upsurge of the struggle for power, however, these organisms became more and more exposed as means of political struggle in the hands of clans of reaction. Precisely on this account, the possibility of exposing them and rejecting their yoke is greater today than in periods of "quiet," "peaceful" development. Just as the proletariat threw off the yoke of the unions manipulated by the revisionists, it has the task to throw off the yoke of unions manipulated by the Walesas, the Bujaks and the Ruswelks, indeed, as quickly as possible, without giving "the union chiefs" the possibility to turn themselves into rulers of the state through the strength of the proletariat. The struggle and efforts of the proletariat should serve it, not to change masters, but to eliminate them.

In its efforts to mobilize and organize itself under the leadership of its Marxist-Leninist party, the Polish proletariat, like the proletariat of any other capitalist-revisionist country, will become more and more clear that the course of the revolution cannot be contained within the bounds and forms of a trade-union movement, even if this movement is completely in the hands of the proletariat and develops correctly. Just as the organization of the proletariat in revolutionary unions is one of the many forms of organization of the masses, the trade union movement is one of the many forms of the class struggle. Any illusion about this is fraught with harmful consequences. The only possible end for a class movement based on the trade-union movement alone is reformism.

The fundamental aim of the revolution is not to improve the state power through reforms. On the contrary, its aim is to destroy the existing state power and set up in its place the new state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This objective can never be achieved through trade-unionism. "Syndicalism either repudiates the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, or else relegates it, as it does with political power in

general, to a back seat,"* points out Lenin. Therefore, "we must transform the workers' movement, which at the moment is only occupational, into a political and directly revolutionary movement,"** was the call which the great Lenin in his time directed to the communist and workers' parties of countries where capital ruled. This call, which remains valid to this day, assumes a special urgency for the Polish proletariat, brainwashed with theories about reformist syndicalism.

In recent years, as throughout its history, the Polish proletariat has shown that it will not long put up with oppression and ruin, that its spirit of revolt and insurrection against socio-economic injustices is well developed. The widespread strike movement into which it threw itself was an expression, not only of the grave and intolerable situation that existed and still exists in Poland, but also of the readiness of the masses to hurl themselves into concrete actions against this situation. The task of the Marxist-Leninist party is *to channel and direct this spirit of revolt, this readiness of the masses to rise in insurrection, on the rails of the revolution*. The fact is that up till now, the Polish proletariat is attacking the revisionists in power from the right, attacking them with its own hands, but from the standpoint and spirit of pro-Western counter-revolutionary forces. Herein lies the misfortune of the movement. The working class and the working masses have to understand that their readiness to go into action must be directed not only against the modern revisionists and their social-imperialist allies, but equally against the internal ultra-capitalist forces, against the destructive influence of the Catholic Church, and against links with Western capital, reaction and the Vatican. Without a frontal radical attack against all these counter-revolutionary forces, the readiness of the masses to go

* V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 26. p. 100, Alb. ed.

** Ibid., vol. 13, p. 56.

into action is placed under the control of clans of the bourgeoisie and serves the advent to power of one clan or the other, but never of the proletariat.

The party of the proletariat makes the masses conscious that in the course of the protracted struggle for the revolution, *the strike movement is only one form of the class struggle, and neither the main, nor the final one.* As the Polish reality is proving, confining the working class to a strike movement, carefully manipulated by reaction, not only brought the proletariat no benefit, but even worse, exhausted its energies in vain, and in this context, discredited the revolutionary essence of the strike movement itself. The task of the revolutionary proletariat is that, while using the powerful strike movement to gain whatever can be gained within the framework of the existing order, to ensure above all that this movement is used as the first step towards higher forms of the class struggle, as training for the revolution, as an elementary form in which the masses are trained, organized and mobilized for the stern but decisive battles of the future.

Otherwise, the readiness of the Polish working masses to hurl themselves into action will remain merely a readiness that takes small steps, readiness to force a few reforms, a few momentary improvements. This position of the proletariat keeps alive the deception that it is fighting, but “it’s no use beating your head against the wall.” The violence of the Jaruzelski government, after December 13, 1982, could reinforce such a defeatist and fatalist view. If the so-called workers’ movement in Poland was suppressed by this violence, it was suppressed because it was not a genuine workers’ movement, not a revolutionary movement. When the proletariat is made conscious about the struggle in which it is to rise, when it is led by a genuine party of the working class, when it has a clear revolutionary strategy and tactics, undoubtedly it cor-

rectly foresees the steps it will take, foresees both the successes and the temporary defeats, and so on. As a result, it takes all measures to ensure that even from the defeats it emerges more organized and more determined to carry the struggle through to the end successfully. The great experience of all revolutions carried out hitherto, including the experience of the triumphant revolution in Albania, confirms this.

On the other hand, throwing the proletariat into minor actions for minor gains, with the bourgeois idea that the bastion of the ruling order is impregnable, keeps the proletariat in permanent bondage. This is the readiness of the petty-bourgeois who shouts about his great “valour,” but who loses his bearings, is confused and satisfied with a bone tossed at his feet.

Through its powerful movement, the Polish proletariat has proved that, irrespective of the counter-revolutionary inspiration that characterized those movements, it does not tolerate oppression, is not satisfied with and does not accept “minor victories” or, even less, charity squeezed out of the ruling bourgeoisie. As the PLA said in “Zëri i popullit” on February 13, 1981, “the Poland of the revolution has not died, and will not die, it has only lost its way.” And now, bitterly disillusioned, but also deeply revolted by the bitter reality, the Polish working class is left no other way but to take its true revolutionary road. “This,” says Comrade Enver Hoxha, “undoubtedly demands determination, courage, sacrifice, revival of the revolutionary spirit and traditions of the time of Lenin and Stalin. Above all, this demands the organization of genuine revolutionaries in new Marxist-Leninist parties, which will mobilize, organize and lead the general uprising of the proletariat and the other working masses to victory.”*

* Enver Hoxha, “Against Modern Revisionism 1968-1970,” pp. 84-85, Alb. ed.

Proof