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THE OPENING ADDRESS BY PROF. Ndreçi Plasari, VICE-DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE OF MARXIST-LENINIST STUDIES AT THE CC OF THE PLA

It is now twenty years since November 16, 1960, when Comrade Enver Hoxha, on behalf of the PLA, made his historic speech at the Meeting of the 81 communist and workers' parties in Moscow.

This is an historic speech from every point of view. First and foremost, this is due to its principled, revolutionary and militant content. It is an ardent defence of the Marxist-Leninist principles and a devastating attack on Khrushchevite revisionism, at a time when this revisionism had completely liquidated the revolutionary line of the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin and had replaced it with the anti-Marxist counter-revolutionary course of the 20th Congress. The Khrushchevites had long been striving to impose this course on the communist and workers' parties of various countries. And at the Moscow Meeting of November 1960 their aim was to have it formally sanctioned as the general line of the international communist movement.

In Moscow Comrade Enver Hoxha unmasked the revisionist theses and stands of the Khrushchev group on the fundamental problems of the theory and practice of the revolution and the socialist construction, and the strategy and tactics of the international communist movement, as well as the anti-Marxist methods used by that
group to force the other parties to adopt those theses and stands, while expounding the revolutionary views and stands of the PLA on all these questions and defending the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

Comrade Enver Hoxha refuted the counter-revolutionary view about the change in the nature of capitalism and imperialism. He, who does not see that imperialism has not changed either its hide, its coat or its nature, that it is aggressive and will be aggressive while even a single tooth is left in its mouth, «is blind, while he, who sees this but covers it up, is a traitor in the service of imperialism.»

He defended the revolutionary view of the PLA that peace cannot be safeguarded and strengthened by flattering, cajoling and making concessions to the American imperialists, by capitulating to their pressure, as occurred with the Khrushchev group and the other revisionists, but by waging a resolute political and ideological struggle to defeat the aggressive plans of the imperialists.

He described as anti-Marxist the view of the Soviet leadership which presented peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition with the imperialists as the general line of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist camp, the main road for the triumph of socialism over capitalism! Peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems is only one of the aspects of the foreign policy of a socialist country, while the struggle against the imperialist policy and the bourgeois ideology, or the unreserved support for the revolutionary liberation struggle of the proletariat and the peoples against imperialism and the reactionary bourgeoisie, must not be renounced for the sake of it, as it was by Khrushchev and his successors.

The communist party of any capitalist country is truly Marxist-Leninist only if it raises the masses in struggle against imperialism and all its lackeys within the country in order to undermine their rule, and, in the conditions of a revolutionary situation, to destroy their political power, to establish the people's state
power, to consolidate and further develop this power as a dictatorship of the proletariat, and does not wait for socialism to come through the peaceful parliamentary road of Khrushchev and other revisionists.

In particular, Comrade Enver Hoxha criticized the Khrushchev group for its counter-revolutionary stand towards Stalin who dedicated his whole life to the defence and creative implementation of Marxism-Leninism, to the cause of the revolution and socialism. He repeated the unwavering view of the PLA on the revolutionary work of Stalin and stated the issue bluntly: «We all should defend the good and immortal work of Stalin. He who does not defend it is an opportunist and a coward.»

Stalin and the Information Bureau were completely right to denounce and condemn Yugoslav revisionism as an anti-Marxist counter-revolutionary trend, as an agency of imperialism. Time had completely vindicated this assessment, therefore the struggle against Yugoslav revisionism remained an indispensable and constant duty for the communist parties. However, it was not only in Yugoslavia that revisionism existed, Comrade Enver Hoxha has pointed out. It was spreading alarmingly in other countries and parties. For this reason the PLA insisted that the assessment, which the Moscow Meeting of 1957 had made of modern revisionism as the main danger, should not be renounced as demanded by the Khrushchevites who described it as no longer valid, but should be re-emphasized!

In order to bar the way to revisionism it was very important to put an end to the methods of pressure, interference and plots in the relations among the communist parties. In particular, the stand of Khrushchev and his group at Bucharest, where they resorted to such methods with unprecedented brutality, should be condemned. The attempts of the Khrushchevites, acting like great-state chauvinists, to compel the other parties to go to the Moscow Meeting in step with their revisionist
views, should also be condemned. In particular, Comrade Enver Hoxha exposed the domineering and huckster-like activities of that group towards our Party and socialist Albania. Addressing Khrushchev he declared at the meeting: «There was a time when Albania was considered a commodity to be traded, when others thought it depended on them whether Albania should or should not exist, but that time came to an end with the triumph of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism in our country.»

No other party made such a courageous defence of Marxism-Leninism and such a penetrating principled exposure of the anti-Marxist course and activity of the Khrushchevites. They could not do so because the other parties were all infected, to a greater or lesser extent, by the disease of revisionism, whereas the heart and mind of the PLA were sound and its line crystal-clear.

The Chinese also spoke against the Khrushchev group. They spoke there not from militant, attacking positions, but from defensive, wait-and-see, opportunist positions. As it became clear later, they did not proceed from the aim of defending Marxism-Leninism and the interests of international communism, but from the aim of defending their own narrow chauvinist and hegemony-seeking interests, just as the Khrushchevites did.

Comrade Enver Hoxha’s speech at the Moscow Meeting completely upset the «tranquil» situation of the first six days of the meeting. Khrushchev had deliberately created this situation because he wanted to cover up the deep principled contradictions and disagreements in the international communist movement, so as to avoid criticism and the exposure of his anti-Marxist views and activity and to put the blame on our Party and the Communist Party of China, against which the attacks in a long material, full of accusations and slanders that was distributed prior to the meeting, were aimed. But Comrade Enver Hoxha’s speech foiled this diabolical tactic. It set the meeting ablaze forcing the delegations of other parties to express their stand
towards the problems under discussion. The savage counter-attacks launched by the Soviet and other revisionists on our Party, in an effort to neutralize the bombshell effect of the voice of our Party, only served to strengthen this effect, to make this voice stronger, more devastating.

This extraordinary effect of Comrade Enver Hoxha’s speech at the Meeting of the 81 parties is one of its important historic aspects.

It is the period after various events which brands them as historic. And time has fully confirmed the great historic importance of Comrade Enver Hoxha’s speech in Moscow. It has shown how completely right our Party was to oppose the counter-revolutionary revisionist course of the Khrushchevites and how correct were the views it put forward at that international forum of the communist movement.

At that time Comrade Enver Hoxha warned about the great danger that threatened the Soviet Union, the socialist camp, the entire international communist movement from the anti-Marxist views and stands of the Khrushchev group, if this danger was not faced bravely and measures taken to heal the open wounds. However, those views and stands were not simply mistakes and distortions. As Comrade Enver Hoxha pointed out at the 7th Congress of the PLA, they constituted «a consciously chosen course» to liquidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and restore capitalism, to transform the Soviet Union into an imperialist state. Today we can see clearly where the «theories» and policy of Khrushchev, which have been faithfully followed and further developed by his «worthy» disciples, Brezhnev and company, have led the Soviet Union. Nothing remains there of the former socialist order but the empty shell. The bourgeois-revisionist content pervades every field of life. The internal policy of the present-day Soviet party and state is a fascist policy of oppression and exploitation of the working masses, and of the Russification of the non-Russian nations, while its foreign policy is a fascist-
imperialist policy which, like that of the USA, aims at world domination.

Meanwhile the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism have been liquidated in the other former socialist countries, too, which have been turned into satellites of the revisionist Soviet Union. China has set out on the road of its transformation into a social-imperialist superpower, whereas nearly all the former communist parties have turned into bourgeois-revisionist parties.

Comrade Enver Hoxha’s speech left its deep imprint upon the international communist movement, which is now on the way to its revival on Marxist-Leninist foundations, and upon the history of the entire world revolutionary and liberation movement. It is and will remain for ever an example of adherence to principle, courage and independence, factors which are indispensable in waging a revolutionary struggle against the internal and external enemies of the proletariat and the people and in achieving the final victory over these enemies. It will always be an emblem of struggle in the hands of our Party and people, one among the fighting flags of its great victorious battles in the revolution and the socialist construction and in the struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism.

Many party documents and works of Comrade Enver Hoxha prove with scientific arguments how correct and vital the struggle of the PLA against Khrushchevite revisionism, which burst out openly and directly on November 16, 1960 in Moscow, has been and is to the defence of Marxism-Leninism and socialism in our country and to the freedom and national sovereignty of our people. This is brought out again in Comrade Enver Hoxha’s new work «The Khrushchevites».

This work, which is pervaded by a dialectical Marxist-Leninist iron logic, based on facts and concrete historical events, convincingly demonstrates the anti-Marxist counter-revolutionary and hegemony-seeking
character of the aims of the Khrushchevite revisionists and their efforts to achieve these aims, on the one hand and, on the other hand, the principled Marxist-Leninist stands of our Party and its revolutionary struggle against them. It gives a full and clear explanation of the reasons for the defeat of the plans and efforts of the Khrushchevites to force our Party and people to yield and to harness them to their revisionist chariot, and for our victory over them. In essence this was due to the loyalty of the PLA to Marxism-Leninism, its adherence to proletarian principles, its wisdom, vigilance and courage in defence of Marxism-Leninism, its correct line, our people and our socialist Homeland. The steel unity of the Party and its Central Committee with Comrade Enver Hoxha at the head, as well as the Party-people unity, have played a decisive role in the implementation of the principled line of our Party. In the struggle against the Khrushchevites, as well as against all other enemies, our Party has never fought alone but always together with the people. That is why it has always emerged triumphant from this struggle.

With the publication of the new work of Comrade Enver Hoxha «The Khrushchevites» the Albanian communists and people are provided with a new, powerful weapon in the fight against modern revisionism, which, as our Party has laid down, will never cease until socialism and communism triumph on a world scale.

In the context of this struggle, this scientific session has been organized by the Institute of Marxist-Leninist Studies, with the active participation of cadres from the «V.I. Lenin» Higher Party School, the University of Tirana, the Academy of Sciences, the Foreign Ministry, people of the press, the literature and art, etc. The theme of the session is: «Soviet Revisionism and the Struggle of the PLA to Unmask It». However, the materials to be presented in this session go somewhat beyond these bounds, because the struggle against Soviet revisionism is closely linked with the struggle
against modern revisionism, in general, and against all its trends, in particular, because «Khrushchevite revisionism,» as the 7th Congress of the Party has defined, «always stands at the head of the modern revisionist front» and the exposure of that revisionism «also serves the exposure of all the other opportunists».

On behalf of the Institute of Marxist-Leninist studies I declare the session open.
THE 20th CONGRESS OF THE CPSU AND THE
EVOLUTION OF MODERN REVISIONISM

Twenty years ago Comrade Enver Hoxha delivered his historic speech at the Meeting of 81 communist and workers’ parties in Moscow. The experience of these twenty years has completely confirmed how correct and vitally important was the position of the PLA and has proved indisputably that the line of resolute struggle against revisionism is the only correct stand to escape its destructive effects. In his new book «The Khrushchevites» Comrade Enver Hoxha stresses, «To this fight, which demanded and still demands great sacrifices, our small Homeland owes the freedom and independence it prizes so highly and its successful development on the road of socialism. Only thanks to the Marxist-Leninist line of our Party did Albania not become and never will become a protectorate of the Russians or anyone else.»*

With clear and well substantiated arguments Comrade Enver Hoxha exposed the treacherous course of the Khrushchevite revisionists and established the dividing line between Marxism-Leninism and Khrushchevite revisionism.

He devoted special attention to criticism and exposure of the opportunist theses and counter-revolutionary

standpoints of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, which formulated the general line of Khrushchevite revisionism, both for the internal problems of the country and for international problems. «Time has proven,» writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, «that the theses of the 20th Congress were neither 'simple ideological distortions' nor erroneous assessments of situations. The 'Khrushchevite theories' represented a consciously chosen course for the elimination of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the restoration of capitalism, an ideological and political means specifically chosen for the transformation of the Soviet Union into an imperialist state and for the liquidation of obstacles to the implementation of the policy of great-power chauvinism.»*

1. The Struggle Against Modern Revisionism —
A struggle for the Defence of the Fundamental
Teachings of Marxism-Leninism

At the 20th Congress of the CPSU and after it, the Khrushchevite revisionists made great play with the slogan of «creative development» of Marxism-Leninism and «the struggle against dogmatism», as all the other modern revisionists have done, using the change in the ratio of forces in the world and the appearance of certain new phenomena in the period following the Second World War as the pretext to spread their opportunist theories and justify their counter-revolutionary actions.

On this basis, they declared the major teachings

* Enver Hoxha, Report to the 7th Congress of the PLA, pp. 224-225, Alb. ed.
of Marxism-Leninism about the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism to be obsolete, superceded and unsuitable for our time.

However, their «anti-dogmatism» is nothing but a pragmatic manoeuvre to justify and conceal their revisionism. It is a fact that many of the things which the present-day revisionists preach, about the «peaceful road to socialism», about «mass workers’ party», legal and «open» about various ideological and political currents and factions, about «democratic socialism» etc., etc., are revivals, of course with new trappings to adapt them to the new conditions and needs of the old theories of Bernstein and the Mensheviks, and of Kautsky and the Second International, which Lenin denounced in his time and which were buried by the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The Khrushchevites’ attacks on Stalin and their discrediting of the Soviet socialist order of the time of Stalin, their rehabilitation of the Yugoslav revisionist leadership and proclaiming Titoite Yugoslavia a socialist country — all these things opened the doors to the revival of revisionist theories about «the separate national roads of transition to socialism», «specific socialism», etc. This was the basis on which Togliatti’s «Italian road to socialism», Marchais’ «socialism with French colours», Dubcek’s «socialism with a human face» in Czechoslovakia and suchlike came into circulation. This, too, is one of the directions of the modern revisionists’ attack on Marxism-Leninism and the theory of scientific socialism. Hence, they advocate a road radically different and quite another «socialism» from that of the time of Lenin and Stalin.

At the 20th Congress of the CPSU and after it, the Khrushchevite revisionists made great play with the false slogan of returning to the teachings of Lenin, allegedly abandoned, distorted and violated by Stalin. Our Party has exposed the aim of the manoeuvre of the so-called return to Lenin. It has shown that the attacks on Stalin were, in reality, attacks on Marxism-Leninism,
which Stalin consistently applied and defended in the Soviet Union and the world communist movement.

Life and later development fully confirmed this analysis of the PLA. As Comrade Enver Hoxha pointed out in his book «Eurocommunism Is Anti-communism», the revisionists who spoke with such great enthusiasm about «liberation from Stalinism» in order, allegedly, to return to Leninism, are now preaching abandonment of Leninism in order to go back to the founders of scientific socialism, Marx and Engels, as the Eurocommunists, the most undisguised revisionists of the present day are doing. «However,» points out Comrade Enver Hoxha, «all revisionists, whether Khrushchevite or Eurocommunist, fight with equal ferocity and cunning both against Stalin and against Lenin and Marx.»*

The preaching of «ideological pluralism» also constitutes one of the most fashionable directions of the modern revisionists’ attack on Marxism-Leninism. The attacks of Nikita Khrushchev and his group on Stalin and Marxism-Leninism, the rehabilitation of Titoism and the Khrushchevites’ rapprochement with social-democracy, gave the «green light» for the spreading of these preachings.

The Titoite thesis that it is allegedly possible to advance to socialism even under the leadership of parties, organizations and forces which do not consider themselves socialist gained respectability and was quickly embraced by the Togliattists and others. The point was reached that in the revisionist press, including the Soviet press, views appeared claiming that it was possible to go over to socialism «holding the Koran in one hand and ‘Capital’ in the other», or «with the Cross in one hand and the Hammer and Sickle in the other», etc.

This thesis of «ideological pluralism» pervades the concepts of the modern revisionists about socialist so-

ciety. The renunciation of Marxism-Leninism as the leading ideology in socialist society, the opening of doors for «the free exchange of ideas and culture», for the unrestricted inflow of bourgeois ideology, culture and the bourgeois way of life, in other words, the complete spiritual degeneration of the socialist society — this is the essence of the revisionist preachings of «ideological pluralism» in socialism.

Finally, the modern revisionists have extended this «ideological pluralism» even to the ranks of the party of the working class itself, by advocating the coexistence within it of the most widely varied philosophical trends, even including religious trends.

It is clear that without Marxism-Leninism there can be no talk of the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and transition to socialism, of the construction of socialism and communism, or of the truly revolutionary party of the working class. As Comrade Enver Hoxha points out, the bourgeois theories and the Khrushchevite, Titoite, Eurocommunist and Chinese revisionist theories, are component parts of the overall strategic plan of imperialism and modern revisionism to strangle the revolution and the liberation struggle, to perpetuate the domination of the bourgeoisie and imperialism and destroy socialism. Therefore defence of the purity of Marxism-Leninism and its fundamental teachings from the revisionist distortions and attacks, whether disguised or open, constitutes a major revolutionary task.

2. The Modern Revisionists — Sworn Enemies of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat

In particular, the 20th Congress of the CPSU, with its notorious «secret report» by Nikita Khrushchev, marked the commencement of a general campaign of
modern revisionism against the dictatorship of the proletariat. At the 22nd Congress, the Khrushchevite revisionists declared the dictatorship of the proletariat a thing of the past, claimed that it is contrary to socialist democracy, and replaced it with the so-called «state of the entire people», which is nothing but a façade for the dictatorship of the new Soviet bourgeoisie.

However, within a few years the so-called «state of the entire people» evolved into a social-fascist state. The unprecedented inflation of the police and military apparatus, the use of violence to suppress the protests of the working masses, the savage oppression and persecution, the widespread use of concentration camps and «psychiatric clinics» against revolutionary elements, the use of the Soviet army to enslave other peoples and countries, are facts which testify to the social-fascist character of the Soviet state today.

The Khrushchevite campaign against the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union and its historical experience served as a major support for the propagation of the anarcho-syndicalist theories of the Yugoslav revisionists about «bureaucratic etatism». While they advocate renunciation of the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeois state and the destruction of the oppressive bourgeois state machinery in the capitalist countries, the Yugoslav revisionists denigrate the socialist state and demand its earliest possible liquidation, in order to replace it with «genuine humanitarian socialism», with their so-called «direct democracy», etc hence with the Titoite system of «self-administration» which is nothing but a capitalist theory and practice, as Comrade Enver Hoxha has pointed out.

The 8th Congress of the CP of China proclaimed one of the main tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat to be the securing of the alliance with the national bourgeoisie in the process of the so-called socialist construction of the country, the application of the course of «coexistence for a long time and mutual
control» between the Communist Party and the so-called democratic bourgeois parties, etc. The unprincipled struggle for power between revisionist groups and factions, the throwing of the masses into anarchist actions for the destruction of the state organs, of the party itself and of the organizations of the masses, as was done during the so-called Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the adoption of the course of Titoite «self-administrative» decentralization of the economy, the opening of the doors of China to the inflow of imperialist monopoly capital, the undertaking of aggression against Vietnam, as well as a series of other anti-Marxist practices and actions, likewise testify clearly that the Chinese revisionists have nothing in common with the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the dictatorship of the proletariat. In their onslaught against the dictatorship of the proletariat the revisionists have gone so far as the Eurocommunists have compared the dictatorship of the proletariat with the fascist regimes of Hitler, Mussolini, Salazar and Franco, as the renegade Marchais did from the tribune of the 22nd Congress of the French CP. This is a significant fact which indicates the extent of the degeneration of the modern revisionists and their descent to the positions of the most rabid and banal anti-communism.

But what do these revisionists put in place of the order of the dictatorship of the proletariat? What is the essence of the so-called «democratic socialism» without the dictatorship of the proletariat which they advocate? It is nothing but the present-day bourgeois society, painted in pseudo-socialist colours to conceal its capitalist character, a hybrid capitalist-socialist society which the Eurocommunist revisionists offer the bourgeoisie as a way of escape in their critical situation, in order to retain their domination in the face of the proletarian revolution.

Historical experience, both the revolutionary experience of the times of Lenin and Stalin, and that of the socialist construction in Albania in our days, as
well as the experience of the revisionist counter-revolution in the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, China and other countries, completely proves the correctness, vitality and the unshaken present-day value of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Defence of the teaching of Marxism-Leninism on the dictatorship of the proletariat, against which the forces of anti-communism and reaction and the modern revisionists of all hues have risen ferociously in a united front, remains one of the most important duties for the genuine Marxist-Leninists to carry forward the cause of the revolution and socialism.

3. Saboteurs of the Revolution, Defenders of the Capitalist Order

All revisionists, both those of the past and the modern ones, whether they are in power or operating in the countries of classical capitalism, are united by their hostility towards the revolution, their efforts to sabotage and undermine it and to perpetuate the domination of the bourgeoisie.

However, the theories of the denial of the revolution became widespread in the communist and workers' movement following the 20th Congress of the CPSU, which rejected as obsolete the Marxist-Leninist theory about the revolution with violence as a universal law of the transition from capitalism to socialism and on the smashing of the bourgeois state machine, and replaced it with the Khrushchevite thesis about the "peaceful road" to socialism using the bourgeois parliament and the bourgeois state apparatus in general.

This thesis became the source and the basis for
the «flowering» of all the counter-revolutionary theories of the revisionists today, and especially of the Eurocommunists, who have as their aim the preservation and perpetuation of capitalism and who are a living proof of the total social-democratic degeneration of the revisionist parties.

As Comrade Enver Hoxha points out in his book «Eurocommunism Is Anti-communism», the present strategy of revolutionaries, according to the renegade Carrillo, is not to overthrow the state power of the bourgeoisie, because the state power no longer belongs to it, neither is it to overthrow the bourgeois relations of production, because they have already changed. Therefore the only thing which must be done is to bring about the gradual transformation of the existing political and ideological institutions through reforms, in order to bring them into conformity with the social reality and change them in favour of the people. In his time, Lenin, exposing such views which were then being spread by Kautsky, wrote: «The general conclusion = socialism without revolution! Or revolution without the destruction of the political power, of 'the state machine' of the bourgeoisie!! What a pearl of idiocy! !» * Here, says Lenin, we have the purest and most banal opportunism; we have rejection of the revolution in fact, while it is accepted in words.

The bloody fascist coup in Chile in 1973, which overthrew the Allende government and brought to power the military dictatorship of Pinochet, was a crushing blow to the revisionist theories of «peaceful democratic transition to socialism». In their efforts to rescue these theories at all costs, the Italian Eurocommunists dished up the so-called strategy of the «historic compromise», the true name of which is historic betrayal.

The same counter-revolutionary and pragmatic standpoints characterize the Chinese revisionists' «theory of

---

the three worlds». They distort and ignore the fundamental contradictions of our epoch, deny the existence of any revolutionary situation and prospect in our days and oppose any revolutionary activity, because, allegedly, the time for them has not yet come. According to the Chinese revisionists, the sole duty of the proletariat and the people of any country, whether in the «third world», the «second world» or in the USA, is to unite with the bourgeoisie and the leading circles of their own country, even the most fascist and reactionary ones, allegedly for the defence of the homeland and national independence against the threat which comes only from the Soviet social-imperialism.

The period in which we are living is characterized by a general upsurge of the world revolutionary process. The objective conditions are becoming ever more favourable for the revolution. Now the decisive thing is the preparation of the subjective factor for the revolution. The main obstacle to this is the influence of revisionist views among the masses and the disruptive counter-revolutionary activity of the revisionists. Anarchist, foquist, terrorist, Trotskyite and other preachings and practices in connection with the revolution and the armed struggle have also caused confusion and disillusionment. «Today when this question is put forward for solution,» writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, «it is an imperative duty for the Marxist-Leninists to dispel the fog the revisionists have spread about the revolution, to unmask their manoeuvres and deliberate misrepresentations about this problem, to expose their counter-revolutionary chauvinist hegemonic intentions and to ensure that the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the revolution are understood and applied correctly.»*

4. The Struggle Against Imperialism and Social-imperialism Is Inseparable from the Struggle Against Revisionism

All the trends of modern revisionism have placed themselves in the service of imperialism and social-imperialism, in order to undermine socialism, the revolution and the people’s liberation struggles. Moreover, in the present period, revisionism in the Soviet Union and in China has evolved into social-imperialism.

Following the betrayal by the Yugoslav revisionists, who became a special agency of American and world imperialism to undermine socialism, to split the socialist camp and the world communist and workers’ movement and to sabotage the revolutionary and liberation struggles, the Khrushchevite revisionists, especially at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, were those who laid the «theoretical» and practical basis for the course of conciliation, rapprochement and counter-revolutionary collaboration with imperialism to the detriment of the revolution and the freedom-loving peoples.

Using as a pretext the creation of weapons of mass extermination and the ideas that «any spark might cause a world conflagration», «a nuclear catastrophe», which according to him, would lead to the destruction of human civilization, Nikita Khrushchev declared that Lenin’s teachings on the stand towards just and unjust wars were obsolete and outdated. The teachings of Lenin were completely falsified and the Khrushchevite opportunist theses on peaceful coexistence as «the general line of the foreign policy of socialist countries and international communist movement», as «the universal course for the triumph of socialism on a world scale», and as the most effective means «for the solution of all the vital problems that face present-day society», etc. were served up instead.

However, the Soviet revisionists use the thesis on
«peaceful coexistence» not merely to justify the policy of unprincipled concessions to and compromises with American imperialism. «This line,» points out Comrade Enver Hoxha, «also served and is still serving them as a mask to hide the expansionist policy of Soviet social-imperialism in order to lower the vigilance and resistance of the peoples to the imperialist plans of the Soviet revisionist leaders for hegemony. The thesis about 'peaceful coexistence' was a call of the Soviet revisionists to the American imperialists to divide up the world and rule it jointly...»*

The fascist type aggression and the occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1968 and of Afghanistan in 1979, the unrestrained arms race, the transformation of the other countries of the «socialist community» into neo-colonies of Soviet social-imperialism according to the theory and practice of «limited sovereignty» and «socialist integration», the penetration and interference of the Soviet social-imperialists in Africa, in the zones of the Middle and Far East, in the Mediterranean, in the Indian and Pacific Oceans, etc brought to light all the falsity of the preachings and propaganda of the Soviet revisionists about peace and peaceful coexistence, disarmament, security and détente.

The 20th Congress of the CPSU with its course of rapprochement and collaboration with American and world imperialism also serves as a «theoretical basis» of justification for the present foreign policy of China. If, at one time, the Chinese revisionists criticised this course of the Khrushchevite revisionists and the Chinese propaganda attacked American imperialism as the greatest enemy of all the peoples of the world, this was done from a purely pragmatic standpoint at that juncture and was intended to prevent the formation of a Soviet-American alliance against China, or without China. The rapprochement of China with the USA has now

been transformed into a typical alliance between imperialist powers, aimed against the revolution, freedom-loving peoples and other countries.

From the motives which inspire it, the aims which it pursues and the dangerous consequences with which it is fraught, China’s present-day policy of opposition to Soviet social-imperialism has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism. China’s leaders are openly inciting the USA to launch an imperialist atomic war in Europe against the Soviet Union, calculating that its two main rivals will destroy one another far from the borders of China and leave China as the omnipotent ruler of the world. Hence, not the raising of peoples in struggle to prevent imperialist war, not the transformation of imperialist war, if it should break out, into a revolutionary liberation war for the overthrow of imperialism, but the replacement of the revolution with imperialist war — such is the monstrous distortion which the Chinese revisionists have made of Marxism-Leninism.

The Khrushchevite revisionist theses at the 20th Congress of the CPSU for rapprochement, collaboration, and «peaceful competition» with imperialism, fostered a series of other revisionist «theories» both of the Yugoslav revisionists and of those who are known today as Eurocommunists.

It is a fact that the Eurocommunists have become supporters of the policy of imperialist blocs, as alleged factors for the preservation of peace. They not only conceal the role of NATO for the suppression of the revolution in the West-European countries, but also ignore the major national problem of the countries and peoples in Western Europe, that of the domination of American imperialism in these countries and the need for liberation from it. At the same time, the Eurocommunists have proclaimed the EEC and United Europe as «a reality which must be accepted». They conceal the exploiting character of this Europe of capitalist monopolies which is aimed against the West-European peoples and is an organ of the neo-colonialism of
European imperialism against the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and they spread false illusions about the «democratisation» of these inter-imperialist organizations, allegedly in favour of the working masses and the peoples. «But,» as Comrade Enver Hoxha writes, «to accept this 'reality' means to accept the elimination of the sovereignty, the cultural and spiritual traditions of each individual country of Europe in favour of the interests of the big monopolies, to accept the elimination of the individuality of the European peoples and their transformation into a mass oppressed by the multi-national companies dominated by American big capital.»*

Therefore, along with the unmasking of the poisonous propaganda of imperialism, it is essential that the deceptive theories and the dangerous preachings of the modern revisionists on the stand towards imperialism and the struggle against it must be exposed and defeated, too.

5. Rapprochement with Social-Democracy — the Liquidation of the Proletarian Party

The historical experience of the communist and workers' parties world-wide shows that the revisionists, both old and new of all trends, in their efforts to undermine the revolutionary movement and socialism, have always aimed their first blow against the revolutionary leading staff of the working class, the proletarian party. The Khrushchevite revisionists provided the example for this by proclaiming at the 22nd Congress the liquidation of the proletarian character of their party and

its transformation into a so-called «party of the entire people», a thing which is a great absurdity in theory, while in practice it means the elimination of the leading role of the working class.

However, the Khrushchev group did not restrict itself to the Soviet Union alone. It tried to impose the course of the degeneration of the proletarian parties on the entire international communist and workers’ movement. From this point of view, it is not in the least accidental that, along with the rehabilitation of Titoism, the Khrushchevite revisionists at the 20th Congress of the CPSU launched the slogan of rapprochement with social-democracy. Moreover, at the 22nd Congress, Nikita Khrushchev declared that, «this is not a temporary tactical slogan, but a general line of the communist movement,» propagating the illusion that positive changes are taking place within the ranks of social-democracy. However, as our Party has stressed, the facts prove the opposite: they show that the social-democratic station has not moved in the direction of the revisionist train, but the revisionist train has rushed toward the social-democratic station.

The revisionists have abandoned the fundamental theoretical positions of Marxism-Leninism and the doctrine of scientific socialism, and in fact have adopted the opportunist counter-revolutionary ideological positions of social-democracy. From the viewpoint of their political strategy, the parties of Eurocommunism have completely abandoned any revolutionary activity for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and have changed into parties of social reforms within the framework of bourgeois legality and the bourgeois constitution, zealous defenders of the capitalist order and possible administrators of the affairs of the bourgeoisie, in order to gradually replace the discredited social-democrats in case difficult situations arise. From the organizational viewpoint, the Eurocommunist parties, following in the footsteps of the social-democrats have proclaimed the Leninist norms and teachings on the life of the revolu-
tionary party of the proletariat to be incompatible with the principles of democracy and the conditions of the developed capitalist countries. The revisionists advocate the so-called «mass party» the doors of which are open to anyone who votes for that party, to all kinds of petty-bourgeois elements, from the ranks of the worker aristocracy and bureaucracy, bourgeois liberal intellectuals, etc.

The logical result of this social-democratic degeneration of the revisionist parties is the open trend towards liquidation, of which the banner-bearer has been the Italian revisionist G. Amendola, who in condemning the former division in the socialist movement and the organization of the communists as a separate party, came out with the thesis of the direct amalgamation of the (revisionist) communist party with the social-democrats and socialists, allegedly in order to find «a new road to socialism». However, everyone knows that the «new road» which the revisionists are seeking is nothing but the social-democratic road of the preservation and perpetuation of capitalism.

In our time social-democracy and the revisionists are fighting on the same side of the barricade to undermine and sabotage the cause of the liberation of the working class from bourgeois exploitation and oppression and to rescue capitalism from the revolution which is approaching. Therefore, the struggle against these agents of the bourgeoisie in the workers’ movement, the liberation of the masses from their poisonous influence are decisive conditions for the preparation of the subjective factor for the revolution.

The formation and tempering of the revolutionary party of the working class, a genuine Marxist-Leninist party, is achieved through ceaseless struggle against any revisionist influence and by drawing the necessary lessons from the social-democratic degeneration of the revisionist parties.
As the PLA has continually stressed, the setting of the Soviet Union on the anti-Marxist Khrushchevite course sanctioned at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, led, as it was bound to do, to the complete degeneration of the Soviet Union into a social-fascist capitalist state and a social-imperialist power. In this connection, it is necessary to expose and refute the clamour of the bourgeois, social-democratic, Eurocommunist and other propaganda, that the Soviet leadership after Khrushchev, especially after 1968, has allegedly abandoned the line of the 20th Congress and of Khrushchev, has taken certain steps back towards some «Stalinist methods», has allegedly evolved into «neo-Stalinism», etc.

Immediately after the fall of Khrushchev, the Party of Labour of Albania, opposing the vacillations and pressure exerted by the Chinese leadership, exposed the demagogic manoeuvres of the Brezhnev group and described the policy of the new Soviet leadership as a continuation of Khrushchevism without Khrushchev. The PLA stressed that it is essential to carry the struggle against Soviet revisionism, with or without Khrushchev, through to the end unswervingly.

There is also speculation with the contradictions which exist today amidst different trends of modern revisionism, especially between Soviet revisionism and other trends. The Soviet leadership, in particular, tries to present the matter as if these are contradictions over principles and that it is defending the Marxist-Leninist positions in polemics with certain deviations of the Eurocommunists and in stern struggle with the Chinese revisionists who have betrayed Marxism-Leninism, etc. However, analysis of the facts refutes these claims and shows that these contradictions are not of a principled character, on the part of the Soviet or of the other revisionists, because all of them are enemies of Marxism-
Leninism who, regardless of the contradictions which divide them, have a common, counter-revolutionary, opportunist, ideological base.

Let us take the Chinese revisionists who have sought to make political capital from the struggle waged by the CP of China against Khrushchevite revisionism. Now, however, every one knows that this struggle by the CP of China was conducted with great zigzags and vacillations and that it was never waged from sound, principled Marxist-Leninist internationalist positions, but from pragmatic and chauvinist great-power positions.

In regard to the contradictions between the Soviet revisionists, on the one hand, and the Titoites and Eurocommunists on the other, they are based, from the one side, on the interests of Soviet social-imperialism which is trying to dominate all the revisionist parties and to use them as instruments of its expansionist foreign policy, and from the other side, on the interests of the Western bourgeoisie and Western imperialism, with which both the Eurocommunists and the Yugoslav revisionists, who are seeking to be as independent as possible from Moscow, are closely linked. They want to be independent of any kind of Soviet dictate and free to unite with the local bourgeoisie and Western imperialism, with NATO and the EEC, in order to adapt themselves better to their interests and demands and do not want to have their hands tied by any sort of «common decisions and obligations» which the Soviet social-imperialists wish to impose on them.

The bourgeois, social-democratic, Trotskyite and other propaganda is making a great noise about the «failure» of Marxism-Leninism and the crisis and disintegration of communism. In reality, it is not a crisis of Marxism-Leninism or communism, but of modern revisionism. The unprincipled struggle for power and the disturbances in the revisionist countries, from the overthrow of Khrushchev in the Soviet Union, of Rankovic and others in Yugoslavia, to the frequent ups and downs in China, the fall of Gomulka and now of Gierek in Poland etc the
failures of the revisionist countries in their economics and foreign policy, the Soviet and Chinese aggressions in Czechoslovakia, Vietnam and Afghanistan, the contradictions and squabbles in the revisionist camp — all these and other facts are evidence of the deep and insoluble crisis which has gripped revisionism.

The evolution of modern revisionism with all its offshoots and «theories», its demagogy and dangerous deceptions, show what a colossal task faces the Marxist-Leninists today to unmask it in the eyes of the working class and the peoples. It shows also that it is essential to wage an unceasing principled struggle against all trends of modern revisionism, without underestimating or creating illusions about any of them. The struggle against modern revisionism, for the liberation of the masses from the poisonous revisionist influence, and for the revolutionary tempering of the Marxist-Leninist parties themselves, is not a temporary campaign but a permanent and vital necessity in order to carry the cause of the revolution and socialism forward to total victory.
THE STRUGGLE OF THE PLA AGAINST
THE PRESSURE AND INTERFERENCE OF THE
KHRUSHCHEVITE REVISIONISTS AGAINST OUR
PARTY AND COUNTRY

The struggle of the Party of Labour of Albania against the interference and pressure of the Khrushchevite revisionists is a component part of the whole great principled struggle which it has waged against Soviet revisionism.

The whole world knows that at the Meeting of the 81 communist and workers' parties, in November 1960, the Party of Labour of Albania took a resolute, open stand against the revisionist course and chauvinist policy of Nikita Khrushchev. In his historic speech, Comrade Enver Hoxha not only exposed the Khrushchevite revisionist platform in general, not only presented the views of our Party on the fundamental questions of the theory and practice of the revolution and the construction of socialism, as well as on the problems of the strategy and tactic of the international communist movement, but at the same time, openly and resolutely exposed the pressure, blackmail and interference of the Khrushchevite revisionists against our Party and country.

The firm and principled stand of our Party at the Moscow Meeting was in no way accidental or unexpected.
«Our open and principled attack on Khrushchevite modern revisionism at the Meeting of November 1960,» writes Comrade Enver Hoxha in his work «The Khrushchevites», «...was the logical continuation of the Marxist-Leninist stand which the Party of Labour of Albania had always maintained, was the transition to a new, higher stage of the struggle which our Party had long been waging for the defence and consistent application of Marxism-Leninism.»*


* * *

The first clash was over question of Yugoslav revisionism. Only one year had passed since the death of Stalin when Khrushchev began to alter the accepted Marxist-Leninist course of the international communist movement of the principled struggle against Yugoslav revisionism and to make approaches to Tito. He needed this in order to realize his plans for the elimination of Marxism-Leninism and socialism. Tito was the first who attacked Stalin and rejected Marxism-Leninism. That is why Khrushchev regarded Tito as his ideological ally in his struggle against communism.

The PLA opposed the efforts of the Khrushchevite clique for their rapprochement with the Titoites from the time it received the first letter on the Yugoslav question, in June 1954, which was the first warning of this rapprochement. In particular, it protested sternly against Khrushchev’s visit to Belgrade in May 1955, to fall on his knees before Tito. This action which was undertaken without consulting other parties for their opinion about it, was a flagrant and arbitrary violation

---

of decisions taken unanimously by the communist and workers’ parties and was clear evidence of the opportunist line which Khrushchev had begun to follow.

The Party of Labour of Albania, which knew the true face of the Yugoslav revisionists only too well and which waged a consistent irreconcilable struggle against them, immediately and unhesitatingly expressed its opposition. «The daily experience of our Party in relations with the Yugoslavs...,» the CC of the PLA wrote in its letter, «proves clearly and completely, with many vivid facts, that the principled content of all the resolutions of the Information Bureau in connection with the Yugoslav question is completely correct. The procedure which it is proposed to follow for approval of the abrogation of the resolution of the Meeting of the Information Bureau of November 1949 appears to us to be improper... In our opinion, such a rapid and hasty decision on a major question of principle, without first making a profound analysis together with all the parties interested in this matter... would not only be premature, but would cause serious harm in the general orientation...»*

Khrushchev went to Belgrade where he fell on his knees to Tito and admitted that «mistakes had been made» in regard to the CP of Yugoslavia and its leadership. He rehabilitated Tito as a «Marxist-Leninist»! Meanwhile time had proved, and proved even more clearly later, that Tito had not undergone any change from an anti-Marxist and Trotskyite (as Stalin and the Information Bureau had described him) to a Marxist-Leninist (as Khrushchev called him). It was Khrushchev who had embraced anti-communism and become like Tito. As Comrade Enver Hoxha says, «Anti-communism remained the foundation of their relations.»** This was the main factor which united them.

* Letter of the CC of the PLA to the CC of the CPSU, May 23, 1955, CPA.
The PLA went on to oppose all the later actions of the Soviet revisionist leadership for rapprochement and ideological collaboration with Yugoslav revisionists and never ceased its struggle against this revisionism as Khrushchev insistently demanded. It raised its opposition and waged its struggle on the basis of principle for the defence of Marxism-Leninism and the unity of the international communist movement and the socialist camp, and not from the positions of narrow nationalism or from pig-headedness as the Khrushchevites tried to present our just stands.

* * *

The differences over principle and the clashes of our Party and the Khrushchev group increased and became deeper when the latter formulated and adopted its revisionist programme at the 20th Congress of the CPSU while at the same time undertaking the savage campaign against the so-called cult of the individual of Stalin, and when it tried in every way to impose its counterrevolutionary line on the whole world communist movement.

The Khrushchev group exerted especially great pressure on the PLA to have it accept the line of the 20th Congress and consequently to alter its own general line.

The Khrushchevites were aware of our Party’s opposition to them over the Yugoslav question and were also aware of the high assessment which it made of Stalin as a great Marxist-Leninist theoretician and leader. Therefore they doubted that it would be willing to approve the course of the 20th Congress. Nevertheless they hoped that any obstacle would be overcome and that the PLA would not become an exception from the other parties which with varying degrees of enthusiasm, accepted the revisionist course of the 20th Congress describing it, in the terms which the Soviet revisionist
leadership used, as a congress «which marked a new stage in the development of the Soviet Union and the international communist and workers’ movement.»

The Khrushchevites made every effort to ensure that the theses of their congress were embodied in the 3rd Congress of the PLA, which had been set for three months later, in May 1956. They had charged their main ideologist, Suslov, with the task of convincing the leadership of our Party of the necessity for re-examination and alteration of its general line in conformity with the course of the 20th Congress. They had also given their agent, Liri Belishova, the task of exerting pressure from within. They utilized the Party Conference of the city of Tirana to attack the Marxist-Leninist line and leadership of our Party. They kept up their efforts to achieve their aim by means of a delegation which they sent to our 3rd Congress. However, our Party did not budge from its positions.

In order to mislead our Party, the revisionists employed the so-called arguments about «new situations» and consequently about «new roads and possibilities for advance», presenting the counter-revolutionary course of the 20th Congress as a «creative development of Marxism-Leninism» in conformity with these situations and possibilities! «Many were misled by this demagogy of traitors», writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, «however, the Party of Labour of Albania was not misled.»

Contrary to the aims of the Khrushchevites, the 3rd Congress of our Party fully approved the political line and the practical activity of the Central Committee and the whole Party. Unanimously and without hesitation, it decided that the Marxist-Leninist course which our Party had pursued from the day of its foundation should be continued.

In the concrete circumstances, the 3rd Congress of the PLA could not openly denounce the anti-Marxist course of the 20th Congress of the CPSU. Nevertheless,

in essence the revolutionary and Marxist-Leninist content of all the decisions and conclusions of the 3rd Congress was opposed to that course.

On all the revisionist theses of the 20th Congress, on all the problems of principle which were concerning the communist international movement, the Party of Labour of Albania had its own revolutionary views and its reservations, which it had not only made known to the Soviet leadership, but which it also expressed publicly in the press and all its propaganda.

At that time, our Party did not speak openly about the differences over ideological principles which had arisen between it and the Soviet leadership, but it defended the Soviet Union, at a time when the imperialists and the various revisionists were attacking the Soviet Union in order to discredit communism. Our Party could not come out openly at that time against Khrushchevites, also, because it needed time to gain a complete knowledge of them, knowledge which was not achieved all at once. The actions of the Khrushchevites were camouflaged, they manoeuvred with Marxist-Leninist slogans, advanced in zigzags which, along with doubts, sometimes aroused hopes that the Soviet leadership might understand the catastrophe to which the course which they had adopted was leading the Communist Party and the socialist order and that they might take a course of correcting their erroneous stands.

Therefore, as Comrade Enver Hoxha explains, our Party was cautious in the stand it took, and it kept its eyes open. It followed every action and stand of Khrushchev's with the greatest care, proceeding from the desire to preserve and strengthen the friendship with the Soviet Union but at the same time it did not leave unanswered, in one way or another, the erroneous stands and actions, the deviations of the Khrushchevites and the pressures which they exerted upon it.

The Khrushchevites exerted pressure for the rehabilitation of our traitors, demanding that our Party act in regard to Koçi Xoxe, Tuk Jakova and others as was
done under the pressure of Khrushchev and Tito with Rajk, Kadar and Nagy in Hungary, with Kostov in Bulgaria, with Gomulka in Poland, etc. The terse reply of our Party in the face of this pressure was: «We have never accused and condemned anyone for nothing...»*

In particular, the Khrushchevites strove to liquidate the main leaders of our Party and state and to replace them with rehabilitated traitors as it succeeded in doing in many other parties and former socialist countries.

The Khrushchevites' pressure was intended also to place our army, economy and culture under their control by means of the Soviet advisers and specialists, as well as by means of their Albanian agents. «All the parties of the socialist countries fell into this Khrushchevite trap, with the exception of the Party of Labour of Albania.»**

The Khrushchevites also continued the pressure which they had begun to exert immediately after the death of Stalin to give the people's economy and our country a one-sided, agricultural development, mainly growing fruit. They were opposed to the setting up and development of socialist industry in Albania and especially opposed to the creation of the processing and machine-building industry. They raised all sorts of pretexts for this and left no stone unturned to hinder the implementation of the revolutionary economic policy of our Party of the industrialization of the country, the building of the material-technical basis of socialism and achieving self-sufficiency in bread grain. Proceeding from the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, the PLA regarded the construction and defence of socialism as impossible without a modern, multi-branched industry, without an advanced mechanized agriculture to ensure the economic independence, without which there could be no political independence. However, the Khrushchevites wanted Albania to be a country economically dependent on the Soviet

** Ibidem, p. 325.
Union, and, consequently, it would be dependent upon it politically, too.

Meanwhile, modern revisionism was spreading rapidly and gaining control of almost all the communist and workers’ parties and all the socialist countries (with the exception of our country and Party) turning into a very great danger for the international communist movement and the socialist camp. The PLA had no doubt at all that the unprecedented invigoration of the Yugoslav revisionism, its very extensive diversionist activity, the appearance of Togliatti’s theory of «policontrolism» «the Italian road to socialism», «unlimited democracy», etc the liquidation of leaders of many parties, the rehabilitation of many traitors in different parties, the counter-revolutionary manifestations in Poland, the counter-revolution in Hungary, etc all had their source in the 20th Congress and that the main culprits for all these things were Khrushchev and company.

Our Party watched these developments with great concern. While maintaining its principled stand on all questions and events, its suspicions were becoming ever stronger and the opinion was crystallizing that the Khrushchevite leadership of the Soviet Union was abandoning Marxism-Leninism and the road to socialism. The crystallization of this opinion was influenced especially by the filthy role which Khrushchev, Mikoyan, Suslov, Andropov, etc played in Hungary, by removing Rakosi, supporting Nagy, bringing down the former Central Committee of the Hungarian party and forming another in the Crimea, where Khrushchev was on holiday and where he had invited Kadar for this purpose, while collaborating and striking secret bargains over these things with Tito, etc.

The Soviet leadership sent the letters exchanged between Khrushchev and Tito over the Hungarian question in November 1956 to the Central Committee of our Party for its information, with the aim of receiving its approval of the bargain struck and to show the way which our Party ought to follow, too!
Presenting these letters for discussion in the Political Bureau of the Central Committee, Comrade Enver Hoxha said: «... the question before us is whether to breach our principles, to keep silent or to march forward, not reconciling ourselves to incorrect stands? ... I insist that we proceed on the basis of principles which we have defined... We should not publicize these differences of opinion, for this is to the detriment of the Soviet Union and the socialist camp. On the other hand, it is my opinion that we must not make concessions of the kind that the leadership of the CPSU wants us to make, for this is a markedly opportunist stand... Nowhere will we yield the slightest concession on principles, not even a millimetre... We shall uphold the issues of principle even if we remain alone. We shall certainly not remain alone for long if we wage a just struggle in defence of principles.»*

In December 1956, Comrade Enver Hoxha put forward our opposition over a series of wrong actions and our concern about the great danger which the spread of revisionism constituted, directly to the Soviet leaders. Two months later, in February 1957, the Plenum of the CC of the PLA, while denouncing the revisionists as the culprits for the events in Hungary, Poland and elsewhere, defended the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism about the leading role of the revolutionary party of the working class in the revolution and socialist construction, about the necessity for the dictatorship of the proletariat during the whole period of transition from capitalism to communism and about the class struggle in this period, principles which the Khrushchev group and its followers had trampled upon. The violation of these principles in Hungary and Poland was testimony to the catastrophe which was threatening the revolution and socialism. The Central Committee also defended Stalin and exposed the so-called «Stalin’s cult of the individual». Thus, in fact, the plenum of the Central Committee of

our Party rejected the revisionist theses of the 20th Congress.

The Khrushchevites were aware of the principled stand of the PLA and its opposition to many of their actions. However, as Comrade Enver Hoxha says, they did not want to exacerbate the contradictions with us. With their logic of counter-revolutionaries and great-state chauvinists, they thought that we, as a small Party of a small country, would have nowhere to turn to. If not today, tomorrow, we would fall on our knees to them. However, the publication in «Zeri i popullit» of Comrade Enver Hoxha's speech at the plenum of the CC in February 1957 alarmed the Khrushchevites. Therefore, they demanded that a top-level delegation of the Party of Labour of Albania should go urgently to Moscow. As Comrade Enver Hoxha writes in his work «The Khrushchevites», the Khrushchev group used «the carrot» and «the stick» in an attempt to subjugate the leadership of our Party. «The carrot» was the promises of greater economic aid, the conversion of old credits to grants and the formal approval of some revolutionary stand of our Party. «The stick» was their insistence, backed by threats, that our Party should change its revolutionary stands towards Stalin, towards Titoism, towards internal enemies of our Party, and likewise change the policy of ensuring economic independence.

The first direct clash with the Khrushchevite revisionists occurred in April 1957, when Khrushchev, powerless to overcome the refusal of Comrade Enver Hoxha and other members of our delegation to accept these changes, said to them with uncontrolled anger: «We cannot reach agreement with you Albanians! We shall break off the talk!» However, he did not dare break them off, because he still hoped to achieve his aim.

Besides these pressures, activity was undertaken to sabotage the construction and defence of socialism by means of their advisers, specialists and diplomats in Albania, and also to prepare their agency for this
purpose within our Party, so that they could take the fortress from within.

The aim of the Khrushchevites was to break the resistance of the PLA and compel it to change its course. «But,» as Comrade Enver Hoxha writes, «they broke their heads.»*

The revolutionary stand of the PLA on all the questions which had given rise to differences after the 20th Congress, was also expressed at the first Meeting of communist and workers’ parties in Moscow, in November 1957, as well as on the occasion of the announcement of the counter-revolutionary program of the Communist League of Yugoslavia in 1958. A series of articles, published on this occasion in our press, unmasked not only the theses of that program, but also the theses of the 20th Congress. In vain the Soviet leadership nurtured hopes that things would change after the signing of the agreement on the granting of a new credit to Albania for the 3rd Five-year Plan, especially after Khrushchev’s visit to our country, in May 1959. As is known, he came to carry out a «reconnaissance» before commencing decisive operations for the implementation of his military and political plans in Albania. With the discovery and smashing of the counter-revolutionary plot of Teme Sejko in 1960, Khrushchev’s hopes of exploiting this for his own aims were wiped out too.

While resolutely continuing its revolutionary course, through clashes with the Khrushchevite, Titoite and other revisionists, the Party had become thoroughly aware of what they were and about the end of 1959 and the beginning of 1960, it had reached the conclusion: «For us the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was finished. Khrushchev and the Khrushchevites were revisionists, traitors.»**

---

** Ibidem, p. 383.
In June 1960, with this conviction the delegation of the PLA, headed by Comrade Hysni Kapo, went to Bucharest where, as is known, the Khrushchev group tried to deliver a decisive stab in the back to the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

As Comrade Enver Hoxha tells us, when the CC of the PLA sent the delegation to Bucharest it knew nothing of Khrushchev’s aim, but after receiving Comrade Hysni Kapo’s radiograms, it very rapidly formed the complete conviction that Khrushchev had concocted a plot «... one of the most perfidious and savage...» and therefore, everything possible had to be done to defeat this plot.

In Bucharest the delegation of the PLA carried out the instructions of the CC, openly opposed the destructive activity of the Khrushchevite group and attacked Khrushchev over his anti-Marxist aim and the conspiratorial methods that he employed. In his book «The Khrushchevites» Comrade Enver Hoxha says, «Hence in Bucharest and Moscow we did not defend China, as a big country from which we might get aid, but we defended the Leninist norms, Marxism-Leninism. We did not defend the Communist Party of China because it was a big party, but we defended our principles, we defended Marxist-Leninist justice. At Bucharest and Moscow we would have defended any party or country, big or small numerically, provided only that it was with Marxism-Leninism.»** As a result of the principled stand of the PLA the Khrushchev group did not achieve its diabolical aims. This stand was a logical result of the whole revolutionary line which our Party had followed.

** Ibidem, p. 408, Alb. ed.
The Bucharest Meeting marked an immediate turn in the relations between the Party of Labour of Albania and the Soviet leadership. «The Albanian rebellion» had to be crushed with all the means of compulsion and pressure. For Albania and the Party of Labour of Albania the period of the great test began.

In the first place, the Khrushchevites strove to split and subdue the Central Committee of the Party in order to force it to condemn its own stand in Bucharest. They used their agent prepared in Moscow, Liri Bellishova, to this aim. However, they ran up against the steel unity of the Central Committee.

The Khrushchev group had pinned great hopes on the cadres who had graduated from schools in the Soviet Union. However, the Khrushchevites were unable to find or to cause any breach in the ranks, either of the Party or of the people. Faced with the unity of the Party and unity of the Party with the people, their plans came to nought.

In particular, the Soviet revisionists employed pressure and sabotage in the economic field, by delaying and, in many cases, stopping the dispatch of goods and industrial equipment on the basis of agreements concluded. They went so far as to bring into action the weapon of starvation, by refusing the delivery of a quantity of grain to ensure bread supplies of which there was a shortage because of the exceptional draught of 1960. They made threats to our Government that they would cut off deliveries of any kind of armaments and military equipment for our People's Army.

The Party of Labour of Albania did not bend the knee to them. It appealed to the heroism and patriotism of the people, to their spirit of struggle and sacrifice. Our people closed their ranks even more tightly around the Party in the struggle to cope with the difficulties, pressure and interference by the Khrushchevites.

In August, the Soviet leadership sent the CC of our Party a letter in which it demanded that they should go to the Meeting to be held in Moscow, in November
1960, «with complete unity of opinions.» This would have meant our Party’s abandoning its principled stands in Bucharest and its Marxist-Leninist line. However, our Party was determined not to make any concessions, but to defend its principles to the end. Its reply to this demand from the Khrushchev group was: «Even if we Albanians have to go without bread, we do not violate our principles, do not betray Marxism-Leninism. Everybody, friends and enemies, should be clear about this.»

Meanwhile the Central Committee of our Party instructed its delegation to the commission of 26 parties which was drafting the declaration of the Moscow Meeting, to fight persistently for the rejection of the revisionist theses which the Soviet leadership and others wanted to embody in it: «We are for taking the matter through to the end.» Comrade Enver Hoxha wrote to the delegation. «... A determined revisionist does not change course... Compromise with them does not serve our cause.»

The historic speech which Comrade Enver Hoxha delivered on behalf of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania at the Meeting of the 81 parties in Moscow is known to all. This speech defeated Khrushchev’s cunning tactic to cover up the profound differences over principles, the existence of two opposing lines in the international communist movement and to avoid criticism of the revisionist line and splitting activity of the Soviet leadership. With this tactic he aimed to saddle our Party and the CP of China with the blame and, to this end, a Soviet document distributed before the meeting launched filthy attacks and slanders against them, while he himself was to emerge as the banner-bearer of Marxism-Leninism and unity!

In reply to Khrushchev’s attempts to make deals over Albania, Comrade Enver Hoxha told him at the meeting: «There was a time when Albania was considered

---

as something to be bought and sold, while others thought that it depended on them whether Albania would exist or not, but that time came to an end with the triumph of the ideas of Marxism–Leninism in our country... The fact that Albania is advancing on the road to socialism and takes part in the socialist camp is not decided by you..., this does not depend on your wishes. The Albanian people, with the Party of Labour at the head, have decided this with their struggle and there is no force that can divert them from this course.»*

After the Moscow Meeting, at which the ideological conflict reached its culmination, the Khrushchevites' pressures and attacks against our Party and country assumed harsher and more aggressive forms. Thinking that he had all the necessary means in his hands Khrushchev raised his fist to wreak vengeance on the Party, the people and a small socialist country, by organizing an all-round political, economic and military blockade against Albania, unprecedented in its ferocity.

They unilaterally annulled all the agreements concluded between the two countries, stopped all credits and economic aid and broke off all commercial relations, withdrew all their specialists from Albania in a threatening way and expelled all the Albanian cadres and students who were studying in Soviet educational institutions. These hostile actions were accompanied with a letter to our Government in April 1961, which said: «From now on, Albania cannot hope that the Soviet Union will assist it on the former basis.» that «from now on the Soviet Union considers it necessary to build its relations with Albania on a new basis.» Immediately after this, in May, they arbitrarily annulled the bilateral agreements about the obligations they had assumed, on the basis of the Warsaw Treaty, to supply our People's Army with armaments and military equipment. They robbed Albania of 8 submarines, as well as the Albanian warships which were in the port of Sevastopol at that

time. They demonstratively withdrew the ships from
the military base of Vlora.

At no time had the history of relations between
socialist countries known such pressure against a small
socialist country and a small people. «Even the im-
perialists have not imposed such a complete blockade
against a socialist country...»*, wrote Comrade
Enver Hoxha.

The Soviet revisionists were also ready to undertake
military intervention in Albania, using as a pretext the
question of the military base at Vlora. However, these
plans failed, thanks to the heroic resistance of our Party,
our army and our armed people.

Finally, in October 1961, from the tribune of the
22nd Congress Nikita Khrushchev openly launched a
public attack against our Party, calling on communists
and our people for counter-revolution, and followed this
up with another hostile act, the breaking off of diplo-
matic relations with Albania.

All these things testified to the failure of every
effort to subjugate our Party and force it to take a
revisionist course, as the other parties did, to compel
our people to abandon the road of socialism and to enter
the road of capitalism, like the other former socialist
countries. The Party of Labour of Albania had scored
a big victory over Khrushchevite revisionism.

In these conditions it could remain silent no longer.
It not only had the right, but felt it to be a duty to
make publicly known the Khrushchevites’ betrayal of
Marxism-Leninism and socialism and all their hostile
activity and crimes against our Party of Labour and
socialist Albania. The Party of Labour of Albania declared
stern and irreconcilable war on Khrushchevite revision-
ism, being fully convinced that through this struggle
it was defending the great cause of Marxism-Leninism
and socialism. «The struggle which is being imposed
on our Party and people,» declared the Central Com-

mittee of the Party, «will be protracted and difficult. But our Party and people have never been afraid of difficulties.»*

The Khrushchevites were greatly mistaken when they thought that Albania would not be able to take a single step forward without the aid of the Soviet Union and that, in the end, it would be obliged to return to the «socialist family» which would mean to become dependent on the Soviet Union like the revisionist countries of Eastern Europe, or to sell itself to imperialism for 30 pieces of silver!

As Comrade Enver Hoxha says, the PLA «... did not sell out and never will sell out to imperialism or anyone else because... a genuine Marxist-Leninist party, ... whatever the conditions and situations it is in, never allows itself to be bought or sold, but resolutely pursues its course, the course of uncompromising struggle against imperialism, revisionism and reaction.»**

Socialist Albania did not mark time, but advanced very rapidly without the aid of the Soviet social-imperialists, vigorously developed its economy and culture, and all fields of the life of the country on the road of socialism and strengthened its defence. With its far-sighted revolutionary policy in the political economic, cultural and military fields, the PLA had ensured all the conditions for such an advance. The achievements marked in 1961-1980 testify to the gigantic creative force of a people which is led by a revolutionary party of the working class. They refute the predictions and imperialist logic of the Soviet revisionists.

The Khrushchevite revisionist clique was gravely mistaken when it thought that it could isolate Albania. Albania was not isolated and never will be isolated, because throughout the world there are Marxist-Leninists, genuine revolutionaries and internationalists and there are friendly peoples and countries who understood and

* «Principal Documents of the PLA», vol. 4, p. 154, Alb. ed.
continue to understand ever more profoundly the revolutionary line and the principled struggle of the PLA in defence of freedom, independence and socialism in Albania, in defence of the interests and ideals of the proletariat and peoples of the whole world.

* * *

Although they suffered defeat in their encounter with the PLA, the Khrushchevites did not relinquish their efforts to subjugate it and the Albanian people. They had great hopes of achieving the submission of our Party after the fall of Khrushchev, when they tried to lay all the blame on him for the «quarrels and disagreements» for which, according to them, there is no objective basis or ideological reason. However, the Party of Labour of Albania had no illusions at all about the aims of Khrushchev’s successors who merely carried out «a change of horses» in the leadership while retaining Khrushchevism quite unaltered.

Our Party also rejected the «advice» of the Chinese leadership to follow their example in making approaches to and reaching conciliation with the Khrushchevites. There was a strong smell of opportunism and pragmatism about the judgements of the Chinese leadership that «we should offer our hand to the dear Soviet comrades», «we should forget the past», and «we should understand the difficulties of the comrades of the Soviet Union». «The exclusion of Khrushchev from the leadership of the Soviet party and state,» wrote Comrade Enver Hoxha, «did not mean the end of Khrushchevite revisionism, or the liquidation of its ideology and policy, which were expressed in the political line of the 20th and 22nd Congress of the CPSU... We must not create and foster
illusions, we must not be deceived by demagogy and disguises. . . . for the Marxist-Leninists, the struggle against Khrushchevite revisionism ends when its course is liquidated politically and ideologically, when the spirit, practices and stands from Khrushchevite revisionist positions have been liquidated. . . .

After the break with the Chinese, the Soviet revisionists hoped once again that we would offer them the hand of friendship, because they thought that in these conditions the «appropriate time» had come to settle matters with Albania. Even to this day the revisionist press is openly hinting that, left without Chinese aid, the Albanians will return to the «socialist family» and the allies of the Soviet revisionists are intervening to sound out our reaction to this.

However, their hopes will never be realized. Comrade Enver Hoxha has said: «Our enemies are mistaken when they think that our country is... 'abandoned on the streets' that 'it will hold out its hand to somebody who will pull it out of the mire', etc. The People's Socialist Republic of Albania... is advancing confidently, relying on its own strength, building, creating, training and defending itself fearlessly, and with its heroic example, it is inspiring and will continue to inspire the oppressed masses of the world.»**

* * *

Looking back at the road traversed during the past twenty years or so, we can define those causes, the

political-moral factors which ensured the great victory of our Party over the Khrushchevites and their ignominious defeat:

1. Our Party fought and successfully defeated the interference, pressure, blackmail and blockade of the Khrushchevites, because it has always remained loyal to Marxism-Leninism and has pursued a consistent principled line. The struggle of our Party against Soviet revisionism is a just, profoundly principled struggle. Our differences with the Khrushchevites did not have to do simply with the relations between two parties and two countries. They were of a general character before they assumed a bilateral character; they were principled ideological differences, differences between two opposing lines, before they were inter-state contradictions. The Soviet revisionist leadership carried out ugly hostile activities against our people and country, because the PLA defended Marxism-Leninism, whereas it had betrayed Marxism-Leninism. Consequently, the struggle of the PLA against Khrushchevite revisionism was not aimed simply against the hostile anti-Albanian actions of the Khrushchevite clique against our Party and country, but above all, against the revisionist betrayal, in order to defend Marxism-Leninism and the cause of revolution and socialism. Comrade Enver Hoxha has said that we condemned the Soviet revisionists’ betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, just as we condemned the betrayal of the Titoite and Chinese revisionists for «... profound ideological and political reasons and not for trifles. They were not of a national character only, because they affected not only Albania’s economic interests, no, they had and have more of an international character, because they violated the great principles for which the peoples, the world proletariat and progressive mankind are fighting.»*

2. The Party of Labour of Albania successfully

smashed the pressure, blackmail and hostile blockades of the Khrushchevites, because it had the support of the broad working masses of the country, the powerful backing of the people. In steel unity with the Party, the people fought together with it against the savage hostile activity with a high level of political consciousness. Precisely «In this unity,» stresses Comrade Enver Hoxha, «lies the invincible strength of the Party and our people, the sound guarantee of all the past, present and future victories of the people. This unity is the heaviest blow against all enemies of our Party and people, imperialists and revisionists of every description.»*

3. The Party of Labour of Albania overcame the Khrushchevite blockade because it has always remained loyal to the great revolutionary principle of self-reliance. No one brought us our freedom, independence and the great victories of the revolution and the socialist construction as a gift, they were achieved by shedding rivers of blood and sweat.

When the Soviet leadership cut off all the credits and economic aid, our Party and people did not capitulate, our economy did not come to a standstill, but on the contrary, developed with rapid rates on the road of socialism. The correct policy of the Party for the socialist industrialization of the country, the development and modernization of agriculture, the building of the material-technical base of socialism, and an independent economy, ensured that our socialist economy would not experience any kind of crisis or stagnation, but would go ahead vigorously.

In the West there are politicians and historians who distort and falsify the great truth about the conflict of the PLA with the Krushchevites, motivating the victories and resistance of our Party with unreal causes and factors. Among these we can mention the «Chinese aid», and the «geographical remoteness from the Soviet

Union». It is not difficult to refute these arguments. Our Party began and successfully waged the struggle against the Khrushchev group, not for the interests of the Chinese, or because that it had their support and aid, but for major national and international ideological and political motives, and relying on its own strength. In regard to the danger of Soviet military aggression, this existed twenty years ago, just as it does today. If the Soviet social-imperialists or any other aggressor have not dared to undertake military adventures against socialist Albania, this cannot be explained by geographical remoteness, or by the lack of the desire on their part.

They know that socialist Albania is not a mouthful that can be easily swallowed, that the traditionally patriotic and freedom-loving people of Albania, linked in steel unity with their fearless Party of Labour are prepared from every aspect and determined to fight to the end to defend the freedom and independence of their Homeland. Any aggressor who would dare to attack it, would encounter a terrain ablaze with people's war from which he would not manage to extricate himself.

4. Another factor in the triumph over the Khrushchevites is the fact that our Party has persistently implemented the revolutionary principle that foreigners (whether allies or enemies) must not meddle in the internal affairs of our country. Remaining constantly vigilant and not permitting any external interference, it has worked out and applied its revolutionary line in a completely independent way and has fought hard to defend our independence from anybody.

5. In the struggle against the Khrushchevite revisionist betrayal the Party of Labour of Albania had the aid and the resolute support of the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist forces. The resolute support which these forces gave our Party added to its strength, determination and confidence in the great battle with the enemies and betrayers of the revolution.
The struggle of the Party of Labour of Albania against Soviet revisionism is an experience of great value. It shows clearly that even a small party of a small country can successfully face up to any enemy, however big and powerful, do battle with it and emerge triumphant, provided it faithfully adheres to Marxist-Leninist principles, provided it pursues a correct line and has sound unity in its ranks, has close links with the people, and provided it proves to be resolute and courageous in the struggle and is confident of victory.
Omer Hashorva

Candidate of Sciences

THE PRESENT SOCIO-ECONOMIC ORDER IN THE SOVIET UNION — A CAPITALIST ORDER

On the basis of a penetrating all-sided analysis, which they made from the beginning of the betrayal by the Khrushchevite revisionists, the PLA and Comrade Enver Hoxha, among other things, predicted that if revisionism were not prevented from coming to the head of the Soviet party and state, this would have fatal consequences for the Bolshevik Party and for the destiny of revolution and socialism in the Soviet Union. Time has proved that the Khrushchevite betrayal caused the socialist order in the Soviet Union to degenerate into a capitalist order. At the 7th Congress of the PLA Comrade Enver Hoxha pointed out: «The Soviet society has become bourgeois down to its tiniest cells, and capitalism has been re-established in all fields.»*

The counter-revolutionary process of the degeneration of socialism and the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union began with the usurpation of the leadership of the party and the state of the Soviet Union by the Khrushchevite revisionists, who gradually brought about their degeneration into a bourgeois party and state. The alteration of the character of the party and the

* Enver Hoxha, Report to the 7th Congress of the PLA, p. 215, Alb. ed.
state, the counter-revolutionary transformation in the field of the political and ideological superstructure, could not fail to lead to the alteration of the character of the structure also, because the new Soviet bourgeoisie could not exist and rule politically and ideologically, without also creating its economic base.

While preserving the external forms of the former socialist property, the Khrushchevite revisionists changed its essence, turned it into capitalist property, both in town and countryside. The economic reforms which they applied in conformity with their capitalist anti-Marxist ideological concepts, for "the perfection of the management and planning of the economy", for "the primary role of material stimuli", as well as other later measures, in fact, made profit the main objective of production, and this, as Karl Marx pointed out, constitutes the absolute law of capitalist relations of production.

With the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, the state socialist property was not fragmented, but degenerated into state monopoly property. This kind of property is the dominant form of property in that country today. State monopoly capitalism extends to all the branches of the economy and services, to industry, agriculture, construction, transport, trade, communications, the financial and credit system, the banks, etc.

Hiding behind Marxist terminology, the Soviet revisionists continue to speak about the planned and centralized management of the economy. However, in the economy of the Soviet Union today, there is only a bureaucratized centralism which is made possible by the specific conditions of the Soviet capitalist order in which state monopoly property is dominant. This gives the Soviet bourgeoisie the possibility to centralize the production and distribution of a portion of the commodities and to set their prices, especially of those commodities which have importance for the militarization of the economy. While preserving some of the forms of organization and management of the former socialist economy, the Soviet bourgeoisie, whose aim is to secure maximum profits,
has at the same time implemented new forms of organization and management, which are suitable to state monopoly capitalism. The «industrial complexes», «agrarian-industrial complexes», various «multi-national companies», etc come within this heading. The Soviet bourgeoisie uses these «new» forms to increase the oppression and exploitation of the Soviet working masses and other peoples of the world, to overcome the difficulties of the crisis which has gripped the Soviet economy, and also because they are more adaptable to the integration of the Soviet economy into the world capitalist economy and the integration of the economies of other revisionist countries into the Soviet economy.

In order to secure maximum profits, the Soviet bourgeoisie, within the framework of bureaucratic centralism has granted the managers of economic enterprises and combines extensive freedoms and competences covering the volume of production, the range of products, prices, the structure of the organization and management, the establishment of links with the market and trade enterprises, engagement and dismissal of workers, etc. These managers, by misusing the competences they have been given, alter even the aim of production, change the range of commodities, direct production towards those goods which are most profitable, and raise the prices of commodities under various pretexts and masked ways, with the main aim of securing the greatest profits possible for themselves and for the entire Soviet bourgeoisie.

Having profit as their loftiest aim, the directors of these economic enterprises and combines organize production in such a manner as to increase the degree of intensification of work, to bring about the reduction of labour force, while a considerable part of the fund of wages «saved» from these «reductions» and dismissals of workers is appropriated by these managers in the form of supplementary bonuses. Thus, the economic enterprises and combines which constitute the main form of state monopoly capitalism in the Soviet economy, are the source of all those laws which operate with all their impact
in the Soviet economy today, such as the law of profit, value, anarchy and competition, etc., which are specific laws on which the economy of every capitalist country is based and developed.

The present-day Soviet economy is characterized by such problems of the capitalist economy as the inharmonious development of its branches, non-utilization of productive capacities, decline in the rates of production, rising prices and cost of living increases, growing inflation, shortages of mass consumer goods on the market, etc. Such phenomena are neither accidental nor temporary, or the difficulties allegedly of the growth of "socialism", as the Soviet revisionists try to present them. They are phenomena which have their roots in the very capitalist nature of the economic order which prevails in the Soviet Union and which, like the whole world capitalist economy, is wallowing in a profound all-round crisis.

In order to disguise the exploiting character of their socio-economic order, the Soviet revisionists in recent years have been making a great demagogic clamour about the rights and competences of the so-called "workers' collectives". According to them the "workers' collectives" have state and economic rights to discuss and solve problems of production and the management of enterprises and institutions, problems of the distribution of cadres, material rewards for the working people, etc.

However, the fact that on such vital problems of the workers as pay, engagement and dismissal from work, etc. it is the managers of enterprises who decide, shows that the rights of the "workers' collectives" are completely formal and they serve as a demagogic cover to hide from the eyes of the workers their oppression by the revisionist bourgeoisie. The so-called rights and competences of the "workers' councils" have been propagated simply to create illusions among the Soviet working people that they are allegedly masters of their own fate, at a time when the Soviet revisionist bourgeoisie decides everything in conformity with its own interests and against the interests of the working people.
In the countryside, as a result of the degeneration of the former collective farm socialist property, the capitalist property of the group has been created, and this represents the second most widespread form of capitalist property in the Soviet Union. The breaking up of the machine and tractor stations, and the selling of their means to the individual agricultural economies, the creation in place of them of so-called regional centres for the repair of agricultural machinery, brought as a consequence that all the means of production in the Soviet agriculture became subject to sale and purchase. The establishment of profit and the material stimulus as the basis of all the activity of the collective farms, the organization in them of piece-work, the extension of the collective farmer's private plot and its transformation into pure private property in the countryside, as well as other measures of this kind, have led to the total all-round degeneration of collective farm socialist property into capitalist group property and the re-establishment of capitalist relations in the whole of Soviet agriculture. On this basis, such phenomena as the absorption and exploitation by the more powerful collective farms of the labour power of the weaker collective farms, economic differentiation among their members, the mass departure of collective farm members for the cities, etc have become rampant.

It is a known fact that the Soviet agriculture of the revisionist Soviet Union has for years been immersed in a grave and deep crisis. It has become the most backward branch of the Soviet capitalist economy. This has forced the Soviet Union to import, among other things, large quantities of grain every year from 1963 onward. And this is explained by the fact that the Soviet revisionist bourgeoisie, guided by the law of maximum profit, is interested in investing most of its capital in those branches of the economy inside or outside the Soviet Union which bring greater profits, rather than in agriculture, to extract it from its backwardness.

As Lenin has stressed, in the conditions of capitalism, small-scale private property exists as a fellow-traveller
with large-scale property. This property exists and is now widespread in the Soviet Union, both in town and in countryside. It constitutes one of the forms of capitalist property in that country, which the Soviet bourgeoisie has permitted and encouraged to develop. To this end, the right to carry out private activity in the skilled trades, agriculture and services, as well as the right of Soviet citizens to have land, livestock and poultry for their personal use, has been legalized in the Soviet revisionist constitution. As a result, a special sector of small-scale private property has been created in the Soviet Union.

To bring out the class nature of the economic order of the Soviet Union it is important to analyze the relations of distribution, the capitalist character of which is more obvious and tangible, so the Soviet revisionists have great difficulty in disguising this.

It is known that these relations depend on and are determined by the property relations. But, as Engels says, «The economic relations of a given society present themselves in first place as interests.»* Analysis of the property relations from this point of view, i.e. in whose interest is property used in the Soviet Union, whom does it serve, reveals its capitalist essence.

The Soviet bourgeoisie uses various ways for the appropriation of surplus value. The biggest part of it is achieved in the form of charges on the funds which the Soviet state receives from the various economic enterprises and combines. It achieves another part of it from the taxes which the Soviet capitalist state extracts from the working masses of town and countryside and which are also sanctioned in the new constitution of the Soviet revisionists. Various kinds of funds have been created in the economic enterprises and combines, such as the «fund of profit», the «fund of material stimuli», etc. the overwhelming bulk of which is appropriated by that part of the bourgeoisie which is at the head of these economic

enterprises and combines. The Soviet bourgeoisie transforms part of this surplus value into functioning capital in order to ensure even greater surplus value in the future, while using a part of it to maintain and finance the large military and bureaucratic apparatus and distributing the remainder amongst its members in the form of high salaries, various bonuses and honoraria.

The ratio of the pay of workers to that of various members of Soviet bourgeoisie varies from 1:10 to 1:30. This means that, regardless of the fact that «the whole people» is formally proclaimed to be the owner of the property, its real, de facto, owner is only a handful of people, who just like the capitalist owners in the other bourgeois countries, appropriate the unpaid labour of workers through high salaries, bonuses and other material privileges.

In order to open the way to the degeneration of the socialist relations in production and to conceal the bourgeois class character of the large differences in pay and rewards, the Soviet revisionists proclaimed the priority of material stimuli in socialism, presenting this as allegedly a Leninist idea. However, everyone knows about the struggle Lenin waged against high salaries and other material privileges in socialist society, which carry the danger of the corruption of cadres and the birth of new bourgeois elements. Speaking about the tasks of the proletarian state in 1918, Lenin forcibly stressed the problem of «creating conditions in which it will be impossible for the bourgeoisie to exist, or for a new bourgeoisie to arise.»* Lenin considered that one of the main factors to achieve this was precisely the struggle against high salaries and the elimination of any material privilege in socialist society. Lenin called high salaries «a bourgeois way» of the treatment of specialists and functionaries, «...a departure from the principles of the Paris Commune and every proletarian state».** However,

** Ibidem, p. 274.
in the Soviet Union, as a result of the restoration of capitalism, high salaries, material stimuli, bonuses, favours, privileges, etc. have been raised to a whole institution in order to appropriate the surplus value extracted from the sweat of working people.

The present-day Soviet economy has been integrated into the world capitalist system. "While American, German, Japanese and other capital has penetrated deeply into the Soviet Union, Soviet capital is being exported to other countries and, in various forms, is merging with local capital."* This integration has assumed extensive proportions and is being carried out in the most varied forms.

The Soviet Union has become one of the countries to which more and more of the capital of Western countries is being exported. Its debts to these countries are calculated at 19 billion dollars. About 500 of the biggest trusts of the Western countries have invested their capital in the form of credit for the construction of industrial projects in the Soviet Union or for the financing of the trade which it carries on with these countries. More than 75 American, West-German, British, Japanese, etc. multinational companies have offices in the Soviet Union. (It is precisely this inflow of monopoly capital from other capitalist countries which has brought them into partnership with the Soviet bourgeoisie for the exploitation of Soviet working people.)

Evidence of the capitalist nature of the economy in the whole Soviet social order can be seen also in the practice of economic relations which the Soviet Union carries on with the other countries of the world, both with the countries of the "socialist community" and with the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. In this practice we see that the Soviet Union makes extensive use of enslaving credits, unequal exchanges, the creation of "multi-national companies" and banks in the other

countries of the world, for the exploitation of peoples. This is a typical neo-colonialist practice which stems from and has its base in the capitalist nature of the economic order of the Soviet Union.

Marxism-Leninism teaches us that politics is the concentrated expression of the economy. The policy of each country is an inevitable consequence and direct product of its economic order, while the character of this policy cannot fail to express the class nature of this order, its physiognomy. Looked at with a Marxist-Leninist eye, the aggressive, war-mongering, hegemonic and expansionist policy which the Soviet Union pursues for the redivision of the world, for the extension of its spheres of influence, to gain possession of sources of raw materials, for the oppression and enslavement of peoples, shows that the economic order on which this imperialist policy is based, cannot be other than the capitalist order, because, as Lenin argues, an aggressive war-mongering external policy is an inevitable product only of the capitalist order.

The radical transformations in the economic structure of the Soviet Union were bound to lead, as they did, to radical changes in the class structure of present-day Soviet society.

On this question, too, in order to conceal the existence in the Soviet Union of a new bourgeois class, the Soviet revisionists, in general, still preserve the external appearance of the erstwhile class structure of socialist society. To bring to light the real nature of this structure one must start from the Leninist teachings, according to which the nature of classes and, consequently, that of the class structure of any society, can be determined correctly only by analysing the real relations of classes to the means of production, their place and role in the management and organization of production and the economy, as well as the size of the share they receive from the social wealth.

The fact that the former state and cooperativist socialist property has been turned into capitalist property, the fact that the working masses of town and country-
side have been stripped of the right to take any real part in the organization and management of production, the fact that a small section of the population such as the bureaucrats, technocrats, the top-level of the military caste and the upper part of the creative intelligentsia, appropriate the greater part of the income of society in various ways, leading a parasitic life, all these things taken together show that in present-day Soviet society there are classes with fundamental opposite economic interests, proletarians and bourgeois. The strata of bureaucrats and apparatchiki, who usurped the leadership of the party and the state, who carried out the «peaceful» counter-revolution, and who seized real possession of the means of production, have now changed into a new bourgeois class. Whereas the working class, which lost its party and political power and which was stripped of the means of production, has been transformed into a simple producing class, an oppressed and exploited class, which lives by selling the commodity labour power.

In order to conceal the capitalist reality of the class structure of present-day Soviet society, the Soviet revisionists spread all kinds of allegedly new «theoretical» theses. This is the aim of their theorizing about the transition of «developed socialist society» towards «social homogeneity» by means of which they claim that in the Soviet Union the distinctions between the working class, the collective farm peasantry and the intelligentsia are allegedly disappearing and being replaced only with working people with common features, thus creating a classless society.

As the classics of Marxism-Leninism have argued, during the revolutionary transformation of socialism into communism, the process of the gradual dying out of class distinctions and classes themselves will certainly occur and, as a consequence, communist society will be created in which, as Marx says, all will be working people. But this can be achieved only by means of the dictatorship of the proletariat, under the leadership of the proletarian party, through consistently waging the class struggle and
applying the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, through the development of the productive forces in a centralized and planned way and the transformation of socialist property into communist property. However, after the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union there can be no more talk of these revolutionary processes.

The Khrushchevites claim that the so-called collective farm peasantry «is being integrated into the working class,» «becoming identical» with this class. This process has nothing in common with socialism and communism, because it is a result of the operation of capitalist laws in Soviet society. The purpose of these claims is to justify the fact of the class disintegration of the Soviet peasantry, which as a result of the capitalist laws, is filling the ranks of the proletariat in town and countryside. It is precisely the process of the polarization of the present-day Soviet capitalist society that the Soviet revisionists try to present as the alleged transition of this society to «social hemogeneity».

Likewise, the claims about «the integration of various detachments of the intelligentsia into the ranks of the working class», about the creation of the «worker intellectual», «worker-collective farmer», «worker-collective farmer-intellectual» social groups, are intended to deny the hegemonic role of the working class and to justify the creation of privileged bourgeois strata in the ranks of the working class, the collective farm peasantry and the intelligentsia.

Analysis of the class structure of present-day Soviet society brings out that, fundamentally, it is identical with the class structure of bourgeois capitalist society. Two main classes exist in it — the new bourgeoisie which is the ruling class and the working class which is an oppressed and exploited class. Besides them, there is the peasantry, also an oppressed class, which is subject to the process of disintegration, a new stratum of intellectuals as well as a new petty-bourgeois stratum comprised of private owners, such as skilled tradesmen, blackmarket-eers and other dealers.
With the degeneration of the proletarian party, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist economic order in the Soviet Union, those factors which, for the first time in history, made it possible to achieve a radical solution on a new basis of the national question, were wiped out. Now this question has again become one of the most acute problems of Soviet society, because in the Soviet Union «Great-Russian chauvinism has been set up as the dominant ideology, national oppression has become part and parcel of the bourgeois class policy pursued by the ruling clique.»*

To conceal this policy from the eyes of the working people within the country and from public opinion abroad, the Soviet revisionists have also worked out their «theory» and practice about «the new historical community of men,» or «the unified Soviet people». While unfurling the banner of such a «theory», they claim that the national problem has allegedly been completely solved in the Soviet Union and such a problem no longer exists. In essence, this «theory», which the Soviet revisionists present as a Leninist idea, is a nationalist and chauvinist view intended to justify the Russification of non-Russian nations and nationalities and to deny their sovereignty and national identity. If those negative phenomena and processes which are occurring, in fact, in the relations between nations and nationalities in the present-day Soviet Union are analyzed from the positions of Marxism-Leninism, these chauvinist aims emerge clearly.

For the denationalization of various nations, the imperialist bourgeoisie has always striven to eliminate their mother tongue and their culture. This is what the Soviet social-imperialists are doing with the non-Russian nations and nationalities. Through the slogan of the creation of «a unified Soviet culture», and «the international culture», the Soviet revisionists are making similar efforts also

---

* Enver Hoxha, Report to the 7th Congress of the PLA p. 215, Alb. ed.
for the Russification of the culture of other nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union.

The alteration of the national structures of the nations and nationalities is another of the main directions in the great-Russian chauvinist policy which the Soviet revisionists pursue and are applying under the slogan of the internationalization of their whole life. In the Republic of Kazakhstan for example, there are 5.5 million Russians, while the 4.5 million Kazakhs are left as a minority and represent only 34 per cent of the population of Kazakhstan. This is a clear example of the great-Russian chauvinist policy pursued by the Soviet revisionists.

The process of the Russification of the population in the other Soviet republics is being carried out ever more extensively. Other factors such as «internal emigration» also assist this process. By means of mechanical movement, the Soviet revisionists displace the populations of other nations en masse from their birthplaces, turning the populations of various nations into what they call a «multi-national collective».

Analysis of these phenomena from the Marxist-Leninist standpoint also reveals the demagogic character of the Soviet revisionists’ claims about their so-called enrichment of Lenin’s idea about the creation of a «new historical community of people of a higher level than the nation». Although they formally enjoy the right of state sovereignty and equality, the Soviet Federal Republics are being transformed simply into administrative territories without real state rights, with completely formal sovereignty. In this bourgeois federation, the Russian Republic occupies a hegemonic position. Irrespective of the demagogic slogans about «equality» of nations, between it and the other republics there is a marked dislevel of the whole economic and social development which is growing wider. In the conditions of the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, the Khrushchevite revisionists utilize Russia’s great human and material potential in order to realize their great Russian chauvinist policy.
In the conditions of imperialism, the existence and extraordinary strengthening of a bureaucratic-military apparatus and other organs of oppression and aggression is characteristic of the states in which a savage dictatorial regime exists and which pursue a hegemonic foreign policy. Such an apparatus exists in the revisionist Soviet Union. The bureaucratic apparatus of the present-day Soviet state is comprised of a whole many-millions strong army of officials and bureaucrats, of the armed forces which amount to more than 3.5 million men and of the other extremely inflated organs of oppression such as the KGB, the courts, the prisons, the concentration camps, the psychiatric hospitals, etc. The militarization of the Soviet state has assumed unprecedented proportions. The annual military budget of the Soviet Union amounts to about 160 billion dollars. This reality shows that the Soviet state is by no means a «socialist», «humanitarian» state of «the entire people», as the Soviet revisionists present it, but is, as Comrade Enver Hoxha described it at the 7th Congress of the PLA «...a capitalist fascist dictatorship».

The Soviet revisionists try to disguise the real nature and functions of their bourgeois-fascist state. After they proclaimed the replacement of the dictatorship of the proletariat with «the state of the entire people», at the beginning of the 1960's, now, to justify the policy of fascist terror and violence which they exert over the working masses, they claim that «the state of the entire people», in essence, is allegedly a direct continuation of the dictatorship of the proletariat. For these same demagogic purposes, the Soviet revisionists spread illusions that the Soviet state «of the entire people», «is not a machine for the oppression of one class by the other class», «is not an organ of the rule of one class over the other class», because the violence which it employs is allegedly directed only against individual persons,
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against vagabonds, murderers, thieves and all those who breach the norms of society. The Soviet state may take and does take measures against people of this category, of course not to defend the working masses, but to protect the class interests of the revisionist bourgeoisie. However, the existence of an extremely large bureaucratic-military machine in the Soviet Union shows that it was not set up, and that there was no need for it to be set up, to suppress individual persons, but it is maintained precisely to oppress and exploit the working class and the working masses as well as to undertake aggressions against the peoples of other countries.

Although for demagogic purposes the Khrushchevite revisionists have not changed the name of the party of the Soviet Union, it has been turned into a bourgeois, fascist party, a carrier of the ideology and policy of oppression and exploitation. It has elaborated the most complete theory and practice of the revisionist counter-revolution for the degeneration of socialism and the restoration of capitalism, tries to find theoretical justification for the policy of social and national oppression within the country and the hegemonic, chauvinistic, aggressive and expansionist policy which the Soviet bourgeoisie pursues towards other countries and peoples of the world. With demagogic slogans about the alleged strengthening of national pride and internationalist aid, the Soviet bourgeois party is trying to implant in the hearts and minds of the Soviet people and nations an aggressive nationalism, the chauvinist spirit of megalomania and omnipotence in order to realize the hegemonic aims of Soviet social-imperialism.

In conformity with their aims and policy of oppression, the Soviet revisionists radically changed the political essence of their party, too, turning it into an organization of oppression just like the army, the KGB, the militia and the other organs of oppression of the present-day Soviet fascist bourgeois state. By enlarging and inflating the basic organizations of the party, by filling their ranks with bureaucrats and technocrats, they have
turned them into inactive and completely formal organizations. At the same time the Soviet revisionists use the leading organs of the party, which, not only at the centre but also at the base, are made up mostly of bureaucrats and technocrats, as repressive organs against all those who oppose and do not obey the revisionist chiefs by organizing big campaigns of purges and condemnation against them, such as that of the years 1973–1974. On the international level, this organization, which bears the name of the communist party, corrupts the chiefs of other revisionist parties as well as chiefs of the bourgeoisie in various countries, employs them in the service of the Soviet bourgeoisie, using them as cat’s paws for interference in those countries. This is what was done in Czechoslovakia and the other former countries of people’s democracy; this is what was done in Angola and recently in Afghanistan, too. Analysis of the activity of the CPSU leads to the unavoidable conclusion that this party has become a bearer of the ideology and policy of oppression and exploitation and has become a regressive organization.
THE SOCIAL-IMPERIALIST CHARACTER OF THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE PRESENT-DAY SOVIET UNION

The retrogressive change which occurred in the course of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union after the death of Stalin constitutes one of the most important aspects of the capitalist degeneration of that country.

In order to grasp the full dimensions of the thoroughly harmful work carried out by the Khrushchevite revisionists in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, we need only mention that they brutally put an end to a majestic historical phenomenon, such as the emergence for the first time in the history of mankind of a socialist foreign policy, not just as an idea but as a practical application.

Almost a century and a half ago Marx and Engels forcefully raised the imperative need for the working class, even without being in power, to have an international policy of its own. According to Marx's laconic definition, the new principles of the foreign policy of the working class ought to be the «simple laws of morality and justice».

At the beginning of the 20th century what had seemed like an unattainable ideal, a utopian dream, in the face of the capitalist jungle, inflamed by the fury of destruction and mass murder, found its realization for the first time with the triumph of the socialist revolution in Russia.
The confrontation between capitalism and socialism has been a constant factor of all the international life of our century. The clash between them along the whole front of the foreign policy has had consequences of exceptional importance in the whole of contemporary history. Fascism did not pass. Socialism overcame its isolation and emerged as an international community. The omnipotence of the big imperialist powers went into crisis. The colonial system disintegrated. A large number of peoples and nations gained consciousness of their ethnic identity, as well as their state independence, and international relations went through unprecedented envigoration and enrichment. All these things occurred under the sign of the superiority of socialism which found full expression in the field of foreign policy, especially after the Second World War.

Socialism passed into the second half of the 20th century giving indisputable proof of its vitality, not only as a socio-economic system within individual societies divided by state borders, but also as an international community built on the foundations of an internationalism which only the working class in power could affirm.

The continuity of this development was interrupted at the 20th Congress of the CPSU. Codifying all the opportunist theories of the past, which it took care to adapt to and link with the major problems of contemporary development, the 20th Congress of the CPSU made a synthesis: that of modern revisionism, as a strategy and tactic for the anti-historical turning back from socialism to capitalism.

*  *

A very important component of the policy inaugurated at the 20th Congress of the CPSU was that which had
to do with the socialist states. At the end of the Second World War, in the practice of the construction of socialism, a new problem arose which was closely linked precisely with the growth of socialism to international proportions: instead of a single socialist country in the period between the two wars, now we have a series of countries which set out on the road of socialism.

«A people that oppresses other peoples cannot be free,» said Marx more than a hundred years ago, proclaiming with this a whole program of striving by the working class to bring about the revolutionary change in the field of international relations too. But there is more than this to the program of socialism in the field of foreign policy: it also includes direct action and constructive contribution to its fullest possible realization in the relations between states. It is self-evident that its most complete realization can and must be achieved in the relations between socialist states and then proletarian internationalism constitutes the foundation of these relations. The socialist camp provided the model of these relations, which was applied for nearly a decade after the Second World War and which of course was expected to be carried further. However, a step towards the destruction of the basis of relations between socialist states was especially taken immediately after the 20th Congress which created real ideological confusion in the ranks of the communist parties and anti-imperialist forces on the most important problems of strategy and tactics. The campaign against Stalin cast a black shadow over the historic experience of the October Revolution and the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union and over its foreign policy.

It was Khrushchev’s aim to subjugate the socialist countries and the communist parties, so that they would become obedient instruments bound hand and foot to the Soviet chariot, and his dictate and arbitrary will would be turned into obligatory norms.

The revisionist group of Khrushchev and his successors found ready-to-hand the international juridical in-
struments to facilitate the implementation of such a policy in practice. We mean the degeneration and the counter-revolutionary transformation of the Warsaw Treaty and the Council of Mutual Economic Aid — Comecon, which today are identical in form and content with the political and economic blocs of the capitalist states of Western Europe, NATO and the Common Market.

When speaking of the Warsaw Treaty and Comecon today, they cannot be judged on the basis of their origin which dates back to more than a quarter of a century ago. Originally created as organs of the political and economic alliance of the former socialist camp to cope with the aggressive strategy of NATO, as well as to carry forward and deepen the new experience of the fraternal collaboration between socialist countries, the Warsaw Treaty and Comecon were transformed into instruments of Soviet hegemony, both within the countries of Eastern Europe and on a European and world scale. In this way, from counterweights to the counter-revolutionary front of the capitalist West they became counter-parts of the savage, declared and undeclared war for the division of spheres of influence and the preservation of the «balance of power». Comrade Enver Hoxha has described NATO and the Warsaw Treaty as «...the main pillars on which all the hegemonistic and expansionist policy of the superpowers is based and carried out, the principal shield protecting their imperialist systems, the fundamental weapons for their rivalry and war preparations...»* while in regard to Comecon and the Common Market, he has pointed out their complementary role «to serve this aggressive, oppressive and exploiting policy.»**

It is self-evident that the burden of this policy weighs, first of all and especially, on the backs of the satellite countries.

In order to prettify a practice of international links
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which have all the capitalist features, various slogans and «theories» have been put into circulation which, although heavily loaded with Marxist phraseology, are obviously clumsy misrepresentations which cannot withstand any criticism.

From this viewpoint, the first which comes into consideration, is the «theory» of «limited sovereignty» which has enriched the arsenal of propaganda means whereby the reactionary bourgeoisie attacks the basic principles of international relations. Everyone knows that this theory was spread by the revisionist clique of the Kremlin, precisely in connection with the aggression against Czechoslovakia in 1968. This fact alone is sufficient to demonstrate that the aim of theories of this nature is to ensure that ideological and juridical platform on which the policy of aggression, dictate and brutal naked violence can be based. This theory tries to prove that the interests of the «socialist community» constitute «the supreme sovereign right», and therefore they must take priority. As to the interests of this or that individual state, the ordinary members of this «community», they are described as «narrow and individual» and as such are dependent on and conditioned by the higher general interests.

The fraudulent character of the «theory» of «limited sovereignty» becomes immediately obvious if one bears in mind that it is precisely the leadership of the Kremlin which is the «supreme instance», which has the absolute, exclusive right to determine the restriction of the sovereignty of each member state under the pretext that this sovereignty is contrary to «the major interests of the socialist family». The best illustration of the mechanism of such an action can be found in Czechoslovakia in 1968. In this way the «collective» aggression of the Warsaw Treaty against one of the member states assumed the force of a precedent, not only for relations within the bloc but eventually outside it, too. Thus the case of Afghanistan is added to that of Czechoslovakia, on the basis of an extremely broad social-imperialist interpreta-
tion of «proletarian internationalism». With this, the sphere of action of the «theory» of «limited sovereignty» extended its bounds: it is no longer restricted to the «socialist» countries of Eastern Europe which are «covered» by the Warsaw Treaty, but is extended more broadly, taking in other countries and geographical zones.

The «theory» of «limited sovereignty» marks a definite stage, a new step in the elaboration of the platform of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. On the one hand, this (theory) is a vivid expression of the deepening of the hegemonic social-imperialist course of Soviet foreign policy which finds its primary sphere and most complete application in Eastern Europe. On the other hand, it is linked with the ever more obvious change in the relationship of the countries of Eastern Europe with the Soviet Union in the direction of increasing their dependence to the point of the loss of the main attributes of state sovereignty.

At the 25th Congress of the CPSU Leonid Brezhnev declared openly that «the process of gradual unification of socialist countries is now operating as an objective law which requires that states of the socialist community must combat isolation and national exclusiveness.»

The «theoretical» elaboration of this process of the concentration in the hands of the Kremlin of the attributes of state sovereignty within the framework of the «socialist community» has not come to an end with this. From this point of view, a significant development a year or two ago is what was called the «theory of the socialist nation», which was dealt with especially in the Czechoslovak press.

In itself, this marks a very advanced step in the theoretical mystification in connection with the «socialist community». It is claimed that this is the harbinger of a more profound union of the countries of Eastern Europe on a federal basis, a union which would have no other role but that of extending the borders of the existing Soviet federation. Thus, directly or indirectly, it is
claimed that the «objective conditions» exist today for the creation of «the socialist people in the countries of the socialist community.» It is claimed that the experience of the Soviet Union over many years has indicated the road of «coming together», of «overcoming contradictions», of «the blending», or «alignment of specific national peculiarities», which must lead finally to the creation of «a socialist people». To this end, of course the notions of «socialist patriotism» and «proletarian internationalism» are distorted. «Pravda» of Bratislava some time ago quoted a member of the Presidium of the CP of Czechoslovakia, Bylak, who demanded that «socialist patriotism must be understood as a stand towards the whole socialist community, in which the Soviet Union has a decisive role». This of course is a jeer at what they call «the harmful consequences of a narrow and one-sided concept of independence, sovereignty, equality and non-interference» in the relations between countries of the community.

Brezhnev’s «proletarian internationalism» is likewise undergoing transformations to adapt it to the aims of the Soviet expansionism. It has to serve as «the foundation on which the integration of all fields of life of the countries of socialist community is based.» And in order to ensure that this does not remain an empty slogan, an extensive program for the «complex integration» of the economy, culture, art, education and all other sections has been worked out, a program which the Soviet revisionists are trying to implement «through the now institutionalized military-political and ideological joint actions» on the scale of the «community».

From all this it is not difficult to reach the conclusion that the objective of Soviet policy in relations with the satellite countries of Eastern Europe is to consolidate the domination of the Soviet Union and to extend the border of the empire, which may change its name but not its content.
In the whole framework of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union after the 20th Congress, the evolution of relations with the capitalist states and especially with the USA, as the main imperialist power, assumes particular importance. Immediately after the death of Stalin, but more obviously after the 20th Congress, the tendency can be clearly seen to build a new relationship with the capitalist world in general, and first of all with American imperialism, over the whole front of foreign policy. Consequently the confrontation with the capitalist states, with American imperialism in particular, would be done from standpoints different from those of the period of the emergence of the Soviet Union as a great socialist power. Now the Soviet Union has emerged on the stage of world politics as a partner and, at the same time, as a rival in the great struggle for markets and spheres of influence. «...Soviet socialimperialism is no longer satisfied with the domination it exercises over the satellite states» of Eastern Europe, points out Comrade Enver Hoxha. «Like the other imperialist states the Soviet Union is now fighting for new markets, for spheres of influence, to invest its capital in various countries, to monopolize sources of raw materials ...»*

In other words, the Soviet Union has changed from a factor of innovation in foreign relations into one of the main protagonists in the great imperialist contest for the division of the booty and the «balance of power». This is the reason that these last twenty years have been characterized by a great about-turn in the whole structure of international relations in the contemporary period, in which collaboration and alliance, on the one hand, and competition and rivalry, on the other, between the two superpowers are the two sides of the same medal.

In the final analysis, this is something very well known, especially in the history of Europe at the end of the last century and the beginning of this century: the great imperialist powers of Europe have acted «in concert» as a «supreme instance», as «directorate» on an international level, going through phases of agreement, conciliation, pacifist euphoria, as well as clashes of antagonistic interests, up to major crises which have ended in the outbreak of imperialist wars. The special feature here is, first, that the Soviet Union, a former socialist power, has joined this «company», and second, that the circle has been narrowed and reduced to a minimum, to the pair USA-SU. The other capitalist states, to which the superpowers allocate the role of «secondary powers», cannot be in agreement with this reduction of the circle of «the mighty». It is true that the United Nations Charter proclaims five great powers, to which certain prerogatives and special responsibilities on an international scale are recognized, but in practice this has long been a thing of the past. Both in Washington and Moscow claims are now made openly that the fate of the whole of mankind is in the hands of the two superpowers, that both «fine weather» and «storms» in the relations between states depend on them and them alone.

The monopoly which the two superpowers want to impose in the «settlement» of problems of world policy, comes within this contest. Comrade Enver Hoxha says, «...On all the major international problems they try to come out with a co-ordinated policy and with a common stand towards third parties...»* «Their aim», continues Comrade Enver Hoxha is «...to compel the other states to entrust their fate to the two superpowers, so that they become arbiters, not only of the foreign affairs of the other countries but also of their internal affairs. The two superpowers want acceptance of their will and dic-

tate to be raised to a law and norm of international life.*

Both the bourgeois and the revisionist propaganda are in unison in their efforts to prove that the Soviet-American agreement is the only guarantee for securing peace in the present-day conditions. This is neither new nor original. In every historical period pacifist labels have been stuck on the dictate of the mighty.

This process of the concentration in the topmost spheres of world politics, the transition from the «powers in concert» to the two superpowers, in reality, has not reduced but, on the contrary, has added to the dangers, both for the individual countries and for peace and collaboration amongst the peoples.

Despite the efforts of the bourgeois and revisionist propaganda to present the Soviet-American agreement, the «balance of powers» between the two superpowers, as the only basis for international security and peace, the reality of relations between the USA and the Soviet Union demonstrates clearly that the secret or public agreements between them are not able to put an end to their quarrels and disagreements. They have only a temporary importance, are «ceasefires» in the protracted, never-ending, merciless struggle which puts the two superpowers eyeball to eyeball.

The experience of these recent years demonstrates very clearly that the Soviet Union is irrevocably committed to the expansionist policy, that it has completely adopted the imperialist logic in the field of foreign policy. It has conformed completely to the rule of «filling the vacuums». Thus the partial withdrawal of American imperialism from Southeast Asia, because of its defeat in Vietnam, corresponds to the general advance of Soviet social-imperialism in many regions of the world, especially in Asia and Africa. The events in Angola and Ethiopia, and now the recent military occupation of Afghanistan—
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tan, are clear evidence of the great drive of the Soviet Union on its course for world hegemony.

On the other hand, it would be wrong to claim that the world political scene today looks like a confrontation of the two superpowers alone. In reality, the situation is much more complicated and is an extraordinary tangle of contradictions. In his work «Imperialism and the Revolution», Comrade Enver Hoxha dwells especially on this aspect of the present world situation. «A very complex situation has been created in the world at present,» says Comrade Enver Hoxha. «Operating in the international arena today are various imperialist and various social-imperialist forces, which, on the one hand, are fighting in unison against the revolution and the freedom of the peoples and, on the other hand, are contesting and clashing with one another over markets, spheres of influence and hegemony. Now, in addition to the Soviet-American rivalry for world domination, there are the expansionist claims of Chinese social-imperialism, the predatory ambitions of Japanese militarism, the strivings of West-German imperialism for living space, the fierce competition of the European Common Market which has turned its eyes towards the old colonies.»*

Especially prominent among these groups of large and medium powers which likewise want to occupy the place «which belongs to them» in the arena of the clash of interests is the imperialist China of the present day. What was said about Italy last century could be said about China today, that «it is developing its appetite before its teeth». The chronic backwardness of China in every field, its lack of economic industrial potential, on the one hand, and on the other hand, all the twists and turns on the course which it has been following for decades on end, the lack of a clearly defined political program, all the «Chinese puzzles» in policy, have brought about that present-day China does not have sufficient
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wind to keep pace with the biggest powers. However, the revisionist clique in Beijing is no less determined to join the «superpower club» as a third partner. At present, China is caught up completely in the great diplomatic game, not only on the regional Asiatic scale, but on the world scale, and this it does openly from the positions of a great power which intends to enter the ranks of the superpowers. To achieve this aim the revisionist leadership in Beijing has made a strategic choice which it thinks conforms best to the current circumstances; it has chosen total confrontation with the Soviet Union in alliance with the American superpower. Soviet social-imperialism has accepted the challenge and today we are witnesses to the rivalry of the two great «communist» powers, especially in the Far East. From this the bourgeois propaganda is hastening to prove that capitalism is not the only source of evil, that «communism» has brought no alterations», «has not made any radical change» in «traditional» international relations. However, today it has become ever more clear that this is one of the usual falsifications of the bourgeois propaganda, because the international activity of both the Soviet Union and China is completely identical with the imperialist policy and it has fully consummated its break with the ideals of socialism in the field of foreign policy.

*

The stands and actions of the Soviet Union in regard to the countries and peoples who have achieved or aspire to a state existence of their own, after the disintegration of the old colonial empires, comprise a very important characteristic of the foreign policy in the Soviet Union. Here the social-imperialist course of Soviet
foreign policy finds a field in which it is expressed especially clearly.

The process of affirmation and consolidation of a large number of nations and nationalities of different continents after centuries of bondage runs through new efforts, no less difficult and requiring, no less commitment than the anti-colonial liberation armed struggle. The present world reality is dominated also by the contrast between the big «wealthy», so-called «civilized», industrial countries and the poor, former colonial or «developing» countries as they are often called. This contrast is referred to in geographical terms, the «North-South relationship», no doubt in an attempt to justify the present flagrant injustice as an accident of fate determined by natural conditions. This great confrontation, which constitutes one of the most significant expressions of the class struggle on the international scale at the present time, finds the revisionist Soviet Union lined up completely on the same side of the barricade as «the wealthy» and the exploiters, beside the imperialist bourgeoisie.

Of course it would be an idle illusion to think of the world of undeveloped countries as something homogeneous, either from the viewpoint of their socio-economic order, or from their political orientations. In particular, the Chinese revisionist scheme about the division of the present-day world in three and about the so-called «third world» as the main motive force of the historical development of the epoch, which Lenin recognized as belonging to the proletarian revolution, must be rejected as baseless and misleading. Nevertheless, it is a fact that the «subcontinents» of Asia, Africa and Latin America are regarded to this day globally, as a sphere for the extension of interests, for the all-round activities of the bigger and wealthier powers and the only relationship which the capitalist and revisionist powers wish to build and perpetuate in regard to these countries is that of their subjugation and exploitation.

The Soviet Union has now joined in this dance, therefore these last two decades are characterized by increa-
sing aggressiveness in its foreign policy, with special aims in the direction of the former colonial countries. The division of «the booty» had been made, but its redivision goes on permanently and step by step, systematically and persistently, the Soviet superpower is smoothing out the obstacles and opening paths in order to take the place «which belongs to it» in the great imperialist partnership.

In the application of this policy a definite role has been allocated to the revisionist parties which have become the bearers of the interests of Soviet social-imperialism, simple instruments of Soviet foreign policy. In open contradiction to the former practices of the time of the Communist International, when the communist parties everywhere, but especially in the oppressed colonial and semi-colonial countries, acted as advanced detachments which were united by a single cause under the banner of revolutionary national-liberation ideals, today these parties have turned into conspiratorial agencies, into a fifth column, which carry out allocated «missions» on account of the revisionist leading centre, in order to smooth the way to the hegemony of the Soviet Union in the respective countries. However, the bonds of «loyalty» of these parties and groups towards Moscow are now known to all, and they frequently expose the game of the Soviet leadership prematurely. That is why Moscow frequently operates outside the «solidarity» with the «sister» parties, takes the course of «pragmatism», and enters into agreement with the most reactionary anti-communist regimes. The revisionists of Moscow, points out Comrade Enver Hoxha «...according to the occasion and circumstances, also try to corrupt and bribe the ruling cliques in the undeveloped countries, offer enslaving economic ‘aid’ in order to get a foothold in these countries, stir up armed conflicts among the different cliques siding with one or the other, and organize plots and putsches to bring pro-Soviet regimes to power.»*

The Soviet social-imperialists also have «specific socialist» labels, ready-made to stick on «new spheres of influence» which they manage to secure in various ways. Provided only that these countries link themselves with the expansionist policy of the Soviet Union, they are declared to be «bearers of the non-capitalist road to development», of «the socialist orientation», of new «original, intermediate» forms of the transition to socialism. However, the great powers' game is a «gamble», as Lenin said at the beginning of the century. Luck changes: Soviet social-imperialism has successes, but also has defeats. In conformity with this, the list of countries «of the socialist orientation» and «the non-capitalist road» is subject to continual correction in Moscow. The only criterion is to what extent this or that country is ready to open its doors to the penetration of Soviet influence.

In the present-day policy of the Soviet Union towards the undeveloped countries today there are ever more powerful expressions of the militarist tendency, that of playing with fire, of brandishing arms, which is fraught with very dangerous consequences not only for the peoples of these countries, but also for world peace. This tendency has two aspects: first, the trade in arms, and second, direct military intervention.

The Soviet Union, along with the United States, is one of the two biggest arms dealers at the present time. If the traffic in the means of war has reached the flourishing level it has today, one of the reasons is that the Soviet Union is fully involved in this activity which is doubly profitable: as a means of securing certain political positions and as a business operation which brings great profits. Here politics is mixed with business in order to serve a single aim, that of realizing the hegemonic ideas of the Soviet superpower.

On the other hand, the reality has shown in many cases that the trade in arms is the prelude to open military intervention and this, in particular, expresses the strengthening of the military tendency in Soviet foreign policy. Soviet expansion demands new horizons. Europe does
not provide all the necessary space. Now Africa, Asia, the undeveloped countries are the focus of its aims. Angola, Ethiopia, and following them, Afghanistan are typical instances of intervention by force of arms and, undoubtedly, from the two former examples to the third, Afghanistan, we have an extension of the commitment of Soviet power, in which the Kremlin threw its own military forces directly into the field of battle.

The policy of the Soviet Union towards the «third world» has now assumed all the fundamental features which are characteristic of the imperialism of our time. As such, it constantly brings up new elements of tension and contrast, which give rise to great heat in the current international relations and greatly increase the danger of war.

* * *

Comrade Enver Hoxha’s speech at the Moscow Meeting of the 81 parties 20 years ago was not only an act of unrivalled political courage. It marked a very important stage in the struggle against modern revisionism, as the most refined form of bourgeois opportunism and the most dangerous trend which has ever threatened Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary movement of the working class in the second half of the 20th century.

When Comrade Enver Hoxha, twenty years ago, denounced the violation of the Leninist principles of foreign policy by the Khrushchevite revisionists, especially in regard to Albania, there were many who described this as almost a sacrilege and heresy, but the development of events proved that our Party was right, showed that its act in Moscow that November was not the fruit of «haste» or «hot-headedness», as Khrushchev and company claimed, but was a correct assessment of the situation and an accurate prediction of what would occur later.
Today it can be seen clearly that the Soviet Union is emerging more and more as a second «international gendarme». Especially in the countries of Eastern Europe, but also within more remote limits which are included within the social-imperialist concept of «the sphere of the most direct interests», the danger of brutal Soviet intervention is hanging over the heads of the peoples.

Another great merit of our Party is that it never ceased its struggle against the pacifist illusions about which the bourgeois and revisionist propaganda make such a clamour. Making a correct assessment of the real factors in the international life of the world today, our Party has continually stressed that the different slogans about «reduction of tension» and the «guarantee of peace» in Europe and the world, about the «limitation of armaments» and the «world without wars and without weapons» are products of bourgeois and revisionist concepts which pave the way to war precisely when there is most talk about peace.

All the activity of our Party and state in the field of foreign policy has been carried out under the emblem of the principled struggle for complete equality in international relations, for the full right which belongs to every state, regardless of its potential or size, to take part actively in international life and to have its say on the major problems of world policy. By exercising this right extensively in practice, either to defend the interests of the homeland, or to express its own views with courage and dignity, without sparing profound principled criticism in the field of foreign policy, our Party and socialist state have made and are making a valuable contribution to the development of the historic process of the emancipation of the smaller states from the dictate and tutelage of the bigger ones. Indeed, one of the distinctive features which give a real, concrete character of the independence of the foreign policy of the People’s Socialist Republic of Albania is precisely its active role in the strug-
gle of world historic importance, in which an ever greater number of states are joining, to oppose the hegemonic policy of capitalist and revisionist states, and especially of the two superpowers.
Sevo Tarifa

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA’S SPEECH AT THE MOSCOW MEETING — A WORK OF HISTORIC IMPORTANCE

The Moscow Meeting of November 1960 was a stern ideological battle. Its proceedings can be divided into two separate phases:

The first phase is that of the beginning of the meeting, which was characterized by unreal calm. Khrushchev tried to create the impression that the meeting would proceed quietly, peacefully, without open attacks, but it was he who began the attack, of course, without mentioning anyone by name. With this tactic, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha in his book «The Khrushchevites», Khrushchev «wanted to warn us: 'Take your pick, either general attacks without any names, but with everybody understanding for whom they are intended, or if you don’t like it that way, we shall attack you openly'». * Meanwhile, outside the conference hall, in the corridors, intrigues and backstage deals were hatched up, pressures, threats, blackmail and working on delegates in the Khrushchevite style continued.

The second phase is that of the open discussion and the exposure of Khrushchev and his group. The aim and

tactics of our Party were: «We do not accept peace for the sake of peace in the communist movement; we do not permit errors to be covered up. We cannot allow the Moscow Meeting be a «meeting of revisionists» and right-wing pacifists; we shall fight to make it a militant, constructive, Marxist meeting. There is no other way.»* And the turning point in the Moscow Meeting was reached when Comrade Enver Hoxha made his historic speech.

This speech was a sharp sword aimed against the distortions of Marxism-Leninism by Khrushchev and his group. Defence of Marxism-Leninism, profoundly in the party spirit and with adherence to lofty proletarian class principles, was its essence.

Our Party had pledged: «We shall go to Moscow not with ten flags, but with only one, with the banner of Marxism-Leninism». Therefore, the central idea of the speech at the Moscow Meeting was: «We must make no concessions over principles»; «He who puts his trust in the enemy will sooner or later be the loser.» Proceeding from these positions, this speech deals scientifically with problems of the revolutionary theory and practice, of the strategy and tactics in the international communist movement. Hitting right on the mark, Comrade Enver Hoxha showed that the origin of the evil in the ranks of international communism lay in the anti-Marxist theses of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. And he fearlessly declared to the Moscow Meeting: «If anyone considers our struggle against revisionism, dogmatism or sectarianism, we say to him: take off your revisionist spectacles and you will see more clearly.»**

In his speech at the Moscow Meeting, Comrade Enver Hoxha consistently defended proletarian internationalism. To the revisionist pressure that by fighting against Khrushchev we were allegedly against the Soviet Union, he replied: «Our Party puts the problem in this way: shall we pat the back of Khrushchev, this arch

---

** Ibidem, p. 463.
enemy of the Soviet Union, or should we say to the Soviet people: there is your enemy! We are sure that it is better to tell the Soviet people the reality, because in this way we carry out our internationalist duty.»** The time was past when the stand towards the Soviet Union, as the centre of the world revolution, was the criterion of the proletarian internationalism. With the advent to power of the Khrushchev group this criterion had to be applied in the opposite way: he who fought the Soviet revisionists and exposed their betrayal was an internationalist and a revolutionary. That is precisely what our Party did at the Moscow Meeting.

In this speech, the struggle for the defence of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and the struggle for the defence of the lofty interests of our people and Homeland are combined in a single whole. At those critical moments of great importance for the fate of socialism and the international communist movement, our Party had to choose between two roads: first, the road of refusal to submit to the revisionist Soviet leadership, which was a rough road but the only one leading to victory; or second, the road of submission to the Khrushchevite traitors, a road strewn with flowers and laurels, but which led to disaster.

Our Party chose wisely and resolutely followed the former road. The latter road meant we would lose the independence of the Homeland. Therefore, at the Moscow Meeting Comrade Enver Hoxha said: «May we be cursed by our mother’s milk, may we be cursed by the bread with which the Party and the people nurture us, if we fail to defend the interests of our people.»** Under the motto, «by defending Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism we defend the interests of our people and Homeland,» he courageously and consistently unmasked the hostile intentions of the Khrushchevites towards the Party of Labour of Albania and its leadership

which were: to «convince» the leadership of our Party of
the «correctness» of the line which the Soviet Union
followed in all directions; to discredit our Party, to present
it as if it had left the rails of Marxism-Leninism and was
not a socialist country; to force the Party of Labour of
Albania to change the correct stand it maintained at
Bucharest, to undermine its unity, to split and overthrow
its leadership.

The exposure of these anti-Albanian aims and me-
thods by our Party was not done with kid gloves, but
with open criticism and ideological courage. The time
had come to put the finger on the sore spot. «We could
not call ourselves communists,» Comrade Enver Hoxha
declared, «if we were to close our mouth in the face of
distortions of Marxism-Leninism..., regardless of the fact
that the violators and the deviators, in the concrete case,
are the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet
Union.»* And with his characteristic great courage he
told Khrushchev at the Moscow Meeting: «It is not we
who are acting like the Yugoslavs, but you who are using
methods alien to Marxism-Leninism against our Party.»**

While Comrade Enver Hoxha, with great courage and
iron logic waged a principled struggle and fearlessly un-
masked the opportunist views and actions of the modern
revisionists, Mao Zedong had long been currying favour
with Khrushchev, while allegedly criticizing him in a
figurative way: «You, Comrade Khrushchev, are like a
beautiful lotus, nevertheless, you need the support of
green leaves...» (From the speech to the Moscow Meeting,
November 18, 1957, p. 11, CPA.)

The principled stand of our Party at the Moscow
Meeting speaks of its great strength. It found this strength
in Marxism-Leninism, in the steel unity of its ranks about
which Comrade Enver Hoxha says: «We must safeguard
our Party, safeguard it with love, tenderness, vigilance,
because the arrows of the enemy are aimed against it.»***

---

** Ibidem, p. 424.
Comrade Enver Hoxha’s speech at the Moscow Meeting was a stern indictment against modern revisionism, in general, and against Khrushchevite revisionism, in particular. The revisionists were wrong in their calculations. The stone they picked up to throw at our Party fell on their own heads. In his letter to the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of our Party, Comrade Hysni Kapo wrote: «...When Comrade Enver Hoxha began to mention the facts, especially about what Khrushchev had done, all of them (Khrushchev and the other members of the Presidium of the CPSU-S.T.) turned red with anger, seemed revolted and bursting with indignation... The members of the other delegations listened with such fixed attention that there was not the slightest movement of their heads or hands.»*

These were long-range ideological «bombs». The speech which Comrade Enver Hoxha delivered in Moscow became the talk of the day everywhere. When it was published it had great international repercussions. Many well-wishers expressed themselves in terms such as: «The temperament of the Albanian leadership in Moscow was necessary and indispensable»; «Your line is correct and we have great respect for your leadership»; «Stand firm, because if any danger threatens you, everyone will rise on his feet to defend Albania.» Articles in the world press had such titles: «Indictment by Mr. Enver Hoxha»; «An important document in the international communist movement»; «Invaluable aid from the Party of Labour of Albania»; «A document of great ideological, political and historical value»; «Every phrase of this speech carries the Marxist-Leninist truth, testifies to the indomitable courage of the Party and of the small Albanian people, who are so great in the history of the international communist and workers’ movement and before the entire world»; «We thank the glorious Albanian people, their heroic Party of Labour and the outstanding leader Enver Hoxha.» Our Party’s speech in Moscow was called

«a bomb and a banner»: a bomb for the imperialists and the revisionists and a banner for the peoples and the proletariat. Its content remains so to this day.

Following this speech, the Khrushchevites hoped that the Albanian communists and the Albanian people would rise against their leadership. But the opposite occurred. The unity of the ranks of the Party and the Party-people unity were steeled as never before. A new revolutionary impetus to carry out the tasks burst out everywhere in our country. The historic speech delivered at the Moscow Meeting raised the reputation of our Party even higher.

* * *

Time has proved the correctness of this speech and the far-sightedness of Comrade Enver Hoxha. Khrushchev degenerated and was pushed off the political stage. His successors, Brezhnev and company, have suffered continual defeats. This is the fate of all revisionists of every hue. Their end is inglorious. Glory belongs only to Marxism-Leninism.
THE STAND OF THE PLA IN THE BUCHAREST MEETING — A REVOLUTIONARY MARXIST-LENINIST STAND

«Judging from the aims which the Khrushchevites sought to achieve,» says Comrade Enver Hoxha, «politically, ideologically and organizationally, the Bucharest Meeting was a Trotskyite, anti-Marxist, revisionist putsch. From the form of its organization, too, this meeting was a plot from start to finish.»*

The great merit of the leadership of the PLA is that it detected this anti-Marxist plot hatched up by Khrushchev and his henchmen from the very beginning, that it strongly opposed it, unmasked it and condemned it in the face of the plotters themselves.

There are many concrete reasons why the PLA was able to discover and oppose this revisionist plot, but they can be summed up as the imbuing of our Party with the principles and norms of Marxism-Leninism, its loyalty to these principles and norms, and its revolutionary courage to defend them at any time, before anyone.

The Soviet leadership unilaterally changed the purpose of the Bucharest Meeting, on which the participating parties had previously agreed, and arbitrarily replaced it with another purpose, that of attacking the CP of China, (we say arbitrarily, because the opinion of the PLA on this change was not sought and it was not told whether

or not the other parties, which were to participate in the Meeting, had been consulted.)

This was followed by other equally arbitrary actions and methods: the material of only one side, the Soviet side, was handed out before the Meeting, when it is recognized that in order to pass judgement on a conflict, it is necessary to know the opinions of both sides; solidarity with the Soviet material was demanded there and then, when it is known that before a party can express its opinion it must have the necessary time to examine the problem, to discuss it in its leadership and then pronounce itself in a joint party meeting; impermissible pressure was exerted and unscrupulous attempts were made to ensure that the delegations participating in the meeting danced to the Soviet tune; the party facing the accusations was not asked to present its material and even when it wanted to speak, its time to do so was restricted to the minimum, because, as Khrushchev blissfully remarked: «We are communists but even God does not give us the strength to stand up to very long meetings. Besides, as a trade unionist, I ask the comrades to respect the working hours.» (Minutes of the Bucharest Meeting, CPA.)

Without going into the content of the problems raised at the meeting, just these actions and methods of the Soviet leadership at the Bucharest Meeting constituted a complete departure from the most elementary principles and norms of Leninist relations between parties. Therefore, for a party which considers and respects itself as a genuine Marxist-Leninist party, there was only one stand which it was possible to take towards such violations: strong and open opposition to those actions, regardless of who committed them. And this is exactly what the Party of Labour of Albania did in Bucharest: it did not allow the violation of the norms and rules of Marxism-Leninism, but rose in their defence, with heroism and courage.

In Bucharest, Khrushchev and his henchmen violated the Leninist principles and norms deliberately, consistently, and persistently in order to achieve a definite aim:
to subjugate all the communist and workers’ parties of the world, and harness them firmly to their revisionist chariot, especially the most «disobedient» two, the Party of Labour of Albania and the Communist Party of China which, at that time, for different motives and reasons, had come out in opposition to the Khrushchevite leadership.

Judging the aim of the Khrushchevites and the ways they followed to achieve it, after the Bucharest Meeting, the PLA drew the only possible correct conclusion: what the Soviet leadership did in Bucharest was an anti-Marxist plot hatched up behind the scenes. Having reached this correct conclusion, the leadership of the PLA immediately defined the correct stand it had to maintain: no conciliation with the plot and the plotters, struggle to defend Marxism-Leninism and the correct line of our Party.

Another great merit of the PLA is that not just when the plot was put into operation, but even beforehand, it had sensed that the leadership of the CPSU might hatch up something dangerous and anti-Marxist in Bucharest, therefore it took all precautions to avoid slipping into any mistaken stand.

The first suspicions about the plot arose on June 4, 1960, when the ambassador of the Soviet Union in Albania, Ivanov, handed to Comrade Enver Hoxha the letter of the Soviet leadership of June 2. As is known, in this letter, Khrushchev suggested that a joint meeting of the sister parties be organized «for exchange of opinions on the problems of the present international situation» which had emerged «after the failure of the summit conference in Paris.» (Letter of the CC of the CPSU to the CC of the PLA, June 2, CPA.)

Comrade Enver Hoxha asked Ivanov two questions: «Will all the parties or only the parties of the socialist countries attend the meeting?» and «Have the Yugoslavs been invited to the meeting?» (Minutes of the meeting of the Political Bureau of the CC of the PLA, June 6, 1960, CPA.) As usual, the Khrushchevite ambassador did not reply, but with these two questions Comrade Enver Hoxha
wanted to clarify the main question: Could it be that, through the Bucharest Meeting, under cover of discussion of the «international situation», Khrushchev wanted to settle accounts with the parties which were not obedient to his line? Two days later, Comrade Enver Hoxha expressed this doubt again in a meeting of the Political Bureau and on that same day, June 6, 1960, he wrote in his diary; «Khrushchev’s aim is to deal with the serious Soviet-Chinese disagreements quickly and superficially in Bucharest, and by so doing he wants to prevent if he can, or diminish the value of the forthcoming Moscow Meeting. This is a sly and unacceptable manoeuvre on the part of Khrushchev.» Just 15 days later, this prediction was proved correct.

When the letter of the Soviet leadership of June 7 arrived, it became even clearer that Khrushchev was hatching up something sinister in Bucharest. In order to conceal any trace of the plot and to eliminate any doubts that might have arisen, Khrushchev, in this letter proposed, on the one hand, that the discussion in Bucharest should be only «to set the time for the Moscow Meeting» while on the other hand, as if in passing, he added that «the possibility of exchange of opinions is not ruled out.» The far-sighted and mature stand which the leadership of the PLA took in this new situation is well known: it was decided that Comrade Enver Hoxha should not go to Bucharest but the delegation would be headed by Comrade Hysni Kapo; he was to take part in the meeting and on behalf of the Political Bureau of the CC decide only on what had been agreed on, i.e., discussion of the place and time of the forthcoming meeting. If Khrushchev made any attempt to open up discussion on the major political and ideological problems which were worrying the communist movement and which had been manifested in various ways between the CP of the Soviet Union and the CP of China, our delegation would not only refuse to pronounce on them, but must also refuse to agree that these problems should be discussed at all. They would be dealt
with at the coming meeting. The Bucharest Meeting should discuss only the place and time of that meeting. Our delegation, headed by Comrade Hysni Kapo, acted precisely as instructed and carried out the duty with which the Party had charged it with honour and glory.

What is the truth about the defence which the PLA made of the CP of China in Bucharest (and later in Moscow), or more precisely, what did our Party of Labour defend there?

In Bucharest and Moscow, the Party of Labour of Albania did not come out in defence of the Communist Party of China proceeding à priori from the fact that the Communist Party of China was being attacked. No, the reasons go much deeper, they have to do with principles.

First, as was stressed above, the ways and methods which the Soviet leadership used to attack a sister party (in this case it happened to be the Communist Party of China, just as it might well have been any other communist party of the former socialist camp or of any capitalist country), were wrong, improper, anti-Marxist. The PLA could not reconcile itself to these anti-Marxist ways and methods and this was precisely the essence of the PLA’s objections in Bucharest.

Second, the accusations of the Soviet leadership against the CP of China over the way it interpreted and dealt in practice with a series of fundamental issues of the international communist movement and the international situation were, at the same time, accusations directed against the PLA, and above all, were a rejection of Marxism-Leninism. The stand of the PLA over these fundamental problems was identical with the stand that the CP of China seemed to maintain at that time. (As to how and why it came about that the CP of China at that period had to maintain such stands, which in many instances appeared to be correct and Marxist-Leninist is another matter.) What must be stressed in the period under discussion, is the main fact that in connection with the stand which it maintained towards the problems which were
discussed, the Party of Labour of Albania proceeded solely from the fact that this was what Marxism-Leninism taught it, this was how Marxism-Leninism, and consequently, any party which came out in defence of Marxism-Leninism, should be defended.

Time has fully confirmed all these things.

Another question might be asked: Why did the PLA refrain from pronouncing itself in Bucharest on the content of the problems under discussion?

The strength and ability of a party is displayed not only when it opposes an evil, but also when it clearly defines when, where and how this evil must be opposed, when it launches its attack, not at random, in a haphazard way, but at the right time and place, on the basis of a clear revolutionary tactic and strategy.

And this strength and ability of our Party was manifested in Bucharest.

It did not pronounce itself on the major problems there, because it correctly considered the Bucharest Meeting completely out of order, and to pronounce itself there, meant to fall into the trap set by Khrushchev, who wanted to get away with a superficial treatment of the major problems, whereas the traitor had to be attacked, not just by tripping him up, but with an earthquake which would crush him.

Not all the communist and workers’ parties were present at the Bucharest Meeting and the majority of the participating parties were not prepared for the problems which were put forward for discussion, were not represented by top-level delegations and were not authorized by their leaderships to discuss and take decisions on the major problems of the communist movement.

Likewise, the leadership of our Party could not pronounce itself at Bucharest without first examining, discussing and approving the speech in the Political Bureau and in the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party.

The Bucharest Meeting was to decide only the place and time of the coming meeting of all the parties. To alter
this objective, even from the opposite standpoint, would mean to do what Khrushchev did from the positions of the counter-revolution. The leadership of the PLA did not make this mistake either.

Therefore, in Bucharest, the PLA defended the Leninist norms which regulate relations between parties, defended Marxism-Leninism and its correct line, and uncovered and exposed forcefully the Khrushchevite revisionist plot. In short, the Party of Labour of Albania only did its duty in Bucharest.
THE UNDERMINING ACTIVITY OF THE SOVIET
REVISIONISTS IN THE MILITARY FIELD AND
THE STRUGGLE OF THE PLA TO FOIL
THIS ACTIVITY
(1956-1961)

To achieve their political-strategic aims in regard to our country, the Soviet revisionists engaged in wide-ranging hostile activity in the military field, too. The struggle of our Party against this activity during the period 1956-1961 passed through three stages.

The first stage begins with the 20th Congress which replaced the Marxist-Leninist course with the revisionist course, and continues to the middle of 1960.

Although it appears at first glance as if everything was proceeding normally, as if the military aid to our country was not inadequate but, on the contrary, was provided correctly, deeper analysis shows that even then the aims and stands of the Soviet revisionists were not Marxist-Leninist.

On the one hand, the military aid accorded under the agreements signed after the Khrushchevite group came to power, was minimal, less than what we sought. And this was at a time when our Party had always kept its requests to the minimum, because it took account both of the needs of the Soviet Union itself and of its obligations on an international scale. On the other hand, during this period, the Khrushchevites did their utmost to introduce their revisionist spirit into our army in all fields, in its organization, structure and political-military
training; in the life of the Party organs and organizations, in the character of the army cadres, etc.

The second stage begins with the ill-famed Bucharest Meeting and extends to the end of 1960. The delays and interruptions in supplying military materials, as well as the failure to carry out certain agreements for military constructions on time, began in July 1960.

The aim of the Soviet revisionists in taking these actions was to compel our Party to renounce its principled Marxist-Leninist stand and go to the Moscow Meeting «with complete unity of opinion», as they said.

The third stage, the stage of the most ferocious attacks of the Khrushchevites and the heroic struggle of our Party to withstand these attacks, began after the Moscow Meeting, especially after the 4th Congress of the PLA. Losing all hope of inducing the PLA to depart from its correct Marxist-Leninist road and of bringing it to its knees, the Moscow chiefs went over to open hostile activity: they stopped all military supplies, committed provocations and tried to rob us of our military equipment. This stage ends with the departure of the Soviet armymen from our country and the breaking off of all contacts with them in the military field.

*   *

The events at and struggle over the Vlora naval base are vivid evidence of the social-imperialist policy of the Soviet revisionists in the military field and the fearless revolutionary stand of our Party.

The Vlora naval base was set up under a joint agreement reached between our Government and the Soviet Government in September 1957. This was followed by another agreement in May 1959, which envisaged the further extension and strengthening of the base. The
Vlora base was set up to strengthen the defence capacity of our country, as well as to serve the common interests of the socialist camp.

Up till June 1960, the Soviet side honoured its obligations in the main, but immediately after the Bucharest Meeting it began to delay implementation of the agreement to hand over all the ships to our crews.

When they saw they could achieve nothing in this way, the Soviet revisionists tried to deny that our state owned the ships. «The submarines are not yours,» they declared. «Their flying the Albanian flag... was only a political act on our part.»

What is the truth? The Albanian-Soviet agreements, signed in September 1957 and May 1959, stipulated clearly that on their arrival in Albania the ships would become the property of the PR of Albania and would be taken over by the Albanian crews, while the Soviet crews would remain merely as instructors, until the training of our crews was completed. And this was done in practice: the ships were taken over by our crews with official documents signed by both sides and all of them sailed under the flag of our Naval Fleet. A good number of the ships were handed over completely in the period 1957-1960 while in the remainder, training continued to enable their gradual transfer to the full control of our crews.

That was the situation. However, the Soviets deliberately confused the taking over of the ships according to the official agreements and documents with the taking over of the ships for autonomous navigation by our crews. The Soviets not only persisted in this stand, but also used various tactics and tricks to rob us of our ships. But they did not get away with any of these things because our Party and our navy men were very vigilant.

Having failed in all these attempts, the Soviet revisionists made their last move: they demanded that the Vlora base should be placed completely under their command.
In order to give this proposal the colour of a joint decision, they used the meeting of the Consultative Political Committee of the Warsaw Treaty held on the 28th and 29th of March that year, at which the decision was taken that «...only Soviet crews should serve in the warships of the fleet stationed at Vlora Bay, solely under a Soviet command which would be subordinate to the Commander-in-chief of the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Treaty.» Thus, not only was the fact that the warships belonged to the PRA disregarded but, as Comrade Enver Hoxha has explained, it was demanded «that we agree to give up the Vlora base and its hinterland and allow it to be placed under the control of the Soviets.»*

The stand of our Party towards this decision was curt: the agreements signed by the two parties must be applied, otherwise all the Soviet military personnel must be withdrawn from Vlora. The Soviet revisionist, Admiral Kasatonov who came to Albania with the intention to take all the ships with him, was compelled to leave with the submarines in which Soviet crews served, robbing Abania of them and two other warships which were being refitted in Sevastopol.

Thus the events at the Vlora base came to an end. This was one of the most typical examples of brutal interference by the Soviet revisionists in the internal affairs of our country in the military field.

* * *

From analysis of the hostile activity of the Soviet revisionists in the military field certain conclusions emerge:

The relations of the Khrushchevites with us, the agreements signed and the military aid accorded to our country had hegemonic and expansionist ulterior motives. They regarded and dealt with our army and our country as a whole from the angle of the Soviet social-imperialist interests and strategy. As early as December 1956, Khrushchev openly expressed this aim when he declared to our Party delegation: «Albania is a small country but it has an important strategic position. If we were to build a submarine and missile base there, we could control the whole Mediterranean.»* Later, during his visit to Albania in 1959, this renegade concretized his idea in terms of the Vlora Bay, where he was struck by its strategic importance rather than its beauty. Meanwhile, in regard to Lake Butrint, he supported Malinovsky’s idea that «if an outlet to the sea were cut, a marvellous submarine base could be built here and Greece would be ours.»** Hence the aim of the Soviet revisionists was clear: to turn our country into a military base, into a bridgehead for aggression against other countries and peoples.

At the same time, the Khrushchevites tried to use their relations with us, and especially their military aid, as means of pressure and blackmail to impose their revisionist line on our Party. The alternative Khrushchev placed before the leadership of our Party on the eve of the Moscow Meeting, «either submit or we shall dismantle the Vlora base», the pressure and declarations about expelling us from the Warsaw Treaty, the threats about the dangers which would allegedly threaten us if we broke with the Soviet Union, etc were the culmination of these pressures.

Their attempts to introduce the revisionist spirit in the ranks of our army showed that one of the Khrushchevites’ main aims was to turn it into a counter-rev-

---


volutionary weapon to take the castle from within. How-
ever, our Party which had sensed the impending danger, long ago did not allow the ugly features which were flowerishing in the Soviet army to develop in our army.

The Khrushchevites employed every kind of manoe-
uvre to achieve their aim. They came out in open support of the American-Soviet double agent, Teme Sejko, and his group which comprised the internal link in the plot against socialist Albania, which was discovered in 1960. As it came out later, the Khrushchevite revisionists had been working for a long time to prepare their agency within the ranks of our army, to support them in their hostile activity. The discovery of this agency, especially of the putschist group headed by Beqir Balluku, shows clearly what great danger threatened our inde-
pendence and the cause of socialism in Albania.

With its characteristic foresight, our Party had taken timely measures to ensure the defence capacity of the country. As in every other field, on this issue, too, our Party did not base its hopes on foreign aid, but always relied on the internal forces. The breaking off of all relations with the revisionists did not weaken the defence of our country at all, but on the contrary strengthened it, increased the mobilization of the people and gave a new impulse to the development of scientific military thought. In this field, too, we solved and are solving all the problems ourselves. This is why today, 20 years after the break with the Soviet revisionists, we feel ourselves much stronger, politically, economically and militarily.