

**MARXIST-LENINIST IDEOLOGY
WILL CERTAINLY
OVERCOME REVISIONISM**

(II)

THE "NAIM FRASHERI" STATE PUBLISHING ENTERPRISE
TIRANA

**MARXIST-LENINIST IDEOLOGY
WILL CERTAINLY OVERCOME
REVISIONISM**

(II)

**THE "NAIM FRASHERI" STATE PUBLISHING ENTERPRISE
TIRANA 1964**

CONTENTS

FAILURE OF YUGOSLAV "SPECIAL SOCIALISM" AND THE NEW MANOEUVRES OF THE BELGRADE REVI- SIONISTS (<i>Zëri i Popullit</i> , May 17, 1962)	1
THE HUE AND CRY ABOUT A "CHANGE" IN TITO'S POLICY AND THE UNDENIABLE TRUTH (<i>Zëri i Popullit</i> , June 30, 1962)	23
MODERN REVISIONISM HELPS THE FUNDAMENTAL STRATEGY OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM (<i>Zëri i Popullit</i> , September 19-20, 1962)	43
HIGH TREASON AGAINST MARXISM-LENINISM (<i>Zëri i Popullit</i> , October 13, 1962)	105
CONCERNING THE THESES FOR THE Xth CONGRESS OF THE ITALIAN COMMUNIST PARTY (<i>Zëri i Popullit</i> , November 17-18, 1962)	137
LET US HOLD ALOFT THE REVOLUTIONARY BANNER OF THE MOSCOW DECLARATIONS AND PROTECT THEM FROM THE ATTACKS OF THE MODERN REVI- SIONISTS (<i>Zëri i Popullit</i> , December 6, 1962)	229
THE TITO CLIQUE AND THE DRAFT OF THE NEW YUGOSLAV CONSTITUTION (<i>Zëri i Popullit</i> , December 13, 1962)	251
THE KHRUSHCHEV-TITO REVISIONIST GROUP CON- COCT NEW PLANS AGAINST THE CAUSE OF SO- CIALISM (<i>Zëri i Popullit</i> , January 8, 1963)	271
FOR THE MILITANT UNITY OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT UNDER THE VICTORIOUS BANNER OF MARXISM-LENINISM (<i>Zëri i Popullit</i> , February 7, 1963)	311

- KHRUSHCHEV AGAIN IN THE ROLE OF A DEMAGOGUE,
A SLANDERER AND A SOWER OF DISSENSION
(*Zëri i Popullit*, April 18, 1963) 347
- THE NEW REVISIONIST CRUSADE AGAINST
MARXISM-LENINISM WILL MEET WITH SHAMEFUL
FAILURE
(*Zëri i Popullit*, June 15, 1963) 403
- 15 YEARS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE INFORMATION
BUREAU RESOLUTION "ON THE SITUATION IN THE
YUGOSLAV COMMUNIST PARTY"
(*Zëri i Popullit*, June 29, 1963) 423

**FAILURE OF YUGOSLAV
"SPECIAL SOCIALISM"
AND THE NEW MANOEUVRES
OF THE
BELGRADE REVISIONISTS**

Article published in the newspaper

Zëri i Popullit

May 17, 1962

At the beginning of this month, the Yugoslav president Josip Broz Tito delivered a lengthy speech in Split, Dalmatia, on the occasion of the inauguration of a hydro-power station on the Cetina River. On such an occasion one might expect that the head of the Yugoslav state should speak of "successes" in the economic field and of "prospects" for the future, as he used to do during the campaign to advertise his "special socialism". But the speech of the Yugoslav president was devoted indeed, from top to bottom, to the disastrous situation of the Yugoslav economy, to the chaos and anarchy which characterise it, to the corruption and degeneration of its managers, to the dissolution of the party organisation and the state apparatus.

What did Tito say in his speech? In Yugoslavia, he pointed out, everyone does what he desires and what is to his liking; there is no system of and control on the investments; the financing of economy is effected by the banks according to the bribes received by their clerks and not according to the needs of the economic sectors; the highest pay within a working collective is 20 times the lowest one. He said that many people needlessly travel abroad and stay there several months spending state money, that they receive gifts from the foreign capitalist firms because they make concessions by selling them Yugoslav goods at a cheap rate and buying their goods at a high price; there are even cases in which money is deposited in different foreign banks. Tito

devoted a part of his speech to the rise of prices of industrial and agricultural products. "We in Yugoslavia," he declared, "constantly feel, and not only feel but also witness the rise of prices of various products." He tried in vain to attribute this phenomenon which has been evident for a long time in the Yugoslav economy, to the poor organisation of supply, to the fact that people allow the rise of prices as they like. "Moreover," Tito said, "in the capitalist countries also there exist some regulators that prevent the undue rise of the prices, while in our country there appears such a phenomenon that our merchant, in my opinion, does what no capitalist so openly does: he raises the prices when there is a lack of different products on the market. In some cases, our commerce has kept the goods in warehouses to cause a shortage of such goods on the market and thus keep the prices high." It is obvious that this is not a matter depending on the desires of people, but it is a result of the unlimited action of the law of demand and supply in the conditions of anarchy in production — a characteristic of the capitalist economy. These anomalies in the Yugoslav trade have also led to the creation of the local closed markets so that commodities cannot be sold or purchased from one republic to the other.

Tito openly spoke also of the real chaos reigning in the field of foreign trade. In Yugoslavia there are some 540 enterprises, he said, which are engaged in the import and export of goods and rival and compete with one another in the home and foreign markets, squandering the state's foreign exchange. Pointing out that Yugoslavia's foreign trade has an adverse balance of 800

million dollars, he said that goods are purchased abroad which the country does not need.

Dwelling on the political consequences of this situation, Tito said that "many negative phenomena have appeared of late, such as localism and chauvinism. . . . Some communists have forgotten the broad interests of the whole community; they see only their own narrow circle so that political dissatisfaction and injustice have appeared in some republics".

Tito presented a no less obscure picture of the situation in Yugoslav agriculture. He said that the small plots of land stretching like carpets near one another are unable to feed even the peasant himself. As he said it, "a large part of the financial means allocated by the state for agriculture is lost on its way to the banks. Today, there are cases in which the banks give their clerks 18-month salary for a year".

Dealing with crimes committed in matters of economy, Tito emphasized that they are widespread and not punished. "When someone steals 5, 6 or 7 million dinars he is sentenced to 2 years' imprisonment and in this way he gains more than when he is free." They steal in economic enterprises, they steal in banks, they steal in villages, they steal at the social insurance, they steal everywhere and when there is a possibility — such is the real picture of the situation that has arisen. We could continue at length with what Tito said, but it would cover a very large space because his speech in which such facts are mentioned fills several newspaper pages.

The fact that the Yugoslav president is obliged to speak so openly and admit the impasse in which the Yugoslav economy has landed, shows that the situation there is

indeed much worse than he describes it and that the dissatisfaction of the people is much greater. But this is not something new, nor unexpected. Whoever has objectively followed the development of present-day Yugoslavia, ever since the Tito clique openly betrayed Marxism-Leninism and step by step passed over to the fold of the imperialists, has forecast without any difficulty that the road onto which the Yugoslav revisionist leadership has led the country could result only in the loss of the victories which the Yugoslav people achieved through their national-liberation struggle, and in Yugoslavia's transformation into a country dependent on the big monopolies of the Western capitalist world, with all the ensuing consequences. The difference is that now the Yugoslav leadership is obliged to admit openly the disaster, seeking to conceal the real causes that have brought about this situation. But why does Tito speak in these days about the serious situation of the Yugoslav economy? Why does he pretend to criticise the shortcomings and a series of negative phenomena in various sectors of the country's life? Why does he rebuke and draw the attention of the party and the state apparatus to a series of ugly things the causes of which he does not uncover and does not show even the way of removing them?

In the first place, the economic difficulties and the dissatisfaction among the people are so great that one can no longer remain silent: an explanation must be given in one way or another. But the Yugoslav leaders want, in connection with the situation that has arisen, to remove the blame from themselves and lay it on some individuals, speculators, trade employees who go abroad

and do not know the foreign market, or on the unscrupulous enterprise managers, on communists who no longer play the role or on corrupted persons. Had it been a matter of certain individuals, this would not constitute any serious problem and Tito would pass it in silence, he would take measures and everything would be mended up. But such individuals are not just "some"; they constitute a whole stratum of party and state officials, the stratum of the employees of the whole bureaucratic and police machinery set up by the Tito regime itself and which are at the same time its principal mainstay. It is, therefore, they that rule present-day Yugoslavia and without whom Tito cannot get along.

Another reason which compels the Belgrade leaders to denounce publicly the great difficulties which Yugoslavia is undergoing at present, is that the people's disgust has considerably grown. Therefore, to mitigate it, to appease it there must be used such a demagogical manoeuvre: to take the initiative and denounce them from above and give pledges. Tito needs this to create the impression that it is not the leadership to be blamed, but some employees, that the leadership is itself aware of these things and condemns them, and has even thought of taking measures to improve the situation. The aim is evident: to throw dust in the people's eyes, to make them take hope and behave as they did before. Demagogy is the favourite weapon of the revisionists; of this they are masters. All this serves to conceal the real cause of this situation: the treachery of the Tito clique and their passage to the fold of the imperialists.

Finally — and this, in the present-day conditions, is of special importance — the public denunciation by the

Yugoslav leaders is effected in order to create the impression that in Yugoslavia some forward strides of a socialist character are being made, that some positive corrections are being made in the economic policy and that some indications are given that Yugoslavia "is embarking on the right path". The aim pursued by Tito and his imperialist masters through this new game is big and very dangerous. The question is to get "the Trojan horse" into the castle, into the socialist camp as now people have come out who are ready to breach the walls and greet it in with ceremony, even reserving a place of honour for it. It has been trumpeted for a long time that the Tito clique show some "positive aspects" as regards the foreign policy. Now the modern revisionists will trumpet that "positive signs" are appearing also with regard to the home policy. Thus, under the pretext that the Yugoslav leaders are making some turning point and, by making some "objective, comradely remarks" on what the Belgrade traitors themselves have denounced, they are able to stretch a friendly hand to the Tito clique. It must be said that all this story by no means damages either Tito or imperialism but helps the Yugoslav revisionists to find new loopholes to split and undermine from within the camp of socialism and the international communist movement.

Everybody remembers how much fanfare with the "Yugoslav way to socialism" was advertised; everybody remembers the advertising of the 1958 Ljubljana Congress and of the programme of the Yugoslav Communist League. It was said at that time that an invention had been made in Yugoslavia, that a kind of "special socialism" had been found which would work

miracles within a short period of time, that the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism had become obsolete and that they should now be replaced by Tito's "national communism". According to the Yugoslav revisionists, in order to build socialism, the party and state leadership in economy should be abolished, planning should be renounced, the so-called workers' councils should replace the single management of the enterprises, or the workers' self-administration system should be substituted for the state centralized management of the enterprises, the collectivisation of agriculture in the countryside should not be carried out, etc., etc. Liberalisation, self-administration, decentralisation, democratisation — these slogans so often used by Tito and his propagandists were the means that should create the "Yugoslav miracle" which would afterwards illuminate the whole world. What now remains of this "miracle"? What remains also of the "Yugoslav experiment which deserves to be carefully studied" and about which the whole of the revisionist chorus shouted? "Liberalism" brought about the freedom to rob the national wealth, "self-administration" — the workers' right to be exploited by the bureaucratic apparatus and that of the managers to receive salaries 20 times those of the workers; "decentralisation" led to everybody's acting according to his own will, thus giving rise to anarchy in production, market competition and the free game of prices; "democratisation" — to the stealing of millions with impunity, to the complete degeneration of the state machinery.

The real Marxist-Leninists have long since pointed out that the so-called "Yugoslav road to socialism" is

nothing but an ideological diversion of imperialism to disorientate and hit the building of socialism in the countries of the people's democracy, while in respect to Yugoslavia proper it would inevitably lead to the expansion of the capitalist elements.

What now characterises the Yugoslav economy? According to Tito's speech and from the daily reports of the Yugoslav press, it is characterised by non-fulfilment of the industrial production plans, by a great diminution in agricultural production, by the constant growth of the adverse balance of foreign trade and by the rapid increase of living costs.

Last year many branches of the Yugoslav industry, including electric power, coal industry and metal-working, metal-processing industry, chemical, building materials, textile and other industries, did not fulfil their production plans. In many industrial branches the value of goods produced was smaller than in 1960. This has happened, as indicated also in the Yugoslav press, for many reasons. The Yugoslav industry has been built up very chaotically. Enterprises have been set up according to the narrow local interests of the republic and communes, without a raw material base and without proceeding from the real necessities of the home market or from the export demands. Many enterprises depend on imported raw material which is often not secured. In these conditions it is understandable, that the small enterprises, which are numerous in Yugoslavia and do not have sufficient financial means, have no chance to conduct their economic activities normally. The lack of planning, anarchy in production, rivalry, a bad administration, thefts and abuses are doing, of course, their job.

In these conditions, an important factor determining this situation in Yugoslav industry is also the dumping by the Western monopolies headed by those of the United States, onto the Yugoslav market.

In recent years Yugoslavia has got 2 billion dollars in economic loans from the United States and other Western countries, and this does not include the military and other aid. Of course, these billions of dollars have been granted to Yugoslavia for definite political aims, for the services which the Tito group renders to imperialism; at the same time the capitalist trusts do not give their dollars without drawing other dollar profits from them. In reality, the loans which imperialism gives Yugoslavia are an export of capital. Although there is no Western monopoly capital directly invested in the Yugoslav industry, an important condition attached to the loans for Yugoslavia has been that they should be used for the purchase of manufactured and semi-manufactured goods, wheat and consumer goods in Western countries. The capitalist monopolies sell the goods to the Yugoslav state enterprises and organisations at higher prices than those of the world market. In his speech Tito laid the blame for this on the trade representatives sent abroad who are corrupted by the motor-cars or other things which the capitalist firms give them as bribes. This is true — bribery has been raised to a system; but the main fault lies elsewhere. Early last year, the Yugoslav ruling circles adopted the policy of free imports and, by their "reform" in foreign trade and in the currency exchange system, they lowered the customs tariffs, raised the value of the United States dollar in Yugoslavia and gave the importers complete freedom to purchase all kinds of goods

from Western firms. The Yugoslav revisionist leadership did not do what even the most developed capitalist states do, i.e. adopt strong protective measures for their own industry. Thus it happens that the foreign goods, although purchased abroad at higher prices, for a number of reasons compete with the domestic goods, which remain unsold on the Yugoslav market. The Yugoslav press carries numerous articles saying that the Yugoslav industry is by no means able to resist the competition of Western monopoly capital. In reality it must be admitted that this "reform" is a concession to the Western monopolies, in this way they get the reward for their loans and draw profits.

If we add to this picture also the fact that the purchasing power of the masses in Yugoslavia is very low, then one can easily imagine in what a situation the Yugoslav economy is at present. The lack of raw materials on the one hand, the accumulation of stocks and the sales crisis on the other are ever more leading to a stagnation of production. It goes without saying that in these conditions, lacking sufficient financial means, many enterprises are unable to cope with the expenditures for the normal development of production and bankruptcy is inevitable.

Of course, it is not those who get bribes from the Western capitalists, not those who are paid 20 times more than the ordinary worker nor those who steal millions of dinars that are suffering from this plight in the Yugoslav industry and throughout the country. In a word, it is not those men who crop up like mushrooms after a shower but the working class and the toiling peasantry that suffer from this plight.

Facts show that the so-called "workers' self-administration", in which the workers administer nothing, is but a subtle form of their exploitation by those who have the enterprises in their hands, by the men of Tito's bureaucratic apparatus. The luxurious life which they and their families are leading, the villas, motor-cars, the money "deposited in foreign banks", the tour, etc., on which Tito also dwelt in his speech—they are all at the expense of the blood and sweat of the Yugoslav workers. In the final analysis, they are doing nothing but following the example of their president, who is known for his sumptuousness and tour around the world. The vice-chairman of the Federal Executive Council of Yugoslavia, M. Todorovic, in a recent report delivered at the session of the Federal People's Assembly, had to admit that "our bureaucrats want to have freedom of action, to realize excessive incomes and enjoy special privileges and they are trying to achieve this by suppressing democracy and the freedom of their inferiors". If we translate this more clearly, it means: by oppressing and exploiting the workers.

It follows from the above that in Yugoslavia, due to all these factors, the cost of living is continually rising. As reported by the Belgrade newspaper *Politika* in its March 9 issue, prices in Yugoslavia for February this year had risen by 8 per cent as compared with the average level of the past year, the prices of agricultural products had risen by 16 per cent, while those of industrial products had risen by 5 per cent. At the same time there have also been increases in taxes, which in 1961 were 22 per cent higher than in the previous year and which are imposed on the enterprises but shouldered by the

working masses in Yugoslavia just as they are in capitalist countries. From all these things it is evident why Tito in his speech called on the workers not to go on strikes which, although the authorities try to hide them, are not rare.

The problem of agricultural production in Yugoslavia is perhaps more serious than that of industry. Yugoslavia, which formerly was known as an exporter of agricultural products, now is compelled to import large quantities of United States wheat to feed the population. This happens, in the first place, because the land is divided into very small plots, because there is a lack of modern technical means for its cultivation, etc., etc. Moreover, agriculture in Yugoslavia is the object of great speculation by the trade enterprises which, proceeding from the aim of drawing the greatest possible profits, are manoeuvring at their pleasure with the purchase and sale prices of the agricultural products. This has resulted in the constant destruction of the small peasant farmsteads and in the consolidation of those of the kulaks, so that in Yugoslavia, as Tito puts it, "the onions cost more than gold".

All the efforts exerted by the Yugoslav leadership to increase agricultural production have failed. Even those few means that have been earmarked for agriculture have gone, as the newspaper *Borba* reported, into the hands of the kulaks. In 1961 Yugoslav agriculture yielded 20 per cent less than was forecast and 9 per cent less than in 1959.

Tito, who recognized in his speech, just as the other Yugoslav leaders did in their statements of late, the difficulties which the Yugoslav economy is undergoing,

tried to characterise this situation as a temporary and transitive phenomenon, whereas indeed it is a chronic disease which is inherent in the very nature of the relations dominating the Yugoslav economy, just as anarchy in production, competition, the exploitation of the working people, etc. are chronic and permanent in every capitalist country. The Yugoslav revisionists are reaping what they have sown: They renounced socialism — here are the consequences of it.

Lenin had long ago warned that during the transition period, when the question arises "Who will win?", there exist the possibilities for either socialism or capitalism to win. In Yugoslavia, owing to the fact that her leaders have betrayed Marxism-Leninism and placed themselves in the service of imperialism, the question, as plainly seen, is decidedly in favour of capitalism. The facts are so obvious that the revisionists themselves cannot conceal them. Anarchy in production and in the distribution of social funds, competition and speculation on the market, the process of differentiation and the consolidation of the capitalist elements in the countryside, the extension of private economic enterprises, especially in handicrafts, etc. — these are phenomena not of the socialist economy, but of the capitalist one. Let the Belgrade revisionists and their supporters talk as much as they want about the building of socialism in Yugoslavia, the reality shows the opposite.

There remains nothing of the "Yugoslav road to socialism". Practice indisputably confirmed that our party and the other communist parties were right when they criticised the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist nature of this "road" and condemned the splitting and undermin-

ing policy of the Yugoslav leaders. They rightfully pointed out that Tito's "special socialism" has nothing in common with socialism. The Yugoslav revisionist leaders have already done much harm to the cause of socialism and the people's struggle for freedom and national independence, for democracy and social progress, for peace and socialism. But at the same time the tragedy of the Yugoslav peoples, for which Tito and his group are responsible, is an example showing at what point one can arrive if one trusts the revisionist demagogy, alienating oneself from the principles of Marxism-Leninism and from the tried and tested practice of the construction of socialism in the other countries on the foundation of the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. The chaos caused in the economy and in the whole life of the country by the revisionist theories has brought about also the corruption and degeneration of the cadres of the state and party apparatus in Yugoslavia. Some time ago at Novi Sad, as reported by the foreign news agencies, an important court trial took place against some state enterprise managers who, in collaboration with a large group of private undertakers, had speculated on and stolen property, which is worth tens of millions of dinars. Tito openly speaks of embezzlement of state funds, of financial speculations, of the stealing of state property. These things have by now obviously grown to such proportions that the leaders can no longer keep silence about them. In his speech Tito said that, in accordance with a decision which was scheduled to come into force on May 2, the importation of automobiles into Yugoslavia had been prohibited. "But what happened?" — he asked. "Two thousand automobiles arrived

at our border one day before. . . ." It is the question of private motor-cars representing bribes which are now quite a usual thing for those who are trading with foreign firms, and which was mentioned above. Tito admitted also that many enterprise managers, in collaboration with leaders of local organs, use the property entrusted to them as they like and that they draw huge profits for their personal use.

Such a situation has also created favourable conditions to incite further localist and chauvinist feelings among regions and republics. It is understandable that as long as there exists group property in Yugoslavia, every group seeks to develop its own property to the detriment of the others', to draw as much profit as possible at the expense of others', to liquidate others' in order to maintain its own. Thus, for example, Zagreb is not interested in the development of Prizren, Croatia not in that of Montenegro. The competition between the different economic enterprises and between the republics, the drive each one is conducting to draw as much profit as possible for itself, the efforts to grab at the expense of the others — all these give rise to profound political contradictions which, in the long run, are ever more complicated. The relations that have been established in the Yugoslav economy, relations of the capitalist type, lead not to a rapprochement and cooperation between classes and nationalities, but to a split and hostility among them. This is the "settlement" of the national question in Yugoslavia according to Tito's programme!

Chauvinism is deeply rooted in Yugoslavia. But in the new conditions it gains a still greater momentum. Other new disproportions in the economic, cultural and

other fields are added to the previous unequal development among the nationalities. In order to maintain this inequality which concerns the Serbian chauvinists on the one hand, and the Croatian ones on the other, it is obvious that there must be put into operation both the political oppression and the repressive state machinery — police, courts, prisons. This once more confirms what has been said and which is common knowledge about the miserable situation of the Albanians of Kosovo, Macedonia and Montenegro and of many other nationality regions of Yugoslavia.

Of late, the Yugoslav leaders, including Tito himself with his latest speech, compelled by the ever deepening of the contradictions in the Yugoslav economic and political life, have been promising that they will strengthen state control, etc. But the measures they promise, as always, do not touch the real causes. The interests of the groups which draw profits not from their work, especially those of the petty bourgeoisie and kulaks, and the interests of foreign monopoly capital, remain untouched.

The causes of the present situation in Yugoslavia are not subjective, as the Belgrade revisionists are seeking to present them. The causes are objective. It is the very system of the Yugoslav economy, it is the very nature of the relations dominating the economy, it is in the final analysis the very revisionist conceptions that give rise to all those negative phenomena, to all those failures which are manifested in Yugoslavia's life at present.

But recently, the Yugoslav revisionist leaders have blamed Stalin for their economic difficulties and they

continue to attack him even now, alleging that he impeded the normal development of Yugoslavia. Life itself, however, indisputably confirmed that Stalin was right when he unmasked the true features of the Tito clique and warned about the dangers that were threatening the cause of socialism in Yugoslavia and the whole international communist and workers' movement as a result of the treason of this clique. Life showed that Stalin's predictions about the fate that lay in store for the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav people, about the degeneration of the party and state in Yugoslavia were true. The leadership of the Yugoslav Communist Party betrayed Marxism-Leninism and led to the loss of the fruits gained by the Yugoslav peoples, to Yugoslavia being attached to the chariot of imperialism. The present situation of Yugoslavia is, then, another confirmation of Stalin's correct and principled attitude, which once more shows how useless and slanderous is the fight carried out by the modern revisionists against this prominent Marxist-Leninist, a worthy disciple of Lenin.

In his lengthy speech Tito did not show any way out. Nor could he do so. To do this one must change the whole system established by the revisionists in Yugoslavia, one must detach oneself from imperialism. But the Tito group cannot do this, you cannot expect this from those who have betrayed Marxism-Leninism.

The Tito clique is politically, economically and militarily connected with imperialism. The words "socialism" and "neutrality" which are used according to the needs, are only masks used by the Yugoslav revisionists to

conceal their dependence on imperialism and the services they render to it. In reality, there is nothing socialist or neutral in Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia is attached to NATO through the Balkan pact. Not in vain has the United States of America given her billions of dollars and military equipment. Today, Yugoslavia is quite an armed country and she continues to arm. The Western observers noticed this also during the May Day parade this year in Belgrade where American armaments mainly struck one's eyes, although new Soviet-made tanks were not missing. The arming of Yugoslavia by United States imperialism is not without purpose. It is part and parcel of the general armament of the imperialist powers and their allies; that is why it constitutes a permanent danger and menace to the socialist countries in the Balkans, and in particular to our country, because Yugoslavia's annexionist aims towards Albania are well known. Therefore, in such conditions, cooperation with the Tito clique means to play into the hands of imperialism. Neither Tito's demagogy nor the sophistry of his supporters is able to change what is known and publicly confirmed: that Tito is the apprentice while the United States imperialism is his master.

A Marxist-Leninist party capable of implementing the great ideas of scientific communism does not exist in Yugoslavia today. The Yugoslav League of Communists and the Yugoslav state apparatus have long since submerged into the mire of revisionism, of the betrayal of the interests of the Yugoslav peoples and of the international communist and workers' movement. To nourish illusions and to hope that there is still a possibility of

the Yugoslav revisionist leaders "mending their ways" and starting properly to "build up" socialism means to lose completely the sense of objectivity, to be in open opposition to what is shown by the daily practice of the present-day Yugoslav life, or to judge by not on the basis of Marxist-Leninist analysis of the facts but of the idealistic considerations of the revisionists.

The complete failure of the Yugoslav economic line, just as the political failure of the Yugoslav revisionists, does not mean at all that they are no longer dangerous. As long as they continue their splitting and undermining activities against the socialist camp and the international communist movement, as long as imperialism is unsparingly financing their traitorous activities, all the communists must constantly enhance their revolutionary vigilance and carry out to the end their struggle of principle for the unmasking and the complete ideological and political destruction of the Yugoslav revisionists, these sworn traitors to socialism and loyal servitors of imperialism.

The Moscow Declaration of the 81 communist and workers' parties says that "further exposure of the leaders of Yugoslav revisionists and active struggle to safeguard the communist movement and the working-class movement from the anti-Leninist ideas of the Yugoslav revisionists, remain an essential task of the Marxist-Leninist parties". The reality of these tasks continues always as previously. The Yugoslav revisionists, in spite of the defeats they have suffered and continue to suffer, will try to find new "arguments", new ways of fighting socialism, new allies to split the socialist camp and undermine the ranks of the anti-imperialist front. There-

fore, the more we unmask the demagogical manoeuvres and subtle tactics of the Yugoslav revisionists, the better we promote the great cause of the triumph of socialism and peace.

Sofokli Lazri
Javer Malo

**THE HUE AND CRY
ABOUT
A "CHANGE" IN TITO'S POLICY
AND
THE UNDENIABLE TRUTH**

Article published in the newspaper
Zëri i Popullit

June 30, 1962

The recent hue and cry about a certain "change" in Tito's policy has again given rise in the West to the question "of guarantees to safeguard the independence of Yugoslavia from world communism". It is, however, clear to all who have followed closely the American policy towards Yugoslavia and the manoeuvres of Tito's clique to sow dissension in the socialist camp and the international communist movement, that there is actually no such "change" nor can there be any. In any case, the American Senators, who do not know all that the State Department knows, demanded new guarantees. Mention was even made of a resolution which the American Senate supposedly passed to refuse further aid to Yugoslavia and that Kennedy himself had later intervened to have this resolution annulled. What a comedy!

Nevertheless, the guarantees did not fail to come forth. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Yugoslavia, Koča Popovich, paid an official visit to Washington where he was cordially received by the head of the State Department, Dean Rusk, and by President Kennedy himself. News agencies reported that the topics dealt with at these talks, at "these pleasant and interesting talks", as Koča Popovich described his talks with Dean Rusk, included "the Common Market, Berlin and the whole question of East-West relations, the aid to be given by the United States to Yugoslavia and, probably, an eventual visit of Marshal Tito to Washington towards

the end of the current year". In other words, time-pieces were set and new guarantees negotiated for the days to come.

The American Ambassador to Belgrade, George Kennan, who is no second-rate diplomat but is considered as a "Number One American expert on Eastern affairs", stated, according to the Yugoslav Tanjug News Agency itself, that "there is no reason to doubt that Yugoslavia is an independent state and that it will continue to maintain this stand in the days to come, too".

Lastly, Kennedy himself gave "guarantees". At his press conference on June 7, he justified the policy of his Government towards Yugoslavia, calling the aid to Tito's clique as in keeping with "the national interests" of the United States of America. Nothing more need be said under the circumstances. Let those who have eyes see and those who have ears hear, as the saying goes.

It is thus plain that the hubbub about some kind of a "change" in Tito's policy, which was started after his speech at Split in which, for obvious reasons, hints were dropped about some "changes in Yugoslav politics", is only a pill intended to put to sleep those who have shut their eyes and stuffed their ears so as not to see and hear that this is only another ruse and nothing else.

Both Belgrade and Washington brag about the so-called "independence" of the Tito clique. A lie, pure and simple! When we know that the imperialists consider only the socialist states as dependent and in bondage and that Taiwan, south Korea, south Viet Nam, etc. are proclaimed by them as champions of independence, it is not hard to draw the conclusion that Yugoslavia, too, is as

"independent" as these classic countries of imperialist slavery. Nobody envies them for this kind of "independence".

But there is nothing new in this: such words as "independence" or "socialism" applied to Yugoslavia are nothing less than masks which the Belgrade revisionists and their friends use to cover up the truth. It is plain that if these masks were to fall off the Yugoslav revisionists would be good for nothing.

Close, all-round American-Yugoslav collaboration is so extensive and so conspicuous that it cannot be kept secret. The history of American-Yugoslav relations bears full evidence of the "independence" of Yugoslavia and the role that has been assigned to it. We need to mention only a few facts of recent years. At the 7th Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia Tito stated:

"We received economic and military aid from America at the time when it was most urgently needed, that is, when Stalin exerted political, economic and propaganda pressure on our country. This was of great help to us in overcoming the difficulties we encountered at that time."

Let us assume for a moment that it was only during a certain specific period that the Yugoslav revisionists received economic and military aid from the United States of America. Why, it should be asked, did the American imperialists give this help to Yugoslavia at that time?

If one can describe as disinterested the "aid" which the American imperialists gave the Greek monarchical fascists to oppress the Greek people or the "aid" which they are giving the reactionary cliques in the Far East, then one can equally describe as disinterested the "aid"

which they have been giving to Yugoslavia. There is no case in history of imperialists giving disinterested aid. American "aid" has always and everywhere been aimed at making the countries which receive it dependent economically and politically on American imperialism. Yugoslavia can make no exception.

It is to the best of everybody's knowledge that the economic, military and political aid allocated by the United States to Yugoslavia is not confined to any specific period but has been continuous and in ever increasing proportions.

It is publicly known that from 1948 to the end of 1961, Yugoslavia, as the American magazine *U.S. News and World Report* of November 27, 1961, wrote, received military and economic aid amounting to 3 billion 500 million dollars from the United States of America. Newspapers and periodicals abroad do not hesitate even to publish time-tables listing in detail the amounts of this "aid" given in various forms, in some cases openly and in others not, at times directly in dollars, at other times in surplus agricultural produce and in many cases in armaments. Nor are conclusions lacking as to why this "aid" is given in specific situations. Thus, for instance, the Tito clique received large sums of dollars at the time of the counter-revolution in Hungary, in the preparation of which the Yugoslav revisionists took active part, and following the speech by Tito at Pula, in which he made a violent attack on and slandered the Soviet Union and all the other socialist countries. On November 3, 1956 Yugoslavia and the USA concluded an agreement whereby 98,300,000 dollars worth of American surplus agricultural produce would be furnished, and at the end of December

of the same year the American Government handed to Yugoslavia a cheque for nearly 6 billion dinars.

In 1957, when the League of Communists of Yugoslavia refused to sign the Moscow Declaration of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries and made public their revisionist program, as a counter-balance to the entire international communist and workers' movement, the USA gave Yugoslavia another huge loan. A news item reported on November 22, 1957 by AFP said: "There have been clear indications that the Yugoslav stand (in connection with the Moscow Declaration) has given rise to great interest in the State Department. The impression prevails in Washington that the Yugoslav President, Marshal Tito, has again stood firm in showing his independence from the communist bloc". A few days later, on December 8, 1957, Tito received the former Ambassador of the USA to Yugoslavia, James Ridelberger. The next day *The New York Times* stated that "Tito mentioned Yugoslavia's refusal to sign the Moscow Declaration as a further proof of its continued independence". These are not sheer coincidences. But there is more yet.

On June 15, 1958 Tito delivered his infamous speech at Labin, the main objective of which was to justify the revisionist nature of the program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, a program repudiated with disdain by all the communist and workers' parties of the world, and to give a new tone to his slanders against the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries. The speech was acclaimed by the imperialist camp, and only three days later, on June 18, President Eisenhower praised Tito for attempting to "create centrifugal forces"

within the socialist camp, expressing at the same time his readiness to strengthen the ties with Yugoslavia.

During the same period and precisely on June 19, Robert Murphy, then Assistant-Secretary of the State Department, declared: "He (Tito) has never faltered in his determination to safeguard the independence of Yugoslavia from intrusion into the internal affairs of his country". There is no doubt that all these declarations would be followed by gifts of dollars. And that is exactly what happened. On June 18 a Yugoslav military mission paid a call to the Department of Defence of the USA and asked that military equipment be furnished more speedily. *Newsweek* said during those days: "The United States has decided to give Yugoslavia a political priority in the American aid, and a loan as well". Further down it added: "The United States of America will give Yugoslavia a special aid in the form of a 10-15 million dollars as well as 80-90 million dollars worth of surplus agricultural products, and plans are being examined to sell to it armaments directly".

What do all these things speak of? The complete harmony of the Yugoslav policy with that of the imperialists leaves no room for us to consider it casual. This policy persistently pursued by Belgrade has been received with enthusiastic approval in the imperialist camp. The Yugoslav leaders have even been encouraged by these periodic "aids" to tread on this road. "The elastic trend shown by America towards Yugoslavia in the past," *The New York Times* wrote, "was justifiable from the standpoint of our own interests".

American aid did not fail to pour forth during 1959 as well as the following years. It is publicly known that

this year's aid amounted to the gross sum of 156,300,000 dollars.

But the catastrophic consequences of the economic policy of the Yugoslav revisionists were clearly manifested in 1960. It was the time when the Yugoslav leaders were about to launch a new system of foreign trade and rate of exchange, through which the penetration of American capital in Yugoslavia would be greatly facilitated. The revisionists stated at that time that they needed 350 million dollars to meet the difficult situation of payments. It was precisely at this point that the American Department of State sent to Belgrade its Under-Secretary, Douglas Dillon, one of the most powerful men on the New York Stock Exchange. Following his talks with the Yugoslav leaders he stated: "The USA has tried to help Yugoslavia for a number of years to consolidate its position as an independent country . . . Yugoslavia and the USA maintain constructive mutual relations which are reflected in economic collaboration, in an ever increasing exchange of men and mutual programs of technical development". He said further: "We continue to look for fields of collaboration in which our common efforts will bring about the rise of well-being and security for our peoples". Just how much the well-being of the Yugoslav people has improved through this collaboration with the USA Dillon is well aware. This was further elucidated by Tito's recent speech at Split. It had been made clear in time by the American press as well. On December 26, 1961 the American news agency UPI gave this tableau of the situation in Yugoslavia:

“Changes have been introduced in Yugoslavia in these years that have pleased the West but on the contrary have made the Kremlin uneasy. Forced collectivization has been practically eliminated by the Tito regime. The economy of the country has increasingly been adapted to Western trade. Some aspects of free trade in industry have come to the fore. Internal and foreign trips have been encouraged. Some Yugoslavs continue to have a ‘Marxist conscience’. They still like to show (pro forma of course) time and again that they are good socialists, that they are opposed to the capitalist system. Because of this they often align themselves with the leaders of the African and Asiatic bloc against the United States and Western imperialism”.

How then can one say that American “aid” is lavished on Yugoslavia without economic and political concessions made by the latter?

But let us return to Dillon’s visit. As expected and as it had always happened whenever American personalities visited Belgrade, the Tito clique received more dollars. This is a fact. It is likewise a fact that the Belgrade revisionists gave further pledges to the “Generous Uncle”. Wherefore all this generosity?

“Why is the Government of the United States trying to strengthen the communist regime in Yugoslavia at the same time as it is trying to fight the other communists throughout the world?” asked *U.S. News and World Report* in one of its last year’s issues. And at the same time it gave its answer: “The Americans should put the question: ‘Do Tito’s interests coincide with ours?’. Viewed from this standpoint, our policy towards Tito is correct”. Here is the reason. Everything is plainly said.

But, as it was then explained, this article was written in order to appease some short-sighted individuals in America who, listening to Tito’s phraseology, took him for a real communist. It was the same people, as it can be remembered, who raised their voices against the 130 fighter planes which Kennedy’s Government would be giving to Yugoslavia and against training Yugoslav pilots in American military bases. Some went even so far as to say that the Kennedy Administration would re-examine American policy towards Yugoslavia. But these rumors were speedily hushed up. On October 18 last year Dean Rusk stated in one of his press conferences that he “has not the least doubt that the policy of American military aid to Yugoslavia has helped the latter preserve its independence vis-a-vis the Soviet bloc”, and that “since 1948 Yugoslavia has not only safeguarded its independence, but it has been a source of dissension in the bosom of international communism”. Moreover, to remove any misgivings about the stand the Yugoslav revisionists maintained at the conference of non-aligned countries in Belgrade, the head of American diplomacy deemed it necessary to state that “the stand of the Yugoslav Delegation at the conference of non-aligned countries does not show that Yugoslavia has departed from the road of her independence”.

Dean Rusk’s various speeches and statements, although camouflaged in diplomatic phraseology, lay bare the services which the Yugoslav revisionists render to American imperialism, especially in their role as sowers of dissension in the international communist movement and in their work of disrupting the national-liberation movements. In this connection it is worth citing another sig-

nificant statement made by Dean Rusk on February 5 of this year. In his controversy with Senator Paul Kitchin, Head of the Special Committee of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of State declared: "The American aid given by Eisenhower and Kennedy consolidated the independence of Yugoslavia and made Tito a leading example of how to successfully detach a communist country from Soviet imperialism". He made this statement more explicit when he said that "the Kennedy Administration is convinced that Yugoslavia takes no part in the international communist plot to undermine the independence of other countries".

Dean Rusk called "the first decision" to "help" Yugoslavia as "full of vision and daring" and wound up by saying that "the results have surpassed our expectations". Or, as his assistant, Herlan Cleveland, stated recently when speaking about the aid that the United States had given Yugoslavia: "I think we have received a good reward for our money".

The facts we have mentioned speak for themselves, they show that the Tito clique are from first to last in the service of American imperialism. This is confirmed not only by the assistance, statements and praises which the leaders of American imperialism have always lavished and continue to lavish on the Belgrade revisionists but also by the revisionist policy and activities of the Yugoslav leaders who keep pursuing the same objective, namely, to sow dissension in the socialist camp and prolong the life of imperialism. Participation in the Balkan Pact, which connects the Tito clique with NATO, bears full witness to this; Tito's open attacks on the socialist camp, likening it to the imperialist bloc, bear witness

to this; and the numerous slanders against the Soviet Union, against the socialist system, bear witness to this. It was Tito who called the decision of the Soviet Government to resume nuclear tests "a thing that has alarmed the whole world on a very large scale" and called the Economic Council of Mutual Assistance "a serious obstacle" to economic cooperation, "bearing resemblance to" the Common Market. Going all the way to embellish the capitalist system, to preach revisionist ideas about war and peace, about coexistence, about revolutions, about the nature of imperialism and so on is another proof of this.

To whose benefit and in whose service the Yugoslav revisionist leaders carry out their policy and activities is also clearly demonstrated by their hostile stand towards the struggle of the oppressed peoples to free themselves from American imperialism and other colonialist powers as well as towards the revolutionary war of the working class against capitalist exploiters. Doesn't the stand of the Yugoslav revisionists towards the struggle of the Congolese people for independence — i.e., their considering American intervention as "a factor that helped stabilize the situation", a very "significant and valuable factor" — speak of this? To praise Kennedy's "Alliance for Progress" which aims at prolonging the period of bondage for the Latin Americans, and to preach that American imperialism "is beginning to realize that times have changed" and that it is "showing readiness to correct mistakes and adjust wrongs", as the Yugoslav revisionists have done — is this not to the advantage of American imperialism and prejudicial to the fight of the Latin American peoples for freedom? To praise Wash-

ington's "endeavours" to solve the Laotian problem because American imperialists "are really eager to see a peaceful and neutral Laos", as the Yugoslav revisionists have done — is this not to the advantage of American imperialism and prejudicial to the struggle of the Laotian patriots for freedom?

Tito's clique is in fact not different from the other allies of the USA except for its "socialist" and "neutralist" mask which it is obliged to wear, and its special role as a "Trojan horse" in order to sow dissension in the socialist camp and in the international communist and workers' movement. One thing is certain: If now and then Rusk and other American politicians find it expedient to blurt out certain fragments of the truth in order to quiet down those who do not know as much as the State Department, they do a thousand other things to keep this mask on.

In the present state of things, when the Yugoslav revisionists are meeting with complete failure in their economic and political system and their activities have been so openly exposed in the international arena, the Tito group have to resort to shrewd tricks and find new ways of sowing dissension in the socialist camp and the international communist and workers' movement. Both the American imperialists and the modern revisionists deem it expedient today to paint in deeper red the mask of the Tito group which has lost colour. And that is what they are doing. At the same time that Koča Popovich went to Washington to strengthen relations with the USA and to coordinate his policy with the American Government, Tito, in his speech at Split, pretended he was making "socialist improvements in Yugoslavia". These

manoeuvres are inseparable parts of that notorious big international plot of imperialist reaction directed against socialism and peace.

Therefore, we would be doing a great disservice to the socialist camp and the international communist and workers' movement if we slackened our vigilance against the danger of Yugoslav revisionists, or, what is worse, if we nourished illusions that they are correcting their mistakes and embarking on the right road, illusions that the socialist elements are being strengthened in Yugoslavia, that socialism is being built there, and so on and so forth.

The international communist and workers' movement has more than once emphasized that it behooves the communists throughout the world to expose and denounce the activities of the Yugoslav revisionists thoroughly. This is indispensable to the consolidation of the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement, of the anti-imperialist front of peace and socialism.

And yet, what is actually happening? While all facts go to prove that Yugoslavia, far from building socialism, has embarked on a comprehensive, all-round drift towards capitalism, the modern revisionists try their utmost to prove the contrary. But such statements as "Yugoslavia is a socialist country" and "socialism is being built in Yugoslavia" and the like are mere bluffs which cause no harm to the imperialists but which allow the modern revisionists of all stripes to throw their arms around Tito and justify him to a certain extent in the eyes of the world. In other words, Tito is the link which connects the other revisionists with imperialism at a time when

this cannot yet be done openly and directly. Vain are all efforts to conceal this truth, though the "arguments" used in explaining why imperialism helps "socialist" Yugoslavia and why the revisionists tighten their connections with the treacherous Tito clique are diverse. If "socialism is being built in Yugoslavia" then what explanation can be given for the fact that the imperialists aid the Tito clique? According to this logic either the imperialists are no longer imperialists and are beginning to set their hearts on building socialism, or Yugoslavia is not building socialism and the imperialists are actually helping to reinstate capitalism. Either the one or the other. The modern revisionists categorically deny the second and stick to the first. If so, then let them say it openly.

If Yugoslavia is a "socialist country" we are justified in asking: How many kinds of socialism are there in the world? According to modern revisionist logic there must be two kinds of socialism: one kind of socialism hostile to capitalism, against which the imperialists wage a relentless fight, and another kind of socialism harmless to capitalism, which the imperialists aid unsparingly. Yugoslav "socialism" therefore is harmless to capitalism, otherwise the imperialists would not be aiding it. The truth is that Tito's "socialism" aided by American imperialism has nothing in common with socialism. Tito's clique simply uses it as a mask. It is like saying that there are two kinds of imperialism: a bad one, hostile to the working class and to all the laboring people, exploiter and warmonger, and a good one that looks after the welfare of the working class and of all the laboring people, liberator of the peoples and peace-loving. But there

are not two kinds of socialism for Marxist-Leninists, just as there are not two kinds of imperialism.

It is not very easy for the modern revisionists to justify their shaking hands with Tito so generously today. To make friends with him they have to renounce the 1960 Moscow Declaration which has designated the Yugoslav revisionists as traitors to Marxism-Leninism. But the modern revisionists have recently let it be understood that they are determined to do even this. After all did they not say immediately after the 1960 Moscow Declaration was signed that this historic document, drawn up and signed by all the representatives of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties of the world, was a document of compromise? And these are the consequences. Compromises are of short duration and that is why the revisionists began to violate the 1960 Declaration and set aside one of the most essential items: the attitude towards Yugoslav revisionism.

Of course, those who are opposed to what was jointly decided upon and clearly written in the 1960 Moscow Declaration are obliged to go on manoeuvring.

This is only a question of tactics. Naturally, at the present phase the modern revisionists are obliged to maintain a certain "distance" from the Tito group, who are highly compromised by their open connections with imperialism. But this "distance" does not at all affect the main thing, namely, the ideological reconciliation which binds the revisionists to one another in their opposition to Marxism-Leninism. This "distance" does not at all affect their blatant manifestation of mutual sympathy and collaboration. On the other hand the Belgrade revisionists are not so foolish as to fail to un-

derstand the "necessity" of this "distance". This is what the "Trojan horse" is after: once the walls are down the rest follows suit. This was what happened in 1956 too, but the Hungarian events, with Tito's group and the American imperialists jointly organizing a counter-revolution, did not come up to their expectations. A lesson was drawn from the mistakes and work has now been started on a more comprehensive plan.

Thus under the masks of "peaceful coexistence" and "normal state relations", the process of fusion began. The statements of "normal relations" were replaced with "good relations", followed by the exchange of numerous delegations, by the extension of economic, cultural and other relations. In short, the modern revisionists mustered their forces through "fruitful and all-round" collaboration for the struggle against Leninism. This process of collaboration is in full swing and is intended to take more concrete form in the days to come.

The fig leaf which is still in use for pretending that "we have opposite ideological views with Yugoslavia" is counter-balanced and neutralized by the other slogans about "socialist Yugoslavia" and such statements as "identical views on the most important international and political issues". What is yet to come is a full identity of views not only in politics but also in ideology and aims.

Another "reason" why it is necessary to make friends with Tito has recently been spread around. It is rumored that the Americans are trying to take advantage of the economic crisis which Yugoslavia is undergoing in order to organize a "counter-revolution there". And it is added: it is therefore just and Marxist-like to "rescue"

Tito from this imperialist "danger" by pursuing a policy of conciliation towards him, regardless of what is said in the 1960 Moscow Declaration. And thereby hangs an amusing tale: the imperialists will overthrow Tito. Why? In order to establish socialism? This remains to be said and everything will be crystal clear. But it is yet too early for this. But then what need is there of saying everything? The revisionists are especially careful not to say everything.

How long this will last is, for the time being, unimportant. The unequivocal and determined stand of the international communist and workers' movement towards the Tito clique is a stumbling-block which the modern revisionists cannot fail to take into account. But the revisionists have not taken into account the consequences resulting from their reconciliation with Tito. Plain common sense tells us that so long as Tito is tied up with the imperialists, reconciliation with him is a step towards reconciliation with the imperialists. Whatever the modern revisionists do, whether they are fully reconciled to or keep a certain "aloofness" from "Yugoslav comrades", whether they speak of "disagreement" with them on certain matters or make any "comradely criticism" to them, what is said in the 1960 Moscow Declaration remains unaltered, namely, that the Yugoslav revisionists are traitors to Marxism-Leninism and the Marxist-Leninist Parties are duty bound to continue to expose them.

In his speech to the electors, Comrade Enver Hoxha was therefore right to stress that "the Communist and Workers' Parties of the world, the communists through-

out the world, acting on the Moscow Declarations, will continue to thoroughly expose the modern revisionists, will tear off the mask of the Belgrade renegades and their bosses, the American imperialists, and will frustrate all their plans”.

**MODERN REVISIONISM
HELPS THE FUNDAMENTAL STRATEGY
OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM**

Article published in the newspaper
Zëri i Popullit

September 19 — 20, 1962

On August 7 this year the leader of the Yugoslav revisionists, Tito, gave an interview to the American newspaperman Drew Pearson of the *Washington Post*. In this interview which we published in our paper on September 18, 1962, Tito displayed once again his true nature, the nature of a renegade from Marxism-Leninism, of a servant and an experienced agent of the American imperialists in their struggle against communism and the movements for national liberation and peace in the world, and of the imperialist go-between for Khrushchev's revisionist group.

Facts and day-to-day occurrences clearly demonstrate that imperialism, with American imperialism in the lead, is becoming more and more aggressive and warlike. Through Kennedy, Rusk and its other spokesmen, American imperialism has of late proclaimed once again its "fundamental strategy", i.e. to exterminate the socialist countries and the people's revolutionary movements for national liberation, and to establish its domination of the world. It is feverishly striving to attain this fundamental objective by all methods and in the economic, political, military and ideological spheres.

By their views and activities the modern revisionists, especially the treacherous Tito revisionist clique, are rendering great service to the imperialists, headed by American imperialists, in carrying out their strategic plan. Tito's last interview is a proof of this.

Tito denies the separation of the world into two antagonistic systems, cancels all distinction between them and expresses his regret that the "unity" of the capitalist world has been ruptured and the world socialist system, which he identifies with a political and military bloc, has been established. Tito openly denies the existence of the fundamental contradictions of our epoch — contradictions between socialism and capitalism, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between the oppressed peoples and imperialism, between the forces of peace and those of war, between democracy and reaction — and preaches putting an end to all struggles against imperialism and reaction, and to all revolutionary and national liberation movements. In his interview Tito made an open confession of the ultimate aim of the revisionists, namely, the integration of socialism into capitalism and the establishment of complete imperialist domination over the world.

On the one hand Tito preaches that imperialism has changed its aggressive and warmongering nature, saying that its exponents have now become "wise", "peace-loving" and "spokesmen of the aspirations of mankind"; he champions the policy of war and aggression of the imperialist powers, especially of the American imperialists, shows grave concern for the prestige of the USA (that is why he suggests that the USA should abolish atomic weapons in its initiative in order to raise this prestige), extols the economic potentiality of the USA, and so forth. On the other hand Tito slanders the peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries, calling it a militaristic policy determined by military circles, puts the economic and

political organizations of the socialist countries in the same category as those of the imperialists, and belittles the magnificent achievements of the Soviet Union.

In the role as the "Trojan horse" Tito drives wedges into the unity of the socialist camp, especially into the friendship of the Soviet people towards the Chinese.

At the head of the spokesmen of the views and aims of the modern revisionists Tito, in his recent interview, openly pointed out the objective towards which the revisionists should proceed at the present time. People still have a fresh memory of Tito's speech delivered at Pula in November 1956. He was then the first to call upon all modern revisionists, masked and revealed, to "come out of their shells" and take a more active part in the fight for the triumph of their revisionist line, to carry to the end their war against "Stalinism" and "dogmatism", to courageously do away with the consequences of the "cult of the individual". This was the way which Tito recommended to the modern revisionists. The Khrushchev group and those who follow them pursued this road with determination, sparing no methods or means which included demagoguery and intrigues, plots and intervention, pressure, blackmail and open threats.

This was the first step. In his recent interview Tito urged the revisionists to courageously take the second step: to proceed boldly towards reconciliation and affiliation with the imperialists, towards "economic and political integration" with the capitalist world, in other words, towards capitulation to the imperialists. In the interview Tito told the revisionists openly that "economic

integration is our perspective" and that "political integration comes after economic integration". He even tried to provide a "theoretical" basis for this revisionist line of action.

It is interesting to note that in the interview given to the American newspaperman Tito became the interpreter of Khrushchev's views and ideas to the imperialists. He described Khrushchev as a pacifist who is set on rapprochement and friendship with American imperialism by all means. Tito told the American newspaperman very clearly that he is well acquainted with Khrushchev, knows what he thinks, has nearly the same views and the same aims and uses the same tactics as Khrushchev, that they heed each other's words and that he is certain that an agreement with Khrushchev is possible. Tito advised the American imperialists to have patience and not to "dramatize" things, for the devil is not so ugly as they say.

It is equally interesting that the Khrushchev group said nothing in response to Tito's interview, nor did they contradict Tito's interpretation of Khrushchev's ideas, tactics and aims. This is significant indeed. This means that Khrushchev and his group approve of what Tito said in his interview and thereby confirm once again that they agree with the views and activities of this experienced agent of imperialism.

It is, therefore, important that we should analyze in greater detail the revisionist views expressed in Tito's interview, looking at them in close connection with all the concrete views and actions of the modern revisionists.

I. SUPPORTERS OF THE IMPERIALIST POLICY OF WAR, AGGRESSION AND OPPRESSION

The main concern of the revisionists has been and still is to convince communists and the people that imperialism has changed its oppressive, exploiting and aggressive nature, to persuade communists and the people to give up their revolution and national liberation struggle and in this way to justify their opportunist and pacifist policy which is detrimental to the interests of the people and renders good service to the imperialist bourgeoisie. This line of the revisionists has been clearly expressed in Tito's recent interview. In this interview he said among other things: "Why is it necessary for people to fight today and what problems are they to solve? . . . Hitler in his days had the crazy notion of dominating the world. But for wise people, for people who are fully aware of and feel the aspirations of humanity, I see no 'raison d'être' for such an idea as to wage war. The world has already passed the period when people fought for economic reasons. History has recorded a whole series of wars from the highwaymen's adventures to the occupation of colonies. But the countries of Asia and Africa are no longer colonies, no longer territories subject to contentions among the Big Powers, for these ex-colonies are now independent countries. The development of productive forces in the advanced countries has reached a very high level and for them there is no need to conquer other countries for the purpose of securing the means of production, for they can produce these themselves and in ample quantities. . . . Besides, war is a hindrance to world integration. . . . Therefore war is

an absurdity, for which no one feels any necessity. But wars appear on the horizon because people have armed themselves to the teeth and do not know what to do with their armaments. . . . It is equally absurd to let the military circles determine and suggest to their governments and people what they should do."

These theses of Tito's make up the nucleus of the arguments of the Yugoslav revisionists with regard to the fundamental issues of our times, to the problem of the struggle between two opposing social systems, the struggle for peace, the struggle of the peoples against oppression and colonial exploitation, the struggle of the working class and of all workers against capitalist domination, etc. They are a badly-disguised adaptation from the "fundamental strategy" of American imperialism. They are at the same time a more explicit and more fundamental essence of the views of all modern revisionists on the main issues of present world developments.

HAS THE AGGRESSIVE AND WARMONGERING NATURE OF IMPERIALISM CHANGED?

One of the main topics that Tito discussed in his interview was that of war and peace. Speaking on this matter Tito repeated his notorious theses that imperialism did not present any danger today and that it was no longer the carrier and initiator of aggressive wars. According to the revisionist Tito it turns out that there is no reason whatsoever to have wars at all, that "the world has already passed the period when people fought for economic reasons", that "viewed from all angles war between states is absurd", that imperialism has changed

its nature, it is no longer imperialism, it is no longer the source of aggressive wars, for the imperialist countries, he says, have attained a high level of development of their productive forces, secure everything in sufficient quantities at home and therefore need no longer go after conquests (!). Moreover, according to Tito, no danger exists today that the imperialists will launch wars, because at the head of the imperialist nations stand "wise men" and "peace-lovers", like Kennedy and Co., who "express the aspirations of mankind"(!).

In a slightly different way the Khrushchev group stand more or less on the same ground. People are already well aware of the dangerous opportunist illusions disseminated by the Khrushchev group that "a world free from wars, armaments and armies" can be realized right away, that Eisenhower, Kennedy, de Gaulle and the other heads of imperialism are for peace, that the imperialists would use the resources released by disarmament to help the backward countries develop their economy and their culture, etc. In his article, "The Urgent Problems of the Development of the World Socialist Movement", published in the journal *Communist*, No. 12 of August 1962, Khrushchev states almost quite openly that there is no more danger of an aggressive war against the socialist countries on the part of imperialism, for the imperialists have "renounced" war as a means of solving the contradictions between the two systems, for "the reasonable personalities of the West" (in other words the heads of imperialism) "are continually tending towards a more realistic way". "The imperialists," Khrushchev continues, "have taken our challenge to compete in economic development to heart. . . . We are

gradually drawing the capitalist countries onto the road of peaceful competition between the two systems." According to Khrushchev, the imperialists have at present almost given up their military preparations for aggressive war against the socialist countries and "aim at mobilizing all their resources to fight the world socialist movement in the field of economy, politics and ideology". Khrushchev arrives at the conclusion that "the question at issue today is: which system will show more vitality, that is, which system will give the peoples more material and spiritual well-being in as a short time as possible. It is precisely in this field, I think, that the hardest battles between socialism and capitalism will be fought".

From what premises does Khrushchev proceed and arrive at the conclusion that the danger of imperialist aggression against the socialist countries is out of the question? As he himself points out in his article he proceeds from the change in the balance of forces in the international arena in favor of socialism, from the fact that the "imperialists cannot fail to see that in the development of modern weapons which correspond to the latest achievements of science and technique, the socialist camp is not lagging behind, but in many instances is ahead of them", that although the imperialists "refuse to give up their fight against the socialist countries, yet this struggle in the military field leads them to a blind alley so long as both sides, the socialist countries and the capitalist countries, possess powerful nuclear armed forces", that under these circumstances the imperialists today cannot hope "to solve the historical rivalry between socialism and capitalism through war", that the

imperialists do not do this of their own free will but they are compelled to do it "as a result of the new balance of forces in the international arena arising from the growth of the power of the socialist system".

It is more than true that the balance of forces in the international arena has changed in favor of socialism, that the world socialist system has become today a colossal international force, that the Soviet Union possesses modern weapons of war and in many aspects is superior to the imperialist powers. This, naturally, is a real fact which the imperialists cannot fail to take into account, a factor which holds them in leash and compels them to think twice before they decide to undertake aggressive action against the countries of the socialist camp. But can one so readily draw the conclusion from this, as Khrushchev does, that at present the imperialists have given up or are giving up their aggressive designs against the socialist countries and that they are really inclined to carry out peaceful competition with socialism? By no means.

While Khrushchev and his followers try to persuade the people that the imperialists have given up or are giving up their attempts to launch an aggressive war against the socialist countries and are seriously embarking on economic competition with socialism, the representatives of imperialism themselves have openly stated and continue to maintain that all the strategy of imperialism, especially American imperialism, is imbued with the idea of preparing for an aggressive war against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries for they consider the war, especially nuclear war, as a means of solving international problems. They never make a

secret of the main objective of their policy, namely, to abolish the socialist system and establish imperialist domination over the world with American imperialism in the lead.

And everyday facts show that the imperialists do not only talk about war against the socialist countries but they are actually preparing for it. Is the unbridled armament race which has taken on colossal proportions in the imperialist countries not a proof of this? Do we not see a proof of this in the encirclement of the socialist countries by a dense network of American military bases, in the consolidation of the aggressive military blocs and their feverish activities, in the revival and rearming of the military revanchists of West Germany, in the attempts to revive Japanese militarism in the Far East, in the creation of hotbeds of war in various parts of the world so as to pass from local wars to a world war, a war principally against the socialist countries, and so on and so forth?

We can include within the framework of this imperialist strategy a number of recent war preparations and dangerous activities of American imperialism, such as the new tests of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, the fighting in south Vietnam, inciting Chiang Kai-shek to attack the People's Republic of China, the dispatch of armed forces to Southeast Asia, the continuous provocations in Berlin, the savage bombardment of Havana, the preparations for a new plot to launch new aggression on socialist Cuba, the undermining of disarmament talks at Geneva, the continued flight of "U-2" spying planes over the territories of the Soviet Union and the

People's Republic of China, and President Kennedy's decision to mobilize another 150,000 reservists in the USA.

In face of all these facts — the aggressive activities and war preparations of imperialism — who can guarantee that the danger of imperialist aggression against our countries is non-existent? Who can guarantee that the imperialists will not make other plans and one day undertake a crazy military adventure against the socialist countries just as Hitler did in the Second World War? There is no absolute guarantee of this.

The war danger today is even actual in view of the fact that the armament race continues ever so feverishly and that the weapons of war are continuously being improved, and under these circumstances war may even break out, as experts maintain, due to some error on the part of the men who handle the means of war, due to defects in the signal-giving apparatus, etc.

It is likewise evident that military circles are exerting more and more influence on the policy of the imperialist countries. Even Khrushchev himself is compelled to affirm that in the imperialist countries there are "sworn enemies of socialism", "crazy people", "people who have lost their senses". They openly declare that they prefer "to die under capitalism rather than live under communism". And these are by no means men of no significance, but high military and political personalities who hold key positions in imperialist military staffs and governments.

We cannot pass on without mentioning that the Khrushchev group itself "called attention" only three months ago to the danger of an aggressive imperialist war against the socialist countries. In his message ad-

dressed to the Soviet people on June 1, 1962 concerning the raising of retail price of meat and dairy products we read among other things: "We do not live in cosmic space. So long as imperialism exists, the risk of fresh wars exists too. It is no secret that international reaction, with the USA in the lead, brandishes its weapons, keeps up a feverish armament race and concocts plans for an unexpected rocket and nuclear assault on the USSR and other socialist countries. Its politicians and generals speak openly of this, the President of the USA, John Kennedy, spoke openly of it. He stated: 'under certain circumstances we may take the initiative in the nuclear conflict with the Soviet Union'."

The question then arises and justly so: How can this statement of the Khrushchev group square with what Khrushchev writes in No. 12 of the journal *Communist*? Could imperialism have made such a radical change during the recent three or four months as to give up its aggressive intentions and activities against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries? This is hard to believe. It looks as though the Khrushchev group needed an interpretation of that kind at that time and now it needs another. This is not the first time that the Khrushchev group trifles with Marxist-Leninist principles, adapting them in a pragmatic way to the exigencies of the day.

Khrushchev's views, which he also expressed recently in the article published in the *Communist*, are openly at variance with the Leninist teachings on imperialism and with the programmatic documents of the international communist movement, that is, the Moscow Declarations of 1957 and 1960. It is clearly emphasized in the Dec-

laration of 1960 that "the aggressive nature of imperialism has not changed", that "so long as imperialism exists the basis for aggressive wars exists too", that "the peoples of all countries realize that the risk of a new world war has not yet been eliminated", and that "only the triumph of socialism throughout the world will ultimately eliminate the social and national cause of wars of all kinds". Proceeding from these theses of principle and the actual policy and activities of the imperialists, the Declaration adds as an obligation "not to underestimate the risk of war", and it is forcefully stressed that "the peoples are called upon to exercise as high a vigilance as ever".

Why did Khrushchev need to declare that the imperialists have given up preparations for aggression against the socialist countries and that they have taken the call for peaceful economic competition with the socialist camp to heart? Apparently he needs this to justify his opportunist policy of open reconciliation with the imperialists and of establishing broad economic and political collaboration with the imperialist countries of which we shall speak in greater detail. Here we only stress that these views of Khrushchev's are very detrimental to the security of the socialist countries and to world peace.

This is evident today as it is also stressed in both Moscow Declarations that "as a result of the growth of the forces of peace" throughout the world and in particular of the consolidation of the world socialist system with the Soviet Union in the lead, it has become possible to avert a new world war and the local wars which imperialism wages. The confidence in the possibility of averting imperialist wars reassures the peace-loving peo-

ples of their own strength, arouses their optimism in safeguarding peace, and mobilizes them for a more determined struggle to that end. But in spite of the great changes in the balance of forces, in spite of the new possibilities that have been created to avert war, the danger of war and the possibility of the imperialists launching it, still exists as long as imperialism exists, for there is no absolute guarantee that there will be no war. To stress the danger of war as well as the possibility to avert it, does not at all mean to frighten the peoples or to arouse in them a feeling of panic and insecurity, but to acquaint them with the situation as it exists in the world and to make them highly vigilant and properly prepared, so as not to be caught unawares and to ward off imperialist aggression in time.

The struggle to preserve and consolidate peace is inseparable from the struggle to expose imperialism, especially American imperialism which is the main stronghold of aggression and war in the world. It should be made clear to the people whence the danger of war comes and who threatens peace, for otherwise their struggle for peace will be futile and without a goal. To speak of peace in the abstract without at the same time exposing the imperialist warmongers and, what is more, to create illusions about "the good and peaceful intentions" of the imperialists, as the Khrushchev group is actually doing, to say that imperialism today has renounced and is renouncing its aggressive action against the socialist countries, and so on and so forth — all this is very dangerous indeed for it lowers the vigilance of peace-loving peoples, leads to the weakening of the defensive forces of the socialist countries on which depends

the preservation of peace, weakens the struggle of the peoples against the imperialist warmongers and helps the latter to carry out their designs with less difficulty.

OPPONENTS OF THE PEOPLE'S ANTI-IMPERIALIST NATIONAL LIBERATION WAR

The aggressive and warmongering nature of imperialism with the American imperialists in the lead, manifests itself not only in imperialism's hostile activities against the socialist countries but also in its aggressive attitude towards other peoples and countries and towards world peace in general. The imperialists are carrying out aggressive acts in various regions of the world every day, they are seriously threatening peace and the security of the peoples every day. American imperialism's gory hand is seen everywhere, in Asia, in Africa, in Latin America, and in the fight against the progressive revolutionary movement in Europe. Everyday experience rejects the absurd revisionist preachings that the aggressive and warmongering nature of imperialism has changed, that in our times the economic basis for imperialist wars has itself disappeared, and that imperialism has renounced economic expansion, as the renegade Tito tries to make us believe.

Then why did the USA forces fight against tiny Guatemala if not to protect the interests of the United Fruit Company? Why did they launch an act of aggression against Cuba if not to protect the interests of the trusts dealing in sugar-cane? Is not the fighting in the Congo for uranium and other resources? Did not Franco-British aggression against Egypt have as its aim the interests of the shareholders of the former Suez Canal

Company in addition to those of politics and strategy? Was not the landing of American troops in Lebanon and that of the British troops in Jordan to protect the interests of the oil monopolists in the Middle East? Was not the seven-odd-year-long fighting in Algeria prompted, among other motives, by those of protecting the enslavers' interests of the Rothschilds in the Sahara and the shareholders companies and French colonialists in Algeria?

Of course the present days are not those of the "highwaymen's adventures" but of the civilized plunderers who not only plunder the spoils of war but the wealth of whole states and whole continents. The Latin American countries, for instance, are very rich in iron, copper, coal, zinc, naphtha, tin, lead and other minerals. But all this wealth is in the hands of the monopolists of the USA; 60% of the foreign trade of the Latin American countries is in the hands of the United States which determines the price of goods itself. Thus, for instance, Colombia received from the "Alliance for Progress" fund an aid amounting to 150 million dollars but Colombia lost 450 million dollars from the price the USA set on coffee. American monopolists have invested 10 billion dollars in Latin America and while they draw an ever increasing amount of income from these investments, Latin America is as poor as it has always been. From 1950 to 1955 the USA invested 2 billion dollars there and gained 3.5 billion dollars of which 1.5 billion went to the USA. It has been reckoned that Latin America has lost 2 billion 679 million dollars through these transactions during the last seven years. The Latin American countries boast of a population of 200 million,

140 million of whom labor under conditions of slavery, writes the *Siempre* of Mexico, 70 million have no means of subsistence, 100 million are illiterate, 140 million lack foodstuffs. Where lies the reason for this misery if not in large-scale plunder of a whole continent by the trusts of the USA which possess the oil wells, the iron mines, the large sugar-cane and coffee plantations, the seaports, the telephone and electric companies?

In spite of the blows that the colonial system has received, the imperialists are doing their utmost and using all means to maintain colonial exploitation in the newly liberated countries. They are doing their utmost to keep their old positions, especially their economic and military positions, and to get the new Asiatic and African states hitched on to their aggressive political cart. To attain this, they make use of all methods and means, from colonial wars, as in the case of Laos and Congo, to the corrupting of the leaders of the national bourgeoisie. Under the pretext of helping the under-developed countries the colonial powers try to maintain their all-round rule over these countries and turn their independence into a symbolic one. In those countries from which they were forced to withdraw, the colonial powers still hold sway over the people in other forms of colonialism, such as neo-colonialism and military penetration. The imperialists never cease to wage colonial wars in Asia, Africa and Latin America. No year passes without a war waged by the colonialists in one corner of the world or another. The colonial wars in Angola and Oman, the preparations to invade Cuba, American aggression against the patriotic forces of Vietnam and Laos, the persecution of patriots in Congo, Kenya, Rhodesia and elsewhere — all this

shows that the imperialists do not hesitate to use all possible means to keep or re-establish their old positions. Why does the United States maintain nearly half of its effective armed forces in the Asian, African and Latin American countries if not to keep the people in those countries in constant fear, so as to strengthen its colonialist positions and to be prepared for armed intervention where these positions are threatened by national liberation movements? Is it for pleasure voyages that the United States keeps its 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean, its 7th Fleet in the Pacific and will be creating a 5th Fleet in the Indian Ocean? In terms of military aid the American imperialists have given France 4.5 billion dollars, Britain more than 1 billion dollars and Belgium 1.2 billion dollars. A good part of this "assistance" has been used for colonial wars.

Under the pretext of assistance and through economic pressure and bribery the USA has drawn into its military blocs a number of Asian, African and Latin American states or has bound them to itself through bilateral treaties. Pakistan, Thailand and the Philippines join the CENTO and SEATO blocs which were set up by the USA to suppress the national liberation movements on the continent of Asia. In the Far East the USA is busy creating the NEATO bloc with the participation of Japan, south Korea and Taiwan. In the American hemisphere the USA is trying to turn the Organization of American States into a military bloc directed against Cuba and the national liberation movement in Latin America. An instrument in the hands of colonial powers is to be found in the so-called "Defensive Pact" concluded last year between the member countries of the African Union and

Malgache, which are bound by military pacts with France, one of the principal partners in NATO. The NATO powers have 17 military and 7 naval bases on the African continent which are used in fact to oppose the national liberation movements of the African peoples and the independence of the countries of this continent.

These facts demonstrate that imperialism makes extensive use of aggressive wars, that colonialism is still up and doing and spares no means to hold its own. But the existence of these facts in themselves and the existence of aggressive wars by imperialism shows that it dreads the national liberation movements that the struggle for national liberation has grown and has greatly extended in breadth, that it has become an irresistible force, a primary factor in our times in destroying imperialism, a factor for progress and consolidating the cause of peace.

The revisionists are certainly not so blind as to fail to see this reality, but they want to assist imperialism by lowering the vigilance of the peoples and by creating a split in the ranks of the national liberation and anti-imperialist fighters. If, as Tito claims, there are no more colonies and no more colonialism, because the advanced imperialist states "produce everything themselves" and thus "need no more" conquests and expansion, then, according to his reasoning, the oppressed people need no longer fight for their national liberation, need no longer consolidate their independence and develop their economy independent of the imperialists. Thus through these theses the revisionist Tito aims to persuade the people to give up their national liberation struggle and

their resistance to the neo-colonial policy which the USA and other imperialist powers pursue; he urges these peoples to "collaborate" with imperialism and to receive "aids and credits" from it since it "no longer" cherishes evil designs against them, in other words, he urges them to submit completely to imperialism. The Tito clique itself is a most clear example in this connection for it has received from the USA and other imperialist powers more than 5 billion dollars.

But the Yugoslav revisionists do not confine themselves to the ideological and theoretical field alone, they take vigorous actions as well. Under the pretext of "positive non-alignment" the Tito clique has tried to hitch the neutral countries to the American imperialist cart, has tried to curb the anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist spirit in these countries which have just won their freedom and independence and to alienate them from the countries of the socialist camp. The yacht, *Galeb*, belonging to the leader of the Yugoslav revisionists has more than once put to sea in order to take this "neutral" missionary of American imperialism to various countries in Asia and Africa whenever the interests of imperialism has demanded it. A new excursion of *Galeb* is under preparation to go to Latin America now that the people's national liberation movement has spread throughout the continent.

The views and activities of the Khrushchev revisionist group are also detrimental to the cause of the peoples, to their national liberation and anti-imperialist movements. They subordinate the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples to general and total disarmament; they claim that "disarmament is the primary condition that

will bring about independence", "the most important factor for bringing about the liberation of the colonial peoples", that it is even "the main objective of the peoples fighting for national liberation". This actually means that the enslaved peoples should discontinue their national liberation struggle and should strive to achieve general and total disarmament which, according to the Khrushchev group, will secure freedom and independence for the peoples "through negotiations" (!). All these things are nothing other than beautiful dreams and dangerous illusions.

There is no gainsaying the fact that general and total disarmament is beneficial to all the peoples of the world, including the peoples who are struggling for freedom and national independence. It is precisely on this account that the just proposals of the Soviet Government for disarmament have met with general approval and the support of the progressive peoples of the world. But experience and day-to-day events show that the imperialists are offering dogged resistance to disarmament, that they have rejected and continue to reject all reasonable proposals and are systematically undermining disarmament talks. Under these circumstances it is a crime to hinder the people's struggle for their national emancipation from colonial and imperialist rule, and condemn them to a life of want and misery as well as to waiting until general and total disarmament is achieved. The decisive factor in liberating the oppressed peoples, as the Moscow Declaration of 1960 stresses, is their determined struggle against the imperialist colonialists. "They can only attain complete victory on the basis of the powerful national liberation movement." This is the

common stand of the whole international communist movement on this question.

Contrary to the wishes and plans of the revisionists the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America who are fighting side by side against the imperialist invaders cannot afford to lay down their arms and wait until imperialism consents to disarmament. They need arms in order to disarm the imperialist invaders in their countries.

By opposing imperialism, weakening its positions and narrowing down the sphere of its domination, the national liberation movement of the oppressed peoples has become one of the main strongholds of peace, an effective and important factor in imposing disarmament on the imperialists. By their fighting, these peoples render a direct contribution to the defence and consolidation of peace. They second and uphold at the same time all movements for peace, all actions in favor of peace and in opposing the aggressive and warmongering schemes of the imperialists which constitute a grave menace to all peoples. The movement of the partisans of peace on its part should feel duty bound to support the national liberation movement of the oppressed peoples unconditionally and in great measure. The national liberation movement and the struggle for peace and disarmament are two fronts of the struggle against the same enemy, imperialism.

The attempts of the Khrushchev group to alienate the movement of the partisans of peace from the national liberation movement which it should support, and to subordinate the national liberation movement entirely to the policy of disarmament— attempts which were

clearly evident once again at the World Congress for Peace and Disarmament held in Moscow during June of this year— weaken both the national liberation movement as well as the movement for peace, causing great damage both to the cause of emancipation of the peoples and the cause of world peace.

At present the imperialist powers with the USA in the lead, are doing their utmost to maintain, by new methods and in new forms, the colonial exploitation of the peoples of former colonies, and to consolidate their economic, political and military positions in the newly liberated countries. They are trying to draw and hitch these countries to their carts and to arouse the hostility of their leaders towards the socialist countries. To attain this end, the imperialists are trying to establish military dictatorial regimes in these countries as their puppets, they are trying to buy off national bourgeois elements and to place them in the service of their own interests. The Khrushchev group and their followers, on the other hand, distorting the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence, uphold and support the elements and reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie in former colonial countries, such as the Indian reactionary circles who in their foreign policy manifest an ever increasing tendency to affiliate themselves with the imperialists and to maintain a hostile attitude towards the socialist countries, whereas in internal policy they persecute the democratic and progressive forces in the country, siding more and more with reaction. While trying to weaken the defensive power of the socialist countries, as in the case of the People's Republic of Albania, the Khrushchev group has even gone so far as to sell armaments and airplanes to the

reactionary circles of India, who actually use them to suppress communists and progressive people and carry out armed provocations against socialist countries.

It is thus clear that although the Khrushchev group tries to give the impression that it is a supporter of the national liberation movement of the peoples, its views, acts and attitudes are far from helping to consolidate the struggle against imperialism and for freedom and national independence, but on the contrary, they weaken it, create greater difficulties for the struggle of the progressive anti-imperialist forces and encourage the reactionary, pro-imperialist and anti-socialist forces in the newly liberated countries.

TITO CLARIFIES HIS POSITION

The Yugoslav revisionists also deliberately confuse the concrete problems in present international life, of which the solution rightfully preoccupies the mind of all peoples of the world; they place the sign of equality between the policy of the imperialist countries and that of socialist countries in order to protect the imperialists and in fact throw the responsibility for tension in international relations on the socialist countries.

In the interview accorded to the correspondent of the *Washington Post*, the leader of the Yugoslav revisionists came out openly in support of the imperialist policy concerning the questions of Germany, Berlin and disarmament.

It is a known fact that in order to justify its reconciliation with the treacherous Belgrade clique the Khrushchev group proclaimed far and wide that the Yugoslav views on these matters "fully coincided with the

foreign policy of the Soviet Union", that Yugoslavia supported the proposals of the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic and all the other socialist countries regarding the peace treaty with Germany and the solution of the problem of West Berlin by turning it into a free demilitarized city, and that Yugoslavia supported the Soviet proposals on disarmament.

But in his recent interview Tito made his position very clear to those who seem to have misunderstood him (!?). He stated: "The Berlin question is a problem which the big powers that came off victorious in the Second World War still hold in their hands and will settle themselves. These powers are the Soviet Union, USA, Britain and France and so long as this question lies within their competence I see no special possibility for its solution. According to my opinion this matter should be left to the Germans to decide themselves." This cut and dry and "very principled" solution means that the Berlin problem will drag on and never find a solution. The idea that "this matter should be left to the Germans to decide themselves" is practically meaningless, demagogical, dust in the eyes of the naive and an "argument" for further deceit for those who support the Tito clique. There is only one way to solve the Berlin problem and that is to carry out to the letter and as soon as possible the proposals of the Soviet Union by signing the treaty of peace with both German states, and if that is impossible, with the German Democratic Republic alone and at the same time by turning West Berlin into a free demilitarized city. As regards the solution of the German problem, that indeed is one for the German people to settle so long as there are two German states with dif-

ferent social and political systems. The signing of the peace treaty with both German states about which Tito kept silent in his interview, would serve this end. Whereas Tito's hazy views are nothing else than a tactful withdrawal, an echo of the stand of the American imperialists and their allies on the so-called "free elections", which imperialist propaganda turns out now and then in connection with the solution of the German problem. Tito thinks it is high time to make another departure from this question, too, in order to appease both the American imperialists and Adenauer.

In connection with the problem of Berlin, Tito goes even further. He encourages the imperialists to stand their ground. Replying to another question by Drew Pearson he said: "Khrushchev has given broader interpretations to his former stand regarding Berlin and the whole affair has become less critical." This and the whole tone of the interview points to the fact that Tito favors an "easing" of the Berlin issue, he favors further concessions in this sense and further delay in solving it. From this point of view the foreign policy of the Yugoslav revisionists fully coincides with the policy of Khrushchev and his group.

On the question of disarmament, too, Tito champions quite openly the stand of the American imperialists. He not only refrains from any comments to condemn the unbridled armament race which the imperialists have launched or their attempts to foil disarmament but on the contrary tries to blackmail by accusing the Soviet Union of an armament race on the same scale as the USA. Moreover, the only thing that disturbs Tito is the prestige of the USA being recently lowered in the eyes

of the world due to its aggressive, warmongering activities. Speaking about an agreement to ban atomic weapons, the leader of the Yugoslav revisionists, in his capacity as a loyal servant of American imperialism, took the liberty to suggest to his master: "Under the circumstances, if the United States of America would take the initiative for this, this would be of great political significance to it. . . . With an agreement of this kind the USA would win politically more than if it continued nuclear tests." In other words, Tito tells the American imperialists that there is no harm in nuclear testing but that they would not benefit *as much politically* from it. Besides, Tito stated to the American newspaperman that "nuclear tests do not bring anyone military supremacy" and that "such tests have only purely political significance". This statement made by Tito following the decision of the Soviet Government to resume nuclear testing as a consequence of the last series of nuclear tests made by the USA means that he opposes this justifiable decision of the Soviet Government which aims at raising the defensive power of the Soviet Union, and of the entire socialist camp.

It is thus clear that the "support" which Tito seemed to give to the proposals of the Soviet Government and of the other socialist countries with regard to the questions of Germany, Berlin and disarmament was nothing short of a bluff, a demagogical statement which Tito and his revisionist friends needed to prepare the ground and add another "argument" for his penetration into the ranks of the socialist camp in order to play his role of splitter more easily. And those who took upon themselves the task of "rehabilitating" the Tito clique or,

more precisely, of fully reconciling themselves with Tito, trampling the 1960 Moscow Declaration underfoot, have often used and continue to use the "convincing argument" that towards the questions of Germany, Berlin and disarmament Tito maintains the same attitude as the socialist countries, and that "in foreign affairs the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia have the same views".

The policy of bluffing is however not lasting, as everyone can testify. Tito used it this time too as long as it suited him. Such manoeuvring in politics is not unusual among revisionists of all types, the Yugoslav revisionists not excluded, and we have not come into contact with them for the first time. And it cannot be otherwise. The Tito clique has acquired some skill in this kind of work, but this is not so much its merit as the merit of its allies, the modern revisionists, who, for reasons well known, allow this clique of traitors to manoeuvre as and when it pleases.

In contrast to the road pursued by the modern revisionists Marxism-Leninism teaches us that peace, peaceful coexistence, national independence, disarmament and the solution of other international problems cannot be begged as a boon from the imperialists, they must be imposed on them. Talks between statesmen are undoubtedly useful but people cannot pin their hope of securing peace on these meetings and talks *alone*. Experience has shown that leaders of imperialist states have gone to such talks under the pressure of public opinion, not favorably inclined to reach any specific agreements to preserve peace but aiming to deceive the people, pretending they are for peace, to gain time and to prepare for war behind the backs of the people. Reply-

ing to the question of the interviewer on how America could persuade Khrushchev that it, too, was for peace, Tito said: "Talks should be carried on and not only once but many times."

When for a number of years in succession the imperialists have rejected all proposals on disarmament made by the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist camp, when they foil all attempts to conclude a peace treaty with Germany to solve the Berlin and other international issues, it is obvious that the endeavours of the Tito clique, the Khrushchev group and other revisionists are very risky and arouse dangerous illusions as they try to persuade the peoples that peace may be secured, general and total disarmament may be achieved and the other important international issues may be solved through the approval, good wishes and free will of the imperialists and only through talks with the heads of imperialism, or international meetings controlled by them. The problem of maintaining peace is the problem of the peoples themselves. It is only by drawing the masses into the fight against imperialism, by mobilizing them for concrete actions in favor of peace that the hand of warmongering imperialism can be stayed, that it can be compelled to subscribe to peace, disarmament and peaceful coexistence. Talks and various meetings in favor of peace can only yield positive results if they are backed by the struggle of the international working class and the masses.

It is clear to everyone who examines closely the views and deeds of the Tito clique and of the Khrushchev revisionist group and is not befooled by their demagogical phrases, that their goal is to alienate the peoples and

the communist and workers' parties from the determined struggle against imperialism, from the national liberation movement and from revolution, to strangle their militant revolutionary spirit and throw them into passivity. This wholly opportunist line of action of Khrushchev and his group is nurtured by the illusion which they proclaim far and wide, namely, that imperialism has lost its aggressive and warmongering nature and that the important problems facing the peoples of the world today can be solved by "peaceful" methods and in agreement with the imperialists. In addition to this, the Khrushchev group is apparently of the opinion that by pursuing a conciliatory and opportunist policy towards the imperialists it will succeed in making the imperialists "peace-loving" and "reasonable" and create in this way favorable conditions for rapprochement and all-round economic and political collaboration with the capitalist world, with imperialism, particularly with American imperialism, a thing which constitutes one of Khrushchev's principal objectives. It is not hard to comprehend that this entirely anti-Marxist and opportunist line which sacrifices the vital interests of the peoples for the sake of reconciliation with the imperialists, serves, in fact, only the imperialists.

The opportunist and treacherous line of the Khrushchev revisionist group is being unmasked from day to day and they are losing credit in the eyes of communists and the peoples throughout the world. That is why Khrushchev is obliged now and then to manoeuvre with demagogy and pronounce some "harsh words" against imperialism. But these are nothing more than a coat of paint on a policy that is fading.

II. RAPPROCHEMENT WITH IMPERIALISM IS THE GENERAL LINE OF THE MODERN REVISIONISTS

The synthesis of all revisionist views expressing the ultimate goal which the modern revisionists have set themselves is rapprochement and subsequent merge with imperialism, in other words, the so-called "integration" of the world. In his interview with Drew Pearson Tito stated openly that "economic and political integration is our perspective". The whole line of action which the modern revisionists pursue leads to the ultimate realization of this perspective.

THE ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL INTEGRATION OF THE WORLD IS THE REVISIONIST VERSION OF KENNEDY'S THEORY OF "PEACEFUL EVOLUTION"

The idea of "economic and political integration" in the world is nothing new in the theories of the Yugoslav revisionists. But the fact that Tito raises this question with force at this time is not fortuitous.

It is a known fact that much is made of the "economic and political integration" of the capitalist world today in Western countries. This has found tangible expression in the form of "European Economic Union" (The "Common Market"). Integration in the capitalist world is nothing other than an attempt to solve, or at least to mitigate, the contradictions and difficulties of present-day capitalism, to alleviate in some way or other the sore spots to the benefit of the big capitalist monopolies and to the detriment of the broad masses of laborers; it is a counterbalance to the growth of the power and attractive force of the world socialist system, which is giving daily

proof of its superiority over the capitalist system; it is a form of collective colonialism which aims at subjugating the less advanced countries and maintaining colonial rule over them by new methods and means; it is an instrument of the "cold war" which serves to strengthen the military aggressive blocs of the imperialists as a basis for political union by creating the corresponding super-nation organs of administration; it is a contrivance to prepare for an aggressive war against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and to suppress the national liberation, revolutionary and democratic movements in various countries. Monopolist integration has been and continues to be part and parcel of the fundamental strategy of American imperialism which aims at extending European integration to include the Atlantic region and later the entire world with the USA in the lead, in other words, to establish American imperialist world domination. "As soon as full European Union is achieved," President Kennedy has said, "we will be ready to discuss ways and means of establishing a tangible Atlantic alliance. . . . This Atlantic alliance will serve as a nucleus for an eventual union of all free men, of those who are today free and of those who will some day regain their freedom." This is what the imperialists, particularly the American imperialists, understand by "integration".

In his interview Tito also spoke of "world integration". But he did not specify the kind of integration he was thinking of as whether it is on a socialist basis or on a capitalist basis, and his vagueness was not unintentional for a serpent never lets its fangs be seen. He only said that he did not favor integration "that is of a discriminat-

ing character" and that he "does not subscribe to such an integration". In spite of his carefulness to hide his tracks, his theory of integration, in fact, means to merge socialism into capitalism and to let American imperialism swallow up the world.

Tito says that in order to achieve integration all kinds of wars should be discontinued for "wars keep us away from integration", and he makes no distinction between wars. Thus, according to him, in order to achieve the integration of the world, it is necessary to give up the revolutionary struggle of the working class and of all workers to overthrow the capitalist order and make socialism triumph, it is necessary to give up the national liberation struggle of the peoples against oppression and imperialist exploitation and to abandon the ideological struggle of socialism against capitalism, against the aggressive and warmongering designs and activities of imperialism. What does this actually mean? This means to keep intact the capitalist order, and to let the imperialists have a free hand to carry out their policy of aggression the ultimate goal of which is to overthrow the socialist order and establish capitalism wherever it has been overthrown. This would mean that the socialist countries would be swallowed up by imperialism and the integration of the world would be achieved on a capitalist basis.

It is plain to every Marxist-Leninist and to every man who is a realist that under conditions of a world divided into two antagonistic systems it is futile to talk about integration of any kind, be it economic or, less still, political, for a unified world where socialism and capitalism would merge together cannot even be conceived.

The world could be united only on one social basis, either on a capitalist basis or on a socialist basis. There is no middle course nor can there ever be. The Yugoslav revisionists consider the creation of a unified world, an integrated world, possible even today, because, according to them, the existence of two opposing systems, socialist and capitalist, is not something objective, conditioned by the laws of development of human society in our epoch, but an artificial division into military and political blocs which, according to the program of the Yugoslav Communist League, "has brought about the economic division of the world" and "hinders the process of world integration and the social progress of mankind".

But we all know that the world was formerly "unified" and that there existed but one single world system, namely, the capitalist system. This "unity" was rent asunder as a result of the triumph of the socialist revolution in Russia and in a series of other countries, as a result of the establishment of the world socialist system. It is thus clear that Tito regrets that the former "unity" of the capitalist world was destroyed and considers the creation of the world socialist system something negative which "hinders the process of world integration and the social progress of mankind". Therefore according to Tito's logic, in order to create a unified world it is necessary to do away with the cause of this division, namely, the existence of the world socialist system. Thus it follows that Tito is speaking of the economic and political integration of the world on the basis of capitalism, in other words, of integrating socialism into capitalism.

It follows from all this that Tito publicly upholds the "fundamental strategy" of Kennedy, one of whose main

goals is "to create the possibility of a long constructive evolution of the communist bloc and the influx of the communist states into the community of the free world". The theses of the Yugoslav revisionists on "economic and political world integration" in fact presuppose the peaceful integration of socialism into capitalism, the abolition of socialism and the re-establishment of full imperialist sway over the world.

RAPPROCHEMENT WITH IMPERIALISM UNDER THE MASK OF PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

In his capacity as an agent of imperialism and a principal revisionist, Tito speaks more openly about the perspective of integration into capitalism and of submission to imperialism. But the views and acts of the other revisionists lead objectively to the same road. A proof of this lies in the views of the Khrushchev revisionist group on the fundamental issues of our epoch and especially its anti-Marxist conception of peaceful coexistence.

On the one hand, the Khrushchev group overestimates the power of the imperialists, is scared by their atomic blackmail and threats of war and therefore tries by all means to be on good terms with imperialism and to come to understanding and reconciliation with it, by flattering and making concessions of principle, concessions which lead as far as to the sacrifice of the interests of the world revolutionary and national liberation movements. On the other hand, by overestimating our forces and underestimating the power of the imperialists the Khrushchev group spreads the illusion that imperialism, especially American imperialism, has changed or is changing its nature, has become peace-loving, has renounced or is

renouncing its aggressive and warmongering designs against the socialist countries and other peoples, and has earnestly embarked on a peaceful economic competition with socialism.

Although these are two contradictory assessments they lead the Khrushchev group to one and the same revisionist conclusion: actual renunciation of the ideological and political struggle against imperialism, discontinuance of unmasking its policy of war and aggression, cessation of help to the national liberation struggles and revolution, and establishment of all-round economic and political collaboration between socialism and capitalism. This is in fact the line of rapprochement and blending together with imperialism, a line which constitutes the essence of the anti-Marxist conception of the Khrushchev group regarding peaceful coexistence.

According to the Khrushchev group, peaceful coexistence is "the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries" and "the only right way to solve all the vital problems that face human society at present". Therefore, according to the Khrushchev group, all other tasks and problems as well as the world revolution and the national liberation struggles should be subordinated to peaceful coexistence while the peoples should cross their arms and await their national liberation until the realization of the policy of peaceful coexistence. This in reality means that oppression and exploitation of the peoples by the capitalists and the imperialists should continue *ad infinitum*.

We do not deem it necessary to analyze in detail the anti-Marxist and revisionist conception of the Khrushchev group on peaceful coexistence for this subject has

been dealt with in great detail in the former articles and publications of our Party. We only want to point out that this conception has nothing in common with the teachings of Lenin and with the theses of both Moscow Declarations on peaceful coexistence. In the 1960 Moscow Declaration it is pointed out that: "In a world divided into two systems the only correct and reasonable principle in international relations is the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems." But peaceful coexistence, the Declaration goes on to emphasize, "does not mean renunciation of class struggle, as the revisionists claim". Peaceful coexistence among states of different social systems is a form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism, it "does not mean reconciliation of socialist ideology with bourgeois ideology. On the contrary it presupposes the intensification of the struggle of the working class, of all the communist parties to assure the triumph of socialist ideas". It is likewise stressed in the Declaration that "the success of the revolutionary class and national-liberation struggle promotes peaceful coexistence", since it leads to "the weakening and continuous narrowing of the positions of imperialism". The Declaration stresses that to fight for peace and peaceful coexistence "means to be highly vigilant, to expose the policy of imperialism indefatigably, to be on one's guard against the machinations and intrigues of the warmongers, to arouse the righteous indignation of the peoples against those who pursue a policy of war, to organize all peace-loving forces still better, to continuously intensify mass actions for peace, and to strengthen ties and co-operation with all states which have no interest in new wars".

The anti-Marxist, revisionist conceptions of Khrushchev and his group regarding peaceful coexistence as the line of rapprochement with imperialism and of discontinuance of all the struggles against it, are closely connected with their opportunist preachings on the ways of transition to socialism, which try to deviate the attention of the working people and communist and workers' parties from a determined and effective struggle to overthrow capitalism and from the socialist revolution, and make them wait until the policy of peaceful coexistence has created favorable conditions for socialism to be established by peaceful methods. Thus the Khrushchev group lays one-sided emphasis on the peaceful transition to socialism, ignoring the urgency of preparing for both eventualities, peaceful and non-peaceful transition to socialism, at the same time. It claims that the possibilities of peaceful transition to socialism are continually increasing and, what is worse, it sets forth the peaceful road as a plain parliamentary road, a plain majority triumph in the bourgeois parliament, ignoring altogether the fundamental teaching of Marxism-Leninism on the necessity of doing away with the bourgeois state machinery and replacing it with the organs of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Khrushchev's propaganda agents have of late gone so far as to consider state monopoly capitalism in the capitalist countries as one of the principal factors for the decline of bourgeois monopoly and almost, yes almost, as the first step towards socialism. Thus in winding up the discussions at the international forum of Marxist scientists in Moscow on the actual problems of modern capitalism, a summary of which was transmitted by the

TASS news agency on September 3, 1962, A. Arzumian, director of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, said among other things: "Now, at the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism, state ownership cannot be considered as an ordinary reform. It is connected with the revolutionary struggle to do away with monopolies, to overthrow the rule of financial oligarchies. Through a correct policy of the working class based on the impetus of the struggle of the broad masses of people, it can become a radical means of doing away with the domination of the bourgeois monopolists. The state ownership of industry and of banks is now becoming the slogan of the anti-monopolist coalition." And what difference is there between this conception and the notorious and extremely opportunist point of view of the program of the League of Yugoslav Communists as embodied in such statements as "the specific forms of state capitalist relations can be . . . the first step towards socialism" and "the ever growing wave of state capitalist tendencies in the capitalist world is the most eloquent proof of the fact that mankind is heading more and more and in an irresistible manner towards the epoch of socialism"?

We need not dwell here long in order to argue in detail how groundless these openly opportunist views of the Yugoslav revisionists and of the Khrushchev group are. We need only mention that not very long ago the propaganda agents of the Khrushchev group, debating the draft program of the League of Yugoslav Communists, stressed that "the growth of state monopoly capitalism would mean further strengthening of the monopolies, further concentration of economic and political power in

their hands, would mean that the monopolists would utilize the state for their own selfish interests at the expense of the workers" (see the article "On the Draft Program of the League of Yugoslav Communists" published in *Communist*, No. 8, 1958). Commenting on the above statement on the program of the League of Yugoslav Communists, the present secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, B. Ponomaryov, wrote in *Communist*, No. 8, 1958 that this was "exactly what Bernstein and Kautsky had said that capitalist society integrates itself spontaneously into socialism". It turns out that the Khrushchev group was wrong in former days to oppose the Yugoslav revisionists, and Bernstein and Kautsky since they are essentially propagating the same opportunist viewpoints (!).

In connection with this matter we cannot help recall that in his time Lenin sharply criticized the bourgeois reformist evaluation of state monopoly capitalism as a non-capitalist order, as a step towards socialism, an evaluation which the opportunists and reformists need in order to question the necessity of a socialist revolution and to make capitalism look prettier (see Lenin: *Works*, Vol. 25, pp. 414 and 415, Russian edition). Lenin stressed firmly that "steps towards larger monopolies and bigger state ownership of production lead for certain to more ruthless exploitation of the working masses, to further oppression, to making resistance against exploiters more difficult, to the strengthening of reaction and military despotism and, parallel to this, to an extraordinary growth of profits for the big capitalists to the detriment of all the other strata of the population" (*Works*, Vol. 24, pp. 276 and 277, Russian edition). The above thesis

of the Khrushchev group is in flagrant opposition to the 1960 Moscow Declaration which maintains: "By expanding the rule of monopolies in the life of a nation, state monopoly capitalism joins the strength of the monopolies to the strength of the state into a single mechanism to save the capitalist order and increase to the maximum the profits of the imperialist bourgeoisie by exploiting the working class and plundering the broad masses of the population."

By making much of the "ever growing possibilities" of peaceful transition to socialism Khrushchev takes the shadow for the substance. But what do the facts of present-day life show? They show that monopoly capital is making its reactionary and anti-democratic nature more evident. It does not even uphold the liberties of former bourgeois democracy, it denies the popular masses the opportunity to express their free will and elect the true defenders of their interests to state organs. When the bourgeoisie finds that even those limited rights which the constitution accords to workers constitute a menace to its rule, it renounces them without ceremony, makes arbitrary changes in its electoral system, proclaims the elections "illegal", and does not hesitate to suppress the organs elected, as, for instance, it recently did in Argentina. In fact the monopoly bourgeoisie has established fascist regimes in some countries and it is showing a continuous tendency to establish similar regimes in other forms in a series of other countries. Do not the terrorist operations of OAS in France, the persecutions of the Communist Party and the activities of the "ultras" in the USA, and the establishment of military dictatorships in the countries

of Latin America, in south Korea and elsewhere show this tendency? Today the reactionary bourgeoisie is depending to an ever increasing degree on the armed forces — army, police and gendarmerie — to safeguard its rule and suppress every revolutionary and progressive movement of the working masses. How can this reality be ignored and be underestimated when the Khrushchev group itself is in some cases compelled to own (naturally in a make-believe way)? How can the Khrushchev group lay stress only on the peaceful way of transition and claim that the possibilities for it are growing every day in the present circumstances?

Recent attempts of the Khrushchev group to establish all-round economic collaboration with the imperialist countries and with their monopoly groups come within the framework of rapprochement and appeasement with the imperialists. In his article published in *Communist*, No. 12, Khrushchev stresses that taking into account "the objective trends of internationalization of production operating in capitalist countries we formulate our own policy and take our own economic measures". But what is this policy and what are these economic measures about which Khrushchev is speaking? Among other things he wants an extension of economic collaboration not only with separate capitalist states but also with their economic unions, specifically with the "Common Market", and what is more, not only in the field of trade but also in that of production, "to deal with deficient raw materials, to increase the resources of energy, to make common use of waterways and so on".

Socialist countries, of course, are in favor of carrying on trade with capitalist countries on the basis of mutual

benefit, and this is beneficial to the peoples of both parties, to the easing of international tension and to the improvement of relations between states. But the line which Khrushchev pursues for collaboration and establishing economic relations with the capitalist world, viewed in the framework of his general opportunist line, clearly testifies to the tendency of the Khrushchev group to enter into unprincipled relations with imperialism. This is more plainly seen if we take into account that while the Khrushchev group is gravely concerned about strengthening economic ties and collaboration with the capitalist world and coming to terms with it, it does not hesitate at all to impair economic co-operation among the countries of the socialist camp, going so far as to discontinue all economic relations, even ordinary trade transactions. The most eloquent example of this is the anti-Marxist, discriminating attitude of the Khrushchev group towards the People's Republic of Albania, which is already publicly known. And this happened at a time when, in view of the imperialist attempts to create a unified economic, political and military front directed first and foremost against the socialist camp, the socialist countries were faced with the urgent and imperative duty to strengthen their unity and internationalist co-operation in all fields, a thing to which Khrushchev himself gives lip service, of course not to put it into effect but to disguise his anti-Marxist and revisionist activities against the unity of the socialist camp.

The measures which Khrushchev sets forth in his article give rise to justified doubts and suspicions among communists and all reasonable people, because on the one hand he stresses, for instance, that "the so-called

economic unions of the imperialists have the same aims as the aggressive military blocs (NATO, SEATO, etc.)", and that "the leaders of the Western powers make no secret of the direct mutual ties and interdependence between the 'Common Market' economic organization and the aggressive NATO alliance", and for this reason he calls upon communists and the people to fight against the "Common Market" and other capitalist unions of the kind, to expose their anti-popular and aggressive aims. On the other hand Khrushchev however calls for the broad collaboration of the socialist countries with these economic unions of the imperialists in all economic fields, including the field of production; in other words, he calls for some kind of international division of labor between the two systems. But so long as the "Common Market" has the same aims as the aggressive NATO bloc as Khrushchev himself says, and so long as "it is turned into an economic base of this bloc in Europe" as is pointed out rightly in the theses "On Imperialist Integration in Western Europe" published in August this year by the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR — so long as matters stand thus, to call for broad economic collaboration in all fields with the "Common Market" really means to establish broad collaboration with the NATO aggressive military bloc which opposes first and foremost the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

Does not all this give rise to the dangerous illusion about which Khrushchev speaks so openly, namely that imperialism in our days has given up and is giving up its aggressive aims and actions particularly against the socialist camp, that it has responded to the challenge of

peaceful competition with socialism, that it is seriously taking it to heart, and that ever growing possibilities are daily being created for all-round collaboration between the two systems, socialism and capitalism? It is not hard to find out how near and similar these views of the Khrushchev group are with the anti-Marxist views of the Yugoslav revisionists about the economic and political integration so clearly set forth in Tito's recent interview.

TITO — ADVISER AND GO-BETWEEN WHO BRINGS THE KHRUSHCHEV GROUP CLOSER TO THE IMPERIALISTS

It is now becoming ever so clear that both the imperialists and revisionists want to come to terms with each other, to approach each other, and to gain the confidence of each other in order to break ground for "the economic and political integration of the world". In his interview with Drew Pearson Tito tried to render his contribution precisely along this line, but no longer in the role of the servant. He posed this time at least to the eyes of the world as the "adviser". The American journalist said openly to Tito: "You understand the Soviet Union and the USA and have friends both in the one as well as in the other. Would you be able to become the go-between?" And Tito somewhat taken aback answered: "I do not choose to become an intermediary but when I meet Prime Minister Khrushchev I will tell him what I think. This will be my own personal opinion and I can tell it to both Prime Minister Khrushchev and to President Kennedy if I have the occasion to meet the latter." To assure the American imperialists that he might be able to succeed in his mission as "adviser",

the leader of the Yugoslav revisionists stated: "Up to now too, I have communicated with Prime Minister Khrushchev, verbally or by writing, about how we view international issues and I must say that I have encountered no resistance against this. Prime Minister Khrushchev knows how to size up opinions and I have noticed this also among leading American personalities." To indicate that he did not intend to leave it at that, Tito disclosed the following information: "I have been invited to spend my vacation in the Soviet Union. . . . I will go there on vacation towards the end of the year or in the spring of the coming year. On this occasion I will certainly carry on talks."

The functions of an "adviser" and the idea of closer understanding between the imperialists and the revisionists seemed to be very alluring to the revisionist Tito. Therefore, in order to remove any misgivings and in order that both parties might carry conviction that each was a fighter for peace (by revisionist standards, of course), Tito "advised" not without pride: "Talks and more talks must be carried on and not only once but many times, and continued contacts must be maintained for that is the way to proceed toward 'the consolidation of peace' and to remove mistrust."

Tito advised his imperialist masters not to "dramatize" things and said that he was very well acquainted with Khrushchev and he was fully confident that one could easily come to terms with Khrushchev. To the query of the American journalist whether he thought that "eventually the USA and the USSR will become good friends", Tito stated with full confidence that the day would come when a thing of that kind would be attained.

And why should it not be achieved? said he. There is no obstacle in the way, all the ways lie open for such a thing.

Thus it is evident that Tito does not play badly the role of the "servant to two masters", promoted to the rank of adviser, and his mission for the rapprochement and drawing the Khrushchev group closer to the imperialists.

III. THE REVISIONISTS — SPLITTERS OF THE UNITY OF THE SOCIALIST CAMP AND OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' MOVEMENT

Tito's interview lays bare the other objective of the revisionists, that of splitting the socialist camp and the international communist movement. It is not a question of a new role or of a new task for the revisionists. To split the socialist camp and the communist movement is one of the main objectives of the activities of all the revisionists of our days.

It is a well-known fact that one of the most subtle and dangerous forms of the fight of the imperialists and their agents against the world socialist system is their attempt to undermine the unity of the socialist camp from within by setting the socialist countries and the communist and workers' parties against one another. To realize this end of its fundamental strategy, imperialism headed by American imperialism has assigned the main role to the revisionists, particularly to the revisionist and traitorous clique of Belgrade.

Facts go to prove that the Tito clique has spared no effort to play the role of the "Trojan horse" to the best

of its ability, not only by disseminating its anti-Marxist views but by its practical hostile activities against the socialist countries and the communist and workers' parties. Everyone is now aware of the role the Yugoslav revisionists played in stirring up and organizing the counter-revolutionary rebellion in Hungary, in organizing plots against the People's Republic of Albania, in carrying on subversive acts to undermine the security of the socialist countries, in launching slanderous attacks against the Soviet Union, against the other socialist countries, against the Marxist-Leninist parties and their leaders, etc., in order to sow dissension and split them asunder.

Tito tried to cause a split through his last interview too. The target for his splitting attacks this time was the People's Republic of China and Soviet-Chinese friendship. It was not without purpose that Drew Pearson asked Tito: "What is your opinion on the divergence between China and the Soviet Union?" And it was not without purpose that Tito too went into great detail about this matter. He slandered the People's Republic of China and its peaceful foreign policy, he accused it in a round-about way of being opposed to disarmament, to peace, to almost all agreements and so on. He went so far as to tell the American imperialists almost to their face that China wanted war, not peace, that danger came to them from China, and therefore it is towards China that they should direct not only their attention but their operations and provocations, their armies, guns and rockets! And all these things were said and done at a time when the American imperialists in close co-operation with Chiang Kai-shek's clique and their allies of the

aggressive SEATO bloc were concocting dangerous plots and provocations against the People's Republic of China and against the consolidation of peace in the Far East. This is another evidence of the coordinated policy of the Yugoslav revisionists and the American imperialists.

Tito set forth once again, and not without purpose, the old thesis of the Yugoslav revisionists, which is now being reiterated far and wide by all modern revisionists, that there were socialist states that stood for peace but there were also other socialist states that favored war. "I am of the opinion," Tito replied to the American journalist, "that the Soviet Union acts in a conciliatory way towards the problem of the Chinese islands and Chiang Kai-shek and brings its influence to bear to avoid the aggravation of matters and a major conflict." He added: "The same is the case with the Indian-Chinese border incidents in which the Soviet Union tried to forestall any conflict." In this he openly upheld the American plan to create "two Chinas", which obviously aims at perpetuating the occupation of the Chinese territory of Taiwan and of the other Chinese islands by the American imperialists and Chiang Kai-shek's clique. In this matter, too, the Belgrade revisionists do not side with the Chinese people and their lawful leaders but with the imperialist invaders and their aggressive policy. Tito took the same stand when he came out openly in defense of the Indian reactionary circles with regard to the Chinese-Indian border conflict, a conflict which everybody knows has been incited by the American imperialists in order to aggravate the relations between the two great neighbouring countries and in that important region of Asia in general, and which serves the

aims of the American imperialists and their policy of aggression and war. It was precisely the same stand that A. Mikoyan took towards the Chinese-Indian border conflict during his sojourn in India in July this year. Replying to a speech by the Indian Minister of State Mr. Krishnamachari in which he openly stated that it was not India but the People's Republic of China which carried on aggressive acts on the Chinese-Indian border, Mikoyan stated: "The honorable host delivered such a good speech that there is nothing left for me except to agree with him. In his speech he found particularly clear and correct expressions" (*Pravda*, July 26, 1962).

Taking advantage of the occasion, Tito tried again to drive wedges into the unity and friendship between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. But neither Tito's wedges nor the acts of the modern revisionists to undermine this friendship, will be of any avail, as they have been of no avail up to now. The friendship between the Soviet Union and China will become ever stronger and will flourish for centuries, for it is not a product of casual political combinations, but a friendship of the peoples, a friendship kneaded with the immortal Marxist-Leninist ideology, inspired by the common ideal of socialist and communist construction.

This is not the first time, nor can it be the last, that modern revisionists direct their attacks, sometimes openly and at other times in a round-about way, against the People's Republic of China. The modern revisionists as well as the American imperialists find an insuperable obstacle to their plans in the People's Republic of China, a great power that stands firmly against imperialism and in defense of the cause of socialism, peace

and the independence of the peoples, they find a stumbling block to the realization of their designs in the Communist Party of China, a persistent fighter in defense of the purity of Marxism-Leninism and of the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist and workers' movement. Time has shown and will show that all the attacks, slanders, provocations and plots of the imperialists and revisionists against the People's Republic of China will meet, as they have always met, with failure and disgrace. Led by its glorious Communist Party with Comrade Mao Tse-tung at the head, the People's Republic of China will march ahead in triumph, holding aloft the banner of socialism and communism, of peace and national independence, the banner of unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist and workers' movement.

In his interview Tito posed, with the hypocrisy typical of all modern revisionists, as a friend and well-wisher of the Soviet Union. He even went so far as to take the liberty to "interpret" the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and to speak in the name and on behalf of the Soviet Union. But the whole spirit and content of Tito's interview bear witness to the contrary, to his hatred of the Soviet Union, to his old and inveterate anti-Soviet attitude. The Yugoslav revisionists have never been nor can they ever be sincere friends of the Soviet Union as Khrushchev tries to describe them. The Yugoslav revisionists are and will continue to be the same as they have been: agents of American imperialism, who try to get promotion from the rank of servants to that of advisers; they are experienced provokers and plotters against the unity of the socialist camp.

In their activities of splitting the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist and workers' movement the imperialists and the Yugoslav revisionists receive ample incitement and encouragement from the anti-Marxist and anti-socialist stand and activities of the Khrushchev group itself. The Khrushchev group has been engaged in acts of dissension and splitting for quite some time and went so far at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as to launch public attacks of hostility against a Marxist-Leninist Party and a socialist country, namely, the Albanian Party of Labour and the People's Republic of Albania, calling for open counter-revolutionary action to overthrow the Party and state leaders of Albania. Following the 22nd Congress the Khrushchev group even broke diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of Albania. Through its attacks and hostile activities against fraternal parties and fraternal socialist countries the Khrushchev group has caused serious damage to the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist and workers' movement and has given our imperialist foes weapons to attack us.

The Khrushchev revisionist group has never ceased for a moment its splitting and hostile activities against our unity. Khrushchev's fine words about unity are only a bluff and demagogy; they are a mask which he needs to deceive, to gain time, so that he may calmly carry out his splitting activities and take other and more ominous steps against the unity of the socialist camp and the communist movement.

Experience has shown that the modern revisionists do not care a pin about the unity of the socialist camp and

the international communist movement. They are not at all concerned about the interests of the socialist countries. They are trying hard to undermine this unity and trample upon the highest interests of the socialist system. We won't dwell here on the Yugoslav revisionists who have stated publicly that they are opposed to the existence of the socialist camp and who, in collaboration with the imperialists, have concocted plots against the socialist countries, as, for instance, the chauvinist plan of Tito and King Paul of Greece to partition Albania, or the plot organized by the Tito clique in conjunction with the Greek monarchical fascists and American imperialism against the People's Republic of Albania. What is important and needs be emphasized is the fact that for the sake of getting closer to the imperialists at all costs and to the bourgeois governments and politicians and under the pretext of "peaceful coexistence", the Khrushchev group does not hesitate to trample underfoot the sovereign rights of socialist countries. People are well aware by this time of the unprincipled bargains struck between Khrushchev and S. Venizelos in defiance of the territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Albania. It was precisely the Khrushchev group which stood up for the traitors and enemies of the Albanian people, who joined the Yugoslav revisionists, the Greek monarchical fascists and the American imperialists in plotting for aggression against the People's Republic of Albania. And when our Party and our people justly condemned the inhuman, chauvinistic Serbomanian policy of the Belgrade revisionist band which they carried out against more than a million brother Albanians in Kosova, Montenegro and Macedonia, when we exposed by

facts their policy of discrimination, the homicidal crimes, judicial repressions, administrative deportations and mass extermination of our brothers by the Belgrade clique, the Khrushchev group did not hesitate to reproach us as "nationalists", approving thus the inhuman and anti-Albanian acts of the Belgrade renegades. It is not only against the People's Republic of Albania and the Albanian people that the Khrushchev group maintains such an anti-internationalist attitude as this.

Facts thus show that as far as the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist and workers' movement is concerned the line of the treacherous Tito clique and that of the Khrushchev revisionist group coincide and both serve, in fact, the imperialists in their designs and plans. In this matter, too, the Khrushchev group tramples underfoot and without scruple the 1960 Moscow Declaration which stresses that when imperialist reaction musters its forces to fight communism, it is highly essential to strengthen by all means the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement, for it is the supreme internationalist duty of every Marxist-Leninist Party to see to it that this unity is continuously strengthened.

Our Party of Labour has always stood and continues to stand for the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement; it has struggled and continues to struggle with all its might and in accordance with the principle of strengthening this unity on the sound basis of Marxism-Leninism. In this unity our Party has always seen the indestructible force of our camp and our movement, the important factor in establishing socialism in our country, the guarantee for

the successful development of the struggle for the great cause of socialism and communism, of national liberation, of democracy and peace. Proceeding from this principled stand our Party has faithfully followed and continues to follow the common line of the international communist movement expressed in the two historical Moscow Declarations of 1957 and 1960 and has carried out this line to the letter. In its relations with the fraternal parties and with the fraternal socialist countries our Party has been and continues to be strictly guided by the principles of proletarian internationalism and by the Marxist-Leninist norms that govern the relations between communist parties and socialist countries.

Determined to strive for unity, the Party of Labour of Albania has been, continues to be and will always be in the vanguard to preserve and strengthen the friendship and affection of our people for the glorious fraternal Soviet people, to preserve the affection and respect for Lenin's great Party, for just as before, the Party of Labour of Albania considers the friendship with the Soviet people and the unity with the Soviet Union and with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as one of the fundamental questions of principle of its revolutionary activities. Our Party has never confused nor will it ever confuse the Soviet Union and its Communist Party with the Khrushchev revisionist group. Regardless of the Khrushchev hostile attitude towards our Party and our country, regardless of his attempts to impair Albanian-Soviet friendship, this sacred friendship is kept intact in the hearts of our communists and of all our people.

Our Party has striven and continues to strive for the sound unity of the socialist camp and the international

communist movement, unity based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, for strict implementation of the Moscow Declarations, and for a united front against the imperialists and the renegades from Marxism-Leninism, the modern revisionists. The struggle for unity and the fight against the splitters of unity, the modern revisionists, are inseparable. Only a Marxist-Leninist unity of this kind can be a real, effective and lasting unity of which the international communist movement stands in need.

An analysis of Tito's interview with the American journalist Drew Pearson and of the deeds of the Yugoslav revisionists shows them up in their true colors, in their treacherous hostile role as servants of American imperialism and its fundamental strategy. But it is precisely this active service to American imperialism that has exposed the Belgrade revisionists before the eyes of the world. Communists, progressive men and women and the people as a whole see for themselves what the Tito clique represents and what danger it constitutes to the cause of peace and the national independence of the peoples. In the 1960 Moscow Declaration of the 81 communist and workers' parties the leaders of the Yugoslav revisionists are denounced as traitors to Marxism-Leninism, as servants of imperialism, as enemies to the national liberation movement and to peace.

But the Tito clique has friends, accomplices and allies who by means of all sorts of cunning methods try to preserve its bankrupted "prestige" and to re-establish its lost "credit". Working in this direction is its imperialist master with the USA at the head whose aim is

to squeeze the lemon until it is dry; working in the same direction are the modern revisionists with the Khrushchev group at the head, whose intention it is to recruit Tito and his clique as active co-fighters and effective allies in their opposition to Marxism-Leninism and as go-between in their machinations with imperialism. These bilateral endeavours have become more obvious in recent days.

The American imperialists are raising a hue and cry about Tito joining up with the East. Proposals are made in Congress and in the Senate to discontinue help to Yugoslavia for it is "shifting its ground" and "changing sides". The Khrushchev group and its followers on their part and contrary to the Moscow Declaration of November 1960 proclaim far and wide that "Yugoslavia is a socialist country", that "in the most important issues the foreign policy of Yugoslavia fully coincides with that of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries" and that "Yugoslav experience must be studied carefully". By way of carrying out this admonition various delegations have been exchanged, Yugoslavs have been attending meetings of socialist countries, temporarily as "observers", boundaries are being opened for big meetings, and so on and so forth.

It is clear that both sides are bluffing, they are trying to create illusions among the people and communists; they help each other in order to be able to continue to utilize the Tito revisionist clique in the manner and for the purposes each side desires. Because in reality nothing has changed. Regardless of the fuss raised in the American Congress or Senate, Tito continues to serve imperialism, he continues to receive credits and "help",

he continues to be bound from head to foot to the imperialist cart. Regardless, likewise, of the bombastic statements of the Khrushchev group about "socialist Yugoslavia", etc., etc., socialism in Yugoslavia continues to be a mere expression, a mask to allow the Tito clique to undermine the socialist camp, and carry out subversive acts, as is required by its role of "Trojan horse".

In short, the Tito clique continues to be what it was regardless of the illusions which the imperialists and the Khrushchev group try to create about it. The Tito clique continues to play the double role of serving two masters, in other words, to serve both the imperialists in their designs against communism and against the movements for liberation and for peace as well as the Khrushchev revisionist group in its fight against Marxism-Leninism and in its designs to come to terms with imperialism.

The Khrushchev group had no response to Tito's interview, thus taking upon itself and approving what Tito said about Khrushchev. This goes to show that both the Tito clique and the Khrushchev group pursue the same road. But the Khrushchev group could not help but maintain an attitude of this kind towards Tito's interview for yet another reason: for else it would have to go back on what it had said in defense of the Tito group, and to own that it had made a mistake in its policy of reconciliation with the Yugoslav revisionists. Facts of recent days, however, show that the Khrushchev group and the Tito clique are getting closer and closer as time goes on. It has already been announced that L. Brezhnev will soon go to Yugoslavia while Josip Broz Tito, upon the invitation of Khrushchev, will go

to the Soviet Union towards the end of this year or during the spring of the coming year. These visits are not without a purpose; evidently they are intended to better coordinate their common operations and activities.

Every passing day goes to show more and more clearly how dangerous the views and operations of the modern revisionists, particularly the agent of imperialism, the Tito clique, are to the cause of socialism and the struggle of the peoples against imperialism. To keep silent and not expose these dangerous views and activities of the revisionists means to take upon oneself a great responsibility before the communist movement and before all the peoples of the world who are engaged in a great struggle for their national liberation and social emancipation. Therefore, as stressed with force in both the Moscow Declarations of 1957 and 1960, it behoves us now more than ever before to fight with determination against modern revisionism which continues to be the main threat to the international communist and workers' movement, and to expose the Yugoslav revisionists as traitors to Marxism-Leninism and as the foes of socialism and peace, of the freedom and independence of the peoples.

**HIGH TREASON
AGAINST
MARXISM - LENINISM**

Article published in the newspaper
Zëri i Popullit

October 13, 1962

On Tito's invitation the President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, L. Brezhnev, paid an 11-day official visit to Yugoslavia. Both the Soviet and the Yugoslav press proclaimed this as a return visit for that paid by Tito to the Soviet Union in 1956.

Brezhnev was seen off at the Moscow airport by Khrushchev. Immediately upon his arrival in Belgrade, where he was given a pompous reception by Tito and his clique, Brezhnev hurried to express to "honorable Comrade Tito" his thanks for the "friendly invitation" and to convey to him on behalf of Khrushchev "heartly greetings and good wishes for success in life and work, in his struggle for durable peace and socialism".

During the visit neither president spared himself in speech-making. In his speeches Tito expressed great pleasure at having been given the chance to show Comrade Brezhnev "the results of developing and building socialism in Yugoslavia" achieved under the leadership of the Communist League of Yugoslavia. He said that "the existence of certain differences should not be a stumbling-block for they are a normal phenomenon which often arises in the present world from the fact that the actual ways of economic and social development, and of the development of specific countries, differ, depending on the various historical and other conditions". Tito spoke of the "assistance" and "support" which Yugoslavia had offered to the national-liberation and progressive movements in the world and to the indepen-

dent countries in Asia and Africa. He loudly proclaimed before the President of the Supreme Soviet that "the attitudes of the Yugoslav Government and of the Government of the Soviet Union coincide or are identical on a number of fundamental international questions". Alluding to the period of certain aggravation in the relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, Tito laid down the following line: "We need not call each other names. We must put an end to this once and for all time and become good friends. I am certain that the present visit will be a great step forward towards developing the relations of our countries." In the speech delivered at Kragujevac Tito said: "We may openly tell our friends that they have come to a country in which socialism is being built and in which there can be no other way of development. We will continue on this path and we have the ways and means to build our socialist social order (of course he made no mention of American aid — Ed.). In winding up I would like to thank our Comrade Brezhnev and the other friends for their visit here and the words they said which are in complete accordance with our views on socialism" (Tanjug, Sept. 26, 1962).

Brezhnev, President of the Supreme Soviet, member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, on his part applauded Tito and made various statements. In his first speech on September 24 and in his subsequent speeches at other times he repeated that "collaboration with Yugoslavia is to the advantage of all the countries that build socialism and communism". (?!). Having pointed out that "the field of activities in Soviet-Yugoslav relations is very broad", he said: "We highly appreciate the efforts and expres-

sions in favor of peace, of friendly collaboration between states, etc. on the part of the Government and the President of the FPRY, Comrade Josip Broz Tito." In a speech delivered before a rally at Split, Brezhnev reported to the "Yugoslav comrades" on the elimination of the "cult of the individual" and its "harmful consequences", emphasizing that "the exposure, bold denunciation and condemnation of Stalin's cult of the individual had gone a long way towards building communist society successfully". Brezhnev expressed here also his impressions of "socialist construction" in Yugoslavia, saying: "We have seen how the Yugoslav peoples, united in a fraternal community, have set to work to build their new life." He often referred to "the interesting and valuable talks with President Tito and other distinguished personalities of Yugoslavia", to "the very interesting things he saw", to "the very interesting visit", to "the very interesting trip through Yugoslavia".

In his trips through Yugoslavia the President of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR was accompanied by A. Rankovich, notorious for having tortured and killed thousands of Yugoslav communists who had dared oppose the revisionist line of the Tito clique after 1948 and onward.

Taking "cordial" leave of Tito, Brezhnev stressed once more "the sincere talks with him on many problems of the common struggle for peace and of the all-round development of the Soviet-Yugoslav relations for the good of peace and socialism", thanked again "cordially his cherished friend, the President of the Republic, Comrade Tito" and on behalf of Khrushchev asked him to visit the Soviet Union. According to TASS, Tito accepted this

invitation with pleasure and will pay his visit to Khrushchev in December this year.

At the end of Brezhnev's visit the newspaper *Borba* announced with overzealous delight that "the friendship and fruitful collaboration between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia will certainly assume the qualities of long standing, more stable and better relations".

These are the things that were said openly and in public. But the things that were left unsaid, that were omitted purposely both in the speeches and in the communiqué that was published cannot but attract one's attention. It is not a question here of the secret talks which have been carried on for some time between the Khrushchev and Tito groups, of their plans for the collaboration and coordination of their splitting activities. Time will again expose them as it has already done time and again. We refer to those questions which have been met by silence or which have been incorrectly touched upon. Anyone who has closely followed Brezhnev's visit to Yugoslavia and has carefully read the final communiqué of the Tito-Brezhnev talks cannot but note that no mention is made of the danger from American imperialism — the danger which lies in store for peace, for the national independence of peoples and for socialism; nor can anyone fail to note the illusions spread purporting that the time has come when as a consequence of disarmament the imperialists will devote a good part of their funds to the welfare of the peoples, particularly those of the underdeveloped countries; nor can anyone fail to note that when speaking of Cuba no mention is made of American imperialism which threatens it with aggression, but of certain aggressive circles of imperialism; nor can any-

one fail to note that when speaking of admitting the People's Republic of China into the UNO, no mention is made of ousting the Chiang Kai-shek representative from the UNO and that no objection is raised to the imperialist plan of "Two Chinas", etc.

* * *

All this shows that Brezhnev's visit, the visit of this personal envoy of Khrushchev's to Tito, is not a simple, ordinary trip to see "the marvellous and picturesque sights of friendly Yugoslavia" in spite of the futile attempts to include it formally within the framework of peaceful coexistence in inter-state relations. This visit was made soon after Khrushchev's speech delivered at Varna in Bulgaria in which he praised the Tito clique "who are building socialism", and said his relations with Tito were "not only normal but also good"; in which he appealed for closer relations with the Yugoslavia of today, considering collaboration with and assistance to Yugoslavia as a factor which "will not only help improve the mutual relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia but will be to the advantage of all the countries which are building socialism and communism". (!). Against the background of the Tito group's splitting activities — which are directed against the socialist camp, against the national-liberation movement, against the revolutionary movement of the working class, against progressive movements in general — and the revisionist views and splitting machinations of Khrushchev's group, coupled with the attempts of Khrushchev and Tito to coordinate their anti-Marxist activities, Brezhnev's visit

is certainly beyond the framework of visits of courtesy demanded by diplomatic protocol. Brezhnev's visit, this "visit of friendship" of his, this "important visit" as the Soviet press itself calls it, is of a highly political and ideological nature and is a link in the chain of Khrushchev's attempts to get closer to the Yugoslav revisionists, to coordinate with them the new revisionist line of action, to split the socialist camp, to do away with socialism.

It is a known fact that Khrushchev began his endeavours to get closer to the Yugoslav renegades publicly as early as 1955 when he went to Belgrade and kowtowed to Tito, apologizing to him for the "mistakes" which the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries had allegedly committed against "the Yugoslav leaders", using in this way the authority of the Soviet Union to make amends for the sins of the Titoites. This was the first step. Having again placed a mask of Marxism-Leninism on the Yugoslav revisionists Khrushchev took one step after another, as experience has shown and continues to show, to get closer and closer to them.

Events following Tito's visit to the Soviet Union in 1956, especially the Hungarian counter-revolution and the publication of the revisionist program of the Communist League of Yugoslavia, made it difficult for Khrushchev to continue along the road on which he had embarked. The 1957 and 1960 Moscow meetings, at which the Yugoslav revisionist clique was rightfully condemned as traitors to Marxism-Leninism for undermining the socialist camp and for being in the service of the American imperialists, greatly embarrassed Khrushchev. However, under pressure of the struggle which the communist and workers' parties justly waged against re-

visionism, especially Yugoslav revisionism, as the main source of danger to the communist movement, he felt compelled to say a word or two, now and then, against the Tito clique. But in his frequent speeches which experience has shown to be ill-timed, Khrushchev has always left a leeway for an understanding with the Tito clique and in some manner or other has always urged others not to aggravate relations, not to oppose the Yugoslav revisionists under the absurd pretext of "not raising their importance".

At the 22nd Congress, however, Khrushchev showed himself to be a downright splitter of the socialist camp and of the communist movement. The first thing he had to do at this time was to remove all obstacles lying in his way and to begin official state and Party contacts with the Titoite clique. This was essential for him to continue his splitting activities, and his best ally in this undertaking was of course Tito who had already given ample proof of his treachery to Marxism-Leninism. To attain his goal Khrushchev had to trample under foot the Moscow Declaration of 1960 and being determined to carry out his scheme he did not hesitate to do this.

Thus began their collaboration in the economic field. As early as 1961 the exchange of goods between the two countries increased to 2.5 times that of 1955, and in 1962 it will be well over 30% more. In July this year all the problems of mutual economic collaboration were easily solved "in the atmosphere of cordial talks in the spirit of friendship and complete mutual understanding". Agreements were signed one after the other envisaging a considerable increase in the mutual exchange of goods for the period from 1963 to 1965 as against the volume

set for this period in the long term agreements in force. All steps were taken to coordinate their industries, to collaborate in the technical and scientific fields, to exchange specialists, etc.

Having solved the economic problem, it was essential for Khrushchev to fully settle with the Titoite clique the problems of a political and ideological nature. For instance, one of Khrushchev's intimate collaborators, J. V. Spiridonov, Chairman of the Union Soviet of the Supreme Soviet, has said: "If we have increased contacts between states and Parties on the problems of foreign, economic and cultural policies then we can also aim at doing away with differences in the field of ideology" (excerpt from a speech delivered by Spiridonov on July 2, 1962 at a reception given in honor of the Yugoslav parliamentary delegation). Collaboration was extended in the form of exchanges of numerous delegations in all sectors, including delegations in the political and ideological sectors. Delegates have been exchanged representing mass organizations such as the trade unions and associations of journalists, men of letters, artists and scientists. The clamour raised by Khrushchev and his propaganda agents about his policy being identical with that of the Tito group was the prologue to Brezhnev's visit.

Khrushchev masked his rapprochement with the Titoite clique by statements that "Yugoslavia is a country which is building socialism". A mask of this kind is too thin to cover the high treason which is being committed by collaborating with the Belgrade renegades.

On what grounds and with what logic do Khrushchev and his followers base their statement that Yugoslavia is building socialism? How can a group of traitors to

Marxism-Leninism build socialism when it is a known fact that Marxism-Leninism is the scientific ideology of socialist construction? How can socialism be built by allowing free rein to the development of capitalism in the countryside, by steering the economy nearer and nearer to capitalism? How can socialism be built on the billions of American dollars which have gripped the whole Yugoslav economy? How can socialism be built in a country whose leaders undermine the unity of the socialist camp? Hence, underminers of socialism and builders of socialism! How can a country be called a socialist country when its leaders, under the pretext of pursuing a policy of non-alignment in foreign affairs, cause damage to the cause of the unity of all the peace-loving forces and states? What changes have come about in Yugoslavia since the 1960 Moscow meeting to justify such an attitude and such considerations as those of Khrushchev's group? Nothing has changed. The Yugoslav revisionists have not only not reversed themselves but are daily plunging into the service of imperialism, on the road to the restoration of capitalism in Yugoslavia.

Khrushchev's group stands in need of precisely this treacherous splitting activity of the Titoite clique. Khrushchev stands in need of Tito's experience in this direction in order to execute his revisionist line of action. Therefore he ignores the present reality of Yugoslavia, which is following a line that leads to the restoration of the capitalist system, and recants everything he has said against the Yugoslav revisionists. This explains all the various ideological concessions, all the attempts made to harmonize views during Brezhnev's recent visit to Yugoslavia.

It was not unintentional that Brezhnev, throughout his visit and in every one of his speeches in Yugoslavia, avoided using the term "socialist camp". He was compelled to do this, firstly because Tito would have objected to it, for he is "opposed to camps" and stands "above camps". Secondly, and of more importance, because as Brezhnev's speeches bear out, instead of referring to the socialist camp as such, he speaks of "the world of socialist countries", of "the socialist forces in the world", of "the association of the socialist states", he tries to find suitable ways of doing away with the socialist camp, of getting the wolf into the fold, of enrolling "friendly socialist Yugoslavia" in the family of socialist countries in order to carry out the common objective which is by now an open secret to all.

To carry out his objective of rapprochement Khrushchev gave Brezhnev a sure support in the composition of the delegation which accompanied him to Yugoslavia. This support was made up of the closest and most experienced men of his revisionist trend, such as Adjubey, Firyubin and Andropov. Adjubey, whose only qualification as "a statesman" is that he is Khrushchev's son-in-law, is notorious for having called the multi-millionaire President of the American monopolists, Kennedy, "a hero of whom the American people should very well be proud", a statement quite in keeping with his father-in-law's views, and for his being Khrushchev's direct intermediary in his transactions with Kennedy. Firyubin has been an ambassador in Belgrade and has served as an official intermediary between Khrushchev and the Tito clique with special merit in the Tito-Khrushchev rapprochement. Andropov, ex-ambassador to Hungary and now an im-

portant functionary in the apparatus of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, is known as the executor of Khrushchev's manipulations during the 1956 counter-revolutionary events in Hungary and in Khrushchev's plots against the Party of Labour of Albania and the other communist and workers' parties of the world.

Khrushchev's group and Tito himself consider that it is high time for an all-round rapprochement, that it is high time for open collaboration in all spheres and forms. This is clearly demonstrated by Tito's words to Brezhnev: "Enough of calling each other names. We must put an end to our quarrels. We must become good friends, now." In other words Tito says: "Enough of throwing dust in other people's eyes pretending we are opponents. Let us tear off the mask. It is high time for us to shake hands and work together towards our common goal."

During his sojourn in Yugoslavia Brezhnev frequently repeated Khrushchev's widely known formula on their "concurrence" in views and conduct as regards problems of foreign policy.

In our former articles we analyzed in detail and proved by facts that the stand of the Yugoslav revisionists has nothing in common with the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries. Therefore we will not enlarge on this here. We will only point out that precisely at the time when Brezhnev was trying to round up the stand and policy of the Yugoslav revisionists and represent them during his sojourn in Yugoslavia as identical with the Soviet policy, the representative of the Yugoslav revisionists at the present

session of the United Nations Organization General Assembly, Popovich, in his speech flayed the policy of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries, paralleling it with the policy of aggression and war of the American imperialists.

The attempts of Khrushchev's group to place the policy of the Yugoslav revisionists on the same plane as that of the Soviet Union, to identify the Soviet position in foreign affairs with that of Yugoslavia, are only a bluff, a mask which Khrushchev needs in order to present the renegade clique of Belgrade as socialists. In reality these attempts have been invalidated by numerous facts and by Tito himself in his recent interview when he stated: "First of all our representatives do not always vote in favor of the side opposed to USA. There have been cases when our representatives, in conformity with our viewpoints, have taken sides identical to the stand of the American representatives."

It is now publicly known that the Yugoslav policy in foreign affairs is an appendage of the policy of aggression and war which the American imperialists pursue and it cannot be said that it concurs with the state policy of the Soviet Union or of any other socialist country. The policy of the Yugoslav revisionists is fully at one with the views and aims of Khrushchev's revisionist group.

Of paramount importance to Khrushchev is the fact that the attitude of the Tito clique towards various international problems should be in accordance with the fundamental strategic problems which unite Khrushchev's group and the Tito clique. These problems are: class reconciliation of socialism and capitalism, political and ideological coexistence between them, peace and coex-

istence at all costs, renunciation of every revolutionary movement, the economic and political integration of the world. As to activities and attitudes in specific cases Khrushchev himself is often self-contradictory and out of line with the principles of the state policy of the Soviet Union and of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. There are many examples of Khrushchev saying one thing today and quite another thing tomorrow, one day praising Eisenhower and the next day reprimanding him. One day he says the German question must be solved without delay and sets a time limit, the next day he shamelessly says the question of a time limit is of no importance; one day he says that Yugoslav revisionism is a Trojan horse, the next day he says that Yugoslavia is building socialism. These tactics are a distinctive feature of the modern revisionists, for they are men of no principles. In their capacity as anti-Marxists they try to adapt themselves to the turn of events brought about by insignificant political events and forget the vital interests of the proletariat and the nature of the capitalist order of things.

Khrushchev's group tried in vain at times to give Brezhnev's visit an anti-imperialist appearance in order to camouflage the real purpose of the visit which was to bring their revisionist views and deeds into agreement. The Soviet newspaper *Izvestia* in an article entitled "In the Name of a Common Goal", stressing "the pure atmosphere of Soviet-Yugoslav relations", tries to make the point that Brezhnev's visit was received with a feeling of "uneasiness and restlessness" in Adenauer's leading circles and in imperialist circles in general. But the truth points in the opposite direction. As a matter

of fact Brezhnev neither thought much of this nor did *Izvestia* persist in authenticating its statement. On the contrary, fearing lest the imperialists lose their temper and turn their backs on the Tito clique, Khrushchev's group stressed in particular that "by trying to extend its good relations with Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union does not intend to have Yugoslavia aggravate her relations with other countries" (*Izvestia*, September 29). And this is not done without a purpose: Khrushchev by no means wants the Yugoslav revisionists to detach themselves from the imperialists, especially from the American imperialists. The Tito clique is an important bridgeway between Khrushchev and Kennedy. Nor is the hubbub purposeless which has been raised in the United States recently about a resolution passed by the American Senate to drop Yugoslavia from the list of the most favored nations in foreign trade with the USA. The facts are that the reactionary press could not suppress their joy and called this amicable gesture of Khrushchev's group towards Tito a "springtime in Soviet-Yugoslav relations".

All this shows clearly enough that Khrushchev's group and Tito's renegade band are politically and ideologically at one on all fundamental questions, that they are at one in tactics and strategy in getting closer to the imperialists, that they are at one in opposing Marxism-Leninism, against the unity of the socialist camp, that they are at one in their joint efforts to drag onto the road of betrayal, to corrupt certain leaders of the communist and workers' parties in some socialist countries of Europe and of some capitalist countries as well. They are at one in the strategy and tactics of undermining the national-liberation

movement and subordinating it to general and total disarmament; they are at one in their strategy and tactics of integrating the world economically and politically.

All this makes it very clear that we are faced with high treason to Marxism-Leninism. This treachery may escape the eyes only of those who do not want to see, or deem it inexpedient to see.

* * *

We must look at things as they are and call them by their right name. Modern revisionism has become a real menace to the great historical achievements attained by the proletariat, to the revolution, to socialism. It has become aggressive and impudent.

As an anti-Marxist trend, revisionism has not been fully exposed as yet. And it is precisely in this that the danger lies. It is true that the Yugoslav brand of revisionism has been amply exposed but at present it is the united front which the modern revisionists are setting up in their fight against socialism, against revolutionary Marxism-Leninism, that should be thoroughly exposed.

Where does the force of modern revisionism lie? We are not dealing today with an opportunism like that of the Second International in the period between 1894 and 1917 which depended entirely on the alms that the ruling bourgeoisie gave it from the unlimited profits it reaped by exploiting colonial and dependent peoples. The great tragedy that has befallen the international communist movement today is that revisionism is represented by Khrushchev's group, who stand at the head of the Soviet Union and of the great Lenin's Communist Party.

By exercising an unbridled demagoguery the revisionists utilize the great international authority which the Soviet Union acquired under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin as well as the glorious revolutionary past of some communists of various countries. Modern revisionism uses Marxism-Leninism and especially Lenin's name as a label under which to spread its anti-Marxist theories and views to mislead the masses. One could not of course prohibit Khrushchev, Tito and their followers from using any labels they like in order to sell their stale goods. But they become a danger when they are used by persons whose mask disguising their true anti-Marxist features has not yet been torn off. V. I. Lenin persistently stressed that open opportunism is not so dangerous and harmful as that which is disguised under the cloak of Marxism-Leninism.

Moreover, modern revisionism enjoys the support of international imperialism, which helps it in various ways and by various means, both openly and in secret. As an example, it suffices to take Yugoslavia, where the American monopolists have handed Tito, one of the leaders of modern revisionism, the sum of five billion dollars, which will be used to help the imperialists attain their main strategic objective, namely, the elimination of the socialist system and the establishment of world imperialist domination.

The source of modern revisionism was revealed and well defined at the meetings of the representatives of the communist and workers' parties held in Moscow in 1957 and 1960. "The existence of bourgeois influence is an internal source of revisionism," states the Declaration of

1957, "whereas capitulation to imperialist pressure is its external source."

Thus modern revisionism is not something casual; it did not spring up all at once like Minerva out of Zeus's head. It sprang up as a result of the ruthless class struggle between socialism, to which the future belongs, and the imperialist bourgeoisie, which is doomed to die. It is the embodiment of the capitulation in this struggle of the aristocratic wavering members of the working class as a consequence of the strong and persistent pressure which imperialism exerts upon them.

At present, as well as in the past, the essence of opportunism is the concept of class collaboration. Modern revisionism has based all its activities on this concept.

The scientific definition of our epoch given in the 1960 Moscow Declaration sounds harsh to the ears of Khrushchev's group and that is why they never make any reference to it. This Declaration defines the present epoch as an epoch of struggle between the two antagonistic social systems, the epoch of socialist and national-liberation revolutions, the epoch of the fall of imperialism, of the extermination of the colonial system, the epoch of the adoption of socialism by other countries, of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world scale, whereas Khrushchev and his followers in reality define the present epoch as an epoch of peaceful coexistence during which the social and political problems that split the world today should find solution in a peaceful way through talks. According to them the main trend of our epoch is the peaceful economic competition between the two world social systems, socialist and capitalist. Therefore much is made of peaceful coexistence by Khrush-

chev's group as the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries, as a general road leading to the triumph of socialism on a world scale. The assessment which Tito's group make of the present epoch, which he calls the "epoch of peaceful integration of the world into socialism", leads to the same conclusion.

We stress the essential difference between the definition of our epoch given by the 1960 Moscow Declaration and that given by the revisionists, because it is here that the diametrically opposite paths of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism and the modern revisionists separate.

Proceeding from the scientific definition of the present epoch the Marxist-Leninists draw correct revolutionary conclusions regarding the radical changes that have taken place in the new balance of forces in the international arena, a balance which is in favor of socialism. They consider the growth of communist forces in the world, the consolidation of the influence of the revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist socialist system as a factor which has created very favorable conditions and new opportunities for the communist and workers' parties, for the working class and all the revolutionary forces in the capitalist countries as well as for the people oppressed by imperialism, for the *inevitable triumph of the socialist and national-liberation movements*, for the triumph of socialism and communism throughout the world. But no triumph ever comes of itself, nor is it bestowed by anyone; it is attained through the struggle and effort of the popular masses guided by a revolutionary leadership loyal to the cause of the people, to the revolution. This is what history teaches. The situation today demands more than ever that the communist and workers' parties stand

in the vanguard of the struggle of the masses against imperialism, that they effectively demonstrate their ability to lead the proletariat and their allies in the struggle for the triumph of the socialist and national-liberation revolutions. "It is not enough to call ourselves 'the vanguard,'" V. I. Lenin says, "it is essential that we should act in a manner so that everybody else may see that we march in the lead in order that they may accept our leadership" (*Selected Works*, Volume 1, page 174). The historical development of events does not at all ask what name you bear, "communist" or any other name, nor what slogans and programs you proclaim. The revolution does not call for words but for deeds. If you do not meet the situation with deeds it will cast you aside, and it will hurl you with such force that it will completely destroy you and no one will care about you. Examples are not lacking, and there are even concrete ones which show what harsh treatment the development of revolutionary events has meted out to those who have stood aloof as a result of having pursued Khrushchev's revisionist line of action.

American imperialism constitutes today the main force of aggression and war; it is the most frenzied foe of mankind. The world is an eye-witness to the numerous acts of aggression and war which the imperialists have launched in various countries. It is an eye-witness to the feverish preparations for new wars and acts of aggression by the American imperialists and their partners in the aggressive blocs against the socialist countries, against the peoples who have newly acquired their freedom and independence, against the peoples who have risen and are continuously rising to overthrow the yoke

of the imperialist colonialists, to do away with the abominable regime of oppression and exploitation by the capitalists.

The present situation demands more urgently than ever before the creation of a united front in the struggle against imperialism, for peace, national independence and socialism, a united front of the socialist countries, of the revolutionary movement of the workers in capitalist countries, of the revolutionary national liberation and democratic movement, of all the peace-loving countries and peoples of the world, for imperialism is today the main and common foe of mankind. Only in this way can a stable peace be attained and a new world war avoided, and at the same time can imperialist rule be quickly done away with and socialism triumph on a world scale.

But the modern revisionists are doing all they can to hinder the creation of a solid front against imperialism. They leave no stone unturned and go even so far in their criminal acts as to wreck the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples against imperialism, hinder the union of all anti-imperialist forces in their struggle for peace, national independence and socialism, prevent the ideas of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism from spreading and taking root. In this connection the modern revisionists make great concessions of principle to the imperialists.

Meanwhile the imperialists, with the American imperialists at the head, take full advantage of the weaknesses and leniency of the modern revisionists, especially Khrushchev's. The opportunistic, anti-revolutionary policy and activities, the policy of conciliation with the imperialists which the modern revisionists pursue, split and weaken the socialist camp, weaken the revolutionary

movement of the peoples against imperialism, favor the imperialists and give them time to strengthen their positions in different parts of the world which have been turned into hotbeds of aggression against the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the other socialist countries as well as against the liberation movements of the oppressed peoples.

In spite of the ruthless measures and the billions of dollars which imperialism uses in order to stamp out the revolutionary anti-imperialist movements with the help of the modern revisionists, the revolutionary movement and the international communist movement are becoming wider and stronger every day. And it could not happen otherwise. The contradictions of various kinds in the imperialist camp keep going from bad to worse. Today more than at any time in the past the timeworn capitalist world is pregnant with socialist and national-liberation revolutions. A ruthless class struggle is being waged in the international arena. The flames of revolutionary wars are widespread in most oppressed countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Nor is the class struggle stamped out in the more advanced capitalist countries, and it can never be stamped out because it is not subject to the whims of the revisionists or of the imperialist bourgeoisie but is brought about by the objective conditions of oppression and of the exploitation of man by man, conditions which cannot be removed unless the capitalist order is overthrown and the socialist order of things is established. A certain unusual rise in production in some capitalist countries is nothing more than an accidental, temporary phenomenon, for there has not been nor can there be a continuous, peaceful development

of capitalism. The capitalist system of the world is plunged into severe general crises, therefore the situation of "peaceful development" of capitalism in certain parts of the world cannot last indefinitely.

As pointed out in the 1960 Moscow Declaration no attempts of the imperialists can prevent society from moving ahead, from doing away with the imperialist system and fully establishing socialism on a world scale. But this may come about in a shorter or in a longer period of time. This will depend on whether the proletariat and the other oppressed and exploited masses will be ready and well prepared in all respects to act in the revolutionary situations which have now become inevitable, whether the communist and workers' parties will be in a position to take all-round measures for revolution, to make them fully aware of and lead them to complete victory over the external and internal foes. No party of the working class is in a position to carry this task out if it is infected with the noxious germs of revisionism, if revisionist leaders are sitting cross-legged at the top, if the solidarity of the world revolutionary movement, the unity of the international communist movement, the unity of the socialist camp in opposition to revisionism, are not safeguarded and consolidated. The spread and consolidation of revisionism in the international communist movement not only prolongs the life of imperialism but imperils the gains attained by the working masses in countries where socialism has already triumphed.

Therefore, how true is the definition which the 1957 and 1960 Moscow meetings gave of revisionism as the main danger to the international communist movement

as well as their pointing out the fight against and the ideological liquidation of revisionism as the present task. This fight has become an urgent historical necessity.

Revisionism not only benumbs and saps the revolutionary energy of the masses but it finds suitable ground to thrive on this languor and debility. We come across this phenomenon today in countries where the communist parties are in the hands of revisionists, whereas Marxism-Leninism and the Marxist-Leninist parties depend on and become strong precisely on the revolutionary energy of the masses. Thus the fight against revisionism and the exposure of its carriers invigorates the revolutionary drive of the masses and they become more politically conscious and learn to fight in defense of their rights, of the revolution, of their full national independence, of democracy, socialism and communism.

Imperialism cannot be successfully fought and overthrown without fighting and exposing revisionism. V. I. Lenin always stressed: "The fight against imperialism will become an empty and misleading phrase if it is not closely bound with the fight against opportunism" (*Selected Works*, Volume 1, page 858).

To wage a successful struggle against revisionism, which has become so dangerous a menace, it should be made clear to communists and the masses what revisionism actually is. Khrushchev's group too sometimes feels obliged to say a word or two about the struggle against revisionism. Of course the "fight against revisionism" in the minds of Khrushchev's group is only something abstract, with no objective but only empty phrases. Formerly, when the press of the present Soviet leaders referred now and then to "the fight against re-

visionism" in their speeches, it might be interpreted to refer to the Yugoslav revisionists. But now that the coordination of Khrushchev's policy in all fields with that of Tito's is a fait accompli, there is no doubt left but that Khrushchev's group, far from fighting revisionism in any form, has taken the banner of modern revisionism in its own hands.

Under the present conditions of relentless class struggle between communism and imperialism, when imperialist reaction is mustering its forces against communism, it is essential to safeguard and strengthen to the utmost the unity of the socialist camp, the communist movement and the international revolutionary movement of the workers. It is clear to every true Marxist-Leninist that this unity has been heavily prejudiced by modern revisionism. One of the main objectives of Tito's revisionist group has always been to split the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist forces. But Khrushchev's revisionist group is now also acting against this unity by its vile and criminal attacks, plots and other hostile acts against the Party of Labour of Albania and the other revolutionary Marxist-Leninist parties, against the socialist camp as well as against the entire world revolutionary movement.

The preservation of the unity of the socialist camp as well as the further consolidation of this unity demands that we firmly oppose modern revisionism, that we fight to expose it in all its forms and in all spheres, so as to draw once and for all a demarcation line between ourselves and revisionism. Revisionism is a tumor in the body of the communist movement which must be promptly removed however painful the operation may be.

The revolutionary slogan "**Proletarians of all lands, unite!**", which has guided the bitter class struggle and has led to victory for the proletarians and all the oppressed and exploited masses for over a hundred years, is still the order of the day as it was in Marx's and Lenin's heroic times. As always, this unity can be achieved only on the bedrock of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism, only on the immortal ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, and never on the rotten ideas of the revisionists.

Even when the modern revisionists hold leading positions, in some parties they have no followers among the mass of communists, or among the proletarians and the revolutionary peasantry although they have made it a habit to refer to the "masses" every time they want to advertise their anti-communist theories and deeds as perfect. Their followers consist merely of some privileged persons they have promoted for the purpose of upholding them in their anti-Marxist exploits. The rank-and-file communists and the masses of workers are daily growing wiser to the fact that high treason is being perpetrated at their expense and to the detriment of Marxism-Leninism, and that the revisionists are incorrigible renegades from communism. At these historical moments it behooves the rank-and-file communists and the masses of workers to have their say and show the revisionists their place and to do it soon, for revolution and counter-revolution, Marxism and anti-Marxism, proletarian ideology and bourgeois ideology, an offspring of which is revisionism, cannot live long together neither within the framework of one party nor within the framework of the movement at large.

Moreover, it is high time for those communists who are wading through the quagmire of Khrushchev's swamps and have an opportunity to see, some more and some less clearly, the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, to pluck up courage to halt and detach themselves from the revisionists. They face two alternatives: either to hurl themselves into the abyss to which Khrushchev's group is leading them or to pluck up courage and react, to join the rank and file of the party, to hold on fast to the working masses and to deal a death blow to the revisionists. Only in this way can they help their Party, their country, socialism, communism, and peace.

It is not the first time that the workers' and communist movement has encountered high treason such as the treachery of the modern revisionists. The history of the struggle of the world proletariat has confirmed time and again that whenever capitalism was in the throes of general crisis the opportunists, the offspring and agents of the bourgeoisie, have become busy, have stirred themselves and tried to throttle the parties of the working class, coming thereby to the assistance of the international imperialist bourgeoisie to establish their sway over the world and to stamp out the revolutionary movement of the masses. Everybody is now familiar with the treachery of the Second International and its failure, with the betrayal by Kautsky, Plekhanov, Trotsky and their failure, with the betrayal of Zinovyev, Kamenyev, Bukharin and their failure. True Marxist-Leninists have acted with determination at the decisive moment of impending danger from opportunists; they have stood up bravely and courageously and waged an uncompromising, bitter struggle of principle against the foes of

Marxism-Leninism. Lenin and his Bolshevik comrades were never intimidated even when they had to face fire from many sides, from the frenzied tsarist autocrats and later from Kerensky's bourgeois dictatorship, from the international imperialist bourgeoisie and from the treacherous leaders of the Second International; they courageously stood for the principles of Marxism-Leninism, and drew a clear distinction between themselves and the Mensheviks, the Trotskyites and the others in order to unite around the ideas of Marxism-Leninism with more firmness. We know very well what the Bolsheviks with Lenin in the lead did when they saw that all hopes to reform the Mensheviks were futile and that their continued membership in the same party with them was both harmful and impossible. Only when the Mensheviks were finally cast out in 1912 was the real unity of the Bolshevik Party established, and only in this manner could the latter become a revolutionary party, a vanguard in the whole international communist movement. In 1917, in response to those who continued to demand the union of all the Russian social democrats, Lenin wrote: "The union of the social democrats in Russia is out of the question. It is better to be reduced to two persons like Liebknecht — **and that means to stand by the revolutionary proletariat** — then to accept even for one moment the idea of uniting with the Party of the Organizational Committee (the Mensheviks — Ed.) with Ceixhen and with Tcheretel" (Volume 24, page 62, IVth Russian edition).

Marxism-Leninism has always emerged victorious in the struggle against capitalism and opportunism because, first and foremost, the Marxist-Leninists have always

drawn a line between themselves and the traitors to the proletariat, because all the masses oppressed and exploited by the international imperialists and the domestic bourgeoisie as well as the working class have sided with the revolutionary communists.

The process of ideologically unmasking, isolating and doing away with modern revisionism as a noxious disease in the body of international communism has already begun and is making speedy headway. This is a dialectic process which nothing can stop. The demagogy which Khrushchev's group uses cannot stop it, nor can Khrushchev and his followers, who misuse the authority of the great Lenin's Party, stop it for any considerable length of time. The high authority of the Soviet Union and of Lenin's Communist Party cannot be considered as the property of certain people, least of all the property of a group of renegades and revisionists like Khrushchev's group. The authority of the Soviet Union and of Lenin's Communist Party is preserved and defended not by words but by deeds, by those who consistently pursue Lenin's line, his successful teachings, by the fraternal parties which strive for the purity of Marxism-Leninism, by the Party of Labour of Albania, by the Bolsheviks of Lenin's Party itself, loyal to his revolutionary ways, by the communists and the revolutionaries of the entire world. By fighting modern revisionism they at the same time express their affection and respect for the country of the October Revolution, for the Party and ideas of the great Lenin, which a group of revisionists are trying to defile.

The creation of the Khrushchev-Tito common front of the revisionists, their collaboration, their common whet-

ting of weapons speeds up the process of political and ideological deterioration of modern revisionism, because the communist parties, the international communist movement, the working class see in their open coordinated deeds the ever increasing threat today to the international communist and workers' unity, and to the unity of the progressive and peace-loving forces in general. Therefore, fully confident of the inexhaustible revolutionary energy of Marxism-Leninism, we can say that there is no force in the world that can stop the triumphal march of its ever victorious ideas.

**CONCERNING THE THESES
FOR THE Xth CONGRESS
OF THE
ITALIAN COMMUNIST PARTY**

Article published in the newspaper
Zëri i Popullit

November 17-18, 1962

CONTENTS

CONCERNING PROBLEMS OF WAR, PEACE AND PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE	141
Peace at All Costs?!	141
Peaceful Coexistence or Reconciliation with the Bourgeoisie and Imperialism?	144
Peaceful Coexistence and the Attitude Towards National Liberation and Revolutionary Wars	147
Peace Is Not Safeguarded by Spreading Pacifist Illusions About the Imperialists	152
CONCERNING THE "ITALIAN WAY" TO SOCIALISM	159
A Denial of the General Laws of the Socialist Revolution Under Pretext of "National Peculiarities"	160
Making the Peaceful Way of Transition to Socialism Absolute "Democratic" Way or Denial of Dictatorship of the Prole- tariat?	164
The "Italian Way" — a "Parliamentary Way"	172
Transition to Socialism Within the Framework of the Present Italian Constitution?!	181
Substituting the Revolution with the Struggle for Social Reforms	188
Denying the Role of Leadership by the Marxist-Leninist Party	191
ON CERTAIN PROBLEMS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT AND OF THE RELATIONS AMONG COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES	197
P. Togliatti Speaks Ill of the Socialist Countries	206
Backing Up Revisionism Under the Pretext of Combating "Dogmatism"	207
Why Does P. Togliatti Stand Up for the Titoite Clique with So Much Fervor?	212
Who Is It That Splits the Unity of the International Com- munist Movement?	215
	220

The Theses for the Xth Congress of the Italian Communist Party which will be held on December 2, were published in the newspaper *Unità* on September 13 of this year. These Theses define the strategical and tactical line of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party both as regards the problem of the struggle for democracy, for the welfare of the workers and for socialism in Italy as well as certain basic problems of the present world situation and of the international communist movement.

In the Theses all the emphasis is laid on "the new conditions", on "the revolutionary processes" which are taking place also in the capitalist countries, on the "transformations of structures and superstructures" of present society in these countries. But under the pretext of "the new conditions" of the present period and of the "national characteristics" of Italy both the Theses and other material of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party deny some basic teachings of Marxism-Leninism and replace them with fallacious pacifist and non-revolutionary conceptions.

What strikes one's eye at the same time is the fact that both the Theses and other material of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party are contradictory: they contain a mixture of correct Marxist-Leninist theses and distorted non-Marxist notions, sometimes explicit and at other times inferred. The various theses and conceptions are often worded in ambiguous, vague lan-

guage which leaves leeway for maneuvering and interpreting them to fit the occasion.

The Theses are intended to be discussed in the Italian Communist Party and in a certain way also by the international communist movement. P. Togliatti himself stated before the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party responsible for the summoning of the 10th Congress that he is in favor of public discussion among the communist and workers' parties of questions on which there exist divergences of thoughts and opinions among them. He stressed at the same time that he is opposed to ungrounded polemics and "excommunications" and for a "friendly and well-intentioned exchange of ideas which would help our cause to move ahead".

The truth is that contrary to the principles they themselves have put forward, the leaders of the Italian Communist Party again launch public attacks on the Albanian Party of Labour in these Theses and in a downright arbitrary, ungrounded and far from friendly way reproaches it, claiming that it has allegedly alienated itself from the path of Marxism-Leninism, that it has allegedly drifted towards open refraction, towards splitting the communist movement, that it has allegedly abandoned proletarian internationalism and so forth and so on.

In view of all this we deem it necessary to state our views in connection with some non-Marxist ideas and assessments which the leaders of the Italian Communist Party are spreading about certain basic aspects of the present international situation, of the struggle for socialism and of the communist movement, and to point out in a concrete way who in reality have deviated from

the line of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

ON CERTAIN PROBLEMS OF WAR, PEACE AND PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

In essence the whole attitude of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party towards the problem of war, peace and peaceful coexistence can be summed up in these main points: the spreading of pacifist illusions about the bourgeoisie and the imperialists, particularly the American imperialists, capitulation to the atomic blackmail of the imperialists, reconciliation with capitalism under the pretext of "peaceful coexistence", ushering this in as the key to the solution of all the historic problems that stand before mankind at present.

PEACE AT ALL COSTS?!

Much is said in the Theses, in the speeches by P. Togliatti and other leaders, in all the propaganda of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party, about the transformation of the nature of war in our days, about the catastrophic consequences which a nuclear war would have on all humanity and human civilization and so on. "In contrast to all former wars," the Theses have it, "this would be a war of extermination of mankind and of modern civilization. After a war of this kind every possibility for progressive economic and social

development presumably throughout the world, but in any case, certainly in whole large regions of the world and first and foremost in Western and Central Europe, including Italy, would be dealt a tragic blow."

Propagation of the thesis of a new world war that would lead to the extermination of mankind and to the total ruin of human civilization **would certainly lead to capitulation to the threat of a nuclear war by the imperialists, to all-round concessions and subjugations to it.** This is precisely what is implied in P. Togliatti's speech to the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party on July 21, 1960 when he stated that under the present condition of the change in the nature of war, the Leninist thesis on just and unjust wars should be viewed with reserve. What other meaning could this have except that faced with the threat of a nuclear war by the imperialists we should renounce even just wars, the wars of the socialist countries to defend themselves from imperialist aggression, the revolutionary and national liberation wars! We are here faced likewise with an overvaluation of weapons and an undervaluation of the role of man in war as well as with the fallacious notion that the character of a war is no longer determined by its purpose and its objectives but by the change of the kinds of weapons.

It is a known fact that such capitulations are also expressed by declared revisionists. The French revisionist Pierre Erve, for instance, wrote in his book *Revolution and Fetishism* "Let us suppose that the assumption of power by the communists in our country would practically bring about a war between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. What else could

we do in such a case except to pronounce ourselves against the assumption of power?" This is the logical conclusion of capitulation to the atomic blackmail of the imperialists.

But it is precisely such a thing similar to what the revisionist Erve presumed, that took place before our own eyes a few days ago: the head of American imperialism, Kennedy, imposed a most ruthless blockade and made preparations for open aggression against revolutionary Cuba and, under the threat of launching nuclear war, demanded that Cuba be disarmed, that is, to lie at the mercy of American imperialism which is dead set on doing away with the Cuban revolution and the revolutionary movement in Latin America. Must we capitulate from head to foot to the threat of the American imperialists and sacrifice the Cuban revolution, the beacon light of the revolutionary and liberation movement throughout Latin America, under the pretext of sparing the world a "nuclear catastrophe"? No true communist and revolutionary would accept a thing of this kind. It is clear that a capitulating stand of this kind, besides being in itself a hard blow to the entire revolutionary and liberation movement of the world, would not only not help secure peace, but would result in whetting the appetite of the imperialists, in strengthening their aggressive and war-mongering tendencies. But no matter what the imperialists and revisionists may be up to, they will never be able to smother the Cuban revolution and its combative spirit. Socialist Cuba will live and march forward with courage.

We are well aware of the nature of present wars, of their catastrophic consequences, and that is why we

are dead set for peace, for avoiding war, and we deem it our primary duty to strive to stay the hand of the imperialists **before they succeed in launching a nuclear war.** But if we admit that the danger of war exists, that it comes from the imperialists and that the basis for aggressive wars exists so long as imperialism holds sway, something which even P. Togliatti and the other leaders of the Italian Communist Party are forced to admit, at least in words, so long then as this is admitted, it is very natural that **the communist and workers' parties, the socialist countries, peoples in every country should earnestly prepare for an eventuality of this kind both materially and intellectually so that they may be prepared for energetic and effective action at any moment to stay the hand of warmongering imperialists, to cause them total defeat, if they undertake the crazy action of launching a nuclear war.** By preaching only the terrors of war, as Togliatti does, for instance, they arouse panic and insecurity among the people, they discourage, mislead and demobilize them before the threats of the imperialists, they lower their efficiency for decisive action against the imperialist warmongers, they encourage the aggressive inclination of the imperialists. This is very harmful and jeopardizes the cause of peace and is of great danger to the socialist countries.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE OR RECONCILIATION WITH THE BOURGEOISIE AND IMPERIALISM?

In the Theses it is said: "The socialist states, especially the Soviet Union, have challenged the ruling

bourgeois classes to a peaceful competition for establishing an economic and social order in which the aspirations of men and peoples for freedom, for wellbeing, for independence, for all-round development and for respect for the dignity of the individual, for peaceful collaboration of all states will be gratified". An idea of this kind has been stressed also before by P. Togliatti in his report "The Italian Way to Socialism" made to the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party on June 24, 1956 where he stated: "The socialist countries today proclaim the urgency, I do not yet say to unite the world, but at least to create a higher level of cooperation among different peoples to solve the major issues before mankind."

What comes out of this?

An illusion is created that the ruling bourgeois classes could presumably agree to a competition to establish an ideal economic and social order in which all the aspirations and desires of men and peoples would find fulfillment (!), an idea is launched that it would be possible to establish collaboration between the socialist countries and "the ruling bourgeois classes," in other words collaboration with the big monopolist imperialist bourgeoisie which is at the head of the major capitalist countries to create an order like this in the world. But can such a world be created today when it is well known that the capitalist order in which the exploiting class hold sway, is still in existence in a large part of the world? If the leaders of the Italian Communist Party are of the opinion that all these miracles, that all this "general wellbeing" can be attained also within the framework of the capitalist order of things, this would

mean in fact to accept that capitalism has changed its oppressive and exploiting nature, to fall in line with all the revisionists, new and old, and the bourgeois ideologists, who, in one way or another, embellish capitalism, describe modern capitalism as "people's capitalism", speak of the capitalist state "of general well-being" etc.

As a matter of fact the leaders of the Italian Communist Party, under the pretext of "peaceful coexistence", preach reconciliation and all-round collaboration with the capitalist world, with imperialism "in order to solve the major issues confronting mankind." This idea is nothing less than a subtle variation of renegade Tito's theory on "the economic and political integration" of the world which was also upheld in essence by N. Khrushchev's group. The leaders of the Italian Communist Party substantiate the above thesis also with the attitude which they suggest should be maintained towards the "European Common Market". It is a known fact that the leaders of the Italian Communist Party have expressed themselves opposed to a "frontal" denunciation of the "European Common Market". Why? The Theses have it: ". . . attempts should be made within the framework of world struggle for peace and for peaceful coexistence, for the policy of international economic collaboration which would provide a way to overcome the obstacles lying in the way to a speedy, economic development which would lead to social progress. In Europe especially it is essential also to take a unified initiative to lay the basis for a European economic collaboration among states of differing social structures to allow for intensive exchange and for elim-

ination or reduction of custom house hindrances and for joint intervention to assist the underdeveloped countries within the framework of the economic and political organizations of the United Nations". This is in full agreement with N. Khrushchev's preachings to establish all-round economic collaboration between the countries of "the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance" and "the Common Market" even in the field of production (in connection with this see the article entitled "Modern Revisionism Serving the Basic Strategy of American Imperialism" published in *Zëri i Popullit* dated September 9 and 10, 1962).

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE AND THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS NATIONAL LIBERATION AND REVOLUTIONARY WARS

It is said in the Theses that "peaceful coexistence is based not only on the rejection of force as a means to solve international disputes but also on respect for the independence and sovereignty of each country and on non-interference in the internal affairs of other states . . ." "to 'export' neither counter-revolution nor revolution". The Theses further state that coexistence demands the "establishment of such an order of things in international relations as to allow each country and people to solve all the problems of its own existence according to its aspirations and interests, to be the indisputable master of its own destiny, to march ahead on the road to economic and social progress according to its interests, needs and capabilities. In this manner the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence is linked with the struggle for democracy and socialism".

These and the above-mentioned statements of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party lead to the following conclusions:

Firstly, it is not right to speak equally of the exportation of counter-revolution and "exportation of revolution". This is probably done to be "impartial" and "objective." But in fact this means to beat time to the bourgeois reactionary propaganda which raises a hue and cry about "the exportation of the revolution" from the socialist countries. Pleading the case in this manner compels one to admit that revolutions have been exported in the past and that there is danger that they will be exported at the present time as well. But this is contrary to the 1960 Moscow Declaration where it was stated that "guided by the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, the communist parties **have always opposed** the exportation of revolutions" (underlining by the editors).

History knows no case where revolution has been exported. Or do the leaders of the Italian Communist Party think that the revolution had been exported to the countries of the People's Democracies in Europe? If that is so, that would mean on the one hand, to belittle and deny the national liberation struggle of the peoples of these countries and on the other, to consider the liberating role of the Soviet Union as interference, as a violation of the rights of peoples for self-determination. Since not the Soviet but the Anglo-American army went to Italy, P. Togliatti poses as the representative of a country to which the revolution was not exported but it will triumph in a peaceful way according to "the Italian way to socialism". But even if we accepted for a moment his entirely untenable thesis, there are countries like

Albania where socialism did get the upper hand notwithstanding the fact that the Soviet army did not come here, although in this case too, the liberating role of the Soviet Union cannot be questioned. In Italy socialism and revolution did not win and this doubtless has its own reasons which we shall not go into here.

Secondly, the statements of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party give rise to the idea that peaceful coexistence will automatically fulfill all the desires and aspirations of men and peoples for freedom, wellbeing, independence, social progress and so on and so forth, that without the establishment of peaceful coexistence the people cannot themselves solve their problems, their destiny, their development. Therefore they must wait till peaceful coexistence takes root.

On the one hand the leaders of the Italian Communist Party broadcast illusions that the "ruling bourgeois classes" can agree to help solve "the major issues confronting mankind" within the framework of peaceful competition and peaceful coexistence, therefore the national liberation wars and revolutions are altogether unnecessary; on the other hand they claim that peoples cannot fulfill their aspirations, nor are the national liberation wars and revolutions possible so long as peaceful coexistence has not been established since this is fraught with the risk of aggression and of the exportation of counter-revolution by the imperialists. Thus both of these ideas, at first glance seemingly contradictory, lead but to one single opportunistic conclusion, namely, that at the present time national liberation wars and revolutions are **neither necessary nor can they be successful, for all the efforts of the communist and workers' parties,**

of the workers and peoples should be concentrated on establishing peaceful coexistence.

This is in truth a replica of N. Khrushchev's anti-Marxist theory considering peaceful coexistence as a "magic wand" to solve all the issues confronting human society today, a theory which serves the interests of the bourgeoisie and of imperialism for it weans the workers and peoples away from a determined revolutionary war for national liberation and social emancipation pending the solution of all problems through peaceful coexistence.

As to the question of exporting counter-revolution by the imperialists, it is true that the danger of outside intervention, of exportation of counter-revolution, exists in reality. This truth is borne out by the Anglo-French aggression against Egypt, the counter-revolutionary coup in Hungary, the aggression of the American imperialists against Cuba and a host of other facts and events. But, as the 1960 Moscow Declaration points out, the possibility exists today not only to export counter-revolution but also to halt it. This is quite possible in our time for the ratio of forces in the world has radically changed in favor of socialism to the disadvantage of imperialism. Imperialist aggression, that is, the exportation of counter-revolution, can be warded off if the forces defending the revolution and liberty, inside each country and in the international arena, the powerful socialist camp in the first place, unite and summon their forces and firmly oppose every aggressive and counter-revolutionary act of the imperialists, undaunted by imperialist blackmail.

Thirdly, a biased, anti-dialectic stand is maintained in the Theses and other materials of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party with regard to the relation between the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence on the one hand and the struggle for national emancipation, democracy and socialism on the other, no consideration is given to the influence they exert on each other. Only one side of the matter is emphasized, namely, that the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence is not only not opposed to the struggle for democracy and socialism but it even creates favorable conditions for its development. This is, in general, true if peaceful coexistence is correctly understood and carried out in a Marxist-Leninist way and not in the way the revisionists understand and carry it out. Yet, to stress **only** this side of the question is not at all correct, for the other and very important side is ignored, namely, that revolution and the national liberation wars are likewise a struggle for peace, that they are an effective means which, by weakening and shaking the position of imperialists, strengthen the position of peace in the world, help impose peace and peaceful coexistence on the imperialists. It is plainly pointed out in the 1960 Moscow Declaration that the success of the revolutionary class struggle and of the national liberation wars helps strengthen peaceful coexistence. The Declaration calls upon communists to contribute in every possible way so that the peoples by their active struggle for peace, democracy, national emancipation and socialism, weaken imperialism and narrow down its influence. This is the effective way to fight for peace and peaceful coexistence.

Fidel Castro was fully justified to stress in one of his speeches that to fight for peace and disarmament and against war "means not to adopt a passive stand but an active one in favor of the independence and emancipation of peoples" for "when more and more people rise up to fight for freedom there will be more chances for world peace and more shackles for the imperialists so that they may have less power to launch a war", for "when we (i.e. the Cuban revolutionaries — Ed.) liberated our country from imperialist bondage and set an example and pointed out the way to our fraternal peoples of Latin America, our people rendered a contribution to peace; when we issued the First Declaration and the Second Declaration of Havana, in which we promulgated our experience and the methods which we used to achieve the triumph of the Cuban revolution, when we did this, we rendered a contribution to peace."

**PEACE IS NOT SAFEGUARDED BY SPREADING PACIFIST
ILLUSIONS ABOUT THE IMPERIALISTS**

The leaders of the Italian Communist Party say they admit both possibilities: the possibility of forestalling a world war at the present time as well as the possibility of its breaking out. They claim at the same time and as far as this question goes, they strive in two directions: both against those that deny the possibility of forestalling the war at the present time as well as against those who underestimate the present risk of war.

The leaders of the Italian Communist Party reproach, in fact, the Marxist-Leninist parties for both

these fallacious trends. Thus, for instance, concerning the denial of the possibility to forestall war, P. Togliatti wrote in the magazine, *Rinascità*, (No. 12, 1961): "This is a wrong conception, but one can understand why it is adopted in those parts of the workers' movement directly and immediately confronted with continuous pressure and provocations from an aggressive and impudent imperialism like that of the United States, for instance, against the great People's Republic of China". In other words, since the Chinese are threatened by imperialism, they think, according to Togliatti, that war is inevitable. But Marxist-Leninist parties are reproached, in the Theses, for underestimating the risk of atomic war, for adventuresome tendencies. "We criticize," it is further said there, "and firmly reject every tendency in the workers' and peoples' movement, to trifle with the prospect of an atomic war by considering it a second-hand affair, and by denying the catastrophic nature of a new world war that would be waged with atomic weapons".

This of course is a rude distortion of the stand of the Marxist-Leninist parties who have never denied nor belittled the possibility of forestalling war at the present time nor the risk of it breaking out, nor have they "trifled" or trifle with the prospects of a nuclear war. The leaders of the Italian Communist Party with P. Togliatti at the head do nothing else in this regard except to repeat the accusations of imperialist propaganda, which tries in this way to justify the aggressive and warmongering acts of the imperialists as well as those of E. Kardelj and other Titoite renegades who speak of the danger of war coming from the socialist countries.

We do not deem it necessary to dwell any longer on this matter which is and has been clear for all. But what's the position of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party itself?

The leaders of the Italian Communist Party speak a great deal about the terror of war and one gets the impression that they assess correctly the risk of war. This does not correspond to the truth. If they really assess correctly the risk of war then how can they fail to expose the aggressive and warmongering policy of the imperialists and in the first place of the American imperialists where the danger of war lies. It is not enough to say that the aggressive nature of the imperialists has not changed, but one should **ceaselessly, day by day**, expose the concrete policy and acts of war and aggression in which the imperialists engage, the people should be ever alert and mobilized to stay the hand of the imperialists. Whereas in all their propaganda the leaders of the Italian Communist Party speak of the danger of war and of peace in general, in abstract terms and, except for some isolated case, the aggressive and warmongering policy of the imperialists, especially of the American imperialists, is not exposed as it should, no stress is laid on the fact that the struggle against imperialism, against its aggressive and warmongering plans, is a struggle for peace. Velio Spano even went so far at the World Council of Peace held in Stockholm in December 1962 as to insist that the struggle for peace should not be directed against imperialism.

Acting in this way the leaders of the Italian Communist Party in fact not only belittle the risk of war but weaken the chances for forestalling it, for, by keep-

ing the people in the dark as to whence the risk of war comes, they weaken the effective struggle for peace and leave a free hand to its launching to the warmongering imperialists.

Undervaluation of the risk of war on the part of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party stands out clearly also by the pacifist illusions which they spread that, as a consequence of the change of the ratio of forces in favor of socialism, and of the destructive nature of world war at the present time, more and more "realistic" and "peaceful" trends are evidenced in imperialist circles, especially in the USA. It is stressed in the Theses that "a trend of this kind exists even in the political group which is headed by the new President of the USA". "It would be wrong", the Theses continue, "to deny that distinct elements are continually making themselves evident among the ruling groups of imperialism". No one denies the fact that even among the imperialist ruling circles there are distinct individuals, there are elements in the world who see things with a more realistic view today. These distinct individuals and realistic trends should of course be taken into account, but there are two things that should be stressed here: firstly, that a clear line should be drawn between the true realistic elements and trends and the demagogists who try to waylay people, and secondly, these trends and individuals should not be overestimated, not much trust should be laid on them, for after all the line of policy of the imperialist countries is not determined by individuals but by the nature of the classes who hold economic and political sway over a country and whose

interests are expressed by the persons at the head of imperialist states.

But apparently the leaders of the Italian Communist Party consider as distinct individuals and realistic trends also those which are not such, those who hide the dagger behind the olive leaf, and concentrate their hopes for forestalling war and safeguarding peace on these "different" trends among the imperialist circles, on the "realist" and "peace-loving" stand of various leading individuals of the Western powers. The source of evil, according to them, lies in the pressure exerted on Kennedy, for instance, by the military circles, by the general staff, by the fascist organizations and so forth. Therefore the war for peace should not be directed against imperialism, against American imperialism in the first place, as the Moscow Declaration stresses, but against "the extremist groups which exist in every country and which are headed on the one side by the general staff and organizations inclined to fascism in the USA, and the combined German and French militarists, on the other".

These ideas are absolutely the same as those which of late Tito and N. Khrushchev have expressed openly. Specifically, N. Khrushchev declared in September of this year in an article "The Urgent Matters of Development of the World Socialist System" published in the 1962 September issue of the periodical *Communist*, that "sober statesmen of the West are tending more and more towards a realistic way out" that "the imperialists have taken the call for peaceful competition with socialism to heart," that the danger of an imperialist aggression against the socialist countries has passed or is passing away, that the imperialists "tend toward mobilizing all their forces to

fight the world socialist system in the spheres of economy, politics, ideology and so forth and so on."

From the theoretical point of view these conceptions are entirely wrong, they are an open deviation from historical materialism, from the class treatment of social phenomena, because the ruling circles of the Western powers and the general staffs are considered apart from the class they represent and made to appear as if they determine their policy independently. This is entirely a subjectivist treatment. While from the political, practical point of view these conceptions are very harmful because they spread pacifist illusions about Kennedy and the other imperialist leaders, they thus lull the vigilance of peoples and imperil the cause of peace, leaving a free hand to the imperialist warmongers.

But all these pacifist illusions which are being spread by the leaders of the Italian Communist Party, by N. Khrushchev's revisionist group, by Tito's clique and by all revisionists, are doomed to blow up like soap bubbles when faced with the facts and experience of life. What did the perilous adventure which the "realist" and "peace-loving" President of the USA, John Kennedy, undertook recently against heroic Cuba show? Where are "the differentiated individuals" about whom the Theses are so persistent? Or must Kennedy's aggressive and warmongering act be considered as "an acknowledged preoccupation for the security of the United States" and should one express to him "satisfaction and gratitude for recognizing the responsibility that now falls on him for the preservation of world peace"? It is really surprising that there are "communists" who have taken upon themselves the function of flattering presidents of USA and

the other heads of imperialism and of describing them as "wise men", "realistic", "peace-loving" etc. etc.

All of these clearly point out that it is precisely the leaders of the Italian Communist Party who, on the one hand, belittle the danger of war and on the other, weaken the possibility to avert it. If the imperialist aggressive wars can be averted today, this can be achieved not by spreading all kinds of illusions about "the good will and peaceful intentions" of the heads of imperialism, not by depending on the elements so differentiated in the leading circles of imperialism, but on the determined struggle of peoples to force peace and peaceful coexistence upon the imperialists, on the growing strength of the socialist camp and of the national liberation and revolutionary world movement.

The Theses and all the propaganda of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party consider general and total disarmament as the only effective way to safeguard peace and secure peaceful coexistence. Whereas the only effective way to achieve disarmament is, according to them, mutual agreements and talks with the imperialist powers. There is no doubt that the struggle to achieve disarmament is a struggle of primary importance in safeguarding and consolidating peace. But disarmament is not the only way. In order to safeguard peace and consolidate it one must consider the war for freedom, for national independence, for democracy and socialism as decidedly important as disarmament. And it is even thanks to this war of peoples to narrow down and weaken the positions of imperialism and to force peace on it that there can be chances for success in the field of disarmament and in the meetings and talks for disarmament.

But the leaders of the Italian Communist Party go even further. They consider the solution of the disarmament problem as the main link in the solution of all other world issues since, as P. Togliatti himself has pointed out in his report to the 9th Congress, the achievement of general and total disarmament would lead to "the total reorganization of the world on a new basis" in which the colossal means set free from disarmament would go to raising the standard of living of men throughout the world, to putting an end to misery, to epidemic diseases and to starvation, to raising the underdeveloped countries to a new level, and so forth; this means that imperialism could be transformed from an order of oppression, enslavement and exploitation of peoples to one that would foster the good and emancipation of peoples, that would strive to raise their standard of living and that would develop them. But if imperialism can do all these things, then what is the use of fighting against it, what is the use of revolutions and national liberation movements? This is where the gravely mistaken views of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party which are proclaimed far and wide as the "last" word of Marxism, lead to.

CONCERNING THE "ITALIAN WAY" TO SOCIALISM

According to the Theses and various other materials of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party, it turns out that the "Italian way" to socialism is charac-

terised by these main distinctive features: a) it takes into account the new phenomena in the world and the international characteristics of Italy; b) that it is a peaceful way; c) it is a democratic way which will be realized by making use of the parliament and by enacting "reforms of structure" envisaged in the Italian constitution. Let us dwell at some length on these topics.

**A DENIAL OF THE GENERAL LAWS OF THE SOCIALIST
REVOLUTION UNDER THE PRETEXT OF
"NATIONAL PECULIARITIES"**

The Theses and all the propaganda of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party emphasize the national and historical peculiarities of the various countries of the present time ignoring the general laws of socialist revolution and socialist construction. Two factors are stressed in the Theses and other materials in this connection:

1) It is emphasized "that revolutionary processes which are transforming the structure and superstructure of society in a radical way" have been and are being carried out in capitalist countries, including Italy in the first place, and that "economic and political transformations have taken and are taking place" in these countries. In the same context, P. Togliatti emphasized at the 8th Congress of the Italian Communist Party that "not only the make-up but the very structure of the capitalist regime has changed" in various countries. All of these create the impression that we are now faced with a qualitative change of the capitalist order. This reminds

one of the Yugoslav revisionist thesis that "capitalism in its classic form belongs to the past".

2) Proceeding from the changes that have taken place in the world in general the leaders of the Italian Communist Party loudly proclaim that the ways of transition to socialism in the present capitalist countries will be **very different** in comparison with those heretofore, that "the term dictatorship of the proletariat itself may assume another meaning" in different countries and under different conditions, that the basic experience of the Soviet Union and of the countries of the People's Democracy is not necessarily so essential to other countries, that this transition may also be done without doing away with the bourgeois state and without the leadership of the communist parties, etc.

This stand of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party is a departure from the general truth of Marxism-Leninism, from its basic revolutionary teachings, it is a headlong drift towards the positions of opportunism and revisionism.

Firstly, it is true that radical changes of a revolutionary character have taken place and have brought about a decided change in the world. These transformations are: the overthrow of capitalism in a series of countries and the establishment of the world socialist system, the disintegration of the colonial system of the imperialists and the advent of peoples formerly oppressed and enslaved into the historical arena. These two major changes of our times have led to the narrowing down of the sphere under imperialist domination and to the weakening of its position on all fronts.

As a result of these changes in the international arena, of the objective development of capitalism itself, of the aggravation of its irreconcilable contradictions and of the class struggle in capitalist countries, important changes have taken place, and new phenomena have come into being in the capitalist countries as well. These changes are related to the growth of the role and preponderance of the big capitalist monopolies in the economic and political life of the country, to the extension of state monopoly capitalism, to the growth of the economic role of the State in capitalist countries, to the establishment of international monopolist unions, and to the trend of capitalist economic and political integration, to an emphatic tendency to restrict the democratic life and institutions of democracy, to the attempts to replace the classic form of colonialism with neo-colonialism etc.

These changes have, no doubt, laid before the working class and its revolutionary parties in the capitalist countries new problems, new tasks, possibilities for more extensive alliances of the working class with the other strata of the population in the struggle against the domination of the monopolists, for democracy and socialism. But they have by no means changed the essence and nature of the capitalist order: from the economic point of view, they have not touched the private capitalist ownership of the means of production, from the political point of view, they have not touched the political rule of the bourgeoisie as a class, especially of the big monopolist bourgeoisie. These are the basic criteria by which to judge whether the capitalist order has changed in quality or not.

The new conditions and phenomena do not invalidate Marxism-Leninism, do not disprove its basic teachings on capitalism and imperialism, on the class struggle and revolution, on the state and the dictatorship of the proletariat etc., but on the contrary verify them in the best way. Therefore correct, revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist lessons should be drawn from them to help avoid reformist and pacifist illusions, not to curb the revolutionary spirit of the workers, not to lead them away from the struggle against capitalism, from revolution but on the contrary, to raise this struggle to a higher scale, to draw nearer the triumph of socialism and not to move away from it.

Secondly, there is no doubt that the new phenomena which have arisen in the world today, as well as the national characteristics of each country should certainly be taken into account, should be studied with scrutiny and conclusions drawn to help the successful development of the revolutionary movement of the working class. Ignorance of them, as the 1957 Moscow Declaration emphasizes, damages the cause of socialism, leads to isolation from reality, from the masses, leads to dogmatism. But in addition to all these changes, the new phenomena and national peculiarities, there exist general laws of socialist revolution and socialist construction which comprise the very essence of this necessary process for all countries, general laws discovered by Marxism-Leninism and verified by the experience of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries as well as of the entire international communist and workers' movement, general laws which are defined in the 1957 Moscow Declaration and reaffirmed by the 1960 Moscow Declaration.

Overvaluation of the new phenomena in the capitalist world and of the national peculiarities and undervaluation of the general laws, of the general truth of Marxism-Leninism on the socialist revolution and socialist construction, under the pretext of new phenomena and national peculiarities, as pointed out in the Moscow Declaration, is likewise damaging to socialism and leads to revisionism and nationalism. As V. I. Lenin had said the specific peculiarities of every country have nothing to do with what is important and common to them, do not effect nor change it. Peculiarities affect only the form, the rate and the method of transition of each country to socialism, thus causing the historic process of transition to socialism of each country to have its characteristic features, its special form, while it is in basic matter alike for all countries. Proletarian internationalism and the interest for a successfully waged war for socialism demand that this or that typical characteristic of each country, while taken into consideration and utilized, should not be given priority but the emphasis should be laid on what is of primary importance, on what is common and general, on what stands at the basis of the struggle for socialism. This is the basis of the unity of the socialist countries and of the entire international communist movement.

MAKING THE PEACEFUL WAY OF TRANSITION TO SOCIALISM ABSOLUTE

“The Italian way” to socialism is described by the leaders of the Italian Communist Party as a peaceful way. Naturally it is the right and the duty of every com-

munist and workers' party to take into account the external and internal historical conditions of the country and to determine its way of transition to socialism. We will only express our view as to how the leaders of the Italian Communist Party approach this problem especially because they advance their views as “a model of creative Marxism” and as the only way for all capitalist countries.

1) They say that the external factor that makes this peaceful method possible is that the forces of socialism are continuously growing throughout the world and are bringing nearer their victory in competition with capitalism. Moreover, the idea is even expressed that the non-peaceful way of transition to socialism is fraught with danger for it is linked with the outbreak of a world war. In this connection P. Togliatti and others reproach the Marxist-Leninist parties for being allegedly in favor of socialism triumphing over the ruins, in favor of “exporting the revolution through a world war.” In his speech to the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party dealing with the calling of the 10th Congress of the Party, P. Togliatti said that heretofore transition to socialism has taken place through two grave world crises — of 1917 and of 1945 — both of them connected with world war and stressed that it would be a grave mistake to work with such an objective in view. “Then,” Togliatti asked, “how can modern society be pushed towards socialism?” And he answered: “In a peaceful way”. He said that Lenin, in his time, had considered the thesis of the peaceful development of the revolution as a rare eventuality, whereas “we on the contrary have set it forth as a principle of a world strat-

egy of the workers' and communist movement under actual conditions".

The accusations of P. Togliatti and the other leaders of the Italian Communist Party against the Marxist-Leninist parties are unfounded and their views are far from being Marxist.

Firstly, there is no communist party which would strive to have socialism win through a world war. This is a base calumny. Nor is it true that socialist revolution has heretofore triumphed only under conditions of world war. This is a distortion of historic reality. It is very well known, for instance, that the revolution in China and in Cuba did not triumph under conditions of world war but a number of years after the Second World War. To treat of the problem the way P. Togliatti and the supporters of his views do, means in fact to play second fiddle to the bourgeois reactionary propaganda pretending that socialism can win only through war, that the communists are allegedly warmongers who try to establish socialism in the world through war. Kennedy too used precisely the same accusation to justify the imperialist aggression against Cuba.

Secondly, according to Togliatti there can be but one way to socialism, the peaceful way, because the danger of the outbreak of a world atomic war has shut the way to every other method, therefore, the non-peaceful way should be given up. This does not at all correspond to reality, it is a gross distortion of truth. In fact, the realization of socialist revolution in a non-peaceful way has not led nor should it lead to world war. That is an internal affair of each country. According to Togliatti, the existence "of a democratic regime and, as a consequence,

the possibility of democratic development" is an essential basic condition for peaceful transition to socialism. But Togliatti himself and the Theses maintain that there are two phenomena at work in the capitalist countries: an ever growing restriction of democracy and an ever open outside intervention in the affairs of other countries. Here is what the Theses say about this: "This tendency is manifested in various ways: by the preservation of open fascist regimes, or regimes of the fascist type (Spain, Portugal, Greece etc.), by the decadence of the parliamentary regime which may deteriorate to totalitarian forms of government (France), by the revival of nazi militarism and the suppression of the political organization of the working class (the Federal Republic of Germany), by the maintenance of racial, anti-democratic and anti-communist discriminations (USA), by forcing brutal reactionary regimes on South Korea, on South Vietnam, on Formosa and elsewhere on the part of the American imperialists. The situation is significant in the Latin American countries, a region under United States influence and domination, where nearly no state enjoys real democratic prerogatives, where the people submit to tyrannical regimes, where they are exploited and oppressed in the interests of American imperialism, where they are in no position to face and solve the problems of their economic and social development and progress freely. Even in countries like Italy where the combative power of the workers' movement has so far hampered such anti-democratic trends to take the upper hand, the latter trends have recently manifested themselves openly (Tambromi's attempts) and remain outstanding in the policy of the ruling capitalist circles".

It therefore turns out that there is a contradiction in the arguments of P. Togliatti and the other leaders of the Italian Communist Party, an outspoken contradiction between the actual reality in the capitalist world and their opportunistic thesis about the peaceful way as a "principle of the world strategy of the proletariat". Another question arises in addition to this: What are the communist and workers' parties to do in those countries where the democratic regime and the possibility of democratic development do not exist and where there is danger of outside interference? According to P. Togliatti they should wait until favorable conditions are created and then pass over to socialism in a peaceful way. In opposing Kautzky's theories V. I. Lenin wrote that imperialism "... is less inclined to peace and freedom and more bent upon developing strong and general militarism. To ignore this when taking up the question of how typical and feasible peaceful or non-peaceful revolution is, means to be reduced to a very commonplace servant of the bourgeoisie" (*Works*, Vol. 28, page 267 — Albanian edition).

Thirdly, the triumph of socialism in a series of countries, the creation of the world socialist system and its achievements, create favorable conditions for the triumph of socialism in general, hasten the **victory** of socialism in separate countries and in the world at large, **regardless of the way in which the revolution will be carried out** in different countries, in peaceful or non-peaceful ways. The socialist countries play a primary role especially in forestalling the exportation of the counter-revolution on the part of imperialism, in warding off foreign intervention. But in forestalling exportation of armed

counter-revolution from abroad the decisive role is played by internal factors, by the determined opposition of the working masses led by the communist party. **The foreign factor cannot be decisive in determining this or that way of transition to socialism in different countries**, although it exerts a certain influence on it. As the 1960 Moscow Declaration points out, "The actual possibility of this or that method of transition to socialism in each separate country is determined by the concrete historical conditions," "the forms and methods of developing the socialist revolution will depend on the actual ratio of forces in this or that country, on the degree of organization and maturity of the working class and its vanguard, on the strength of resistance of the ruling classes."

2) The leaders of the Italian Communist Party say that the internal factor which points to the peaceful way of transition to socialism in Italy is the position of the Italian working class and its vanguard party; this position has been attained in the ten-year long struggle during which they have been at the head of the people during the most critical moments. It is true that the Italian working class, led by the Communist Party, have waged a long war of many years against the fascists, against the German nazis, against the reactionary forces of the country, during which they have become a political force in the life of the country and have secured some freedom and democratic rights for themselves and for Italian workers in general.

From this point of view the working class of Italy possesses its own peculiarities as far as its economic and political position in Italian life and society are concerned.

But this position of the Italian working class should not be overestimated and made absolute, because in reality it is not essentially different from the position of the working class in other capitalist countries: it is an oppressed and exploited class, divested of the means of production and kept at bay as far as State power goes.

Although the Theses and other material of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party stress the peaceful method, yet they admit, at least formally, that "it is not certain that uprising and civil war can be averted", that "the bourgeois reactionary groups are always predisposed to the use of force to bar the road to social and political progress." P. Togliatti too has often pointed to this, emphasizing: "Peaceful and painless development will depend on an intricate complexity of conditions, some of which depend on us, others on the objective development of events and still others on the attitude of adversaries. It would be mad to think it a certainty that socialism could triumph in Italy without a bitter clash of classes. . . . If we do not want to waylay the working class and the members of our Party we will never say that peaceful development is completely assured" (*Rinascita*, No. 7, 1956).

This is quite right. But if this is so, it is clear that the communist party should prime the masses and itself for the eventuality of the non-peaceful way as well. How true are Lenin's words that the working class should master, without the least exception, all the forms of struggle, should be ready to replace one form with the other as quickly and suddenly as possible. "The working

class," Lenin wrote, "would naturally prefer to get the reins of state into its own hands in a peaceful way . . . but to **renounce** the revolutionary way of assuming power by the proletariat would be **madness** both from the theoretical as well as from the political and practical point of view, it would only mean leniency towards the bourgeoisie and to all the wealthy classes." If one does not prepare for both eventualities at the same time, for the peaceful and non-peaceful way, one is likely to lose both possibilities. Also in those countries where the possibility of the peaceful development of the revolution exists, the communist parties, while making all efforts to take advantage of this possibility, should not make it an absolute method by any manners or means, because there is always a possibility which, due to a change of conditions and circumstances which in themselves cannot be foreseen with exactitude for they do not depend on us alone, might change to the contrary. In fact, if one is prepared at the same time for the non-peaceful eventuality, the chances for realizing the peaceful way grow stronger.

But what actually do the leaders of the Italian Communist Party do to face the eventuality of the non-peaceful way and to avoid being caught unawares? Absolutely nothing. On the contrary they do not even like to hear of the simultaneous preparation for both eventualities. Moreover, as we shall see in more detail below, they spread all kinds of opportunist and reformist illusions among Party members and the working class in order to justify their orientation only to the "peaceful" way.

“DEMOCRATIC” WAY OR DENIAL OF THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT?

It is forcefully stressed in the Theses and in the other materials of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party that the Italian way to socialism is a **democratic** way and, in one way or another, is set against the way pursued by the Soviet Union and the countries of the People's Democracy which they consider as “a road filled with mistakes and pain, with gross violation of socialist justice, of freedom and of the democratic life of the country and of the Party” etc. At least two things come out of this: a) that the Italian way will be a **very different** one from the general Marxist-Leninist way which has been pursued by the socialist countries, a thing which the leaders of the Italian Communist Party themselves do not deny; b) that **only the Italian way** claims to be a democratic way, whereas the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries seem to have pursued an anti-democratic way, a thing which is a slanderous lie.

“We are democrats,” Togliatti said at the 8th Congress of the Italian Communist Party, “because we move within the framework of the constitution, of the democratic traditions and of the legality which it defines.” In other words, according to Togliatti, if one does not move within the framework of the bourgeois constitution and of capitalist legality, but violates them in a revolutionary way, then he ceases to be a democrat. This is exactly what the bourgeoisie does when it brands the communists as “rebels”, “disturbers of peace”, “smashers of democracy”, and so forth.

In this connection they may accuse us of being “dogmatists”, “adventurers” and what not, saying that we are

allegedly of the opinion that the Italian working class and communists should give up their struggle for democracy, should give up upholding the constitution, etc. This is not true at all: we are fully aware of the importance of the struggle for democracy, its significance under the present conditions, especially for countries like Italy, we are fully aware of the close relation between the struggle for democracy and the struggle for socialism, we are conscious of the fact that one cannot be called a communist if one is not at the same time a real democrat. But that is not the question. The question is that the leaders of the Italian Communist Party claim that the peaceful way, the so-called “Italian” way is the only democratic way.

But let us stop and analyze in essence what the leaders of the Italian Communist Party really understand by the “democratic” way. It is pointed out in their various publications that the Italian way is the way “of consistent democratic development and of the development towards socialism through a realization of the reforms of structure envisaged by the constitution itself” (P. Togliatti “The Italian Way to Socialism”, June, 1956). The Theses maintain: “The struggle to give Italian democracy a new socialist make-up has a wide field of development in the constitution. The Italian way to socialism passes through the building of a new State envisaged by the constitution (which is something quite different from the present regime) and through the assumption of its leadership by new classes”. The Theses maintain at the same time: “The establishment of an Italian way to socialism is in this way a process of the struggle of the masses towards positive objectives which will bring about modifications in

the economic structures and in the political order, will continually change the ratio of forces in favor of the working class and its allies and will bring about the formation of a social and political bloc capable of realizing the constitutional socialist transformation in Italy within the framework of legality". They tell us that it is precisely under such terms that the Italian way is spoken of as a democratic way. Let us dwell a little longer and in more detail on this question.

The idea of the socialist revolution and of the dictatorship of the proletariat is not at all spoken of in any definitions or publications of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party about the transition of Italy to socialism. It is not a matter of the use of such terms as "socialist revolution" and "dictatorship of the proletariat", though this formal side bespeaks a sort of dread and fright towards these basic revolutionary ideas of Marxism-Leninism, apparently not to intimidate the bourgeoisie (!). The question at issue is that these basic teachings of Marxism-Leninism are essentially ignored in the Theses and the other publications of the leaders of the Communist Party of Italy.

All communists are acquainted with the Leninist thesis that only he can be a communist who extends his acceptance of the class struggle up to the acceptance of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for it is precisely through this that the real understanding and acceptance of Marxism is proved, for the dictatorship of the proletariat, being indispensable and equal in make-up and in essence for all countries embarking on the road to socialism may take and it really does take different forms in compliance with the concrete historical conditions of every country.

Whereas in the Theses it is maintained that "the term of the dictatorship of the proletariat itself may assume a different make-up" in comparison with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. Thus, it is not a question of the form alone but of the **very make-up** of the dictatorship of the proletariat. But if the make-up or the essence changes then it may be a question of any other kind of state but never of the dictatorship of the proletariat. We do not hold by formal terms, but we think it is not a question of an error on the part of the authors of the Theses; we base our judgment on all the arguments of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party on the Italian way to socialism which in **fact, in essence** deny the very idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat as an essential condition of the transition from capitalism to socialism.

The classic authors of Marxism-Leninism have stressed that the dictatorship of the proletariat is an entirely new state which can be established only when the old capitalist state apparatus is radically crushed, for the working class and its party cannot keep the bourgeois state apparatus intact and use it for their interests and purposes. This is one of the basic teachings of Marxism-Leninism put to the test by the historic experience of all socialist revolutions so far. V. I. Lenin emphasized that especially in the stage of imperialism when the bureaucratic, police and military capitalist state apparatus has taken colossal proportions, it must be insisted that the bourgeois state machinery be done away with (see *The State and Revolution*).

Whereas P. Togliatti, referring to this thesis, says: "When we, in fact, say that a way to socialism is possible

not only in the field of democracy but also making use of the parliamentary forms, it is clear that we are making an amendment to something in this line by taking into account the transformations which have taken place and are still taking place in the world" (P. Togliatti: "The Italian Way to Socialism", June 24, 1956). L. Longo said in his report to the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party in April, 1962, that "the weight which the centers of monopolist power have assumed and the extent of contradictions which they give rise to make us look at the problem of doing away with the state apparatus in a prism different from that rightfully formulated by Lenin".

That means according to the leaders of the Italian Communist Party, that this thesis of Marxism-Leninism was valid only in the past whereas now it needs to be "corrected", "revised" to fit the "new conditions", and, of course, in the "creative" spirit of Marxism!

It is clear that the thesis of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party on the need of re-examining the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, on breaking up the bourgeois state machinery is connected, first and foremost, with their conception of the class nature of the present bourgeois state. L. Longo again expresses this idea clearly in the above-mentioned report when he says: ". . . The liquidation of monopolies and their power may be done without assuming the reins of state as well, provided there exist adequate social and political ratio of forces". And he continues: "We say that under the present circumstances the power of the monopolies can be curbed and modified in a real sense through the action of the political power". As a first step, he says, we aim at

freeing the political power from the economic power of the monopolies and later to limit and modify the economic power of the monopolies through political action. Thus it turns out that the power of the monopolies can be directed against the monopolies.

The truth is that Longo admits that "socialist society cannot 'mature spontaneously' within the old capitalist social and political formation", that "a complete socialist transformation of society cannot be achieved if the working class and its allies do not take the reins of state into their hands". But all of these go to show that the first steps towards socialism and the beginnings of socialist society can also be made within the framework of the capitalist order of things and even by utilizing for this purpose the present bourgeois state itself. Longo makes this very clear when he poses the question: "Is it possible to intervene in economic development by political action even in an order where trends of the capitalist system are still predominant? (Does this mean that only trends of the capitalist system are still predominant in Italy?! — Editors.) In other words: are the laws of capitalist development so rigid that, in order to bridle and modify them even partially, the working class has no other alternative than to overthrow the capitalist system **in total** and replace it with the socialist system?"

This gives rise to a "new" conception of the relation between economy and politics, between the basis and the superstructure in the process of transition from capitalism to socialism. It turns out that, contrary to one of the fundamental characteristics of the socialist revolution which, unlike all other revolutions of the past, begins with the seizure of political power as an essential and

decisive means of socialist transformation of the economy and of the entire social life from the first steps until complete construction of socialism, the leaders of the Italian Communist Party believe that it should not begin there but from the change of economy, from the change of economic laws of capitalism, from the abolition of the economic power and basis of the monopolies. And what is more, this is to be done, according to them, by utilizing the present capitalist state, the state of the monopolists, itself.

And how would all this be brought about according to the leaders of the Italian Communist Party? They maintain that this will be brought about "by setting up an adequate ratio of social and political forces" as a result of which the capitalist state may be compelled to act against the monopolies and in favor of the working masses by carrying out "fundamental reforms of structure" towards socialism. Velio Spano was more outspoken at the meeting of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party, prior to the 8th Congress of the Party in September 1956: "Every state," he said, "is a dictatorship; but it may happen that another class may be strong enough to effectively limit the activity of the class in power".

Just what "clear perspectives" these notions open to the party and the working class in Italy can be seen in the words of P. Togliatti himself who said at the meeting of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party on the eve of the 10th Congress: "How will it be achieved to put an ultimate end to this power (the power of the monopolies — Editor), we do not know, but we open a

pathway ahead, a warpath, which will develop in most varied forms".

All of these constitute an open departure from the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, from the classic Marxist-Leninist conception of the state:

Firstly, history records many cases of equilibrium of forces of different classes in power. Such cases have been, for instance, as V. I. Lenin points out, the absolute monarchies of the XVII and XVIII centuries in France, Bismarck in Germany and others elsewhere which were a relative equilibrium of the feudal lords and the bourgeoisie. But these were an equilibrium of forces between two exploiting classes at the cost of and against the workers.

Secondly, it also occurs that the state may be the dictatorship of two classes, like the case of the revolutionary dictatorship of the working class and the laboring peasantry (directed against the exploiting classes) which is a transitory state pending the transition from the bourgeois or feudal-bourgeois order to the socialist order.

Thirdly, the case is also on record of the temporary existence of two powers of opposite classes in the same country such as occurred in Russia in the first period after the 1917 February revolution. V. I. Lenin foresaw the possibility of peaceful development of the socialist revolution under these conditions by working out a concrete program of transitory measures in the field of economy for this purpose. But Lenin linked the transition to socialism under these circumstances too, with an imperative condition that all **state power be vested in the soviets**. Anyhow, no parallelism could be drawn between the situation in Russia then and the situation in Italy now,

where no powerful revolutionary movement is afoot as in Russia of that time, where the people are not armed as there and where they do not possess a government of their own to match that of the exploiting classes. The leaders of the Italian Communist Party themselves reproach those "who see the perspective of dualism of power, that is to say the perspective of developing a workers' power as an alternative of bourgeois power" (see L. Longo's report to the 10th Congress of the Italian Communist Party).

Thus it is clear that in antagonistic society there can be no power to stand above classes, to act in the interests of the exploited and of the exploiters. But the present leaders of the Italian Communist Party stand more or less on these positions. P. Togliatti himself has expressed this idea in quite an explicit way in a speech published in the newspaper *Unità* dated September 26, 1956 where he says: "Concrete political and historical conditions have changed. A battle is being waged and new transitory positions are being arrived at and intermediary forms are being created."

The well known Italian revisionist Giolitti, with whom the present leaders of the Italian Communist Party themselves have entered into polemics, has said in essence but in different words the same thing in his book *Reforms and the Revolution* (published in 1957): "At the present time new forms of power arise in practice and are written down in theory which could not be defined either as dictatorship of the proletariat or as dictatorship of the bourgeoisie". The same thing is said in the Program of the Yugoslav Communist League: "It is possible that the development of the class struggle

towards the dictatorship of the proletariat may enrich more and more the different political forms with different transitory forms of dual political power and compromise, in which the interests of the working class will come more and more to the fore until this influence will eventually become dominant in the political form which will come into being under the concrete conditions of the class struggle".

All of these are nothing else except harmful reformist illusions, they are anti-Marxist theses that confound the communist party and the working class. Lenin stressed with great emphasis that "the struggle to free the working masses from the influence of the bourgeoisie in general and of the imperialist bourgeoisie in particular cannot be carried out without fighting the opportunist prejudices in connection with 'the state'" (*Selected Works*, Albanian edition, Vol. 11, page 143).

THE "ITALIAN WAY"—A "PARLIAMENTARY WAY"

The leaders of the Italian Communist Party rest their hopes for transition to socialism on using the parliament and on conforming to the present Italian constitution.

More than once have the leaders of the Italian Communist Party stressed that "it is possible to proceed towards socialism also through parliamentary forms". Thus, for instance, the programmatic statement of the 8th Congress of the Italian Communist Party, the rightness of which was reaffirmed once more by L. Longo in his report prior to the 10th Congress, claims: "that the democratic institutions can be developed into

an effective basis of a regime which by warding off the subversive attempts of the monopolist groups and by divesting them of their power, will lead the way to socialism" because "parliament can and should exercise an active function . . . provided forms of direct democracy may and should develop at the same time in order to further the superiority of socialist democracy". P. Togliatti also wrote in an article published in *Pravda* on March 7, 1956 that ". . . parliament which in the past served to organize and consolidate the capitalist regime, may today become an effective means in the hands of parties who strive for socialist transformation of the society."

On the other hand, P. Togliatti protests "most energetically" against those who have expressed the opinion that "the Italian way to socialism is a parliamentary way and nothing more". Why does P. Togliatti maintain such a reserve? Why does he insist on holding aloof from the expression "parliamentary way"? Apparently because he feels the weakness of his reformist stand. In his report on "The Italian Way to Socialism" made to the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party on June 24, 1956 he said: ". . . if an all-round identity is established between 'the Italian way' and the 'parliamentary way' there is danger of creating harmful illusions, on the one hand, and grave disillusion, on the other. The comrade busy at work in the factory who knows how burdensome the rule of the boss is, the citizen who has succeeded in realizing what the nature and weight of the power of the capitalist ruling classes are and, on the other hand, sees what our present parliament is like, may come to the conclusion that a radical

reversal can never be attained in this manner". Very well! But what then, according to Togliatti, is the distinction between "the Italian way" and the "parliamentary way"? What must be done to forestall such illusions? P. Togliatti in fact makes no tangible distinction; he only says that in order to make successful use of parliament for the purpose of making headway towards socialism it is necessary to fulfill these essential conditions: a parliament that would be a true mirror of the country; a parliament that would function; a massive popular movement to raise the demands which later could be fulfilled in a parliament where the popular forces will have secured an adequately powerful representation. The question is here again of a "parliamentary way". One can even find issues of *Unità* with large type captions on whole pages "Transform the aspect of Italy by votes!"

This is made even clearer if we take into account the fact that it was precisely in connection with "the use of parliamentary forms" that P. Togliatti deemed it advisable to revise the thesis of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on the exigency of breaking up the bourgeois state apparatus as an essential condition under which transition to socialism can be achieved. This view of P. Togliatti really means to spread opportunist parliamentary illusions claiming that the will of the working class and of the other working masses of the people could allegedly be forced on the present capitalist state through the bourgeois parliament.

But this viewpoint of the Italian communist leaders is, if not identical with, very similar to K. Kautzky's opportunist illusions which V. I. Lenin has already refuted. "The duty of the masses on strike, — Kautzky used to

say,— can never be to **destroy** the state power, but only to oblige the government to make concessions on a definite issue or to replace a government opposed to the proletariat with a government that lends it a hand. . . . But this” (i.e. the victory of the proletariat over the government opposed to it), “can never lead to the **destruction** of state power but only to a kind of **replacement** . . . of the ratio of forces **within the state power**. . . . Thus, the objective of our struggle, remains as heretofore, the seizure of state power by winning majority votes in parliament and by making parliament master over the government”. “Here,” V. I. Lenin says, “we have opportunism in its purest and most vulgar form: here, though admitted in word, we have renunciation of the revolution in fact. Kautzky’s opinion does not go further than ‘a government which lends a hand to the proletariat’, a step backwards to Philistinism in comparison with 1847 when the *Communist Manifesto* proclaimed ‘the organization of the proletariat into a ruling class’. As for us, we shall draw the line with the opportunists; and all the conscientious proletarians will be with us in the struggle, not for a mere ‘replacement of the ratio of forces’, but for the **overthrow of the bourgeoisie**, for the **breakup** of bourgeois parliamentarism, for the democratic republic of the type of the Commune, or for the republic of the Soviets of the representatives of the workers and soldiers, for the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat” (V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 25, pp. 459-460, Russian edition). Could Kautzky’s ideas which Lenin repudiated as entirely anti-Marxist and opportunist have become realizable under the present conditions of Italy?!

It should always be borne in mind not to overestimate the role of parliaments, not to create opportunist illusions that the socialist transformation of society could allegedly be done through them. One should not lose sight of two tendencies of the bourgeoisie towards parliaments in capitalist countries today, two tendencies which the leaders of the Italian Communist Party themselves are obliged to admit:

Firstly, the bourgeoisie make use of the most varied means to prevent a broad representation of the working masses in parliament beginning with the day-to-day ideological pressure exerted on the voters through vast means of propaganda, restrictions of various kinds to free participation of workers at the polls and even changes in the electoral system etc.

Secondly, the bourgeoisie, particularly the monopolist bourgeoisie, are tending ever so openly towards limiting the rights and prerogatives of parliaments in order to concentrate power in the hands of the executive. The clearest proof of this in our days are the de Gaulle’s doings in France to amend the constitution.

In the imperialist stage, which, as Lenin has pointed out, is reaction in all fields, there is always the danger of establishing military or fascist dictatorships every time the monopolist bourgeoisie feel that even the regimes of curtailed bourgeois democracy risk their interests. Isn’t there a good proof of this in the existence of fascism in Spain and Portugal, in the establishment of de Gaulle’s dictatorship in France, in the persecution of the Communist Party in the USA, in Western Germany and elsewhere, the military coups in Argentine and in other countries of Latin America, etc.? This is a reality that

could not escape the notice of nor be belittled by any earnest revolutionary party of the working class. Under these conditions, it would be very harmful to the great cause of the struggle for socialism, to lay hopes for transition to socialism on the parliament and on general suffrage, to create parliamentary illusions, to direct the struggle of the workers **only** or **entirely** towards this goal.

We, of course, are not nor could we be opposed to using the bourgeois parliament in the interests of the working class and its struggle. It is well known that V. I. Lenin warned against "the infantile disorder of communism", against extreme "leftists" who denied the communist parties the expediency of utilizing parliaments to defend the interests of the working class, to expose the bourgeoisie and their rule, the insincerity of bourgeois democracy and to force definite measures on the bourgeoisie in favor of the workers, etc. The working class and its communist party should raise aloft the banner of democratic rights and liberties which the bourgeoisie have trampled under foot especially at the present time. Under the present conditions of bitter antagonism between the big monopolies on the one side and all the other classes on the other, there are more chances for using parliaments to carry on an extensive democratic and anti-monopolist fight. Therefore, it is a duty of prime importance for the communist parties in democratic-bourgeois capitalist countries to wage an all-round democratic and anti-monopolist war in parliaments and outside them.

But it is essential that, while fighting for democracy and the democratic rights of people, while fighting for

the use of parliaments in promoting the cause of the working class, the masses should be warned against perilous parliamentary illusions, they should be enlightened on the falsity of the bourgeois democracy even in the "most democratic" bourgeois republics, on the falsity of bourgeois parliamentarism, the masses should be trained in the revolutionary spirit of overthrowing the false bourgeois democracy and of replacing it with the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is real democracy for the broadest masses of people.

However, the leaders of the Italian Communist Party conceive of the democratic way to socialism through parliament as one with no leeway for abolishing false bourgeois democracy and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat. "The democratic way to socialism," L. Longo said in his September 1956 report to the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party on the eve of the 8th Congress of the Party, "is the way towards a broader, more secure and more effective democracy which, through broadening the scope of the democracy in existence, particularly by basing it on more sound social bases, transforms it into a real democracy for all, that is, a democracy of persons of equal political and social rights, in other words, into a socialist democracy." By rejecting exactly such opportunist illusions and by exposing the falsity of bourgeois democracy V. I. Lenin wrote that ". . . progress through this capitalist democracy (which is of course self-centered, which keeps the poor secretly away, which is, therefore, hypocritical and deceptive from head to foot) to an ever broader democracy cannot be brought about so easily, straight away and without struggle as the liberal professors and the

petty bourgeois opportunists think. No! Progress towards communism is made through the dictatorship of the proletariat and in no other way for there is no other class and no other way to **overcome the resistance** of the capitalist exploiters" (*Selected Works*, Vol. 2, page 204, Albanian edition).

TRANSITION TO SOCIALISM WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE PRESENT ITALIAN CONSTITUTION?!

In determining the "Italian way", the "democratic way" to socialism the leaders of the Italian Communist Party rest great hopes on the present Italian constitution. Speaking before the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party P. Togliatti stressed that: "we should look forward to socialist progress made along the lines set forth and foreseen by the Constitution which is the field of democratic liberties and of progressive social transformations. . . . This constitution is not yet a socialist constitution; but since it is the expression of a broad, unified, renovating movement, it differs a great deal from other bourgeois constitutions; it represents an effective basis of development of Italian society along the path that leads to socialism". And he continues, ". . . This is the sense in which we think that the working class may succeed in playing the leading role in the socialist revolution under the concrete Italian situation". And speaking before a meeting at Frascati on November 20, 1961 P. Togliatti stated that the Italian communists intend to achieve socialism ". . . not through civil war, through bitter and armed conflict, but through the enactment of

reforms foreseen in the Italian Constitution, and through the democratic struggle for the unity of the popular masses".

Again opportunist illusions about the "Italian democracy". This is entirely identical with what Giolitti, whom Togliatti and others reproached for revisionism, expressed at the 8th Congress of the Italian Communist Party when he said that the Italian road to socialism passes through the Constitution of the Republic and the reforms of structure! The leaders of the Italian Communist Party claim that the Italian constitution is allegedly radically different from other bourgeois constitutions, that though it may not yet be a full-fledged socialist constitution, it nevertheless, contains in itself many socialist principles but which "unfortunately" is not put into execution by the Italian government, therefore they direct and concentrate all their attention, all the struggle of the working class, on carrying out the stipulations of the Constitution and the reforms which it envisages. And they claim to attain socialism in this manner!

We do not intend by any means to belittle the importance which the Italian Communist Party and the Italian workers attach to the struggle to safeguard and further the democratic rights and freedoms foreseen in the Italian Constitution. It is true that it is a democratic constitution which has come into being as a result of the struggle of the working class and of the Italian Communist Party against fascism, that it contains some advanced demands on the capitalist world in favor of the working class and of the laboring masses. And of course the struggle to implement these demands is of primary importance.

But these should not all be overvaluated and exaggerated. In fact the present Italian constitution is a bourgeois democratic constitution which does not at all make an exception to the other bourgeois constitutions which have come into being especially as a result of the struggle against fascism. Therefore it is very harmful to create illusions about the Italian constitution and to confine the struggle of workers and of the communist party to the demand of implementing the constitution. This would in fact mean to give up the socialist revolution and remain within the framework of the capitalist order.

In truth what the Italian constitution foresees are formal freedoms and rights which are daily trampled upon by the bourgeoisie, a thing which the leaders of the Italian Communist Party themselves admit. It foresees, for instance, certain limitations on private property, or the right to work, but there has never been any effective limitations on the property of capitalist monopolies but on the contrary there has been a rapid concentration of capital in the hands of a few or in spite of the proclamation of the right to work for all, Italy stands out for chronic mass unemployment etc. Moreover it should not be forgotten that the Italian ruling classes have made various attempts to limit Italian democracy, it should not be forgotten that in certain capitalist countries in Europe, as France, for instance, they have succeeded in attaining their goal. Therefore, illusions of any kind about bourgeois democracy, about bourgeois parliamentarism, about bourgeois democratic constitutions, are very harmful to the cause of the working class and to socialism.

SUBSTITUTING THE REVOLUTION WITH THE STRUGGLE FOR SOCIAL REFORMS

The leaders of the Italian Communist Party make a lot of the "reforms of structure" which they consider as the most effective means for the socialist transformation of the Italian society under the present conditions. These reforms affect the demands for higher pay and reduction of hours of work, the demands to set up committees in the factories and workshops to supervise their economic productive capacities, the demand to carry out agricultural reform laws, to nationalize the big monopolies and to establish a system of control on monopolies etc.

What is the nature of these reforms? The stand of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party in this matter is contradictory. On the one side they say that these reforms are of a general democratic nature. Thus, for instance, in a speech at the party council of the city of Moscow on June 27, 1960, P. Togliatti said: "We are fully aware of the fact that these demands are not socialist, but they are in essence democratic demands of a progressive nature". While, on the other hand, they claim that the implementation of these reforms is the way to socialism. In his report "The Italian Way to Socialism" dated June 24, 1956, referring to the program of these reforms P. Togliatti said: "A movement which we could steer and lead towards these revendications and these reforms, is, no doubt, a movement towards socialism".

The leaders of the Italian Communist Party try to justify these contradictions by referring to Lenin's sayings that there is no Chinese wall between democracy and socialism, thus using the relation existing between the

struggle for democracy and the struggle for socialism as an argument. This is of course a just thesis but it should be viewed in a dialectic and not in a one-sided way. The whole trick here is that they stress in a one-sided way **only the relation** between the struggle for democracy and the struggle for socialism but ignore the **distinction** between them for they **confine the struggle for socialism to the struggle for democracy alone**. But this would mean, in fact, to remain within the framework of the existing capitalist order of things. The revisionists in general do not give priority to their socialist duties over their democratic duties but act to the contrary. This is in fact what the present leaders of the Italian Communist Party do also.

The leaders of the Italian Communist Party depart from the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the relation between reforms and the revolution. According to them, in fact, socialist revolution is nothing else except the total sum of the reforms of structure. But revolutionaries consider the reforms under conditions of imperialism in the way Lenin taught, namely, as by-products of the revolution and use them to further the class struggle, subordinating the reforms to the solution of their fundamental revolutionary tasks.

Although P. Togliatti, in his article "Communism and Reformism" published in *Rinascita* on July 28, 1962, reproaches the reformists who, for the sake of reforms, ignore the final objective of overthrowing capitalism and establishing socialist relations, he himself and his associates act exactly in this manner when **they concentrate all the attention of the party and of the working class on the struggle for reforms alone** even as foreseen

by the Italian constitution, and say: **that this is the way to pass to socialism under the conditions of Italy**. In what then do they differ from the reformists?

To justify precisely this line of action of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party, P. Togliatti in the above article sets forth as an argument the fact that "acute revolutionary situations do not often occur and are not created to order. It is not enough to say that the problem of power should be launched, that this problem should be really launched forth and immediately to be solved by a direct revolutionary war".

There is no doubt that the creation of a revolutionary situation depends, first and foremost, on the creation of objective conditions; revolutions are not made on the spur of the moment and at the discretion of one or of the other. Failures to take account of this may lead to adventurous risks and grave mistakes. But the role of the subjective factor in revolution must not be lost sight of at the same time. To depend solely on the role of the objective factor and to neglect the role of the subjective factor would leave the revolution to spontaneity, and this is very harmful to the cause of the working class. Preparing the ground for revolution depends not only on objective factors alone but also on a large extent on how the revolutionary party of the working class goes about familiarizing the masses with the revolution, in what direction it educates them, in the spirit of a determined revolutionary struggle or in a reformist spirit? Facts go to show that the present leaders of the Italian Communist Party are spreading among the party members and the working masses harmful reformist and parliamentary illusions which alienate them from the

real revolutionary struggle. Making the objective conditions of revolution absolute and keeping silent about the role of the subjective factor, as P. Togliatti does, is nothing less than a justification, a pretext to renounce revolution and to concentrate all efforts and energies on the struggle for reforms.

We do not at all intend to say that under difficult capitalist conditions, particularly in Italy, the communist party should abstain from struggling for reforms beneficial to the interest of the working class and of the workers in general. A rigid, "leftist" stand of this kind can have nothing in common with revolutionary Marxism-Leninism. But it is essential that while fighting for reforms one should not forget two important teachings of Marxism which have been put to the test and confirmed and are daily being tested and confirmed by the actual experience of tens of years of the revolutionary movement of the working class:

Firstly. The role of reforms under imperialist conditions should not be overvaluated, no illusions should by any means be created in the working class and among the laboring masses that vital problems of the workers could be solved and the conditions of work and of their life could be radically improved, through reforms. Marx has scientifically argued in his *Capital* that the accumulation of poverty on one pole and of wealth on the other pole is the law of the development of capital, that the struggle of the working class and the partial improvements that they may wrest from capital may temporarily bridle and limit the effects of the action of this law, but they cannot abolish it without doing away with capitalism itself. This is borne out also by the facts mentioned

in the Theses themselves. Thus, for instance, the gap between the rising yield of work and the real pay of workers has become wider during the last decade in Italy: the yield of work has risen at least twice as much as the pay of workers. A tendency to mark time and even to decrease the part of national income accruing to the workers has made itself felt during the last decade in Italy.

If the program of reforms is detached or isolated from and becomes something independent of the general struggle to overthrow capitalism and establish socialism and, what is worse, if the struggle for reforms is identified as the way to socialism, as the present leaders of the Italian Communist Party actually do, this will lead to the opportunist and reformist positions of the "Economists", of Bernstein, this will deviate the struggle of the working class for the sake of certain improvements and partial reforms, will sidetrack them from the main objective, from the struggle to overthrow capitalism.

Secondly. In the struggle for reforms one should not lose sight of V. I. Lenin's important teaching that there are reforms and reforms. There are reforms which the workers under the leadership of their revolutionary party, wrest from capital in battle, they compel it to withdraw and make concessions. These are, no doubt, beneficial reforms in the interests of the working masses, and one should strive for such reforms. But there are also sham reforms which the exploiting classes in power undertake with the purpose of alienating the workers from the revolution. Typical are the words of the English right-wing socialist G. Laski, who in his book *Thoughts About the Revolution of Our Times*, wrote: "To the danger

of revolution history knows only one answer: reforms. . . ." Therefore the attitude of the revolutionary party of the working class towards reforms should be censorious and reserved.

They tell us that at the present stage of general crisis of capitalism, the working class of many countries may force upon the bourgeoisie even before the overthrow of capitalism, such measures as go beyond the bounds of ordinary reforms and which may become basic means to do away with monopolist bourgeois rule and as a consequence, an effective means to proceed ahead to socialism. Reforms of this kind are, for instance, transition to state ownership, in other words, the extension of state capitalism. The leaders of the Italian Communist Party justify this stand with "the specific character of the workers' movement in Italy" which is in a position to oblige the capitalist state to put into execution deep anti-monopolist reforms, to transform it into a state "above classes" and "neutral", into a means for Italian society to proceed towards socialism.

We will not dwell here on the analysis of these views as we have already spoken of them above but we will add that these views are as identical as two drops of water with those of the Yugoslav revisionists, which have been criticized and rejected as anti-Marxist by the entire international communist movement. For example, Yugoslav revisionist N. Pashich wrote in the *Nasha Stvarnost* No. 5, 1958: "It has become historically possible at the present time that in advanced countries where matters have not gone as far as to overthrow the capitalist order by force such structural reforms of various kinds have been realized in economic and social relations

as to contain in themselves clear elements of denial of capitalism". In the program of the Yugoslav Communist League it is maintained that ". . . the specific forms of capitalist state relations may be a final attempt of capitalism to stay in power or they may be the first step towards socialism, or they may at the same time be both the one and the other. Whether the one or the other will be realized depends on the efforts and politically conscientious acts of the working class".

From the above analysis it turns out that "the Italian way to socialism", which P. Togliatti and the other leaders of the Italian Communist Party proclaim far and wide, is not a way to socialism and to the dictatorship of the proletariat, but a reformist one, a way to social reforms, which will be brought about by making use of the capitalist state. This position has nothing in common with the revolutionary teachings of Marxism-Leninism; it is openly opposed to the facts of life as well.

DENYING THE ROLE OF LEADERSHIP BY THE MARXIST-LENINIST PARTY

The views of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party on the "Italian way" to socialism are closely connected with another special conception of theirs concerning the role of the communist party in the struggle for socialist transformation. In this conception one sees clearly the tendency to attribute the march towards socialism to a spontaneous development of the productive forces in capitalism which sets the various classes of people and their parties in motion to struggle for social-

ism. At the meeting of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party on June 24, 1956 P. Togliatti stressed that one should proceed "from the analysis of the productive forces whence an objective impetus towards socialism comes". Proceeding precisely from such an analysis the Italian communist leaders deny the role of leadership of the Communist Party in the transition from capitalism to communism and preach, in fact, spontaneity in the workers' movement deviating in this manner to the position of the "Economists" and of the anti-Marxist theory of the productive forces.

Making his views more explicit P. Togliatti stated in this same meeting: "We can indeed see an approach to socialism and a more or less clear impetus towards reforms and economic transformations of the socialist type also in countries where the communist parties not only do not participate in the government, but are not even a great force at the time. . . . This situation is met with today and assumes significant importance in those regions of the world recently liberated from colonialism. But also in highly developed capitalist countries it may happen that the majority of the working class may join a non-communist party and it cannot be excluded that in these countries non-communist parties, but based on the working class, may express the impetus that comes from the working class to proceed towards socialism. But also in those countries where powerful communist parties are in existence, there may be side by side with them other parties that have bases in the working class and a socialist program. Trends to realize radical economic transformations in a way which is generally that of socialism

may come, after all, also from organizations and movements which do not call themselves socialists".

Before we stop to make our remarks, we will point out that the views held by P. Togliatti and his associates in connection with this matter are **absolutely identical** with those of the Yugoslav revisionists, who have been reproached and condemned as anti-Marxists by all the international communist movement. In the program of the Yugoslav Communist League we read: "The view that the communists enjoy the monopoly on all sides of development towards socialism and that socialism is expressed only in them and through them, is theoretically incorrect and practically very harmful", and further on: "A number of parties and movements, first and foremost, in backward countries and at a given period, may play a positive role in developing society and even in opening the road to socialist development". "In countries where practically no political classic parties of the working class exist, as in the USA, it is possible that the working masses, organized in syndicates and through the syndicates will keep on participating in the process of aggrandizing the conscientious socialist ranks, in the process of strengthening the social influence of the working class and its role of leadership in the system of government". In connection with the period of socialist construction it maintains: ". . . The Yugoslav Communist League considers it a dogma to proclaim the absolute monopoly of the communist party in the political power, as a universal and perpetual principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of socialist construction".

As can be seen the picture is so complete as to make any comment superfluous. But for the Italian leaders

who consider the Yugoslav revisionists as their associates and allies, who lavish great sympathy and respect on them, who highly appreciate their experience, the identity of their views with those of the Yugoslav revisionists is no argument whatsoever for rejecting their views as incorrect and anti-Marxist. Therefore we deem it necessary to dwell at some length and in more detail on this matter.

We want here to stress, above all, that while the views of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party run parallel with those of the Yugoslav revisionists, they are altogether at variance with such a programmatic document of the international communist movement as the 1957 Moscow Declaration which considers "the guidance of the working masses by the working class whose nucleus is the Marxist-Leninist party, during the accomplishment of the proletarian revolution in this or that form and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in this or that country" as a general and essential law.

This basic Marxist-Leninist lesson sanctioned in the 1957 Moscow Declaration, the correctness of which is reaffirmed also at the meeting of the 81 communist and workers' parties in the 1960 Moscow Declaration has been derived from the scientific and theoretic analysis which the Marxist classic writers have made to the development of human society towards socialism and communism, as well as from the practical experience of the development of the international communist movement in all the countries which have, heretofore, actually embarked on the road to socialism. History records no case of a country having embarked on the road to socialism and having built socialism under the leadership

of any non-Marxist-Leninist party or political organization. The fact that in all countries where the power of the exploiting classes has been overthrown and where socialism is being built with success the victory has been attained under the leadership of revolutionary parties armed with the Marxist-Leninist theory, is not at all casual but the expression of objective law as regards the transition of society from capitalism to socialism.

It is true that many people in the world speak today of socialism and there are, moreover, many parties who call themselves socialist and who pretend that they lead the struggle for socialism. But things should not be judged from words and names which people and parties attach to themselves. On the contrary, they should be judged by their deeds, by their practical stand, by the policy they pursue, by the fact as to whom and to whose advantage their views and deeds serve. There are many workers' parties or parties depending on the working class. Parties of this kind are the socialist parties, the social-democratic and labor parties and so forth and so on. But do these parties really express the vital interests of the working class and do they seriously fight for these interests? The bulk of these parties have been transformed into what Lenin calls "bourgeois parties of the working class". Facts go to show that even when these pseudo-socialist parties have been in power they have zealously served the exploiting classes, have sided with the imperialists, have pursued an anti-popular reactionary policy. And how can it be seriously thought that the transition to socialism can be made also under the guidance of these parties?

The communist parties, of course, are dutybound to strive against splitting the working class in the capitalist countries, to collaborate with the other parties of the working class and to achieve unity of action of all its sectors in solving pressing problems dealing with the improvement of the living conditions of the workers, with the extension and preservation of their democratic rights and so forth. But while striving for unity of action the communist party should by no means spread harmful illusions among the working class pretending that transition to socialism can be carried out also under the leadership of other non-Marxist-Leninist parties. On the contrary, as the 1960 Moscow Declaration emphasizes, the communists should criticize the ideological positions and the opportunist right-wing practice of the social democrats, and more so when it is plain that the leaders of these parties are sliding more and more towards the positions of imperialism, they are defending the capitalist system and splitting the working class by capitulating to reactionary and conservative forces. The 1960 Moscow Declaration calls upon the communist parties of the countries newly liberated from the imperialist colonial yoke to "unmask the attempts of the reactionary wing of the national bourgeoisie to present the egoistic interests of their class as the interests of the whole nation, to unmask the demagogical use of socialist slogans by bourgeois diplomats for the same purpose". The communists hail and support every honest and sincere socialist tendency, but it must always be stressed that socialism under present conditions can win only under the leadership of parties which maintain the positions of Marxism-Leninism, regardless of the name these parties

call themselves by. The point is that only Marxism-Leninism gives us the only true conception of the nucleus of socialism and of the way to its victory. Marxism-Leninism is the only theory of scientific socialism.

To preach, as the leaders of the Italian Communist Party do, that not only communist parties armed with the Marxist-Leninist theory but also other parties "based on the working class" and even organizations and movements which do not even pretend that they are socialists, can lead the struggle for socialism, means to belittle and to deny the role of the revolutionary theory, of Marxism-Leninism in the struggle of the working class and of the laboring masses for socialism, to depart from the basic Marxist thesis that no revolutionary movement can exist without a revolutionary theory, to preach spontaneity in the workers' movement since it is the communist party which carries the revolutionary theory of scientific socialism to the masses, develops it and puts it into execution in practical life.

According to the views of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party it turns out that socialism could be achieved both by the revolutionary method based on the teaching of Marxism-Leninism as well as by other methods not based on the Marxist-Leninist doctrine. How can a thing of this kind be possible when it is widely known that the principles, the basic features of the social order of socialism are common for all countries, that Marxism-Leninism is the theoretical basis of scientific socialism? Or are we to accept that the socialist order is different in different countries, that there are **various kinds** of socialism and as a consequence, various socialist theories and ideologies, upon which socialism could be

set up? The Yugoslav revisionists proceed precisely from such a conception when they proclaim far and wide that socialism is being built everywhere in the world, that, as Tito said not very long ago: “. . . the socialist world is much more widely spread than certain dogmatists think. Although painfully and with difficulty, socialism comes to life, develops and waxes strong throughout the world. Africa is the best example of this.”

To deny the necessity of the leadership of the communist party, as the leaders of the Italian Communist Party and the Yugoslav revisionists do, means to deprive the working class and all the workers of their political general staff, to leave them unorganized and disarmed at the mercy of their enemies, it means to alienate them from socialism and to leave them at the mercy of capitalist oppression and exploitation for life, for no socialist revolution can triumph, no dictatorship of the proletariat can be established and no successful building of socialism and communism can be achieved without the Marxist-Leninist party of the working class, without its organizing, mobilizing, managing and leading role. There is no gainsaying the fact that other non-communist parties and organizations can participate in the struggle for socialism and its successful construction. But this is by no means a general law of proceeding to socialism, it is merely a national or historical characteristic of this or that country linked with various concrete circumstances, which does not at all deny that which is a general and essential law for all countries, the leadership of one single party, of the Marxist-Leninist party, during the revolution and the construction of socialism. This law

is confirmed by the experience of numerous socialist countries where there have been and where there are even now, some political parties and organizations.

It is clear that the attempts of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party to deny the role of leadership of the communist party and the existence of many parties in the socialist system and specify this as an expression of the “democratic” way to the rise and development of socialist society, are quite alien to Marxism. Is the socialist order in those countries like the Soviet Union, Albania and elsewhere, where there has been and where there is one single party, the communist party, not democratic? Is the democratic character of an order measured by the number of political parties existing in it? Or does P. Togliatti and his followers want that the communist parties in the socialist countries give up their role of leadership and strive to set up as many parties as possible so as to “widen” socialist democracy?

To lead does not at all mean to dictate and to force one's will on others but it means to persuade, to mobilize and organize the masses and to lead their efforts and the efforts of their social organizations towards a single objective, by making these objectives and the ways to attain them, clear to them. Only a Marxist-Leninist party of the new type can play this historical role. To deny this role under a pretext that there are other parties of the working class, and to preach that the massive organizations of the working class, like the trade unions and other social organizations, should be “independent” of the communist party, that they could not be “transmission belts” to link the party with the masses, as the Italian communist leaders of the party and of these organ-

izations maintain, means to place the communist Party on the same level with the bourgeois and petty bourgeois reformist parties, means to let the trade unions and other organizations of the masses come wholly under the influence of bourgeois and reformist ideology, to give up the endeavors to turn them into an important means for the revolutionary uplift of the masses in the struggle to overthrow capitalism and to establish socialism.

Such are in general lines the views of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party on the role of the communist party. It is clear to every communist that these views have nothing in common with the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the party, that they are in outright contradiction with the programmatic documents of the international communist and workers' movement, with the historical experience of this movement and with the living reality of our days.

ON CERTAIN PROBLEMS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT AND OF THE RELATIONS AMONG COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES

The position of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party with P. Togliatti at the head, in connection with various problems of the socialist camp and of the relations among communist and workers' parties can be summed up in these terms: departure from the joint documents of the communist movement, the 1957 and 1960 Declarations and deviation from the principles of proletarian internationalism.

P. TOGLIATTI SPEAKS ILL OF THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

The Theses and other publications of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party take up the question of the attitude adopted towards the socialist countries and towards their experience in socialist revolution and socialist construction. What is most striking is the fact that the leaders of the Italian Communist Party refer primarily and mainly to "the shortcomings and mistakes" of the socialist countries and in fact berate the socialist system thus keeping pace with and giving aid to the bourgeois reactionary propaganda.

According to Togliatti and the other leaders of the Italian Communist Party the main source of these "shortcomings and mistakes" in the Soviet Union and in the countries of the People's Democracy lies in J. V. Stalin's "cult of the individual" and its consequences. But the source of "the cult of the individual", according to them, must not be looked for only in J. V. Stalin's "personal negative qualities" but also in the organization of the Soviet socialist order itself, which seems to have even reached some kind of degeneration. In his interview with the review, *Nuovi Argomenti* in May 1956 P. Togliatti pointed out that if one explains everything by Stalin's personal shortcomings one is apt to fall within the framework of "the cult of the individual" himself. "The real problems," he says, "dealing with the question of how and why soviet society could and did fall into some forms of alienation from democratic life and from the legality which it had assigned to itself and even to degeneration would remain unexplained." He adds that

after the October Revolution “. . . a new type of bureaucratic management arose in the ranks of the new ruling class at the moment when entirely new tasks lay before it.” And Togliatti stresses that “the criticisms against Stalin give rise to a general common problem for the whole movement, namely, the problem of the danger of bureaucratic degeneration, of smothering the democratic life, of the confusion of the creative revolutionary forces with the destruction of revolutionary legality, of the rift between the economic and political management and life, and initiative and criticism and the creative activity of the masses.” As a consequence one arrives at the conclusion that radical changes should be made in the socialist order itself, as a “non-democratic” order, towards “liberation”, “democratization”, “decentralization” and so on and so forth.

The reactionary theses of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party on “the degeneration” of the Soviet socialist system are repeated in more outspoken and more brutal forms after the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Togliatti’s claim that he says this allegedly to defend the Soviet socialist system from the attacks of the anti-communists (!) cannot be characterised otherwise than sheer cynicism.

What strikes one again and again is the **identity to the letter** of these theses with those of the Titoite clique on “The Stalinist degeneration of the Soviet socialist system”, on the “bureaucratic statecraft” in socialist countries and so on and so forth.

P. Togliatti’s above-mentioned conceptions are so openly anti-Marxist and are so closely related to anti-communist propaganda that N. Khrushchev himself was

obliged to restrain Togliatti after the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and tell him “not to go so far so soon,” although in essence he was of one mind with Togliatti and he, himself, had given him food for such conclusions.

The deep source of “grave mistakes” in the countries of the People’s Democracy is, according to the views of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party, the mechanical duplication of the Soviet experience by them. It is stressed in the Theses that “It turns out that the tendency to **adopt on compulsion and carry out perforce a single pattern in building an economy and a socialist society**, without taking into account the different historical conditions, the actual political situation, the traditions and needs of each country has been especially harmful. This erroneous conduct contrary to the principles of Marxism and to Lenin’s teachings could not help having harmful economic and political consequences which have at times become more bitter **from forms of restrictions of democratic life unjustified by extraordinary circumstances of a bitter class war, by civil war or foreign intervention to suppress the revolution**”. At the 8th Congress of the Italian Communist Party, too, P. Togliatti spoke of a “servile imitation of the Soviet pattern”. While in the above-mentioned interview with the review, *Nuovi Argumenti*, P. Togliatti emphasized the same idea: “That which the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has done remains, as I said, the first great model of building a socialist society which was brought about by a great, decisive, revolutionary upheaval. Today the front of socialist construction in countries where the communists are in the ascendancy is so extensive (comprising one-

third of mankind) that the Soviet pattern cannot and should not be obligatory any longer even to this part". Utterances of this kind are repeated time and again.

We need not dwell here any longer to clear up in greater detail in just what manner P. Togliatti intends to review and revise the experience of the Soviet Union for this comes out very clearly in our treatment of his Italian way to socialism. We only want to point to one very queer "detail", namely, that while they proclaim out loud that "the Soviet pattern should not be copied" the leaders of the Italian Communist Party **keep on stressing the necessity of making a detailed study of the Yugoslav experience.** Thus in an interview granted to the newspaper, *Borba*, in May 1956 Togliatti emphasized that Yugoslavia's example "is of immense value to us and it behooves us to acquaint ourselves with and study it in greater detail". Even later, at the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party dedicated to the proceedings of the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union P. Togliatti set forth again the necessity and importance of studying the Yugoslav experience. The Theses too refer to this question saying: "Our divergences with some positions which the Yugoslav communists uphold, for instance, could not and should not be in the way for us to neglect the study and deny the value of what they have done and are doing, pursuing a way of their own." P. Togliatti expressly defended this thesis with zeal and passion also in an article published in October 1962 in the review, *Rinascità*.

All of these go to show that the leaders of the Italian Communist Party strive to the utmost to reject the basic experience of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist

countries based on the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and to revise these teachings. It is precisely for these reasons that the leaders of the Italian Communist Party consider this experience as a chain of errors in all fields which, because of this, can be of no positive value to other countries which will embark on the road to socialism, and may even be detrimental to them. Moreover, even the suppression of the resistance of the disowned exploiters and the war against the agents of imperialism in the socialist countries on the part of the state of the proletarian dictatorship seems to have been nothing else but "distortion of Marxism-Leninism," "violation of socialist legality," "restrictions on democracy" etc. altogether unjustifiable. According to them, there seems to be no class struggle, no pressure on the part of enemies, no imperialist attempts against socialist countries, nor has the revolution ever been menaced by the imperialists. Apparently Togliatti and company have either not drawn a lesson, at least from the counter-revolution in Hungary or they have made common cause with those who called this "a popular revolution". The leaders of the Italian Communist Party go so far as to call the relations among socialist countries as relations by compulsion and submission, claiming that the countries of the People's Democracy seem **to have been compelled by the Soviet Union** to adopt by all means its "erroneous" experience, to be obliged to copy the Soviet pattern. This is in fact a repetition of the accusation of "a political hegemony" and "ideological monopoly" of the Soviet Union about which Tito's renegade clique has raised a hue and cry.

On the other hand, the leaders of the Italian Communist Party try to justify in this manner the anti-Marxist line and deeds of N. Khrushchev, Tito and other revisionists, calling it "a creative development" of Marxism, they try to justify themselves for their opportunist line and to recommend the "Italian" and the "Yugoslav" ways as the only correct way. Just what this way is in essence and whom it serves we have analyzed at great length above.

BACKING UP REVISIONISM UNDER THE PRETEXT OF COMBATING "DOGMATISM"

In the Theses it is claimed that the workers' movement in capitalist countries has declined, it has not yielded what it should have yielded. "As a whole we should in any way admit," the Theses point out, "that the working class and the laboring masses of Western Europe and their organizations have in **recent years** not rendered the contribution which would have been necessary to the struggle for democracy, socialism and peace. . . . Regardless of our opinion about certain specific countries, the general rule is that the working class has not exercised that leading political function which pertains to it both for the influence which its position in the field of production exerts as well as for the significance of the problems affecting its immediate existence, the development of democracy and progress towards socialism. One of the most pressing and important tasks of the present is to overcome this delay."

How can such a thing be explained? Where does the reason for this lie? The contrary should have occurred

if we took into account that more favorable external and internal conditions have today been created for developing the revolutionary movement of the working class: the growing consolidation of the socialist countries and their stupendous achievements in all fields, the further weakening of the imperialist system, the growing impetus of the national liberation movement and the breakup of the colonial system, the aggravation of the economic, class and political contradictions of the capitalist system and so on and so forth. No answer is given for this in the Theses and in the other publications of the Italian Communist Party.

We must first and foremost point out that the workers' movement in recent years has declined in certain capitalist countries and specifically in those capitalist countries where the leaders of the communist and workers' parties pursue the opportunist, pacifist anti-Marxist line of N. Khrushchev's revisionist group. It must be said that a thing of this kind is characteristic of Italy, for instance, where the combative spirit of the Communist Party has declined, where also a number of communists have left the party (The leaders of the Italian Communist Party themselves are obliged to admit that the number of those who renew their membership is growing less and less and they consider it a success that 80% of the members renew their membership cards).

The Theses themselves point, perhaps unintentionally, to the source, the social and economic basis, of the spread of revisionism in Italy: on the one hand, the economic crisis relatively high in Italy of recent years, connected with a series of causes on which we shall not dwell here, but which, no doubt, give rise to illusions of

all kinds; on the other hand, the fact that nearly half of the membership of the working class has come in recent years from the various ranks of the petty bourgeoisie, a thing which favors the spread of bourgeois ideology in the workers' movement. Add to these the capitulation to imperialist atomic blackmail, which is so characteristic of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party with Togliatti at the head, and the picture is complete.

But how can one improve this situation and raise the workers' movement to the height of the historical tasks lying before it? Togliatti's recipe to relieve the workers' movement from this predicament is a revisionist recipe which aggravates the wound. The only way out is a return to the sound revolutionary positions of Marxism-Leninism, to a firm stand against all manifestations of revisionist tendencies, to pull it out from the roots.

All of these go to show that the thesis forcefully stressed in both the 1957 and 1960 Declarations of the communist and workers' parties that **revisionism is the principal menace to the international communist and workers' movement at the present time** is as actual and more important now than it has ever been.

In fact, the leaders of the Italian Communist Party with Togliatti at the head, have discarded this thesis of principle of these two basic documents of the present international communist movement. In words they say they fight on two fronts: against revisionism and against dogmatism; whereas in fact they consider "dogmatism" as a principal menace (we are putting this word between quotation marks, for, in reality, as pointed out in great detail above, what the leaders of the Italian Communist Party consider dogmatism are the basic teachings of

Marxism-Leninism, the general laws of the socialist revolution and of socialist construction scientifically proved by Marxism-Leninism and confirmed by the experience of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries, by the day-to-day life of the entire international communist and workers' movement). No doubt, the struggle against dogmatism is a perpetual duty of great significance for all serious Marxist-Leninist parties which do not want to stay aloof from life but which try to stand at the head of the movement and to solve the new problems of life with courage and daring, guided in all cases by the basic teachings and methods of Marxism-Leninism and by spreading the new experience gained through creative application of it. But it is extremely harmful and it should by no means be tolerated that under the pretext of fighting dogmatism, one should discard Marxist principles and spread all kinds of opportunist and reformist views, and spread and uphold revisionism.

But abstract polemics on who fights dogmatism and who does not, does not help solve the problem. Judgment on this should be passed through facts, through practical results. And facts go to show that P. Togliatti and his associates, for instance, who raise a hubbub about the "danger of dogmatism" and the struggle against it have not brought any great benefit to the cause of the working class and of socialism in Italy.

WHY DOES P. TOGLIATTI STAND UP FOR THE TITOITE CLIQUE WITH SO MUCH FERVOR?

The leaders of the Italian Communist Party say they fight against revisionism. This is untrue. On the contrary,

the facts show that they protect the revisionists because they themselves are revisionists. A clear evidence of this is their stand towards the Yugoslav revisionists.

It is publicly known that the leaders of the Italian Communist Party, with P. Togliatti at the lead, have continually spoken in defense of the Titoite renegade clique: following the 20th Congress and the 22nd Congress and here again now in the preliminary materials for the 10th Congress of the Italian Communist Party. What is more, P. Togliatti published a sharp worded article against the Albanian Party of Labour and in defense of Tito in the review, *Rinascità*, of October 13, 1962.

In this article P. Togliatti launches a frenzied attack on the Albanian Party of Labour and on all those who condemn Tito's clique as agents of imperialism and who maintain that this clique is leading Yugoslavia on the road to the restoration of capitalism, he calls these reproaches as "stale invectives", "stereotyped definitions" and so on. Togliatti wrote: "On the basis of facts, it is now absurd and even ridiculous to deny the fact that Yugoslavia is not a bourgeois country, for it is a country which proceeds along the road to socialist development and its leaders try to forge ahead along this line."

We feel obliged to freshen up P. Togliatti's memory by referring to the Declaration of 81 communist and workers' parties published in December, 1960, where it is said that the leaders of the Yugoslav Communist League "betrayed Marxism-Leninism", "they set the Yugoslav Communist League against all the international communist movement", "they alienated their country from the socialist camp and brought it under the dependence of

the so-called 'aid' of the American imperialists and of the other imperialists and in this way risked the loss of the revolutionary achievements attained by the heroic struggle of the Yugoslav people". The Declaration points out, at the same time, that the "Yugoslav revisionists are engaged in the work of undermining the socialist camp and the international communist movement", that "under the pretext of a policy of non-alignment with blocks, they carry on an activity which is harmful to the cause of the unity of all peace-loving forces and states". And in face of these clear-cut valuations of the Declaration based on concrete facts of the activity of the Titoite clique, how can one say that they are not agents of imperialism, that the Yugoslav leaders are leading the country towards socialism, as P. Togliatti claims? According to this it turns out that the traitors to Marxism-Leninism, like Tito, and his companions, can also lead the country to socialism!

In P. Togliatti's above-mentioned article it is further said: "**Probably** the Yugoslav comrades err in **some of their judgments**. Let us try to delve deep into where, according to us, is the mistake made and let us evaluate it with exactitude. This is important now. But the bitter attacks **against 'Tito's clique' do not help us make any headway, on the contrary, they compel us to take many steps backward**, towards the impossibility of that mutual good understanding which should have been, especially today, the primary basis of the unity and solidarity of the workers' and communist movement even if certain points of difference may exist" (underlined by us).

Thus, according to P. Togliatti, our duty seems to be to get closer and closer to the Yugoslav revisionists, who, after all is said and done, "may err in some of their judgments". The Declaration of the communist and workers' parties which stresses that "the further exposure of the Yugoslav revisionist leaders and the active struggle to put the communist party and the workers' movement on their guard against the anti-Leninist ideas of the Yugoslav revisionists continues to be the primary duty of the Marxist-Leninist parties" is hurled into the waste basket.

All of these clearly point out that the valuations which P. Togliatti and his companions consider "as ordinary stereotype definitions", "stale invectives", "excommunication" etc., which "do not help us to make any headway, but compel us to take many steps backwards", are not only the line of the leaders of the Albanian Party of Labour alone, but of all the international communist movement. The fact that the Italian Communist Party leaders with Togliatti at the head objected to the above valuations formulated in the Declaration as early as at the meeting of the 81 communist and workers' parties in 1960, making a separate declaration to this effect, does not change the situation: those valuations, not the views of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party, are the general line of the international communist movement regarding the Yugoslav leadership. But of what use are such joint documents of the international communist and workers' movement to P. Togliatti, N. Khrushchev and all other revisionists who despisedly call them: "documents of compromise which will not last long"!

Every communist and every honest man cannot help pose to himself the question: "Why does P. Togliatti rise in defense of the Titoite renegade clique with such passionate fervor, and precisely at this moment?"

First and foremost because the leaders of the Italian Communist Party, with Togliatti at the head, preach and defend **in essence** identical views with those of the Yugoslav revisionists in main matters concerning the present world development of the socialist revolution and of the building of socialism. Utterances that "the Yugoslav leaders pursue a program which does not conform to that of the other communist parties" sound very formal in Togliatti's mouth. It is more than true that the program of the Yugoslav revisionists is absolutely at variance with the common line of the entire international communist movement clearly expressed in both the 1960 and 1957 Moscow Declarations. But it is also true that the views of the Yugoslav revisionists, expressed in a condensed way in the program of the Yugoslav Communist League, on certain basic questions, do not differ at all, **in fact**, from the opportunistic, reformist views of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party, as we have had the occasion to point out above. It is significant that in tens of speeches and articles by P. Togliatti and other leaders of the Italian Communist Party, made since the 20th Congress, one finds not a single case of discord with the views of the Yugoslav revisionists, but only appeals "to make a careful study of their experience and profit as much as possible from it, to approach as much as possible to them". Therefore P. Togliatti's ardent defense of the Titoite clique springs from their common line of action.

Moreover, this ardent patronage at the present moment when the modern revisionists are making a lot of their improved relations with Tito's clique which was crowned with L. Brezhnev's recent visit to Yugoslavia, aims at justifying to public opinion of the communist movement these acts of N. Khrushchev's renegade group and their supporters, which are nothing less than a gross violation of the 1960 Moscow Declaration.

Finally, P. Togliatti's articles in the review, *Rinascita*, in defense of the Titoite clique is at the same time aimed at preparing the ground and appealing for a closer rapprochement of N. Khrushchev's group and their followers with this clique of renegades for a united revisionist front against Marxism-Leninism.

WHO IS IT THAT SPLITS THE UNITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT?

Both the Theses as well as other materials of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party refer a great deal to the unity of the international communist movement and reproach the Albanian Party of Labour for allegedly splitting it.

We do not deem it necessary to go into great detail here in order to prove that the accusation against the Albanian Party of Labour as a splitter of the unity of the communist movement is altogether false and groundless. There is to this effect a whole series of printed matter by our party showing by **facts and documents** and not in vague terms of a general nature, that it is not the Albanian Party of Labour but N. Khrushchev's revisionist

group and those who follow in their tracks that are doing their utmost to split the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist and workers' movement by unscrupulously violating and trampling under foot the principles of relations among fraternal socialist countries and fraternal parties, clearly defined in the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations. We will dwell here briefly only on certain views of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party dealing with the question of the unity of the international communist movement.

The leaders of the Italian Communist Party and particularly P. Togliatti, have time and again emphasized the necessity of creating a number of various centers of management in the international communist movement, or, in other words, of the so-called "poly-centralization". This thesis met with the firm opposition of the communist and workers' parties of various countries as an anti-Marxist and harmful conception for the international communist movement. Feeling the weakness of their position in this matter the leaders of the Italian Communist Party were obliged to withdraw, at least verbally, their idea of "poly-centralization". The Theses point out that the creation of various regional centers would give rise to a dangerous strife of factionism in the communist movement and it is further claimed in the Theses that allegedly, "this has always been the position of our Party, a thing which follows clearly from the writings of our leaders and from the resolutions of our congresses".

That this has always been the position of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party, is not true at all. Let us refer for this to the writings of the leaders of the

Italian Communist Party themselves. In his report "The Italian Way to Socialism" delivered in June 1956 to the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party, P. Togliatti, having stressed that the experience of the Soviet Union cannot serve as a directive for the communist and workers' parties which work under different conditions, says: "There are thus created **different points or centers of management and development**. There is thus created what I have called . . . **a poly-central system** which meets the new situation, the transformations of structures in the world and the structures of workers' movements themselves . . ." (underlined by Editors) P. Togliatti raised the question of poly-centralization again after the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union at the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party dedicated to the proceedings of this Congress.

We do not intend to argue about words and terms used but about the sum and substance of the problem. The idea of "poly-centralization" is closely related to and springs from the idea that there exist many ways of transition to socialism and for this reason one should not speak of general laws of socialist revolution and of socialist construction common to all countries. This is exactly the position the leaders of the Italian Communist Party take as we have already explained in detail above. It is on this basis that the leaders of the Italian Communist Party preach the idea of creating various centers in the international communist movement, that they stress the idea of "poly-centralization".

But this conception in fact means the denial of the principle of independence of the communist and workers'

parties, because they are required to pursue the line of **certain centers**, among which P. Togliatti and his associates no doubt place the Italian Communist Party, first, as an important center of management for all the communist and workers' parties in Western Europe. The practical meaning of the thesis of "poly-centralization" is that the fraternal parties alienate themselves from the general truth of Marxism-Leninism and from the basic experience of the Soviet Union in the socialist revolution and in the construction of socialism, which is a Marxist-Leninist experience put to the test in practice and which no trumped-up corrections or acrobatic maneuvers of N. Khrushchev's group can throw overboard, and shape their course along such ways as "the Italian way" or "Yugoslav way" to socialism. Besides, "poly-centralization", the creation of many centers that pursue different lines of action, undermines the very basis of the unity of the international communist and workers' movement, creates the danger of splitting it, leads to the renunciation of the principle of international solidarity of the communist and workers' parties.

The leaders of the Italian Communist Party preach public debate as one of the principal and most effective forms of relations among communist and workers' parties. This idea is contained in the various theses and speeches of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party. At the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party in connection with the calling of the 10th Congress of the Party P. Togliatti emphasized: ". . . what I say is that this debate (the debate among communist and workers' parties—Ed.) may have to be, at given moments, within given bounds, a public debate as well".

“But”, he added, “polemics should not be entered into as the Albanians do, in a way that gives no argument for discussion, that explains nothing, but only try to aggravate relations”. The Theses claim at the same time that: “The leaders of the Albanian Party of Labour have abandoned internationalism, have rejected the common line of the communist movement, that they pursue the road of embittering false polemics, of open fractionism, of splitting our ranks”.

What strikes one's eye is that while they express themselves in favor of public debates among parties, the leaders of the Italian Communist Party pass by in silence the **principle of consultation on the basis of equality and comradeship** as a basic principle in adjusting the relations between fraternal parties and in coordinating common actions for common ends. “When questions arise,” the 1960 Moscow Declaration says, “to a party that has to do with the acts of another fraternal party, then the leaders of the said party turn to the leaders of the corresponding party and if need be talks are entered into and consultations are conducted between them”.

At the present time, when the international communist movement has greatly expanded and the communist and workers' parties work under different conditions, face tasks and problems that differ in each country, it is not surprising nor is it to be taken amiss that differences of opinion and even divergencies may arise between parties on various questions. This is normal and excusable under present conditions. But all these problems can be solved in the right way, if all fraternal parties, large and small, will strictly abide by the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism clearly defined in the

Declaration. It is precisely N. Khrushchev's group and their supporters that trampled upon these principles of the Declaration and used anti-Marxist and anti-internationalist methods in trying to solve divergencies, rudely violated the principle of equality and comradely consultations and arbitrarily launched bitter and slanderous attacks at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union against the Albanian Party of Labour, placing the international communist movement before a fait accompli situation and went so far as to break diplomatic relations and so forth and so on.

P. Togliatti and his associates, who claim that they are opposed to bitter, unfriendly, pernicious polemics and have made use of all forms and methods to come to terms with, clarify and get closer to the Titoite clique, have not only made no effort to enter into discussions with the Albanian Party of Labour about issues that have arisen, but at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union joined arbitrarily N. Khrushchev's anti-Marxist assaults against our Party and from that day onward turned their press into an arena of attacks and slanders against our Party and our country.

But what was the outcome of these open attacks on the Albanian Party of Labour? Did they by any means help solve the problems and strengthen the unity of the international communist movement? No! On the contrary, they served only to widen the gap of misunderstanding and dealt a hard blow to unity and more so when they were used as a means to attack and hit not only our Party but all the fraternal parties which do not subscribe to the revisionist line of N. Khrushchev's group and their followers.

P. Togliatti and his associates are now raising the anti-Marxist method of public litigation among the communist and workers' parties into a principle, for, as seen above from their stand towards the Albanian Party of Labour, regardless of the words they utter about public debate "at given moments and within given bounds", in fact they are not in favor of comradely discussions but they are in favor of open public disputes among communist and workers' parties, a thing which harms the unity of our movement immensely. But it is odd that while he allows himself and his friends the liberty to launch public assaults he chafes and frets when our Party uses the right of equality in order to defend itself and gives due response to the slanders and groundless accusations directed towards it.

P. Togliatti claims he has found no argument and topic for discussion in "the polemics of the Albanians", calls it a "venomous debate" and so forth and so on. And this too, of course, is a way to fight shy of the arguments of the opponent and to turn tail on discussions when found in great straits. But vague general terms can convince nobody, they are not arguments. But what in reality are "the deep arguments", the "arguments of principle" which have been used and are being used for the assaults and reproaches against the Albanian Party of Labour? Are we to consider N. Khrushchev's outspoken allusions at the 22nd Congress that the leaders of the Albanian Party of Labour are out for sale to the imperialists, for the price of 30 pieces of silver or his call to overthrow the leadership in Albania, as such? Or are we to consider P. Togliatti's "silly lie" appearing in the newspaper *Unità* of December 15, 1961 that the foundations of the Palace

of Culture which the Soviet Government had bestowed to the country were smashed and even at a public ceremony in Tirana, as such an "argument"? Evidently P. Togliatti has reached the acme of "communist respect for principles and honesty". One can find numbers of such "pearls" in the press of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party but they are not worth bothering about nor is the scope of this article to reply to them.

* * *

Such are in general lines the views that the leaders of the Italian Communist Party, with P. Togliatti at the head, spread far and wide on the most important problems of the present world development of the international communist movement as well as on the "Italian way to socialism". Every reader can now judge for himself what positions the leaders of the Italian Communist Party really take. In fact, the analysis of their views shows that there is in them an outspoken pacifist, opportunist, reformist, revisionist tendency which constitutes an open departure from the revolutionary position of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, from the general line of the international communist movement, clearly formulated in the two joint Declarations of the communist and workers' parties of the years 1957 and 1960. Although in the Theses as well as in their writings P. Togliatti and the other leaders of the Italian Communist Party express in words their loyalty towards the Moscow Declaration and towards Marxism-Leninism they are so reserved under the pretext of national peculiarities and new historical conditions and of

“creative development” of Marxism that they practically reject the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism, its basic teachings, the principal theses of the two programmatic documents of the international communist and workers’ movement.

But the views of the revisionists, be they ever so refined and disguised, cannot escape the merciless judgment of time, of life and of facts. The truth of Marxism-Leninism will triumph.

**LET US HOLD ALOFT
THE REVOLUTIONARY BANNER
OF
THE MOSCOW DECLARATIONS
AND PROTECT THEM FROM
THE ATTACKS
OF THE MODERN REVISIONISTS**

Article published in the newspaper

Zëri i Popullit

December 6, 1962

Two years ago today the Declaration of the Meeting of the representatives of 81 communist and workers' parties, the programmatic, militant and collective document of great historical significance to the world communist movement, came off the press. The 1957 Moscow Declaration was likewise published five years ago. These two documents contain a scientific Marxist-Leninist analysis of the deep revolutionary processes that have been going on in the world during recent decades, a generalization of the experiences of the international communist and workers' movement, and a definition of the principled position and the common tasks of all communists on the most important issues of world development. They constitute a sound basis on which the communist and workers' parties should build their line of action in their struggle for peace, national liberation, democracy, in their struggle to do away with the exploitation of man by man and to establish socialism and communism throughout the world.

The trend of world events during recent years has borne out the correctness, vitality and influential power of the theses and principles of these Declarations. Every passing day shows the radical change that is taking place in the balance of forces in the world, the superiority of the socialist forces over those of imperialism, of the forces of the national liberation over those of colonialism, of the democratic and revolutionary forces

over those of reaction, of the forces of peace over those of war.

The countries of the socialist camp have attained great new successes in building socialism and communism. During the last four years the average annual rate of increase in industrial production in the socialist countries has been nearly three times as high as that in capitalist states. The industrial production in the socialist countries now constitutes 37 per cent of the total world industrial production. The day is not far off when the world socialist system will surpass the capitalist world in industrial production. The Soviet Union already occupies first place in the world in a number of important branches of science and technique. The world socialist system is becoming an increasingly decisive factor in the social development of human society, while the sphere of imperialist domination is getting narrower and narrower. Heroic Cuba has severed itself from the capitalist system of oppression and exploitation. The brave Cuban people, led by their distinguished leader Comrade Fidel Castro, have definitely embarked on the road to socialism and are heroically protecting their sovereignty and independence from blockades, aggression and intervention by American imperialists. The historical triumph and the consistent revolutionary stand of the Cuban people is a brilliant manifestation of the weakness of imperialism and of the strength of socialism in our time, is a great source of inspiration not only to the peoples of Latin America, but to all the peoples of the world, to throw off the imperialist yoke.

The battle front against imperialism and colonialism, both old and new, has been extended and further strengthened in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Many nations have recently won their national independence. The Algerian people won their freedom after seven years of heroic battles against an enemy equipped with the most up-to-date military technique and armed to the teeth. The government of national union was established in Laos. The Indonesian people have scored their first victory in winning back West Irian. The people of Yemen achieved a great success in overthrowing the reactionary regime and foreign domination. The struggle against the yoke of the United States of America in south Vietnam, south Korea, Japan and other countries has become more widespread.

The process of decay and disintegration of the world capitalist system is well under way. The contradictions continuously gnawing at it are getting more and more acute. Capitalist economy is becoming less stable and the contradictions of imperialist powers for economic and political hegemony are becoming more and more acute. The class struggle in capitalist countries is becoming more and more bitter, and the movement of the masses for better living conditions, for freedom, democracy and socialism is growing at a rapid rate. There are now about ninety communist and workers' parties with some 42,500,000 members in their ranks. At the same time the massive movement in defense of peace, against the aggressive and warmongering plans and actions of the imperialist powers, with the American imperialists at the head, is gaining in strength. Facts go to show that the clear revolutionary conclusions of the 1960 Moscow Dec-

laration, "that no attempts of imperialism can stop the development of history", that "a reliable basis has been provided for further decisive victory for socialism" and that "complete victory of socialism is inevitable", are being substantiated in actual experience.

All of these show, on the other hand, that great changes have come about in the world: a new balance of forces has been created, which is daily developing in favor of socialism and to the disadvantage of imperialism; that new and more favorable conditions have been created for a successful struggle for peace, national liberation, democracy and socialism, which the communists should assess correctly and utilize to the maximum.

The Marxist-Leninists, loyal to the basic teachings of their doctrine and to the correct applications of this doctrine in conformity with actual conditions, draw revolutionary conclusions from this situation and muster all their efforts to utilize the present conditions in the raising of the revolutionary and national-liberation movement to a higher level, in order to hasten the overthrow of the imperialist system and the establishment of socialism throughout the world.

In contrast the modern revisionists draw opportunist conclusions, and disregard the 1957 and 1960 Declarations of the communist and workers' parties.

In recent years, especially since the publication of the 1960 Moscow Declaration, the modern revisionists have slid further away from the basic teachings of Marxism-Leninism, have tended more and more towards splitting the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement and aligning themselves with imperialism.

N. Khrushchev's group uses two methods in violating the Moscow Declarations. Firstly, they do their best to ignore them or to belittle their programmatic significance. They pursued and continue to pursue this objective in their propaganda, and present the Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union adopted at the 22nd Congress as "The World Communist Manifesto" as almost a substitute for "The Communist Manifesto" of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Secondly, when circumstances compel them to assume a different attitude they maneuver using demagogic expressions of "loyalty" to them, and cover up, by repetition of general principles, their acts against the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement, against socialism, against the liberty of peoples, and against democracy and peace.

The attitude towards the class enemy, in the first place towards the imperialists, especially the American imperialists, who, as the 1960 Moscow Declaration points out, are the main stronghold of reaction and colonialism, the greatest international gendarme and exploiter, the bitterest enemy of peoples, is the basic criterion by which to judge who stands loyal to Marxism-Leninism, and who has betrayed it, who really upholds the interests of socialism, of emancipation of peoples, of democracy and peace, and who tramples upon and betrays these interests. This is the distinction between the real Marxist-Leninists and the modern revisionists today.

Both the Moscow Declarations emphasize that the imperialists have been, are, and will continue to be, aggressors, greedy exploiters, and ruthless oppressors until socialism has been established throughout the world. The

truth of this is borne out by experience, by the multitude of facts revealed in our own days. A characteristic of all the imperialists, with the American imperialists at the head, is their policy of the "cold war" and their feverish efforts to turn it into a hot war, their policy proceeding from positions of force, of blackmail, of pressure and of open aggression. It was the American imperialists who brought about the crisis in the Caribbean Sea and the threat of aggression against Cuba. Encouraged by the imperialists, the Indian reactionaries launched their attacks on the Chinese border guards, and again encouraged and assisted by them they are trying to widen the conflict with China by turning down the proposal of the People's Republic of China to settle the Sino-Indian conflict by peaceful methods. Wherever and whenever the situation deteriorates, wherever there is bloodshed in the world today, the imperialists, with the American imperialists at the head, are the cause. These and many other facts go to show that the danger of war is imminent, because, as the 1960 Moscow Declaration points out, "so long as imperialism exists, the basis for aggressive wars exists also".

But imperialism is no longer capable of trifling with the destiny of peoples. Thanks to the change of the balance of forces in the world, imperialist war is not fatally inevitable today, peace can be safeguarded and strengthened because large and organized forces have not only the desire to maintain peace but also the necessary means to stay the hand of the imperialist warmongers. The Moscow Declarations constitute the basis on which the peoples carry on their struggle for peace.

Peace can be safeguarded. This can be achieved by forcing it on the imperialists, not by begging it as a boon from them. In the first place, it is necessary to bring about the unity and determined struggle of all the peace-loving forces, and the colossal economic, political and military might of the socialist camp against the warmongering imperialists. Peace is safeguarded by opposing the aggressive plans of the imperialists and not by flattering and making concessions to them. "To fight for peace today means to show great alertness, to continually expose the policy of the imperialists, to give great heed to the intrigues and machinations of the warmongers, to direct the sacred resentment of peoples against those who pursue the policy of provoking war, it means to organize all the peace-loving forces, to increase the active participation of the masses in defense of peace, to strengthen the collaboration with all the states which are not interested in the outbreak of fresh wars," the 1960 Moscow Declaration maintains.

The revisionists act quite differently, quite contrary to the 1960 Moscow Declaration. Instead of mobilizing the people to defy imperialism and defend peace, instead of strengthening their vigilance and determinedly upholding the lawful rights of peoples, their freedom and independence, the modern revisionists, with N. Khrushchev's group at the head, have almost entirely given up unmasking the aggressive, warmongering policy of the imperialists. They are spreading all sorts of pacifist illusions about the imperialists and their top officials, and make unprincipled concessions to them, capitulating to their atomic blackmail. By acting in this manner the revisionists make less the possibilities of maintaining peace

and increase the danger of war, for they leave the war-mongering imperialists a free hand, whet their appetite and encourage them to undertake fresh acts of aggression of an even more dangerous kind.

The dangerous capitulationist policy of the revisionists was very clearly seen in connection with recent events in the Caribbean Sea. N. Khrushchev's group and their followers are now busy trying to justify, before their own people and world public opinion, their concession and retreat before the threats of the American imperialists.

It is claimed that by dismounting and withdrawing the rockets and other items from Cuba, N. Khrushchev saved mankind from a rocket and nuclear catastrophe. But to consider the unilateral withdrawal of rockets from Cuba as an act that saved mankind from a world war, means, in fact, to accept the thesis of imperialist propaganda that by stationing these rockets in Cuba, the Soviet Union led the world to the brink of atomic catastrophe. The road to rescue mankind from war and safeguard peace is not the road of unilateral disarmament of the socialist countries, of weakening their defensive power, of kneeling in obeisance to the dictates and ultimatums of the imperialists, or the road of capitulation before their pressure and their threats, such a road makes them even more aggressive. This kind of road does not lead to the strengthening of peace but to the inevitable outbreak of war. Just what pretty perspectives, this capitulationist attitude of N. Khrushchev's group on the Caribbean issue, does open for settling international issues is clearly shown by the fact that right after this, and encouraged by this attitude, the imperialist

powers stated that they were more determined than ever to maintain their positions in Berlin, and also by the fact of their open declaration of armed participation in the aggression launched by the Indian reactionary circles against the People's Republic of China.

It is further claimed that through his stand N. Khrushchev rescued Cuba from imperialist aggression, and guaranteed its freedom and independence. As a matter of fact the danger of aggression against Cuba has not been removed at all. If the modern revisionists lend credit to President Kennedy's words about not invading Cuba, fortunately, the Cuban people, as well as all the peoples of the world who are very well aware of the nature of imperialism, do not lend any credit to Kennedy's pledges. Kennedy's words are only hot air, on which he is trying, in all kinds of ways, to go back. To really provide guarantee for Cuba it is essential to bring forth facts, and concrete deeds, as pointed out in the five points advanced by Fidel Castro, which constitute the only just basis to safeguard effectively and with dignity the lawful rights of the heroic Cuban people.

Finally, N. Khrushchev's group describe their stand in the Cuban affair as a model of the policy of peaceful co-existence which, according to N. Khrushchev's own words, is nothing but a compromise. Throwing out feelers for arguments to justify the unprincipled compromise of N. Khrushchev's group with imperialism, their propaganda agents, on the Cuban affair, have gone so far as to make trite reference to V. I. Lenin's words, when he rightfully compared the signing of the peace pact at Brest-Litovsk in 1918, with the case of a disarmed man caught by armed bandits. A thing of this kind can only now be said by

those who have been scared out of their wits, who underestimate the power of the socialist camp and, first of all, of the Soviet Union itself, and who overestimate the power of the imperialists. It is natural for such people to completely capitulate, before every blackmail and threat of the imperialists.

Mutual concessions and compromise are of course necessary in order to reach agreements within the framework of the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence. But concessions and compromises should, above all, not encroach upon our general interests or trample under foot the rights of sovereign peoples. Secondly, they should be reciprocal and not one-sided as in the Cuban affair when N. Khrushchev gave up every thing, while the American imperialists made no concession at all, merely mouthing empty words. Moreover, it is not right that peaceful coexistence should be identified with compromise in the way that N. Khrushchev identifies it. The decisive factor that leads to peaceful coexistence is not compromise, but the determined effort made by all peace-loving forces to thrust it on the imperialists. As a matter of fact, it is precisely this that compels the imperialists to make concessions and agree to terms of compromise. But N. Khrushchev's group prefer to identify peaceful coexistence with compromise, and only with compromise. They do this in order to justify their capitulation before the imperialists, their reconciliation with them.

The great movement of our times, stressed by the two Declarations of the communist and workers' parties, both that of 1957 and that of 1960, is that of the struggle of the colonial and former colonial peoples to get rid of the yoke of colonialism, and imperialism, to acquire national

emancipation, freedom and national independence. The successful development of the movement for national liberation, the 1960 Moscow Declaration points out, is at the same time a valuable contribution to the maintenance of peace and powerful support for the socialist camp. On the other hand, the moral and material aid which the socialist camp gives to the national-liberation movement and to the peoples who strive to strengthen their national independence as well as the active struggle for peace in the world, creates favorable conditions for the success of these movements.

The imperialists are doing their utmost to preserve their colonialist sway in the older as well as in the newer forms. They use all methods and means, from sowing dissension and waylaying to blackmail and armed force, to suppress or weaken the national-liberation movements. In this respect the imperialists find active supporters among the modern revisionists, supporters not only among the Titoite clique, which is an agent of imperialism, and which under the mask of "neutrality" and "non-alignment" with blocs, strives to split the national-liberation movement and alienate the peoples from their struggle against imperialism, but also among N. Khrushchev's revisionist group.

Contrary to the 1960 Moscow Declaration, N. Khrushchev tries to subjugate the national-liberation, anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist struggles of the oppressed peoples, to peaceful coexistence, to general and total disarmament. This, in fact, means that the oppressed peoples should endure the hardships of bondage and wait until general and complete disarmament has been attained, because after that the colonialists would

allegedly give them their freedom and would even help them, with both hands, to develop their economy, to progress. But the peoples of colonial and dependent countries, who have for a long time experienced and are still experiencing the cruel oppression and inhuman exploitation of the imperialists, who are seeing with their own eyes that it is the imperialists who are using fire and sword to rob them of their freedom and to suppress their national-liberation movement, cannot be deceived, they know full well that, as the 1960 Moscow Declaration points out, the colonialist powers do not make a gift of freedom to the peoples of their colonies, that they do not freely abandon the countries they exploit, that these peoples achieve sound victory on the basis of the national-liberation movement and in bitter struggle against the imperialists.

Instead of encouraging and helping the national-liberation and democratic movements to attain their objectives, instead of exposing the anti-democratic, unpopular and chauvinist acts of the reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie, N. Khrushchev's group confine themselves to advising the communist and workers' parties to "guard the masses and political workers from an unjustifiable zeal in using socialist slogans". And this advice comes from the same people who have spared neither paper nor ink to praise Nehru's statement that "socialism is being built in India" etc. and have even supplied the most up-to-date arms, which the pro-imperialist reactionary circles are using to oppress communists and progressive individuals, to provoke border incidents and to commit open aggression against a socialist country like the People's Republic of China.

In defiance of the 1960 Moscow Declaration, in which all the communist and workers' parties brand the Yugoslav revisionists as traitors to Marxism-Leninism, wreckers and splitters of the socialist camp and of the forces of peace, and in which we are called upon to carry on the struggle to expose them to the end, N. Khrushchev's group have gone further towards reconciling themselves with, and getting closer to, the Yugoslav revisionist leaders. Many facts bear now full witness to this. It is a well-known fact that N. Khrushchev's group and their followers have widely stated that "Yugoslavia is a country which is building socialism", that their relations with Tito are "not only normal but good", that collaboration with and assistance to Yugoslavia should be considered as a factor which "will not only help to improve mutual relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia but will be of benefit to all countries engaged in building socialism and communism". Within the framework of this approach, collaboration with the Yugoslav revisionists has been extended in all fields, and delegation after delegation is being exchanged between them daily. It is clear that it is no longer a question of a "tendency" of reconciliation and accord between N. Khrushchev's group and their followers with the Titoite clique. The process has entered a new phase and top-level delegations of state and party are being exchanged. A clear demonstration of this is shown by L. Brezhnev's visit to Yugoslavia in October and Tito's present visit to Moscow. Only dupes can pretend that these are "simple visits of formalities and courtesy" within the framework of "peaceful coexistence". In reality, they are a demonstration of further ideological accord and political agreement between N.

Khrushchev's group and the Yugoslav revisionists, in order to coordinate their plans and acts against Marxism-Leninism, the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement, in order to set up and consolidate a united front of the revisionists against the parties who stand on sound revolutionary positions, in order to open a way for further approaches between N. Khrushchev's group and the imperialists, especially the American imperialists, which, as Tito stated in his interview with Drew Pearson last August, was one of the main objects of his present visit to Moscow.

All this is further proof that N. Khrushchev's group has not been in accord with the assessment made in the 1960 Moscow Declaration about the Yugoslav revisionist leaders, right from the start, but that under the pressure of the collective opinion of the communist and workers' parties, they accepted it pro forma. Before the ink of their signatures on this historical document of the international communist movement had even dried, they began to act entirely contrary to it by pursuing a policy of reconciliation towards Tito's clique.

It is not hard to understand that Tito's visit to the Soviet Union is no pleasure trip, as it is claimed, but that it is a visit which aims to end the zigzags which N. Khrushchev was obliged to make to overcome the obstacles placed in his way by the 1960 Moscow Declaration to meet Tito. Just what new plots Tito is going to concoct with N. Khrushchev in the Soviet Union will be revealed in due time. But what is even now clear, is that by inviting Tito to Moscow, N. Khrushchev challenges anyone to say that he does not care about the 1960 Moscow Declaration. This fact alone suffices to prove

that N. Khrushchev and his group have definitely abandoned the 1960 Moscow Declaration. Tito is the same Tito he has always been, nothing has changed in him during these last two years, nor is the Programme of the League of Yugoslav Communists rejected, or its known theses changed. What has come to pass then? It has come to pass that N. Khrushchev has openly betrayed Marxism-Leninism, has made up his mind to openly cross to the side of Tito in order to proceed by leaps and bounds on the road that leads to reconciliation with the imperialists. This is what the facts point to, and it is so clear that nobody can fail to see it.

While striving to get closer and closer to the Titoite renegade clique and the imperialists, N. Khrushchev's group are continually undermining the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement by their unscrupulous violation of the principles of proletarian internationalism sanctioned in both the Moscow Declarations which govern the relations between socialist countries, and communist and workers' parties.

We are all aware of N. Khrushchev's anti-Marxist acts to force his revisionist views on other parties by every possible method and means, by even using most brutal methods of pressure and intervention, and by grossly violating the principles of equality and independence of the communist and workers' parties. That is the way he acted towards our own Party of Labour. He went so far as to make public, before our foes, our ideological differences, to publicly attack the Party of Labour of Albania, to extend our ideological differences to the field of state relations, to call on the people of Albania to rise in counter-revolution, and to sever all diplomatic and

economic relations with our country. This is how he acts everywhere. N. Khrushchev's group are doing their utmost to round up all the revisionists for the purpose of creating a revisionist front, consequently go so far as to resort to most vicious anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist acts. But by embarking on such a road N. Khrushchev's group only expose and isolate themselves and hasten their own unmasking. It is clear that his conduct is an outcome of weakness rather than of strength. The revisionists may succeed in deceiving certain people for a time but they cannot deceive them forever. Resistance against them rises and as they have no persuasive power they resort to repressive measures. The results are tragic indeed, and in the first place for their authors.

As N. Khrushchev's slanders and groundless accusations claiming that the leaders of the Albanian Party of Labour are agents of imperialism, have sold themselves for thirty silver coins, that terror reigns in Albania with mass executions and deportations, met with shameful failure, he and his followers have now had to change their tactics and try to persuade the peoples of the world that the Albanian Party of Labour has deviated from the Moscow Declaration, that it is violating its principles, and has slipped back into nationalism and so on and so forth.

As far as crimes and other acts of terror are concerned, it must be said that they are not practiced in Albania, but they have taken on alarming proportions in the countries where the revisionists hold sway. Let us not mention here the crimes and terrorist acts of the Titoite clique against the Yugoslav communists and patriots, of which much has already been said and written and which

continue most ruthlessly to this very day. But what is taking place in N. Khrushchev's group? Under the pretext of making good the evil consequences of the cult of the individual, they are using the big scythe and sickle against the loyal and tested cadres of the party by replacing them with revisionist elements or elements that kneel in obeisance to revisionism, and are perpetrating insidious crimes against the communists and good people.

The revisionists have not only resorted to measures of terror in order to suppress the growing resistance against them, but they are trying behind a screen of "new" forms of Party and State organization, to break down the party, the state and so forth. By proceeding along the road which Tito pursued before them, N. Khrushchev's group are not hesitating to also borrow his forms of organization.

The new slanders which the modern revisionists spread about the Albanian Party of Labour will meet with fresh failure. In its capacity as a Marxist-Leninist party, our Party has unanimously approved both of the programmatic documents of the international communist movement, has made them the basis of all its activity, and it has been and will always remain loyal to their principles, because in those documents it sees the embodiment of the basic teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the most important issues of world development today, and sees in them the embodiment of its general correct line of action. The Moscow Declarations have in fact been violated, and are continually being violated by N. Khrushchev's group who, right from the start, have opposed them and have called the 1960 Moscow Declaration "a document of compromise which will not last long". The two years

since the signing of the 1960 Moscow Declaration have clearly revealed the evolution of N. Khrushchev's group and their transition to open positions of revisionism. This evolution is manifested through their open deviation from the positions of Marxism-Leninism and the 1957 and 1960 Declarations of the communist and workers' parties, through their growing endeavors to reconcile themselves with the Titoite clique and the imperialists and get closer to them, through their efforts to split and undermine the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement, to smother, under various pretexts, the militant revolutionary spirit of peoples and to thereby weaken their fight against imperialism. It is not for nothing that Hume, Spaak and other notable exponents of imperialism praise N. Khrushchev for his opportunist line and anti-Marxist activity. They not only praise him for what he has already done but also appeal to him to take further steps to get closer, collaborate and integrate himself into the so-called "free world".

By all their views and deeds, N. Khrushchev's group have caused, and are causing great damage to the struggle of the peoples for peace, freedom, democracy and socialism. Therefore, the tasks laid down in both the Moscow Declarations to fight revisionism as the principal menace to the international communist movement, are as real today as they have ever been. Without fighting the revisionists, no struggle against imperialism can be successful.

We are confident that all difficulties caused by the modern revisionists will be overcome, regardless of the time and sacrifices involved. This conviction is

shared by tens of thousands of communists and hundreds of thousands of progressive people throughout the world. The more than century long history of the international communist and workers' movement, has been the history of the struggle of Marxism against bourgeois and revisionist ideology during which Marxism has won through triumphant. It has won the minds and hearts of millions of men and women. Socialism marches forward victoriously. Neither imperialists nor revisionists can thwart its onward march, nor turn society backwards. The future belongs to it. Imperialism together with its outgrowth, revisionism, are doomed to disappear.

**THE TITO CLIQUE
AND
THE DRAFT OF THE NEW YUGOSLAV
CONSTITUTION**

Article published in the newspaper
Zëri i Popullit

December 13, 1962

The draft of the new Yugoslav constitution was approved and published some time ago. The official propaganda of the Yugoslav revisionists has attached great significance to this document, claiming it as "the first monument of real emancipated labour" and a pattern for all the countries which aim to build socialism.

An analysis, be it a general one, of this document shows that in reality it has nothing in common with a socialist constitution, but is merely a substantiation and legalization of those principles of the modern revisionists concerning the social and state order which found their expression in the infamous program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. This document openly ignores and intentionally distorts the principles of Marxism-Leninism concerning the state, puts new garments on the worn-out anarchical, syndicalist and Bukharinist theses branded by Lenin as attempts to restore capitalism and repeats the widely-known revisionist conceptions about political and economic integration both on the internal as well as on the international front. At the same time, this draft constitution repeats a set of principles typical of the bourgeois constitutions and doctrines on the state, although they are formulated in pseudo-revolutionary and pseudo-socialist terms in order to mislead the working masses and international public opinion. Viewed from this angle it is befitting to apply to the Tito clique Marx's censure of the bourgeois republicans of his time, "for whom," he said, "the constitution is a downright **intrigue**."

It should, above all, establish the rule of their own clique” (Marx-Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, page 154).

I

Why are the Yugoslav revisionists in need of a new constitution at this time? It is plain that a change in the basic law of a state, one of the most important and responsible issues in its political and social life, must in itself reflect a great turn in the development of its social relations, a transition into a new qualitative situation. In his report to the Federative Assembly of Yugoslavia in connection with the draft of the new constitution, E. Kardelj pretended that “the decision of the People’s Federative Assembly to draw up a new constitution is based, above all, on the fact that the provisions of the constitution in power no longer reflect, in many cases, the actual situation of the social relations in our socialist country, and as such, they no longer meet the present social needs in these fields of social and political development”. In reality no change has come about in the social and state structure in the socialist development of this country from the adoption of the 1953 constitution to this day. On the contrary, everything has tended towards encouraging and extending capitalist relations in all fields of activity, and tended towards a gradual and inevitable elimination of the revolutionary achievements of the peoples of Yugoslavia.

But the Yugoslav revisionists need the proclamation of a new constitution in order to legalize many anti-Marxist conceptions of the program of the League of

Communists of Yugoslavia, to legalize their line of action towards the re-establishment of capitalism, to replenish the concentrated attack which the modern revisionists have now launched on all fronts against Marxist-Leninist ideology and to extend the revisionist subversion into the international arena.

The draft constitution, Kardelj’s report and the subsequent discussions in the Yugoslav Skuptchina, expose their intention of advertising this revisionist document as a “charter of special socialism” and of broadcasting the experience of Yugoslavia as a universal experience of value to all peoples in all countries. This document ignores the universal significance of the experience of the Soviet Union, the first socialist state in the world, ignores and opposes the experience of all other socialist countries. “The orientation in the general establishment of the political system and the organizational machinery of the socialist state, depends on whether a socialist state **tends towards an ever growing state power** — very widely spread in the socialist world a short time ago — **or on social self-administration and the use of the greatest possible democratic forms in settling contradictions in the development of socialism,**” says Kardelj (emphasis by the ed.).

Thus, by rejecting the Marxist-Leninist thesis on the necessity of consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat under conditions of the existence of imperialism, Kardelj vindicates the revisionist thesis of doing away with the socialist state by integrating antagonistic classes, a process which would open the way to the restoration of capitalism within the country, and to capitulation to imperialism in the international arena.

In order to reconcile their revisionist thesis of gradual elimination of the state at the present stage with the need of drawing up a new constitution — a constitution that cannot be conceived without the existence of the state — the Yugoslav leaders claim that “the draft provides that the constitution is not only a constitution of the state but it is, at the same time, a **special social charter** (emphasis by the ed.) which will comprise the material basis, the political framework and the stimulant for a growing internal development of the machinery for social self-administration and direct democracy”. It is not the first time that the Yugoslav revisionists have placed the sign of equation between society and the state, a conception typical of the bourgeois and social-opportunist ideologists.

What strikes one as a main characteristic of the draft of the Yugoslav constitution is the fact that nowhere is the established principle of state sovereignty, as an expression of the authority of the ruling class, of its dictatorship, typical of the social and state order of socialism, nowhere is this principle formulated, directly or indirectly in this draft. This omission is not accidental, it reflects the revisionist conception of the role of the state, its integration into society, and its elimination as early as at the present stage.

While the socialist constitutions envisage not only the legal guarantees but also the material means and conditions to enforce democratic rights and prerogatives, the bourgeois constitutions are characterized by a formal proclamation of certain democratic principles and, at the same time, their juridical curtailment and limitations, through subsequent provisions in the same constitutions. In such cases the limiting provisions actually eliminate

the democratic principles, endow the state organs with unlimited power to decide whether or not the conditions exist for the citizens to take advantage of the rights proclaimed.

This is also the case with the draft of the Yugoslav constitution which simultaneously is a jumble of theses and antitheses, affirmation of principles and their negation. Of course, this has nothing whatsoever to do with the dialectic unity of opposites; on the contrary, as Karl Marx has said when referring to bourgeois constitutions, “every paragraph of the constitution contains in itself its antithesis, its upper and lower chamber: freedom, in general terms, and lack of freedom sub rosa” (see Marx — *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*). The first paragraph of Article 24 of the draft of the Yugoslav constitution reads: “The exploitation of another’s labour in order to reap profit is prohibited”; whereas immediately after that in the second paragraph exploitation of man by man is allowed: “In agricultural production as well as in the field of trades and crafts which citizens carry on with their own means of production, auxiliary work by others may be allowed within the bounds and under definite conditions prescribed by law.” The same thing is noticed in connection with the exercising of the most important prerogative of citizens, such as the freedom of the press and of the other means of information, freedom of association, freedom of speech and of meetings, which are proclaimed in the first paragraph of Article 41, while the subsequent paragraph of the same article limits and even prohibits their exercise. These provisions manifest the falsity and demagogical pretensions of the Titoite ideologists who describe

the political and social system of Yugoslavia as a "system which would enable the workers to decide their own destiny and justice in the freest and most democratic way".

II

Vladimir Ilich Lenin has divided constitutions into fictitious and non-fictitious ones according to their content. The first group contains all those constitutions which by demagogically proclaiming democratic rights and prerogatives, actually aim at sanctioning and consolidating the political hegemony and the dictatorial power of the exploiting minority against the workers. Historically this group comprises the constitutions which the liberal bourgeoisie have drawn up at certain periods in order to safeguard their own political and economic monopoly. In this respect, the draft of the Yugoslav constitution too, in addition to the theses which openly ignore or distort the well-known principles of Marxism-Leninism, contains many clauses which proclaim literally, for deceptive purposes, principles inspired by socialist ideas, but which are at variance with Yugoslav reality.

The draft is permeated throughout with alleged concern about man. "The starting point of our new constitution," E. Kardelj has stated in an interview to the Italian newspaper *Unità*, "is not really the state, but man and the relations between men." But who is this man? How can man be visualized apart from classes, and the state? Man cannot be conceived and treated as something abstract, as man "in general" separated from his environment and especially as separated from the actual

social relations arising and developing in society, relations in which he participates by carrying out a definite task. Such a one-sided treatment of man, as that by the Yugoslav revisionists, is typical of the bourgeois constitutions and doctrines of the state, which through conceiving of man "in general" try to conceal the true relation that exists in bourgeois society between the separate social groups which constitute it.

According to E. Kardelj, "the draft of the constitution always takes into account two main factors in the development of society, namely, the interest of emancipated labour and the interest of socialist society". The draft constitution proclaims that "the socialist system in Yugoslavia is based on the relations among men as free and equal producers and creators, whose work serves to meet their individual and common needs alone". It proclaims "the emancipation of labour brought about by doing away with the wages system".

But what "emancipation of labour" can one speak of in Yugoslavia when there are a number of private artisan workshops employing over 300,000 workers, that is, one-tenth of the total number of workers and employees in the country? The number of these workshops has recently been increasing. Some of them have tens of wage-earners in them, while others employ over two hundred workers. These are capitalist enterprises pure and simple, which wrest large profits from exploited workers.

As in capitalist countries, the continuous rise of unemployment is a typical feature of Yugoslav economy. According to data furnished by the Yugoslav press itself, the average number of unemployed workers rises year after year. During the first six months of 1962 it reached

266,000 or 20 per cent above the same period of the preceding year or 52 per cent above 1960. The capitalist system of purchase and sale of labour-power is widely practised in Yugoslavia. Not only the adult peasants but children also sell their labour-power and thus become "hirelings of agriculture". The Yugoslav newspaper *Omladina* has this to say about this disgraceful phenomenon of Yugoslav life: "Children are traded in the market-place like calves, like a sack of oats or any other commodity." Of what kind of "emancipation of labour" can one speak when this newspaper itself is obliged to admit that these "hirelings of agriculture" work on the average 10 hours a day, some of them even 16 hours a day in the fields of others, receiving only a paltry sum for their exertion?(!) Under such circumstances it is not accidental that the draft constitution, while sanctioning the exploitation of others, makes no mention of the great socialist principle "no work, no food", a principle which, as Lenin says, "is understood by every worker. This is admitted . . . by all those who have experienced poverty in their lives, all those who have at any time lived by their labour. . . . It is in this plain, very plain and clear truth that the basis of socialism, its inexhaustible strength, and the unshakable warranty of its final victory lies" (Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. 2, page 362).

Since this draft bears the name "Draft of the new Constitution of the **socialist** Federal Republic of Yugoslavia" its authors feel obliged to sprinkle its text with socialist principles. One of these is the socialist principle of compensation according to work done: "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work". But this important socialist principle of compensation

according to work done is actually tampered with in Yugoslavia. As Josip Broz Tito himself admits, "workers' payments are low" and "the differences in the scales of payments to people are so great that they are inconceivable", and "the accumulation of personal wealth" has become alarming.

The Belgrade revisionists describe the organization of the economic life of Yugoslavia, on the basis of the so-called social self-administration, as a "creative" development of Marxism-Leninism, as a proof of the superiority of the Yugoslav "special socialism" over "bureaucratic and state socialism". The problem of self-administration occupies an important place, and is even raised to a fetish in the draft of the Yugoslav constitution. It is proclaimed as one of the "inviolable bases of the state and the role of man". Moreover, Article 36 sets forth as an "innovation" the declaration that "the right of citizens to social self-administration is inviolable, having priority over all other rights".

The Yugoslav revisionists consider the principle of the so-called social self-administration as the nucleus of "direct" or "integral democracy".

According to them, socialism appears to be divided into two phases: a lower phase, which is "state socialism" and an upper phase, "socialism on the basis of self-administration". The upper phase, according to them, has been attained by Yugoslavia alone while the socialist countries are still in the lower phase of "state socialism". They claim that "state socialism" is characterized by a lack of socialist democracy, such a democracy seems to be an attribute only of "socialism based on self-administration". The Yugoslav revisionists consider state owner-

ship and centralized socialist planning, that is, the economic function of the socialist state which contains in itself the basis of the practical application of true democracy, as the main drawback to socialist democracy. Therefore, it is not accidental that the draft of the Yugoslav constitution bases the economy of the state not on the socialist system of economy and socialist ownership of the means of production, but on "emancipated labour combined with the means of production, which belong to society, and the self-administration of the workers in the production and distribution of the social wealth . . ." thus making a muddle of conceptions and notions unrelated to each other.

The "self-administration" of the Yugoslav revisionists is a reproduction of the anti-Marxist formulae of the anarcho-syndicalists and of the "Workers' Opposition", raised to the height of a basic law. By basing their ideas on economic decentralization they ignore the decisive importance of centralized and planned socialist economy and do not recognize state ownership as the highest form of social ownership, on which socialist relations in production are established as relations of the highest type. On the contrary, by failing to define explicitly (in Article 8) what composes social proprietorship and by leaving it to the usual federal laws to decide on the "disposal" and "other rights on the means of production belonging to society", the draft constitution of Yugoslavia provides legal leeway for such important enterprises as industrial factories, for instance, to belong not to the entire people but to groups of people, at times to very limited groups of people and to cliques who would derive great profits for themselves.

Just how far "socialism" can develop through decentralized economy and through the "workers' council administration" and what consequences follow as a result of such a development of the "free initiative" and "autonomy" in production and distribution, can be seen today in the Yugoslav economy which has been and continues to be plunged further and further into a blind alley, being gnawed at by all the contradictions typical of capitalist economy. In a letter which the Central Committee of the League of the Communists of Yugoslavia addressed to its members some time ago, it admitted that "economic life still faces grave problems". Increased payment deficits and higher prices of goods "have further aggravated the economic situation". The newspaper *Borba* admitted, in April this year, that "many factories in Yugoslavia work only at 10 or 15 per cent of their capacity. The *Federal Bulletin* likewise announced that 618 enterprises were closed last year because of inability to sell their products and that 259 other factories were closed, during the first 5 months of this year, for the same reason. Such phenomena of capitalist economy as over-production and rivalry for markets are typical of the present Yugoslav economy. Thus, Tito himself is obliged to own that "we have also at present industrial enterprises which must be closed tomorrow because of over-production and deficient sales". According to Tito's own words "the national debt has risen to nearly one billion dollars", "the deficit in foreign trade is large". The system of social self-administration has given rise to "the local policy of the closed door", "provincialism and chauvinism".

Pursuing the policy of "free initiative" and of "autonomy", arising from the reforms of foreign trade and the

currency, the Yugoslav state control over foreign currency was altogether abolished. The new system of foreign exchange and foreign trade, established last year with the direct financial assistance of the American imperialists, is a capitalist system which aims at binding Yugoslavia and "integrating it more and more with the Western economic and political world". By granting Yugoslavia credits in the form of goods, the Western capitalist countries throw into the Yugoslav market their unsold goods, thus competing with the Yugoslav industry which is inferior to their own.

Thus "social self-administration" has brought to the political and economic life of Yugoslavia such typically capitalist phenomena as over-production and competition, an increase in unemployment and a rise in the cost of living, and also great economic disproportion and social differences between the classes. The increase of imports and foreign capital investments through the "open door" policy is actually turning Yugoslav economy into one dependent on imperialist monopolies.

But "Yugoslav socialism" exposes its true nature in what is happening in the countryside, where it is clearly seen that it bears no semblance whatsoever to socialism. Yugoslav agriculture gives a true picture of the failure of the economic line followed by the Yugoslav revisionists, of its retrogression into the positions of capitalism. The Belgrade revisionist clique have long since abandoned the Leninist line of collectivization of agriculture, they have dissolved most of the agricultural cooperatives that were set up during the post-liberation period and have given a free hand to the kulaks and other capitalist elements. By setting agriculture "free from administrative

management" the state fostered the development of individual and kulak economy, as well as the free competition of the various economic forces. Engels in his time stressed that the "plight of the peasants came primarily from individual economy conditioned by private ownership" (Marx-Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 2, page 412). Lenin also teaches us that the small individual property inevitably gives rise to capitalism. That is what is happening at present in Tito's Yugoslavia.

The draft of the Yugoslav constitution envisages, in Article 19, that agricultural cooperatives "may be established". But the establishment of agricultural cooperatives is after all also allowed in certain capitalist countries. The question here is, what kind of cooperatives should these be and why is nothing said, in any of the stipulations of the draft of the Yugoslav constitution, about the typical principle of the socialist constitutions and of the state aid and all-round assistance to the socialist agricultural cooperatives. It should be further stressed that the draft does not even mention the principle that "the land belongs to those who till it".

What are the results of the "Yugoslav way" in agriculture? Ninety per cent of the entire arable land in the Yugoslav villages today belongs to individual owners. Land is freely sold and bought or leased out, and farm workers on quite a large scale are freely hired and exploited at low wage rates by rich landowners. Nearly 50 per cent of individual farmers in the principal grain growing regions possess neither draft animals nor ploughs, and are obliged to either sell their land or lease it to the kulaks. The State Secretary for Agriculture, Slavko Komar, was obliged to admit, some time ago, that

the rich peasants in the Yugoslav villages have become "the managers of production". "Trade in labour-power" has recently appeared in many agricultural regions of Yugoslavia.

III

The question of the state is a basic one which reflects the diametrically opposite views of Marxism-Leninism on the one side and of bourgeois and modern revisionist ideology on the other. Marxism-Leninism considers the socialist state, the dictatorship of the proletariat, as the main weapon with which the working class and all the labouring masses can expropriate the bourgeoisie, can do away with all remnants of capitalism in economy and in men's minds, can put an end to antagonistic classes and the exploitation of man by man, and can fully build socialist society and create the conditions for the establishment of complete communism, under which the socialist state will finally cease to exist. "Between capitalist and communist society," Marx has said, "there exists the period of the revolutionary transformation of the first into the second. A political transition period corresponds to this period and the state of this period can be no other than the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat" (Marx-Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 2, page 23).

In this transition period, the state, through its economic, organizational, cultural and educational functions, is the main lever of the working class to bring about radical changes in the field of economy and culture under the guidance of its party. This transition period is a

long historical period which continues until conditions are ripe for full communist equality among men. Therefore, as far as internal conditions are concerned "complete elimination of the state is incumbent on complete communism" (Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. 2, page 209).

In contradiction to this basic Marxist-Leninist thesis the modern revisionists like the Yugoslav revisionists openly expound the need to do away with the socialist state immediately, or, when they dare not come out in the open with a proposal of this kind, they advocate the elimination of the dictatorship of the proletariat and its transformation into "a general state of the people".

To the Yugoslav revisionists, the socialist state is not a new and more advanced type of state, and it is not essentially different from a bourgeois state. The bourgeois state, according to them, "is characterized by those attributes that belong to the socialist state during the phase of transition from capitalism to socialism" (see "Problems of Political Economy of Socialism" — Belgrade, 1958, page 138). Under conditions of "gradual and peaceful integration" of capitalism into socialism, according to them, "state capitalism" is the highest phase of imperialism and at the same time, the first phase of socialism. It is therefore obvious why the draft of the Yugoslav constitution fails to define the class nature of the Yugoslav state and the leading role of the working class, which is blended into the general conceptions of "workers" and "people".

According to the Yugoslav revisionists, "socialism and the state, like socialism and state ownership, are two irreconcilable opposite conceptions". According to them, "no state exists in an advanced socialist society and, as a

consequence no state capitalism exists". According to them, it is impossible to establish so-called economic and political democracy when the state governs relations in production. Since "the state apparatus and bureaucracy are essentially identical notions", the Yugoslav revisionists, in opposition to the Leninist principle of democratic centralization, put forward the thesis of decentralization of power, for without decentralization there is, allegedly, no "self-administration" and without "self-administration" there is no direct democracy and, consequently, no socialist democracy.

In the draft of the constitution the basis of the political system of Yugoslavia is built in conformity with these revisionist principles. Although the communes, with their assemblies of representatives, are proclaimed as the basis of this system (even though the assemblies of representatives within the federated republics are also proclaimed as and formally constitute the only permanent basis of all state systems and organs) yet, in essence, they have neither the character of representative bodies in the real sense of the term, nor do they play any decisive role in state affairs in general. Moreover, the draft lays no constitutional obligations on the representatives to render account of their work to the electors nor does it recognize the right of the electors to recall their representatives. Such a right is a direct expression of the sovereignty of the people and, consequently, of the democratization of the state apparatus as well.

In defiance of the slogans of "direct democracy" and "social and political self-administration" the draft consolidates and extends the prerogatives of the executive organs to the detriment of the representative organs, thus

strengthening the hands of the clique in power. The so-called "system of rotation" of Article 210, whereby no person is elected to the same state position for more than two terms in succession, does not apply to the first President of the Republic, Josip Broz Tito. This serves the same purpose. E. Kardelj justifies this immutability of Tito's personal presidential power by declaring that "the clause of the constitution which exempts the person of Comrade Tito from all restrictions at the polls is not an exception but a constitutional provision of principle".(!) Such "constitutional provisions of principle" are not to be found in any bourgeois constitutions of the past, not even in that of the Karageorgioviiches except in the "Constitution of the Albanian Kingdom" of 1928, which explicitly designated Ahmed Zogu as King!

Contrary to the formal proclamation of decentralization, the draft of the Yugoslav constitution extends and strengthens the prerogatives of the Federation to the detriment of the rights of the federated republics and the autonomous regions. Oppression of national minorities, and the outstanding inequality of economic development in the various republics and regions are typical of Tito's Yugoslavia. The draft provides for the establishment of a special fund of the Federation in order to finance the economic development of the underdeveloped republics and regions. But, regardless of this formal statement of principle in the draft, the essence of the economic policy of the Belgrade revisionists has been laid bare by Tito himself, who stated at Split that "it is better to furnish the underdeveloped regions with means and other things for public works and for cultural activities, than to set up factories which would again cost. . . ."

Such concentration of power in the federative organs and the discrimination against other nationalities has turned the Yugoslav Federation into a screen behind which is concealed a strict centralization of political power, and a denial of the rights of the other nationalities. The draft of the constitution disguises this reality behind a lot of "democratic formulae" which, nevertheless, reveal the expansionist and chauvinist trends of the Tito revisionist clique. "The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia," the draft maintains, "as a free community of peoples, which strives to attain political, economic and cultural cooperation with other peoples and states, considers that this cooperation should contribute towards setting up new forms of democratic integration of peoples and of states which would serve the interests of the peoples, and the need for speeding up social progress; in this respect it is an **open community**" (emphasis by the ed.). Does this mean that Yugoslav revisionists look forward to swallowing up other peoples in a legalized constitutional way in the days to come?

* * *

The whole make-up of the draft of the Yugoslav constitution points clearly to the incontestable fact, of primary importance, that far from being a socialist constitution it is a typical bourgeois constitution draped in "socialist" garments. It is, as a consequence, the continuation, development and further promotion of the anti-Marxist program of the League of the Communists of Yugoslavia. It is another document of betrayal by the Tito clique.

THE KHRUSHCHEV-TITO REVISIONIST GROUP CONCOCT NEW PLANS AGAINST THE CAUSE OF SOCIALISM

Article published in the newspaper
Zëri i Popullit

January 8, 1963

As time passes, the modern revisionists plunge themselves deeper into the mire of betrayal to the interests of Marxism-Leninism, the international communist and workers' movement, the cause of socialism, the liberation of the peoples, and peace. This is clearly shown by the whole history of the evolution of the renegade Tito clique and of N. Khrushchev's revisionist group; it is forcefully borne out by recent events.

The stand of N. Khrushchev's revisionist group towards the Caribbean crisis, towards the Sino-Indian border conflict, the complete rapprochement of this group with Tito's revisionist group, the growing hostility of N. Khrushchev and his followers towards the Albanian Party of Labour and towards other parties that stand resolutely for the purity of Marxism-Leninism, his monstrous assaults and slanders against them — all of these, when taken together and closely connected with each other, lay bare not only what the modern revisionists are doing but also what they intend to do in the days to come.

This is clearly evident also in N. Khrushchev's address to the session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on December 12, 1962. This speech is further evidence of the fact that N. Khrushchev's group are heading towards dissension and betrayal, towards anti-Marxism and revisionism. His views and acts are taking him closer and closer to the ideological and political line of the Titoite clique by rejecting and trampling underfoot the common

line of the international communist and workers' movement clearly formulated in both the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations. He is becoming closer to and hanging together with the enemies of the cause of socialism and communism, with the Yugoslav revisionists and the imperialists, while maintaining an increasingly bitter and hostile attitude towards the socialist countries and fraternal parties which resolutely uphold the revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism, of hostility towards imperialism and revisionism. He is doing so by leaving no leeway for solving divergences within the international communist and workers' movement and consolidating its unity on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and of proletarian internationalism.

N. Khrushchev's speech provided everybody with an opportunity to draw appropriate conclusions, among which it is not difficult to perceive the main one, namely, in whose benefit N. Khrushchev spoke and along what lines he is proceeding.

When Tito attended the meeting as a guest of honor and spoke to the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, he hailed N. Khrushchev's speech, saying that "he had followed it with close attention", that he was "generally at one with what Nikita Sergeyevich had said concerning the relations between our two countries", and that "our views on major international issues are identical or nearly so", and so on and so forth. A few days later, in his press conference, President Kennedy spared no word of praise for Khrushchev whom he in fact upheld as "the best premier of the Soviet Union", as far as the interests of American imperialism are concerned, of course. This is what the enemies of communism said. And

it is evident that when the enemy praises the deeds of a communist it goes without saying that those deeds do not serve the revolution, nor the people, but are of benefit to the enemy and to the counter-revolutionaries.

True Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries and the people, too, draw a conclusion from N. Khrushchev's speech. They see that N. Khrushchev's group are persistently proceeding along the line of dissension and betrayal, that they are causing ever greater damage to the basic interests of the communist and revolutionary movement, of the people and of world peace by their views and acts. That is why true communists sharpen their vigilance and strive now more than at any time in the past to expose the treacherous nature of the revisionists in order to frustrate their diabolic plans and aims.

* * *

In order to carry out their plans which are to dismember the communist movement and the socialist camp so that they may deal a harder blow at Marxism-Leninism and at the revolutionary movement of the people, the revisionists have long striven to form a united front, have long striven to find a common language in their activities against the communist movement. Tito's clique represent the first group of the modern revisionists which manifested themselves in the international communist and workers' movement immediately after the establishment of the socialist camp. Placing themselves in the service of the American and other imperialists, the Yugoslav leaders' revisionist clique set to work, right at the start, to undermine the socialist countries, to oppose Marxism-Leninism, to check the growth of the influence

of socialism in the world. In many of the People's Democracies in Europe they set up and organized groups of agents with whose assistance they hoped to put into execution the criminal imperialist designs to overthrow the people's regime and destroy the socialist camp. But Tito's subversive plans met with failure. J. V. Stalin, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Information Bureau, tore the mask off the treacherous group of Yugoslav leaders by clearly proving in a convincing way that these were an anti-Marxist group, agents of the imperialists, a group of saboteurs within the international communist and workers' movement. The exposure of the Yugoslav revisionists led to the detection of their collaborators in the ranks of the fraternal parties and they were duly called to account and met with what they deserved.

Later events corroborated the correctness of the condemnation of Tito's clique by the international communist movement. Tito's clique betrayed Marxism-Leninism, the interests of socialism and openly band together with the American and other imperialists, as can be proved by a host of facts. Up to date they have received from the imperialists over 5 billion dollars in the forms of "aid" and credits. They have joined the military Balkan Pact, two members of which are members of NATO; under the guise of "neutrality" and "keeping outside blocs" they have striven and continue to strive to alienate the newly liberated countries from cooperation with the socialist camp and to link them with the imperialist powers, particularly the American imperialists; they have never ceased to undermine the socialist countries, as manifested by their active support of the counter-revo-

lutionaries of the Imre Nagy type in the Hungarian events and by their joint participation with the American imperialists, the Greek monarchical fascists and the various Albanian traitors in the plots against our country; they have launched attacks against Marxism-Leninism and attempted to revise its basic theses, as expressed so clearly in the program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia which was adopted at its 7th Congress, and so forth and so on. It is precisely because this clique of traitors have gone to such an extent that the 1960 Declaration of the 81 communist and workers' parties stresses the need to continuously expose and resolutely combat the Yugoslav revisionist leaders. This is the joint conclusion of the international communist and workers' movement, which expresses the unanimous opinion of revolutionaries and Marxist-Leninists.

The anti-Marxists, all of those who work not to strengthen the communist movement and the socialist camp but to split and to exterminate it, think otherwise. Such are N. Khrushchev's group who, in order to temporarily disguise their own plans, formally agreed with the opinion of the 81 fraternal parties and signed the Declaration, on the other hand dead set on violating it. And this is very clear indeed to every true communist. For N. Khrushchev and his group who had long since gone over to the position of revisionism would surely try to unite all revisionists throughout the world in order to carry out their plans against Marxism-Leninism. The best organized and most experienced group that enjoyed the full confidence of the American imperialists — and this is a thing which interested N. Khrushchev for his later plans — was the group of Yugoslav revisionists.

True Marxists, all who have attentively followed Nikita Khrushchev's activities since his ascent to the highest post in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, cannot have failed to notice his persistent efforts to join in a common front with the Yugoslav revisionists. These efforts have been expressed in more than one way: in May 1955, N. Khrushchev went to Yugoslavia and, violating the resolution of the Information Bureau, embarked on the line of reconciliation and rapprochement with the Yugoslav revisionists; at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union N. Khrushchev attacked J. V. Stalin, a thing which would serve the dual purpose of discrediting Marxism-Leninism and rehabilitating the Titoite clique and justifying his reconciliation with them; under the demagogical pretext of doing away with "the consequences of the cult of the individual" Tito's agents who had been tried and found guilty in the European socialist countries were rehabilitated in good time. N. Khrushchev collaborated with Tito in making changes in the leadership of the Party and the State in Hungary and let him have a free hand during the events of the Hungarian counter-revolution under the ridiculous pretext of "not enhancing his vanity"; N. Khrushchev's group ceased in fact to denounce the hostile activities of the Yugoslav revisionists and, under the pretext of "peaceful coexistence", began all-round rapprochement with them both in state and party relations, through frequent exchange of delegations, through various agreements and so on and so forth.

Our Party of Labour has continuously unmasked these dealings pointing clearly to the goal N. Khrushchev intended to achieve. It pointed this out at the Moscow

meeting of the 81 parties as well. But N. Khrushchev kept going his own way. The signal that prepared the ground for the final rapprochement between Tito's and Khrushchev's group was sounded by the speech which Khrushchev delivered at Varna in Bulgaria in which he gave directives for union. This directive was followed by Brezhnev's visit to Belgrade and was sealed with Tito's "vacation" trip to the Soviet Union where the Yugoslav revisionist leaders met with a warm, a very hearty and friendly reception, a triumphal reception. The latest acts of the revisionists were well coordinated and carefully prepared so as to give "honorable comrade" J. B. Tito as much satisfaction as possible. This is clearly evident by the fact that Tito's visit to the Soviet Union took place after the congresses of the communist and workers' parties of Bulgaria and Hungary were held and those of Czechoslovakia and Italy were proceeding.

Nothing was ever said at these congresses by way of criticism of the Yugoslav revisionist clique and at the Congress of the Italian Communist Party where they were represented by a delegation, much was publicly said in their defense. This is also evident by the fact that the attacks of the revisionists both at these congresses and in Khrushchev's speech were directed mainly against "dogmatism", "sectarianism" and especially against the "Albanian dogmatists", by arbitrarily proclaiming "dogmatism" as the principal menace to the international communist and workers' movement. The revisionists needed this assessment of the "menace" of "dogmatism" among others in order to please J. B. Tito and to belittle the just opposition the Marxist-Leninists made to the modern revisionism of the Khrushchev-Tito group.

Finally, in order to justify his complete reconciliation and rapprochement with the Titoite clique, N. Khrushchev dwelt at great length in his speech and publicly endorsed that Yugoslavia was a "socialist country", that the Yugoslav leaders had "corrected" many of their mistakes and had "turned over a new leaf" and that too many things had been said about them, that the Moscow Declaration was a "stereotyped specimen", and trifles of this kind to which no man with a clear conscience can give credit.

What right has N. Khrushchev to call the Moscow Declaration a "stereotyped specimen" and reject its conclusions which have been approved of by the entire international communist and workers' movement and corroborated by experience? This is quite a disdainful and hostile attitude towards the international communist movement and its jointly adopted documents, an attitude which goes to show that he intends to place himself above the whole communist movement and to force his revisionist views on it. The jointly approved documents of the international communist movement cannot be arbitrarily modified by any person or party, whoever they may be. But of what significance is this to Nikita Khrushchev who, as an anti-Marxist, acts always as a putschist adventurer. He wanted to establish a united revisionist front and he has managed to achieve his goal. Whereas modern revisionism had formerly found its tangible expression in Tito's clique, the Khrushchev-Tito group are now the typical representative of the united front of the modern revisionists.

The establishment of the united front of the modern revisionists was essential to both Tito and N. Khrushchev

so that they might more easily attain their common objective. Firstly, they needed it so that they might deal a more pugnacious blow at Marxism-Leninism and at the unity of the international communist and workers' movement. This was clear especially at the recent congresses of the communist and workers' parties as well as in N. Khrushchev's address to the Supreme Soviet, by the bitter attacks against the Albanian Party of Labour and other "dogmatists" as the "principal menace" to the international communist and workers' movement, etc. Finding their position untenable because of the growing exposure of their revisionist views by life itself and of the growing resistance of parties and communists against them, the modern revisionists are striving by all methods and means to conceal their true nature, to disguise themselves under the false slogans of combating "dogmatism", "sectarianism" and "foolhardiness". But this is an old well-known tactics. The revisionists have always used the struggle against dogmatism and dogmatists as a mask behind which to fight Marxism-Leninism and the parties and communists who loyally uphold their revolutionary doctrine, just as they have used the struggle against sectarianism and adventurism as a mask behind which to make the people give up their fight and their revolution, to immobilize and paralyze them in order to preach reconciliation with their class enemies, to make unprincipled compromises and concessions and to capitulate to them. The attack the modern revisionists direct against Marxism-Leninism is one that affects our basic victorious doctrine. They strive to revise its basic principles, to reject the general laws of revolution and of socialist construction, to proclaim Marxism-Leninism as

out of date, to deprive it of its militant and revolutionary spirit, to make of it something acceptable and harmless to the bourgeoisie and to all reactionaries. That is why it is essential to tear off the mask of the revisionists, to expose their false slogans and to lay bare their true aims and purposes. Dogmatism and sectarianism cannot be fought from positions of revisionism. Only those who successfully fight against revisionism are in a position to wage a successful struggle against dogmatism as well.

The tendency of the revisionists to intensify their opposition to Marxism-Leninism and the interests of communism is clearly manifested also in some processes which have taken place recently among certain parties. Among these parties we notice the phenomenon of the removal from positions of leadership of those persons who do not uphold or are not so enthusiastic about the opportunist and treacherous line of the Khrushchev-Tito group. The pretext always is that either they are responsible for "illegal dealings" during the "period of the cult of the individual" or because of rotating cadres. It is becoming clearer and clearer that the revisionists are using, for their own hostile purposes, the correct Marxist thesis of considering the manifestation of the cult of the individual as alien to the communist and workers' movement. They utilize the so-called cult of the individual of Stalin as a screen behind which to do away with cadres who loyally uphold Marxism-Leninism, and those who oppose revisionism. The purge in the ranks of certain parties is being accompanied by continuous "reforms" and "reorganization" of the party and of the economy on a national as well as on an international basis, the essence of which reminds one in many cases of the

"reforms" which were long ago carried out by Tito's revisionist group in Yugoslavia.

As a result of the revisionists' activities, which are prejudicial to the interests of socialism, a visible process of differentiation is being manifested in many parties: side by side with the revisionist group who hold the reins of the state in their hands a growing number of ordinary and responsible communists, dissatisfied with and disgusted by the deeds and line of action of the revisionists, are resisting the revisionist course. No doubt the revisionists will go to great lengths in their line of betrayal and will not hesitate to adopt even methods of persecution towards those who stand loyal to Marxism-Leninism. This is borne out by the harshness with which they fight the parties courageously upholding Marxism-Leninism in the international arena, by the experience of the Yugoslav revisionist leaders who in opposing the true communists make use of jails, concentration camps and bullets.

By all their views and deeds the modern revisionists are splitting the unity of the international communist and workers' movement and of the socialist camp, while on the other hand they accuse Marxist-Leninists of being splitters. They themselves fight against unity while, on the other hand, they pretend to demand unity. But of what unity do the revisionists speak? They demand an infirm unity, a unity that tends to the right, a unity of revisionists based not on a principled policy, not on the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary ideology, but on the policy of capitulation to the imperialists on the anti-Marxist ideology of the revisionists. The rapprochement with Tito's clique, unity with these agents of imperialism and

N. Khrushchev's recent speech itself show clearly what kind of unity the revisionists have in mind. The Marxist-Leninists strive firmly for unity but for a sound, immaculate unity free from disease, capable of withstanding the warmongering attempts of the imperialists and of guiding the revolutionary fight of the peoples with pluck and courage. In striving for unity the Marxist-Leninists bear in mind the teachings and example set by Lenin who kept stressing that the struggle against the imperialists cannot be brought to a successful end without first getting rid of the opportunists within the ranks of the workers' movement, without freeing the workers' movement of revisionists.

Every passing day confirms the correctness of the conclusions of both the Moscow Declarations that revisionism rather than dogmatism is the main menace to the international communist movement, that this menace is growing more serious and that, without fighting it with all the revolutionary vigor which characterizes communists, it may bring greater damage to the cause of socialism, to the just struggle of the peoples and to world peace.

The revisionists stood in need of a united front in the second place, in order to enable them to get closer and closer to the imperialists, to make a leeway for a "broader" international policy on the basis of leniency and "reasonable" compromise in order to create the necessary conditions for the deterioration of socialism by following the experience of the Yugoslav example of conduct towards imperialism. This tendency, which has been observed even before and which is more obvious in Nikita Khrushchev's address to the Supreme Soviet,

springs from the anti-Marxist conception of N. Khrushchev and his group on imperialism and the imperialist leaders. The modern revisionists presume that the aggressive nature of imperialism has undergone a change, that only certain "madmen" and "lunatics" want and urge war, that President Kennedy himself behaved "wisely", "realistic", "restrained" and "preoccupied" in "preserving peace", etc. during the Cuban crisis. As early as September 1962 N. Khrushchev stated in his article published in the journal *Communist*, No. 12, that the imperialists had given up and were giving up their aggressive designs against the socialist countries, that they had taken to heart the call for peaceful economic competition with socialism, that they had concentrated all their efforts on competition with the world socialist system in the field of economy, politics and ideology.

N. Khrushchev has gone so far in disseminating such illusions about the desire of the imperialists for peace that he publicly declared in his recent message to Adenauer that he fully supported the efforts for peace of Pope John XXIII. There may of course be people who would call this statement of N. Khrushchev's as "ingenious", as an "expression of Leninist elasticity in politics", as "wise tactics to differentiate the camp of the enemy", and so on and so forth. But what kind of peace does the representative of the Vatican, of this well-known reactionary and anti-communist center, preach or dream of? The Roman Pontiff and all the representatives of the Vatican preach Christian peace, peace between the classes that have been created by the will of God, they preach the liberation of the peoples from the "infidels", they preach Christ's principle of unconditional obedience: "if

they deal you a blow on one cheek turn to them the other cheek". Could N. Khrushchev have this last principle of the Bible in mind when he declared that he fully supported the efforts for peace of Pope John XXIII?

It was with such anti-Marxist conceptions which express the subjective desire of pacifists and not at all the conclusions of class analysis, that N. Khrushchev "reasoned out" and even raised to a "theory", in his speech of December 12, the necessity of making concessions to the imperialists, as a basis for peaceful coexistence. No true Marxist-Leninist can deny the necessity of reasonable and mutual compromises in given situations and under given conditions. This is one of V. I. Lenin's teachings. But every true communist and revolutionary is opposed to unilateral compromises like those which N. Khrushchev's group preach and carry out, which are detrimental to the basic interests of the peoples, to the cause of peace and of socialism and which constitute, in fact, capitulation to the enemy. He is opposed to attempts to present the policy of peaceful coexistence as only a compromise and nothing else, to present the policy of leniency and compromise as the only just policy and as the only way to safeguard peace and to establish peaceful coexistence.

Following this line N. Khrushchev's group try to achieve "an easing of international tension", a "softening" of the cold war on the basis of unprincipled compromises in order to create a false situation of peace which will lull the vigilance of the peoples to sleep and which will seriously menace the cause of peace and socialism.

Of course, a special role in realizing the plans of the Khrushchev-Tito group and of putting into execution the "broad policy" with the imperialists to the detriment of the interests of communism, will be played by the agents of imperialism, the treacherous Tito group, as an intermediary in new political machinations between N. Khrushchev and Kennedy. These machinations may burst forth in any putschist meetings, with bitter attacks against the parties which strongly uphold the positions of Marxism-Leninism. It must not be forgotten that Tito himself revealed the final goal of the revisionists when he said in his interview granted to the American newspaperman D. Pearson, in August 1962, that "our way is that of the economic and political integration of the world" and that he would take up all issues with N. Khrushchev as well as with Kennedy. He stressed that "Premier Khrushchev knows how to estimate the opinions and I have noticed this among the American leaders as well".

The united Khrushchev-Tito front is ready for fresh deeds, for fresh betrayal, for fresh blows to the socialist camp, to communism. But they will surely fail for our epoch is the epoch of Leninism, the epoch in which the destiny of mankind does not depend on the machinations of imperialist and revisionist chancelleries but on the peoples themselves. The peoples, true communists and revolutionaries are alert and at these decisive moments will frustrate the dangerous plans of the various foes of communism, will advance the cause of peace and social-

ism by mercilessly smashing the imperialist warmongers as well as their allies, the revisionist lackeys.

* * *

The "broad policy" in relations with the imperialists, the policy of "concession" and "reasonable compromises" which N. Khrushchev has tried to put into execution, the policy that aims openly at reconciliation with the imperialists, was best shown during the Cuban crisis. It was there that the danger of this policy to socialism and to world peace itself came forth with consummate clarity. The peoples and revolutionaries in various countries and honest communists saw tangible evidence of the unbalanced attitude of N. Khrushchev's group, and their capitulation and withdrawal before the blackmail of the American imperialists. The prestige of N. Khrushchev's revisionist group was dealt a deadly blow. It was precisely because of this and in order to justify their opportunist and treacherous policy and to make good their lost prestige that N. Khrushchev devoted most of his speech to the Caribbean crisis to lay bare the corresponding "arguments" in order to prove that the stand they took coincided with the interests of peace and socialism.

In his December 12, 1962 speech N. Khrushchev claimed that the peoples of the world hailed the Soviet attitude as a "wise" stand that saved "Cuba and the world from a nuclear catastrophe", and so on. But if all the people of the world had hailed N. Khrushchev's stand with so much enthusiasm why did he go to such great lengths to explain the Caribbean crisis in detail? If everything was clear and orderly why should this question be taken up

in all Party Congresses, in all Central Committee plenums or in all national and regional conferences, and special resolutions be adopted to "support" N. Khrushchev's stand? Revisionist propaganda treats the question of N. Khrushchev's "elasticity" in the Cuban crisis with so much zeal as to create the impression that everything had been carefully prepared so as to leave the door open for further compromises in the days to come. But regardless of the earsplitting noise, the peoples and true revolutionaries clearly saw in the Cuban crisis the danger of N. Khrushchev's policy of acrobatics, his opportunist and treacherous trend to capitulate to and to compromise with the imperialists without taking into account the sovereignty of the people and the impending danger to world peace in the days to come.

The Caribbean crisis demonstrated once again that American imperialism is the main stronghold of aggression and war, that the American imperialists are the sworn enemies of the socialist countries and of the peoples, that, in order to attain their reactionary, predatory aims, they do not hesitate to undertake most dangerous acts and to lead the world towards a new war. The aggressive acts against socialist Cuba were not undertaken by certain "madmen" and "lunatics" as N. Khrushchev tries to pose the question, but by the USA government itself, headed by Kennedy, and in a very conscious and premeditated way at that. As a matter of fact one October day in 1962 the American imperialists made up their minds to haughtily dictate to a sovereign people, to the fraternal Cuban people, what weapons they should and should not have to defend themselves with, from whom they should and should not procure them. Thus the mat-

ter was put to the Cuban people and government in the form of an ultimatum: that they should either remove the defensive weapons from and allow imperialist control of Cuban territory or the USA would attack. They set up a naval blockade around Cuba. The sovereign rights of a people were trampled upon. The USA thus gave itself the right to force its will on others, now on Cuba and later on other countries.

Two attitudes were adopted towards this arbitrary act of the American imperialist bandits. American aggression was opposed by the heroic Cuban people who, rallying around their leader, Comrade Fidel Castro, and under the militant watchword "Country or death, we shall win", rose as a single man to defend their independence, sovereignty and national dignity. It was opposed by the people of the world, by all international public opinion. Those who believe in the strength of the peoples, in the role of the masses and evaluate their influence cannot but arrive at the conclusion that it was precisely the unbending, revolutionary and dignified stand of the Cuban people and of their leader Comrade Fidel Castro, as well as the solidarity of the socialist camp and of all the peoples, that compelled the American imperialists to balk, bridle and give up their hazardous adventure. This was the decisive factor which averted the immediate danger of aggression against Cuba and of war.

In the Cuban crisis, N. Khrushchev's group pursued the line of concession and compromise, the line of solving the problem by accepting, in fact, the right of the American imperialists to force their will on others and to trample on their sovereignty as an incontestable right. Underestimating the strength of the peoples and over-

estimating the strength of the imperialists and in order to prove to President Kennedy how magnanimous he was towards imperialism and how desirous of peace, N. Khrushchev withdrew the rockets and airplanes which, according to him, were the cause of the crisis, and recognized the right of the USA to supervise. According to N. Khrushchev, both parties made concessions. What N. Khrushchev conceded is more than clear. What "concessions" the USA made is also clear. According to N. Khrushchev's propaganda, Kennedy gave guarantees that he would not launch military intervention in Cuba. But can this be called a concession? Cuban President Comrade O. Dorticos has rightly said: ". . . If military non-intervention is taken as a warranty, it would create a dangerous precedent that would lead to recognizing the right of military intervention. If we gave up our sovereign right to have this or that weapon in exchange for the United States giving up military intervention, then military intervention in our country would be considered as a sovereign right of the United States which it would give up. . . . We will never agree to nor can anyone agree to the right to military intervention".

This then is "the reasonable compromise" which N. Khrushchev made, which according to him saved Cuba and world peace and pleased all parties concerned. As a Russian proverb has it, "the wolves ate their fill and the sheep suffered no losses"! In vain does N. Khrushchev try to conceal what cannot be concealed: his disgraceful capitulation to the atomic blackmail of the American imperialists and the way he did not hesitate to sacrifice the sovereignty of the peoples and to prejudice the interests of socialism in various countries.

N. Khrushchev tries to utilize the events in Cuba to further his anti-Marxist aims. He tries to spread the illusion that the danger of aggression against Cuba and of war has been removed, that peace has been strengthened and that the way has been opened to a peaceful solution of all the major international issues since N. Khrushchev's "determined" stand, as it was claimed, has "checked" the imperialist warmongers, has compelled them to "withdraw" and "to learn a lesson". As a matter of fact the development of events following the Cuban crisis goes to show that the American imperialists have not only failed to learn a lesson but they have, on the contrary, become more dangerous and more greedy. The imperialists are making more energetic preparations for war and plots against the peoples. Encouraged by the events in Cuba, the American imperialists and their President are making more persistent efforts to establish their hegemony over the world and their NATO allies.

Firstly, the danger of the American imperialist invasion against Cuba exists regardless of the vague and often denied statements by President Kennedy not to undertake military intervention against it. In fact, Kennedy did not fail to speak of "liberating" Cuba, of the need to make preparations against "Castro's communist regime", and so forth, both in his interview on December 17, 1962 and in his pow-wow with the Cuban counter-revolutionary ex-prisoners who returned to the USA on December 29, 1962. The true guarantees to check the military intervention of the American imperialists in Cuba lie in the implementation of Fidel Castro's five-point demands. The joint statement of the leadership of the Union of Revolutionary Organizations and of the

Government of Cuba on October 25, 1962 was justified in saying: "We give no credit to empty words about not attacking us. We need facts. And the facts we need are contained in our demands of five points."

Secondly, N. Khrushchev himself was obliged to own in his speech to the Supreme Soviet following the Cuban events, that many statesmen in the USA, Adenauer and others in Western Germany, Home in England as well as other statesmen in the Western world had made and continued to make statements that "a policy of strength" should be firmly pursued towards the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, that the pending issues should be settled through concessions by one party alone and that in the light of the Cuban concessions, the Soviet Union must make concessions to the NATO bloc in everything. Such are the conclusions which the imperialists drew from N. Khrushchev's "reasonable compromise". It is plainly seen that the policy of flattery and unprincipled concessions does not make the imperialists more reasonable nor more peace-loving.

But the imperialist circles do not confine themselves to words and declarations alone, they have resorted and continue to resort to practical acts as well. Following the Caribbean events the efforts of the imperialists in preparing for war were clearly expressed in the Kennedy-Macmillan talks which ended by supplying England with "Polaris" rockets which would place the latter under growing dependence on American imperialism. In his recent interview President Kennedy announced, on the other hand, that the military budget of the USA of 52 billion dollars may rise to 60 or 65 billion dollars in the days to come, and he asked the other NATO powers

to follow the same line. Finally, immediately after the crisis in the Caribbean region, the imperialists, the American and British imperialists in the first place, publicly announced their direct participation in the boundary aggression against the People's Republic of China by openly encouraging the Indian reactionary circles and by promising and sending them assistance in arms and military personnel.

In spite of N. Khrushchev's endeavors to embellish the imperialists, to disseminate illusions among the masses about the "peace-loving" and "wise" Kennedy and to hurl bombastic thunderbolts on the "madmen" of the Adenauer type alone, he cannot mislead the peoples who know that Adenauer and Kennedy are both enemies of peace and of mankind, that Kennedy is Adenauer's instigator and that in order to defend world peace one must be on guard against both the warmongering acts of Kennedy, Adenauer and all their allies as well as against the machinations and the agreements of the Khrushchev-Tito group with the imperialists to create a false peaceful situation.

N. Khrushchev tries to make believe that he is the saviour of peace, that people should rest all their hopes in the days to come on N. Khrushchev who through his "elasticity" can ease international tension, safeguard and consolidate peace in agreement with Kennedy.

Whereas the Cuban events and the avoidance of the immediate danger of American aggression clearly indicate the significant and decisive role of the peoples themselves and of the international solidarity in preserving peace, N. Khrushchev belittles the role of the popular masses and distrusts the power and determination of the peoples to

defend their destiny. It turns out from his speech that the protests of the people and their international solidarity are nothing else but "bombastic statements" which "did not reduce the strength of the imperialist forces and hardly gave Cuba any relief". This stand of N. Khrushchev's springs from the fact that he requires a freer hand in his bargains with the imperialists, he requires that the masses should blindly follow and unconditionally approve every "compromise" of his, every agreement of his with the imperialists. This was very clearly expressed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, A. Gromyko, who said that "... if there is harmony between the head of the Soviet Government, N. Khrushchev, and the President of the United States, Kennedy, the international problems on which the destiny of mankind depends, will also be settled". It is clear that a risky view of this kind has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism. The 1960 Moscow Declaration stresses: "To strive for peace today means to maintain the greatest vigilance, to ceaselessly expose the policy of the imperialists, to follow with great attention the intrigues and machinations of the warmongers, to arouse the sacred wrath of the peoples against those who pursue the policy of launching war, to raise the organizations of all the peace-loving forces, to continuously increase the active efforts of the masses in favor of peace". The stress is always laid on the masses, on the peoples, on their decisive role. Nowhere are their efforts called "bombastic statements". Nowhere is it said that the destiny of world peace lies in the hands of two statesmen. And it cannot be otherwise. Without denying the role of leaders, Marxism-Leninism teaches that the masses, the people, are the main

force of history and not individuals, however clever they may be, whatever post they may fill. These are the most elementary teachings of Marxism-Leninism, which, however, N. Khrushchev with his revisionist zeal and for his future designs tries to reject as worthless.

However queer it may seem, N. Khrushchev stated in his December 12 speech that "the dogmatists" and "sectarians" were the "warmongers", for they "intended to hurl the world into the flames of a nuclear war". He aims to discredit before the eyes of the world those Marxist-Leninist parties and socialist countries, which firmly oppose aggression and the imperialist warmongers, which unreservedly uphold the revolutionary wars of the peoples to free themselves from imperialist yoke, or those which oppose neo-colonialist endeavors of the imperialists. He aims to tell the imperialists that, in order to get closer to them, he is not only ready to break with the "dogmatists", but can also justify later any action of the imperialists against these "adventurers" who have themselves to blame for the consequences which are due to their "stubborn" and "uncompromising" attitude.

In order to make more or less acceptable his commonplace censure about "dogmatists" trying to drive mankind to a new world war, N. Khrushchev tries to attribute to it a "theoretical" basis by claiming that they "do not believe that socialism and communism can win under conditions of peaceful coexistence with the imperialists", and that they want to settle the matter of the victory of communism over capitalism through war by annihilating millions upon millions of people.

True Marxist-Leninists have never been nor can ever be in favor of bringing about the triumph of socialism

through wars among states. They strictly adhere to the view that revolution cannot be exported. The war among states is not at all essential for the triumph of socialism. The question of the triumph of socialism in various countries is the internal affair of each country, which is settled by the revolutionary forces of every people when favorable conditions have matured for this. Up to recently the censure that the socialist countries and communist parties are in favor of exporting revolution through war, has been heard only from the most reactionary and most warmongering circles of imperialism who try to justify through this their own acts of aggression against the socialist countries, and their reprisals against the communist and workers' parties, against every progressive movement. By repeating these charges N. Khrushchev has legalized these arguments of the imperialists and he undoubtedly has his own purposes and strong reasons for doing this.

Marxist-Leninists are at the same time opposed to N. Khrushchev's anti-Marxist thesis that the triumph of Marxism-Leninism can be achieved through economic competition between the two systems and through the policy of peaceful coexistence. Of course, when the world is divided into two opposing systems, no Marxist-Leninist can deny the need and the importance of an economic race and of peaceful coexistence between them. If the achievements of the socialist countries in their economic competition with the imperialists and the policy of peaceful coexistence are rightly understood and applied in accordance with Marxist-Leninist teachings, they are of great importance also to the revolutionary and national-liberation struggle of the people, they create fa-

avorable conditions and opportunities to carry out this struggle with success, to make socialism win in various countries. Nevertheless the decisive factor in the triumph of socialism is the revolution, the determined struggle of the workers against capitalist oppression and exploitation. It is precisely this struggle that turns into reality the favorable opportunities that the existence of the socialist world system and its achievements in the economic competition with capitalism create. But to lay one-sided emphasis on the role and the importance of economic competition and peaceful coexistence by considering them as "a magic wand" to solve "all the vital problems confronting society", and using them as a pretext to hold in leash the revolutionary and liberation struggles of the peoples, to fail to give them all the necessary backing and support, without reserve and hesitation, as N. Khrushchev and his followers actually do — this would mean to lack confidence in the strength of the peoples, in their revolutionary struggle, and in the triumph of socialism.

Thus N. Khrushchev stretches his hand out to the imperialists in all directions, and turns his back on the interests of the revolution, of Marxism-Leninism, and of the peoples. In unity of thought and action with the Yugoslav revisionists, he opens the way to further harmful deeds against communism and the peoples. Time will best show how events will develop and how far the Khrushchev-Tito group will go in carrying out their plans. But regardless of this, one thing is certain: the people, the Marxist-Leninists, the genuine revolutionaries, on their side, will not cross their hands behind their backs. They fight and will continue to fight ever more firmly both against the warmongering plans of the im-

perialists who are the number one enemy of the peoples, as well as against the plots and anti-Marxist activities of the renegades from communism. The people, the Marxist-Leninists and the true revolutionaries will come off triumphant in the end. The banner of truth, of Marxism-Leninism, of revolution, is not downed nor will it ever be downed by any enemy, or by any traitor. It has waved and will always wave triumphantly.

* * *

The Albanian Party of Labour has fought and continues to fight with pluck and courage against the policy of betrayal of the Khrushchev-Tito revisionist group. It has always stood for and continues to stand for the purity of Marxism-Leninism, in the interests of socialism and communism, and for the Marxist-Leninist unity of the international communist and workers' movement, based always on the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations.

The principled stand and struggle of our Party has always been received with rage and hostility by the modern revisionists, both by Tito's renegade clique as well as by N. Khrushchev's group. That is why the modern revisionists have directed and continue to direct all the guns of their resentment against our Party, sparing nothing: neither pressures, monstrous slanders, base reproaches, calls for counter-revolution, nor the organization of plots. But none of these objectives have met nor will ever meet with success, for our Marxist-Leninist Party cannot be intimidated nor destroyed. It is bound to its people like bone to flesh and it enjoys the sympathy and support of the various peoples, of the communists

and revolutionaries of different countries to which it is bound by ties of internationalist solidarity.

In his speech of December 12, 1962 N. Khrushchev also devoted a great deal of time to slanders and assaults against the Albanian Party of Labour, using a rich vocabulary of vagabonds for the purpose. It would not be worth the trouble to take up here all that N. Khrushchev said against us if it were not for certain matters regarding the revisionist conception of N. Khrushchev himself, matters which throw light on his future aims against the Albanian Party of Labour.

In his speech N. Khrushchev stated, among other things, that the Albanian Party of Labour was primed by certain "foul-mouthed" people "to speak ill about the mother Communist Party of the Soviet Union" and that the Party of Labour was paid 3 kopeks by these people for doing this. A few days before, N. Khrushchev and P. Togliatti at the Italian Communist Party Congress called our Party "the loudspeaker of the Chinese".

The Albanian Party of Labour is an independent party with equal rights in the international communist and workers' movement. It has its own views which correspond to the triumphant teachings of Marxism-Leninism, to the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations and to the interests of socialist construction in our Fatherland. The Albanian Party of Labour has courageously expressed and will always continue to express these views and has no need to be "primed" by or to "obey" any one. During all its revolutionary existence the Albanian Party of Labour has proved by its struggle, its line of action and its stand that it has never bargained with the principles of Marxism-Leninism, that it has never acted

as a loudspeaker for others, that it has never sold itself either to the imperialists, to renegades from Marxism-Leninism or to anyone else, as N. Khrushchev himself has had the opportunity to be fully convinced of.

To meet our needs for economic and cultural reconstruction our socialist country has received credits and all-round internationalist aid only from the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the other countries of the socialist camp. And for this we are grateful to the fraternal peoples of these countries. Now, after the economic blockade set up in retaliation against our country by N. Khrushchev's group, our country continues to receive internationalist help and credits from the People's Republic of China alone. These credits and aid are given to the People's Republic of Albania without interest and without conditions that would in any way prejudice the independence and sovereignty of the country or of the Party. This is due to the fact that both the Albanian Party of Labour and the Communist Party of China are Marxist-Leninist and entirely internationalist parties. Tendencies towards great-nation chauvinism and the way of forcing its views and its line on other parties and on other countries, are alien to the Communist Party of China. It stands firmly on the position of proletarian internationalism, it firmly defends the principles of equality, of independence and of comradely consultations in its relations with fraternal parties and fraternal socialist countries, and grants them all its internationalist aid and backing. By referring to "3 kopeks" and the "foul-mouthed", N. Khrushchev seems to gauge others by his own yardstick, by the yardstick of a great-nation chauvinist, according to whom only the parties

of the big countries, of those possessing large economic, political and military power, are entitled to have their own views which they can force on others through "aids" and credits, while small countries and parties, according to chauvinist N. Khrushchev, cannot have their own views, and since they stand in need of international aid and credits from big socialist countries, they are considered as sold to and loudspeakers for those which grant these aids and credits. This is how N. Khrushchev conceives of the relations among socialist countries and fraternal parties. This is how he conceives of the principle of equality and of independence of fraternal parties. If we follow this anti-Marxist line of reasoning are we to think that all the socialist countries which receive aid and credits from the Soviet Union are sold to N. Khrushchev? Are we, likewise, to think that when the Soviet Government used to help our country, N. Khrushchev had in mind to purchase us? It is quite evident that through these conceptions N. Khrushchev does nothing else but join in the chorus of the bourgeois reactionary propaganda which has always raised and continues to raise a hue and cry in this direction in order to discredit the socialist system and the lofty principles of proletarian internationalism.

Our stand towards the mother Communist Party of the Soviet Union is unalterable. Our Party and our people have considered, continue to consider and will always consider the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as a mother party and have nurtured and continue to nurture the greatest respect and affection for it. In vain does N. Khrushchev try to identify himself with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and sow the seeds of en-

mity between two sister parties, between two fraternal peoples, between two socialist countries. With their anti-Marxist views N. Khrushchev's group do not by any means represent the noble views and sentiments of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. On the contrary, they have betrayed its internationalist revolutionary traditions, its glorious line of action and its lofty ideals. Our Party has always drawn the line between N. Khrushchev's group and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. That is why it has always launched its criticism only upon N. Khrushchev's group which is a temporary disease in the sound body of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, of the great party of Lenin and Stalin.

In his December 12 speech N. Khrushchev censured the Albanian Party of Labour as a "warmonger", an abettor which tried to plunge "the Soviet Union and the USA into a war and it itself to play the onlooker". By uttering such monstrous slanders, by upholding E. Kardely's known anti-Marxist thesis that the danger of war may come also from socialist countries, N. Khrushchev is mainly thinking of his strategy of reconciliation with the imperialists, which we have mentioned above. But by uttering such absurd slanders N. Khrushchev pursues, at the same time, some other ends, too. He tries to stain and to discredit our Party in the eyes of the peoples, to please, on the other hand, his friends, the Yugoslav revisionists, who, in order to justify their hostile and subversive aims and deeds against our Fatherland, have long since spoken of our country as a "warmonger", as a "disturber of peace" in the Balkans, and so on and so forth.

Our Party and our Government have always pursued and continue to pursue a foreign policy of peace which

is in accordance with the interests of safeguarding peace in the world and in the Balkans and with the interest of our small socialist country. We have striven and continue to strive to strengthen the fraternal relations, the mutual aid and cooperation based on the principles of proletarian internationalism with all the countries of the socialist camp; we have worked and continue to work to establish relations of friendship and mutual respect with all states of different social systems and especially with neighboring countries, on the basis of peaceful coexistence; we have supported and continue to support without reservation the national-liberation struggle of the peoples to win their freedom and independence, of the peoples who resist aggression and intervention by the imperialists and colonialists; we have actively backed and continue to back the struggle of all the peoples and progressive individuals to preserve peace throughout the world. This clear line of policy which our Party and our Government pursue is evident in all our concrete activities, it has yielded positive results and has aroused the affection, sympathy and respect of all peace-loving peoples.

This line of policy of our Party and our Government was clearly expressed also in the stand they maintained during the Cuban crisis. In spite of N. Khrushchev's censures the world knows that it was not Albania that brought about the crisis in the Caribbean sea. How this crisis sprang up is better known by Kennedy and N. Khrushchev. Are we to be responsible for their acts? We have neither abetted nor incited anyone to enter into a conflict and launch a war. What we did and continue to do is this: like all Marxist-Leninists and all progressive

mankind we firmly denounced and continue to denounce the piratical acts of the American imperialists; we stood by and continue to stand by the Cuban people in their just struggle, with all our energy; we are unreservedly at one with the firm revolutionary stand of the Cuban government headed by Comrade Fidel Castro, considering it the only just stand in the interest of the Cuban people and of the cause of peace in the world; we criticized and continue to criticize N. Khrushchev's harmful stand and acts, his negotiations with the American imperialists and his shameful capitulation to imperialist blackmail.

For this stand N. Khrushchev censures us as "abettors" and "warmongers"! Must we give up exposing the American imperialists, their policy of aggression and warmongering, must we disseminate illusions, must we flatter and sing praises to Kennedy, in order not to be "abettors" and "warmongers"? Must we, for this, give up our firm support to the national-liberation and revolutionary war of the peoples, must we give up our proletarian internationalist solidarity and urge them to renounce their struggle and capitulate to the imperialists? Must we accept bargaining with imperialism as a "Marxist principle", and submission, fear and capitulation as the way to safeguard peace, in order not to be "abettors" and "warmongers"? If all of these are "Marxist attitudes" what should we then call anti-Marxist and revisionist attitudes?

Whenever the revisionists find themselves in straits before incontestable facts that expose their activities, they trump up charges against our Party and attack it as "warmongers", "dogmatists", "adventurers", and so on and so forth. The Yugoslav revisionists have done this

for a number of years and N. Khrushchev's group are now doing the same thing. But it is difficult to deceive anyone with such slanders and groundless denunciations. It is clear to all the peoples, the communists and the revolutionaries of the world, that it is altogether absurd to censure as warmongers the people of a small country like Albania who have more than once suffered from wars and who would incur devastations and colossal losses in the event of a new war. It is even more absurd to accuse the Albanians of aiming to plunge the Soviet Union and the USA into a war while they remain onlookers (?!). But there is no end to what a slanderer's mind can trump up!

The experience of grappling with numerous enemies has taught our people that every time foes have concocted plans and plots against the freedom and independence of our country, they have organized a campaign of slanders and disparaging assaults against our Party beforehand, against the policy of our Government and against our people's rule. This is what the Yugoslav revisionists have always done. This is what they did also when they organized their plot against the People's Republic of Albania in collaboration with the 6th American Fleet, with the Greek monarchical fascists and with certain Albanian traitors, a plot which we unmasked and shattered in due time. We never forget the instigators, those connected with and participating in this plot.

Our attention cannot help being attracted by the fact that in his December 12 speech, while passionately upholding Tito's renegade clique, N. Khrushchev launched a fierce attack against the Albanian Party of Labour by accusing it of wishing to insert the "bestial laws of the

capitalist world" and the "bestial morality" into relations with communist and workers' parties and with the socialist countries, that the Albanians are prone "to tear the Yugoslav communists to pieces for their mistakes". We will not pause here to prove how monstrous such slanders are nor to show that it is precisely N. Khrushchev himself and his allies, the Yugoslav Titoites, and nobody else, who have used and continue to use the "bestial laws of the capitalist world" and the "bestial morality" in their relations with Albania and the Albanian people. For it is well known that it was not the Albanians, but N. Khrushchev's group who set up the economic blockade against the People's Republic of Albania; not Albania but N. Khrushchev's group that ruptured diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of Albania; not the Albanian Party of Labour, but N. Khrushchev who called for a counter-revolution in Albania; not Albania but the Yugoslav revisionists who organized and still organize, against our country, plots and acts of subversion which aim at overthrowing the people's regime in Albania.

Such an enumeration of facts alone suffices to verify who have made the "bestial morality" a law of their own, who have placed themselves towards Albania in an identical position as the American imperialists towards heroic Cuba.

But we will dwell on another matter. Why did Nikita Khrushchev need the provocation that the Albanians are prone "to tear the Yugoslav communists to pieces for their mistakes"? Through such a statement N. Khrushchev probably wants to justify the up-to-now anti-Albanian activities of the Titoite clique, on the one hand, and with such slanders, to further incite the hostility of the

Yugoslav leaders against the Albanian people, against the People's Republic of Albania, on the other. Does N. Khrushchev through this statement pledge his public and solemn word to uphold any new plot that the Yugoslav leaders intend to undertake together with their allies, against our Fatherland? Can this matter have been taken up in the "hearty" pow-wows between Tito and Khrushchev just as it may have been taken up by the numerous to-and-fro recent military and diplomatic delegations between Athens and Belgrade? The Albanian people and the Albanian Party of Labour take note of all these things and strengthen their vigilance. They never lose sight of the hustle and bustle of the Yugoslav Titoite agents to rake up, unite and organize the Albanian emigrant traitors residing in Yugoslavia, Greece and in other regions of Western Europe, for their hostile intentions against the People's Republic of Albania. But no revisionists and no enemies of our country will ever find us unprepared. Our boundaries are sacred and inviolable. The mercenaries, their instigators and organizers, who dare to violate them, will share the same fate as the mercenaries and the American imperialists at the Playa Giron in Cuba.

* * *

N. Khrushchev's group are proceeding further and further along the anti-Marxist and anti-socialist road of dissension and betrayal, causing increasing damage to the cause of socialism, peace and the struggle of the peoples for national liberation and social emancipation. But through these acts the revisionists are daily exposing their

true features as renegades before the entire world communist movement and progressive public opinion. No demagogical manoeuvres and no assaults and slanders can save them from their inevitable fall. However long and strenuous the struggle against revisionism may be today, it will be crowned, as always, with the triumph of Marxism-Leninism.

With this absolute conviction the Party of Labour of Albania like all true communists and revolutionaries, loyal to their sacred ideals, will keep up their fight against the enemy number one of the peoples, the imperialists and particularly the American imperialists, as well as against the principal menace to the international communist and workers' movement, the modern revisionism of the Khrushchev-Tito group, and for the inevitable victory of communism.

**FOR THE MILITANT UNITY
OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT
UNDER THE VICTORIOUS BANNER
OF MARXISM-LENINISM**

Article published in the newspaper
Zëri i Popullit

February 7, 1963

Recent events, more concretely the affinity to and the full reconciliation of the Soviet leaders and their followers with the treacherous Tito clique, the congresses of the communist and workers parties of Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy, Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic which indulged in bitter public attacks on Marxist-Leninist parties, N. Khrushchev's speech to the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union on December 17, 1962 as well as N. Khrushchev's speech at the 6th Congress of the German United Socialist Party on January 16, 1963, have pointed out very clearly that a serious danger is threatening the international communist and workers movement and its unity.

In the above-mentioned events the true Marxist-Leninists see open attempts to throw both Moscow Declarations overboard in order to split the communist movement and the socialist camp. That is why the communist and workers parties loyal to Marxism-Leninism, every communist and revolutionary, raise their voices today higher than ever in defense of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism, in defense of the Moscow Declarations, in defense of the militant unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement. The communist and workers parties, as well as every communist, are faced today with a great test of historical responsibility. To pass this test with success requires Marxist-Leninist devotion to principle, political and ideological clarity and determination, the power to

distinguish right from wrong, truth from falsity, friend from foe.

Calls for unity and its re-establishment come from many directions. True unity is upheld by the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists. Compelled by the weakness of their positions and the resistance they encounter in carrying out their opportunist line, the revisionists too speak of unity in a demagogic manner. While the Marxist-Leninists strive to attain true militant unity, unity based on the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, the revisionists try to establish false unity based on a revisionist platform. While the Marxists strive for unity by upholding the banner of the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations, the revisionists strive for unity by rejecting the Moscow Declarations, by discarding their basic theses one after the other.

The interests of the revolution and of socialism demand of every communist party and of every consistent revolutionary for whom the unity of the communist movement and of the socialist camp is dear, not words and declarations which have no value, but concrete deeds in favor of unity. And the main requirement is that they all align themselves without fail with the militant Moscow Declarations, that they all respect their basic principles and norms, that they all strive unwaveringly to carry out in theory and in practice their theses and conclusions in both the present problems of world development as well as in matters pertaining to the tactics and strategy of the international communist and workers movement. There is no other way out. Either with the Moscow Declarations and for

unity or against the Moscow Declarations and for dissolution.

LET US DEFEND THE MOSCOW DECLARATIONS AND CONSOLIDATE UNITY ON THEIR BASIS

The unity of the international communist movement is seriously at stake because a revisionist trend, opposed to Marxism-Leninism, has manifested itself among its ranks, a matter that has given rise to deep misunderstandings on a range of important issues having to do with the theoretical and practical activity of the communist and workers parties. The first group of problems over which misunderstandings have arisen are connected with the problems of peace and war, of the attitude towards the imperialists and the struggle against them, of the theoretical conception and the practical application of the policy of peaceful coexistence, of the stand towards the national-liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples, of the paths of transition to socialism and so on.

While our Party of Labour as well as other fraternal parties abide by the principles and conclusions of the Moscow Declarations, N. Khrushchev's revisionist group and their followers pursue in all these matters both in theory and practical activity, a revisionist and opportunist line which has nothing in common with the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations.

In contrast to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and to the joint conclusions of the representatives of the 81 fraternal parties, the modern revisionists try by all

manner and means to embellish imperialism, to spread illusions among the masses that American imperialism is no longer an enemy of peace throughout the world and that as a consequence, it is no longer necessary to oppose the policy of aggression and war which it pursues, that in general and particularly in the Caribbean crisis Kennedy showed concern about safeguarding peace, that the hopes of attaining peace throughout the world should be based on "mutual concessions", "negotiations" and "reasonable compromise" with imperialism. In order to work out these views the revisionists, as experience has shown, do not only hesitate to trample under foot the vital interests of peoples, by relinquishing revolutionary principles, but they firmly demand, as noted in N. Khrushchev's recent speeches, that others should sacrifice their revolutionary principles, too, and to beg a boon of peace from the imperialists. The revisionists attach no value to the struggle of peoples in exposing the warmongering and aggressive policy of the imperialists and in intercepting them. They claim, as N. Khrushchev himself has stated, that the struggle and efforts of peoples are "empty words of no value", people only "prattle" and this "disturbs no one".

In their views and practical activity the revisionists supersede the national-liberation movement and the revolutionary wars of peoples with the struggle to maintain peace. According to their points of view the oppressed peoples should receive their freedom as a "gift" from imperialism and reaction, from the achievement of peaceful coexistence and general and total disarmament, and they should not rise up and attain it by a clash of arms, for otherwise a nuclear war might

allegedly be provoked and world peace might be risked. This is the true meaning of N. Khrushchev's words pronounced on January 16, 1963, that "no problem of the revolutionary movement of the working class and of the national-liberation movement can now be taken up without due regard to the struggle for peace, to the avoidance of nuclear war".

The Marxist-Leninist conclusions of the Moscow Declarations regarding peaceful coexistence are substituted in theory and practice by the revisionists with totally opportunist concepts, with concepts according to which the antagonism between the two systems, the socialist and capitalist systems, the antagonism between the oppressed and the oppressor nations are disappearing, the Leninist teachings on the class struggle are rejected and substituted by class collaboration on an international plane, as far as propagating the "political and economic integration of the world".

The views of N. Khrushchev's group in connection with the paths of transition to socialism are likewise different from those of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. The whole nucleus of his revisionist arguments is to make the communist and workers parties, the proletariat and the working masses renounce the revolution, the determined struggle for overthrowing capitalist enslavement and to throw them into a state of passive inertness, pending the establishment of favorable conditions for "peaceful transition" to socialism. In his address to the Congress of the German United Socialist Party, N. Khrushchev tried to justify his revisionist views on the peaceful path, by reminding the Party of Labour of Albania that J.V. Stalin too has

spoken on this matter. No one has any doubts on this. For J.V. Stalin, as a true Marxist-Leninist, could not have opposed the peaceful path of transition to socialism as a possibility. This has always been and is clear to Marxist-Leninists. But the evil of it all lies in the fact that a clear point of this kind is purposely jumbled by N. Khrushchev at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union by proclaiming the possibility of peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism as a "novelty", making the peaceful path absolute, by presenting it as tangible possibility under present conditions, a matter which is aimed at arousing that confusion which actually spread among the ranks of some fraternal communist and workers parties.

By pursuing in theory and practice an anti-Marxist line in these matters, N. Khrushchev's group and all the modern revisionists have caused and continue to cause great disservice to the communist movement, to its militant unity and to the unity of the separate parties, to the struggle of peoples for peace, freedom, national independence and socialism. By pursuing a line of this kind, different from that jointly adopted by the representatives of the 81 fraternal communist and workers parties, they have acted and continue to act at variance with the instructions of the Moscow Declaration which emphasizes: "The interests of the communist movement demand the undivided application by each communist party of the assessments and conclusions regarding the general task of the struggle against imperialism in defense of peace, democracy and socialism which are jointly elaborated by the fraternal parties in their meetings".

The Party of Labour of Albania has abided and continues to abide by the basic teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the Moscow Declarations in all matters pertaining to present world developments, to the strategy and tactics of the international communist and workers movement. It is futile for the revisionists to try, as they have done and are doing, to misrepresent our correct stand in these matters and the struggle of principle which it wages in defense of the cause of the revolution, of peace and of socialism. Their intention is clear: by misrepresenting the correct attitude and struggle of our Party, of the Chinese Communist Party and of the other Marxist-Leninist parties, they want to sell their policy of unprincipled compromise and leniency towards imperialism, of fear, of capitulation and submission to it, their line of withdrawal from the revolutionary and national-liberation struggle of peoples, as a Marxist-Leninist line and to legalize revisionism and reformism in the international communist movement.

To speak of unity in the communist movement and in the socialist camp while violating at every step the conclusions of the Moscow Declarations in basic matters and adopting a line at variance with the interests of peoples and of socialism, as N. Khrushchev's revisionist group do, means to waylay the communists and the people and to practice demagogy. It means to be in favor of dissension and against unity or to seek a false unity based on an anti-Marxist, revisionist platform, to maintain an attitude based on a revisionist platform and at variance with the common line towards the various events and important issues of the day and,

on the other hand, to demand, as N. Khrushchev does, that the Marxist-Leninists refrain from expressing their views in defense of the Moscow Declarations. It means to continue to consciously pursue the line of betrayal to the interests of the people and of socialism by removing every obstacle standing in the way of the attainment of these ends.

EITHER WITH THE YUGOSLAV REVISIONISTS AND FOR DISSENSION OR AGAINST YUGOSLAV REVISIONISTS AND FOR UNITY

The other major issue on which there are deep misunderstandings is the stand towards the Yugoslav revisionist leaders. The international communist and workers movement has exposed and condemned the traitors to Marxism-Leninism and the cause of socialism, the Yugoslav revisionists. It has waged a continuous war of principle against their arrant anti-Marxist views and their undermining and dissentient deeds. It has considered this war as its primary duty in defense of the purity of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine and the unity of the socialist camp and international communist movement. This unanimous stand towards the Yugoslav revisionists is clearly expressed and sanctioned in the joint programmatic document of the communist and workers movement, in the 1960 Moscow Declaration. It reads: "The Communist Parties unanimously condemned the Yugoslav form of international opportunism which is the concentrated expression of the 'theories' of the present revisionists. Having betrayed Marxism-Leninism

by proclaiming it out of date, the leaders of the League of Yugoslav Communists set their anti-Leninist and revisionist programme against the 1957 Declaration, set the League of the Yugoslav Communists against the whole international communist movement, detached their country from the socialist camp, placed under the dependence of the so-called 'aid' of the American and other imperialists, and in this way endangered the revolutionary achievements attained by the heroic struggle of the Yugoslav people. The Yugoslav revisionists carry on undermining work against the socialist camp and the international communist movement. Under the pretext of a policy of non-alignment they carry on activities which prejudice the cause of unity and of all the peace-loving forces and states. Further exposure of the leaders of the Yugoslav revisionists and active attempts to keep the communist and workers movement free from the anti-Leninist views of the Yugoslav revisionists continue to be an essential duty of the Marxist-Leninist parties".

But in spite of the clear stand of the entire international communist movement towards the Yugoslav revisionist leaders, N. Khrushchev and his followers pursuing under all kinds of pretexts the line of approach and reconciliation with the Yugoslav revisionists, rehabilitated the Titoite clique and went so far as to join up with them completely. Particularly L. Brezhnev's visit to Yugoslavia last September and Tito's visit to the Soviet Union, N. Khrushchev's speech to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on December 12, 1962 and the recent 6th Congress of the German United Socialist Party crowned N. Khrushchev's continuous efforts to attain this objective. Now, having arbitrarily dubbed the League of Yugoslav Communists

as a "fraternal party" and Yugoslavia as a "socialist country", he is trying to include Yugoslavia in the family of socialist states and the League of Yugoslav Communists in the ranks of the international communist and workers movement as a **fait accompli**.

The attitude towards the Yugoslav revisionist group, towards their programme and policy is a matter of principle, is one of the main criteria by which to judge what political and ideological positions the leadership of this or that party takes. The Yugoslav revisionists are the vanguard of the modern revisionists, their programme is the code of present revisionism, they are agents of the imperialists, in the first place of the American imperialists from which, they keep receiving millions and billions of dollars in the form of credits and "aids" for services rendered to them through all their views and acts in effecting the counter-revolutionary strategy of the American imperialists.

To concur with the Yugoslav revisionists would mean to accept their views, summed up in the programme of the League of Yugoslav Communists, as correct Marxist-Leninist views and to renounce the basic teachings of Marxism-Leninism which the Yugoslav revisionists have proclaimed as "out-of-date", to discard the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations which they have dubbed as "formal", "bureaucratic" and "dogmatic".

To agree with the Yugoslav revisionists would mean to revise all the strategy and tactics of the international communist and workers movement, to substitute its revolutionary Marxist-Leninist line specified in the Moscow Declarations with the strategy and tactics of the Tito clique, with its anti-Marxist and opportunist line of

submission to imperialism, of world economic and political integration, of deterioration of socialism.

To concur with the Yugoslav revisionists would mean to turn one's back upon the true unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement based on Marxist-Leninist principles and on the Moscow Declarations and to bid fair for a false unity based on the ideological anti-Marxist platform of the programme of the League of Yugoslav Communists.

To join up with the Yugoslav revisionists would mean to wipe out the distinction between friends and foes, between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism, between the defenders and the splitters of unity, between the opponents of imperialism and their agents, it would mean to make common cause with and to support the enemies of socialism, the renegades of Marxism, the splitters of unity and agents of imperialism who plot against socialist countries.

The arbitrary rehabilitation of Tito's clique, the reconciliation and complete union with the Yugoslav revisionists, the attempts to usher this "Trojan Horse" into the international communist movement, constitute one of the most arrant and open violations of the 1960 Moscow Declaration unanimously adopted by all the fraternal parties. Through these acts N. Khrushchev clearly demonstrated that right from the start he had been opposed to the condemnation of the Yugoslav revisionists on the part of the international communist movement at the Moscow meeting, but formally agreed to it and signed the Moscow Declaration in order to temporarily mask his intentions which he has recently disclosed. Now he openly calls the Declaration "a stereotype" and states that "it would be

erroneous to denounce as renegades all those who do not abide by this 'stereotype' ". But are we now to consider as Marxist-Leninists all those who are opposed to the Moscow Declarations and renegades and anti-Marxists those who abide by the Moscow Declarations?

But regardless of the subjective opinions that N. Khrushchev or anyone else may have, on what authority does he arbitrarily revise the Moscow Declaration, a joint document of the entire international communist movement? How can one consider this scornful attitude of N. Khrushchev's towards the joint documents of all the fraternal parties other than an attempt to place himself above the entire international communist movement and to dictate his will and force his revisionist views on them? This is an open act of dissension undermining the unity of the world communist movement.

Under compulsion of having to justify this open violation of the Declaration of the 81 communist and workers parties before the Soviet party and people, before the international communist movement, N. Khrushchev stated in his address to the Supreme Soviet that the Yugoslav leaders have allegedly made "some major changes in their internal and foreign policy", that they have allegedly "made good many of their former mistakes", that they have allegedly made "strides towards getting closer to and uniting with the entire world communist movement". But he said nothing concrete as to where, in what matters the Yugoslav revisionists seem to have changed their anti-Marxist line of action, what are the concrete "mistakes" which they seem to have corrected. And there is nothing concrete for him to say, for nothing has happened in this connection. The Yugoslav revisionist leaders themselves

have more than once stated that they have made no change whatsoever, that their programme and their policy are what they have always been, that they do not intend to make any changes in the days to come either. They have firmly denied the statements of those who like to make believe that changes have supposedly been made in the policy of Yugoslavia and in the programme of the League of Yugoslav Communists, they have called them "ridiculous and absurd" and they have counseled the authors of these statements to withdraw them and not to nurture vain hopes. Even recently, at the Congress of the Yugoslav Youth, Tito stated once again that Yugoslavia "has neither changed nor intends to make any changes in its policy".

Consequently, facts show that those who speak of changes in the policy of the Tito clique deceive the communist movement, that if anyone has made changes, it is precisely N. Khrushchev's group who has done so.

N. Khrushchev and his followers have not only changed their attitude and have already joined up completely with the Belgrade revisionists by discarding as worthless the 1960 Moscow Declaration, but they are trying to force this affinity and reconciliation with the Tito clique on all the parties, on the entire international communist movement. And while singing praises of the Yugoslav revisionists they bitterly condemn all those parties which, being true to the Moscow Declarations and carrying out the tasks specified by it, criticize and expose the Yugoslav revisionists. In their assaults against these fraternal parties they even reproach the Party of Labour of Albania with wanting to establish the "law of the jungle" and "morality of beasts" in its relation with

Yugoslavia. But it is publicly known that like all Marxist-Leninist parties, it abides by the Moscow Declarations in this matter, and within the bounds of its capabilities, it renders its contribution to the joint struggle against the Yugoslav revisionists, in exposing their hostile views and acts both against the People's Republic of Albania as well as against the socialist camp and the international communist movement as a whole. To call this struggle a "law of the jungle" and "morality of beasts" means, in fact, to call by this name the thesis of the Moscow Declaration regarding the Yugoslav revisionists and the duty which it lays before all the communist and workers parties to further unmask them.

The "law of the jungle" and the "morality of beasts" have been put into the groundwork of their policy not by the Albanians but by N. Khrushchev's friends and allies, the Yugoslav revisionists, by their attitude towards the People's Republic of Albania and the Albanian people. N. Khrushchev is very well aware of this. Because, as the official account of the talks between N. Khrushchev and the member of the Titoite leadership, Vukmanovich Tempo, on January 16, 1960, a document kept in the archives of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, points out, N. Khrushchev at that time stated to Tempo the following: "Comrade Enver Hoxha told me that the Yugoslav intelligence service smuggles to Albania murderers and spies who organize acts of terror against Albanian citizens. The Albanian comrades say that the Yugoslavs have their agents in Albania and I believe Comrade Enver Hoxha because you maintain your agents in other countries as well". N. Khrushchev

stated also: "We consider it erroneous when you conscientiously pursue the policy of assaults against Albania. This is prejudicial to the entire cause of socialism". And, true enough, the Yugoslav revisionists have for years in succession organized and continue to organize acts of subversion and criminal plots in order to overthrow the people's regime in Albania, and collaborate for this purpose with their ally of the Balkan Pact, the Greek monarchic-fascists and also with the American imperialists. In accordance with the "law of the jungle" and the "morality of beasts" the Yugoslav revisionists together with their friends are trying now also to hatch fresh plots against our socialist Fatherland. N. Khrushchev who has changed colours by calling our party and our people "beasts" and the Belgrade revisionists "victims", has taken the Tito clique under his protection and in fact supports their conspiratory activity against the People's Republic of Albania. But he who supposes that Albania can be easily swallowed up through acts of subversion and plots, he who presumes that little Albania can be vanquished, is grossly mistaken.

At the 6th Congress of the German United Socialist Party things went so far as to maintain an unseemly attitude towards, and organize a very shameful scandal having no precedence in the history of the international communist and workers movement against, the Delegate of the great Communist Party of China who was invited to that Congress, at the same time that the frantic foe of the communist movement, the Belgrade revisionist clique, was ardently supported and its representative was received with ovation. And this all happened because the

Delegate of the Communist Party of China, on the basis of the 1960 Moscow Declaration, said the truth about the Yugoslav revisionists. Moreover, the representatives of certain other fraternal parties who uphold the purity of Marxism-Leninism and express themselves against the Yugoslav revisionists, among whom was the representative of the Party of Labour of Korea, were altogether denied the right to address to the Congress.

How can such an insolent and hostile attitude be maintained towards a fraternal party like the Communist Party of China which has striven and strives heroically for the great cause of socialism and communism, which has wisely and courageously led and leads the great 700 millions of Chinese people from victory to victory, which loyally abides by the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the Moscow Declarations, which firmly upholds the purity of the revolutionary ideology of the proletariat and the cause of the unity and solidarity of the socialist camp and of the international communist and workers movement, for the sake of a clique of renegades? It is clear to every Marxist-Leninist, to every honest man who seriously upholds the anti-imperialist line, it is very clear to all that to maintain a hostile attitude towards the glorious Communist Party of China, as the modern revisionists do—especially at these moments when world reaction with the American imperialists at the head, from Kennedy to the Indian reactionary circles and the social chauvinist traitors of the type of Dange and Company, are trying to set up a broad front against the People's Republic of China, against this powerful stronghold of the struggle against imperialism, the stronghold

of the liberation and socialist movement, when a frantic campaign of monstrous inventions and dangerous provocations and aggressive acts has been launched—means to join in the anti-Chinese reactionary chorus and to openly depart from proletarian internationalist solidarity.

These facts are very significant. They clearly demonstrate that those who undertake such acts join with those against whom they should join up and strengthen the solidarity against the imperialists and renegades for the triumph of the cause of socialism and communism. Those who follow this line actually wreck the unity of the international communist movement, for this unity can be preserved and strengthened not by joining up with the foes of socialism and communism like the Belgrade revisionists, but on the basis of the war against revisionism as the principal menace to the communist movement, on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, of proletarian internationalism, of the Moscow Declarations.

Firm and zealous pursuance of the line of rehabilitating the Tito clique on the one hand, and the hue and cry about unity, about removing misunderstandings in the movement and about the preparations for the meeting of international communism, on the other, are two different things which are mutually exclusive. The question is posed thus: either with the renegades of Marxism, with the treacherous Tito clique against the Moscow Declarations and for the rupture of unity, or with the Moscow Declarations for exposing the activity of the Yugoslav revisionists and for the Marxist-Leninist unity of the movement.

**UNITY CAN BE STRENGTHENED BY OBSERVING
THE NORMS OF RELATIONS AMONG THE
FRATERNAL PARTIES AND FRATERNAL
COUNTRIES, NOT BY FORMAL STATEMENTS
ABOUT UNITY**

Divergencies in the international communist and workers movement extend also in the field of concrete application of the norms that govern the relations among the communist and workers parties and the socialist countries.

“All the Marxist-Leninist parties” the 1960 Moscow Declaration has it, “are independent, equal, they elaborate their policy proceeding from the concrete conditions of their countries, guided by the principles of Marxism-Leninism and give one another mutual support”. These norms are the practical application of the principles of proletarian internationalism in the relations among the fraternal communist and workers parties. Strict observance of them is an indispensable condition to the preservation and consolidation of the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement. While non-observance of them, their violation, undermines unity and leads inevitably to the mire of nationalism and chauvinism.

The grave situation created within the communist movement, the serious danger of dissension threatening it, arises also from the fact that these norms have been trampled under foot and brutally violated. A most outstanding and clear example of this is set by the attitude and activity of N. Khrushchev's group towards the Party of Labour and the People's Republic of Albania.

The problem of Soviet-Albanian relations is an important issue of principle for it is a question of open attempts to force a line and view at variance with the platform of the Moscow Declarations upon other parties by totally inadmissible methods, by perilous acts which undermine the unity of the socialist camp and of the communist movement. The anti-Marxist attitude of N. Khrushchev's group towards the Party of Labour and the People's Republic of Albania is not an isolated and casual act, but it is the logical consequence of its entire line and activity which is at variance with the general line of the Moscow Declaration, it is one of the links within the framework of the attempts to subjugate and split the socialist camp and the communist movement at large.

In the international communist and workers movement there are big and small, old and new parties of more or less experience, but there are no superior and inferior parties, parties that lead and parties that are led, commanding parties and subjugated parties. Every attempt to place oneself above the other parties, to make the decisions of one party, whatever that party be, binding for all the parties, to subjugate the fraternal parties and to force on them the views of a party, cannot but be considered a manifestation of big-power chauvinism, of selfishness, of haughtiness and patriarchal vein of the man who pretends that he is the communist movement, that he and he alone is the embodiment of wisdom and truth, that what he says is law and all should obey.

True to the Leninist norms and principles which govern the relations among fraternal parties and fraternal countries, the Party of Labour of Albania has striven against every violation of these norms and principles, for

their strict observance, so that the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement may be preserved and strengthened. It acted thus at the Bucharest June 1960 meeting where it opposed the inadmissible methods used by N. Khrushchev and the leaders of certain fraternal parties in arbitrarily attacking and condemning another fraternal party, the Communist Party of China, a matter which dealt a serious blow to the unity of the socialist camp and of the communist movement.

Proceeding from the intention of further strengthening the socialist camp and the communist movement, forestalling any act or method which prejudices this unity, the Party of Labour of Albania, through Comrade Enver Hoxha's speech, delivered at the Moscow meeting of 81 parties, in November 1960, expressed its views regarding the extremely important problems which preoccupy the communist movement and criticised in the spirit of comradeship and frankness N. Khrushchev's erroneous attitude towards the problem of J.V. Stalin, towards the Yugoslav revisionists and so on, as well as to certain inadmissible acts of his with regard to the Party of Labour of Albania and other fraternal parties. The Party of Labour of Albania made these remarks not out in the public square but in a meeting of communists, complying with rules and only in order to correct mistakes and further strengthen the unity of the communist movement.

Unfortunately the voice of our Party and of the other fraternal parties was not only turned a deaf ear to, but the Party of Labour of Albania was subjected to attacks and unheard-of slanders, to most insulting harangues; it was

reproached for being "anti-Marxist", "dogmatic", "venturesome", "warmongering", "street urchin" and so on. This can by no means be considered a comradely stand, it has nothing in common with mutual respect among fraternal parties. The representatives of many communist and workers parties were fully justified in expressing their deep uneasiness at the fact that a fraternal party was subjected to bitter attacks and slanders only because it criticised in a Marxist way N. Khrushchev's erroneous conduct. This uneasiness is legitimate, for tolerating a method of this kind would create a dangerous precedent for anyone who would dare to freely express his own views in an international meeting of communists in days to come.

In order to preserve and strengthen the unity of the socialist camp which lies at the root of the unity of the international communist movement it is altogether inadmissible that ideological misunderstandings which may arise among parties should extend to the field of state relations. A conduct of this kind aggravates misunderstandings and leads to a split. To extend the ideological divergencies into the field of the state relations between socialist countries, to force your line on others, means to renounce the principle of equality and comradeship and to replace it with the principle of the cudgel and whip, of subjugation and of compulsion. This is precisely how N. Khrushchev behaved towards the People's Republic of Albania following the Bucharest meeting and particularly following the 1960 Moscow meeting. Rigorous measures were taken against our country in all fields: all credits were unilaterally suspended, all Soviet specialists were withdrawn from Albania, all Albanian

students were expelled from the Soviet Union, all trade, military and other agreements were annulled, they even went so far as to sever diplomatic relations with a socialist country, the People's Republic of Albania, an act without precedent. In short, all-round attempts were made to establish a strict economic and political blockade around the People's Republic of Albania, similar to that of the USA against Cuba. Why did N. Khrushchev adopt such an entirely hostile attitude towards a fraternal socialist country like the People's Republic of Albania, brutally trampling under foot not only the principles of proletarian internationalism, but also the principles of peaceful coexistence of which he raises such a hue and cry, while he tries to establish as good state relations as possible with the most reactionary imperialist powers and while persistently demanding not to extend the ideological divergencies with the Tito clique to the field of state relations? What thing can such an attitude have in common with Marxism-Leninism, with the interests of socialism and communism?

The practice of airing the divergencies in the movement within earshot of foes, the practice of using the platform of this or that party for open attacks and slanders against fraternal parties, is also at variance with the teachings of proletarian internationalism, with the interests of socialism and with those of unity and solidarity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement. An anti-Marxist practice of this kind was pursued at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union where N. Khrushchev was the first to publicly attack the Party of Labour of Albania and to arbitrarily reproach it for its alleged departure from

Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, from the common line of action of the international communist movement. At the same time he brutally intervened in the internal affairs of our Party and our country, by accusing the leaders of the Party of Labour of Albania of being sold to the imperialists, of being murderers and criminals, and he went so far as to launch an open call for counter-revolution in Albania, for the overthrow of the leadership of the party and of the people's regime.

Our Party, the Communist Party of China and a number of fraternal parties firmly denounced such a practice which is totally irreconcilable with the norms of relations among communist parties of the socialist countries and stressed most emphatically that those who pursue this sectarian practice, undermine the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement and assume upon themselves a grave historical responsibility.

It is to be regretted, but it is a fact that certain comrades, leaders of some fraternal parties, subscribed to this stand and activity of N. Khrushchev's. They hurried, especially after the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to align themselves with N. Khrushchev without setting to work to make a scrutinized and unbiased study of the documents of both parties, without discussing and exchanging views with the Party of Labour of Albania, but only on the basis of the subjective attacks and false reproaches which N. Khrushchev formulated against the Party of Labour of Albania. They convened the central committees of their parties, adopted resolutions condemning the Party of Labour of Albania and organized an extensive campaign

through the press and other means of propaganda against our Party. And to justify their incorrect and far from comradely stand towards the Party of Labour of Albania before the communists and their people, they have declared now and then that the Party of Labour of Albania on its part has allegedly launched attacks against their parties and their people. But this is far from true. In fact, despite the numerous attacks launched on it from many quarters, our Party has at no time uttered a word against the leadership of any fraternal party or fraternal country, regardless of the many divergencies existing between us. A glance at the documents of our Party and its press suffices to prove this. Our Party has responded only to P. Togliatti and to certain other leaders of the Italian Communist Party, and then only when they had gone too far in their attacks. Our Party has always maintained and continues to maintain a just and correct attitude, prompted by the principles of proletarian internationalism and of fraternal friendship, towards the other fraternal parties. Its conscience is clear and calm towards them.

The leaders of certain fraternal parties, pursuing the example set by N. Khrushchev, adopted in their congresses too, the anti-Marxist practice of the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union by making extensive use of these platforms to launch insults and attacks not only against the Party of Labour of Albania, but also against the Communist Party of China, against the Party of Labour of Korea, against the unity of the international communist movement itself. This was done at the Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party, at those of Hungary, of Czechoslovakia, of Italy and of

the German Democratic Republic. The tendency to exclude the Party of Labour of Albania from the international communist movement and the People's Republic of Albania from the socialist camp, towards which end the Soviet leaders and the leaders of certain other fraternal parties have long striven, was clearly manifested at these congresses and especially at the congress of the German United Socialist Party to which our country was not invited. The splitters set to work and dealt a hard blow to the unity of the international communist and workers movement. Today it is against the Party of Labour of Albania, tomorrow it will be against another fraternal party and thus in a row against any party which will dare to express its own opinion, be it even at a meeting of communists, as the Party of Labour of Albania did at the Bucharest and Moscow meetings. This is the most ominous and arrant attempt to turn arbitrariness and subjectivism into law. It is the most brutal attempt to force on the entire movement the hostile views of certain individuals promulgated from the platform of a party to be introduced as "unanimous decisions" of the international communist movement. It was not unintentional that N. Khrushchev in his speech to the 6th Congress of the German United Socialist Party called the recent congresses of the fraternal parties "international forums of communism". Is it not high time for some persons to reconsider and to see how far N. Khrushchev's group is proceeding towards anti-Marxism, if the cause of the unity of the movement, the cause of socialism and communism is still dear to them? We are absolutely confident that there are in the international communist and workers movement enough

sound forces, loyal to revolutionary Marxism-Leninism, capable of taking upon themselves the necessary historical responsibility, who will say "halt!" to revisionism in order to avert the aggravation of a split, in order to preserve true Marxist-Leninist unity, to forestall in due time the grave danger menacing the communist movement in general and the fraternal parties in various countries.

The violation of the principles and norms of relations among fraternal parties and fraternal countries has created serious danger to the unity of the socialist camp and the communist movement. Therefore, in order to return to the way of strengthening the unity and solidarity of our movement, to forestall a split, to return to the way of solving the grave misunderstandings existing within the movement, it is above all necessary to return to the principles defined by the Moscow Declarations, to the observance of the norms of relations among fraternal parties. The Soviet leaders must have the courage to make public self-criticism just as they had made unjust attacks against the Party of Labour of Albania, and to condemn their mistakes which consist in extending the ideological divergencies into the field of state relations up to and including the rupture of diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of Albania and the setting up of a rude economic blockade against it; to retract the call they have made to our Party and our people for counter-revolution, for the overthrow of the leadership, the most scandalous intervention in our internal affairs as well as the monstrous slanders and accusations they have made against the Albanian leaders calling them agents of imperialism, to

retract every thing they have done and are doing against our Party, our State and our people at variance with the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the Moscow Declarations. If N. Khrushchev fails to do these preliminary acts, every statement of his for unity is demagoguery, intended to establish false unity. These should be done so that such acts may not ever again be repeated against anyone, so that unity may be preserved, so that the necessary premises may be established for a solution of the differences through meetings and comradely consultations on the basis of equality and mutual respect. These must by all means be done for only thus is the right of a fraternal party restored, and thus is the injustice to the Party of Labour of Albania eliminated. This is a question of principle, not one of prestige and dignity. V.I. Lenin was right to say: "that the attitude of a political party towards its own mistakes is one of the most important and surest criteria of a party's seriousness".

The Soviet leaders and following them some leaders of certain other fraternal parties claim that they made every effort to harmonize their relations with the Party of Labour and the People's Republic of Albania, but these efforts have yielded no result allegedly due to the fault of the Albanian leaders who have allegedly refused every bilateral meeting and discussion of the misunderstandings that have arisen in spite of the proposals allegedly made to them. And these seem to have compelled them to even go so far as to launch public attacks against the Party of Labour of Albania. This is an open distortion of the truth, it is an attempt to justify their unprincipled fight against the Party of Labour of Albania based on slander and their hostile acts against the People's Re-

public of Albania. Whereas the truth is that they have tried not to solve but to aggravate their differences with our Party and State by going so far as to take the aforesaid extremest measures.

As far as the Party of Labour of Albania is concerned, it has never refused nor refuses bilateral talks and consultations for the discussions of matters of mutual interest on the basis of equality. This is proved by a number of facts.

On August 13, 1960, following the Bucharest meeting, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union proposed to the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania that our two parties should carry on discussions in order to remove the divergencies that had arisen between them at the Bucharest meetings, so that they might go to the Moscow meeting "with a complete unity of views." First of all, the divergencies manifested at the Bucharest meeting were not between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Party of Labour of Albania, but between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China. Secondly, our Party's attitude at the Bucharest meeting was primarily with regard to the nature of the meeting and to the method of discussion which were at variance with the rules and regulations governing relations among fraternal parties, whereas it withheld the expression of its views regarding the essence of the differences that were manifested there. What was there then left for our two parties to discuss about? What was meant by our two parties going to the Moscow meeting "with a complete unity of views"? Behind whose back? Therefore the Central Committee of our Party stressed in its reply

to the Central Committee of the Soviet Union on August 29, 1960, that the discussions at the Bucharest meeting had been about the differences between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, consequently if the representatives of our two parties were to get together to discuss about what took place at the Bucharest meeting, that would mean to discuss behind the back of a third party and on questions that concerned the latter. A practice of this kind would of course not be fair and would not help matters but would prejudice them.

During the proceedings of the Moscow meeting in November 1960, the representatives of our Party conducted four bilateral discussions with the Soviet leaders including N. Khrushchev. But if nothing came out of these talks this was due to the fact that N. Khrushchev tried through arrogance, pressure and threats to force on our Party his ideas and seeing that he fell short of attaining his goal he provoked the suspension of the talks. Nevertheless regardless of the Soviet leaders' stand and acts towards the Party of Labour and the People's Republic of Albania, our Party has more than once from November 1960 onwards, called upon the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to take the initiative to settle the differences, but the Soviet leaders turned a deaf ear to every one of these proposals. The letter sent by the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on July 6, 1961 said:

"We are, of course, well aware that the settlement of these differences demands time and patience by both sides so that the necessary conditions may be brought

about for an elimination of the negative phenomena which have appeared within the last year marring the friendly, fraternal and, we may say with no fear of being contradicted, more than exemplary relations that have existed before between our two fraternal parties, countries and peoples. First and foremost an end should be put in this respect to extending the ideological divergencies existing between our two parties to the sphere of state relations in the economic, political and military fields. Our Party and our Government have never refused to carry on bilateral talks on every issue. But we have stressed and continue to stress that necessary conditions, conditions of equality for both sides, should be created for a matter of this kind”.

In the letter approved by the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania handed to the Embassy of the Soviet Union in Tirana on January 11, 1961, addressed to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union it is emphasized:

“Deeply concerned about the undesirable and very grave situation of present Albanian-Soviet relations arising out of the rude anti-Marxist conduct of N. Khrushchev and his group, the Party of Labour of Albania calls on the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to view the situation created in cold blood and to take the necessary steps to harmonize it. . . . The Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania is of the opinion that the remedy for this dangerous disease demands the immediate intervention of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in which the Party of Labour of Albania has had and continues to have unshakable faith”.

Following the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union where the Party of Labour of Albania was publicly and slanderously attacked, our Party turned once again to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, through Comrade Enver Hoxha's speech on November 7, 1961.

“With a calm and clear conscience the Party of Labour of Albania calls upon the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, calls upon the new Central Committee elected by the 22nd Congress to study, with Leninist fairness, with unbiased objectivity and calmness, the situation created between our two parties and our two countries. Our Party has always been in favor of a settlement of the existing differences for the sake of unity of the communist movement and the socialist camp, of the interests of our countries. But it has always been and is of the opinion that these matters must be settled correctly and in a Marxist-Leninist way, under conditions of equality, not of pressures and dictates. We have hope and confidence in the equity of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union”.

These are the facts. And in order to throw more light on the truth, to help the public opinion of the communists to pass fair, unbiased judgement on who is in the right and who is in the wrong, the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania suggests to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for whom our Party has cherished and still cherishes indisputable confidence and respect, to jointly publish all the authentic Albanian and Soviet materials and documents which deal with the differences between our two parties and countries. This would help all parties to dis-

cuss the matter objectively and without bias at some future meeting of the international communist movement. We are most certain that it will then be proved in a more persuasive way that it is not the Albanian leaders who "should give up their mistaken views and turn to the ways of unity and close collaboration with the fraternal community of the socialist countries, to the ways of unity of the entire international communist movement" as N. Khrushchev said at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and reiterated at the 6th Congress of the German United Socialist Party. On the contrary it will be proved that it is N. Khrushchev and his followers who should turn as early as possible to the ways of the Moscow Declarations, to the ways of observing the norms and principles that govern relations between fraternal parties and countries, that they should renounce their anti-Marxist views and deeds and to return once and for all time to the ways of Marxism-Leninism and of proletarian internationalism before it is too late.

The unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement is not strengthened by formal utterances about unity while at the same time continuing to launch attacks and maintain hostile attitude towards fraternal parties, but by standing true and strictly carrying out the basic teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the conclusions and norms jointly arrived at in international meetings of the entire communist movement with determination, by effective and determined opposition to the common enemy, imperialism, to the opponents of unity, to splitters, to the principal menace of the communist movement, to modern revisionism as well as to

dogmatism, to all manifestations of chauvinism and nationalism. On the contrary if views will be spread and policies will be pursued which are at variance with the conclusions, principles and norms fixed in the Moscow Declarations, and which prejudice the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist and workers movement, the interests of the national-liberation and revolutionary wars of peoples, the cause of peace, the interests of each individual socialist country and fraternal party, it is clear that such acts cannot but arouse the most determined opposition of Marxist-Leninists, of true revolutionaries.

The Party of Labour of Albania, like all other Marxist-Leninist parties, has always considered and still considers the problem of the unity of the communist movement and of the socialist camp as a most vital one, as its primary internationalist duty and has sincerely striven to guard and strengthen it by deeds and not through words. It is gravely concerned about the injury which the views and deeds of the modern revisionists are causing the unity of the socialist camp and the communist movement. The Party of Labour of Albania is of the opinion that the calling of an international meeting where the representatives of the entire communist and workers movement may take part, where the most important problems facing the communist movement today may be openly and frankly discussed under conditions of equality, would help strengthen unity and solidarity, would settle the differences on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations.

Faced by the united forces of imperialism and of the entire world reaction at war with communism, let us try

with all our might and main to strengthen the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement, holding aloft the banner of Marxism-Leninism and of the Moscow Declarations! Unity constitutes the source of the insuperable force of our cause, of the guaranteed attainment and consolidation of our achievements, of the hope of all the oppressed and the exploited, fighting for national liberation and social emancipation, it constitutes a powerful weapon for a successful struggle against the common foe of all the people, imperialism, for the triumph of the cause of socialism and communism. The preservation and consolidation of this unity is the highest internationalist duty of every Marxist-Leninist party.

Proletarians of all countries, unite!

**KHRUSHCHEV AGAIN
IN THE ROLE OF A DEMAGOGUE,
A SLANDERER
AND A SOWER OF DISSENSION**

Article published in the newspaper
Zëri i Popullit

April 18, 1963

On March 30 of the current year the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union dispatched a letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, which was published in the newspaper *Zëri i Popullit* on April 17, 1963.

This letter treats, among other questions, the organization of bilateral talks between representatives of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Communist Party of China concerning the relations between the two Parties and the preliminary arrangements for an international meeting of the communist and workers' parties.

The Party of Labour of Albania has always expressed itself in favor of meetings, talks and comradely consultations on conditions of parity for the purpose of settling misunderstandings that arise among communist and workers' parties of different countries and in the ranks of the international communist movement as a whole.

Our Party is of the opinion that mutual exchange of views and the organization of bilateral meetings and talks is an internal affair of the parties concerned.

But since in this letter Khrushchev, persisting in carrying on his open polemics with the Party of Labour of Albania (which goes to further prove that his statements at the 6th Congress of the German Socialist Unity Party about putting an end to disputes and so forth are sheer bluff and hypocrisy), launches attacks against our Party by calumniating it in a biased way, trying at the same

time to demagogically present himself and his attitude as being in line with the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and with the Moscow Declaration and Statement, we have to make a reply.

The letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China contains among other things the following:

“In your letter you touch upon the Albanian and Yugoslav problems. As we have written, we are of the opinion that though they are matters of principle, they cannot and should not eclipse the main issues of our times which demand discussion at our meeting.

Our Party, condemning the splitting activities of the Albanian leaders, has at the same time ceaselessly undertaken the necessary steps to normalize the relations between the Party of Labour of Albania and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other fraternal parties. Although the leaders of the Party of Labour of Albania have recently launched slanderous attacks against our Party and the Soviet people, we, prompted by the highest interests, do not renounce the idea that the relations between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Party of Labour of Albania may be improved. Towards the end of February this year, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union took another initiative and proposed to the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania to hold a bilateral meeting of the representatives of both our parties. The leaders of the Party of Labour of Albania did not consider it necessary even to accept

our letter containing the proposal of the Central Committee of the Soviet Union for a bilateral meeting. Later on, apparently after thinking it over, the Albanian leaders sent a letter in which they speak of such a meeting under a number of reservations and conditions. If the desire is truly expressed we are ready to come to such a meeting.”

As can be seen, Khrushchev's group have combined their resentment, slander and attacks against the Party of Labour of Albania with perjury and demagogy in these paragraphs, too. They try in every way to shift the responsibility for their own faults on to others, to make the Party of Labour of Albania responsible for the undesirable situation in Albanian-Soviet relations. They try once again to mislead the whole communist movement and the international public opinion.

THE SO-CALLED “ALBANIAN ISSUE” IS NOT A CASUAL AND ISOLATED INCIDENT

The above-mentioned letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China alludes to the so-called “Albanian issue” which “cannot and should not eclipse the main issues of our times”. But what is this so-called “Albanian issue” and does it really exist? There exists no “Albanian issue” *per se*, it is only a trumped-up affair of Khrushchev's who wants to conceal his own hostile acts and attitude towards the Party of Labour and the People's Republic of Albania and to

justify his further attacks and slanders against them. It is an attempt to present this "issue" as one of secondary importance, isolated from the "main issues" of our times and from the deep differences of principle which have arisen within the ranks of the international communist movement and which, according to him, seem to have been brought about by the "erroneous" and "incorrect" views and stand of the Albanian leaders.

In sizing up this problem we do not proceed from narrow premises, we do not proceed only from the fact of our being directly interested in the matter, but we think that this is an essential issue of principle.

The so-called "Albanian issue" is by no means a casual and isolated incident; it is not even confined to the narrow framework of mere Albanian-Soviet relations, but is one of the most emphatic and typical manifestations of the great struggle being waged today between Marxism-Leninism on the one hand and modern revisionism represented by the Titoite clique and Khrushchev's group on the other. It is part and parcel of this struggle, because the Party of Labour of Albania resolutely upholds the line of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism and wages an irreconcilable struggle against modern revisionism. The question of Soviet-Albanian relations, the question of the relations between our two parties and our two countries is closely connected with this great issue of principle.

How did the so-called "Albanian issue" arise? Before Khrushchev's group came out in the open with their outspoken anti-Marxist, opportunist, revisionist line, that is, when they were carrying on their activities in forms more or less camouflaged and under zig-zag subterfuges imposed by the circumstances of the time, the Party of

Labour of Albania, maintaining a correct Marxist-Leninist attitude, was silently at variance with them on a number of important issues, such as the stand towards J. V. Stalin and his work, towards the Yugoslav revisionists and so on. Although the Party of Labour of Albania opposed in silence Khrushchev's activities in a number of matters, it waged an open resolute fight against the Yugoslav revisionists and maintained a clear-cut attitude towards them as renegades from Marxism and enemies of socialism, thus coming into open conflict with Khrushchev's attempts to rehabilitate the Titoite clique, to reconcile and get close to them. Khrushchev has ever since seen clearly enough that the Party of Labour of Albania was a stumbling-block in his way to realizing his anti-Marxist ends. This determined also his disguised hostile attitude towards the Party of Labour of Albania for its correct line of action in general and especially for its resolute clear-cut stand towards the Titoite clique, Khrushchev's future allies. Nevertheless the so-called "Albanian issue" had not yet come to the fore. The "Albanian issue" came up when Khrushchev openly set out to split the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement, when he strove to force his revisionist line on them by using rude and anti-Marxist methods. This came about at the June 1960 Bucharest meeting and at the meeting of the 81 communist and workers' parties in Moscow in November of the same year where the Party of Labour of Albania together with other fraternal parties persistently opposed the splitting attempts of Khrushchev, criticized his hazardous anti-Marxist views, attitude and acts, courageously upheld the Marxist-Leninist line of the international communist movement and its

unity. It was from here on that Khrushchev aired in public the ideological differences between the Party of Labour of Albania and his group, that Khrushchev's group and their followers started the open and unprincipled fight against the Party of Labour of Albania, a fight which became more and more bitter, reaching its culmination with the public attacks from the rostrum of the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and in the press and subsequent congresses of certain other parties.

Thus, the so-called "Albanian issue" came into being as an aspect of the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism, between the Parties which follow the revolutionary line and the revisionists, Khrushchev's group and their followers. In reality, therefore, this is an issue concerning the general line of the international communist movement with which Khrushchev, openly or in disguise, has always been at variance; it is connected with the question whether this movement will develop along the line of Marxism-Leninism or that of revisionism.

THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA HAS LOYALLY PURSUED THE COMMON LINE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The line of the Party of Labour of Albania has always been in full agreement with the general line of the international communist movement; it has been a correct, consistent line in all problems of present world development. The Party of Labour of Albania has strictly

observed the basic teachings of Marxism-Leninism, the principles of proletarian internationalism, the programmatic documents of the international communist movement, the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations. Its correct line has been clearly expressed in all the writings and documents of the Party as well as in all the practical acts of our Party and Government.

The Party of Labour of Albania has continuously stood in positions of irreconcilable combat against imperialism, has never nurtured any illusions about the change of its aggressive nature, has resolutely exposed the aggressive and warmongering policy of imperialism, especially of American imperialism, considering it as the center of world reaction and international gendarme, as the bitterest enemy of mankind. Being fully aware of the change in the balance of forces in favor of the forces of socialism, peace and the national liberation movement, our Party has never overestimated or underestimated the strength of the imperialists and it has never committed the error of adventurism or capitulationism.

The Party of Labour of Albania considers the establishment of the world socialist system as the highest historical achievement of the international working class. The socialist camp is the powerful base supporting the world revolutionary and liberation movement; it is the main-spring of power in the struggle against imperialism, and is the bulwark of peace and social progress for all mankind. The Party of Labour of Albania has resolutely pursued the policy of friendship, fraternity, co-operation and mutual assistance with all the socialist countries. It has loyally applied and strictly observed the norms of relationship among socialist countries and communist parties.

It has always considered the help and support of other socialist countries as a very important factor in building socialism in Albania. On its part it has rendered its own contribution to strengthening the socialist camp and its unity.

In their relations with the capitalist countries the Party of Labour of Albania and the Government of the People's Republic of Albania have consistently pursued the policy of peaceful coexistence based on the principles of equality, non-interference in each other's internal affairs and mutual respect, a policy which they have always viewed as a form of class struggle in the international arena being continually waged in all ideological, political and economic fronts, between the two systems, the capitalist and the socialist. This they have considered and continue to consider as the only correct policy between countries with different social systems but they have never applied it in the relations between the opposing classes in the capitalist countries or in the relations between the oppressed and enslaved peoples and the imperialist colonialists.

The Party of Labour of Albania has viewed the struggle for peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems as an important way to safeguard and consolidate peace in the world. In view of present conditions it has not considered nor does it consider today a world war or other aggressive wars of the imperialists as fatally inevitable, but at the same time it holds the view that, as long as imperialism exists, the basis for aggressive wars remains. It has always made a distinction between just and unjust wars; it has unreservedly supported the just wars and exposed and condemned the

international aggressors. The Party of Labour of Albania has viewed the struggle for peace as a fight against the imperialists, headed by the United States, because they are opponents of peace and it is precisely from them that the danger of war comes. The Party of Labour of Albania has been of the opinion, and continues to believe that peace and peaceful coexistence cannot be expected to be offered as a gift by the imperialists. Peace and peaceful coexistence cannot be attained by flattery and concessions, but only by determined struggle of all the peace-loving forces of the world forcing this on the imperialists.

The Party of Labour of Albania has been and continues to be in favor of easing international tension and of solving outstanding problems that are faced today, such as disarmament, nuclear test ban, conclusion of the peace treaty with Germany and the turning of West Berlin into a free and demilitarized city, etc. The solution of these problems requires that meetings and talks be held among the representatives of the various states, but these should be combined with the struggle of the peoples as the main force to oblige the imperialists to go to these meetings and talks, so that they may yield concrete results.

The Party of Labour of Albania has viewed the national liberation movement of the peoples against imperialist oppression and for freedom and national independence as one of the major movements of our times that undermines the positions of the imperialists, weakens and narrows down their sphere of action. But our Party is of the opinion that the colonial system of the imperialists has not yet been done away with, that millions upon

millions of people of entire continents still languish under their sway and that the imperialists headed by the United States are doing their utmost, resorting even to wars and open aggression, to maintain their positions and to re-establish their colonial oppression and exploitation in newer forms. The struggle of these peoples against the imperialists is, at the same time, a struggle for the triumph of peace and peaceful coexistence, a potent ally and powerful support for the revolutionary struggle of the international workers' movement and of all the socialist countries. It is precisely on this account that the Party of Labour and the People's Republic of Albania have supported without reserve this just war of the peoples for national liberation against the imperialists and have given it every assistance. We have considered this support and assistance a high internationalist duty.

The Party of Labour of Albania has likewise upheld and supported without reserve the revolutionary movement of the working class and of the working masses in the capitalist countries against capitalist oppression and exploitation and for their social emancipation. It has always maintained the Leninist viewpoint that revolutions cannot be exported and it has at the same time expressed itself against the exportation of counter-revolution by the imperialists. Our Party has maintained and continues to maintain the view that the path to the triumph of revolution does not necessarily have to pass through wars among states, that such wars are neither the cause nor the essential condition for the triumph of the revolution. As to the forms of development of revolutions, it has maintained the view that they depend on the concrete historical conditions in each country and on the international

situation. It has admitted and still admits the peaceful way as a possibility for transition to socialism, but it has expressed itself against making this the absolute way and against the reformist and opportunist interpretation denying the need of breaking up the old apparatus of the bourgeois state and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat. Our Party has maintained that it is necessary for the communist parties to be prepared at the same time for both possibilities — the peaceful and the non-peaceful ways, and is of the opinion that a good preparation for the non-peaceful way increases the chances for the triumph of socialism in the peaceful way.

This has been in general the line of the Party of Labour and of the People's Republic of Albania in its main aspects long before Khrushchev broached his "Albanian question". This consistent line remained unaltered and did not comply with Khrushchev's opportunist and revisionist line even after he came out in the open with his anti-Marxist course of action in opposition to the general line of the international communist and workers' movement. The correct line and principled stand of the Party of Labour of Albania has never been to Khrushchev's liking and this is the source of the contradictions and the disagreements with him, the source of his bitter attacks against the Party of Labour of Albania. It is precisely on this account that he has called the line of our Party a "sectarian", "dogmatic", "adventurist" line, and the leaders of the Party of Labour of Albania "partisans of the cult of the individual, of terror, of the violation of socialist legality" etc., with a view to discrediting the Party of Labour of Albania and intimidating others so as to force on them his anti-Marxist line of action.

DESPITE HIS DEMAGOGY, KHRUSHCHEV IS UNABLE TO CAMOUFLAGE HIS OUT-AND- OUT REVISIONIST LINE

But what is this line which Khrushchev has striven to force on the international communist and workers' movement and which he loudly proclaims as a creative Marxist-Leninist line? In reality, despite his demagogy, it is an entirely revisionist and opportunist line that has caused and is causing great damage to the socialist camp, to the international communist movement, to the revolutionary and liberation struggles of the peoples against imperialism; to the cause of peace, freedom, democracy and socialism.

In their propaganda, particularly in recent times, Khrushchev's group continue to spread their anti-Marxist thesis and try to prove by a play upon words that their views and acts are in line with the Moscow Declarations, with the Leninist teachings and the interests of the socialist camp and the international communist movement. Thus, for instance, Khrushchev's group claim that they are guided by "the Leninist spirit of irreconcilable struggle against the imperialists" and they reiterate some conclusions of the Moscow Declarations that "the anti-popular and predatory nature of imperialism has not changed", that "the American imperialists are now exercising the functions of an international gendarme", that "because of their predatory nature the imperialists cannot free themselves from the tendency to settle contradictions in the international arena through wars" and so on and so forth.

But how can these be reconciled with Khrushchev's former statements and acts? Is it not Khrushchev who has all along tried to spread illusions about the change of the nature of the imperialists and their leaders, and on this hypothesis based his entire attitude and activity? It is precisely he who, disregarding "the predatory nature of imperialism", has more than once declared that "a world free of arms, free of armies and free of wars" can be realized right away, that "the year 1960 will go down in history as the year marking the beginning of the realization of this age-long dream of mankind" (Khrushchev's conversation with the director of the Argentine newspaper *Klarin* on December 30, 1959), that "the real possibility of finally eliminating war from the life of society for all time is being brought about during our very own time" (Khrushchev's speech in Indonesia on February 21, 1960). It is none other than Khrushchev who has stated that "the imperialists have taken our challenge for peaceful competition in economic development to heart . . . we are continually drawing the capitalist countries towards the road of peaceful competition between the two systems", that "now the question is which system will show greater vitality, that is, which system will give the people more material and cultural values in a shorter period of time" (Khrushchev's article in the journal *Communist*, No. 12, August 1962).

In arrant contradiction to what is said in the Moscow Declarations on American imperialism and its leaders, Khrushchev declared on his return from a visit to the USA before Moscovites, before all the people, before the Government and the Party, that the President of the USA, Eisenhower, "is seriously eager to put an

end to the cold war" and that "he enjoys the absolute confidence of his people" (Khrushchev's speech at the rally of the Moscow workers on September 28, 1959). In praising Eisenhower, Macmillan and de Gaulle, Khrushchev has said: "All of them are aware of the necessity of serving to further ease international tension and to settle international problems through discussions and not through war" (Khrushchev's speech in Azerbaydjan on April 25, 1960).

Khrushchev has lavished praises on Eisenhower's successor, President Kennedy, as well. Even during the critical days of the Caribbean crisis, when Kennedy and his government laid bare their features as warmongers and aggressors, Khrushchev in his message of October 27, 1962, wrote to Kennedy: "Your concern for the security of your country is understandable to me, Mr. President, for this is the prime duty of a President. . . . You desire to secure your country and this is understandable". In his message sent one day later on October 28, 1962, he wrote to Kennedy: "I express my satisfaction for your appreciation of the responsibility devolving now upon you to preserve peace in the entire world".

According to Khrushchev's statements, war is not an offspring of imperialism and its aggressive policy, but the risk of war comes from certain "madmen", from certain "lunatics", who "prefer to die in capitalism rather than live in communism". And according to him, it is exactly these persons who exert "a strong pressure" on "peaceful Presidents" (who seem to desire to live in communism!) and on the governments of the USA and other imperialist countries and who urge them to pursue "at times" a non-peaceful foreign policy. Khrushchev went even so far

as to slanderously allege that the danger of war comes today also from "people who pose as Marxist-Leninists but who, in reality, are dogmatic, who do not believe in the possibility of achieving socialism and communism under conditions of peaceful coexistence with capitalism" (Khrushchev's speech at the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on December 12, 1962).

This list of Khrushchev's statements and talks embellishing imperialism and describing imperialist chieftains as "peace-loving", is not at all exhausted. But we think it is sufficient. And where is to be found "the Leninist spirit of irreconcilable struggle against the imperialists" which Khrushchev uses to try to deceive the people?

Persisting in his demagogy, Khrushchev alleges that he takes into account the change in the balance of forces in the international arena and says that in order to preserve peace and forestall a world war "it is necessary to continuously strengthen the socialist system, the unity of all the forces of the international working class, the national liberation movement and all the democratic forces".

But does Khrushchev really depend on these forces to safeguard peace and forestall a world war and other aggressive wars which the imperialists undertake? Judging from all the views and acts of Khrushchev's group in the field of international politics, it would seem that the destiny of peace and of the peoples depends on "superior individuals", on their "wisdom" and "rationality", on the outcome of Khrushchev's talks with the representatives of the imperialists, especially of the American imperialists. In a speech delivered as early as October 31, 1959 to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Khrushchev stated: "We have said it more than once that the most

complicated international issues can be settled only by the heads of governments vested with competent authority. It is only they who can clear up the pile of anomalies in international relations accumulated during many years of cold war". It was precisely in this spirit that he and his followers called the Khrushchev-Eisenhower meeting at Camp David as the beginning of a "new stage", of a "new era", as "a turning point in the history of mankind". A. Gromyko, member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, stated in his speech to the Supreme Soviet in December 1962 that "if there is harmony between the Chairman of the Soviet Government, Khrushchev, and the President of the USA, Kennedy, there will be also a settlement of the international issues". In order to better realize this "harmony" it was even decided recently to establish direct telephonic communications between Khrushchev and Kennedy, between these two statesmen who seem to have the destiny of mankind in their own hands. This is Khrushchev's real concern!

Therefore, it is becoming more and more evident that what the modern revisionists say about the strength of the peoples, about the role of the masses in the struggle for peace, etc., is nothing but demagoguery and deceit. Khrushchev himself, in a speech on December 12, 1962, went so far as to call the struggle of the peoples against the imperialists "hot air", "bombastic assertions" that cause no damage to the imperialists. Moreover, Khrushchev has not hesitated to stigmatize all those who have the courage to expose the imperialists and who call upon the people to rise against the imperialists in defense of

peace and of their national liberation and social emancipation, as warmongers who "are eager to hurl the world into a nuclear catastrophe", who wish to score victory over the imperialists "through wars among states, through savage and destruction, through bloodshed and the death of millions of people".

In order to make people give up their just struggle against the imperialists, in order to paralyze the revolutionary movement and the national liberation war of the peoples, Khrushchev has become a voluntary propagandist for the policy of atomic blackmail which the American imperialists pursue, a thing which goes to show that he is scared to death, that he has slid into the mire of defeatism, that he has lost all faith in the triumph of socialism and communism in the world at large. Is this not borne out by Khrushchev's speech to the Austrian-Soviet Society on July 2, 1960, where he is recorded as saying: "If in this world we cannot live as the living beings could live in Noah's Ark but begin to settle differences among states by means of war — who dislikes socialism and who dislikes capitalism — then we will wreck our Noah's Ark, our terrestrial globe." He reiterated the same ideas in 1963 when speaking at the 6th Congress of the German Socialist Unity Party. He stated: "According to the accounts of the scientists, 700 to 800 million persons would be killed as a result of the first attack alone. All the large cities, not only of the two superior atomic powers — the United States and the Soviet Union — but also of France, England, Germany, Italy, China, Japan and of many other countries of the world, would be destroyed and razed to the ground. The consequences of atomic and hydrogen

war would be felt throughout the life of many generations of men, causing diseases, deaths and leading to the ugliest development of man." Statements of this kind abound in Khrushchev's speeches as well as in the propaganda materials of his group.

And what do all of these show? Such pessimistic and capitulationist stands serve only the imperialists and cause great damage to the struggle of the peoples in defense of peace. And truly enough, what good comes from the propaganda of atomic blackmail which Khrushchev also joins when the imperialists threaten the peoples with war and aggression? Are the people of the socialist countries and the other peace-loving people to be trained and cultivated in this spirit of defeatism, so that in case the imperialists launch a war, they should surrender unconditionally and hoist the white flag? What does this have in common with the Moscow Declarations? Is it not demagogical for Khrushchev, therefore, to state that "we will constrain the imperialists not to forget that if they launch a war to settle by force of arms the issue of which path mankind will follow — the capitalist or the socialist — this will be the final war in which imperialism will be crushed"? There is no doubt that Khrushchev's demagogy and sophistry will fail to intimidate and deceive the Marxist-Leninists and the peoples.

Khrushchev speaks a great deal about peaceful coexistence, its Leninist meaning and its practical application in conformity with the terms of the Moscow Declarations. And, to give the devil "his due", he has even stressed recently that coexistence "presupposes uninterrupted ideological, political and economic struggle between the two social systems, the class struggle within the countries

of the capitalist system including the armed struggle when the people consider it essential, the further development of the national liberation movement of the colonial and dependent countries". But how far is Khrushchev from these theses! If he conceives peaceful coexistence in this way, then why does he accuse the Party of Labour of Albania and other fraternal parties which consistently abide by the terms of the Moscow Declarations as regards this matter, of being opposed to peaceful coexistence?

As a matter of fact, here too, Khrushchev is demagogically playing with words, for although he admits in words that "peaceful coexistence does not mean socialist and bourgeois ideological reconciliation", he actually believes that the ideological contradictions between the two systems will be settled not through revolutions for the triumph of socialism in various countries, but through peaceful economic competition between the two systems. Thus, in an interview granted on November 21, 1957 to Brazilian journalists, Khrushchev stated: "If all the pending issues are settled through discussions and the ideological contradiction between the socialist and the capitalist systems through peaceful competition in economic and cultural development and in fulfilling the material and cultural demands of the people, we can say with certainty that a long period of peace will be secured for humanity".

Although he admits in words that peaceful coexistence presupposes the political struggle between the two systems, Khrushchev in fact has renounced this struggle and, instead of exposing the warmongering and aggressive policy of the imperialists headed by the United States, he spreads, as we stressed above, all kinds of pacifist illusions about the imperialists and sings the praises

of their leaders. Khrushchev has said, "We must ensure that the inevitable struggle between the two systems is channelled without exception into the struggle between ideologies and into the peaceful competition or rivalry, if we speak in terms more understandable for the capitalists" (Khrushchev's speech to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR in January 1960). It is exactly the peaceful coexistence in this way that the present Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, B. Ponomarev, has dubbed as "the highest form of class struggle between two opposing systems — socialism and capitalism" (*Pravda*, August 12, 1960).

Although they admit in words that peaceful coexistence does not exclude but assumes the class struggle and national liberation wars, Khrushchev and his group in reality maintain the point of view that peaceful coexistence and economic competition between the two systems are the main and more effective means for achieving national liberation and social emancipation of the peoples. A. Rumyantsev, member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, has said, "Peaceful coexistence and that alone is the best and only acceptable way to settle the problems of vital importance that society faces" (*Problems of Peace and Socialism*, No. 1, 1962).

With such anti-Marxist views, Khrushchev has distorted the Marxist-Leninist conception of peaceful coexistence, on the one hand by proclaiming it as "the general line" of the foreign policy of the socialist countries, while on the other hand, by attempting to force it "as a general line" on the world revolutionary and liberation move-

ment, with the aim of compelling people to renounce their revolutionary and liberation struggles.

Khrushchev sets the struggle for peace and for peaceful coexistence against the world revolutionary and liberation movement. He proclaims far and wide that "the struggle for peace has become the most important condition of the struggle for socialism", that "no problem of the revolutionary movement of the working class and of the liberation movement can now be examined apart from the struggle for peace, from the prevention of nuclear war" (Khrushchev's speech on January 16, 1963, at the 6th Congress of the German Socialist Unity Party). His propaganda agents have even gone so far as to describe disarmament as "the most important factor for the liberation of colonial peoples", that disarmament is "the main goal of the peoples who fight for national liberation". What do Khrushchev's statements, such as "every local war today might turn into a world war" and "every spark might kindle a world conflagration", mean if not that the peoples should renounce their revolutionary and liberation struggle and accept the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence as the highest goal of their effort? Khrushchev has said in the same vein that "general and total disarmament would create new opportunities to give assistance to states whose economies are now weak and need aid from the advanced states", that an "aid" of this kind (given by the imperialist powers) "could inaugurate a new epoch in economic development in Asia, Africa and Latin America" (Khrushchev's address to the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization on September 18, 1959), that "durable peace under conditions of general and total disarmament would make it possible

to place all the resources that exist in the world at the service of the peoples in order to fulfil their material and cultural needs”.

Khrushchev's group not only spread the illusion that the national liberation and social emancipation of the peoples comes automatically as a result of the realization of disarmament, of economic competition and of peaceful coexistence between the two systems, thus lulling the people into a state of inertia, expecting liberation and progress to come as a boon from abroad, but they fail to stress that the revolutionary and liberation struggle against the imperialists is a powerful force which plays a very important role in preserving peace and achieving peaceful coexistence and disarmament, that this struggle is of great assistance to the strengthening of the positions of the world socialist system and of all the forces that strive for the triumph of socialism in the world.

ILLUSIONS AND OPPORTUNIST ATTITUDES HAVE HAMPERED THE ACHIEVING OF GREATER RESULTS IN THE CAUSE OF THE PEOPLES, OF PEACE AND OF SOCIALISM

The demagogy of Khrushchev's group, their revisionist views and activities regarding the above issues extend into all the other cardinal issues of the time which pre-occupy the international communist movement and the whole of mankind. They all prove eloquently but one thing — that by openly defying the Moscow Declarations, they have caused great damage to the whole international revolutionary and liberation movement of the world.

This damage stands out like a dark spot against the background of the great achievements that have been attained, thanks to the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, to the struggle of the international proletariat, of the oppressed peoples, the other peace-loving forces against imperialism and for peace, freedom, democracy and socialism. The Party of Labour of Albania has always stood by and supported the just policy of the Soviet State and of the other socialist states regarding the major problems of the day, such as the prevention of world war, disarmament and banning nuclear arms, the German problem, the West Berlin problem, and so on. Not only this, but our Party has always and consistently striven and continues to strive for the precise implementation of the joint policy of the socialist countries in settling these problems.

There is no doubt that the achievements of the socialist camp and of all the people would have been far greater if subjective opinions and idle illusions proceeding from anti-Marxist conceptions of the nature and aims of imperialism had not been spread and had not taken root.

The favorable situation brought about by the struggle of the people and the aggravation of the contradictions within the ranks of imperialism would have been turned to better advantage if the opportunist views and attitudes had been ceased, if the line and joint decisions had been consistently carried out.

“The world free of arms, free of wars and free of armies” which, it was pretended, would have been offered to mankind as early as 1960, brought nothing good to them except vain illusions and damage to the struggle of the peoples. And it could not have been otherwise.

This slogan is impossible of being realized so long as imperialism exists. As a matter of fact, regardless of the bouquets strewn before "peace-loving presidents", the imperialists have recently continued with the same zeal and violence as before a chain of belligerent acts in various regions of the world — the Congo, south Vietnam, Laos, Angola and elsewhere — plunging whole peoples into bloodbaths in order to maintain their colonial rule or to re-establish the sway of neo-colonialism, the rule of ruthless exploitation, terror and murder. The revisionists have not considered imperialism as imperialism — the bulwark of world reaction — because they have always thought and still think that they can please "the international gendarme" with their flattery and concessions and persuade him to establish "a world free of wars" by "sound reasoning".

On the problem of general and total disarmament, how injurious it was to these talks to spread illusions about the chieftains of American imperialism going to these talks to settle this issue "with frankness"! In reality the imperialists have used and continue to use these endless talks as a smokescreen to hide their preparations for war. The imperialists, far from being disarmed, have speeded up their armaments race, and are arming themselves to the teeth with modern weapons, investing for this purpose tens of billions of dollars. They are arming the Bonn revanchists with atomic weapons; they are supplying their allies with "Polaris" missiles and so on and so forth. The same is true of the nuclear test ban. The American imperialists, after completing their recent program of explosions, continue to prepare for other detonations. On this question they are not "becoming reason-

able" even though Khrushchev has made concessions. Khrushchev, who formerly maintained that "on-the-spot inspections" were acts of espionage — which they really are — has accepted three such inspections a year within the territory of the Soviet Union. The American imperialists, who are in fact opposed to the ban on nuclear tests, are not pleased even with this concession. They demand new concessions; they demand that the portals of the Soviet Union be opened to them, at least for eight or ten inspections a year.

It is a known fact that the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have long since correctly drawn up and coordinated their policy also with regard to the German question and that of West Berlin. But what do Khrushchev's loud promises, repeated waverings and "elastic" withdrawals have in common with this policy? His frivolous and unprincipled stand is clearly indicated, if by nothing else, by the following statements:

In his press conference at the Kremlin on November 27, 1958, Khrushchev, arguing the need of concluding a peace treaty with Germany and of settling the West Berlin problem within a period of six months, that is, by May 27, 1959, stated: "As a consequence of the policy of the Western powers West Berlin has been turned into a kind of cancerous tumor. And if it is not done away with, a thing of this kind threatens to become a risk that may have very undesirable consequences. For this reason we make up our minds to perform a surgical operation, that is to do away with the status of occupation of Berlin".

In his speech at Leipzig on March 5, 1959, referring to the time limit for signing the peace treaty with Ger-

many, Khrushchev stated: "I have been telling the leaders of the Western countries: 'If you, gentlemen, desire to discuss with us on reasonable grounds, we may postpone this time limit from May 27 to June 27. If you so desire, to July also, but the Berlin problem and the problem of the peace treaty with Germany must be settled'".

The year 1959 ended. No other time limit was set, but at his press conference in Paris on May 18, 1960, Khrushchev stated that for signing the peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic "the projects are already at hand", and stressed that there was nothing else to do but "pull out our fountain pens and sign and proclaim it".

The year 1960, too, came to an end. On June 15, 1961, in a speech broadcast by radio and television, Khrushchev stated: "We ask everyone to understand us correctly: the conclusion of the peace treaty with Germany cannot be further postponed, a peaceful settlement of the issues in Europe must be arrived at this year", and on June 21, 1961 he declared: "Together with the other peace-loving states we shall sign the peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic at the end of this year".

In his speech broadcast by radio and television on August 7, 1961, arguing the need of concluding this treaty immediately, Khrushchev stressed: "What would be the outcome of continuing to postpone the conclusion of the peace treaty with Germany for several years more? This would mean we would show tolerance towards the forces of aggression, we would retreat before their pressure. A situation of this kind would encourage NATO and the Bonn Government to set up more and more

divisions in Western Germany, to equip them with atomic and thermonuclear weapons, to turn Western Germany into the main force to launch a new world war". Khrushchev reiterated this idea in the interview granted to the American journalist D. Pearson on August 26 when he said: "Every delay would be interpreted by the revenge-seeking circles of Western Germany as an encouragement for aggression and for the launching of a new war".

Less than two months after these declarations were made Khrushchev proclaimed in his report to the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on October 17, 1961: "If the Western powers show readiness in settling the German problem, the question of the time for signing the peace treaty with Germany will not be so important, and we will not insist on signing it by all means before December 31, 1961".

Thus ended 1961. Towards the end of 1962 — on November 7, to be exact — Khrushchev, in reply to a question by journalists as to when the peace treaty with Germany might be signed, said: "The question here is like the birth of a child. When the proper time comes, it is born. Therefore, wait for the time to come!" And finally, in his speech to the 6th Congress of the German Socialist Unity Party, considering the building of the wall between the two parts of Berlin as the object of what we wanted, he stated: "Now, if we look at the matter in the light of the direct interest of the socialist countries, the question of the conclusion of the peace treaty does not in reality stand as it stood prior to the taking of protective measures on the border between the German Democratic Republic and West Berlin". Immediately after this, certain followers of Khrushchev in-

licated that whoever raised the question of the peace treaty with Germany or of Berlin now "would be doing the work of the enemy" and "would be taking the side of the warmongers".

All this humbug only proves that the unprincipled stand of Khrushchev slurs and jeopardizes the policy of the Soviet State and of the socialist camp.

Khrushchev pretends that he is well acquainted with the world and its grave and complicated problems and that he has faced them. But the fact is that he is little acquainted with these problems and has turned his back on them.

The ugliest aspect of Khrushchev's erroneous and hazardous activities, of his revisionist views and unprincipled concessions, is, no doubt, his attitude towards the Cuban crisis and the Sino-Indian border conflict. In the Cuban events Khrushchev acted both as an adventurist and as a capitulationist. It is a known fact that during the Caribbean crisis he not only made unilateral concessions to the American imperialists by withdrawing rockets, airplanes and military experts from Cuba, but he exerted much pressure on a sovereign state to accept the international control of the American imperialists within its territory so that he could make good the promises he had given to President Kennedy. Whereas in the Sino-Indian border conflict he not only proclaimed his quasi "neutrality", but went so far as to give military aid to the Indian reactionary clique who had launched aggressive acts against a socialist country.

There is no gainsaying the fact that because of his revisionist policy, Khrushchev will have to render account somewhere for the harm he has caused and is causing

the international communist and workers' movement. He will have to render accounts both to his party and his people as well as to the entire communist movement in future international forums.

It may come about that, in their struggle, Parties and true communists may have to meet with not only triumphs but also defeats which may be partly due to subjective mistakes. But the Communist Parties and devoted revolutionaries are not afraid of criticising and admitting their mistakes. Whereas with Khrushchev it is different. He is afraid of admitting his mistakes and failures. He even tries his best to cover them up with demagogy, to distort the truth and present it in false colors, and to expect others to chime in with him, to refrain from censuring him and to hide the truth. Khrushchev practises demagogy when, parallel with his revisionist views and deeds, parallel with his opportunist concessions combined with "a storm in a tea-cup", which have led him to such grave errors, he claims that he has never nurtured any illusions about the imperialists. He indulges in demagogy when, parallel with his overestimation of talks and of the role of individuals, he proclaims that he upholds the actions of the masses, the revolutionary and liberation movements of the peoples and their relation to the settlement of the major problems, such as the preservation of peace, disarmament, the banning of atomic weapons and so on.

To say the least, he practises demagogy when he disregards and violates the Moscow Declarations and at the same time swears loyalty to them. Of course, in all these and similar cases, when it is a matter of settling acute international problems, he tries to hide his hand

and to strengthen his demagogy by attacking the "war-mongering dogmatists" of the Party of Labour of Albania and others, by posing the pathetic question: "But why, do you wish us to settle matters by resorting to war?" It is futile for Khrushchev to slander the Party of Labour of Albania and the other Marxist parties. The Party of Labour of Albania has never nurtured the idea that international issues should be settled by war. It has thought and continues to think that there is only one way to settle them, namely by carrying out to the letter the joint decisions of the Moscow Declarations both as regards specific cases such as that of the peace treaty with Germany as well as all the problems that face mankind today. This is what our Party has demanded and continues to demand.

Khrushchev's demagogy and trickery will never attain their goal, for if they did they would greatly jeopardize the whole international communist movement. Therefore it is essential to point out the sore spot, to put things in order, to lay bare the truth with courage, so that our movement may forge ahead more powerfully in order to fulfill its mission in history. This is precisely what the Marxist-Leninist parties and true revolutionaries will do.

The line of Khrushchev's group is facing a grave risk, the risk of being fully unmasked. And it could not happen otherwise. The revisionist trumpeters will one day blow themselves hoarse and the opportunist "heroes" will clash with the Marxist-Leninists within the ranks of their own parties and with the international communist movement. Their revisionist line of action, followed with so much zeal, has brought a number of difficulties to the revisionist

groups themselves not only in foreign policy but also in internal policy, economic, cultural and so on, which cannot be covered up for long by demagogy and bombastic speeches, nor by the so-called "echoes" which sound like the peal of bells without festivity.

Khrushchev feels obliged to make numerous reorganizations in all fields of activity, which have brought about nothing but chaos and detriment to his own group. His heart broke when he felt obliged to throw overboard his cherished child, Yevtushenko, whom he had brought up and fondled, whom he had raised to a place of honor in *Pravda*, as the trumpeter of anti-Stalinism. But Khrushchev's demagogical manoeuvres do not easily and for long deceive the Bolsheviks and the Soviet people, nor the communists and peoples of other countries.

Khrushchev's allies, whom he led into a blind alley, whom he compromised, whom he hitched to his wagon and is now dragging into the abyss, are also facing serious difficulties. Nevertheless there are people who can think, and this is positive, there are those who react, and this is even more positive; there are also those who waver, who fear and lack courage, but who have doubts about these so-called "good things" of this revisionist line. These people are in conflict with their Parties, with their comrades, with their own conscience. They are in conflict with Khrushchev and Tito. The sworn revisionists have unsheathed their daggers and are shamelessly placing these people in a dilemma: either to follow a course of complete betrayal or to be removed from the scene as Stalinists, anti-Marxists, dogmatists, nationalists!

Finding themselves face to face with the displeasure of the overwhelming rank and file of communists and the masses of the people, due especially to the difficulties which their policy has created in all the phases of life, Khrushchev's loyal allies, too, resort to demagoguery, copy their "master" in everything and at the same time strive to carry de-Stalinization to the end, to totally rehabilitate traitors, to purge the ranks of the party and the organs of the state not only of the Stalinists, but also of the "lukewarms", of the "waverers". These revisionists see their only salvation in posing as better Catholics than the Pope. But their assaults resemble Don Quixote's charge on the windmills.

Under the pressure of Marxist-Leninists, Khrushchev's group strive to defend themselves by appropriating the arguments of the Marxists, and pretending they are their own. At times, they go so far in their attempts to deceive the people as even to sing Stalin's praises. The revisionists are well acquainted with the threads with which they have interwoven the great plot against the Soviet Union and the international communist movement by assailing J. V. Stalin's person and work. But the Marxists have detected these threads and are busy cutting them one after another until the black spider will one day be left without a web. Khrushchev knows very well the colossal significance of the Stalin question not only for the Soviet Union, but for all the international communists, for Marxism-Leninism itself. He thought he had wound up this matter successfully; he thought he had created such a terrible "scarecrow" in the world that nobody would dare to stand in defense of Stalin, nor would his name be mentioned again. However, the con-

trary happened. The Marxist-Leninists, true revolutionaries and the people are daily realizing more and more that since the question of Stalin is inseparable from the safeguarding of Leninism it is a matter of primary importance and principle in the fight between Marxists and revisionists. For without reinstating Stalin and his work, our revolutionary movement and the cause of Marxism-Leninism can make no headway. The truth cannot be obscured, for it is a glowing light; lies, slanders and demagoguery are the weapons of plotters, the weapons of darkness.

KHRUSHCHEV ON A COMMON FRONT WITH THE YUGOSLAV REVISIONISTS

In the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, a so-called "Albanian question" is not only mentioned but placed on the same level with the Yugoslav question. In other words, the People's Republic of Albania is equated with Titoite Yugoslavia and the Party of Labour of Albania with the renegade clique of Belgrade.

It is a known fact that Khrushchev has persistently pursued the line of approach, of affiliation and complete union, of all-round collaboration towards Yugoslavia, establishing a common front with the Tito clique under the pretext that "Yugoslavia is a socialist country" and the League of Yugoslav Communists "a fraternal party". And he tries to impose on the entire international communist movement this line of his, which is in arrant

contradiction with the 1960 Moscow Declaration, in which the Yugoslav revisionists are unanimously condemned as renegades by all the communist and workers' parties. He does this by launching bitter attacks on all those who loyally abide by the Declaration and oppose affinity with the Tito clique, as well as Khrushchev's attempts to include Yugoslavia in the family of socialist countries and the League of Yugoslav Communists in the ranks of the international communist movement.

In order to deceive public opinion, and justify his views and acts, Khrushchev trumpets abroad that "changes are being effected" in Yugoslavia, that "the foreign policy of Yugoslavia is in line with the policy of the socialist states", that, after all, "certain serious divergences are noticed in some ideological matters and the Yugoslav comrades will be frankly told about them". Khrushchev's demagogy can deceive no one. For it is plain to all that "no changes" have been effected nor are being effected in Yugoslavia by the Titoite clique to show that mistakes are being corrected there, but, on the contrary, they are proceeding directly towards betrayal. The Tito clique have themselves more than once declared that no changes have been effected or will be effected contrary to the program of the League of Yugoslav Communists approved at their 7th Congress. Why does Khrushchev not tell the communist movement where are the changes of which he speaks? Why does he not bring forth concrete facts instead of glittering generalities? It is clear that there are no concrete facts nor will there ever be.

One of Khrushchev's "sound" arguments is the so-called "sameness" or "identity" of the position of Titoite

Yugoslavia with that of the socialist countries in a number of questions of foreign policy. Again empty words, again bluffs. Every one who follows carefully the development of events and the attitude of Titoite Yugoslavia towards various international issues has noticed that the attitude of the Yugoslav revisionists has had in each and every instance nothing in common with the attitude of the socialist countries. This is borne out by their attitude during the crisis in the Caribbean sea and towards the Sino-Indian border conflict in which the Titoite clique sided with the aggressors and condemned both Fidel Castro's Cuba and People's China. In what matters does the policy of the Yugoslav revisionist renegade clique "coincide" with the foreign policy of the socialist countries? Is it in the stand towards the national liberation wars of the oppressed and the newly liberated peoples, which the Titoite clique do their best to wreck? Or is it in their conduct towards the socialist countries, against whom the Titoite clique have hatched and continue to hatch counter-revolutionary plots, as in the case of the People's Republic of Albania and of the People's Republic of Hungary? Or are the Yugoslav revisionists possibly of the same mind with the socialist countries on such major issues as, for instance, the question of the peace treaty with Germany and of turning West Berlin into a free demilitarized city? When the situation calls for serious action in these matters, it will be seen which side the Titoite clique will take, whether they will line up with the socialist countries, whether they will identify with the Soviet Union or will side with the imperialists.

Empty words for demagogical purposes are not used by Khrushchev alone. The Tito clique are also well versed in them. They too can express themselves in favor of peaceful coexistence and disarmament, in favor of the independence of the peoples and so on and so forth. But it is not only the Belgrade renegade clique who so express themselves. The most aggressive imperialists, Kennedy and Adenauer, also wave the olive branch, speak of coexistence and disarmament, deliver speeches and dispatch messages upholding the independence of the peoples, but this by no means hinders them from actually pursuing the policy of war and armaments, the policy of oppression and enslavement of the peoples.

Khrushchev is well aware that a minaret cannot be put into a sack, that the communists who abide by the Moscow Declarations cannot be made to subscribe to the idea that Yugoslavia is a socialist country. Therefore, posing as a man of principle, he stresses that in certain ideological matters he is not at one with "the Yugoslav comrades" and that he will tell them so. But what are these ideological matters and how will they be disclosed publicly or confidentially? The Moscow Declaration emphasizes that it behooves the communist parties to continually expose the Yugoslav revisionists. Khrushchev and his group have not only disregarded this correct conclusion of the Declaration but, on the contrary, have more than once attacked those parties which abide by the Declaration and expose the views and activities of the Titoite renegades. Isn't the scandalous conduct towards the delegate of the Communist Party of China to the 6th Congress of the German Socialist Unity Party a best proof of this?

All facts show that by trampling underfoot the Moscow Declarations Khrushchev's group have not only given up exposing the Yugoslav revisionists but have long since pursued the line of complete understanding, forming in this way a joint revisionist front with them. And this has come about not because the Tito clique has "changed" but because the attitude of Khrushchev and his group has changed to positions of revisionism, of anti-Marxism. This is clearly borne out by their stand towards another thesis of the Moscow Declarations, namely, towards the thesis that specifies revisionism as the principal menace to the international communist and workers' movement.

With regard to this, too, Khrushchev claims that he abides by the Moscow Declarations and that he even wages a struggle on two fronts, against revisionism and against dogmatism. But what are the facts? It is well known that in addition to the Yugoslav renegade revisionist clique, the leaders of the Italian Communist Party, headed by Togliatti, have also embraced revisionist views that have found expression in numerous official documents and writings of theirs. Khrushchev and his group have not uttered a single word of reproach for these opportunist views; on the contrary, they have smiled upon and lost no opportunity to praise the revisionist line of Togliatti and his companions, describing it as an example of "creative Marxism". Another of the ugliest manifestations of modern revisionism is Dange's group in India, who have become obedient servitors of the most reactionary circles of the Indian bourgeoisie and have crossed over to open betrayal and social chauvinism. Khrushchev and his group have not uttered a single word

of reproach to this group of traitors nor condemned their views; on the contrary, they conduct "heartly meetings" with Dange, thus encouraging him to proceed further along the path of betrayal.

Where then is Khrushchev's and his group's "determined struggle" against revisionism? They have renounced this struggle, and since they themselves stand in the position of revisionism they even try their utmost to compel others to renounce such a struggle. In fact, Khrushchev and his group have turned the sharp edge of their daggers against the so-called "dogmatists", by which they really mean the Marxist-Leninists.

KHRUSHCHEV IS LOOKING IN VAIN FOR AN "ORIGINAL" WAY TO RE-ESTABLISH "UNITY"

But after all is said and done, why does Khrushchev need to place, even formally, the so-called "Albanian question" on the same level with the Yugoslav question? To us it is very clear that he needs this stratagem in order to link the two things and to make one serve the other, so that he may oblige the Marxist-Leninist parties to admit Yugoslavia as a socialist state, the League of Yugoslav Communists as a fraternal party, "compensating" this with the recognition of Albania as a socialist country. In other words: either you, Marxist-Leninist parties, recognize Yugoslavia as a socialist country and the League of Yugoslav Communists as a fraternal Communist Party and consequently give up your attempts to expose the Titoite clique, while we (i. e. Khrushchev's group) agree, "in compensation", to call Albania a social-

ist country and to give up our public assaults on the Party of Labour of Albania and its leaders; or, in case you continue to expose the Yugoslav revisionists, we will continue our attacks on the Party of Labour and the People's Republic of Albania and will demand their expulsion from the communist movement and the socialist camp. Or, let us, as a last resort, shove aside both the Yugoslav question and the "Albanian question", and let time take care of them. (But Khrushchev forgets one "little detail": Tito's revisionist clique have been unanimously condemned by the international communist and workers' movement as traitors to Marxism-Leninism, whereas the Party of Labour of Albania is a Marxist-Leninist party and the People's Republic of Albania, a member of the socialist camp. Therefore they can neither be compared to the League of Yugoslav Communists and Tito's Yugoslavia nor be shoved aside when the settlement of problems pertaining to the international communist and workers' movement is under discussion.)

Evidently Khrushchev has discovered an "original" way out of the grave situation into which the socialist camp and the communist movement have been hurled by his anti-Marxist attitude and activities, and, in defiance of the Moscow Declarations, he proposes some sort of "reasonable compromise". He proposes a compromise to the detriment of a Marxist-Leninist party and a socialist country — the Party of Labour of Albania and the People's Republic of Albania. Khrushchev is accustomed to bargaining the sovereignty of others, notwithstanding the fact that he has not met nor will ever meet with success as far as Marxist-Leninist parties and free and sovereign peoples are concerned.

The arbitrary stand of Khrushchev's group towards the Party of Labour and the People's Republic of Albania shows beyond all doubt that they do not intend to effect a change, that they have not the least desire to settle the differences, but that they are bent on treading the path of dissension and betrayal and of wrecking the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement.

The above trend of Khrushchev's activities goes to show that he would desire to put into effect his unrealizable dream of settling the affairs of others and those of the international communist movement by anti-Marxist methods in the days to come, too. But, to his ill luck, he will fail to find such partners. The affairs of others and those of the international communist movement can be solved and settled only at the appointed place, by those interested and by all the fraternal parties, and not at his bidding. This is the only Leninist way of settling matters. Khrushchev looks in vain for other ways.

On the other hand, it is obvious that the settlement of differences within the ranks of the international communist and workers' movement is of vital interest to the movement towards which all the Marxist-Leninist parties and all the communists of the world without exception bear their share of responsibility. Khrushchev, however, does not like the idea of taking into account the necessity of discussing and weighing the arguments of the various disputants within the ranks of each party as a preliminary phase for an international meeting so that the forum of international communism may reflect the true opinion of the millions of communists of the whole world. This is the line V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin

pursued during their lifetime and this is the line they have taught other communists to pursue.

As a matter of fact a broad discussion is going on in the world today concerning the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism. The views of both sides have been clearly expressed. But the leaders of certain fraternal parties have not only put the writings that express Marxist-Leninist views "under quarantine" but have also distorted them. The masses of the communists of these Parties demand that they be shown the writings which express these views, but they are refused this privilege. The communists demand that this matter be taken up for discussion, but their demand has met with disapproval. Under these conditions the communists are obliged to look for ways to express their opinions in one manner or another. Let it, therefore, be brought home to those who set up such "quarantines" that if they ban discussions and take no notice of the opinion of the masses of communists—a thing which is contrary to Marxism and democracy—the latter will devise ways of expressing their opinion in the most varied forms and, without violating any Leninist rule, in a meeting of international communism, too. No Marxist-Leninist unity can be achieved in the international communist movement without, or contrary to, the will of the communists.

KHRUSHCHEV MAINTAINS AN OPENLY HOSTILE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE PARTY OF LABOUR AND THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF ALBANIA

In their letter of March 30 to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, Khrushchev's group, as

we said at the beginning of this article, launched a series of slanders and reproaches against the Party of Labour of Albania, laying bare once more their intentions to cause a split. We are not at all taken aback by this. Khrushchev persists in his hostile attitude towards the Party of Labour of Albania because the Party of Labour of Albania is an "undesirable" living example on which have been tried, but without success, all the "norms" of Khrushchev as regards relations with fraternal parties and countries of the socialist camp — from cajolery and promises to brutal interventions, pressures, blockades, slanders and calls for counter-revolution. How cynical and false sound the statements so often made, especially in recent times, by Khrushchev's group that the Soviet leaders abide by the principle of non-intervention in each other's internal affairs, of respect for all parties, big or small, of mutual aid and support, that airing differences between and launching attacks on fraternal parties in public can only aggravate matters, that extending ideological differences to the field of state relations among socialist countries is not permissible and very harmful and so on and so forth.

In his last letter to the Communist Party of China, Khrushchev uses his old tactics of attacks on the one hand, and of deceiving public opinion on the other.

He reiterates his widely known pretext that he has done and continues to do his utmost to settle the differences between our two parties and our two countries, but that all these efforts have failed to find the "necessary response" on the part of the Albanian leaders.

We have maintained for a long time and reiterate it now that these claims are completely groundless. The Party of Labour of Albania has more than once made it

clear through numerous facts and documents that the present leaders of the Soviet Union, with Khrushchev at the head, far from taking steps to improve Soviet-Albanian relations, have persisted in aggravating and deepening these differences by carrying out hostile acts, each more grave than the other, against our Party and our country. In its article of February 7, 1963, the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania proposed to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union that a joint publication be made of the written material of our two parties and governments and the correspondence exchanged between us on these differences, so as to lay bare the truth before public opinion. But this proposal of ours met with deadly silence on the part of Khrushchev's group. It is clear that Khrushchev dreads the truth and does not wish the facts as revealed by documents to become public knowledge nor to disclose what he was actually aiming at when he hastened to aggravate the Soviet-Albanian divergences. That is why he prefers to pursue the path of demagogy.

He tries to pursue the same path when he writes in the March 30 letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China that: "the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union again took initiative and advanced another proposal to the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania to hold a bilateral meeting of the representatives of our two parties". It would have been much better if the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had quoted in full the letter addressed to the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania on this matter, especially since it was only a very few lines, so

that the communists of the world could be convinced of the "comradely step and the practical application of the principles of respect, equality and independence of the fraternal parties"(!?) by the Soviet leaders with Khrushchev at the head. We urge the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to do a thing of this kind. We, on our part, considering the fact that Khrushchev strives to use the exchange of letters between our two parties at the beginning of March 1963, for new slanders against the Party of Labour of Albania, are herewith quoting the full text of our reply to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union dated March 13, 1963:

"On March 11, 1963 the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania received the Charge d'Affaires of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in Tirana, Miroslav Hollub, at his own request*. On instructions from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Charge d'Affaires of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic handed to the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, for its information, a copy of the letter which the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had sent to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. It was accompanied by another letter addressed to the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, consisting of a few lines, through which the Central Committee of the Communist Party

* Editor's note: Ever since the Soviet Union's rupture of diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of Albania, the Czechoslovak Embassy in Tirana protects the interests of the USSR in Albania.

of the Soviet Union, claiming that its letter addressed to a third party should serve as a basis for harmonizing Soviet-Albanian relations, proposed, in passing, that (bilateral talks be conducted between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Party of Labour of Albania). The Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania thinks that a step of this kind by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, made in this manner, utilizing the opportunity of a letter from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, which contains arguments and considerations pertaining to the relations and need for talks between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, projects the Party of Labour of Albania as dependent on another party, a thing which can only be interpreted as humiliation, disparagement and contempt for the Party of Labour of Albania, as a violation of the principle of equality and mutual respect, an elementary principle in contacts and relations among communist and workers' parties. Therefore the above letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was rejected as unacceptable.

The Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania cannot help thinking that the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is again evidencing its lack of sincere desire to improve relations between our two parties and is apparently trying to establish a pretext that the Party of Labour of Albania is 'opposed to bilateral talks'.

The Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, which abide by the Leninist principle of mutual respect in its relations with fraternal parties, has been and continues to be ready to welcome and give due attention to every letter and every proposal which the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union may forward to our Party, but it will reject any attempt to discredit the Party of Labour of Albania or to violate its independence and its equal rights in the international communist and workers' movement. The Party of Labour of Albania has been and is always ready for bilateral talks with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union provided the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union establishes all conditions of complete equality."

As can be clearly seen from the above letter of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the so-called "initiative" of the Soviet leaders for bilateral talks was in reality a pursuance of malicious ends and constituted an attempt to discredit the Party of Labour of Albania, to trample upon its independence.

This conclusion is evident to anyone who does not wilfully close his eyes in the face of the truth. It is further corroborated by Khrushchev's every act and attitude as regards relations with the Party of Labour of Albania in recent years. He has continuously maintained an attitude of disdain and of disregard towards our Party, considering it not as an equal and independent party, but as an

appendage or a tool in the hands of others. As early as November 6, 1960, at the time of the Moscow meeting of the 81 parties, proceeding from his chauvinist ideas of a bourgeois business man he said to the delegates of the Communist Party of China: "We have lost an Albania while you, the Chinese, have gained an Albania". In his closing speech at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in October 1961, where he vented all his anger and resentment against the Party of Labour of Albania, Khrushchev made open insinuations that our Party is a dependent one, calling upon the Chinese comrades that "if they want Soviet-Albanian relations improved, none better than they can help in this matter". He repeated these absurd accusations more openly and in the vilest of terms in his speech to the Supreme Soviet on December 12, 1962, where he alleged that the Party of Labour of Albania is primed and urged by certain "foul-mouthed ones" to "insult the mother Communist Party of the Soviet Union" and that they had paid the Party of Labour of Albania three kopeks for this service.

We are fully convinced that Khrushchev knew only too well that the proposal for bilateral talks with the Party of Labour of Albania made in the particular form, considering our Party as an appendage of a third party, was unacceptable to the Party of Labour of Albania, as it would be to any self-respecting independent party. But he needed this for demagogical purposes to deceive others, to lay the blame on the Party of Labour of Albania and to justify in this way his course of action against the Party of Labour and the People's Republic of Albania, his attempt to oust them from the ranks of the commu-

nist movement and of the socialist camp. He needed this as a pretext to try to show that he has done his utmost to improve Soviet-Albanian relations and restore them to normal and that it was the Albanian leaders who opposed all meetings and talks.

This foresight of the Party of Labour of Albania was fully substantiated not long after. This is clearly demonstrated by the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union addressed to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on March 30, 1963.

It must be said that Khrushchev persists in playing his game. Significant is the fact that in their letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China the Soviet leaders stress: "If the desire is truly expressed we are ready to come to such a meeting". Here again the same tactics are employed, as if to say, "we have expressed our desire", "we have taken our stand", "we have had our say through the Communist Party of China", "now it is up to the Albanian leaders to have their say". We say to the Soviet leaders: Address yourselves to the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, but observe the usual norms of respect and of mutual relations between parties. Establish conditions of full equality which you have so far trampled upon in your relations with the Party of Labour and the People's Republic of Albania, if you are really in favor of harmonizing your relations. Take off your diplomatic gloves, stop all vain talk about prestige and demagogical phrases. Do not forget that you are very guilty towards the Party of Labour and the People's Republic of Albania. If you think your anti-Marxist and anti-Albanian acts towards

the Party of Labour and the People's Republic of Albania can pass so easily, you are gravely mistaken!

But Khrushchev and his group are not sincerely interested in talks and in the settlement of differences with the Party of Labour of Albania. This is evident also from the fact that even when speaking of talks and the settlement of differences, the Soviet leaders continue their attacks and calumnies against the Party of Labour of Albania. They accuse the Albanian leaders of continuing "their splitting activities" and "launching slanderous attacks" against the Communist Party and the people of the Soviet Union.

By accusing the Party of Labour of Albania as splitters, Khrushchev's group are trying to cover up the tracks of their own splitting activities. What does Khrushchev mean by "splitting activities" of the Albanian leaders? Can the fact that the Party of Labour of Albania refused to submit to Khrushchev's dictates at the Bucharest and the Moscow meetings, that it had the courage to express its own views and to criticize Khrushchev's anti-Marxist views and acts at a meeting of the international communists, be called splitting activities, while Khrushchev's plots against fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties behind their backs and the endeavors to inveigle other Parties into these plots through threats and pressures are to be called Marxist-Leninist acts favoring unity? Why are we to praise as "Marxist-Leninist elasticity" Khrushchev's outright violation of the Moscow Declarations, while the observance of these documents by the Party of Labour of Albania and by other Marxist-Leninist parties should be called splitting activities? No, no! it is not the Party of Labour of Albania but Khrushchev's group that have

caused and are causing a lot of harm to the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement by their views and acts; it is they who have sowed and are sowing dissension among our ranks. And if Khrushchev raises a hue and cry about unity, facts show that he is not in favor of true Marxist-Leninist unity based on the Moscow Declarations, but of false, anti-Marxist unity on a revisionist basis.

In the March 30 letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China it is written that "the Albanian leaders have launched and continue to launch slanderous attacks" against the Communist Party and the people of the Soviet Union. Where and on what occasion have we slandered the Communist Party and the people of the Soviet Union? Let Khrushchev cite but one single example. Our Party and our people have always cherished and cherish great affection and respect for the glorious Bolshevik Party founded by Lenin and for the fraternal Soviet people. We have always considered and continue to consider them as our heartiest friends, nurture for them most brotherly internationalist feelings. We have been and will always be grateful to them for everything they have done for the good of our people and of our Party. The Party of Labour of Albania continuously cultivates the feeling of love for the Soviet Union among communists and the masses of the people. This is manifested in all its acts and propaganda; it is manifested also in its press which keep them well informed about the life and the achievements of the Soviet workers regardless of the fact that the Soviet press has these last three years written not a single word about

the endeavors and struggle of the Albanian people for socialism. The principled struggle which the Party of Labour of Albania is waging against revisionism is at the same time a struggle in defense of the Soviet Union. Time will verify this.

Nor have we ever launched any slanders against Khrushchev's group itself. We have always told the truth, referring to the real facts, to Khrushchev's attitude and deeds. We have said that Khrushchev was the first to air our differences in public. He did this at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, giving our enemies an advantage and creating in this way a harmful precedent in the international communist movement, whereby the congress of a party is used as a platform from which to launch arbitrary attacks on other parties. We have said and do say that Khrushchev's group suspended all credits, withdrew all Soviet experts, expelled Albanian students from the schools of the Soviet Union, annulled trade, cultural and military agreements and ruptured even its diplomatic relations, setting up a total blockade against the People's Republic of Albania. We have said and do say that Khrushchev's group has slanderously described the leaders of the Party of Labour of Albania as agents of imperialism, sold to it for thirty pieces of silver. We have said and do say that Khrushchev and his group have openly taken under their protection the enemies of our people's power who have been condemned as traitors to the Fatherland and as agents of foreign espionage, as well as various anti-Party elements, and at the same time have called for an overthrow of the leadership of the Party and of the state in Albania, thereby interfering in the crudest manner in the

internal affairs of our Party and of our country. These have all been documented. We could mention here a number of other facts as, for instance, the hostile and arbitrary conduct of Khrushchev's group towards the People's Republic of Albania in connection with the Warsaw Treaty and the Council of Mutual Economic Aid. But we do not deem it necessary to go into more detail on this and other matters at this time.

Such are some of the facts to which we have referred in our polemics with Khrushchev's group. If these are slanders as Khrushchev claims, then let him take courage to deny in public these acts with which the world is already acquainted, acts which in international practice resemble in their entirety steps which one country undertakes against another on the verge of the declaration of war.

In fact it is not we but Khrushchev who shamelessly slanders our Party and our country. What is Khrushchev after? Does he intend that we should shut our mouth and keep silent while he continues to discredit, to slander and to act against the Party of Labour and the People's Republic of Albania? This is unacceptable. Let it be clear once and for all that this is not the way that leads to the settlement of differences and the improvement of Soviet-Albanian relations.

If Khrushchev is eager to find a solution of the differences and to strengthen unity, he must show this by deeds, undertake real — not fictitious — steps, to remove all obstacles he has laid in the relations between our two parties. Just as he took the courage to launch slanderous attacks, to interfere in the internal affairs of, and to carry on hostile acts against, our Party and our country, so

should he now take the courage to publicly condemn these anti-Marxist attitudes and acts and to begin the strict observance of the international norms in relations between communist and workers' parties and between socialist countries. We will welcome any honest step in this direction.

**THE NEW REVISIONIST CRUSADE AGAINST
MARXISM-LENINISM WILL MEET WITH
SHAMEFUL FAILURE**

Article published in the newspaper
Zëri i Popullit

June 15, 1963

As inveterate agents of American imperialism, the treacherous clique of Yugoslav revisionists have recently set more zealously to work to split the socialist camp and the international communist movement and to dismember them for good, with active support and all-round help from Khrushchev. This is plainly manifested in the proceedings of the last Plenum of the Central Committee of the League of Yugoslav Communists held on May 18 of this year.

Much had been said about and threefold publicity given to the Plenum of the Central Committee of the League of Yugoslav Communists and particularly to Tito's report. The Yugoslav revisionist press and propaganda extolled its "extraordinary significance" and made a lot of noise about it. According to the news items and comments in the Yugoslav press itself Tito's report was given wide publicity in the Western bourgeois press. Similar publicity was given to it by the Khrushchev group and their supporters. The *Pravda* of May 26 gave a whole page to the summary of Tito's report. This "tripartite alliance" is very significant. It points clearly to the common purpose of the joint assaults of all the participants in this "Holy Trinity": opposition to revolutionary Marxism-Leninism and to the parties which firmly uphold it.

It is not at all incidental either that the Plenum of the Central Committee of the League of Yugoslav Communists, which was "dedicated to the problems of the

international workers' and communist movement", was held soon after Tito's meeting with Dean Rusk, on the eve of parliamentary elections in Yugoslavia, prior to the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on ideological matters, prior to the bilateral talks between the representatives of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the representatives of the Communist Party of China, as well as under conditions of the growing resistance and opposition of the more sober communists and of the whole world to the revisionist trend headed by the Khrushchev group, which opposition has brought about misgivings and perplexity within the ranks of the revisionists. Under such circumstances Tito's renegade clique, in compliance with the needs and interests of the imperialists, took a new step in their treacherous activities. They urged that "de-Stalinization", the fight against "dogmatism", in other words, against revolutionary Marxism-Leninism, should be carried to the end "without compromise", and that a crusade be launched against the "dogmatists", wherever they might be, that is, against the parties which maintained a firm Marxist-Leninist stand.

The Plenum of the Central Committee of the League of Yugoslav Communists and Tito's report are another clear indication that the renegade clique of Belgrade, as the number one spokesmen of the modern revisionists, persist in carrying out their treacherous aims of exterminating the revolutionary communist movement, subordinating it to imperialism, trying to draw onto this road all the ranks of the revisionists and to encourage and incite them for more active work in this direction. It is a well-known fact that it was Tito and his clique who

first raised the banner of "de-Stalinization". In his infamous speech at Pula in 1956 Tito called upon all the modern revisionists, masked or unmasked, "to break the shell" and strive more actively for the triumph of the revisionist line over "Stalinism" and "dogmatism", for eliminating the "consequences of the cult of the individual", and so on. When the Khrushchev group and their supporters resolutely embarked on this road, especially at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and thereafter, the bitter campaign against "Stalinism" was carried to its acme. In an interview with the American journalist Drew Pearson in August 1962 Tito called on the revisionists to take another step towards betrayal, to proceed with more determination towards greater proximity to and open reconciliation with the imperialists, and towards their "economic and political integration" with the capitalist world, which, in fact, means to submit to the imperialists. Now he calls for total liquidation of anyone who has become a stumbling-block on this way of betrayal; he calls for an organized frontal campaign of all the combined revisionist forces against Marxism-Leninism and the parties that uphold it and oppose the revisionist course.

The proceedings of the Plenum of the Central Committee of the League of Yugoslav Communists lasted 3½ to 4 hours, just enough time to hear out Tito's report of 11,000 words and hold 8 discussions. This fact too shows clearly that this was not "a thorough, all-round discussion of the major issues of present international developments and the world revolutionary movement" as the Yugoslav propaganda tries to describe it, but a

political manoeuvre of the Tito clique dictated by the present moment.

What first arouses one's attention is the fact that, defending, supporting and encouraging Khrushchev's revisionist line, Tito in his report tried to reaffirm with unrestrained joy their complete unity of views on the basic issues of present world developments and of the international communist and workers' movement. Thus he pointed out their similar and downright anti-Marxist, anti-revolutionary views on the problems of peace and war, of peaceful coexistence, of the ways and forms of transition to socialism, and so on and so forth. It is noteworthy that on all these matters Tito spoke in Khrushchev's terms, used the same language and the same arguments which we have seen in Khrushchev's widely known address to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on December 12, 1962 (an address which, as is well known, was delivered in Tito's presence) as well as in the other written material of the Khrushchev group.

In reading Tito's speech at the Plenum and the speeches by those who took part in the discussions, we see clearly enough that the Tito clique have changed nothing of their basic revisionist theses consecrated in the infamous program of the League of Yugoslav Communists. As a matter of fact, by presenting his views through Khrushchev's formulae, Tito reiterates in a different way his old anti-Marxist theses formulated five years ago in the anti-Marxist and revisionist program of the League of Yugoslav Communists, a program from which Khrushchev himself finds a source of inspiration. But Tito is shrewd. In his 11,000-word report to the Plenum he never made any direct reference to the pro-

gram of the League of Yugoslav Communists. And this is not unintentional. The infamous program of the League of Yugoslav Communists is unanimously condemned as the code of the modern revisionists by the entire international communist movement. Therefore if Tito had made direct reference to the theses of the program, it would have been prejudicial to himself and his friends, Khrushchev and his partners, who would not like to mention rope in the home of the hanged. And why irritate the sore spot when the program is in force as such, when its theses are being persistently carried out by the Yugoslav revisionists themselves, when they are being adopted and further developed even by other revisionists, by Khrushchev and his ilk? Why lay new obstacles in the way of Khrushchev's attempts to rehabilitate Tito's clique and present the League of Yugoslav Communists as a "Marxist party" and Yugoslavia as a "socialist country"? Tito is well aware of his basic duty: at this moment Khrushchev must be supported, be given unreserved assistance in his attempt to split the socialist camp and the communist movement, and be urged ahead in this direction. Tito's main objective is to unite the wavering ranks of the modern revisionists and consolidate the united front of revisionism for further opposition to revolutionary Marxism-Leninism and its supporters.

Tito and his accomplices sang hymns of triumph for the first successes they had scored; they sang hymns of triumph because their line of betrayal had been extended to include, first and foremost, Khrushchev and his group, because their views had taken root in the Soviet Union and in certain other countries and parties, as was so

clearly borne out especially at the 20th and the 22nd Congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which Tito did not fail to hail openly again. It was precisely this that he stressed in a roundabout way when he spoke of "the rise of the international authority of Yugoslavia and the League of Yugoslav Communists". It was this which he likewise stressed when he boasted of the "success" of Yugoslavia in improving the relations and strengthening the links with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Tito on his part thanked Khrushchev in public for having created possibilities for his clique to play, with more chances of success, their role of the "Trojan horse" in the service of imperialism in splitting and undermining the socialist camp and the international communist movement. "Thanks to Khrushchev and the other colleagues," Tito said, "we have been able to gradually improve our relations with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, though at a slow rate."

The patrons of the Tito clique, the American imperialists, have no reason to be displeased at the success of their lackeys and at their policy of "getting closer" to the socialist countries. Nevertheless, Tito did not fail in his speech at the Plenum of the Central Committee of the League of Yugoslav Communists, as in other previous speeches, to clear up any misunderstanding and to calm any "disturbed soul". He stated in very explicit terms that the reconciliation with certain socialist countries "does not mean that Yugoslavia intends to prejudice its state relations with the capitalist countries or to give up its co-operation with these countries". And to prove his "correct" stand towards his tutelary he never once

mentioned in his speech the words "American imperialism" or the menace it presents to world peace.

As a matter of fact the American imperialists have not been nor are they upset by Tito, their obedient agent, because Tito's affiliation with Khrushchev's group is fully to their advantage and is made on their instructions. This affiliation enables the "Trojan horse" to better play the role which imperialism has assigned him, namely, to undermine and split the socialist camp and the international communist movement; it enables the Tito clique to carry out more easily and in a better way the role of the intermediary for the gradual reconciliation of all the modern revisionists with the American imperialists, the role of "detector" of Khrushchev's views, intentions and designs. If the American imperialists have begun, especially in recent times, to be less disturbed by Khrushchev's "firm stand" or his speeches and notes filled with "threats", if they (the American imperialists) themselves make statements to the effect that their attitude towards the Soviet Union and towards the problem of peace should be revised, that Prime Minister Khrushchev should be supported and so on, a role of no little significance has, of course, been played through the recommendation of their Titoite agents, apart from the fact that the American imperialists are "well acquainted" with their partner who has been fully "exposed" during these ten years.

In his report to the Plenum of the Central Committee of the League of Yugoslav Communists Tito gave unreserved support to the Khrushchev group in their assaults on the communist and workers' parties which firmly uphold the principles of proletarian ideology. As

a faithful servant of American imperialism and in its service, Tito said: "We side with the communist and workers' parties which strive to do away with dogmatism and Stalinist methods in the communist movement. . . . When I say that we side with anti-dogmatic forces in the communist movement, I mean to emphasize our duties and the international obligations of the League of Yugoslav Communists in the ranks of the international workers' movement." Such is the treacherous mission assigned to him by American imperialism; such are the "international obligations" which this clique of renegades, this "fraternal party" of Khrushchev's, has taken upon itself.

The terms "elimination of dogmatism", "elimination of Stalinist methods" and "elimination of the consequences of the cult of the individual" are the inventions of the modern revisionists, of the Khrushchev group and of the Tito clique. In fact the essential goal of the modern revisionists is to do away with Marxism-Leninism, with the revolutionary spirit, and with the cadres who are faithful to the revolution. It is now already clear that just as they try to hide their real features as traitors under the label of "creative Marxism" and "true Leninism", the modern revisionists try to hide their real objective of destroying communism and quelling the revolution, under false labels and absurd assertions about the need of fighting "dogmatism", the "consequences of the cult of the individual", "Stalinism", "bureaucracy", and so on and so forth.

But Tito did not stand aloof nor did he confine himself to giving unreserved support to the activities of the Khrushchev group. He passed over to the role of abettor

and instigator of the fight against Marxism-Leninism and against the revolutionary spirit. He launched violent attacks especially against the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania, and by way of suggesting to Khrushchev: "That's the way! Keep it up with more fervor!", he trumped up all sorts of slanders and fabrications against them, particularly against the glorious Communist Party of China. It must be said that in this matter, too, Tito was very cautious to keep to the slanders which Khrushchev himself has been formulating from time to time against the "dogmatists".

In what way did Tito in fact slander? By repeating in essence the familiar thesis of imperialist reactionary propaganda which, in order to hoodwink public opinion and justify the unbridled armaments race and aggressive warmongering policy of the imperialists headed by the United States, makes a lot of noise about the "communist menace" coming from the socialist states, the renegade Tito in his report presents the matter as if the threat of war came from the People's Republic of China, from the "dogmatists" and "pseudo-revolutionary phrasemongers", who, according to him, are opposed to peaceful coexistence, to general and total disarmament, and are in favour of settling the various issues by force of arms regardless of the consequences, and so on and so forth. The traitor Tito labelled as Trotskyite and adventurous the Marxist-Leninist principled stand of the Communist Party of China on the issues of peace and war, its consistent stand, which is fully in agreement with the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on revolutions, and the resolute struggle which the Communist Party of China waged to expose the warmongering activities of the

imperialists, especially the American imperialists. Khrushchev too has in fact said the same thing about the "dogmatists". Thus in his speech on December 12, 1962, he stated: ". . . on the one hand it is the adventurous aggressive forces of imperialism, the so-called frenzied forces, that try by all methods to launch a war . . . on the other, it is those who pretend to be Marxist-Leninists but in reality are dogmatists that try to push matters in that direction." And "some dogmatists have shifted to Trotskyite positions and are prodding the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to the course of unleashing world war".

Tito's and Khrushchev's slanders and accusations have their real source in their renunciation of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, in their betrayal, in the change of their ideas, which are no longer based on the materialist conception of history, on the class analysis of the various phenomena or on the objective study of the real status of things in the world, but on their subjectivism. Tito's and Khrushchev's slanders and accusations have their source in their argument that imperialism has changed basically, that wars no longer spring from the nature of the capitalist social order itself, from its internal and external contradictions, from the aggressive and warmongering policy of imperialism, but come from the frenzied, crazy persons, that the invention of new weapons has abolished from the world the conception of just and unjust wars, that the danger of nuclear war has blocked the way to revolutions, etc., etc. Of course, whoever opposes these treacherous conceptions which serve only the imperialists and run counter to the interests of the peoples and of revolutions is, according to the revi-

sionists, an adventurist and a Trotskyite. The revisionists forget, however, that if these terms are to be applied they really apply to Khrushchev more than to anyone else, for it was he who not so long ago, in the Caribbean events, behaved both as an adventurist Trotskyite and as a capitulationist.

The renegade Tito, in his chain of slanders, especially against the Communist Party of China, labelled the resolute, principled struggle of the glorious Communist Party of China for preserving the purity of Marxism-Leninism and opposing the counter-revolutionary views and hostile assaults of the modern revisionists, as "a struggle for hegemony", in precisely the same way as Khrushchev tried to do. It is clear that both Tito and Khrushchev assess others by their own chauvinist standards. For everyone knows that pretending that they have a monopoly of the "creative development of Marxism" and that all others should pursue the line dictated by them, they have left no stone unturned to impose their views on others: from dealing blows plotted behind others' backs (by organizing counter-revolutionary rebellions, such as that in Hungary) and removing leading cadres of fraternal parties who oppose their revisionist line of action (by sending for this purpose special emissaries to persuade the leadership of these fraternal parties), to economic and military pressure and the use of cajolery and means of corruption.

Tito called the active support and the unreserved, internationalist aid which the Communist Party of China gives to the revolutionary struggles and the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America in order that they may free themselves from imperialist oppression and the

clutches of colonialism, as a tendency to set the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America against the peoples of Europe and of other advanced countries. It was precisely a thing of this kind that Khrushchev reiterated on May 24, 1963 when he accused the "dogmatists" of trying to split and isolate the revolutionary forces by grouping them according to continents, to the colors of the skin or other distinctive signs. This really means that when one catches a cold the other coughs! Through such slanders both Tito and Khrushchev try, in fact, to conceal their own hostile attitude towards the national-liberation movement of the peoples fighting against the imperialists; they try to weaken the struggle against imperialism by sowing seeds of distrust and discord among the oppressed peoples and the persistent fighters for their emancipation. As a matter of fact, if there is anything to be said about discrimination it is precisely the modern revisionists who split the communist and workers' parties and the socialist countries according to the criterion of advanced and backward countries and try to prove that those parties which carry on their work in under-developed countries are "dogmatic", "sectarian" and "adventurist" whereas those in the more advanced countries stand in the positions of "creative Marxism" (Tito's speech and V. Vllahovich's talk at the Plenum of the Central Committee of the League of Yugoslav Communists in May 1963, and Khrushchev's address to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR in December 1962).

The Titoites, in their attempts to discredit the Chinese Communist Party and the People's Republic of China, devoted a lot of time at their Plenum to the favorite theme of the imperialist and revisionist anti-Chinese

propaganda, namely, the Sino-Indian border conflict. Of course, as had been expected, China was called the aggressor, and all kinds of slander were hurled at her. We will not stop here to disprove these false accusations, for every honest man in the world is fully aware of the fact that the tension and the aggression on Chinese territory in the Sino-Indian border incidents were provoked and begun by the Indian reactionaries. But the "theory" formulated by the Belgrade revisionists (which is certainly the "theory" of the Khrushchev group as well) on which they based their slanderous accusations against the Communist Party of China as regards the Sino-Indian border, is quite interesting. According to the revisionist theoreticians, the Chinese have not taken into account the teachings of Lenin on the border issue for they have been "guided by bourgeois views of sovereignty" and "not by the point of view of the rights of a sovereign socialist state". The modern revisionists view Lenin in a cynical way and distort him impudently. The gist of the Sino-Indian conflict lies in the fact that the Indian reactionary circles launched aggression against the People's Republic of China (they occupied about 90,000 sq. kilometres of Chinese territory) at the instigation and with the direct support of the American and other imperialists. Lenin has never said in any of his works that a socialist country has not the right to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity from capitalist and imperialist aggression; he has never said anywhere that the sovereignty and the borders of a socialist or of any other country are items for bargaining.

We need not dwell here at greater length to list the hostile and splittist assaults and slanders of Tito and his

accomplices against the fraternal parties which defend Marxism-Leninism with determination. And what we said above clearly proves: firstly, that the Tito-Khrushchev group act in unison against revolutionary Marxism-Leninism and in splitting and undermining the international communist movement and the socialist camp; secondly, that the acts of the united revisionist front are fully at one with the deeds, purposes and interests of the American and other imperialists.

Encouraged by the stand and unlimited support of Khrushchev and his group, by their manifestation of sympathy and solidarity with him, and having stressed that the target of their blows should be the "dogmatists", the Communist Party of China, the Party of Labour of Albania and the other revolutionary parties, Tito in his speech warned Khrushchev and his revisionist group against any concession in what they had decided, otherwise "it would be bad for the communist movement"! In an authoritative tone Tito said: "Every compromise and unprincipled agreement detrimental to any one and to the main principles on which the present struggle for socialism rests, would cause great damage to the workers' movement in general." And as if to remind Khrushchev of what he was alluding to, Tito stressed: "The decisions of the 81 parties about Yugoslavia at the 1960 Moscow Meeting do not comply with facts and have not been based on principle." This means no less and no more than: we revisionists must hang closely together and launch more determined, irreconcilable attacks against Marxism-Leninism, against the unity of the socialist camp, against the Chinese, Albanians and other "dogmatists". *Pravda*, the organ of the Central Committee of

the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, devoted one whole page to this provocative and hostile speech. It was also favorably commented upon. The fact that no voice was raised against this speech, or against any of its theses, by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union or by any other party that followed Khrushchev's line, shows that Khrushchev and all his revisionist followers admit once again that they are fully in accord with Tito's slanders against the Communist Party of China, the Party of Labour of Albania and other fraternal parties which abide by Marxism-Leninism, that they are in full agreement with Tito's call for splitting the socialist camp, with his call for undermining and dismembering the communist and workers' movement, with his demand for trampling underfoot the 1960 Moscow Declaration. We, on our part, are absolutely convinced that Khrushchev and his group are by no means at variance with Tito's ideas, views, plans and objectives. And not only this, but Khrushchev himself and his followers pursue the same plans and objectives in their activities.

The hard times which imperialism in general and American imperialism in particular are experiencing are not very pleasing to the foes of socialism, freedom and peace. This is best manifested by the development of events, by the growing contradictions within the ranks of the imperialists, by the growth of the revolutionary and liberation movement of the people, by the consolidation of the peace-loving forces in the world, and by the strengthening of the socialist countries. For the modern revisionists likewise, the times are not as pleasant as they used to be or as they may seem on the surface. Modern revisionism is continuously being gnawed by the resist-

ance of the Marxist-Leninist communists and of the parties and people in the socialist countries where revisionist elements hold sway, by the waverings of the people who are temporarily deceived and who are continually finding the right road and have enough courage in themselves to fight, as well as by the inevitable contradictions among the revisionists themselves. It was under such circumstances that Tito made another effort at the last Plenum, trying his utmost to unite and consolidate the wavering ranks of the modern revisionists — those special agents of imperialism — for more determined action against Marxism-Leninism, against the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement, against freedom and peace.

Thus the world is now face to face with the coordinated attempts and feverish preparations of all revisionist cliques to organize a new crusade against Marxism-Leninism, against the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement, and in favor of the most reactionary forces of the world led by American imperialism. The enemies of socialism and peace have of course pinned great hopes on this crusade. Our Party, like all Marxist-Leninist parties, is deeply convinced that the attempts of the revisionists to sow discord will meet with shameful failure as they have always done heretofore. And this is not a statement springing from subjective speculation but from objective reality. The imperialists and revisionists will never be able to stop the wheel of history from rolling ahead, to destroy the seed of socialism and communism sown by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, and to extinguish the flames of revolution. The resistance against these plans

by the communists and the people in the parties and countries where revisionists hold sway is taking more clear-cut and tangible form. The ranks of the “allies” of the imperialist and revisionist crusades are dwindling. Revolutionary Marxist-Leninist forces are rising everywhere in the world, from one party to another, from one country to another, from one continent to another, raising far and wide the Marxist-Leninist battle cry: proletarians of all countries, the oppressed peoples and nations, unite in the fight against imperialism and all its tools, and for peace, freedom, democracy, socialism! Marxism-Leninism and the sacred cause of the revolution will triumph; revisionism and all the foes of communism will perish!

**15 YEARS SINCE THE ISSUE
OF THE INFORMATION BUREAU
RESOLUTION "ON THE
SITUATION IN THE YUGOSLAV
COMMUNIST PARTY"**

Article published in the newspaper

Zëri i Popullit

June 29, 1963

Fifteen years have elapsed since the Resolution of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties "On the Situation in the Yugoslav Communist Party" was made public on June 29, 1948. This resolution was an historical document of special significance for the international communist and workers' movement. It disclosed a grave and threatening menace, the manifestation of modern revisionism, represented by the leaders of the Yugoslav Communist Party. Revisionism, which had existed also before in the communist movement as an opportunist trend, prevailed now for the first time over the leadership of a party which had taken the reins of state in its hands.

The representatives of the communist and workers' parties participating in the Information Bureau made a deep Marxist-Leninist analysis of the situation created in the Yugoslav Communist Party and detected the roots of the anti-Marxist and revisionist errors and deviations of the Yugoslav leaders. They proceeded in this matter from the urgency of safeguarding the purity of Marxism-Leninism and the destiny of socialism and the revolution in general as well as from the intention of helping the Yugoslav Communist Party and the Yugoslav people to overcome this grave danger manifested within their ranks.

The historic decision of the Information Bureau was a program of action and combat for all communist and workers' parties, a serious warning, a call to all the com-

munists of the world for revolutionary vigilance against the danger of the new-emergent revisionist trend, and to fight firmly against it until it is totally destroyed.

The Resolution served practically as a weapon for the Marxist-Leninists in their struggle to strengthen unity of views and activity in the ranks of the parties, to further improve the ideological, theoretical and political work of the parties, to safeguard the socialist achievements in countries where the working class had established its rule, to protect the socialist camp, to consolidate the revolutionary forces throughout the world, to intensify the struggle against imperialism, to prevent the imperialist agents from penetrating any further into the people's democracies.

The errors and deviations for which the Yugoslav leaders were reproached in the Resolution of the Information Bureau were grave indeed. As a whole they represented an entirely erroneous and opportunist line, a complete departure from Marxism-Leninism, a downright betrayal of the ideology of the proletariat and their cause.

In their internal policy the leaders of the Yugoslav Communist Party deviated from the Marxist theory of classes and class struggle, denied the dictatorship of the proletariat, preached the opportunist theory of peaceful infiltration of the capitalist elements into socialism. The Yugoslav leaders revised the Marxist-Leninist theory on the Party, lowering its role by fusing it with the non-party People's Front. They violated democracy within the Party, introduced into it Trotskyite military methods of leadership and displayed positive tendencies of liquidation, which constituted the danger of deteriorating the Party and the Yugoslav state.

The leaders of the Yugoslav Communist Party abandoned internationalism and embarked on the road of nationalism. "The Yugoslav leaders," the Resolution pointed out, "apparently do not understand or pretend they do not understand, that such a nationalist orientation may only lead to the degeneration of Yugoslavia into an ordinary bourgeois republic, to the loss of its independence, to the transformation of Yugoslavia into a colony of the imperialist countries."

The Document of the Information Bureau was unanimously approved and received full and unreserved support from all the communist and workers' parties of the world. They firmly condemned Yugoslav revisionism and exposed it in all aspects.

The Resolution of the Information Bureau was of a programmatic nature, for it clearly defined that under the new circumstances, after the victory over fascism and at a time when socialism had triumphed in a number of countries, the stand to take towards modern revisionism, was to re-emphasize the role of the Party of the working class in the state of the people's democracy, the role of the dictatorship of the proletariat in building up socialism, the policy of the Party in liquidating the exploiting classes during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism and the consolidation of the young state. It was to re-emphasize the necessity of strictly carrying out the principles of proletarian internationalism and of maintaining fraternal relations and mutual aid among socialist countries, drew our attention again to the danger of the possibility of the re-establishment of capitalism in countries where the revolution has gained the upper hand and pointed out that the only way to protect the achieve-

ments of the revolution and of socialism is the way of irreconcilable struggle against imperialism.

The 1948 Resolution of the Information Bureau and the historic letters of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union undersigned by Stalin and V. M. Molotov "On the Situation in the Yugoslav Communist Party" were of special significance to the whole communist movement of the world and to the socialist camp. For our Party and our country they spelled salvation. Tito's clique brutally interfered in the internal affairs of our Party and of our country and, proceeding from their covetousness to plunder and colonize, they attempted to turn Albania into a "7th Republic of Yugoslavia". In their relations with Albania and the Party of Labour of Albania, Tito's group displayed all the characteristics of modern revisionism: ideological and political deviation, lack of respect for equality, the chauvinism of the big state, arrogance, plots and so on. Therefore, their attitude towards our Party and our state constitutes the gravest indictment against the Yugoslav revisionists.

The leaders of the Yugoslav Communist Party rejected the just, principled criticism of the Information Bureau and the entire communist and workers' movement. What is worse, they kept moving further and further away from Marxism-Leninism, they continued betraying the interests of the working class and of all the workers of Yugoslavia, they strengthened their collaboration with the imperialists, becoming dangerous counter-revolutionaries.

Fifteen years of persistent counter-revolutionary activity of the Tito's clique has more than corroborated the correctness of the Resolution of the Information Bureau and of the other documents of the communist and work-

ers' movement on the situation in the Yugoslav Communist Party. Life has provided many facts to prove how far-sighted, correct and beneficial to the communist and workers' movement and to the socialist camp was Stalin's warning on the danger of the revisionist deviation of the Tito's clique. Stalin's great merit lies in the fact that he was the first to discover the anti-Marxist course in its incipience and the anti-Marxist treacherous role which the Belgrade renegade band would later be playing and which took new impetus when Khrushchev seized and monopolized the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The Tito clique was transformed into a band of counter-revolutionaries, into an agency of American imperialists, into an advanced detachment of saboteurs and plotters against the socialist countries and the international communist and workers' movement, into a band of nationalists and bourgeois chauvinists.

In internal affairs they pursued the policy of nullifying the achievements of the national-liberation war of the Yugoslav people, the policy of liquidating the true cadres of the party and of debasing the party into a tool in the hands of the Tito's clique to carry out their anti-Marxist course. Following the announcement of the Resolution of the Information Bureau, the Tito's clique launched a big campaign against the internationalist communists by making short work of them physically or attacking them ideologically. They set up for this purpose a large police force of terror whose methods were provocation, threat, terror, torture and murder. The jails and concentration camps at Goli Otok in Dalmatia, Stara Gradishka and other regions are the stain and stamp of Titoite shame and

crime which nothing can efface. Much as Khrushchev may try, he can never succeed in whitewashing Tito's mask, for the specter of the infamous UDB has held and continues to hold sway over Yugoslavia to this very day. Facts prove that over 200,000 communists, half of the total membership, were expelled from the Yugoslav Communist Party during the period from 1948 to 1952. In Montenegro alone they sent to jail nearly all the members of the government and of the Central Committee, and deported 800 Montenegrans to Goli Otok. Over 5,000 officers, among whom were a number of generals and colonels, mainly commanders or commissars of brigades, divisions, army corps, were cast into prison, while 12,000 officers were "discharged" from the army.

The documents of the Information Bureau of the communist and workers' parties bear clear evidence, based on many facts, which reveals not only the reign of terror in Yugoslavia but also the aims and plots of the Tito clique to overthrow the people's rule in the socialist countries, to detach these countries from the camp of socialism and democracy, to transform the countries of Central and Southeastern Europe into agents of the American imperialists. Experience corroborates the fact that the criticisms made of the Yugoslav revisionist leaders were not related to certain mistakes of an ordinary kind but to an open counter-revolutionary, anti-Soviet and anti-communist policy.

The view of the Party of Labour of Albania has been and continues to be that the conclusions arrived at by the Information Bureau and Stalin regarding the Yugoslav communists have been correct and remain so to this day.

They retain their great value as being completely principled and factual. New facts are daily cropping up to prove that in appraising the Yugoslav problem and the stand towards the Tito's clique, it was not the communist movement nor Stalin, but Khrushchev who erred so gravely by viewing this whole matter subjectively and contrary to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, contrary to objective reality, contrary to the common attitude of the international communist movement.

As a distinguished Marxist-Leninist and a firm defender of the Leninist teachings and norms of relations between fraternal parties, Stalin examined the situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia proceeding from the basic interests of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement, of the working class and people of Yugoslavia itself, viewed it from positions of Marxism-Leninism and assessed the situation on the basis of facts and reality. The meeting of the Information Bureau, in conformity with all Leninist rules and regulations, pursued a correct procedure in examining the issue and adopting its Resolution. This was also one of the major reasons why the communist and workers' parties approved the Resolution of the Information Bureau unanimously and carried it out with determination.

The Marxist-Leninists will guard with vigilance the Leninist spirit and the methods based on equal and comradely consultations which Stalin pursued in examining and solving problems arising in the international communist and workers' movement. The methods of arbitrariness, pressures, inequality, mutual disrespect—Trotskyite and putschist methods—to which the modern revisionists Tito and Khrushchev resort today, have been

and continue to be alien to Stalin, and to the communist parties.

The correctness of the conclusions of the Information Bureau is borne out clearly by the splitting undermining and plotting activities of the Tito clique. Their counter-revolutionary, anti-socialist acts in the service of American imperialism are numerous indeed. Their experience as agents of imperialism is of long standing. As early as 1951 the Tito's clique signed with the USA the military agreement on the so-called "mutual defence", which aimed at increasing tension through provocations especially in the Balkan region. Two years later the Belgrade clique together with two member states of the aggressive NATO bloc set up the Balkan Pact as an appendage to NATO in this region.

The peoples of the socialist countries, especially in the Balkans and in Europe, are well aware of the counter-revolutionary plots hatched by the Yugoslav revisionists through their agents in Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Albania and other countries. They are well aware of the counter-revolution which broke out in Hungary and imperilled its very existence as a people's democracy, a counter-revolution incited and organized by the Tito's clique and their agents in collaboration with the American imperialists. They are well aware of the plot which the Yugoslav revisionists hatched in April 1956 against the Party of Labour of Albania through their agents in collaboration with anti-Party and treacherous elements, a plot that was discovered and exposed at the Party Conference in Tirana. They are likewise aware of the 1960 plot contrived jointly by the Yugoslav revisionists, the Greek monarchic fascists, the American imperialists and

certain traitors like T. Sejko, P. Plaku, inveterate agents of Greek and Yugoslav espionage, aimed at overthrowing the people's regime in Albania. With regard to all the hostile activities against the People's Republic of Albania from abroad, the Yugoslav revisionists account for 58 per cent of all the armed saboteurs smuggled into our country, for 15 per cent of the border provocations since 1949, as well as for 37 per cent of the centers of espionage, for 35 per cent of the staff of these centers and for 21 per cent of the agents unearthed. It is only due to the firm Marxist-Leninist stand of the Party and the people, united by ties of steel, that the independence and sovereignty of the people and the Fatherland are saved when these are threatened by the imperialists and the modern revisionists. No hostile force whatever can withstand this mighty power of our Party and people.

The Yugoslav modern revisionists made use of all means possible to nullify the achievements of the people's revolution in Albania, to enslave the People's Republic of Albania. The whole world knows this. It is already known what shameful failure they met. But it is worth recalling them for one should bear in mind that the modern revisionists do not renounce their final objective of crushing the socialist order and of enslaving peoples, they do not give up their vicious methods of splitting, of blackmail, of political and economic pressures and even of military pressures. This is how the Yugoslav modern revisionists have behaved towards the People's Republic of Albania.

The Titoites smuggled their spies into the ranks of the Albanian Communist Party, penetrating even as far as its Political Bureau and its Central Committee. This was

the treacherous group of Koçi Xoxe. But the Party got rid of these traitors without hesitation and so consolidated the Party and its unity. The revisionists raised a hue and cry, hurled foul invectives at us and trumped up all sorts of pseudo-Marxist theories to discredit us; but our Party and our people knew what they were about, for they based their acts on facts, and right was on their side. This purge was just and necessary for the highest interest of our Fatherland.

The Yugoslav modern revisionists threatened us with starvation, with economic pressure and sabotage, as in the naphtha industry and so on, but they received hard blows in return. Our Party and our people could not be intimidated. They mustered all their efforts, and with these sturdy efforts we had overcome all obstacles. We had loyal friends to come to our assistance, we had the people of the Soviet Union, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union with Stalin at the head, the peoples of the people's democracies and their Marxist-Leninist parties; we had right on our side.

The Yugoslav revisionists tried to bring their troops, their divisions to Albania and, in this way, to lay hold of the strategic points of our country and to suppress the resistance of the people and the Party, to colonize our Fatherland through military pressure and such agents as Koçi Xoxe and his company. Let us not forget that they intended to carry out this military **coup**, this occupation under the guise of the military treaty of mutual assistance, under the guise of the so-called menace threatening Albania, under the guise of military measures, under the guise of "friendship". All of these were smoke-screens but our Party and people told the Yugoslav modern re-

visionists and their divisions to halt, otherwise there would be bloodshed. Stalin, glorious protector of Marxism-Leninism, of the freedom and sovereignty of peoples, came to our assistance and the subversive Yugoslav revisionists met with disgraceful failure.

The Yugoslav modern revisionists and their like thought they could easily curb the iron will of a party and of a people like the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian people. But they were crushed, they were vanquished, they met with failure. The Yugoslav modern revisionists will meet with the same failure if they try to encroach upon the liberty, independence and sovereignty of any other people's democracy with their intrigues or force of arms. Another such attempt will spell their doom, and put an end to their treacherous, putschist, enslaving deeds. The ground will burn under their feet and the fire they kindle will swallow them alive, they will burn up like mice. Let both friend and foe bear in mind the experience of a small country, of a small Marxist-Leninist party that knows no defeat. Our Party and our people have never been afraid of the enemy, no matter how numerous they are. Our Party and our people have always been on the alert and prepared to fight to the end against any who wanted to rob us of our achievements, of our freedom, of our independence, of our sovereignty. This is what our Party and our people have been and will continue to be: warm and always true to friends and ever ready to come to their assistance, but severe and irreconcilable to foes of every hue.

Serbian chauvinism and the policy of chauvinistic nationalism has assumed a new impetus in Yugoslavia. Civic inequality has become more outspoken and the

national minorities have been deprived of many more rights. The region where the consequences of this policy are particularly evident is Kosova. The Yugoslav revisionists have implemented the policy of denationalization and genocide towards the Albanian minorities. They have neglected this province and turned it into an undeveloped and totally backward region. A new manifestation of the policy of liquidating the alien nationalities, especially the Albanian minorities in Yugoslavia, is seen in the new constitution in which it is stated that "any citizen unwilling to emphasize his nationality may be considered as a Yugoslav citizen and, as such, a full member of the Yugoslav socialist society". Thus, the long and short of it is that one must change one's nationality in order to become "a full member of the Yugoslav socialist society". It is precisely this bourgeois nationalist chauvinist policy of the Tito clique that finds all-round support among the Khrushchev group. The propagandists of Khrushchev's course, in their attempt to carry out his opportunist line of supporting Tito in every way, go so far as to encourage the Titoites to liquidate the alien nationalities in Yugoslavia. The Soviet publication *Mezhdunarodnaya Zhizn*, quoting recently the above paragraph of the new Yugoslav constitution, stresses: "the new constitution of the Federative Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia will help consolidate the fraternal unity of the Yugoslav peoples in promoting a mutual approach to national culture".

While all the communist parties unanimously and resolutely opposed the anti-socialist views and acts of the Tito clique, within the communist movement the Khrushchev group and its followers, appeared as a group of

admirers and ardent supporters of Yugoslav revisionism. Having assumed the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union through intrigues, counter-revolutionary strokes and plots, Khrushchev proceeded on the road of discrediting Marxism-Leninism. In order to attain this objective of betrayal, he had to assail Stalin, follower and great defender of Lenin. Renegade Tito was, according to Khrushchev, his closest and most faithful ally in this infamous undertaking, for Tito had for years given ample proof in this matter. This was the beginning of the line of approach and collaboration between Khrushchev and the Yugoslav revisionists.

To realize this approach and collaboration Khrushchev had to remove firstly the obstacles which severed the communist movement, Marxism-Leninism from the Yugoslav revisionists. Such obstacles were the Resolution of the Information Bureau, the joint documents of the communist and workers' parties, the relentless struggle which the communist parties waged in exposing the Yugoslav revisionists and the total elimination of them ideologically and politically, and the correct line and firm stand pursued by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union under Stalin. Moreover, he needed time to look for allies, or better still, blind followers who would trot along behind him on this road. It was no easy job for Khrushchev to get closer with, to reconcile and rehabilitate the Tito's clique. The fact that the Tito's clique had totally committed themselves as servants of the imperialist bourgeoisie made it even harder.

Persisting in his line and violating the Leninist norms governing relations among parties, Khrushchev went to Belgrade in 1955 to hand to imperialist agent Tito a cer-

tificate of good conduct, rehabilitating him without complying with the usual procedure of consulting the other fraternal parties, though with the approval, which he had obtained, through intrigue and cajolery, of the parties composing the Information Bureau. He begged the revisionists' pardon. He launched the slogan about the "superstructure" that had weighed so heavily on the "Yugoslav comrades", accusing Stalin of deteriorating relations with Yugoslavia, because of the alleged "totally erroneous assessment which he had made of the Yugoslav comrades".

This kowtow to the Yugoslav revisionists by the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union made them ruffle up their feathers like cocks and proclaim far and wide that their cause was a just one and that it had triumphed, that it was not the Yugoslav leadership that had erred, but the communist and workers' movement which made them increase their activity, causing a split in the socialist camp, in the communist movement, in the movement for national liberation and among various peace-loving forces. This was Khrushchev's first official act of betrayal.

By opposing the joint decision of the communist and workers' movement approving the Resolution of the Information Bureau, by opposing the line jointly formulated by these parties to combat Yugoslav revisionism, by getting closer to the Tito clique, Khrushchev gave rise to grave differences on principle between his group and the workers' movement. By so doing, he struck a heavy blow at the unity of views and acts within the communist movement.

The Party of Labour of Albania, well acquainted with the features and bearing the brunt of the hostile activity of this clique, was convinced of the justice of combating Yugoslav revisionism and was, therefore, opposed in principle to Khrushchev's plan of going to Belgrade to rehabilitate the Tito clique. Changing the attitude towards the Yugoslav revisionists and modifying the Resolution of the Information Bureau were not matters for Khrushchev alone to decide. They were matters pertaining to the entire communist movement and any decision about them should have been taken after due consultations among partners, according to Leninist principles. Therefore the Central Committee of our Party wrote to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in May 1955 expressing our Party's opposition to Khrushchev's going to Belgrade to rehabilitate the Tito clique. Time has further corroborated how correct and timely was the warning of our Party that the rapprochement with the Yugoslav renegade band would bring a great danger to the communist movement and to socialism. As a matter of fact, Khrushchev's ideological and political approach to Tito, the latter's rehabilitation and the coordination of their activity constituted the prelude to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party, where the theses of modern revisionism were promulgated to the communist movement. It is significant that only a few months later Tito was warmly received by Khrushchev in Moscow as a distinguished Leninist. And the counter-revolutionary **coup** took place in Hungary with the direct participation of the Yugoslav revisionists only a few months after that.

Following the November 1956 counter-revolution, Tito, in his speech at Pula, issued an open call for subversive activity. "Yugoslavia," he said, "should not keep itself in its own shell. It should set to work in all directions in the field of ideology so that the new trend may triumph." He was not satisfied with the first steps taken by Khrushchev in fighting for "de-Stalinization", or with his opportunist theses preached at the 20th Congress, and called upon him and all revisionists to carry the war against the so-called cult of the individual and its consequences to the end. "We have said," the renegade emphasized, "that it is not only a matter of the cult of the individual but of a whole system which made the pursuance of the cult of the individual possible; there lie the roots of the matter, this is the hardest thing to combat. These roots lie in the bureaucratic apparatus, in the methods followed and attitudes maintained, in ignoring the role and the wishes of the working masses, in Enver Hoxhas and Shehus and various other leaders of certain parties in the West and in the East who oppose democratization and the decisions of the 20th Congress."

No sooner had the Tito clique uttered these words than they acted on them. In 1958 they published their program which was approved by the 7th Congress of the League of Yugoslav Communists. This program was an out-and-out anti-Marxist and anti-socialist one, it was the ideological platform and code of international revisionism, zealously comprising every notorious theory of the various anti-Marxist trends of all time. It was a serious ideological deviation, a general assault against the basis of the revolutionary theory and practice of scientific socialism, an attack on the joint document of the inter-

national communist movement, the 1957 Moscow Declaration.

The communist and workers' parties unanimously condemned the program of the League of Yugoslav Communists as entirely revisionist. They criticized the anti-Marxist line of the Yugoslav revisionists as regards the nature and assessment of the actual international situation, as regards the two world systems and camps, as regards the interpretation of the experience of the Soviet Union and other countries in building socialism, as regards the role of the communist parties and socialist state in building the new society, as regards the application of Marxist-Leninist theory and the conflict with bourgeois ideology, as regards the principles of proletarian internationalism, as regards the mutual relations among socialist countries and fraternal communist parties and as regards a whole range of important issues concerning the theory of Marxism and its practice in the world communist movement.

Consistent in its line of principled combat against revisionism, and considering that every leniency in exposing revisionism is to the advantage of imperialism, to the advantage of the class enemy on a national and international scale, the communist and workers' movement unanimously and firmly condemned the Tito clique for the third time as traitors to Marxism-Leninism, as wreckers and splitters of the socialist camp, the communist movement and all peace-loving forces and states of the world, condemned it as servants of American imperialism through the 1960 Moscow Declaration signed by the representatives of 81 communist and workers' parties. "Further exposure of the leaders of the Yugoslav revi-

sionists and active efforts to guard the communist as well as the workers' movement against the anti-Leninist ideas of the Yugoslav revisionists," the 1960 Moscow Declaration insisted, "continues to be an essential duty of the Marxist-Leninist parties."

But how do matters stand now, in June 1963, fifteen years after the Resolution of the Information Bureau, as regards the struggle against Yugoslav revisionism to safeguard the purity of Marxism-Leninism and to safeguard the unity of the socialist camp and of the communist movement, and as regards the ideological and political smashing of this agency of imperialism?

While the Marxist-Leninist parties, strictly abiding by the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations, have been waging a determined, principled struggle against modern revisionism, especially against the dangerous views and treacherous acts of the Tito clique, the Khrushchev group, in flagrant convention of the common line of the entire international communist movement, has not only failed to oppose the Tito clique, but on the contrary, has taken definite steps towards getting closer to and making common cause with this clique of renegades.

A few of the many well-known facts will suffice to prove this:

A month had hardly elapsed since the publication of the 1960 Moscow Declaration when Foreign Minister A. Gromyko, member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, speaking on the relations with Yugoslavia to the Supreme Soviet on December 23, 1960, stated: "It should be pointed out with satisfaction that on basic international issues our positions are identical."

On September 10, 1961, scarcely a year after the Moscow meeting, Khrushchev himself told a correspondent of the American newspaper *New York Times* that "we, of course, consider Yugoslavia a socialist country".

On October 3, 1961, L. Brezhnev told the Yugoslav Ambassador "we have all the conditions for further and all-round co-operation". And these statements were followed by a great wave of exchanges of declarations, of signing of agreements of all kinds under the slogan of peaceful coexistence. All the problems lying in the way of extending all-round economic and political relations were resolved with marvellous speed and alacrity and the ground was systematically prepared for ideological approach and collaboration between them.

The 22nd Congress from whose rostrum Khrushchev sparkled the differences within the ranks of the communist and workers' movement through his open attacks on the Party of Labour of Albania, served as a means of approach to "the Yugoslav comrades" and of establishing ideological relations and collaboration with them.

The Party of Labour of Albania, on its part, rightly protested against Khrushchev's opportunist conceptions. Our Party emphasized that Khrushchev intended to bring about the rehabilitation of the Tito clique under the slogan of coexistence in state relations with Yugoslavia. The Party of Labour of Albania was subject to reproaches and slanders of the revisionists, who accused it as an opponent of the policy of coexistence, as a warmonger, as a disturber of peace in the Balkans. What did time prove? It proved that revisionists Tito and Khrushchev were guilty of slander; it proved that the Party of Labour of Albania was altogether right.

In his attempts to rehabilitate the treacherous Tito clique, Khrushchev met of course with the determined opposition of the Marxist-Leninists. That is why he has had to manoeuvre and say, now and then, something or other against the views and undermining acts of the Yugoslav revisionists. But his basic line, for all its zigzags, has always been one of rapprochement and reconciliation with the Tito clique. Even when he gives the impression that he is criticizing severely the Yugoslav revisionists, he leaves a leeway for approach and collaboration with them, for keeping alive the "spark of hope" for their rehabilitation. His statements to this effect are widely known. At a rally in Moscow on June 19, 1956, he greeted the Tito clique as a "militant party of the Yugoslav working class, tested leader of the Yugoslav peoples", and on July 13, 1957 in Prague, he stressed the need of "exchanging the experience of socialist construction" with the Yugoslav comrades. At the Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party on June 3, 1958 Khrushchev stated that "the Yugoslav leaders caused great damage to the cause of socialism through their public utterances and their acts at the time of the Hungarian events", that "the Yugoslav Embassy in Budapest became a real center for those who started the struggle against the system of people's democracy in Hungary", that "in his speech at Pula Comrade Tito vindicated the rebels in Hungary and called the fraternal aid of the Soviet Union for the Hungarian people 'Soviet intervention'" and so on and so forth. He did not even spare figurative expressions, calling Yugoslav revisionism a "Trojan horse" in order to keep in line with the unanimous and determined opposition of the communist movement to the

Tito clique at that time. At the Congress of the United German Socialist Party on July 11, 1958, Khrushchev stated: "Even in the situation created in our relations with the League of Yugoslav Communists it would be beneficial to preserve a spark of hope, to look for acceptable forms in certain matters."

Six months later, the tone became "harsher" again. At the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in August 1959, Khrushchev said: "The Yugoslav leaders pretend that they stand outside blocs and above camps, while in reality they participate in the Balkan bloc which unites Yugoslavia, Turkey and Greece. The latter two countries, as everybody knows, are members of the NATO aggressive bloc, and Turkey takes part in the Bagdad Pact besides. And precisely for this reason the positions of 'outside blocs' and of 'neutrality', which the leaders of the League of Yugoslav Communists recommend with such zeal, smack of the American monopolies which nourish Yugoslav 'socialism'. In the history of the class struggle there is not yet a case of the bourgeoisie giving moral and material help to its class enemy to build socialism."

But time has proved that all these "harsh reproaches" directed against the "Yugoslav comrades" by Khrushchev were nothing but sheer bluff, a demagogic manoeuvre to throw dust in the eyes of the communist movement. Although Tito's open acts and Khrushchev's "criticism" seem contradictory, they are in fact far from being so. Both parties pursue the same objective, but each is obliged by the circumstances to resort to different methods. Tito thinks it is high time for them to speed up the process of all-round reconciliation and collabora-

tion aimed at setting up a united front against Marxism-Leninism. While Khrushchev, who has not yet secured the necessary supporters, followers and "allies", tries to camouflage Tito's acts by advising him to be moderate. The aim of his "criticisms", therefore, is to lengthen the period of Tito's masking as much as possible. The result: Tito does not give up his line, his objective. The one who adjusts himself to his collaborator is Khrushchev.

We need not here go into greater detail on Khrushchev's zigzags and acrobaticism. The final result is the full rapprochement and collaboration of Khrushchev's group with the Tito clique of renegades, which was culminated at the Supreme Soviet of the USSR in December 1962, where the Khrushchev-Tito united revisionist front was set up to attack revolutionary Marxism-Leninism and the fraternal parties which resolutely uphold it. This was a brutal violation of the 1960 Moscow Declaration. What is even more, Khrushchev launches wild attacks on all those parties which, in upholding and abiding by the Declaration, continue their principled struggle against Yugoslav revisionism.

Khrushchev has turned on all his loudspeakers with a view to persuading the world that the Yugoslav renegades have become Marxist-Leninists and that Yugoslavia is building socialism. On the other hand he hurls bitter attacks on the Party of Labour of Albania, and the People's Republic of Albania, on their correct line, ignoring the work of our people in building socialism. In dealing with our country Khrushchev has trampled under foot and violated, in a most flagrant way, not only the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, but also those of peaceful coexistence, which

he advertizes so loudly. It was precisely Khrushchev who extended the ideological differences with the Party of Labour of Albania into the field of state relations, who exerted all-round pressure on our Party and our people, who set up a true economic blockade against Albania, who even severed diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of Albania, who brutally intervened in the internal affairs of our country, going so far as to make an open counter-revolutionary call for the overthrow of the leadership of the Party and of the state in Albania.

In his address to the Supreme Soviet Khrushchev clearly defined his stand towards the Tito clique. He stated that his stand towards the League of Yugoslav Communists "is in full accord with the lines of the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union", that he is prepared "to do his utmost to overcome the differences that have still remained" which seem to spring from "the concrete historical and geographical conditions", that "it would be unfair to draw up a stereotyped pattern (referring to the Moscow Declarations) which all should abide by", that those who oppose Yugoslav revisionism "borrow the jungle laws of the capitalist world and introduce them into the relations among socialist countries, as the Albanian dissenters do, who are ready to tear the Yugoslav communists to pieces for their mistakes", that it behooves the communist movement to help the Tito clique "to occupy the place they deserve in the family of all the fraternal parties", that "consolidation and development of economic connections, of state and social relations between our countries create the basis for the approach of our attitudes in ideological matters as well", that "the Yugoslav comrades are

strengthening the achievements of socialism and, proceeding from objective laws, from the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, it is impossible to deny that Yugoslavia is a socialist state", and so on and so forth.

According to Khrushchev's logic it turns out that the 81 communist and workers' parties, who unanimously condemned the Yugoslav revisionists, did not proceed from an analysis of the real situation in Yugoslavia, from objective laws, from the teachings of Marxism-Leninism in formulating their judgment, but that they borrowed the jungle laws of the capitalist world and introduced them into the relations among socialist states. It turns out, therefore, that today there is one and only one supreme judge of Marxism-Leninism: Khrushchev.

But how do matters really stand? What are the arguments Khrushchev uses to repudiate the Moscow Declarations, to call them "bad specimens", and to declare that the Tito clique is no longer committing acts of betrayal, splitting and undermining acts, and that they are building socialism? Why have these arguments been trumped up, and what does the actual Yugoslav situation show?

In order to reject the conclusions of the 1960 Moscow Declaration, Khrushchev props up his thesis with the argument that the Yugoslav leaders have made "changes" both in internal and in external affairs. This argument does not hold water. The Yugoslav revisionist leaders — Tito, Kardelj and others — have themselves rejected them; they have more than once stated that they have made no change nor do they intend to make any changes in the days to come. The Yugoslav revisionists have even forewarned those who are looking forward to such changes not to cherish illusions and vain hopes. Of signif-

icance in this connection is a radio broadcast from Belgrade on December 26, 1962, which, in reply to its listeners on "the open and bitter criticism of the many manifestations in the economic, political and social life of the country", posed the question: "Does this imply something new as regards the views of the program of the League of Yugoslav Communists and the heretofore practice of the League?" And the answer: "The decisions of the fourth plenum and all the activity following it contain nothing new as regards the views of the program of the League of Yugoslav Communists and the steps regarding the policy so far. On the contrary, they aim at putting into effect the ideas set forth in the program in a consistent and all-round way. Nor is there anything new with regard to the views envisaged in the program on the co-operation of the League of Yugoslav Communists with the other communist and workers' parties."

Is not the stand of the American imperialists themselves, their assessment of the activities of the modern revisionists, a strong and persuasive argument to prove whose interest the political course of the Tito clique serves? The billions of American dollars are not lavished in vain on "Yugoslav socialism". It was not without purpose that Dean Rusk rose against certain rumors heard in the American Congress demanding a re-examination of the aid to Yugoslavia, and warned: "If a change was made to the wise policy of the USA towards Yugoslavia, a thing of this nature would be a very serious drawback for the West." For, as Dean Rusk said on another occasion, "Yugoslavia has been and continues to be a source of discord within the ranks of international communism." This subversive role of the Tito

clique is clearly expressed by J. Kennan, United States Ambassador to Yugoslavia, who, according to the newspaper *Long Island Press*, stated before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that "Tito is putting all his efforts to overthrow Enver Hoxha's regime in Albania through secret operations within the Communist Party. If these subversive operations fail, he will resort to military operations".

The fifteen years since the announcement of the Resolution of the Information Bureau have fully corroborated the correctness of its warnings on the deviation and departure of the Tito clique from socialism, on the re-establishment of capitalism in Yugoslavia, and on the betrayal of the Titoites and their utter degeneration into agents of imperialism. The 15-year period has proved that the Yugoslav revisionists have departed totally from the Marxist-Leninist theory in basic matters of the theory and practice of "building socialism" in Yugoslavia, in matters of the ways to develop socialism in the world today, in the so-called "outside blocs" position of Yugoslavia, in matters of the way to preserve peace and practise peaceful coexistence, in further revising the Leninist theory on the Party and the state, and in other matters of Marxist-Leninist ideology and so on.

Therefore, if we are to speak of changes, we must say that the change that has been made is not in the attitude of Tito towards Khrushchev, but in the attitude of Khrushchev towards Tito.

To us it has been made clear that the noise Khrushchev makes about "changes" and "turn-about" in Yugoslavia, is only a tactical measure to justify his complete agreement with the Tito clique and the admission of Yugo-

slavia into the socialist camp. Experience has confirmed our Party's statements, which have long since laid bare the possibility of such a manoeuvre on Khrushchev's part. As early as May 17, 1962 an article entitled "The Failure of Yugoslav Special Socialism and the Latest Manoeuvres of the Belgrade Revisionists" appeared in *Zëri i Popullit*, pointing out that the public denunciation by the Yugoslav leaders of the hard times which Yugoslavia was experiencing at this time, is made, among others, for the purpose of creating the illusion that some progress is being made towards socialism in Yugoslavia, that some positive modifications are being made in its economic policy, that some signs are appearing that "Yugoslavia is treading on the right road". The aim of Tito and his imperialist patrons in this new manoeuvre is dangerous and far-reaching. The objective is to make the Trojan horse force its way into the castle, into the socialist camp, and there are now people who are eager to batter down the walls and to usher it in with due formality, even reserving a place of honor for it. For some time now it has been trumpeted abroad that the Tito clique is showing "some positive signs as far as foreign politics is concerned". Thus, under the pretext that the Yugoslav leaders are effecting some sort of a turn and by making certain "objective, comradely" observations on what the Belgrade traitors themselves have denounced, one can now stretch one's hand to the Tito clique. It must be said that this whole affair costs neither Tito nor the imperialists anything, but helps the Yugoslav revisionists find new ways of splitting and undermining the socialist camp and the international communist movement from within.

Time will again show how hard it will be to build socialism in those socialist countries which have begun to open the door to the Tito deviationist clique, which have tightened their relations with them, which have taken up the study of the Yugoslav experience and are trying to profit by it. The first signs of this are already apparent

Let us consider the attitude of the Yugoslav revisionists towards international matters. The Tito clique have effected no change in their foreign policy, which has served and continues to serve the interests of the imperialists. Examples are numerous: What, for instance, is the stand of the Yugoslav revisionists towards the Caribbean crisis? Referring to the causes of the Cuban crisis, the newspaper *Borba* dated October 1, 1962, instead of denouncing the American imperialists as aggressors and warmongers, wrote: "If we look for the cause of the Cuban crisis we will find that it lies in the unfortunate creation of blocs and in that state of mind which raises the policy of force and of nuclear power to the height of a principle." This places the countries of the socialist camp and the imperialist countries on a par. The Yugoslav revisionists called the firm stand of the revolutionary government of Cuba against imperialist aggression a "biased foreign policy", "an aggravation of relations with the USA", "lack of tact", and "Cuba becoming a front in the cold war". They denounced Cuba because "it dealt blow for blow" and they reproached the Cuban Government as "being a stumbling-block in reaching the Kennedy-Khrushchev agreement", they denounced Cuba's refusal of "international spec-

tion", considered Cuba's just 5-point demands as a hindrance to the solution of the Cuban crisis, and so on.

The attitude of the Tito clique towards the Sino-Indian border conflict is even more hostile and more openly pro-imperialist. In this matter, the Yugoslav revisionists, together with all the reactionary bourgeois propaganda, condemn the People's Republic of China as aggressor, as having caused the Sino-Indian conflict, as "pursuing a policy of creating tension", and as trying to settle the border issue with India by resorting to the use of force", and so on. Even as the question of the well-known proposals and initiatives of the People's Republic of China to settle the conflict peacefully, proposals which have met with full approval by all the peace-loving forces of the world, the Yugoslav revisionists, lining up with the Indian reactionaries and the most warmongering circles of imperialism, hastened to declare that "Peking's conditions are utterly unacceptable to India", that "the initiative taken by China contain in them elements which are hard for the other party to accept". It is clear that the attitude of the Tito clique in the Sino-Indian border conflict does not at all aim at preserving Sino-Indian friendship and settling this conflict in a peaceful manner. On the contrary, this attitude serves the anti-Chinese plot of international imperialism and revisionism.

Under the guise of the so-called policy of non-alignment, the Yugoslav revisionist leaders carry out their counter-revolutionary task of undermining the people's national-liberation struggles. Facts show that whenever questions arise for parties and states to take a stand and clarify their positions in various conflicts, in struggles between the imperialists and the oppressed peoples and

nations, between the bourgeoisie and the working class, the Yugoslav revisionists have always backed the imperialists and the bourgeoisie and opposed the peoples and the working class.

It is a well-known fact that Tito considered the aggressive intervention of the American neo-colonialists in the Congo as a "factor that helped stabilize the situation, a very important and valuable factor". The Yugoslav revisionists called Kennedy's "Alliance for Progress", which is a plan to colonize Latin America, "readiness to adjust and correct errors"; they called the brutal intervention of the USA in the internal affairs of Laos "true concern for peace and the security of Laos"; they called the rightful struggle of the Indonesian people to free West Irian unjustifiable and preached its settlement by "peaceful means", whereas the liberation of Goa by the Indian reactionary bourgeoisie was considered a just one, only because their ally Nehru had demanded it. This is the policy and principle of the modern revisionists.

In order to justify his reconciliation with the Tito clique, Khrushchev makes a lot of noise about Yugoslavia building socialism. He delights in posing as a self-appointed judge determining which country is and which country is not socialist. Who entitles him to force his views on others? It is well known that at the 1960 Moscow meeting the Soviet leaders, with Khrushchev at their head, not only signed the Declaration wherein it is stressed that the Yugoslav revisionists "detached their country from the socialist camp, placed it under the tutelage of the so-called 'aid' of the American and other imperialists", but also stated in public through their mouthpiece, M. Suslov, that they would no longer call

Yugoslavia a socialist country. Why then do they deny today what they said yesterday? Can the Yugoslav reality have changed in these last two or three years? In fact nothing has changed in Yugoslavia; there is nothing new.

In Yugoslavia there is an ever growing manifestation of the characteristics of capitalist economy — typically local and chaotic trends, rivalry between republics, provinces and economic organizations, broad operations in market relations, free play of prices, violation of the principle of distribution according to work, disproportion in development of the branches of economy, low standards of specialization and cooperation of production, unemployment and exploitation of man by man, and so on.

The features of capitalist economy are even more evident in the Yugoslav countryside. What is most striking in the present Yugoslav village is the process of differentiation and polarization. The wealthy economic units become richer, while the poorer units deteriorate and are being eliminated. The larger rural estates, which make up less than 14 per cent of the total number of the rural estates of Yugoslavia, own nearly 40 per cent of all private land. By taking advantage of such conditions as the free purchase, sale and rent of land, the exploitation of laborers through the wages system, speculation in farm products, and also by taking advantage of state credits, the kulaks keep strengthening their economic positions. At the same time, tens of thousands of poor peasants, having been totally ruined, are compelled to abandon their land and go to the cities in search of jobs. The growing dependence of the Yugoslav economy on

American dollars shows along what lines the Tito clique has pushed Yugoslavia.

But whatever manoeuvres the Khrushchev group may resort to in assessing the Yugoslav reality, his statements cannot change it. The revisionist course taken by the Tito clique is inevitably bringing about the re-establishment of capitalism in Yugoslavia. The American imperialists have started to speak openly about this trend. They are witnessing that American dollars were not sunk in enterprises that yield no profits. "During recent years," the UPI news agency announced, "changes have been effected in Yugoslavia which have pleased the West. Collectivization has been practically eliminated. Its economy has been adjusted more and more to trade with the West." The *Wall Street Journal* and other American journals said that Yugoslavia is becoming a capitalist country without capitalists and the West is drawing it ever nearer to the Western economic and political world. This is the direction along which the changes in present Yugoslavia are actually proceeding.

Khrushchev himself declared at the 7th Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party that the American dollars which the Yugoslav clique had received were not given to it to develop socialism. "It is a well-known fact," he said, "that no one will believe that there are two kinds of socialism in the world: a socialism which the world reactionaries resent in a frenzied manner and another socialism acceptable to the imperialists, to which they give support and assistance. Everybody knows that the imperialists never give anybody money for nothing, for 'his good looks'; they invest their capital only in those enterprises from which they expect to get good profits."

Just as before the Tito clique still receives today large sums in the form of credits, loans and alms from the American and other imperialists. On November 28 last year, the Yugoslav Government and the USA Government signed an agreement on the basis of which the USA would supply the Tito clique with agricultural surplus products to the total amount of 103.3 million dollars. The Yugoslav press reported that in 1962 the USA gave the Tito clique a new credit of 46.6 million dollars and 31.6 million dollars more through international organizations supervised by the USA. Britain extended a credit of 28 million pounds sterling.

But, according to Khrushchev's logic, receiving dollars from the imperialists is of no significance at all, nor is it detrimental to socialist construction in Yugoslavia. This poses a question: are we to assume that imperialism is no longer imperialism, that it is now willing to help sincerely and with the best intentions the development of socialism in various countries, that American dollars can be put to good use for socialism, that the dollars are now given without the intention of securing profits and that the imperialists now demand no interest for their dollars?

The letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China dated March 30, 1963 says: "As far as Yugoslavia is concerned the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union think it is a socialist country, and in their relations with them they are striving to draw the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia closer to the socialist commonwealth, a thing which is in line with the stand of the fraternal Parties to unite all the anti-imperialist forces

in the world." What is this line of the fraternal Parties? Which are these fraternal Parties? When have they formulated the line that coincides with the anti-Leninist program of the League of Yugoslav Communists? It is publicly known that there is only one general line of the fraternal Parties, clearly formulated in the 1960 Moscow Declaration on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. The line of which Khrushchev speaks is only the line of his revisionist group, a counter-revolutionary line which aims at liquidating the general revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism and of the communist and workers' movement.

The wily tactics of implicating others and making them accomplices in crime, are today widely used with subtlety and secrecy in all forms by Khrushchev towards the leaders of those parties, in socialist as well as capitalist countries, who, under given circumstances and for various reasons, have come to uphold him, to support him in his line of revising Marxism-Leninism and of splitting the socialist camp and the communist movement. These tactics, beneficial to Khrushchev's intentions, are very dangerous and of grave consequences to those leaders who blindly follow in his tracks; they are very dangerous to the cause for which their Parties have fought and continue to fight, and to the masses of revolutionary communists. To keep silence about what Khrushchev speaks and acts, not only in his own name but in behalf of your Party, against Marxism-Leninism, against the unity of the socialist countries, when he assails the fraternal Parties for the only fault that they abide resolutely by the Leninist principles, that they firmly uphold the Moscow Declarations, that they wage a persistent and unwavering struggle against the com-

mon enemy of the proletariat, of socialism and of peace, namely, the imperialists with the American imperialists at the head, and against their agents, the Tito clique — this would mean to become an accomplice in Khrushchev's plots and to assume a heavy responsibility before the Party, the people, and in history. It would mean spurring Khrushchev on, encouraging him to make further and speedier progress in realizing his anti-socialist intentions, which is to the advantage of the enemy.

It is high time to put an end to silent submission and to the giving of approval to the dictates of others. It is a disgrace for one to be afraid of giving free expression to one's thoughts, but instead to echo the frenzied attacks of others against fraternal Parties in order to please Khrushchev when you see that those Parties you are attacking, against whom you are hurling mud, have said nothing against your Party, but have shown comradely respect for your Party, respect of a communist, and loyalty to Marxism-Leninism.

The Party of Labour of Albania is of the opinion that to make common cause with the Yugoslav revisionists, with those dangerous agents of imperialism, especially today when a bitter struggle is raging in the world between socialism and capitalism, between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, between the imperialists and the oppressed peoples and nations, would mean accepting their program as a just and Marxist-Leninist one and consequently rejecting as out of date the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the joint and unanimous decisions of the communist and workers' parties condemning Yugoslav revisionism. This would mean revising the

whole strategy and tactics of the communist and workers' movement, replacing its revolutionary Marxist-Leninist line with the strategy and tactics of the renegade Tito group, with their opportunist anti-Marxist line of submission to imperialism, as the Khrushchev treacherous group are doing on a large scale. This would mean renouncing the true unity of the socialist camp and of the communist movement based on Marxism-Leninism and on the Moscow Declarations and adopting a false unity based on the anti-Marxist political and ideological platform of the program of the League of the Yugoslav Communists. It would mean wiping out the distinction between friend and foe, between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism, between the defenders of unity and the splitters, between the anti-imperialist fighters and the imperialists' agents — as the Khrushchev treacherous group are doing on a large scale.

The question now is: either to agree with the Moscow Declarations in exposing the views and acts of the Yugoslav revisionists, of the revisionists of every hue and defending the Marxist-Leninist unity of the movement; or to agree with Yugoslav revisionism in opposing the Moscow Declarations and Marxism-Leninism and splitting the communist and workers' movement.

As concerns the position of the Party of Labour of Albania towards the Yugoslav revisionists, it has always been a principled position, precise, firm and inalterable during these 18 years. This was proclaimed once more by the leader of our Party at the 4th Congress of the Party in February 1961 when he said: "Our Party stands firmly on the position of the 1960 Declaration of the 81 communist and workers' parties, because the further ex-

posure of the leaders of the Yugoslav revisionists and the active struggle to guard the international communist movement against the anti-Leninist ideas of the Yugoslav revisionists, continue to be an essential duty of all the Marxist-Leninist parties. It holds the view that a determined and irreconcilable struggle should be waged against revisionism until its complete and final elimination. Every laxity of revolutionary vigilance against it, every weakening of the principled struggle against it, every wavering in this struggle under whatever pretext, leads inevitably to invigoration and activation of revisionist trends, which will seriously prejudice our great cause. Without mercilessly denouncing revisionism and the Belgrade revisionist clique in the first place, it is impossible to denounce imperialism as it should be denounced. Without drawing a clear line between the revisionist views and Marxism-Leninism it is impossible to fight dogmatism and sectarianism with success and from correct positions. The fight for the complete ideological and political elimination of this band of renegades is an internationalist aid to the Yugoslav people themselves."

The attitude of our Party towards Yugoslav revisionism has never been a haphazard policy dictated by narrow interests. Our Party has always considered the struggle against revisionism as an internationalist duty and, as such, has carried it out regardless of difficulties, regardless of any sacrifice. Our Party withstood with pluck and prudence the hard trials of recent years, when Khrushchev launched frenzied attacks against the Leninist stand of our Party which was fighting against revisionism, with a view to curbing the spirit of the

Party of Labour of Albania, and alienating it from the correct Marxist-Leninist road. It did not slacken, it did not withdraw from its Marxist-Leninist principled stand. The justice of the cause for which it fights strengthens its trust and unflinching confidence that in the fight against modern revisionism the victory will be on the side of Marxism-Leninism.

In the light of the events that have taken place during these fifteen years following the announcement of the Resolution of the Information Bureau on the situation in the Yugoslav Communist Party, all the communists and revolutionaries of the world feel proud of the victories in the great and consistent struggle of principle against modern revisionism in general and against Yugoslav revisionism in particular.

Constant adherence to the teachings of the Resolution of the Information Bureau and of the historic letters of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the situation in the Yugoslav Communist Party and of the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations will insure the communists and the revolutionaries of the whole world holding aloft and unstained the revolutionary banner of Marxism-Leninism, the banner of proletarian internationalism, will insure their fighting with tenacious courage and unshakable confidence so that Marxism-Leninism in any situation, however complicated, in any storm and hurricane, will triumph over modern revisionism, over this principal menace threatening the international communist movement, over this dangerous agency of imperialism.

152

