FOREWORD TO THE FIRST EDITION (in Albanian)

From the time the "Manifesto of the Communist Party" of Marx and Engels was published in 1848 to this day the struggle between revolutionary Marxism and opportunism, in both the political and the ideological fields, has centered around one problem: is the revolution necessary for the transformation of society to a socialist basis or not, do the conditions exist to carry out the revolution or not, can it be carried out in the peaceful way, or is revolutionary violence indispensable?

With all their theories, of which there are scores if not hundreds, the bourgeoisie and the opportunists have always tried to negate the incontrovertible truth that the fundamental contradiction of capitalist society is that between the exploiters and the exploited, to deny the place and role of the working class in history, and to negate the class struggle itself as the determining factor of the development and progress of human society. Their aim has always been to disorientate the proletariat ideologically, to hinder the revolution, perpetuate capitalist exploitation, and to destroy Marxism-Leninism, the triumphant science of the revolution and the construction of socialism.

All these opponents and enemies of the proletariat and the revolution have tried to proclaim Marxism-Leninism outdated and to create various "theories", allegedly adapted to the new historical conditions, to the changes that capitalism and imperialism have undergone, and the evolution of human society in general.

Thus Bernstein proclaimed Marx outdated, and Kautsky, deliberately misinterpreting the transition of capitalism to imperialism, negated the revolution. Their example and methods have been followed by all the modern revisionists, too, ranging from Browder and Tito, Khrushchev and the "Eurocommunists", to the Chinese "theoreticians" of "three worlds".

Under the false pretext that they are implementing and developing Marxism-Leninism in a "creative manner", adapting it to the new conditions existing in the world today, all these anti-Marxists are trying to negate the scientific ideology of the working class and to replace it with bourgeois opportunism.

The proletariat, the revolutionaries and their genuine Marxist-Leninist parties have always waged an unrelenting stern struggle against modern revisionism and its various trends, and this struggle will never cease.

The revisionists, the reactionary bourgeoisie and its parties try to label our theory, Marxism-Leninism, a dogma, something rigid, petrified, which allegedly cannot adapt itself to the contemporary realities of the time which are full of dynamism and life. But speaking of dynamism and vitality, Marxism-Leninism is the only theory with these qualities, because it is the theory of the working class, the most advanced class of society, the most revolutionary class, which thinks correctly, which produces the material blessings and is always in activity.

The efforts of the bourgeoisie and its ideologists who are trying to convince mankind that Marxism-Leninism is allegedly outdated and out of step with "modern times", are intended to combat the scientific ideology of the proletariat and to replace it with theories which preach a degenerate life, the life of a lumpen, a society of unrestrained degeneration, a so-called consumer society. The
theories which claim that the forms of a new society in continuous movement and advance have now allegedly been found, are also intended to deal a blow at the progressive revolutionary thinking of the proletariat, at the ideology guiding it, as well as to perpetuate capitalist oppression and exploitation.

Our theory, as Lenin teaches us, judges and defines the forms and methods of class struggle correctly. It remains closely linked with the practical problems arising from life, from the epoch. This weapon helps us to analyse and understand correctly the course of development of human society at every moment, to analyse and understand correctly every historic turning-point of society and to carry out the revolutionary transformation of society.

At its 7th Congress, our Party exposed all the different revisionist currents, including the Chinese theory of <<three worlds>>. Stressing the vital importance of Marxism-Leninism for the triumph of the revolution, socialism and the liberation of the peoples, it resolutely rejected the bourgeois-opportunist theses and views on the present stage of the world historical process, which repudiate the revolution and defend capitalist exploitation, and emphasized strongly that no change in the evolution of capitalism and imperialism justifies the revisionist <<inventions>> and fabrications. Principled criticism and ceaseless exposure of the anti-revolutionary and anti-communist theories are absolutely necessary to defend Marxism-Leninism, to carry forward the cause of the revolution and the peoples, to demonstrate that the theory of Marx Engels, Lenin and Stalin is always young, and remains the unerring guide to future victories.

April 1978.

NOTE TO THE SECOND EDITION

The book <<Imperialism and the Revolution>> was first published [in Albanian] in April 1978 for distribution within the Party. In accord with the wishes of the communists who have read this book, it is now made available to the public. Some events that have taken place during the period since the first publication have also been included.

December 1978.

PART ONE

THE STRATEGY OF IMPERIALISM AND MODERN REVISIONISM

In analysing the present international situation and the situation of the world revolutionary movement, the 7th Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania pointed out the dangers imperialism and modern revisionism represent for the revolution and the liberation of the peoples, stressed the
need for a merciless fight against them and the active support that must be given to the Marxist-Leninist movement in the world. These questions have great importance because the construction of socialism, the struggle to strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat and the defence of the Homeland are inseparable from the international situation and the general process of world development. Today big forces, representatives of darkness, of the enslavement and exploitation of the proletariat and the peoples - American imperialism and its agencies, Soviet social-imperialism, Chinese social-imperialism, the big bourgeoisie and reaction, have risen against and are fighting Marxism-Leninism. Such counterrevolutionary ideological currents as social-democracy, modern revisionism and many other counterrevolutionary currents have also risen against our revolutionary ideology. In our struggle against all these enemies we must base ourselves firmly on the Marxist-Leninist theory and the world proletariat. Our struggle on the theoretical plane will be crowned with success when we make a correct dialectical analysis of the international situation, of events which are developing, the objectives and aims of all the social forces in motion, which are in contradiction and struggle with one another. Scientific analysis of the international situation and clarification of the strategy of the revolutionary struggle help us define the correct tactics in differing circumstances, in order to win battle after battle. That is how our Party has always acted.

Socialism is in struggle with capitalism, the world proletariat is locked in a merciless and continuous struggle with the capitalist bourgeoisie, the peoples of the world are in struggle with their external and internal oppressors. The world proletariat is guided in the struggle by its Marxist-Leninist ideology, which explains the necessity for this struggle and mobilizes the forces in battle. This is why capitalism and imperialism have always organized a bitter struggle against the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

Karl Marx discovered the laws of social development, of revolutionary transformations and the transition of society from a lower to a higher social order. He made a scientific analysis of private ownership of the means of production, the capitalist mode of distribution and the surplus value which the capitalist seizes. He created the scientific theory on classes and the class struggle, and defined the ways of the struggle of the proletariat to overthrow the bourgeoisie, to destroy the capitalist system, to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, and build socialist society.

Various reactionary theoreticians in all countries of the world have striven in every way to denigrate Marx’s theory, to throw mud at it, to distort it and combat it. But this theory, which is a true science, has succeeded in dominating progressive human thinking and has become a powerful weapon in the hands of the proletariat and the peoples in the fight against their enemies.

By applying the Marxist theory and developing it further, Lenin gave the proletariat and its vanguard, the Marxist-Leninist party, a scientific theory on the conditions of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. Lenin developed Marxism not only in theory but also in practice. Applying the doctrine of Karl Marx, he led the Bolshevik revolution and carried it through to victory. Lenin’s work was further developed by Stalin. The triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution dealt the first crushing blow to imperialism, the entire world capitalist system. It marked the beginning of the general crisis of capitalism which has grown deeper and deeper.
The creation and consolidation of the Soviet state was a colossal victory which showed the proletariat and the peoples that the enemy they faced, capitalism and imperialism, could be conquered and destroyed. The Soviet Union was the living proof of this.

Inflamed by the loss the October Revolution in Russia inflicted on it, the imperialist and capitalist world coalition reinforced its instruments of political, economic and military struggle against the new state of the proletarians and the spread of Marxist-Leninist ideology throughout the world. The imperialists, the reactionary bourgeoisie, European and world social-democracy, together with the other parties of capital, prepared the war against the Soviet Union. Together with the Hitlerites, the Italian and Japanese fascists, they also prepared the Second World War.

But in this war the vitality of socialism and Marxism-Leninism, which emerged victorious, was confirmed even more clearly.

After the victory over fascism, great changes in favour of socialism occurred in the world. New socialist states were set up in Europe and Asia. The socialist camp, with the Soviet Union at the head, was created. This was a new great victory for socialism and Marxism-Leninism, and another great defeat for capitalism and imperialism.

The capitalist system came out of the Second World War deeply shaken and with its equilibrium entirely upset. Germany, Japan and Italy emerged from the war as defeated powers with their economies ruined. They lost the political and military positions they had occupied previously. Although they emerged victorious from the war, other imperialist states, such as Great Britain and France, had been so greatly weakened, economically and militarily, that their role as great powers had declined drastically.

The general crisis of capitalism was further deepened with the collapse of the colonial system. As a result of this collapse a series of new national states emerged, while in those countries which still remained colonies or semi-colonies, the liberation movement against the imperialist yoke grew.

These changes created most favourable conditions for the triumph of socialism on a world scale. Because of the deep economic and political crisis and the growing discontent of the masses, many capitalist states were on the verge of revolutionary outbreaks.

In these extremely grave and critical circumstances, American imperialism came to their aid. Unlike the other imperialist powers, the United States of America emerged stronger from the war. Not only had it suffered no damage, but it had accumulated colossal wealth and had immensely increased its economic and military potential, and its technical-scientific base. Fattened on the blood shed by the peoples, this imperialism became the sole leadership of the entire capitalist world.

American imperialism mobilized all the reactionary forces of the capitalist world to rescue the old capitalist order and crush any revolutionary and national liberation movement which endangered it, to destroy the socialist camp and restore capitalism in the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy and to establish its hegemony everywhere in the world. To attain its objectives, US imperialism, along with world capital, set in motion its gigantic bureaucratic-military state machine, its great economic, technical and financial potential, all its human forces. US imperialism assisted the political, economic and military recovery of the shattered European and Japanese capitalism and, in place of the collapsed colonial system, set up a new system of exploitation and plunder - neocolonialism.

American imperialism mobilized its many means of propaganda, its philosophers, economists, sociologists, writers, etc., in the frenzied campaign which began against Marxism-Leninism, against communism, against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries of Europe and Asia. At the same time, American imperialism implemented an openly aggressive policy. Every field of life, the economy, politics, ideology, the army and science, in the United States of America was swept by war fever, militarization and anticommunism.

To conquer socialism, to put down the revolutionary liberation movements, to combat the great influence of the Marxist - Leninist theory and establish its hegemony in the world, American imperialism went about it in two ways.
The first was that of aggression and armed intervention. The American imperialists set up aggressive military blocs such as NATO, SEATO etc., stationed armed forces in large numbers on the territories of many foreign countries, set up, military bases on all continents, and built powerful naval fleets which they deployed throughout the seas and oceans. In order to crush and stamp out the revolution, they undertook military intervention in Greece, Korea, Vietnam and elsewhere.

The other way was that of ideological aggression and subversion against the socialist states, the communist and workers' parties, and of efforts to bring about the bourgeois degeneration of these states and parties. In this direction, American imperialism and world capital as a whole employed powerful means of propaganda and ideological diversion.

But American imperialism and world capitalism, which was recovering after the war, were facing a powerful adversary, the socialist camp with the Soviet Union at the head, the world proletariat and the freedom-loving peoples. Therefore they had to be very careful in their reckoning with this colossal power, which was guided by a correct and clear policy, by a triumphant ideology which had captured and was more and more capturing the hearts and minds of workers, revolutionaries and progressive elements.

Despite the efforts of US imperialism and world reaction to crush and destroy the revolutionary movement of the proletariat and the liberation struggle of the peoples, they were mounting and growing stronger. Under Stalin's leadership, the Soviet Union very quickly healed the wounds of war and was advancing at rapid rates in all fields, in the economy, science, technology, etc. In the countries of people's democracy the positions of socialism were being consolidated. The communist parties and the anti-imperialist democratic movement were extending their influence among the masses.

In these conditions, world imperialism and capitalism utilized the modern revisionists, and the Yugoslav ones among the first, in their fight against socialism and the liberation movements of the peoples.

It was a stroke of good luck for world capitalism that Yugoslavia, a country called a people's democracy, came out in opposition to, and entered into open ideological and political conflict with, the Soviet Union, because within the ranks of the socialist camp one member country had rebelled. World capitalism gave great publicity to this event, which helped it in its fight against socialism and the revolution.

But although it inflicted great harm on the cause of the revolution and socialism, the Titoite betrayal did not succeed in splitting the socialist camp and the communist movement, as the bourgeoisie and reaction hoped. The communists and revolutionaries all over the world sternly condemned this treachery and pointed out the danger posed by Titoism, as an agency of imperialism against communism.

It was the Khrushchevite revisionists, who seized power in the Soviet Union after Stalin's death, that rendered the greatest service to world capitalism in its fight against socialism, the revolution and Marxism-Leninism. The emergence of the revisionist group of Khrushchev was the greatest political and ideological victory for the strategy of imperialism after the Second World War.

The counterrevolutionary overthrow in the Soviet Union caused immense rejoicing among the US imperialists and all the other capitalist powers, because the most powerful socialist state, the bastion of the revolution and the liberation of the peoples, was abandoning the road of socialism and Marxism-Leninism and would be transformed, in theory and practice, into a base of the counterrevolution and capitalism.

The about-turn which took place in the Soviet Union led to the split in the socialist camp and the international communist movement. It was one of the main factors which influenced the spread of modern revisionism in many communist parties and created favourable conditions for this. The Khrushchevite revisionist trend gravely damaged the cause of the revolution and socialism throughout the world.

A stern struggle began between the genuine Marxist-Leninist and revolutionary forces, on the one hand, and khrushchevite revisionism, on the other.
Right from the start, the Party of Labour of Albania raised high the banner of implacable and principled struggle against Soviet revisionism and its followers, courageously defended Marxism-Leninism, the cause of socialism and the liberation of the peoples, just as it had fought and was fighting resolutely against Yugoslav revisionism.

All over the world, the genuine Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries, also, rose against the Khrushchevite betrayal. From the ranks of the revolutionary proletariat of different countries emerged new Marxist-Leninist parties, which shouldered the heavy burden of leading the struggle of the working class and the peoples against the bourgeoisie, imperialism and modern revisionism. The hopes of imperialism and revisionism of finally destroying socialism, extinguishing the genuine international communist movement and crushing the peoples' struggle were not realized. The Khrushchevite revisionists soon revealed their anti-Marxist and counterrevolutionary features. The peoples saw that the Soviet Union had been transformed into an imperialist superpower, which was contending with the United States of America for world domination, that, along with US imperialism, it had become another great enemy of the revolution, socialism and the peoples of the world.

On the other hand, the grave economic, financial, ideological and political crisis which swept the entire capitalist and revisionist world, not only showed the further decay of the capitalist system and its unalterable oppressive and exploiting nature clearly, but also exposed the demagogy and hypocrisy of all modern revisionists, who were prettifying the capitalist order. But at the time when the revolutionary movement was growing and becoming consolidated throughout the world, when capitalism was being squeezed ever more tightly in the grip of the crisis, and when Khrushchevite revisionism and the other trends of modern revisionism were becoming exposed in the eyes of the proletariat and the peoples, Chinese revisionism came out openly on the world scene. It became the close ally of US imperialism and the big international bourgeoisie to smother and sabotage the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and the peoples.

A very complex situation has been created in the world at present. Operating in the international arena today are various imperialist and socialimperialist 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 vital space, the fierce competition of the European Common Market, which has turned its eyes towards the old colonies.

All these factors have further exacerbated the many contradictions of the capitalist and revisionist world. At the same time, the prospect of the revolution and the peoples' liberation has not been eliminated as a result of the betrayal of the Titoite, Soviet, Chinese and other revisionists but on the contrary, after a temporary set-back the revolution is now on the verge of a fresh leap forward. It will certainly forge ahead on the course history has set for it and will triumph on a world scale. Nothing can save imperialism, capitalism and revisionism from the remorseless vengeance of the proletariat and the peoples, nothing can rescue them from deep antagonistic contradictions and never-ending crises, revolutions, their inevitable demise. It is precisely this situation which is driving imperialism to seek new roads and paths, to build new strategies and tactics, in order to escape the -catastrophe awaiting it.

The Strategy of World Imperialism

US imperialism and the other capitalist states have fought and are fighting to maintain their hegemony in the world, to defend the capitalist and neo-colonialist system, to emerge from the great crisis which has them in its grip, with the fewest Possible losses. They have striven and are striving
to prevent the peoples and the proletariat from fulfilling their revolutionary aspirations for liberation.

US imperialism, which dominates its partners, politically, economically and militarily, has the main role in the struggle to achieve these aims.

The enemies of the revolution and the peoples want to create the impression that, because of the changes that have occurred in the world and the losses that socialism has suffered, circumstances entirely different from those of the past have been created. Therefore, although, they have fierce contradictions with one another, US imperialism and the world capitalist bourgeoisie, Soviet social-imperialism and Chinese social-imperialism, modern revisionism and social-democracy are seeking a modus vivendi, a hybrid <<new society>>, in order to keep the bourgeois-capitalist system on its feet, to avert revolutions and to continue their oppression and exploitation of the peoples in new forms and by new methods.

Imperialism and capitalism have come to understand that now they can no longer exploit the peoples of the world with the previous methods, therefore, provided their system is not threatened, they have to concede something, which will cause them no harm, in order to keep the masses in bondage. This they want to do with the investments and credits they distribute to those states and cliques in which they have established their influence or by means of arms, i.e., local wars, either by taking a direct part in them or by inciting one state against another. Local wars serve to make those countries which fall into their trap more deeply subject to the hegemony of world capital.

All the << theoreticians>> in the service of world capital, in the West and in the East, are trying to find the formulae for this <<new society>>. At present they have this new form in the capitalist-revisionist society of the Soviet Union, which is nothing but a degenerate society, they have found it in the capitalist system of Yugoslav <<self-administration>> and in some so-called socialist oriented regimes of the <<third world>>. They are trying to find a capitalist <<new society>> of this type also in the Chinese variant, which is now crystallizing.

From the programmatic statements which President Carter made on May 22, 1977, in which he presented the outlines of an allegedly new policy of the United States of America, it is clear that the general and fundamental characteristic of this <<new policy>> in the present conditions is the fight of this superpower to cope with the proletarian revolution and the national liberation wars of peoples who aspire to liberate themselves from the yoke of big world capital, especially from US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism.

As we pointed out in the foregoing, the capitalist world is searching for a way out of the abyss, even if only for the time being. Naturally, US imperialism is striving to find this way out and, possibly, to co-ordinate it with Soviet social imperialism, with its NATO allies, with China, as well as with other industrialized capitalist countries. Carter appealed to the Eastern, Western and the OPEC member countries and demanded that they work together and effectively help the poorer countries. US imperialism tries to present this collaboration as the only alternative to wars, the only way to stop wars.

In his speech, the US President said, today <<we have been freed from that constant fear of communism, which at one time led us to embrace every dictator who was obsessed by the same fear>>. Of course, when Carter, this faithful representative of the bloodiest imperialism of our time, speaks of being <<freed from the fear of communism>>, he means communism à la Yugoslav, à la Khrushchev, à la Chinese, whose masks only are communist, but the capitalist bourgeoisie has not been and will never be f reed from the fear of genuine communism. On the contrary, imperialism and social-imperialism have always been terrified of genuine communism and they will be even more terrified of it. It is this fear and dread that are driving the imperialists and the revisionists into each others' arms, to co-ordinate their plans and seek the most appropriate forms in order to prolong the existence of their rule of oppression and exploitation.

In these moments of deep economic, political and military crisis, the imperialists of the United States of America are trying to consolidate the victories of imperialism, attained through the betrayal by modern revisionism in the Soviet Union, the former countries of people's democracy
and in China, and to use them as a barrier against the revolution and the revolutionary liberation struggle of the proletariat and the peoples.

The US President also admits that, out of fear of communism, in the past the capitalists and the imperialists embraced and supported the fascist dictators like Mussolini, Hitler, Hirohito, Franco, etc. The fascist dictatorships in the respective countries were the ultimate weapon of the capitalist bourgeoisie and world imperialism against the Soviet Union of the time of Lenin and Stalin and against the world proletarian revolution.

The US President declares with an air of confidence that the communist (read: revisionist) states have altered their appearance, and he is not mistaken in this. He says, <<this system could not last for ever unchanged>>. Of course, he is confusing the revisionist treachery with the genuine socialist system, with communism. US imperialism, considers the Khrushchevite Soviet system as a victory of world capitalism and from this it deduces that the threat of a conflict with the Soviet Union has become less intense, though it does not deny the contradictions and rivalry for hegemony with it.

According to Carter, the US government will make every effort to maintain the status quo. In other words, this means that both US imperialism and the other imperialist states will strive to maintain and strengthen their positions in the world, while they hope that together, they can solve the disagreements may exist, and which in fact do exist, with friendly countries and their allies, within this status quo.

As a conclusion, says Carter, <<the US policy must be based on a new, wider mosaic of global, regional and bilateral interests>>. After analysing this new, wider <<mosaic>> of global, regional and bilateral interests, he reaffirms that <<the United States of America will honour all its commitments to NATO, which must be a strong organization, because the alliance of the United States of America with the great industrialized democracies is indispensable, since it defends the same values, 'and therefore we all should fight for a better life>>.

As can be seen, the United States of America, too, is joining the Soviet modern revisionists, the Chinese revisionists and the <<big industrialized democracies>> in their efforts to create a <<new reality>>, a <<new world>>. In other words, through demagogy, the United States of America is trying to adapt its policy to the new situations. In order to maintain the status quo, to halt the drive of Soviet hegemonism, to weaken Soviet social-imperialism and to win China over to its side, so that it is ever more deeply committed to the imperialist camp, in order to quell the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and the peoples, the United States of America has to make some phoney political concessions. But it is making no concessions in military matters, no concessions in the policy of keeping the states and the peoples in bondage and under control, in the policy of the exploitation of the national wealth of the other countries to its own advantage and that of the industrialized countries.

This is the -new policy, of the United States of America. It is clear to us that this is by no means a new policy, but an old predatory imperialist, neo-colonialist, enslaving policy of ruthlessly exploiting the peoples and their wealth, a policy of putting down revolutions and national liberation wars. US imperialism now wants to give this old, permanent policy an allegedly new, fresh coat of paint, to arm counterrevolutionary elements, whether in power or not, with weapons to fight communism which raises the peoples and the proletariat in liberation wars and revolution.

Contrary to the Chinese theory of three worlds-, which is a fraudulent capitalist and revisionist theory, US imperialism is still on the offensive. It is striving to preserve its old alliances and to create new ones to its own advantage and to the disadvantage of Soviet social-imperialism or whoever else might threaten US imperialist power. In particular it is trying to strengthen NATO, which has been and remains an aggressive political and military organization.

In all its strategic manoeuvring the United States of America is not aggravating its relations with the Soviet Union beyond a certain point and is continuing the SALT negotiations with it, although
Carter stated that it was going ahead with the production of neutron bombs. Despite this, between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, there is an obvious tendency towards maintaining the status quo.

Of course, while the United States of America and NATO are striving to preserve this status quo with the Soviet Union, at the same time, they have contradictions with it, but these contradictions have not yet reached such a level as to justify the Chinese refrain that war in Europe is imminent.

At present, US imperialism is supporting China so that it becomes stronger militarily and economically. US capital is pouring into China, where not only the principal American banks, but also the American state, are making large investments through credits. The United States of America is playing the China card heavily, but is hedging its bets. At the same time it is continuing to play the card of Japan, too. The United States of America wants smooth waters between itself and Japan, wants the aid between them to be mutual so that Japan, according to the American aims, will be strengthened and become like an Israel in the Far East the Pacific, Southeast Asia and, why not, if required and when the time comes, in its confrontation with China too, eventually.

This is the situation in which China signed the treaty of friendship and co-operation with Japan. But this treaty has begun to assume major dangerous and ugly proportions for the fate of the world from many angles, and it will do in the future, because close economic and military collaboration will be established between Japan and China, which will have as its objective the creation of separate and joint spheres of influence, particularly in Asia, Australia and the whole Pacific basin. Naturally, this collaboration will begin to be built under the shadow of the alliance with the United States of America and the propaganda of war against Soviet social-imperialism. The main aim of this Sino-Japanese alliance is the containment and weakening of the Soviet Union, its eviction from Siberia, Mongolia and elsewhere, the elimination of its influence in the whole of Asia and Oceania, and all the ASEAN member countries.

This is the strategy of US imperialism, but at the same time, also of Chinese imperialism and Japanese militarism. The United States of America will try to assist China and Japan and keep them under its direction, to strengthen the alliance with them and hurl them against the Soviet Union. But there is also the possibility that the day may come when the diabolic, hypocritical, empire-building, unprincipled policy in the imperialist-militarist spirit, pursued by China and Japan, will turn against the superpower which helped them to recover, just as Germany did in the past, when it became a terrible fascist power, attacked the allies of the United States of America and went to war even with the latter, in the time of Hitler.

The United States of America will try to hold the balance between the Chinese power and the rising Japanese power. But one fine morning, this balance will slip from its grasp and the Sino-Japanese imperialist-militarist alliance will become a threat not only to the Soviet Union, but also to the United States of America itself, because the interests of these two big imperialist countries of Asia, China and Japan, converge in their aims of domination in Asia and elsewhere, and of weakening US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism.

In NATO, the United States of America has a dominant position and great military, political and economic influence. However, despite its unity, within NATO a differentiation has begun from the standpoint of the influence of its various member countries and the emergence of one state over the others.

Year by year, the Federal German Republic is becoming stronger within this organization. Its economic and political power and its trade in arms go beyond the bounds of the European Common Market. Now we may say that the policy of West Germany is assuming the features of totalitarian fascist revanchism, seeking to create its own spheres of influence. Naturally, this does not suit either Britain or France, the two original main partners of the United States of America in NATO.

West Germany is seeking the re-unification of the two German states so as to create one powerful state with a great military potential which will be a threat to Soviet social-imperialism and, in case of a general conflagration, in alliance with Japan and China, may become a danger to the whole
world. It is developing very close relations with China, in particular. Among the European states, it occupies the main place in trade exchanges with China. West Germany is the biggest and the most powerful European supplier of credits, technology and modern armaments to China. Britain and France are also very interested in China, therefore they are developing their relations with it. However, China is more interested in Bonn. This is worrying Britain and France, because by becoming stronger, the Federal German Republic may become even more dominant over the other partners of NATO and the European Common Market. Hence we observe that both the British and the French governments speak of friendship and relations with China, but they do not forget to stress that they want further development of their economic and friendly relations with the Soviet Union, too. Bonn says this, too, but it is rapidly developing its relations with China, which presents itself as the main enemy of the Soviet Union. The fascist group around Strauss, the Hitlerite generals, the powerful real revanchists of Bonn, are openly advertising themselves as China's closest allies. Therefore, China does not regard Federal Germany in the same light as France and Britain.

The Strategy of Soviet Social-imperialism

Having seized state power in the Soviet Union, the Khrushchevites set themselves as their main objective the destruction of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the restoration of capitalism and the transformation of the Soviet Union into an imperialist superpower.

After they had consolidated their positions following the death of Stalin, Khrushchev and the group around him first of all launched their attack on the Marxist-Leninist ideology and began their struggle to dethrone Leninism by attacking Stalin and levelling against him all the slanders the filthy propaganda of the world capitalist bourgeoisie had long been fabricating. Thus, the Khrushchevites became the spokesmen and the executors of the wishes of capital against the Marxist-Leninist ideology and the revolution in the Soviet Union. They went to work systematically to liquidate the entire socialist structure of the Soviet Union, they fought to liberalize the Soviet system, to transform the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a bourgeois state, and to transform the socialist economy and culture into a capitalist economy and culture.

The Soviet Union, which had turned into a revisionist country, into a social-imperialist state, built up its own strategy and tactics. The Khrushchevites worked out such a policy as to enable them to disguise all their activity with Leninist phraseology. They elaborated their revisionist ideology in such a way as to palm it off upon the proletariat and the peoples as the Marxism-Leninism of the new period., so they could tell the Communists, inside and outside the country, that <<the revolution was continuing in the Soviet Union in the new political, ideological and economic conditions of world development>>, and not only that this revolution was continuing there, but that this country was allegedly going over to the stage of the construction of a classless communist society, where the party and the state were withering away.

The party was stripped of its attributes as the vanguard of the working class, as the sole political leading force of the state and society, and was transformed into a party dominated by the apparatchiki and the KGB. The Soviet revisionists called their party the <<party of the entire people>> and reduced it to such a condition that it could no longer be the party of the working class, but the party of the new Soviet bourgeoisie.

On the other hand, the Soviet revisionists preached Khrushchevite peaceful coexistence as the general line of the international communist movement and proclaimed <<peaceful competition with US imperialism>> as the road to the triumph of socialism in the Soviet Union and other countries. They also declared that the proletarian revolution had allegedly entered a new stage, that it could
triumph also in ways other than the seizure of state power by the proletariat through violence. According to them, state power could be taken in peaceful, parliamentary and democratic ways, through reforms.

Gambling on the name of Lenin and the Bolshevik Party, the Khrushchevite revisionists did their utmost to impose this anti-Marxist line of theirs, this revision of the Marxist-Leninist theory in all fields, on all the communist parties of the world. They wanted the communist and workers’ parties of the world to adopt this revisionist line and transform themselves into counterrevolutionary parties, into blind tools of the bourgeois dictatorship, to serve capitalism.

But this was not fully achieved as they desired. First and foremost because the Party of Labour of Albania remained unwavering in its consistent implementation of Marxism-Leninism and in defence of its purity. At those moments there were some other parties which, for their own, not purely Marxist-Leninist reasons, wavered, did not fully accept the Khrushchevite orientations, while some accepted them reluctantly, but later submitted to them. At those moments, the Communist Party of China, too, opposed the Khrushchevites, but as the facts show, it proceeded from aims and objectives quite the opposite of those which impelled the Party of Labour of Albania to throw itself into the struggle against Khrushchevite revisionism.

With their advent to power the Khrushchevites also prepared the platform of their foreign Policy. Just like US imperialism, Soviet socialimperialism, too, based its foreign policy on expansion and hegemonism by means of the armaments race, pressure and blackmail, and military, economic and ideological aggression. The aim of this Policy was the establishment of social-imperialist domination over the whole world.

In the Comecon countries, the Soviet Union is implementing a typically neo-colonialist policy. The economies of these countries have been transformed into appendages of the Soviet economy. The Warsaw Treaty serves the Soviet Union to keep these countries under its yoke, enabling it to station there large military forces, which are no different from occupation armies. The Warsaw Treaty is an aggressive military pact which serves the policy of pressure, blackmail and armed intervention of Soviet social-imperialism.

The revisionist-imperialist <<theories>> on <<the socialist community>>, <<the socialist division of labour>>, <<limited sovereignty>> <<socialist economic integration>>, etc., also serve this neo-colonialist policy.

But Soviet social-imperialism is not satisfied with the domination it exercises over its satellite states. 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, to extend its neo-colonialism in Africa, Asia, Latin America and elsewhere.

Soviet social-imperialism has a whole strategic plan which includes a series of economic, political, ideological and military activities for the purpose of extending its expansion and hegemonism. At the same time the Soviet revisionists are working to undermine the peoples' revolutions and the liberation wars by precisely the same means and methods as those employed by the US imperialists. Usually, the social-imperialists operate through their tools, the revisionist parties. But, according to the occasion and circumstances, they 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, organize plots and putsches to bring pro-Soviet regimes to power, and even resort to direct military intervention, as they did, together with the Cubans, in Angola, Ethiopia, and elsewhere.

The Soviet social-imperialists carry out their intervention, their hegemonic, neo-colonialist actions under the disguise of aid to, and support for, the revolutionary forces, the revolution and the construction of socialism. In reality they help the counter-revolution.

The revisionist Soviet Union tries to open the way to realizing its expansionist, neo-colonialist Plans, by presenting itself as a country which is pursuing a Leninist and internationalist policy, as an ally, friend and defender of the new national states, the undeveloped countries, etc. The Soviet revisionists preach that, by linking up with the Soviet Union and the so-called socialist community, which they proclaim as the <<main motive force of world development today>>, these countries can
advance successfully on the road of freedom and independence, even of socialism. This is why they have also concocted the theories of the "non-capitalist road of development", countries of "socialist orientation", etc.

Despite what they pretend, the strategy of the Soviet social-imperialists has nothing in common with socialism and Leninism. It is the strategy of a predatory imperialist state which wants to extend its hegemony and domination to all countries on all continents.

This hegemonic and neo-colonialist policy, which the revisionist Soviet Union is pursuing, clashes, as it is bound to do, with the policy which the United States of America is pursuing and which China, too, has set out on. This is a clash of interests among imperialists in their struggle for the redivision of the world. It is precisely these interests and this struggle that pit the one super power against the other, that compel each of them to use all the forces and means at its disposal to weaken its rival or rivals, although clashes have not yet reached such a degree of exacerbation that they hurl themselves into armed conflicts.

The Strategy of Chinese Social-imperialism

The events and facts are demonstrating ever more clearly that China is sinking deeper and deeper into revisionism, capitalism and imperialism. On this road, it is working to attain a series of strategic objectives, on a national and tional level.

On a national level, Chinese social-imperialism has set itself the task of abolishing any measure of a socialist character which may have been taken after liberation, and building in the country a capitalist system in the base and the superstructure, of making China a great capitalist power by the end of this century through the implementation of the so-called "four modernizations", of industry, agriculture, the army and science.

It is striving to create such an internal organization of the country as to ensure the domination of the old and new Chinese capitalist bourgeoisie over the Chinese people. Chinese revisionism is trying to establish this organization and this domination in the fascist way, by means of the club and oppression. It is working to create a unity between the army and the civilian base, so that the latter serve this army of oppression.

The forms and methods which have attracted the attention of the Chinese leadership most and which may be implemented in China are those of the Titoites especially the system of Yugoslav "self-administration". Many Chinese commissions and delegations of all sectors and profiles have been charged with studying this system and the experience of Yugoslav capitalist "socialism" in general, on the spot.

Already, a start has been made on putting this system and experience into practice in China. On the other hand, however, it is impossible for the revisionist leaders of China not to see the failures of the Titoite self "administration", not to bear in mind the conditions of their country which are entirely different from those of Yugoslavia. Besides this, they consider it necessary, also, to borrow many of the capitalist forms and methods, which, according to them, have proved their "effectiveness" in the United States of America, West Germany, Japan and other bourgeois countries. Apparently, the capitalist system which is being built and developed in China will be a hybrid of various revisionist, capitalist and traditional Chinese forms and methods.

To become a big capitalist power, Chinese revisionism needs a period of peace. The slogan of the great order., issued by the 11th Congress of the Chinese party is linked with this necessity. To ensure such order. requires a capitalist order of the fascist dictatorial type on the one hand, while on the other hand, peace and compromise among the rival groups, which have always existed in the Chinese party and state, must be maintained without fail. Time will tell to what extent this order and peace will be ensured.

In their policy of turning China into a superpower, the Chinese leaders aim to make economic and military gains from US imperialism, as well as from the developed capitalist countries which are allies of the United States of America.
This policy pursued by China has aroused keen interest in the capitalist world, especially on the part of US imperialism, which sees in this policy of China a great support for its strategy of maintaining capitalism and imperialism, strengthening neo-colonialism, putting down revolutions and strangling socialism, as well as of weakening its rival, the Soviet Union.

As Carter has declared, US imperialism wants to collaborate closely with the Chinese. He has stressed: <<We consider the US-Chinese relations a central element of our global policy and we look upon China as a key force for peace>>. China is for the closest possible peaceful coexistence with the United States of America.

With these views and stands, China is lining itself up with those bourgeois-capitalist states which base their existence as states on US imperialism. This turn of China towards imperialism, like that of the Soviet Union and others before it, is becoming more and more a reality with each passing day. This is seen even by the imperialists themselves, who, rejoicing at this <<new reality>>, declare that <<the ideological conflicts which divided the United States of America, the Soviet Union and China in the ‘50s are less apparent today and there is an ever increasing need for collaboration among the superpowers...>>

The US imperialists, together with President Carter, are ready to provide China with assistance to strengthen its economy and army, of course, to the degree that interests them. They are patting the backs of the Chinese revisionist leaders because the strategy of China constitutes an important aid for the hegemonic aims of US imperialism.

China applauds the American views and actions against the revisionist Soviet Union because it wants to show that they allegedly serve the revolution and the weakening of the most dangerous great power in the world, Soviet socialism. For its part, US imperialism applauds China's views and actions against the revisionist Soviet Union, because, as one of Carter's closest collaborators has put it, <<the Sino-Soviet conflict creates a more pluralist kind of global structure>>, which US imperialism prefers and considers compatible with its notion of <<how the world should be organized>>, or, in other words, how the others should be inducted to bump each other off in order to make it easier for the United States of America to dominate the world.

China's pragmatic and venal policy has led it to become an ally of US imperialism and proclaim Soviet social-imperialism as the main enemy and threat. Tomorrow, when China sees that it has achieved its objective of weakening Soviet social-imperialism, when, in its logic, it sees that US imperialism is becoming stronger, since it relies on one imperialism to fight the other, it may continue the fight on the other flank. In this case US imperialism could become the more dangerous and then China must automatically reverse its previous stand.

This is a real possibility. At their 8th Congress in 1956, the Chinese revisionists considered US imperialism the main threat. Later, at their 9th Congress, in April 1969, they proclaimed that the two superpowers, US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, comprised the main danger. Later, following the 10th Congress which was held in August 1973, and at the 11th Congress, they proclaimed Soviet social-imperialism alone as the main enemy. With such waverings, with such a pragmatic policy, it is not impossible that the 12th or the 13th Congress could come out in support of Soviet social-imperialism and proclaim US imperialism as the main enemy and this will go on until China, too, attains its goal of becoming a great capitalist world power. This being the case, what role will China play on the international arena? Its role will never be revolutionary, but regressive and counterrevolutionary.

An important aspect of the Chinese foreign policy is the alliance with Japan. As we pointed out above, this racist alliance between these two states, which was recently sealed with the Sino-Japanese Treaty, is intended to realize the strategic plans of China and Japan for their joint domination of Asia, the ASEAN countries and Oceania. The Chinese revisionists need this treaty and the friendship with Japan, so that, together with the Japanese militarists, they can threaten Soviet social-imperialism and possibly liquidate it and its influence in Asia.

But China also wants to take advantage of its links with Japan to get credits, to import equipment, technology and armaments from Japan, in order to realize its own great power ambitions.
China attaches such importance to its all-round economic collaboration with Japan that more than half its foreign trade is with that country. In order to implement its expansionist policy, social-imperialist China is working to extend its influence in Asia as much as possible. At present it has no influence at all in India, where both the United States of America and the Soviet Union their separate and common interests within the context of the changes and alliances which the future may bring. China now wishes to start somewhat better diplomatic relations with India.

But India has great pretensions towards Tibet. India will try to liquidate even that little influence China may have in Pakistan, because Pakistan is situated in a strategic position flanking Iran and Afghanistan. The rivalries over the great oil basin of the Middle East, in which US imperialism is dominant, begin there. It is very difficult for China to penetrate there. It will follow a policy against the interests of the Arab peoples and in support of American interests until such time as it becomes strong. At the same time, China will help the United States of America to set up, jointly with such countries as Iran, Saudi Arabia, etc., a powerful barrier to Soviet political, economic and military penetration into this area vital to American and European imperialism. To achieve their aims, the Chinese socialimperialists are devoting special attention to Western Europe. Their objective is to pit it against Soviet social-imperialism. That is why they support NATO and the alliance of the European countries with the United States of America and the European Common Market and the <<United Europe>>, in every way.

In its strategic plan, social-imperialist China aims to extend its influence and hegemony to the countries of what it calls the <<third world>>. The theory of the <<third world>> has great importance for China. Mao Tsetung did not proclaim this <<theory>> as a dreamer, but with definite hegemonic aims that China should dominate the world. His successors are following this same strategy of Mao Tsetung and Chou En-lai.

The Chinese strategic ambitions also extend to what is called the <<non-aligned world-., which Titoism advocates. There is no difference between these <<worlds>>, one overlaps the other. It is hard to distinguish which states belong to the ,<third world, and what distinguishes them from the <<non-aligned countries-, which states belong to the <<non-aligned>> and what distinguishes them from those of the <<third world>>. Thus, whatever they are called, they are the same states.

This is one of the reasons why the Chinese leadership gives so much importance to maintaining very friendly state and party relations with Tito and Yugoslavia in all fields, ideological, political, economic or military.

The community of views of the Chinese revisionists an,! the Yugoslav revisionists does not prevent either of them from exploiting this cordial friendship for their own particular purposes. Tito is trying to exploit Hua Kuo-feng's declarations about his and the Yugoslav party's loyal to Marxism-Leninism, about the socialist character of <<self -administration>>, and the <<Marxist -Leninist>> internal and external policy which the Titoites are allegedly pursuing, in order to show that Tito's exposure for his anti-Marxist deviations, his revisionism, is nothing but a slander by the Stalinists, and, on this basis, he is seeking to build up his own reputation on the international level. For his part, Hua Kuo-feng is exploiting relations with Yugoslavia for what is called China's opening to Europe. The Chinese revisionist are also trying to exploit their friendship with the Titoites, who pose as champions of <<non-alignment>>, as an important channel through which to penetrate into the <<non-aligned countries>> and establish their domination there. It was not without an ulterior motive that during his visit to Yugoslavia, Hua Kuo-feng praised the <<non aligned>> movement to the skies as the <<very important force in the struggle of the peoples of the world against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism>>. He sang the praises of this movement and Tito because he dreams of taking control of this movement and making Peking its centre.

In all its aspects, the policy of Chinese socialimperialism is the policy of a great imperialist power, a counterrevolutionary and warmongering policy, and therefore the peoples will come to hate it, oppose it, and fight it more and more fiercely.
The imperialist superpowers, of which we spoke above, will remain imperialist and warmongering, and if not today, tomorrow they will plunge the world into a great nuclear war. American imperialism is striving to get its hooks ever more deeply implanted into the economies of other peoples, while Soviet social-imperialism which has just begun to spread its claws, is trying to drive them into various countries of the world in order to create and to consolidate its own neo-colonialist and imperialist positions. But there is also the <<United Europe>>, linked with the United States of America through NATO, which has individual, not concentrated imperialist tendencies. On the other hand, China, too, has joined in the dance in its endeavours to become a super-power, as well as Japanese militarism which has risen to its feet. These two imperialisms are linking themselves in an alliance in order to form an imperialist power opposed to the others. In these conditions, the great danger of world war is increased. The present alliances exist but will tend to shift in the sense that they will change their directions, but not their content. The beautiful words poured out about disarmament at the UNO and the various international conferences organized by the imperialists are demagogy. They have created and are guarding their monopoly of strategic weapons and are trafficking in arms on a large scale, not to guarantee the peace and security of nations, but to draw superprofits and to suppress the revolution and the peoples, to unleash aggressive wars. Stalin has said:

<<The bourgeois states are arming and rearming themselves with a vengeance. What for? Of course, not for talks, but for war. And the imperialists need war, because it is the only means for the redivision of the world, for the redivision of markets, sources of primary materials and spheres of the investment of capital.>>

In their rivalry, which is driving them towards war, the superpowers will certainly cause many partial wars which they will incite between various states of the <<third world>>, the <<nonaligned>>, or the <<developing countries>>.

President Carter has expressed the opinion that war can occur at only two points of the globe, in the Middle East and in Africa. And it is obvious why: because it is precisely in these two regions of the world that the United States of America has greatest interests at the present time. There is the oil in the Middle East, and in rich Africa there is a clash of great neo-colonialist economic and strategic interests over the division of markets and spheres of influence among the superpowers, which are trying to preserve and strengthen their positions and to gain new ones.

However, there are other such areas, apart from the Middle East and Africa, where the interests of the superpowers clash, as for example in Southeast Asia. The United States of America and the Soviet Union, plus China, are striving to establish their spheres of influence and divide the markets. This also gives rise to conflicts, which from time to time turn into local wars, which are in no way intended to liberate the peoples, but to set up or replace ruling cliques representing local capital, cliques which are sometimes with one superpower and sometimes with the other. Soviet social-imperialism and US imperialism are two monsters which the peoples do not trust. Likewise, the peoples do not trust China, either.

When the superpowers fail to achieve their predatory interests through economic, ideological and diplomatic means, when the contradictions become exacerbated to the most acute level, when the agreements and reforms, prove unable to resolve these contradictions, then the war between them begins. Therefore, the peoples, whose blood will be shed in this war, must strive with might and main not to be caught unawares, to sabotage the predatory inter-imperialist war so that it does not assume world-wide proportions, and if they are unable to achieve this, to turn it into a liberation war and win.
The Role of Titoism and Other Revisionist Trends in the Global Strategy of Imperialism and Social-imperialism

In the savage fight which imperialism and social-imperialism, world capitalism and reaction are waging against the revolution, socialism and the peoples, they have the support of the modern revisionists of all trends. These renegades and traitors assist imperialism in the implementation of its global strategy by undermining from within, splitting and sabotaging the efforts of the proletariat and the struggle of the peoples to get rid of social and national bondage. Modern revisionists have taken upon themselves to denigrate and distort Marxism-Leninism, to confuse people's minds and to alienate them from the revolution-struggle, to assist capital, to preserve and perpetuate its system of oppression and exploitation.

Along with the Soviet and Chinese revisionists, whom we mentioned above, the Yugoslav Titoite revisionists play a role of first-rate importance in this great and dangerous counterrevolutionary game.

Titoism is an old agency of capital, a favourite weapon of the imperialist bourgeoisie in its fight against socialism and the liberation movements.

The peoples of Yugoslavia fought self-sacrificingly against the nazi-fascist occupiers: for freedom democracy and socialism. They succeeded in liberating their country, but were not allowed to continue the revolution on the road to socialism. The Yugoslav revisionist leadership with Tito at the head, which had long been worked on secretly by the Intelligence Service and which, during the period of the war, posed as preserving the features of a party of the Third International, in fact, had other aims, which were contrary to Marxism Leninism and the aspirations of the peoples of Yugoslavia for the construction of a true socialist society in Yugoslavia.

The Communist Party of Yugoslavia, which came to power, had inherited many mistakes of a deviationist nature. After the Second World War, it displayed pronounced national-chauvinist features, which had shown up as early as the time of the war. These features were apparent in its departure from the Marxist-Leninist ideology, in its attitude towards the Soviet Union and Stalin, in its chauvinist stands and actions towards Albania, etc.

The system of people's democracy, which was established in Yugoslavia, was temporary. It did not suit the clique in power, though this clique continued to call itself <<Marxist>>. The Titoites were not for the construction of socialism, or for the Communist Party of Yugoslavia to be guided by the Marxist-Leninist theory, and they did not accept the dictatorship of the proletariat. This was the source of the conflict that broke out between the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties and the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. This was an ideological conflict between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism, and not a conflict between persons over domination,... as the revisionists try to make out. Stalin defended the purity of the Marxist-Leninist theory, Tito defended the deviationist, revisionist, anti-Marxist trend of modern revisionism, following in the footstep of Browder and the other opportunists, who emerged on the eve of and during the Second World War.

In the early post-liberation years, the Yugoslav leadership pretended that it was taking the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union as an example and proclaimed that it was allegedly building socialism in Yugoslavia. This was done to deceive the peoples of Yugoslavia who had shed their blood and aspired to genuine socialism.
In fact, the Titoites were not, and could not be, for the socialist social order or the form of organization of the Soviet state, because Tito was for the capitalist system and for an essentially bourgeois-democratic state, in which his clique would hold power. This state was to serve to create the idea that socialism was being built in Yugoslavia, a <<specific>> socialism of a <<more humane type>>, that is, precisely the kind of <<socialism>> which would serve as a fifth column in the other socialist countries. Everything was well calculated and co-ordinated by the Anglo-American imperialists and the group around Tito. Thus, by playing the game of imperialism and world capitalism, and coming to terms with them, the Yugoslav revisionists placed themselves in opposition to the Soviet Union.

From the time of the anti-fascist national liberation war, in pursuit of their old plans, British and, subsequently, US imperialism helped Tito not only to break away from the Soviet Union, but also to carry out acts of sabotage against it, and especially to work to detach other countries of people's democracy from the socialist camp, in order to isolate the Soviet Union from all these countries and unite them with the West. This was the policy of world capitalism and its agency, Titoism. The rabid anti-communist, Churchill, took a direct and personal part in ensuring that Tito and his group were placed in the service of capitalism. During the war he sent, as his most trusted friends, to Tito's staff. Eventually, he himself met Tito in Naples of Italy in May 1944, in order to make quite sure that Tito would play no tricks. In his memoirs, Churchill wrote that, in his talks with Tito, the latter expressed his readiness to make a public statement later that <<communism would not be established in Yugoslavia after the war>>. Tito worked with such great energy to serve his masters that Churchill, appraising his great services, told him: <<Now I understand that you were right, therefore I am with you, I like you even more than I did previously>>. A lover could make no warmer declarations to his love.

Almost before Yugoslavia had broken completely with the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy, the imperialists, the American imperialists in particular, sent it great economic, political, ideological and military aid, which became more frequent and constant later on. This aid was supplied only on condition that the country would develop on the capitalist road. The imperialist bourgeoisie was not against Yugoslavia maintaining its outward socialist forms. On the contrary, it was greatly in its interest that Yugoslavia should keep its outward socialist colour, because in this way it would serve as a more effective weapon in the struggle against socialism and the liberation movements. Not only would this kind of <<socialism>> be radically different from the socialism envisaged and realized by Lenin and Stalin, but it would even come out against it. Within a relatively short time Yugoslavia became the <<socialist>> mouthpiece of US imperialism, a diversionist agency to assist world capital. From 1948 to this day, Titoism has been characterized by feverish activity against Marxism - Leninism to organize a propaganda campaign everywhere in the world to present the Yugoslav system as the form of a <<genuine socialist>> order, a <<new society>>, a <<non-aligned socialism>>, which is no longer like the socialism Lenin and Stalin built in the Soviet Union, but a socialist order <<with a human face>> which is being tried for the first time in the world and which is yielding <<brilliant results>>. The aim of this propaganda has always been to lead the peoples and progressive forces fighting for freedom and independence everywhere in the world up a blind alley.

The Yugoslav revisionists adopted those forms of running their country that the Trotskyites and the other anarchist elements, encouraged by the capitalist bourgeoisie, tried to adopt in the Soviet Union in the time of Lenin, in order to sabotage the construction of socialism there. While he talked about building socialism, by adopting these forms, Tito completely distorted the MarxistLeninist principles on building up industry, agriculture, etc.
The Republics of Yugoslavia assumed such features of administration and organizational political leadership that democratic centralism was liquidated and the role of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia faded into insignificance. The Communist Party of Yugoslavia changed its name. It was transformed into the <<League of Communists of Yugoslavia>>, which looks like a Marxist name, while in its content, norms, competences and aims it is anti-Marxist. The League became a spineless front, was stripped of the distinguishing features of a Marxist-Leninist party, preserved the old form, but no longer played the role of the vanguard of the working class, was no longer the political force which led the Federative Republic of Yugoslavia, but, according to the Titoite revisionists, allegedly performed only general <<educational>> functions.

The Titoite leadership placed the party under the control of the UDB, to Which it was subordinated, turned it into a fascist organization, and the state into a fascist. We know full well the great danger of these activities, for Koçi Xoxe, the agent in the pay of the Titoites, tried to achieve the same thing in Albania.

Tito, Rankovich and their agency entirely liquidated anything which might have had the true colour of socialism. Titoism waged a fierce fight against the attempts of those internal elements who sought to blow up this agency and this capitalist-revisionist organization, as well as against all the Marxist-Leninist propaganda which was conducted abroad to unmask the regime which posed as socialist.

The Titoite leadership quickly abandoned the collectivization of agriculture which had begun in the early years, set up the capitalist state farms, encouraged the development of private property in the countryside, allowed land to be bought and sold freely, rehabilitated the kulaks, left the field free for the private market to flourish in town and country, and carried out the first reforms which strengthened the capitalist direction of the economy.

Meanwhile, the Titoite bourgeoisie was searching for a <<new>> form to camouflage the Yugoslav capitalist order, and this form was found. They called it Yugoslav <<self-administration>>. They dressed it up in a <<Marxist-Leninist>> cloak, claiming that this system was the most authentic socialism.

At first, <<self-administration>> emerged as an economic system, then it was extended to the field of state organization and all the other fields of life in that country.

The theory and practice of Yugoslav <<self administration>> are an open negation of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the universal laws of the construction of socialism. The economic and political system of <<self-administration>> is an anarcho-syndicalist form of the bourgeois dictatorship, which is ruling a Yugoslavia dependent on international capital.

The system of <<self-administration>>, with all its characteristic features, such as the elimination of democratic centralism, the role of unified management by the state, anarchist federalism, the anti-state ideology in general, has brought about permanent economic, political and ideological chaos and confusion in Yugoslavia, weak and unequal development of its republics and regions, great social-class differentiations, national feuds and oppression, and the degeneration of spiritual life. It has brought about great fragmentation of the working class, by putting one detachment of it in competition with another, while fostering the bourgeois sectional, localist and individualist spirit.

The working class in Yugoslavia not only does not play the hegemonic role in the state and society, but the system of <<self-administration>> places it in such conditions that it is unable even to defend its own general interests and to act as a unified and compact class.

From the capitalist world, particularly from us imperialism, large amounts of capital have poured into Yugoslavia in the form of investments, credits and loans. It is precisely this capital which constitutes the material basis of the <<develop- of Yugoslav capitalist <<self - administrative socialism>>. Its indebtedness alone amounts to over 11 billion dollars. Yugoslavia has received over 7 billion dollars in credits from the United States of America.
Despite the numerous c edits the Titoite leadership receives from abroad, the peoples of Yugoslavia have not enjoyed, nor are they enjoying, the <<brilliant results>> of this specific <<socialism>>. On the contrary, there is political and ideological chaos in Yugoslavia. A system which engenders large-scale unemployment at home and mass emigration of labour abroad prevails there, and this makes Yugoslavia completely dependent on the imperialist powers. The Yugoslav peoples are being exploited to the bone in the interests of the class in power and of all the imperialist powers which have made investments in that country. The Yugoslav state is not concerned that prices go up every day, that the poverty of the working masses is steadily increasing and that the country is not only up to its neck in debt, but is also deeply involved in the great crisis of the capitalist world. Yugoslavia has only limited independence and sovereignty, because, apart from anything else, it has no economic potential completely its own. The greater part of it exists in joint ownership with various foreign capitalist firms and states, therefore it is bound to suffer the destructive effects of the crisis and foreign exploitation.

But it is not accidental that world capitalism gives Yugoslav <<self - administration>> such great political and financial support and sings in harmony with the Titoite propaganda to pass this system off as <<a new tested form of the construction of socialism>> for all countries. It does this because the form of Yugoslav <<self administration>> provides a way of ideological and political subversion and sabotage against the revolutionary liberation movements of the proletariat and the peoples, a way to open the road to the political and economic penetration of imperialism into the various countries of the world. Imperialism and the bourgeoisie want to keep selfadministration,... as a reserve system for various circumstances and different countries, in order to prolong the life of capitalism, which does not give up the ghost easily, but is striving to find various forms of government at the expense of the peoples.

The Yugoslav theories and practices of <<non alignment>> render a great service to various imperialists, for they help them hoodwink the peoples. This is in the interest of the imperialists and social-imperialists alike, because it helps them to stabilise and strengthen their influence in the <<non - aligned countries>>, to divert the freedom loving peoples from the road of national liberation and proletarian revolution. Therefore, both CarteF and Brezhnev, as well as Hua Kuo-feng, lavish praise on the Titoite policy of <<non - alignment>> and try to exploit it for their own purposes.

Titoism has always been a weapon of the imperialist bourgeoisie, a fire-extinguisher to quell the flames of the revolution. It is of the same line and has the same aims as modern revisionism, in general, and its different variants, with which it is in ideological unity. The ways, forms and tactics they use in the struggle against Marxism-Leninism, the revolution and socialism may be different, but their counterrevolutionary aims are identical.

In the efforts which the bourgeoisie and reaction are making to put down the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and the peoples, the revisionist parties of Europe, in the first place, and those of all countries on the other continents render them a great service.

The revisionist parties of the countries of Western Europe are making efforts to concoct a theory about a <<new society>>, allegedly socialist, which will be achieved through <<structural reforms>> and in close coalition with the social-democratic parties, and even with the right-wing parties. This society, according to them, will be built on new foundations, through <<structural reforms>> <<social peace>>, <<the parliamentary road>> and the <<historic compromise>> with the bourgeois parties.

The revisionist parties of Europe, such as those of Italy, France and Spain, and following them all the other revisionist parties of the West, deny Leninism, the class struggle, the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. All of them have embarked on the road of compromise with the capitalist bourgeoisie. They have named this anti-Marxist line <<Eurocommunism>>. <<Eurocommunism>> is a new pseudo-communist trend which is and is not in opposition to the Soviet revisionist bloc. This wavering stand is explained by their aim to have a coexistence of ideas with European social-democracy and the whole welter of views setething in the cauldron of Europe.
The <<Eurocomunist>> can unite with anybody at all except those who fight for the triumph of the revolution and the purity of the Marxist-Leninist ideology. All the revisionist, opportunist and socialdemocratic trends are going the whole length to assist the superpowers in their diabolical activ- to suppress the revolution and the peoples. The support of all these trends for the allegedly new organisms of the bourgeoisie has a single aim: to smother the revolution by raising a thousand and one material, political and ideological obstacles to it. They are working to disorientate and split the proletariat and its allies, because they know that, divided and split by factional struggles, the latter will be unable to create, either at home or on an international plane that ideological political and militant unity which is essential to cope with the attacks of world capitalism in decay.

The coalition of modern revisionism with social-democracy is afraid of the advent of fascism, especially in certain countries which are threatened by the extreme right. To avoid the fascist dictatorship, the revisionists and social-democrats make efforts <<to mitigate>> the contradictions and <<tone down>> the class struggle between the masses of the people and the proletariat, on the one hand, and the capitalist bourgeoisie, on the other. Thus, in order to secure <<social peace>>, these subjects of the coalition have to make concessions to one another and to reach a compromise with the capitalist bourgeoisie, come to agreement with it over some sort of regime suitable to both sides. Thus, while the capitalist bourgeoisie and its parties openly continue their fight against communism, the revisionist parties endeavour to distort Marxism Leninism, the guiding ideology of the revolution.

The trade-unions, which are reformist and are especially educated and trained in compromises With the owning class and only for economic claims and not for strikes with political demands and aims of the seizure of state power by the proletariat, have become the mainstay of the revisionist parties of Europe. Naturally, their bargaining is; aimed at striking a balance between the demand and the offer -- one side begs alms and the other side determines the size of this alms. The two sides, both the reformist trade-unions and the revisionist parties, and the owning class with its parties, state power and trade-unions, are threatened by the revolution, by the proletariat and its; genuine Marxist-Leninist parties. Therefore, they are in search of a reactionary compromise a solution that cannot be the same in all the capitalist countries, because of the differences in the strength of capital, the depth of the crisis and the extent of the contradictions eroding them from within

The Revolution - the Only Weapon to Defeat the Strategy of the Enemies of the Proletariat and the Peoples

All the enemies, the imperialists;, socialimperialists and various revisionists, together or separately, are fighting to mislead progressive people, to discredit Marxism-Leninism, and especially to distort the Leninist theory of the revolution, to suppress the revolution and any kind of popular resistance and national liberation struggle. The arsenal of the enemies of Marxism-Leninism is arge, but the forces of the revolution are also colossal. These are the forces which are stirring, clashing and fighting with the enemies of the revolution and which have ruined the peace of mind of the capitalist world and world reaction and are making life impossible for them.

<<A spectre is haunting Europe - the spectre of communism. All the Powers of old Europe... have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre>>.

This observation of Marx and Engels is still valid today. Imperialism, social-imperialism and modern revisionism think that the danger to them from communism has been eliminated, because, thinking that the heavy blow which the revolution has suffered from the revisionist betrayal is irreparable, they are underestimating the strength of Marxism-Leninism, and overestimating the material, suppressive military, and economic potential they have at their disposal. This is only an illusion of theirs.
The world proletariat is gathering its forces. From their own experience, the proletariat and the freedom-loving peoples are gaining a clearer understanding, day by day, of the treachery of the Titoite, Khрушчевite, Chinese, <<Eurocomunismist>> and other modern revisionists. Time is working for the revolution, for socialism, and not for the bourgeoisie and imperialism, not for modern revisionism and world reaction. The fire of the revolution is burning everywhere in the hearts of the oppressed peoples who want to gain their genuine freedom, democracy and sovereignty, to take power into their own hands and to set out on the road of socialism, destroying imperialism and its flunkies.

That phenomenon of the time of Lenin, when the break-away from the Second International was followed by the creation of new Marxist-Leninist parties, is taking place today. The revisionist betrayal has brought about the setting up and strengthening of genuine communist parties, as it is bound to do, everywhere, and these parties have taken up and raised high the banner of Marxism-Leninism and the revolution, which the revisionists have rejected and trampled in the mud. On them devolves the burden of opposing the glorious Leninist strategy of the revolution, the great theory of Marxism-Leninism to the global strategy of world imperialism and revisionism. On them devolves the burden of making the masses fully conscious of the objectives and the right road of the struggle and the sacrifices it demands, of uniting, organizing, guiding and leading them to victory.

We Marxist-Leninists, who are in the forefront of the titanic struggle which is being waged today between the proletariat and the oppressed peoples who aspire to freedom, on the one hand, and the savage rapacious imperialists, on the other, must thoroughly understand the aims, tactics, methods and forms which the common enemies and the individual enemies of each country employ in the fight. We cannot see this thing properly if we do not base ourselves firmly on the Marxist-Leninist theory of the revolution, if we do not see that in the present situation there are a series of weak links in the capitalist world chain, as there will be in the future, at which the revolutionaries and the peoples must carry out ceaseless activity, an unrelenting and courageous organized struggle to break these links one after another. This, of course, requires work, struggle, sacrifices and self-denial. Led by the interests of the revolution, the courageous peoples and individuals can and will face up to the large forces of imperialism, socialism and reaction, which are linking up with one another, setting up new alliances and seeking a way out of the difficult situations created for them. It is the revolutionaries, the Marxist-Leninists, the struggle of the peoples on all continents, in all countries, that create these difficult situations for the regressive forces.

The communists everywhere in the world have no reason to fear the baseless myths which have predominated in revolutionary thought for some time. The communists must fight to win over those who make mistakes, in order to help them mend their ways, making great efforts to this end without, of course, falling into opportunism themselves. In the process of the principled struggle, in the beginning there will be some vacillations but the vacillations will occur among the wavering, whereas amongst those who are resolute and apply the Marxist-Leninist theory correctly, who have a proper view of the interests of the proletariat of their own country, of the world proletariat and the revolution, there will be no vacillation. However, when the wavering see that the comrades are standing firm on their revolutionary Marxist-Leninist opinions, they will be further strengthened in their fight.

If the Marxist-Leninists apply the Marxist-Leninist theory correctly and with determination, on the basis of the present international conditions and the national conditions of each country, if they ceaselessly strengthen proletarian internationalist unity in merciless struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism of all trends, they will certainly overcome all the difficulties they will encounter on their road, however great they may be. Properly applied, Marxism-Leninism and its immortal principles will inevitably bring about the destruction of world capitalism and the triumph of the dictatorship of the proletariat, by means of which the working class will build socialism and march towards communism.
THE LENINIST THEORY ON IMPERIALISM RETAINS ITS FULL VALIDITY

In the present conditions, when the Khrushchevite, Titoite, <<Eurocommunist>> and Chinese revisionists and the other anti-Marxist trends are attacking the cause of the revolution and peoples' liberation on the pretext that the situation has changed, a thorough study of Lenin's works on imperialism assumes first-rate importance.

We must return to these works and make an especially thorough and detailed study of Lenin's work of genius - Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. From a careful study of this work, we shall see how the revisionists, and the Chinese leaders among them, distort the Leninist thought on imperialism, how they understand the aims, strategy and tactics of imperialism. Their writings, declarations, stands and actions show that their View of the nature of imperialism is completely Wrong, they see it from counterrevolutionary and anti-Marxist positions, as did all the parties of the Second International and their ideologists, Kautsky and company, whom Lenin ruthlessly exposed.

If we study this work of Lenin's carefully and faithfully adhere to his analysis and conclusions of genius, we shall see that imperialism in our days fully retains those same characteristics that Lenin described, that the Leninist definition of our epoch as the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions remains unshaken, and that the triumph of the revolution is inevitable.

As is known, Lenin begins his analysis of imperialism with the concentration of production and capital and the monopolies. Today, too, the phenomena of the concentration and centralization of production and capital can be analysed correctly and scientifically only on the basis of the Leninist analysis of imperialism.

A characteristic of present-day capitalism is the ever increasing concentration of production and capital, which has led to the merging or absorption of small enterprises by the powerful ones. A consequence of this is the mass concentration of the work force in big trusts and concerns. These enterprises have also concentrated in their hands huge productive capacities and resources of energy and raw materials of incalculable proportions. At present the big capitalist enterprises are also utilizing nuclear energy and the newest technology, which belong to these enterprises exclusively. Such gigantic organisms have a national and and international character. Within their own country, they have ruined most of the small proprietors or industrialists, while on the international plane they have grown into colossal concerns, which include whole branches of the industry, agriculture, construction, transport, etc. of many countries. Wherever these concerns have extended their tentacles, wherever the concentration of production has been achieved by a tiny handful of multimillionaire capitalists, the tendency to the liquidation of the small owners and industrialists is becoming more widespread and pronounced. This has led to the further strengthening of monopolies.

<<This transformation of competition into monopoly,. said Lenin, (4is one of the most important phenomena, - if not the most important, in the economy of presentday capitalism ... >>,

Speaking of this feature of imperialism, he adds,

<<...the rise of monopolies as the result of concentration of production in general is a universal and fundamental law of the present stage of development of capitalism>>.
The development of capitalism in today's conditions fully confirms the above conclusion of Lenin's. Nowadays, the monopolies have become the most typical and common phenomenon, which determines the physiognomy of imperialism, its economic essence. In the imperialist countries, like the United States of America, the Federal German Republic, Britain, Japan, France, etc., the concentration of production has assumed unprecedented proportions.

For example, in 1976, there were nearly 17 million people, representing over 20 percent of the employed work force, employed in the 500 biggest US corporations. Sixty-six percent of all the goods sold came from these corporations. At the time when Lenin wrote his book <<imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism>>, there was only one big American company in the capitalist world, the <<United States Steel Corporation>> with share capital of over one billion dollars, whereas in 1976 the number of billionaire companies was about 350. In 1975, the General Motors Corporation automobile, tl;ust, this supermonopoly, had a total capital it excess of 22 billion dollars and exploited an army of nearly 800,000 workers. Next comes the monopoly Standard Oil of New Jersey., which dominates the oil industry of the United States of America and other countries and which exploits over 700,000 workers. In the automobile industry there are three big monopolies which account for more than 90 percent of production in this branch; in both the aviation and the steel industries, four very big companies account for 65 and 47 percent of production respectively.

The same process has occurred and is occurring in the other imperialist countries, too. In the Federal German Republic, 13 percent of the total number of enterprises have concentrated about 50 percent of the production and 40 percent of the labour power of the country. In Britain, 50 big monopolies dominate everything. The British Steel Corporation accounts for over 90 percent of the steel production of the country. In France, two companies have concentrated three fourths of the steel production in their hands, four monopolies own the whole production of automobiles, whereas four others control the entire output of oil products. In Japan, ten big black metallurgy companies produce all the pig iron and over three fourths of the steel, while eight companies operate in non-ferrous metallurgy. The same applies to the other branches and sectors.

The small and middle-sized enterprises which still xist in these countries are directly dependent On monopolies. They receive orders from the monopolies and work for them; get credits and raw materials, technology, etc. from them. In practice, they have become appendages of the monopolies. The concentration and centralization of production and capital, creating giant monopolies which have no technological unity, is widespread today. Enterprises and entire branches of industrial production, construction, transport, trade, services, of the infrastructure, etc., operate within these gigantic <<conglomerate>> monopolies. They turn out everything, from children's toys to intercontinental missiles.

The economic power of the monopolies and the concentration of capital, which has increased and is constantly increasing, creates a situation in which the victims of the competition are not just <<the small babies>>, that is, the unmonopolized enterprises, which were typical in the past, but even big financial enterprises and groups. As a result of the insatiable appetite of the monopolies f or high monopoly profits and the extreme sharpening of the competition, this process has assumed colossal proportions during the last two decades. The mergers and take-overs in the capitalist world toda are 7 to 10 times greater than in the years prior to the Second World War.

The mergers and combinations of industrial, trading, farming and banking enterprises have led -to the creation of new forms of monopolies, to the creation of big industrial-commercial or indus-corporations, forms which are finding wide application not only in the capitalist countries of the West, but also in the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and other revisionist countries. In the past the monopoly combines carried on the transport and selling of goods with the help of other independent firms, whereas today, the monopolies control production, transport and marketing.

The monopolies not only try to eliminate competition between the enterprises under their control, but have also extended their clutches to monopolize all the resources of raw materials, all the regions rich in important minerals, like iron, coal, copper, uranium, etc. This process is going on on the national and the international plane.
The concentration of production and capital assumed colossal proportions especially after the Second World War, with the expansion and development of the sector of state monopoly capitalism. State monopoly capitalism means the subordination of the state apparatus to monopolies, the establishment of their complete domination in the economic, political and social life of the country. In this way the state intervenes directly in the economy in the interest of the financial oligarchy, in order to ensure the maximum profit for the class in power through the exploitation of all the working people, as well as to strangle the revolution and the peoples' liberation struggles. State monopoly property, as the most characteristic basic element of state monopoly capitalism, does not represent the property of one individual capitalist or group of capitalists, but the property of the capitalist state, the property of the bourgeois class in power. In various imperialist countries the state monopoly capitalist sector accounts for 20 to 30 percent of the total production. State monopoly capitalism, which represents the highest stage of concentration of production and capital, is the main form of property prevailing today in the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries. This state monopoly capitalism is in the service of the new bourgeois class in power. In China, too, through a number of reforms, such as the establishment of profit as the main aim of the activity of the enterprises, the Application of capitalist practices in organization, management and remuneration, the creation of economic regions, trusts and combines very similar to the Soviet, Yugoslav and Japanese ones, the opening of doors to foreign capital, the direct links of enterprises with foreign monopolies, etc., the economy is assuming forms typical of state monopoly capitalism. At present, in the capitalist and revisionist world the concentration and centralization of production and capital have reached an inter-state level. the European Common Market, Comecon, etc., which represent the union of monopolies of various imperialist powers, also encourage and realize this tendency in practice. Analysing the forms of international monopolies, in his time Lenin spoke of the cartels and syndicates. In today's conditions, when the concentration of production and capital has reached very large proportions, the monopoly bourgeoisie has also found other forms for the exploitation of working people. These are the multinational companies. In their outward appearance, these companies seek to give the impression that they are under the joint ownership of capitalists of many countries. In fact, in regard to their capital and control, the multinational companies belong mainly to one country, although they carry out their activities in many countries. They are expanding more and more through the absorption of local companies and firms, big and small, which cannot cope with the savage competition. The multinational companies open up subsidiaries and extend their enterprises to those countries where the prospects for maximum profits seem most secure. The US multinational company <<Ford>>, for example, has set up 20 big plants in other countries, in which 100 thousand workers of various nationalities are employed. Between the multinational companies and the bourgeois state there are close links and reciprocal dependence, which are based on their exploiting class character. The capitalist state is used as a tool in their service for their aims of domination and expansion on both the national and the international plane. In regard to their major economic role and the great weight they carry in the whole life of the country, some multinational companies, individually, constitute a mighty economic force which, in many instances, is equal to or even exceeds, the budgets or production of several developed capitalist countries taken together. The production of one of the powerful multinational companies of the United States of America, <<General Motors Corporation>>, is greater than the industrial production of Holland, Belgium and Switzerland taken together. They intervene to secure special favours and privileges for themselves in the countries in which they operate. For example, in 1975, the owners of the electronics; industry of the United States of America demanded that the Mexican Government change its Labour Code which envisaged some safety measures, or otherwise they would transfer their industry to Costa-Rica, and, in order to bring pressure to bear, closed down many factories in which nearly 12,000 Mexican workers were employed.
The multinational companies are levers of imperialism and one of the main forms of its expansion. They are pillars of neo-colonialism and affect the national sovereignty and independence of the countries in which they operate. In order to open the way to their domination, these companies do not hesitate to commit any crime, from the organization of plots and the dislocation of the economy, down to the outright buying of top officials, political and trade-union leaders, etc. The Lockheed scandal provided ample proof of this.

Many multinational companies have established themselves and are operating in the revisionist countries, too.* 1 Seventeen US, 18 Japanese, 13 West-German, 20 French, and 7 Italian and other multinational companies have established themselves in the Soviet Union or have opened offices there. Over 30 multinational companies have established themselves in Poland. Of them, 10 are American, 6 West-German, 6 British, 3 Japanese, etc. There are 32 such companies operating in Rumania 31 in Hungary, 30 in Czechoslovakia. The picture is the same in the other revisionist countries. (Information from the book <<Vodka - Cola>>, by Karl Levinson, 1977, pp. 79-82).

They have begun to penetrate China, too. The concentration and centralization of production and capital, which characterize the capitalist world today and have led to extensive socialization of production, have not in any way altered the exploiting nature of imperialism. On the contrary, they have increased and intensified the oppression and impoverishment of the working people. These phenomena prove to the hilt Lenin's thesis that under conditions of the concentration of production and capital in imperialism,

<<the result is immense progress in the socialization of production,>> but, nevertheless, <<. . appropriation remains private. The social means of production remain the private property of a few>>. *V. I. Lenin

The monopolies and multinational companies remain great enemies of the proletariat and the peoples.

The intensification of the process of concentration of production and capital which is taking place in our time, has further exacerbated the basic contradiction of capitalism, the contradiction between the social character of production and the private character of appropriation, along with all the other contradictions. Today, just as in the past the colossal income and superprofits realized from the savage exploitation of workers are appropriated by a handful of capitalist magnates. Likewise, the means of production, with which the united branches of industry have been equipped, are the private property of capitalists, while the working class remains enslaved to the owners of the means of production and its labour power remains a market commodity. Nowadays the big capitalist enterprises no longer exploit tens or hundreds of workers but hundreds of thousands of them. As a result of the ruthless capitalist exploitation of this great army of workers, the surplus value seized by the US corporations in 1976 alone, is estimated at over 100 billion dollars, as against 44 billion in 1960.

Lenin exposed the opportunists of the Second International, who preached the possibility of liquidating the antagonistic contradictions of capitalism as a result of the emergence and development of monopolies. He proved with scientific argument that the monopolies, as vehicles of the oppression and exploitation of labour and the private appropriation of the results of labour, make the contradictions of capitalism even more severe. The superstructure of the capitalist order is built on the basis of the domination of monopolies. This superstructure defends and represents the predatory interests of the monopolies, on both the national and international plane. The monopolies dictate the internal and external policy, the economic, social, military, and other policies.

The present - day reality of the concentration of production and capital also exposes the preachings of the reactionary chiefs of social-democracy, the modern revisionists and opportunists of every hue, that the trusts, the property of state monopoly capitalism, etc., can allegedly be transformed in a peaceful way into socialist economies, that allegedly present-day monopoly capitalism will be integrated gradually into socialism.
The concentration of production and capital, Lenin teaches us, also serve as a basis for increased concentration of money capital, its concentration in the hands of big banks, and the birth and development of finance capital. In the course of the development of capitalism, together with the monopolies, the banks, too, assume great development, absorbing the money capital of the monopolies and concerns as well as of small producers and investors. In this way, the banks, which are in the hands of the capitalists and serve them, become the owners of the main financial means.

The same process, which was carried out for the elimination of the small enterprises by the big ones, by the cartels and monopolies, has also taken place in the liquidation, one after the other, of small banks. Thus, just as the big enterprises created the monopolies, the big banks, too, created their banking concerns. In the last two decades this phenomenon has assumed colossal proportions and it is still going on, very rapidly, today. A distinctive feature of today's mergers and Take-overs is the fact that not only the small banks but also the middle-sized and the relatively big ones are involved. This phenomenon is accounted for by the increasing severity of the contradictions of capitalist reproduction, the extension of the struggle of competition and the grave crisis of the financial and monetary system of the capitalist world.

Twenty-six big financial groups dominate in the United States of America. The biggest of them is the Morgan group, with 20 big banks, insurance companies, etc., and with share capital of 90 billion dollars.

The level of the concentration and centralization of banking capital is also very high in the other main capitalist countries. In West Germany, three out of seventy big banks own over 58 percent of all banking assets. In Britain, all banking activity is controlled by four banks known as the <<Big Four>>. The level of concentration of banking capital is also high in Japan and France, too.

Lenin has proved that banking capital is interlocked with industrial capital. At first, the banks are interested in the fate of the credits they advance to the industrialists. They mediate to ensure that the industrialists who receive the credits reach agreement among themselves to avoid competition with one another because the banks, themselves, would also suffer from this. This was the first step of the banks in their interlocking with industrial capital. With the development of the concentration of production and money capital, the banks become direct investors in the production enterprises, setting up joint-stock companies. In this way, banking capital penetrates in to industry, construction, agriculture, transport, the sphere of circulation and all other fields. For their part, the enterprises buy large holdings of shares and become participants in banks. Today the directors of banks and monopoly enterprises are members of one another's boards of management, thus creating what Lenin called their <<personal union>>. The finance capital which emerges from this process includes all forms of capital: industrial capital, money capital and commodity capital. Characterizing this process, Lenin said:

<<The concentration of production; the monopolies arising therefrom; the merging or coalescence of banks with industry - such is the history of the rise of finance capital and such is the content of that concept>>.

Although since the Second World War finance capital has increased and undergone structural changes, it still has precisely those same aims it has always had, the making of maximum profits through the exploitation of the broad masses of working people inside and outside the country. The insurance companies, which have greatly increased over recent years in the main capitalist countries and have become competitors of the banks, have the same role. In the United States of America, for example, in 1970 as against 1950, banking assets had increased 3.5 fold, whereas those of insurance companies had increased 6.5 fold, over the same period.

With the capital they accumulate through plundering the people, these companies have been able to advance the monopolies large sums amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars. In this way, the insurance companies are merged and interlocked with the industrial and banking monopolies, becoming an organic constituent part of finance capital.
Driven by its insatiable thirst for profits, the monopoly bourgeoisie turns every source of temporarily available monetary means, such as the workers' pension funds, the people's savings, etc., into capital.

Concentrated finance capital draws exceptionally large amounts of income not only from the profit accruing to it from the money absorbed from the concerns, small industrialists, etc., etc., but also from the issue of securities and provision of loans. Just as in the case of savings' deposits, in the latter, too, only a small share of the profit goes to the lenders, while the bank itself makes colossal profits from these activities, through which it increases its own capital and investments, which, of course, create a continuous flow of additional profits for finance capital. Finance capital invest mostly in industry, but it has extended its network of speculation to other assets, too, such as land, railways, and other branches and sectors.

The banks have real possibilities of providing considerable sums in credits, which are required by the high level of concentration of production and the domination of monopolies. In this manner, favourable conditions are created for the big monopoly combines to step up their savage exploitation of the working masses both at home and abroad, in order to ensure maximum profits.

With the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries, the banks there assumed all the features characteristic of monopolies. In these countries, the banks serve the exploitation of the broad masses of the working people, both at home and abroad, in the same way as in all other capitalist countries.

In recent years, trade on time payment under which customers buy consumer goods, especially durable consumer items, has increased rapidly in the capitalist and revisionist countries. The provision of such credits ensures the bourgeoisie markets for the sale of goods, the capitalists make colossal profits from the high interest rates charged, while the debtors are bound hand and foot to the creditors and the capitalist firms.

The debts and other obligations of the working people to the banks and money-lending institutions have greatly increased at the present time. In the United States of America alone, in 1976 the indebtedness of the population from such credits had reached the sum of 167 billion dollars, as against 6 billion in 1945, while in the Federal German Republic the indebtedness of the population had amounted to more than 46 billion marks.

The increased concentration and centralization of banking capital has led to increased economic and political domination by the financial oligarchy and the use of a series of forms and methods to increase the economic bondage, the impoverishment and misery of the broad masses of working people.

The development of finance capital enabled a small group of powerful industrial capitalists and bankers not only to accumulate great wealth but also to concentrate real economic and political power, which makes itself felt in the entire life of the country, in their hands. These all-powerful people are those who head the monopolies and banks and constitute what is called the financial oligarchy. Proceeding from the fact that the large companies have now been transformed into shareholders' companies, in which even some worker may have a few token shares, the apologists of capitalism labour to prove that capital has now allegedly lost the private character which it had in the time when Marx wrote "Capital", or when Lenin analysed imperialism, that it has supposedly become people's capital. But this is a fable. Today, as in the past, powerful private industrial - financial groups dominate the imperialist countries: the Rochefellers, Morgans, Duponts, Mellons, Fords, the Chicago, Texas, California and other groups in the United States of America; the financial groups of the Rothschilds Behrings, Samuels, etc., in Britain; Krupp, Siemens, Mannesmann, Thyssen, Gerling, etc, in West Germany; Fiat, Alfa - Romeo, Montedison, Olivetti, etc., in Italy; the great families in France, and so on.
As the possessor of industrial, and finance capital, the financial oligarchy has established its economic and political domination over the entire life of the country. It has even subordinated the state apparatus, which has been transformed into a tool in the hands of the financial plutocracy, to its own interests. The financial oligarchy dismisses and appoints governments, dictates the internal and foreign policy. In internal life, it is linked with the reactionary forces, with all those political, ideological, educational and cultural institutions which defend its political and economic power while in foreign policy it defends and back up all the conservative and reactionary forces which support and open the road for its monopoly expansion, and fight for the preservation and consolidation of capitalism.

The financial oligarch, does not hesitate to use any means to secure its own domination, establishing political reaction in all fields.

"...finance capital, ... said Lenin, "strives for domination, not for freedom"."

The situation today proves that oppression by the monopoly bourgeoisie has been intensified everywhere. On this basis, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is becoming deeper. At the same time, the economic and financial expansion, accompanied with political and military expansion, has further exacerbated the contradictions between the peoples and imperialism, as well as the contradictions among the imperialist powers themselves. The present-day propaganda of the Chinese revisionists ignores this undeniable objective reality.

The concentration and centralization of banking capital now takes place, not just in the context of one country, but in the context of several capitalist, or capitalist and revisionist countries. The joint banks of the European Common Market, or the "International Bank for Economic Co-operation", as well as the Investment Bank- of Comecon, are of this character. Similarly, the combinations of the West-German-Polish or the Anglo-Romanian, Franco-Romanian or Anglo-Hungarian banks, or the American-Yugoslav, Anglo-Yugoslav or other banking corporations are banking unions of the capitalist type. The Soviet Union has opened up many banks in a number of capitalist countries and these have become competitors and partners of capitalist banks wherever they have been established, in Zurich, London, Paris, Africa, Latin America, and elsewhere.

China, too, is being sucked deeper and deeper into the whirlpool of this process of the capitalist integration of banks. Apart from the banks it has in Hong-Kong, Macao and Singapore, tomorrow China will be setting up banks in Japan, America, and elsewhere. At the same time, it is permitting the banks of imperialist powers to penetrate China.

Lenin emphasized that present-day capitalism is characterized by the export of capital. Today this economic feature of imperialism has been further developed and strengthened. The biggest exporters of capital in the world today are the United States of America, Japan, the Soviet Union, the Federal German Republic, Britain and France.

For a certain period, capital was exported by the United States of America, Britain, France and Germany, countries with developed industry, which sucked from colonies the riches of the land and those that lay below its surface. Later, as a consequence of the war and crises, some imperialist powers such as Britain, France, Germany, were weakened economically, while American imperialism enriched itself and became a superpower. In the situation created after the Second World War the torrent of exports of American capital was very detrimental to the other capitalist powers.

Today, American capital is exported to all countries, even to the industrialized ones, in the form of investments, credits, loans, in the form of co-operation in joint companies or through the setting up of large industrial companies. American imperialism, monopoly capital, invests in the undeveloped and poor countries, because there production costs are low, while the level of exploitation of working people is high. It invests in order to secure raw materials, to monopolize markets, to sell its industrial products.
It is known that the development of capitalist countries takes place unevenly; therefore, the big monopolies and companies of the United States of America and the other countries export capital precisely to those countries in which economic development requires investments and technology. The capital invested brings fabulous profits to the financial concerns and monopolies, because in the poor, undeveloped countries, land is very cheap and large tracts of it, together with its riches, can be purchased with little money. Labour power is cheap, too, because people on the verge of starvation are forced to work for very low pay. It has been calculated that for every dollar invested in these countries, the imperialist powers make a profit of 5 dollars.

According to American official data, during the 1971-1975 period alone, direct investments from the United States of America in the new states totalled 6.5 billion dollars, while the profits it made in these countries over the same period amounted to nearly 30 billion dollars.

In order to disguise the export of capital, the imperialist powers also resort to the practice of according credits. Through these so-called credits or aid, the big capitalist concerns and the states to which they belong bring great pressure to bear on the recipient states and peoples, and keep them under control. The <<aid>> or credits to the undeveloped countries originate from the plunder of the wealth of these countries as well as from the exploitation of the working masses of the developed countries and are given to the wealthy of the undeveloped countries. In other words, this means that the big US monopolies, for example, fatten on the sweat of both the American people and the other peoples, and when they export capital and accord credits, these represent, precisely, the sweat and blood of these peoples. On the other hand, these credits, which the big monopolies provide for the countries of the so-called third world, in fact, serve the feudal-bourgeois classes which rule these countries.

The credits the new states receive are links of the imperialist chain around the necks of their own peoples. As the statistical data show, the debts of these countries double every five years. From nearly 8.5 billion dollars in 1955, the debts of the undeveloped countries to the imperialist powers had risen to over 150 billion dollars in 1977.

World capitalism has developed technology and expertise in its own interests, in order to multiply its profits from the discovery of underground resources, the intensification of agriculture, etc. All this technology, the technical-scientific revolution itself, and the new methods of economic exploitation serve imperialism, the capitalist monopolies, but not the peoples. Capitalism never makes investments, provides loans, or exports capital to other countries without first calculating the profits it will realize for itself. The big monopolies and banks, which have spread their spider's web all over the capitalist and revisionist world, never accord credits unless they are presented with concrete data about the income to be made from the exploitation of a mine, the land, the extraction of oil or water from a desert, etc.

There are also other forms of according credits, like those practised with those pseudo-socialist states which are trying to disguise the capitalist course on which they are proceeding. These are large credits provided in the form of trade credits its which, of course, must be repaid within a short time. These are provided jointly by many capitalist countries which have calculated in advance the economic as well as political profits they will draw from the recipient state, taking into account both its economic potential and ability to pay. In no case do the capitalists provide their credits for the construction of socialism. They provide them to destroy socialism. Therefore, a genuine socialist country never accepts credits, in any form, from a capitalist, bourgeois, or revisionist country.

Like the Khrushchevite Soviet revisionist, the Chinese revisionists, also, employ many slogans, many quotations, build many phrases which sound <<Leninist>>, <<revolutionary>>, but their real activity is reactionary, counterrevolutionary. The Chinese leaders try to present even their Opportunist stands towards, and relations with, the imperialist countries as if they are in the interest of socialism. These revisionists use this camouflage with the intention of keeping the masses of the Proletariat and the people in the dark, so that they will not be able to transform their discontent into a powerful means to carry out the revolution.
Let us take, for example, the question of the economic construction of the country, the development of the socialist economy relying on one's own forces. This principle is correct. Every independent, sovereign socialist state must mobilize the entire people, and define its economic policy correctly, must take all measures for the proper and most rational exploitation of all the wealth of the country, and administer this wealth thriftily, must increase it in the interest of its own people and must not allow it to be plundered by others. This is a main, basic orientation for every socialist country, while aid from abroad, aid from other socialist countries, is supplementary.

The credits two socialist countries accord each other have quite a different character. These credits constitute disinterested internationalist aid. Internationalist aid never engenders capitalism, never impoverishes the masses of the people, on the contrary, it helps develop industry and agriculture, serves their harmonization, leads to the improvement of the well-being of the working masses, to the strengthening of socialism.

In the first place, the economically developed socialist states ought to assist the other socialist countries. This does not mean that a socialist country should not develop relations also with the other non-socialist countries. But these must be economic relations on the bases of mutual interest and must not in any way make the economy of a socialist, or any other non-socialist country, dependent on the more powerful countries. If these relations among states are based on the exploitation of small, economically weak states by big and powerful states, then such <<aid>> must be rejected, for it is enslaving.

Lenin says that finance capital has cast, in the literal meaning of the word, its nets over all the countries of the world. The capitalists’ monopolies, cartels and syndicates work systematically, first they seize the internal market of their own country, get industry, agriculture, under their control, enslave the working class and other working people, make superprofits, and then create great possibilities to monopolize markets all over the world. Finance capital plays a direct role in this.

We see today, and this completely tallies with Lenin's teachings on imperialism as the final stage of capitalism, that the two superpowers, American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, are contending over the division of the world, to capture markets. The problem of oil, for instance, which has become acute throughout the world, is, first of all, the domain of the big American monopoly companies, but British, Dutch, and other oil companies are also involved in them. The Americans are manoeuvring on the problem of oil in order to have a complete monopoly of it. They have invested big capital and established large-scale equipment in the oil producing countries, such as Saudi Arabia, Iran, etc., and have got the ruling cliques of these countries into their clutches, by corrupting kings, sheiks, and imams with large sums of dollars. The rulers of the oil producing countries are allowed by the financial plutocracy of these countries to invest in the United States of America, Britain and elsewhere, even to buy shares in various monopoly companies, as well as luxury hotels, factories, etc.

Saudi Arabia, for instance, is a semi-feudal country where poverty and obscurantism reign, although it extracts 420 million tons of oil a year While the working masses live in poverty, the king and the big landowner class have deposited over 40 billion dollars in the Wall Street banks alone. The situation is the same in Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates, and elsewhere. These cliques make all sorts of concessions to the imperialist powers to plunder the assets of the peoples of the countries where they rule, with the aim of getting a share of the profits for themselves.

The investments made by the oil producing countries, and which are the property of the ruling cliques, constitute a union, of course, on a very small scale, of the capital of these cliques with American or British capital. On the face of it, it seems as if the ruling cliques of the oil producing countries have a sort of partnership of investments with American, British, or French imperialism, and allegedly influence the economies of the latter. In reality, quite the opposite is the case. The profits of American imperialists and the other imperialists are enormously big in comparison with the profits allocated to these cliques.
This is a characteristic of present-day neo-colonialism, which, in order to be able to exploit the riches of some countries to the maximum, makes some cautious concessions in favour of the bourgeoisie-capitalist, or feudal ruling groups, of course, not to its own detriment. This example confirms the correctness of Lenin's thesis, that the interests of the bourgeoisie of various countries can very easily become interlocked, just as the interests of private monopolies can be interlocked with those of state monopolies. The big monopolies may also combine with the monopolies which are less powerful but which control great assets, especially underground resources, such as iron chromium, copper, uranium, and other mines.

Government loans, credits and aid have become one of the most widespread forms of the export of capital today. This kind of export is practised by the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries, in particular.

Apart from the extraction of capitalist profits, these credits, this «aid» and loans also have political objectives. The states which accord the credits aim to support and consolidate the political and economic power of particular cliques, which defend the economic, political and military interests of the creditor country. As the agreements on such credits are concluded between governments, they make the economic and political dependence of the debtor on the creditor even greater. A classical example of this form of capital export is the «Marshall Plan», which, after the Second World War, became the economic basis for the political and military expansion of the United States of America in the countries of Western Europe. The so-called aid which the Soviet revisionists provide allegedly for the development of the economy and the setting up of the state sector of industry in such countries as India, Iraq, and elsewhere, is of the same nature.

At present, American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, and the capitalism of the industrialized countries have reached such a stage of development that the profit they realize from the accumulation of capital has grown extremely. The accumulation of capital creates large profits, which go into the pockets of the monopolists, the financial oligarchy, who do not put this income at the service of the poverty-stricken working people, but export it to those countries from which other, greater profits may accrue to them. These are the countries which China calls the «third world». However, they make investments of this kind in the developed capitalist countries, too.

Many books have been written about the process of Penetration of American capital into Europe and its political and economic aims. A clear picture of this is given in the book by the American author Geoffrey Owen. At the beginning of the chapter «The International Companies>> he says that the development of American investments abroad has been made according to the concept that the American firms represent not companies with overseas interests, but international companies. The headquarters of these companies are in the United States of America. This means that the various big American firms think not only of covering their own country and the needs of industry and clients within the United States of America, but also of extending their networks to foreign countries. These companies invest their «excess capital» in other countries in order to make bigger profits. Such giant corporations as <<Socony Mobil>>, <<Standard Oil of New Jersey>>, etc., make nearly half their profits from the plunder and exploitation of foreign countries. About 500 companies secure profits of about 10 billion dollars outside the country every year. There are more than 3,000 such enterprises with investments in foreign countries. This is how such formulas and terms as «multinational companies», or «international capitalism>>, etc., have come into, daily use in journalism and banking operations.

Geoffrey Owen says that in 1929 over 1,300 European companies were owned or controlled by American firms. This was the first stage of the American offensive on European industry. The pressure of the Second World War, which was being prepared, temporarily halted the invasion Of American capital. From 1929 up to 1946, the amount of direct investments by American companies in other countries of the world fell from 7,500 million to 7,200 million dollars. However, after the Second World War, in 1950, the amount of American investments abroad had risen to 11,200 million, half of it concentrated in the Latin-American countries and Canada.
The investments in Latin America were made to exploit the raw materials: oil, copper, iron ore, bauxites, as well as bananas and other agricultural products. In Canada they were mainly in mining and oil and developed on a wide scale because of its proximity and other conditions facilitating penetration.

The Europe of the 1950's also became another important target for American investments. Investments on this continent were extended rapidly in communications, mass production goods and complex equipment. Together with investments, American goods and products poured in.

The author in question points out that the situation created after the Second World War in the capitalist market gave an even greater impulse to American investments. Here are the figures on the increase of these investments abroad: in 1946 they totalled 7,200 million and then they began to rise to 11,200 million in 1950, 44,300 million in 1964 and over 60,000 million dollars in 1977.

By incessantly extending their operations on a world-wide scale, the American companies have made the competition with the local firms much fiercer and increased the fear of domination by the American giants. This problem is even more acute in the undeveloped countries where the American firms dominate the key branches of industry and exercise a preponderant influence in the national economy of these countries. In other words, these giant American companies control the local economies and governments and in fact they run them. The prolonged struggle which went on between the American oil companies and the Mexican Government and which ended in 1938 with the collapse of the Mexican Government's policy of opposition, is well known. There was a similar outcome to the struggle between the British oil monopoly and the Iranian Government, which resulted in the toppling of Mossadeq. Such ruinous conflicts are going on all the time and they end with the triumph of the big American trusts.

The big oil companies operate world-wide. For them it has become normal and necessary to completely control all the capital and production of this branch, to control governments, etc., in the countries where they have invested, because, if they lacked these possibilities, then difficulties would arise in the co-ordination of their activity on a world scale. This is why the big foreign companies oppose the efforts of the local capitalists to get a bigger share in the profits than that the American investors or those of other imperialist countries allow them.

The American companies in Europe, Canada, Asia, Africa, and elsewhere, have created such a situation that in practice they control the economies of many countries. The governments of these countries stand in great fear of the United States of America, which has made itself the leadership of the European economy, just as it has done in military matters. Therefore, the industrialized capitalist countries of Europe try to hinder the invasion of American capital which has been and is pouring in ever greater amounts into them.

The Chinese leadership claims that the European states, industrialized since the 19th century, are making more investments in the United States of America. But it is known that while the investments of European capital in the United States are made mainly in the form of securities, shares, bonds, deposits, etc., the American investments in Europe have dominant positions in the most important branches of the European economy.

Endeavouring to justify the increase of American investments, Geoffrey Owen claims that the European countries want and are making efforts to develop their industries on scientific bases, as, for instance, the electronics and computer industries. These industries contribute to a certain extent to technical progress, the rise of exports and the overall economic growth of these countries. But the American companies are more advanced in this field than their European rivals and they control this technical progress in their own interests. In computer manufacturing, for instance, the respective European companies have established close links to protect themselves against competition from the American «International Business Machine» (IBM) corporation which controls more than 70 percent of the American market and an even greater proportion of the world market.
Likewise, the big American companies have the tendency to embark on joint ventures with the local enterprises. In order to camouflage their exploitation, many firms avoid having one hundred percent ownership of subsidiaries, and set up companies on a 49-51 percent or 50-50 joint investment basis. That is how the Americans have gone about it in Japan, and that is how they have gone about it in Yugoslavia, too, which tries to create the impression that it is building socialism, relying on its own forces, whereas in reality the Titoites have divided Yugoslavia economically among the United States of America and the big firms of the developed industrial countries. By doing so, the Titoites have also restricted the freedom and independence of Yugoslavia.

There is a tendency among many of these big American companies, like <<General Motors>>, <<Ford>>, <<Chrysler>>, <<General Electric>>, etc., to have, in fact, 100 percent ownership of their subsidiaries in foreign countries. However, these subsidiaries, according to Owen, never forget the problem of nationalization, and their answer to this is that <<it is not a question of setting up companies with local investors, but of encouraging international ownership of the shares in the mother companies>>. This is the concept of the <<international>> of capitalism, of which <<General Motors>>, in particular, is the ardent champion.

These orientations of imperialist American capital or of the American industrial establishment which invests outside the United States of America in order to create its colonies and empire, are just a few facts which clearly illustrate the theses that US imperialism has not been weakened in the least, despite what the Chinese revisionists Pretend. On the contrary, it has grown stronger, has gained large concessions in foreign countries and is running many important branches of their economy. It has also caused the governments of other countries innumerable difficulties, frequently makes the law in these countries, and has many governments under its control and direction. Of course, this process has its ups and downs, but the general trend does not indicate the weakening of US imperialism.

We are now living at a time when another superpower, Soviet social-imperialism, is exporting its capital and is bent on exploiting the different peoples. The capital exported by this superpower results from the surplus value realized in the Soviet Union, which has been transformed into a capitalist country.

The restoration of capitalism has led to a polarization of the present-day Soviet society, in which a small section rules and exploits the overwhelming majority of the people. Now, the stratum consisting of the bureaucrats, the technocrats and the upper creative intelligentsia has been created and assumed the form of a separate bourgeois, exploiting class which appropriates and divides up the surplus value extracted from the savage exploitation of the working class and the broad working masses. Unlike the countries of classical capitalism, where this surplus value is appropriated in proportion to the amount of capital of each capitalist, in the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries it is distributed according to the position people of the higher bourgeois stratum occupy in the state, economic, scientific, and cultural hierarchy, etc. The high salaries, routine and special bonuses, prizes and stimuli, privileges, etc., have been built up into a whole institution for the appropriation of the surplus value extracted from the toil and sweat of the working people. The stratum which represents the <<collective capitalist>> protects this plunder through a host of laws and norms, which guarantee the capitalist oppression and exploitation.

The Soviet economy has now become integrated into the system of world capitalism. 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. It is common knowledge that the Soviet Union economically exploits the satellite countries, in the first place. But now it is competing and contesting with the other capitalist states for markets, spheres of investment, for the plunder of raw materials, the preservation of neo-colonialist laws in world trade, etc.

Bent on extending its hegemony, the new Soviet bourgeoisie exports capital, but here it comes up against competition not only from US imperialism, which is very powerful, but also from the other
developed capitalist states, such as Japan, Britain, West Germany, France, etc. In their quest for superprofits, these states export capital not only to Africa, Asia and Latin America, but also to the East European countries which are under the tutelage of the revisionist Soviet Union, and export capital even to the Soviet Union itself. The ruling cliques of the so-called socialist countries, like the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Poland, etc., and now China, too, allow foreign capital to flow into their countries, because this capital serves the ruling cliques, while it is a heavy burden on the peoples. The Comecon countries are up to their necks in debt. They are in debt to the Western countries to the tune of 50 billion dollars.

Yugoslavia was one of the first revisionist countries to allow the penetration of foreign capital into its economy. First it received credits, then bought licences, and later went over to setting up joint enterprises. In Yugoslavia a law was adopted in 1967, which permitted the creation of joint enterprises, in which 49 percent of capital was owned by foreign companies. In 1977, there were 170 such enterprises in Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia has ensured the most favourable conditions for the capitalist firms to carry out their activity and ensure maximum profits. The Yugoslav phenomenon proves that the foreign capital invested in Yugoslavia is one of the decisive factors which has turned it into a capitalist country. The United States of America and the other wealthy capitalist states have lost nothing by these investments. On the contrary, they have made huge profits, while increasing the misery of the working class and the peasantry of Yugoslavia. Lenin said that the exporting of capital is a solid basis for the exploitation of the majority of the nations and countries of the world, for the capitalist parasitism of a handful of very rich states.

The capitalist states will make huge profits in China, too. We see that US, Japanese, West German and other capital is now pouring in there in billions of dollars. Agreements have been signed with the Japanese for the joint exploitation of oil fields and the power resources of the Yangtze River. An agreement has been concluded with the Germans for the building of coal mines, etc. The investments which are being and will be made in China will certainly bring the foreign capitalists handsome profits, but at the same time they will strengthen the bases of capitalism in China.

The exporting of capital from one capitalist country to another capitalist or revisionist country, no matter whether the state which gives or receives it is big or small, is always one of the forms of exploitation of the peoples by capital. This exploitation brings about the economic and political dependence of the recipient country.

Lenin pointed out that, after capturing the home market, the monopolies engage in economic struggle to redivide and capture the world market for industrialized goods and raw materials. Competition and their greed for profits impel the monopolists of different countries to reach temporary agreements, to enter into alliances and combinations with one another in order to divide the international markets for the sale of finished goods and the purchase of raw materials. Even when they possess reserves of raw materials and energy, the developed capitalist states turn their attack on other countries, since production costs in these countries are lower than in their own countries and workers' wages, especially, are several times lower. The struggle that has been waged and is still going on to capture oil resources and markets is notorious. As a result of this struggle scores and hundreds of private enterprises and companies have been ruined and the international oil cartel, which comprises 7 big monopolies (5 American, 1 British and 1 British-Dutch, the notorious Esso, Texaco, Shell, etc.), have managed to gain control over 60 percent of the oil extraction and oil sales in the capitalist countries of the Western world, and about 54 percent of its processing.

A similar division of resources and markets exists today for copper and tin minerals, for uranium and other valuable strategic minerals. Many of the old colonialist countries like Britain and France have concluded special, so-called preferential agreements of co-operation etc. with the former colonial countries, which ensure them almost exclusive economic and commercial privileges. The so-called dollar, sterling, franc, or ruble areas indicate an economic division of the world among the monopolies and various imperialist states.
US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and the other imperialist powers ensure maximum profits in different ways, through the discriminatory and unequal trade they carry on with these countries. Today the developing countries alone excluding the OPEC countries, have a debit balance which amounts to about 34 billion dollars.

In the present conditions, especially now in the conditions of the economic crisis, the monopolies conclude direct agreements also with the governments of capitalist countries on production quotas, prices, markets, etc. The existence of such organisms as the European Common Market, Comecon, etc., is also clear evidence of the economic division of the world which exists today.

This economic division of the world, the domination of monopolies, their dictate over the life and economic development of other countries is making the contradiction between labour and capital, as well as the contradictions between the peoples and imperialism, and the inter-imperialist contradictions, much more severe.

The Chinese theory of the <<three worlds>>, which seeks to reconcile the <<third world>> with the <<second world>> and with US imperialism, is out of step with this reality. It does not want to see that the relentless offensive of American, British, German, Japanese, French and other monopolies towards what China calls the <<third world>> is increasing the resistance of the peoples to all imperialist and hegemony-seeking powers and extending the objective conditions for the irreconcilable struggle among them. On the other hand, the unequal development of imperialist powers, which is an objective law of the development of capitalism, drives them to competition and abrasive frictions with one another, in their quest for economic expansion everywhere in the world.

The Chinese theory of three worlds, which seeks to reconcile these contradictions and advocates precisely what social-democracy and the revisionists of every hue have long been preaching, is in flagrant opposition to the Leninist strategy, which, far from denying these contradictions, aims to deepen them in order to prepare the proletariat for revolution and the peoples for liberation.

In his analysis of imperialism, Lenin pointed out that, with the transition of pre-monopoly capitalism to its highest and last stage, the stage of imperialism, the territorial division of the world among the great imperialist powers is completed.

<<...the characteristic feature of the period under review is the final partition of the globe, final not in the sense that repartition is impossible; on the contrary, repartitions are possible and inevitable - but in the sense that the colonial policy of the capitalist countries has completed the seizure of unoccupied territories on our planet. For the first time, the world is completely divided up, so that in the future only re-division is possible, that is, territories can only pass from one 'owner' to another....>>.* Lenin

Since the Second World War, the old classical colonialism, which exploited most of the peoples of the world physically, economically, politically and ideologically, has been transformed into a new colonialism. This new colonialism comprises an entire system of economic, political, military and ideological measures, which imperialism has built up with the aim of maintaining its domination and ensuring political control and economic exploitation of the former colonies and many other countries, while adapting itself to the new conditions created after the war.

What are these new conditions?

After the war, the imperialist countries France, Britain, Italy, Germany, Japan and America were not in a position to maintain the situation which existed before the war by force. France, for instance, could no longer keep Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, and other countries of Africa in a colonial status, as it did in the past. The same can be said also of British, Italian, and other imperialisms.
The Second World War brought about a radical change in the ratio of forces in the world. It led to
the defeat of the great fascist powers, but it also greatly weakened the old colonialist powers and
shook them to their foundations. Everywhere, even in the countries which were not involved in the
cyclone, the anti-fascist war gave rise to the problem of national liberation. Those peoples of the
former colonial countries, which took part in the war together with the countries of the antifascist
coalition in order to escape the fascist yoke, could not return to colonial bondage or tolerate it any
longer. The victory of the Soviet Union over nazism, the creation of the socialist camp, China's
liberation, gave a very powerful impulse to the awakening of the peoples' national consciousness
and their liberation struggle. The broad masses of the peoples in the colonies came to understand
that the former situation had to be changed. Liberation wars broke out in Indochina, North Africa,
and elsewhere.

Forced by this situation, many colonialist countries realized that the old method of exploitation and
administration of colonies without any sort of freedom and independence was outdated. The
colonizing imperialist powers reached this conclusion not because of their democratic
feelings or their desire to give the peoples freedom, but because of the pressure by the colonized
peoples and because these powers were militarily, economically, politically, and ideologically too
weak to maintain the old colonialism. But French, British Italian, American and other imperialisms
did not want to give up the exploitation of these peoples and countries. In the existing circumstances each imperialist power was obliged to grant autonomy to these peoples or to promise
them freedom and independence after a certain time. During this period, which they allowed
allegedly for the creation of the consciousness of self-government and the training of local cadres
for this, their real aim was to prepare other, new forms of imperialist exploitation, the new
colonialism, while creating the false impression among these countries and peoples that allegedly
they had won their freedom. This was a stage after the war when world imperialism suffered a great
defeat, when the crisis of the colonial system of imperialism became even more pronounced. At this
period of the decay of capitalism, as a result of the weakening of imperialism by the Second World
War, the United States Of America seized the opportunity and saddled the colonial peoples, who
were allegedly free and independent, with a new, more intensive exploitation. It extended its
imperialist power over the former colonies of the other imperialist powers, which had already been
weakened in one way or another.

Although they had won recognition of that sort of <<independence>> and freedom., which the
former colonialist powers granted them, many former colonial peoples were forced to take up arms,
because the imperialists were not disposed to give them this <<freedom>> and this
<<independence>> immediately. The French imperialists, in particular, even after the war, were
still trying to preserve the power of France, or its ,<grandeur.. Thus, the peoples of Algeria, Vietnam, and many others started their protracted struggle for liberation and, in the end, they won it. Here we are not going into detail about how they achieved it, which were the social forces that
fought, etc. The fact is that the old French and British imperialism was weakened. Thus Lenin's
theses that imperialism was in decay, that the old capitalist-imperialist society was being eroded by
the revolutionary movements and the freedom-loving aspirations of the peoples, who had been
oppressed and enslaved up till that time, was confirmed.

During this period American imperialism grew fat, expanded the dollar area, placed territories of
the franc and sterling areas under its control, and, in order to protect its hegemonic imperialist
Power founded on the maximum exploitation of the peoples, it set up numerous military bases and
established pro-American political cliques in many of those countries of the world which had
allegedly gained their freedom and independence. This exploitation was, of course, as sociated with
a series of changes in the structure and superstructure as well.

Finance capital has also created its own special ideology, which precedes it in its exploitation of the
proletariat and the conquest of the world. It completes its domination of the peoples, and justifies
this domination by various sugar-coated forms of bogus freedom, independence, as well as by
creating some so-called democratic parties, etc.
With the creation of banks and multinational companies, along with US capital investments, the American way of life, with the degeneration inherent in it, is also exported. The export of capital by the big imperialist powers creates the colonies which, today, are the countries where neo-colonialism reigns. These countries have an alleged independence but it is only formal. In other words, now as in the past, the same process of the export of capital is going on, though in different forms, with "honeyed" explanations and propaganda. The ruthless exploitation of the peoples of these countries remains the same or becomes even more ferocious; and the plunder of natural assets continues.

The biggest neo-colonialist power of our time is the United States of America. In the three years, 1973-1975, the government and private capital investments of the United States of America in the former colonies, dependent or semi-dependent countries, represented about 36 percent of the total investments of the most developed capitalist and revisionist countries in these regions. The economic, political and military treaties and agreements between the imperialist powers and the former colonial countries are enslaving, are weapons in the hands of imperialism to keep these countries in bondage. The words of Lenin who stressed "....the need constantly to explain and expose among the broadest working masses of all countries, and particularly of the backward countries, the deception systematically practised by the imperialist powers which, under the guise of politically independent states, in fact, set up states that are wholly dependent upon them economically, financially and militarily,"* Lenin are just as valid today as in the past.

In order to keep the peoples under their domination American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and the other imperialist powers, old or new, incite quarrels wherever they can among neighbour states, or among different social groups within a given country, and then, in the role of the judge or the supporter of one side or the other, interfere in the internal affairs of others, and justify their economic, political and military presence there. The facts show that whenever the superpowers have-meddled in the internal affairs of other peoples, the problems have remained unsolved or the result has been the consolidation of the positions of imperialism and social-imperialism in these countries. The events in the Middle East, the conflict between Somalia and Ethiopia, the war between Cambodia and Vietnam, etc. bear witness to this.

Together with their investments, the United States of America, the Soviet Union and all the other capitalist countries consolidate, also, their positions in the countries which accept these investments, as they struggle for markets and spheres of influence. This leads to frictions among different capitalist states, and among big concerns which are not linked with or interdependent on one another. These frictions kindle local wars and may even lead to a general war. As Leninism teaches us, a war that breaks out for these reasons, whether local or general, has a predatory and not a liberation character. Only when the peoples rise against foreign invaders, when they rise against the local capitalist bourgeoisie, which is closely linked up with imperialism, social-imperialism and world capital, is this a just, liberation war.

The representatives of big world capital are indulging in a great deal of talk about the alleged need for amendments to the present system of international economic relations and the creation of a "new world economic order", which the Chinese leaders, too, support. According to them, this "new economic order" will serve as a "basis for global stability" or "a new structure of international economic relations."

These are efforts and plans of imperialist and neo-colonialist powers, which want to keep neocolonialism alive, prolong its existence, and preserve their oppression and plunder of the peoples. But the laws of the development of capitalism and imperialism are subject neither to the wishes nor to the theoretical inventions of the bourgeoisie and the revisionists. As Lenin said, the consistent fight against colonialism and neo-colonialism, the revolution, is the way out of these contradictions.
In analysing the fundamental economic features of imperialism, Lenin also defined its place in history. He stressed that imperialism is not only the highest stage but also the final stage of capitalism, the eve of the proletarian revolution. Lenin pointed out:

<<Imperialism is a specific historical stage of capitalism... is (1) monopoly capitalism; (2) parasitic or decaying capitalism (3) moribund capitalism,>>*. Lenin

The reality of the present-day capitalist world fully confirms this conclusion. The economic basis of all the socio-economic ills of imperialism, as Lenin proved, is monopoly. Monopolies are powerless to overcome the contradictions of the capitalist economy. Lenin linked the parasitism and decay of imperialism organically with the tendency of monopoly to inhibit the development of the productive forces in general, to deepen the disproportional development between branches and of the national economy as a whole, to fail to utilize the human and material productive capacities, with the tendency to hinder the application of the new developments of science and technology to the benefit of the masses and the progress of the entire society.

The greed for profits, the competition, force the monopolies to invest in advanced technology in the process of production. But in the entire historical process of the development of imperialism, the dominant tendency is towards disproportional development and restraint on development. Expenditure on research and the development of science in the field of industry, and especially the war industry, in the United States of America, for instance, has increased from 2 billion dollars in 1950, to almost 11 billion in 1965, and about 30 billion in 1972. Frequently the big firms come up against difficulties in scientific research, but once something is discovered, they buy up the patents and hire qualified workers; however they apply the research only when their own interests require this. Naturally, the most important sectors, which present more interest for investments in the field of development and the technical revolution, have priority, because they offer greater possibilities for profits. War industry tops the list, as it is here that the rate of profit is highest. For example, in 1964 the United States of America invested 3,565 million dollars in scientific research in the sector of aviation and missiles. In the same year, 1,000,537 thousand dollars were invested in the electrical and telecommunications industry, 196 million in the chemical industry, 136 million in the machine-building industry, 174 million in the automobile industry, 172 million in scientific instruments, 38 million in the rubber industry, 8 million in the oil industry, 9 million in the methane industry, etc.

In today's conditions the militarization of the economy, as a manifestation of the decay of imperialism, has become a characteristic feature of all the capitalist and revisionist countries. But the process of the militarization of the economy has assumed unprecedented proportions, especially in the United States of America and the Soviet Union. The direct military spending by both sides has increased to astronomical proportions, reaching a joint total of over 240 billion dollars a year. In their policy of hegemony and world domination, the United States of America and the Soviet Union are also making extensive use of the arms trade, which is another clear expression of the decay of imperialism. Every year they sell more than 20 billion dollars worth of weapons. The other imperialist states, such as Britain, West Germany, France, Italy, etc., also engage in selling arms. The regular customers of this imperialist trade are such reactionary and fascist cliques as those of Chile Brasil, Argentine, Israel, Spain, South Korea, Rhodesia, the -South African Union, etc. Also numbered among these customers are the countries rich in strategic raw materials or oil, to which the imperialists offer their weapons as a bait to induce them to allow the plunder of their wealth. The ever more frequent outbreak of economic crises of overproduction is clear proof of the decay and parasitism of present-day monopoly capitalism. The outbreak of crises, which have now become very deep, confirms the correctness of the Marxist theory on anarchic, spontaneous and disproportional character of production and consumption, and refutes the bourgeois <<theories>> on the development of capitalism <<without crises>>, or the transformation of capitalism into <<regulated capitalism>>.
The general law of capitalist accumulation discovered by Marx, that the impoverishment of working people grows, on the one hand, while the profits of the capitalists increase, on the other hand, is operating with ever greater force in capitalist society today. The process of the polarization of society into proletarians and into bourgeois, who represent a limited number of people, is deepening. The present-day imperialist system, which has greater economic possibilities to corrupt the upper strata of the proletariat, the worker aristocracy, has increased the latter to very large proportions. The financial oligarchy is making extensive use of this aristocracy today, to deceive and confuse the proletariat, to dampen its revolutionary ardour. It is from this worker aristocracy that those whom Lenin calls socialists in words but imperialists in deeds, usually emerge. Socialdemocracy, the <<bourgeois workers' parties>>, the opportunist leaders of trade-unions, the modem revisionists, etc., all come within this description of Lenin's. Lenin stresses that imperialism is linked with opportunism, that the opportunists assist to preserve and strengthen imperialism. He says: << the most dangerous of all are those who do not wish to understand that the fight against imperialism is a sham and humbug unless it is inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism>>.

The decay of imperialism is clearly seen also in the growth and intensification of reaction in all fields, and especially in the political and social fields. As practice confirms, when the monopoly bourgeoisie sees that the class struggle is becoming acute, it casts off all disguise and denies the working, masses even those few rights they have won by shedding their blood. The fascist regimes and dictatorships which have been established in many countries of the world are evidence of this. All this rotten system, which is in a chaotic state, is propped up by a huge praetorian army, by very large numbers of police mobilized and armed to the teeth. All these military and police forces are set in motion to prevent or suppress any kind of resistance which goes beyond the limits defined by a jungle of laws made by the ruling bourgeoisie. The cadres of the armed forces and other instruments of oppression live in affluence and receive fat salaries. In Italy, for instance, you hear nothing but talk about the army, the police, the carabinieri, about security agents who are decorated, but also killed. In this very confused situation which prevails in the bourgeois states, gangsterism has developed and become widespread, and this is bred by the capitalist order itself. It is an expression of its degeneration, a reflection of the desperation and confusion to which the bourgeois system of oppression and exploitation gives rise. The bourgeoisie tries to prevent those cases of gangsterism which cause it problems and worry the bourgeois state. But it incites and uses gangsterism to terrorize the broad working masses who live in poverty. In many capitalist countries gangsterism has become an industry and has extended from robbing banks and stores to kidnapping people and holding them to ransom for large sums of money. In some countries gangsterism has been organized in different groupings. These groupings often have names with a <<revolutionary>>, or <<communist>>, sound. The bourgeoisie allows them a free hand to operate in order to prepare the situation for, and justify the staging of, a fascist coup d' état. In order to discredit the revolution and socialism, this gangster activity is publicized as though it is carried out by <<communist groups>> which are allegedly operating against the bourgeois order. As a conclusion, we can say that in the present situation of imperialism as a whole, of US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, as well as other imperialisms, imperialism of whatever description is at the stage of weakening and decay, and that the old society will be overthrown to its foundations by the revolution, and will be replaced by a new society, socialist society, This new socialist society exists and will extend, it will develop, gain ground regardless of the fact that the Soviet revisionists betrayed socialism in the Soviet Union, regardless of the fact that opportunism prevails in China and a new socialimperialism is rising there, regardless of the fact that capitalism has been restored in the erstwhile countries of people's democracy. Socialism will pursue its own course and will triumph over world imperialism and capitalism through struggle and efforts, but never, in any way, through reforms and peaceful parliamentary roads, as Khrushchev preached and as all the revisionists are preaching. It will triumph by remaining loyal to the Leninist theory on imperialism and the proletarian revolution and never by following the present-day revisionist theories which
proclaim state monopoly capitalism to be an allegedly new, special stage of capitalism, to be the "birth of socialist elements in the bosom of capitalism".

Proceeding from Lenin's conclusions on the nature of imperialism and its place in history, as a result of the contradictions eroding it from within and people's liberation and revolutionary struggles, the whole of world imperialism as a social system no longer has that undivided power to dominate it once possessed. This is the dialectics of history and it confirms the Marxist-Leninist thesis that imperialism is on the decline, in decadence and decay.

The trend towards the weakening of capitalism and imperialism is the main trend of world history today. Marx and Lenin argued this on the basis of concrete facts, historical events, and materialistic dialectics. The trend towards united efforts by states opposed to imperialism also leads to the weakening of imperialism. But this latter tendency, which China absolutizes without making the necessary differentiations, without studying the particular situations, does not lead to the correct road. While claiming that US imperialism is in decline and less powerful than Soviet social-imperialism, while proclaiming the third world as the main motive force of the epoch, in practice the Chinese leaders are encouraging capitulation and submission to the bourgeoisie.

It is true that the peoples want liberation, but they can gain this liberation only through struggle, through efforts, and headed by a militant leadership. Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin teach us that this leadership is the proletariat of each country. The Proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist parties must make thorough-going political, economic and military analyses, weigh everything in the balance, make decisions and define the appropriate strategy and tactics, always bearing in mind the preparation and carrying out of the revolution. If the revolution is forgotten, as it is by the Chinese, neither the analyses, actions, strategy, nor the tactics can be Marxist-Leninist and revolutionary. We cannot have any illusions about imperialism of any kind, either powerful or less powerful. Imperialism from its nature creates the conditions for economic and political expansion, for unleashing wars, because its character is essentially exploitative, aggressive. Therefore, to deceive the masses of the peoples who want liberation, that they will achieve this if they are guided by such revisionist theories as that of "three worlds", is to perpetrate a crime against the peoples and the revolution.

Our epoch, as Lenin teaches us, is the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. We Marxist-Leninists must understand from this that we have to combat world imperialism, any imperialism, any capitalist power, which exploits the proletariat and the peoples, with the greatest severity. We stress the Leninist thesis that the revolution is now on the order of the day. The world is going to advance towards a new society which will be the socialist society. World capitalism, imperialism and social-imperialism will become even more decayed and will come to an end through the revolution.

Lenin teaches us that we must fight imperialism to the finish, must criticize it in the broad sense of the term and rouse the oppressed classes against the policy of imperialism, against the bourgeoisie. The Marxist-Leninist analysis of the development of imperialism today clearly shows that nothing in Lenin's analysis and conclusions on the nature and features of imperialism and the revolution can be altered. The attempts of all opportunists, from the social-democrats down to the Khrushchevites and Chinese revisionists, to distort the Leninist theses on imperialism are counterrevolutionary. Their aim is to negate the revolution, to prettify imperialism and to prolong the life of capitalism.

When Lenin exposes imperialism and its apologists like Bernstein, Kautsky, Hilferding and all the other opportunists of the Second International, he points out:

"Imperialist ideology also penetrates the working class. No Chinese wall separates it from the other classes." * Lenin

Unfortunately, however, even the "Chinese wall" has now been breached and the imperialist propaganda and ideology have penetrated China.
The Chinese opportunists are not in the least original. Treading the road of Kautsky and company, they, too, are prettifying imperialism, in general, and American imperialism, in particular, presenting the latter as an imperialism in retreat, on which the peoples should rely in order to defend themselves from the Soviet social-imperialists.

The similarity between the <<theories> of the Chinese revisionists and those of Kautsky is all too obvious. In his time, Kautsky tried to defend the colonial policy of imperialism, to cover up its exploitation and expansion, by distorting the Marxist theory on the development of capitalism. This is also being done today by the Chinese leaders who, in an effort to support American imperialism and its neo-colonialist policy, churn out absurd theories allegedly based on Marx or Lenin. However, to speak in the terms Lenin used, the Chinese <<theory>> is a plunge into the mire of revisionism and opportunism.

Kautsky's theory spread the illusion that allegedly in the conditions of monopoly capitalism, the possibility exists of another, non-annexionist policy. In this connection Lenin stressed:

<<The essence of the matter is that Kautsky detaches the politics of imperialism from its economics, speaks of annexations as being a policy 'preferred' by finance capital, and opposes to it another bourgeois policy which, he alleges, is possible on this very same basis of finance capital. It follows, then, that monopolies in economics are compatible with non-monopolistic, non-violent, non-annexionist methos in politics. It follows, then, that the territorial division of the world, which was completed precisely during the epoch of finance capital, and which constitutes the basis of the present peculiar forms of rivalry between the biggest capitalist states, is compatible with a non-imperialist policy. The result is a Slurring-over and a blunting of the most profound contradictions of the latest stage of capitalism, instead of an exposure of their depth; the result is bourgeois reformism instead of Marxism>>*. Lenin

Ignoring the fact that the monopolies, finance capital, dominate the economic field in the United States of America, and that it is precisely they who dictate the home and foreign policy, the Chinese revisionists talk about a peaceful imperialism which no longer seeks expansion and indeed is on the retreat. The Chinese leaders <<forget>> Stalin's words that the main features and requirements of the fundamental economic law of present-day capitalism are,

<<...the securing of the maximum capitalist profit through the exploitation, ruin and impoverishment of themajority of the population of the given country, through the enslavement and systematic robbery of the peoples of other countries, especially backward countries, and., lastly, through wars and militarization of the national economy, which are utilized for the obtaining of the highest profits>>. * Stalin

Thus, the <<new>> theories of the Chinese leaders show that they are singing Kautsky's old song to a new tune.

While exposing the chieftains of the Second International, who wanted to make a distinction between imperialist powers on the basis of which were more aggressive and which less aggressive, Lenin stressed that this stand was anti-Marxist. This attitude impelled the parties of the Second International to the positions of chauvinism, to open betrayal of the cause of the proletariat and the revolution. In our epoch, said Lenin, there can be no question of which of the imperialist states involved in the First World War, on one side or the other, is the <<greater evil>>.

<<Present-day democracy,>> says he, <<will remain true to itself, only if it joins neither one nor the other imperialist bourgeoisie, only if it says that 'the two sides are equally bad', and if it wishes the defeat of the imperialist bourgeoisie in every country. Any other decision will in reality be national-liberal and have nothing in common with the genuine internationalism.>>* Lenin
In the present conditions, if the Chinese thesis, according to which Soviet social-imperialism is more aggressive than American imperialism, were to be accepted, this would lead to open betrayal of the revolution, of the historic mission of the working class, to going over to the positions of the Second International. The two imperialist superpowers represent to the same degree the main enemy and danger to socialism, the freedom and independence of the peoples, and the sovereignty of nations. They are the main defenders of world capitalism.

In order to conceal their betrayal of the peoples, the Chinese leaders say that the relations of the big monopolies with some countries which possess great wealth create a situation in which even conflicts between the monopoly powers and the peoples can be avoided. This is a monstrous absurdity, an attempt to present ferocious imperialism as tame, to create a false situation of euphoria that allegedly the investment of capital will create wellbeing for the people of the country in which the investment is made, and thus the antagonistic contradictions between the imperialists and the peoples of these countries will no longer exist. This false theory, which is now being trumpeted by the Chinese leaders, has been concocted by imperialism in order to extend its domination everywhere in the world and to assist the reactionary cliques ruling in the various countries to oppress their own peoples and to sell their countries to the foreigners.

These <<theories>> are a repetition, in new, refined forms, of the reactionary theories of the opportunists of the Second International. At the time of the First World War, Lenin exposed Rautsky's anti-Marxist theory of multra-imperialism. Kautsky alleged that wars could be prevented under imperialism through an agreement among the capitalist countries. In his polemic with Kautsky, Lenin said:

<<...in the realities of the capitalist system, and not in the banal philistine fantasies of English parsons or of the German 'Marxist' Kautsky, 'inter-imperialist' or 'inter-imperialist' alliances, no matter what form they may assume, whether of one imperialist coalition against another, or a general alliance embracing all the imperialist powers, are inevitably nothing more than a 'truce' in periods between wars>>.* Lenin

These teachings of Lenin's are very relevant in the present conditions when the Chinese revisionists are talking about, and making feverish efforts to set up, an alliance and a great world front of all the fascist and feudal, capitalist and imperialist states and regimes, including the United States of America, against Soviet social-imperialism. Alliances between imperialist countries, Lenin stressed, are possible, but they are created for the sole purpose of jointly crushing the revolution and socialism, of jointly plundering the colonies and dependent and semi-dependent countries.

The Chinese revisionists, like the chieftains: of the Second International, have substituted the pragmatic slogan, <<Let us unite with all those who can be united>> against Soviet social-imperialism, for the slogan of the Communist Manifesto, Proletarians of all countries, unite!-.

The theory of the <<three worlds>>, invented by the Chinese leaders does not analyse the historical development of imperialism from the Marxist-Leninist class standpoint, but sees it in a distorted light, ignoring the contradictions of our time which Marx and Lenin defined so clearly. Following this <<theory>>, <<socialist>>, China unites with American imperialism and the second world, that is, with other imperialists who exploit the peoples, and calls on the <<third world>>, the peoples who aspire to fight against world imperialism and capitalism, whether American imperialism or Soviet social-imperialism, to unite, against Soviet social-imperialism only.

The Titoite theory of non-aligned countries, too, is just as anti-Marxist as the theory of the <<three worlds>>.
These two <<theories>> are the rails of the one railroad on which the train of American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism is running, a train loaded with the wealth plundered from the peoples of the world. The Titoites and the Chine revisionists are trying to open some holes in the trucks of this imperialist and social-imperialist train, so that a little oil, sugar, a few dollars, pounds, francs or rubles may leak out. These rails which have been laid over the backs of the oppressed peoples, and which are intended to keep these peoples in permanent bondage, are two theories just as reactionary as all the other anti-Marxist theories of the Trotskyites, anarchists, Bukharinites, Khrushchevites, of the supporters of Togliatti, Carrillo, Marchais, etc., etc.

Life is constantly confirming Lenin's theses of genius on imperialism. Capitalism has entered the phase of its decay. This situation is arousing the revolt of the peoples and impelling them to revolution. The struggle of the peoples against imperialism and the bourgeois capitalist cliques is building up in various forms, with varying intensities. Quantity will inevitably turn into quality. This will happen first in those countries which constitute the weakest link of the capitalist chain and where the consciousness and organization of the working class have reached a high level, where there is a deep political and ideological understanding of the problem.

Imperialism has stepped up its barbarous oppression and exploitation of the peoples. But, at the same time, the peoples of the world are becoming more and more conscious that they cannot go on living in capitalist society, where the working masses are no less oppressed and exploited than in the pre-War period.

Despite all the efforts by imperialism and its hangers-on, it will find no stability, now or in the future, in its struggle to establish its hegemony over the peoples. It cannot find stability because of the awakening consciousness of the working class and the masses of oppressed working people who want liberation, as well as because of the inevitable inter-imperialist contradictions.

The peoples are seeing, and later they will see ever more clearly, that world imperialism and capitalism are not based solely on the economic, military, political and ideological strength of the two superpowers, but are based also on the wealthy classes which keep the peoples of their own countries in bondage, under exploitation and under fear so they will not rise up to gain their true freedom and independence.

The broad masses of various peoples of the world have also begun to understand that the present-day bourgeois-capitalist society, the exploiting system of world imperialism, must be overthrown. For the peoples this is not just an aspiration, in many countries they have taken up arms.

Therefore, there is no need to concoct theories which divide the world into three or four parts, into <<aligned>> and <<non-aligned>>, but the great objective historical process must be seen and interpreted correctly, according to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. The world is divided in two, the world of capitalism and the new world of socialism, which are locked in a merciless struggle with each other. In this fight the new, the socialist world, will triumph, while the old capitalist society, the bourgeois and imperialist society, will be overthrown.

III

THE REVOLUTION AND THE PEOPLES

Marx showed with scientific argument the necessity for the destruction of capitalist society and the construction of a more advanced society, socialism and then communism. Developing Marx's thought, in his book <<Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism>>, Lenin showed that the present epoch is the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions.
This is the epoch of the destruction of the old capitalist order, colonialism and imperialism, of the seizure of state power by the proletariat and the liberation of the oppressed peoples, the period of the triumph of socialism on a world scale.

This means that today we are living in the epoch of the replacement of the old exploiting society, which is intolerable for the majority of mankind, for the oppressed and exploited, with a new society in which the exploitation of man by man is done away with once and for all. It was precisely from these fundamental teachings and its Marxist-Leninist analysis of the process of world development today that our Party proceeded when, at its 7th Congress, it put forward the thesis that the world is at a stage in which the question of the revolution and liberation of the peoples is a problem demanding solution.

The struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie is a stem, merciless struggle which goes on continuously. Confronting each other stand two great social forces. On the one side stands the capitalist-imperialist bourgeoisie, which is the most ferocious, deceitful and blood-thirsty class known to history. On the other side stands the proletariat, the class totally dispossessed of means of production, ruthlessly oppressed and exploited by the bourgeoisie, which is at the same time the most advanced class of society which thinks, creates, works and produces, but does not enjoy the fruits of its toil.

Each of these classes strives to rally forces around itself and prepare them for its own aims—the proletariat, for social and national liberation, to carry out the revolution; the bourgeoisie, to preserve its domination and suppress the revolution. The bourgeoisie gathers around itself the most ominous, regressive and criminal forces, while the proletariat strives to win all the revolutionary, progressive forces over to its side.

Marxism-Leninism teaches us that the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie builds up continuously and will certainly be crowned with the victory of the proletariat and its allies. But for this struggle to be crowned with success, the proletariat must be organized, must have its own vanguard party, must make the broad masses of the people conscious of the necessity for revolution, and lead them in the fight to seize state power, to establish its own dictatorship, to build socialism and communism, the classless society.

There are many hot-heads in the world, with good or evil intentions, who think that the revolution can be carried out at any time, at any moment, at any place. But such people are mistaken. The revolution cannot be carried out at any time and at any place, according to one's wishes. The revolution breaks out and is carried through at that link of the capitalist chain which is the weakest. For the revolution to break out and triumph, the appropriate objective and subjective conditions must exist, and the favourable moment must be found for launching into revolution. The main thing is that, when they start the revolution, the broad masses of the people, with the proletariat at the head, must be determined and prepared to carry it through to the end.

Lenin stresses that the revolution is carried out by the people of each country, that it is not exported. This does not mean that the Marxist Leninists, wherever they are militating, should not feel themselves in solidarity, should not be linked with one another by the purest feelings of proletarian internationalism, and should not assist the struggle of the proletariat and peoples of other countries for their liberation. On the contrary, all communists, all proletarians, all the revolutionary forces in the various countries are duty bound to assist the revolution in each particular country and all over the world, through propaganda, agitation, material aid, the example of their determination and selflessness, and by faithful adherence to Marxism-Leninism. Of course, success in the utilization of this assistance depends, first of all, on the preparation of the proletariat and its party, on the development of the revolutionary struggle in this or that country.

In the <<Manifesto of the Communist Party>> Marx and Engels show that the interests of the proletariat and the people of one country are inseparable from the interests of the proletariat and peoples of the entire world.
As Lenin teaches us and life has confirmed, the revolution triumphs in each country individually. Therefore, this triumph depends, first of all, on the working class and its revolutionary party of each country, on their ability to implement the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on the revolution in the concrete conditions.

However, a great deal of confusion has been created around these teachings and especially around the Leninist theory on the revolution many mines have been laid. by the Titoite, Soviet, <<Eurocommunist>>, Chinese and other modern revisionists, who have taken it upon themselves to mislead people on the issue of the revolution and to prevent its outbreak.

Today, when this question is put forward for solution, 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 the revolution, to unmask their manoeuvres and deliberate misrepresentations about this problem, to expose their counterrevolutionary, chauvinist, hegemonic intentions, and to ensure that the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the revolution are understood and applied correctly.

We Must Defend and Implement the Marxist-Leninist Teachings on the Revolution

Marxism-Leninism teaches us and the experience of all revolutions has confirmed that for the revolution to break out and triumph, the objective and subjective factors must exist.

Lenin formulated this teaching in his book <<The Collapse of the Second International>>, and developed it further in his book <<'Left Wing' Communism, an Infantile Disorder.>> and other writings.

Dwelling on the revolutionary situation as the objective factor of the revolution, Lenin describes it as follows:

<<1) When it is impossible for the ruling classes to maintain their rule in an unchanged form, due to the deep crisis, which has involved these classes, a crisis which causes discontent and indignation among the oppressed classes. 2) When the want and suffering of the oppressed classes have become acute... 3) When, as a consequence of the above causes, there is a considerable increase in the activity of the masses, who... are drawn into... independent actions of historic importance.>>

<<In other words, this truth can be expressed in this way: revolution is impossible without a nation-wide crisis (affecting both the exploited and the exploiters)>>. Lenin

<<Without these objective changes,>> he emphasizes, <<which are independent not only of the will of separate groups or parties, but even of separate classes, a revolution - as a general rule - is impossible>>. Lenin

But not every revolutionary situation gives rise to revolution, says Lenin. In many cases, he says revolutionary situations like those of the years 1860-1870 in Germany, or of the years 18591861 and 1879-1880 in Russia, were not transformed into revolutions, because of the absence of the subjective factor, that is, the high level of consciousnes and readiness of the masses for the revolution,

<<...the ability of the revolutionary class, as Lenin puts it, to carry out revolutionary mass actions strong enough to break (or dislocate) the old government, which, never, not even in a period of crisis, 'falls' if it is not 'dropped'>>. Lenin

In preparing the subjective factor, as Lenin wrote in his early works, the revolutionary party of the working class, its leadership, education and Mobilization of the revolutionary masses play a
decisive role. The party achieves this both by working out a correct political line, which responds to the concrete conditions and the revolutionary desires and demands of the masses, and through a colossal amount of work, involving intensive and politically well-pondered revolutionary actions, which make the proletariat and the working masses conscious of the situation in which they are living, of the oppression and exploitation, of the barbarous laws of the bourgeoisie, and the absolute necessity for the revolution as a means to overthrow the enslaving order.

In this way, the poor strata will react with such intensity that even the wealthy, the bourgeoisie in power, shaken also by other internal and external contradictions, will have difficulty in continuing to rule as before. When these conditions are fulfilled, when the objective and subjective factors, which are linked with each other, exist, then it is possible for the revolution not only to break out but also to triumph.

Revolutionaries always ponder deeply over these theses of genius of Lenin, and not only ponder over them but also make concrete and all-round analyses of the situations. They act to ensure that they will never be taken by surprise by the revolutionary situations, so they will not find themselves disarmed at these decisive moments, but be able to utilize them for the preparation and launching of the revolution.

What does the analysis of the current situation in the world show? Proceeding from the Leninist theory of the revolution, the Party of Labour of Albania draws the conclusion that the situation in the world today is revolutionary in general, that this situation has matured, or is rapidly maturing, in many countries, while in other countries this process is developing.

When we say that the situation today is revolutionary, we mean that the world today is moving towards great outbursts. In general the situation today is like a volcano in eruption, a scorching fire, a fire which will burn precisely the oppressing and exploiting ruling upper classes.

The capitalist and revisionist world is in the grip of a grave, economic and political, financial and military, ideological and moral crisis. The present crisis, which has shaken the entire structure and superstructure of the bourgeois and revisionist order, has made the general crisis of the capitalist system even deeper and more acute.

The consequences of the crisis are clearly very grave and devastating, especially in the field of the economy. The deepening of the most severe economic crisis following the Second World War has been going on since 1974. It has brought about a decline of considerable proportions in industrial production: 20 percent in Japan, 15 percent in Great Britain, 14 percent in the United States of America, 18 percent in France and Italy, 10 percent in the Federal German Republic, etc. The crisis has caused a very deep depression. In many capitalist countries unused productive capacities in some key branches of the economy have reached up to 25-40 percent and this situation is dragging on for years on end. That is why industrial production continues to stagnate. Colossal stocks of surplus goods remain unsold.

Yet, despite all these stocks of unsold goods and even though many productive capacities are not exploited, the monopolies' profits continue to increase because of rising prices. Prices are going up from day to day, while inflation has reached very high figures in certain countries.

Price rises and, in particular, inflation, have become a very convenient means in the hands of the monopolies and the capitalist and revisionist state to saddle the working class and other working people with the heavy burden of the crisis.

Under the pretext of checking inflation, the capitalist and bourgeois-revisionist states increase the taxes on the incomes of the working masses and freeze their wages, and at the same time reduce taxation on the profits of the monopolies, devalue the currency, etc. These measures are directed against the working class and all working people, step up their exploitation and reduce their standard of living.

The long drawn-out economic crisis has worsened the living conditions of the working class and peasant masses and made life very much harder for them. Unemployment has increased to proportions seldom seen before, and has become chronic, a major ulcer of bourgeois and revisionist society. In the capitalist-revisionist world, 110 million people have been thrown out in the streets.
Only in the United States of America not less than 7-8 millions are unemployed. Today, hundreds of millions of people are living on the verge of starvation or actually starving. Hundreds of millions of people are tortured with the anxiety over insecurity for the morrow.

The poverty and insecurity for the broad masses of working people, as well as the reactionary, anti-popular internal and external policies followed by the capitalist and bourgeois-revisionist regimes have added and are continuously adding to the discontent of broad strata of the population. This grave situation has aroused their incontrollable anger, which is expressed in strikes, protests, demonstrations, in clashes with the repressive organs of the bourgeois and revisionist order, and in many cases, even in real revolts. The popular masses are growing ever more hostile to the regimes ruling them.

Striving, even in this situation of crisis, to safeguard their maximum profits, the governments of imperialist, capitalist and revisionist countries make all sorts of fraudulent promises and proposals to placate the discontent and anger of the masses and divert their minds from revolution. Meanwhile, the poor are becoming even poorer, the rich even richer, the gap between poor and rich even richer, the gap between poor and rich social strata, between the developed capitalist countries and the undeveloped countries is growing deeper and deeper.

The present crisis has also extended to political life, inciting contradictions among the ruling circles of the capitalist and revisionist states. Clear evidence of this is the great increase in government crises and the frequent replacement of teams in power.

The bourgeoisie and the ruling cliques are compelled to change the horses in their government teams more and more frequently, with the aim of deceiving the working people and bolstering their hopes that, the fresh team will be better than the old one, and convincing them that the latter are to blame for the crisis and for failing to get out of it, while the former will improve the situation, and so on. This whole fraud, which is continuously conducted on broad proportions, is camouflaged with false slogans about freedom, democracy, etc., especially during electoral campaigns. At the same time, the bourgeoisie in the capitalist and revisionist countries is reinforcing its savage weapons of violence, the army, the police, the secret services, the courts, the control by its dictatorship over every movement and effort of the proletariat. In the capitalist and revisionist countries today there is an obvious trend towards increased bourgeois violence and the limitation of democratic rights.

The tendency towards the development of fascism in the life of the country and preparations for the establishment of fascism, at the moment when the bourgeoisie considers it impossible to rule by <<democratic>> methods and means, is becoming ever more evident.

The economic-financial and political crisis has gripped not only the monopolies, the governments the political parties and forces inside each particular country, but also the international alliances, the economic, political and military blocs, like the European Common Market and Comecon, the European Community, NATO and the Warsaw Treaty. The contradictions, frictions, contests and quarrels between partners of these alliances and blocs, are manifesting themselves ever more openly and abrasively.

Another expression of the crisis and attempts to get out of it can be seen in the armaments race, the all-round preparations for war and the instigation of local wars by the superpowers and the other imperialist powers, such as those in the Middle East, the Horn of Africa, the Western Sahara, Indochina and elsewhere. This course serves the hegemonic and expansionist plans of one or the other imperialist power. It keeps alive and develops the war industry and the arms trade, which have assumed unparalleled proportions today.

But all these political and military means are only palliatives which do not and cannot cure the ills of the gravely ailing capitalist revisionist system.

To the present economic and political crisis of the capitalist and revisionist world must also be added the unprecedented ideological and moral crisis. At no other time has there been such ideological confusion and moral corruption as that which is being seen today.
At no other time have there been so many variants of bourgeois theories, right, middle or <<left>> decked out in every kind of secular and religious, classical and modern, openly anti-communist and allegedly communist and Marxist cloaks. At no other time has such moral corruption, such a degenerate way of life, or such great spiritual depression been witnessed. The bourgeois and revisionist theories, built up with so much effort and trumpeted so boastfully as guides to salvation from the evils of the old society, such as the theories of the <<final stabilization of capitalism>>, <<people's capitalism,>>, <<the consumer society>> <<post-industrial society>>, <<averting crises>>, <<the technical-scientific revolution>>, Khrushchevit <<peaceful coexistence>>, <<a world without armies, weapons and wars>>, <<socialism with a human face>>, etc., etc., have now been shaken to their foundations.

All these aspects of the general crisis are to be found not only in Yugoslavia, where the consequences of the crisis are more obvious, but also in the social-imperialist Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries. Oppression and exploitation have been stepped up everywhere in these countries, all of them are suffering from the ills of capitalism, from the quarrels and conflicts over power and privileges in the ranks of the leaders and the upper strata; everywhere the popular masses are seething with dissatisfaction and anger. Thus, great possibilities for the revolution exist in these countries, too. The law of the revolution operates there the same as in every other bourgeois country.

It is precisely this situation of the present general crisis of capitalism, the trend of which is to become steadily deeper, that makes us draw the conclusion that the revolutionary situation has already enveloped or is in the process of enveloping the majority of capitalist and revisionist countries, and hence, that this situation has placed the revolution on the order of the day.

Under the ever greater pressure of the crisis and the defeats they have suffered in their predictions and their manoeuvres to strangle the revolution, the bourgeoisie and the revisionists are trying to find new expedients and to fabricate other fraudulent theories.

Today, the modern revisionists have unfurled the banner of defence of the capitalist system, of oppression and exploitation of the people, of splitting the revolutionary and liberation movement, and in general, of the deception of the masses. But they, too, will suffer the same fate as the social-democrats and all other opportunists of the past, who have turned into simple lackeys of the bourgeoisie.

In the present situation of its grave economic, political and ideological crises, the bourgeoisie is demanding that its revisionist servants come out more openly in its support. This is forcing them more and more to drop their disguise, but also to become more thoroughly discredited. Lenin says:

<<The opportunists are bourgeois enemies of the proletarian revolution, who in peaceful times carry on their bourgeois work in secret, concealing themselves within the workers' parties, while in times of crises they immediately prove to be open allies of the entire united bourgeoisie, from the conservative to the most radical and democratic part of the latter, from the freethinkers to the religious and clerical sections>>. Lenin

This scientific conclusion of Lenin's is proved to the hilt by the service the modern revisionists are rendering the crisis-stricken capitalist system today.

Take Italy, for instance, the typical country in which the decay of capitalism, in its base and superstructure, is reflected. From the end of the Second World War up till now the Christian Democrats, the party of the big bourgeoisie, the party of the Vatican which has gathered all the religious-reactionary bourgeoisie and elements of the right around itself, have been in power in Italy. Their government is ruling a country which is in a state of bankruptcy.
Right from 1945 to this day, the top strata of the bourgeoisie have been in the grip of such a grave crisis that, within that period there has been a succession of about 40 governments, Christian Democrat, socialist-Christian-Democrat, tripartite, Christian Democrat-socialist-socialdemocrat, governments, governments, etc. The deep government crisis in Italy reflects that situation of the internal general crisis from which no way out can be found. The quarrels, conflicts, political murders and scandals, such as the removal of President Leone, the murder of the head of the Christian Democrat Party, Moro, etc., which are becoming more and more frequent, are consequences of the crisis. Italy has become a bridgehead of the United States of America. Its bankrupt economy, which has fallen into the clutches of American imperialism, is also linked with the European Common Market, where it is the partner with the least weight.

As a result of this situation, the broad working masses in Italy have been impoverished and are becoming more so. Italy has the highest level of unemployment among the countries of the European Common Market. Italy has the greatest emigration of the labour force and its imports are greater than its exports. By restricting their buying of food products from Italy, the member countries of the European Common Market, especially West Germany and France, have created a difficult situation in Italian agriculture. The export prices of Italian butter, milk, and fruit have fallen sharply while the cost of living in that country has become extremely high. Italy has become a country of big strikes in which workers from heavy and light industry and transport, down to postmen, airline crews and even the police take part.

In such a situation of seething discontent, when the interests of the masses and the revolution require that all this great discontent of the proletariat and the entire people should be channelled into the fight against the reactionary bourgeoisie, against its preparations for the fascist attack it is trying to launch, the Italian revisionists and the reformist trade-unions, the entire worker aristocracy, as well as the supporters of the Chinese theory of the , are acting as firemen to extinguish the flames of the revolution and as defenders of the bourgeois order. This rotten bourgeois order is being defended by all the parties, from the fascist party to the Berlinguer's revisionist party. The Italian revisionist party is united with the bourgeoisie precisely to keep this bourgeois order, shaken to its foundations, in power. It is trying to weaken and suppress the revolutionary drive of the Italian proletariat by spreading the lie that it is following and applying a Marxism applicable to the conditions of its own country.

Not only did Berlinguer enter into negotiations with the Christian Democrats long ago, but he has even reached agreement with them, and indeed, without formally participating in the government, on many problems, he is governing together with them. The government supports this party, but at the same time, for the sake of appearances, makes believe that it disagrees with it. The Italian revisionist party, for its part, is playing the same game. The Italian revisionists are raising a great clamour about a government program, agreed on by the five parties of the Italian parliamentary Majority, which they are boosting as an important victory, as a new political phase in their country. But this political phase, that Berlinguer talks about, is the inclusion of the revisionist party in the plans of Italian capital. Berlinguer describes this as a serious, realistic, and undogmatic agreement. He claims that this agreement will bring about a real change, not only in the political relations among parties, but also in the entire economic, social and state life of the country.

Thus the Italian revisionists are going down precisely the road Lenin predicted for the different opportunists, who seek unity with capital in order to obstruct the revolutionary drive of the masses. With this unity, they think that they have come some way towards achieving their aim of going to socialism through pluralism. Obviously, this is nothing but a dream, and the President of the Italian Senate, Amintore Fanfani, is not at all mistaken when he describes this agreement among the five parties as a collection of dreams.
It is a collection of dreams on the part of the Italian revisionists, whereas on the part of the forces of capital, it is by no means a dream, but a well-pondered act designed to liquidate the ideas of communism in Italy, and to block the claims of the Italian people and proletariat and suppress their revolutionary struggle for the construction of a new society. The Italian revisionists are now receiving a few crumbs, but, claiming that the government needs the participation of the revisionist party, they are trying to have the party brought completely into the government, like a fish in its element. In a word, the Italian revisionist party is trying to become totally involved in the reactionary mess of Italian monopoly capital.

Berlinguer's party is an utterly degenerate party ideologically, with a completely reformist, parliamentarianist, social-democratic program. It supports the order established by the pseudo-democratic Constitution in the formulation of which the Italian <<communists>> themselves, headed by Togliatti took part. It is precisely under this Constitution that the reactionary and clerical bourgeoisie has been making the law in Italy and oppressing the proletariat and the broad masses of the people for the past three decades. The so-called Italian communists find this oppression just and in conformity with the Constitution.

Inside or outside the Italian Parliament, through the press organs, television and radio, the Italian revisionist party together with the other parties of the bourgeoisie, with the Christian Democrat party at the head, is carrying out a policy accompanied with unrestrained demagogy which stupefy the Italian public, confuse and disorganize it day by day, in order to weaken the revolutionary will of the proletariat and the Political consciousness of the working masses.

Italian reaction and the Vatican are in great need of all this activity. The Italian revisionist party is trying to suppress the revolutionary movement of the masses of the people, headed by the proletariat, in order to hinder the revolution, to help the bourgeoisie out of its predicament and avert the overthrow of the existing order.

Take another example, Spain. After the death of Franco, King Juan Carlos came to power in Spain. He is the representative of the Spanish big bourgeoisie, which, seeing that during its long rule the fascist regime had plunged the country into a grave crisis, came to the conclusion that Spain could no longer be governed as in Franco's time. Therefore certain changes had to be made in the form of government and Franco's discredited Falange could no longer be kept in power. After a series of changes of heads of government, the people most trusted by the new king, the continuers of the reformed Francoism, took power.

Demonstrations and strikes broke out in Spain as never before. Through them the people demanded changes, naturally, not this <<change>> that took place, but deep-going and radical changes. The strikes, demonstrations and clashes there did not cease and are still going on. The masses are demanding freedoms and rights, and the different nationalities autonomy. In this situation, in order to mislead the masses in revolt, the government of Juan Carlos also legalized the revisionist party of Ibarruri-Carrillo. The heads of this party have become obedient flunkies of the Spanish monarchic regime, have turned into scabs to hold back the great revolutionary drive which has built up in the existing situation and, in conjunction with the bourgeoisie, to suppress all the elements with revolutionary ideas from the Spanish War and admirers of the Republic.

Here, too, we see the fire brigade role of the Spanish revisionist party, identical with the role played by the Italian revisionist party, although it has less power than the latter.

The revisionist parties in France, Japan, the United States of America, Britain, Portugal and all the other capitalist countries are playing a similar role in defending the bourgeois order, enabling it to overcome the crises and revolutionary situations, to befuddle and paralyze the proletariat and the other oppressed and exploited masses, who are understanding ever more clearly that it is no longer possible to live in the <<consumer society>> and other exploiting societies, and who are rising in revolt against the capitalist political and economic order.
The revisionist parties are particularly hostile to Leninism. This means that they are hostile to the revolution, because it was Lenin who elaborated the theory on the proletarian revolution to perfection and put it into practice in Russia. On the basis of this theory, the socialist revolution triumphed in Albania and other countries. The Leninist theory, which shows the way to the triumph of revolution everywhere, reveals the worthlessness of the counterrevolutionary revisionist theories about peaceful transition to socialism through the parliamentary road, without destroying the bourgeois state apparatus, indeed, according to them, even utilizing it for peaceful socialist transformations, with no need for the leadership of the proletariat and its vanguard party or the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Precisely at these very revolutionary moments, when there are great possibilities for the revolution to break out at the weakest links of the capitalist chain, when there is extremely great need to raise the class consciousness of the proletariat, to prepare the subjective factor, to build up confidence in the correctness and universal character of the Marxist-Leninist theory, which shows the true road to the seizure of state power by the proletariat and other oppressed masses, the revisionists are rendering the bourgeoisie an invaluable service in its efforts to cope with and avert the revolution. That is why the bourgeoisie is striving in every way to involve the revisionist parties and the trade-unions under their influence in the fight against the revolution and communism. This is precisely the objective that the whole line of American imperialism, world capitalism and the bourgeoisie of every country is intended to achieve. The bourgeoisie wants the revisionist parties to place themselves openly and totally in the service of capital by operating under,<<communist>> colours and allegedly fighting to change the situation, to create a new hybrid society in which not only the owning class and wealthy classes, but allegedly the poorer classes, too, will have their say, with the revisionist ,communist>>. parties and the socialist parties passing themselves off as their representatives and champions.

The revisionists in power, in particular, the Yugoslav, Soviet and Chinese revisionists, are rendering world capitalism a very great service in the struggle to hold back and stamp out the revolution. The Yugoslav revisionists are declared enemies of Leninism. They are the most ardent propagandists of the negation of the universal character of the laws of the socialist revolution embodied in the October Revolution and reflected in the Leninist theory of the revolution. They preach that allegedly the world today is moving towards socialism spontaneously, therefore there is no need for revolution, for class struggle, etc. The Yugoslav revisionists present their capitalist system of <<self-administration>> as a model of true socialism, alleging that it is a panacea both against the <<evils>> of <<Stalinist>> socialism and against the evils of capitalism. According to them, the establishment of this system allegedly does not require violent revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, state socialist ownership, or democratic centralism. <<Self-administration>> can be established quietly and gently by agreement and collaboration between ruling circles, between employers and workers, between the government and property owners.

It is precisely because Yugoslav revisionism is an enemy of Leninism and sabotages the revolution that international capitalism, and especially American imperialism, is so <<generous>> in providing Titoite Yugoslavia with financial, material, political and ideological aid.

In words, the Soviet revisionists do not reject Leninism and the Leninist theory of the revolution, but they fight it in practice with their counterrevolutionary stands and activity. They are no less afraid of the proletarian revolution than the American imperialists or the bourgeoisie of any other country, because in their own country the revolution topples them from the throne, strips them of their power and class privileges, while in the other countries it ruins their strategic plans for world domination.

They try to present themselves as continuators of the October Revolution, as followers of Leninism, in order to deceive the proletariat and the working masses both in the Soviet Union and in other countries.
They talk about <<developed socialism>> and <<transition to communism>> in order to put out any discontent, revolt, and revolutionary movement of the working masses in their country against the revisionist rule, and to suppress them as <<counterrevolutionary>>, <<anti-socialist>> acts. Outside their country, they use <<Leninism>> as a mask to conceal their anti-Marxist, anti-Leninistt theories and practices, to open the way for the expansionist and hegemonic plans of social-imperialism.

The Soviet revisionists present the violent revolution in the developed capitalist countries as very dangerous at the present time, when, according to them, any revolutionary outburst could be transformed into a thermo-nuclear world war which will exterminate mankind. Therefore, they recommend the revolution on the peaceful road, the transformation of Parliament <<from an organ of bourgeois democracy into an organ of democracy for the working people>> as the most suitable road today. They also present -<<détente>> the socalled easing of tension, which serves the aims of Soviet foreign policy, as the general trend of world development today., which will allegedly lead to the peaceful triumph of the revolution on a world scale.

For demagogical purposes they do not deny the dictatorship of the proletariat, indeed, in theory they come out in defence of it, saying that, in specific instances, even violent revolution may be used. But they need these declarations especially to justify the plots and armed putsches which they organize in one country or another to establish pro-Soviet reactionary regimes and cliques there, to divert the national liberation movements from the right road, and to put them under their hegemony, etc. Now revisionist China, too, has become a zealous extinguisher of the revolution.

The entire internal and external policy of the Chinese revisionists is directed against the revolution, because the revolution upsets their strategy of making China an imperialist superpower.

Within China the revisionist leadership is savagely suppressing any revolutionary outburst of the working class and the other working masses against its bourgeois-counterrevolutionary stands and actions. It is striving in every way to cover up the contradictions of the present epoch, especially the contradiction between labour and capital, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The Chinese revisionists say that there is only one contradiction in the world today, the contradiction between the two superpowers, which they present as a contradiction between the United States of America and all other countries of the world, on the one hand, and Soviet social-imperialism, on the other. Basing themselves on this fabricated thesis, they call on the proletariat and the peoples of every country to unite with the bourgeoisie of their countries -to defend the homeland and national independence. against the danger which comes only from Soviet social-imperialism. With this the Chinese revisionists preach to the masses the idea of renouncing the revolution and the liberation struggle.

To the Chinese revisionists the problem of the proletarian and national liberation revolution is simply not a current issue, also because, according to them, nowhere in the world is there a revolutionary situation. Therefore, they advise the proletariat to shut itself up in libraries and study theory>, because the time for revolutionary actions has not come. In this context, it is clear how hostile and counterrevolutionary is the policy of the Chinese revisionists, who are splitting the Marxist-Leninist movement and hindering the unity of the working class in the fight against capital. The Chinese press and, as well as the speeches of the Chinese leaders, make no mention at all of the big demonstrations and strikes. which the entire proletariat is organizing in different capitalist countries today. This is because they do not want to encourage the revolt of the, masses, because they do not want the proletariat to utilize these situations in their fight against oppression and exploitation. How hypocritical sound their bombastic and empty slogans that .Kthe countries want independence, <<the nations want liberation and the people want revolution>>!
Not only is the claim of the Chinese revisionists that there is no revolutionary situation in the world today contrary to the reality, but they also, demand that the proletariat with its Marxist-Leninist party sit with its arms folded and refrain from undertaking any revolutionary action at all, from working to prepare the revolution. Long ago, at the 2nd Congress of the Communist International, Lenin had criticized such capitulationist views expressed by the Italian Serrati, according to whom no revolutionary actions should be carried out when there is no revolutionary situation.

<<The difference between the socialists and Communists, said Lenin, o consists in the former refusing to act in the way we act in any situation, i.e., conduct revolutionary work>> Lenin

This criticism by Lenin is a heavy slap in the face also for the Chinese modern revisionists, and all the other revisionists, who, like the socialdemocrats, are against revolutionary actions by the proletariat and the other working masses. Lenin called Kautsky a renegade, because

<<....he had completely distorted Marx' doctrine, tailoring it to suit opportunism, and that he had repudiated revolution in deeds, while accepting it in words>>. Lenin

The Chinese revisionist leaders go a little further than Kautsky. They do not admit the necessity of the revolution even in words. This reactionary line explains the profoundly counterrevolutionary policy and attitudes of the Chinese revisionist leadership, which is seeking in every way to enter into alliances and collaborate with US imperialism and the other developed capitalist countries, supports the European Common Market and NATO. By entering into alliance and seeking unity with the US imperialists, who, together with the Soviet social-imperialists, are the most ferocious oppressors and exploiters and the arch-enemies of the proletariat and the peoples, as well as with the other imperialist rulers, with the blackest world reaction, while demanding that the proletariat of the European countries and the other developed capitalist countries bend their backs and submit to oppression by the bourgeoisie, the Chinese revisionists themselves are also participating in this oppression and uniting with world capitalism in the fight against the revolution, against socialism, and against the peoples' liberation.

As can be seen, world capitalism, with modern revisionism and all its other tools, is waging a fierce and many-sided fight on all fronts to stop revolutions from breaking out. They are striving with might and main to overcome the crises, to cool or defuse the revolutionary situations in order to prevent them from being transformed into revolution. However, the crises and revolutionary situations are objective phenomena, which do not depend on the will and desires of the capitalists, the revisionists or any one else. Only when the capitalist order of oppression and exploitation, which inevitably gives rise to them, has been wiped out, can they be avoided. The imperialists, the other capitalists and the revisionists know well that the revolution does not break out spontaneously in periods of crises and revolutionary situations. Therefore they direct their attention and their main blows towards the subjective factor. On the one hand, they strive to stupefy and deceive the proletariat, the other working masses and the peoples, to hinder them from becoming conscious of the necessity for the revolution, and from uniting and organizing themselves; on the other hand, they fight to destroy the international Marxist-Leninist movement, to stop it from building up and gaining strength, so that it will not become a great leading political force of the revolution, so that the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties of each country will not gain the political and ideological capacity to be able to unite, organize, mobilize, and lead the masses in revolution and to victory.
But, however much the imperialists, the capitalists, the revisionists and reactionaries strive and struggle, they cannot stop the wheel of history from rolling onwards. Their strivings and struggle will come up against the revolutionary strivings and struggle of the proletariat and the freedom-loving peoples, while the modern revisionists will suffer the same fate as the socialdemocrats and all the opportunists of the past, all the lackeys of the bourgeoisie and imperialism.

**The Peoples' Liberation Struggle - a Component Part of the World Revolution**

When we speak of the revolution we do not mean only the socialist revolution. In the present epoch of the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism, the peoples' liberation struggle, the national-democratic, anti-imperialist revolutions, the national liberation movements, also, are component parts of a single revolutionary process, the world proletarian revolution, as Lenin and Stalin explained.

*<<Leninism,>> says Stalin, <<has proved... that the national problem can be solved only in connection with and on the basis of the proletarian revolution, and that the road to victory of the revolution in the West lies through the revolutionary alliance with the liberation movement of the colonies and dependent countries against imperialism. The national problem is a part of the general problem of the proletarian revolution, a part of the problem of the dictatorship of the proletariat>>. Stalin*

This connection has become even clearer and more natural today, when, with the collapse of the old colonial system, most of the peoples have taken a big step forward towards independence by creating their own national states, and when, following this step, they are aspiring to go further. They want the liquidation of the neo-colonialist system, of any imperialist dependence and any exploitation by foreign capital. They want their complete sovereignty and economic and political independence. It has now been proved that such aspirations can be realized, such objectives can be attained only through the elimination of any foreign domination by and dependence on foreigners and the liquidation of oppression and exploitation by local bourgeois and big land-owner rulers.

Hence, the linking and interlacing of the national-democratic, anti-imperialist, national liberation revolution with the socialist revolution, because, by striking at imperialism and reaction, which are common enemies of the proletariat and the peoples, these revolutions also pave the way for great social transformations, assist the victory of the socialist revolution. And vice-versa, by striking at the imperialist bourgeoisie, by destroying its economic and political positions, the socialist revolution creates favourable conditions for and facilitates the triumph of liberation movements. This is how the Party of Labour of Albania sees the question of the revolution. It sees it from Marxist-Leninist positions, and that is why it gives all-out support and backing to the just struggles of the freedom-loving peoples against US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and the other imperialist powers, against neo-colonialism, because these struggles assist the common cause of the destruction of imperialism, the capitalist system and the triumph of socialism in each country and on a world scale.

Therefore, when we draw the conclusion that the revolution is a question put forward for solution, that it is on the agenda, we have in mind not only the socialist revolution, but also the democratic anti-imperialist revolution.

The level of maturity of the revolutionary situation, the character and the development of the revolution cannot be the same for all countries.
These things depend on the concrete historical conditions of each individual country, the stage of its economic and social development, the ratio of classes, the situation and the level of organization of the proletariat and the oppressed masses, the scale of the interference of foreign powers in the different countries, etc. Each country and, people has many specific problems of the revolution, which are very complicated.

At present, there is a great deal of talk about the situation in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the carrying out of the revolution there. The Chinese leaders the question of the revolution and the independence and national liberation of these countries in a global way, as if it can be solved by means of the unity of the entire "third world", i.e., of states, classes, governments, etc., ignoring the concrete situations and problems of leach individual country and region. This metaphysical view shows that the Chinese leaders are, in fact, against the revolution and the liberation of the peoples of Africa, Asia, Latin America, that they are for the maintenance of the status quo, for the preservation of the imperialist and neo-colonialist domination in these countries.

We, too, speak about the question of the liberation the African, Asiatic, Latin-American, Arab and other peoples. These peoples have many common problems which they must solve, but each of them also has very complicated specific problems.

The general and common task of these peoples is the liquidation of any foreign yoke, imperialist, colonial and neo-colonial, and the oppression by the local bourgeoisie. These peoples in Africa, Latin America, Asia, and elsewhere are 'seething with anger and hatred against the foreign yoke, as well as against the yoke of the local bourgeois or landowner-bourgeois ruling cliques, sold out to the US imperialists, the Soviet socialimperialists, or the other imperialists. These peoples have now awakened and can no longer tolerate the plunder of their riches, their sweat and blood, can no longer reconcile themselves to the economic, social and cultural backwardness in which they live.

Arising from the struggle against US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, the main enemies of the revolution and the national and social liberation of the peoples, the struggle against the bourgeoisie and reaction, the peoples have many common interests, many common problems, and on this basis they must unite with one another.

The fight against Israel - the most blood-thirsty tool of US imperialism - which has become a great stumbling block to the advance of the Arab peoples, is a common problem for all these peoples. In practice, however, not all the Arab states are of one mind about the struggle they should wage jointly against Israel and about the character this struggle against their common enemy should have. Frequently, some of them see this struggle from a narrow nationalist angle.

We cannot agree with such a stand. We stick to our stand that Israel must withdraw to its own lair and renounce its chauvinist, provocative, offensive and aggressive attitudes and actions against the Arab states. We demand that Israel give up the territories of the Arabs, that the Palestinians gain all their national rights, but we can never accept that the Israeli people should be wiped out.

The efforts of the peoples of the Arab countries for complete liberation from the clutches of imperialism and social-imperialism, for the strengthening of their freedom and sovereignty, are likewise the common problems of all these peoples.

However, each of the Arab peoples has its own characteristics, has specific problems, which are different from those of the others, and which arise from its socio-economic development, its cultural level, its state organization, the level of freedom and sovereignty achieved, the unification of clans and tribes in many of them, etc. To lump all these separate elements together and to demand that the question of freedom, independence, democracy and socialism must be solved for all these countries in the same manner and at the same time, is an impossibility.

In those Arab countries in which the interests of the bourgeoisie have been greatest, the various imperialists have invested considerable sums for the exploitation of natural assets and the peoples.
To achieve this, certain working conditions had to be created, both for the colonizers and the colonized. Wherever the natural assets have been most plentiful and the interests of the colonizers greatest, there the exploitation of the people and their wealth also have been more intensive. Naturally, the exploitation of assets has also brought about a certain development, but this cannot be considered as an overall, harmonious development of the economy of this or that country. The colonizers financed and assisted the chieftains of the principal tribes, who sold their souls and the riches of the peoples to the imperialist occupiers. In return they were given a small percentage from the colossal profits made by the colonizers.

Depending on the circumstances and the power of the state which had enslaved them, with these profits and the aid of their foreign patrons, the tribal chiefs created some sort of allegedly independent state, with the support and under the control of the colonizing country. In this way, with the aid of the colonizers, the tribal chiefs were turned into the wealthy bourgeois stratum of sheiks, who sold their territories, together with their peoples, for next to nothing putting the peoples under a double bondage, that of the foreign colonizers and their own. Thus, the strata of the big bourgeoisie, the big landowners, mediaeval kings, on the one hand, and the slaves, the proletariat working on the foreign concessions, on the other, were created and confronted one another in the Arab countries. With the money and profits the foreign exploiters granted them, the upper strata adopted the mode of living of the European and American bourgeoisie. Their sons even attended the colonizers' schools, where they acquired some western culture. They passed themselves off as the representatives of their people's culture, but in fact, they were trained to keep the working masses in bondage and to allow the colonizers to continue the ruthless exploitation of the latter.

That Arab state which had greater wealth, developed more rapidly, another which was not so wealthy, developed more slowly, while the state which was poor, remained at a very low level of development.

Having an organization suitable for the imposition of radical oppression, and also having the armed forces in their hands, colonialism, the state power of feudal monarchs and the big land-owning bourgeoisie nipped in the bud any attempt at revolt, any claim, even for some very limited economic rights, let alone for political demands and the revolution.

In the development of the Arab states at the present day, they are not all faced with solving the same problems. The King of Saudi Arabia, for instance, has different problems and views the economic, political, organizational and military questions differently from the Emirs of the Persian Gulf who see these questions from quite another angle and over a different range. Similarly, Iraq, Syria, Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, Mauritania, etc., all see their own problems from different points of view.

Therefore, when we speak of the Arab peoples, we arrive at the conclusion that, though they have many common interests, their problems are not identical and cannot be solved in the same way in one country as in another. Similarly, we cannot say that an alliance and a single opinion about the solution of common problems exist among these countries. The problems are different for each Arab state not only because of the differing stands of the governments of one or the other country, but also because of the attitudes of the colonial and neo-colonial states which still continue to make the law in most of them.

What has been said about the Arab peoples also applies to the peoples of the African continent. Africa is a mosaic of peoples with an ancient culture. Each African people has its own culture, customs, way of life, which, with some variations, are at a very backward stage, for well-known reasons. The awakening of the bulk of these peoples has only recently begun. De jure, the African peoples, in general, have won their freedom and independence. But there can be no talk of genuine freedom- and independence, since most of them are still in a colonial or neo-colonial state.
Many of these countries are governed by the chieftains of the old tribes who have seized power and rely on the old colonialists, or the US imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists. The methods of government in these states at this stage are not and cannot be other than a marked survival of colonialism. The imperialists are ruling most of the African countries again through their concerns, their capital invested in industry, banks, etc. The overwhelming bulk of the wealth of these countries continues to flow to the metropolises.

Some of the African countries have fought for that freedom and independence they enjoy today, while the others have had it granted without fighting. During their colonial rule in Africa, the British, French and other colonizers oppressed the peoples but they also created a local bourgeoisie, more or less educated in the Occidental manner. The leading figures today, have also emerged from this bourgeoisie. Among them there are many anti-imperialist elements, fighters for the independence of their own countries, but the majority either remain loyal to the old colonizers, in order to preserve the close relations with them even after the formal abolition of colonialism, or have entered into economic and political dependence on the US imperialists or the Soviet social imperialists.

The colonizers did not make large investments in the past. This was the case, for instance, with Libya, Tunisia, Egypt, etc. However, the colonizers drained the wealth of all these countries, seized large tracts of land, and developed a proletariat, by no means small in number, in some special branches of the industry, such as in the extraction and processing of raw materials. They also drew large numbers of workers to the metropolises, such as to France, for instance, but also to Britain, as a cheap labour force which worked in the colonizers mines and the factories.

In the other parts of Africa, especially in Black Africa, industrial development remained more backward. All the countries of this region were divided up, especially between France, Britain, Belgium and Portugal. Great underground riches, like diamonds, iron, copper, gold, tin, etc., were discovered there long ago, and industry to mine and process minerals has been set up there.

In many African countries, large, typically colonial cities, were built, where the colonizers; lived a fabulous life. Now, on the one hand, the local great bourgeoisie and its wealth is growing and developing there, while on the other hand, the impoverishment of the broad masses of working people is increasing still more. In these countries a certain degree of cultural development has been achieved, but it has more of a European character. The local culture has not developed. It has generally remained at the stage reached by the tribes and is not represented outside them, in the centres with towering sky-scrapers. This has come about because, outside the large centres, were the colonizers lived, stark misery and extreme poverty existed, hunger, disease, ignorance and ruthless exploitation of the people, in the full meaning of the term, reigned supreme.

The African population remained culturally and economically undeveloped and continuously diminished in numbers, declining because of colonial wars, the savage racial persecution, and the traffic in African negroes, who were sent to the metropolises, the United States of America, and other countries to work like animals in the plantations of cotton and other crops, as well as in the heaviest jobs in industry and construction.

For these reasons, the African peoples still have a great struggle ahead of them. This is and will be a very complicated struggle, differing from one country to another, because of the state of their economic, cultural and educational development, the degree of their political awakening, the great influence which the different religions, such as the Christian and Moslem religions, the old pagan beliefs, etc., exert on the masses of these peoples. This struggle becomes still more difficult since many of these countries are actually under the domination of neo-colonialism combined with that of local bourgeois-capitalist cliques. The law there is made by those powerful capitalist and imperialist states which subsidize or control the ruling cliques, which they Set up and remove whenever the interests of the neo-colonialists require or when the balance of these interests is upset.

The Policy Pursued by the big landowners, the reactionary bourgeoisie, the imperialists and the neo-colonialists is intended to keep the African peoples in permanent bondage, in ignorance, to hinder their social, political and ideological development, and to obstruct their struggle to gain these rights.
At present we see that those same imperialists who used to lord it over these peoples in the past, as well as other new imperialists, are trying to penetrate into the African continent, by meddling in every way in the internal affairs of the peoples. As a result of this, the contradictions among imperialists, between the peoples and the bourgeois-capitalist leaderships of most of these countries, and between the peoples and the new colonizers, are becoming more and more severe every day. These contradictions must be utilized by the peoples, both to deepen them and to benefit from them. But this can be achieved only through resolute struggle by the proletariat, the poor peasantry, by all the oppressed and the slaves, against imperialism and neo-colonialism, against the local big bourgeoisie, the big landowners and their whole establishment. A special role in this struggle devolves upon progressives and democrats, the revolutionary youth and patriotic intellectuals, who aspire to see their own countries advancing free and independent, on the path of development and progress. Only through continuous and organized struggle by them will life be made difficult for the local and foreign oppressors and exploiters and government impossible. This situation will be prepared in the specific circumstances of each African state. British and US imperialism have not given to the peoples of Africa any freedom. Everybody can see what is happening in South Africa, for instance. The white racists, the British capitalists, the exploiters, are ruling there, savagely oppressing the coloured peoples of that state, where the law of jungle prevails. Many other countries of Africa are dominated by the concerns and capital of the United States of America, Britain, France, Belgium, and other old colonialists and imperialists, who have become somewhat weaker, but who still hold the keys to the economies of these countries.

The peoples of Asia, too, have traversed a road full of suffering and hardship, ruthless imperialist oppression and exploitation. On the eve of the Second World War, nine tenths of the population of this continent, Soviet Asia excluded, was in a state of colonial and semi-colonial oppression and exploitation by the imperialist powers of Europe, Japan and the United States of America. Great Britain alone, had colonies totalling 5 million 635 thousand square kilometres of territory with more than 420 million inhabitants in Asia. The colonial oppression and exploitation of the overwhelming majority of the countries of Asia had left them in a state of marked socio-economic and cultural backwardness and utter poverty. They served only as sources to supply the imperialist metropolises with raw materials such as oil, coal, chromium, manganese, magnesium, tin, rubber, etc.

After the war, the colonial order was shattered in Asia, too. Separate national states were set up in the colonial countries. Most of these countries won this victory through bloody war waged by the popular masses against the colonialists and the Japanese invaders. The liberation war of the Chinese people, which led to the liberation of China from Japanese imperialist rule, the routing of the reactionary forces of Chiang Kai-shek and the triumph of the democratic revolution, was of special importance for the collapse of colonialism in Asia. For a time, this victory, in such a large country as China, exerted an extensive influence on the liberation struggle of the Asian peoples and the peoples of other countries dominated by, or dependent on, the imperialist powers. But this influence gradually declined, because of the line followed by the Chinese leadership after the founding of the People's Republic of China. The Chinese leadership proclaimed that China had set out on the road of socialist development. The revolutionaries and the freedom-loving peoples of the world, who wanted and expected China to become a powerful bastion of socialism and world revolution, ardently welcomed this proclamation. But their desires and hopes were not being fulfilled. Hard though it was for people to believe, the facts and the very troubled and confused situation which prevailed in China showed that it was not marching on the socialist road.
Meanwhile, the struggle of the Asian peoples had not ended with the destruction of colonialism. While being obliged to recognize the independence of the former colonial countries, the British, French, Dutch and other colonialists wanted to preserve their economic and political positions in these countries in order to continue their domination and exploitation in other, neo-colonialist forms. The penetration of the United States of America into Asia, especially the Far East, Southeast Asia and the islands of the Pacific, made the situation particularly serious. This region had and still has great economic and military-strategic importance for American imperialism. It established big military bases and deployed powerful strategic fleets there. Parallel with this, US capital got the economies of the countries of this area firmly into its blood-stained clutches. Meanwhile the US imperialists undertook large-scale military operations, diversionist and espionage activities to put down the national liberation movements of the Asian countries. They succeeded in dividing Korea and Vietnam in two, setting up reactionary, puppet regimes in the southern parts of both these countries. Pro-imperialist landowner-bourgeois regimes were established in many former colonial and semi-colonial countries of Asia. In this way, the mediaeval slavery, the savage rule of maharajas, kings, sheiks, samurais, and modernized capitalist gentlemen was preserved there. These regimes sold their countries to the imperialists again, especially to US imperialism, thus immensely hindering the socio-economic and cultural development of these countries.

Under these conditions, the peoples of Asia, who were again languishing under the heavy imperialist and landowner-bourgeois yoke, could not lay down their arms, but had to continue their fight for liberation to get rid of this yoke. Generally, this struggle was led by the communist parties. Wherever these parties had succeeded in establishing sound links with the masses, making them conscious of the liberation aims of the war, and mobilizing and organizing them in revolutionary armed struggle, positive results were reached. The historic victory which the peoples of Indochina, especially the Vietnamese people, won over the US imperialists and their local landowner-bourgeois stooges, showed the entire world that imperialism, even a superpower like the United States of America, with all its mighty economic and military potential, with all the modern means of war at its disposal, which it uses to put down the liberation movements, is unable to subjugate peoples and countries, whether big or small, when they are determined to make any sacrifice and fight selflessly to the finish for their freedom and independence.

Liberation armed struggles have been waged and are still going on in many other countries of Asia, like Burma, Malaysia, the Philippines, Indonesia and elsewhere. Had it not been for the anti-Marxist and chauvinist interference and stands of the Chinese leadership, which have brought about splits and disorientation among the revolutionary forces and the communist parties leading these forces, these struggles would certainly have scored greater successes and victories. On the one hand, the Chinese leaders proclaimed their support for the liberation wars in these countries, while on the other hand, they supported the reactionary regimes, welcomed and farewelled the chiefs of these regimes with paeans of praise and a thousand honours. They have always followed the strategy and tactic of subordinating the liberation movements of the Asian countries to their pragmatic policy and hegemonic interests. They have always brought pressure to bear upon the revolutionary forces and their leadership in order to impose this policy on them. They have never been really concerned about the question of peoples’ liberation and the revolution in the countries of Asia, but only about the realization of their chauvinist ambitions. They have not helped these peoples but have hindered them.

The question of the revolution and the liberation struggle in Asia has never demanded solution so forcibly and imperatively as it does now, it has never been more complicated and difficult to solve. This complication and these difficulties have resulted mainly from the aims and activities of the American imperialists, as well as from the anti-Marxist, anti-popular, hegemonic and expansionist aims and activities of the Soviet and Chinese revisionists and social-imperialists. The United States of America is aiming and striving with might and main to preserve and strengthen its strategic, economic and military positions in Asia, for it considers these positions of vital importance to its imperialist interests.
The Soviet Union, too, is aiming and striving by all means and with all forces to expand the positions it has already occupied in Asia.

China, on its part, has openly displayed its pretension to become the ruler of Asian countries, by forming alliances, to this end, with the United States of America, and especially with Japan, and directly opposing the Soviet Union.

Japan, also, has the ambition to dominate Asia, the old ambition of Japanese imperialism. That is why the Soviet Union is so greatly afraid of the Sino-Japanese alliance and is opposing it so strongly. But neither does American imperialism want this alliance to become so solid that it goes beyond the limits which might infringe American interests, although it encouraged and gave its blessing to the signing of the treaty between China and Japan, from the standpoint that this treaty might contain the Soviet expansion which is to the detriment of American domination.

India, which is a big country, also, has ambitions of becoming a great power with the atomic bombs and great weight in Asia, of playing a special role, in particular concerning the strategic position it has at the nodal point of the expansionist interests of the two imperialist superpowers, American and Soviet, in the Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf and on its northern and eastern borders. British imperialism has not given up its aim of domination in the Asian countries, either. And certain other capitalist-imperialist states also have similar aims.

That is why Asia has become one of the areas of the fiercest inter-imperialist rivalries today, and consequently, many dangerous hotbeds of world conflagrations, for which the peoples will pay the price, have been created there.

In order to quell the revolutions and the liberation struggle in the countries of Asia and open the way to the realization of their hegemonic and expansionist plans, the Soviet and Chinese revisionists, in feverish competition with each other, have been and are engaged in a very filthy job of splitting and destroying the ranks of the communist parties and the revolutionary and freedom loving forces of these countries. This activity was one of the main causes of the catastrophe suffered by the Communist Party of Indonesia, and of the splitting and destruction of the Communist Party of India, etc. They advocate the alliance and unity of the proletariat and the broad popular masses with the local reactionary bourgeoisie, while each of them is trying to win the friendship of this ruling bourgeoisie, for its own ends.

The interference of the Soviet and Chinese social-imperialists in the various countries of Asia from their hegemonic and expansionist positions and ambitions has faced the liberation movements of these peoples with great dangers and has even put the victories of the liberation war in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos directly in jeopardy.

The revolutionary and freedom-loving forces of the Asian countries, which are led by the Marxist-Leninist communist parties, have to face up to and eliminate both the danger from local reaction, which is armed by its imperialist patrons, and the dangers from the splitting and disruptive activities, and the hegemonic and expansionist plans of the Soviet and Chinese revisionists. They also have to free themselves from a series of old reactionary, mystical, Buddhist, Brahmanic and other religious ideas and concepts, which hold back the liberation movement. They also have to prevent reactionary ideas and concepts from striking root, such as the revisionist ideas of Khrushchevism, Maoism, and other just as reactionary theories, which disorientate and deceive the masses, deprive them of their militant class spirit, and lead them into wrong and hopeless paths.

The liberation struggle ahead of the peoples of Asia is truly difficult and has many obstacles indeed, but there never has been, and never will be, an easy liberation struggle or revolution, without great difficulties and obstacles that must be overcome, which do not require bloodshed and many sacrifices to achieve ultimate victory.

The countries of Latin America, in general, have a higher level of capitalist development than the countries of Africa and Asia. But the degree of dependence of the Latin-American countries on foreign capital is not lower than that of the overwhelming majority of African and Asian countries.
Unlike the African and Asian countries, most of the countries in Latin America proclaimed themselves independent states much earlier, since the first half of the 19th century, as a result of the liberation struggles of the peoples of that continent against the Spanish and Portuguese colonizers. Had these countries not fallen under another yoke, the semi-colonial yoke of British, French, German, American and other foreign capital, right after they shook off the Spanish or Portuguese colonial yoke, they would have made much greater progress. Up to the beginning of this century the British colonialists were the masters of the situation on this continent. They plundered colossal amounts of raw materials from these countries, built ports, railways, power stations in the exclusive service of their concessionary companies, and traded there industrial goods produced in Britain. This situation changed, but not in favour of the Latin-American peoples, with the penetration of Latin America by the United States of America at the stage of its imperialist development. The imperialism of the United States of America used the slogan "<Monroe doctrine>>", embodied in the "America for Americans>>, in order to establish its undivided domination over the whole Western hemisphere. The economic penetration of the United States of America into this hemisphere was carried out both by means of military force and political blackmail and by dollar diplomacy, by means of the stick and the carrot. Thus in 1930, investments of American and British capital in Latin America were equal, whereas after the Second World War, the United States of America became the real master of the economy of this region of the globe. Its big monopolies took control of the key branches of the economy in Latin America. The countries of that continent became part of the "invisible" empire of American imperialism, which began to make the law in all of them, to appoint and dismiss the heads of state and the governments, to dictate their internal and external economic and military policies. The monopoly companies of the United States of America drew fabulous profits from the exploitation of the rich natural resources and the toil, sweat and blood of the Latin-American peoples: for each dollar invested in the various countries of this continent they took 4-5 dollars profit. This situation still prevails to this day. Although the capital investments by the imperialist states in Latin America led to the setting up of some modern industry, particularly the extracting industry as well as light and food processing industry, these investments have been a very great hindrance to the general economic development of the Latin-American countries. The foreign monopolies and the neo-colonialist policy of the imperialist states have given the economic development of these countries a distorted, on-sided form, a mono-cultural character, turning them simply into specialized suppliers of raw materials: Venezuela - oil, Bolivia - tin, Chile copper, Brazil and Colombia - coffee, Cuba, Haiti and the Dominican Republic - sugar, Uruguay and Argentina - livestock products, Equador bananas, and so on.

This one-sided character made the economy of these countries utterly unstable, utterly incapable of rapid and all-round development, completely at the mercy of the changes and fluctuation of prices on the capitalist world market. Any decline in production and any manifestation of economic crisis in the United States of America and the other capitalist countries was bound to be reflected negatively, indeed even more drastically, in the economies of the countries of Latin America, too. After the Second World War, the imperialist Metropolises began to make direct large-scale investments in the various branches of industry, mining, farming, to buy up national enterprises, etc. They extended their domination over whole sectors of production, and stepped up the plunder of the countries of Latin America to the maximum. At the same time, they encouraged provision of loans and financing at high interest rates, thus binding these countries even more tightly to the foreign domination and to the domination of the United States of America, first of all. Brazil alone has debts to the foreign banks amounting to almost 40 billion dollars and Mexico nearly 30 billion dollars.
Capitalist development in Latin America has remained generally backward also because there are still many survivals of the latifundia which have not completely lost their feudal character, that is why in some of the Latin-American countries there is very marked backwardness, as in those of Asia and Africa. In the countries of Latin America an oligarchy, a very powerful monopoly big bourgeoisie dependent on imperialist economic policy and direct imperialist interference, has been created, which together with the big landowners has state power in its hands and, always with the support of American imperialism and together with it, ruthlessly oppresses and exploits the working class, the peasantry and the other strata of working people who live in abject poverty.

This development has also created quite a large industrial proletariat which, together with the agricultural proletariat and the building and services workers, makes up nearly half the population, unlike Africa and Asia where, in most countries, the working class is very small.

Besides this, in Latin America the peasantry and the working class, which has emerged from its ranks, have a rich militant revolutionary tradition gained in the ceaseless struggles for freedom, landy work and bread, a tradition which has been developed further in the battles against the local oligarchy and foreign monopolies, against American imperialism. The peoples of Latin America rank among the peoples who have fought and shed their blood the most against their internal and external oppressors and exploiters. In these battles they have had more than a few victories, and not minor ones either, but the complete victory of democratic freedoms, the wiping out of exploitation, securing national independence and sovereignty, has still not been won in any Latin-American country. The Latin-American peoples cherished many hopes, had many illusions, about the victory of the Cuban people, which became an inspiration and encouragement to them in their struggle to shake off the yoke of the local capitalist and landowner rulers and American imperialists. However, these hopes and this inspiration soon faded when they saw that Castroite Cuba was not developing on the road of socialism but on that of revisionist-type capitalism, and faded even more quickly when Cuba became the vassal and Mercenary of Soviet social-imperialism.

In Latin America today, as on all continents, the situation is complicated. In most of these countries the situation, is revolutionary and puts the revolution for the overthrow of the bourgeois-landowner order and the liquidation of imperialist dependence on the order of the day. Of course, these revolutions cannot have the same character, the same process of development and the same solution everywhere, for the known reasons of the particular conditions and problems of each country or group of countries, the different levels of their socio-economic development, their dependence on imperialism or social-imperialism, the more or less moderate, or more or less fascist, bourgeois regimes, etc. But one thing is obviously essential - the interlinking, more closely than in many countries of Africa and Asia, of the anti-imperialist, democratic and socialist tasks of the revolution.

Latin America also has many advantages in regard to the preparation of the subjective factor of the revolution, because of the relatively high level of consciousness and readiness of the broad popular masses to fight against the internal and foreign oppression and exploitation, for freedom, democracy and socialism. However, it is not just the imperialists, especially the Americans, together with local reaction, but also the local revisionists and the other opportunist stooges of capitalism, as well as the Soviet and Chinese revisionists, who are obstructing, confusing, and fighting with all their strength against the full preparation of this factor.

Sticking to its policy of keeping Latin America as its exclusive domain, from which it extracts colossal superprofits, American imperialism is manoeuvring with all its means - military force, secret agents, demagogy and deception, to prevent any other imperialism from predominating there, toensure that the revolution will not break out and triumph in any of these countries. Thus it wants to preserve both the total dependence of the LatinAmerican countries on the United States of America and the bourgeois-landowner order in these countries.
An important weapon in the hands of the United States of America to this end is the so-called Organization of American States, which is under the command of the president, the Pentagon and the State Department of the United States. The Constitution of this organization gives the United States the right to intervene in any way and with any means, even military means, to maintain the status quo, both internal and external, of the countries of Latin America.

Meanwhile, the big American monopolies have perfected their method of exploitation in these countries by organizing the multi-national monopoly companies which have their centres in, and are controlled by, the United States of America, and by making large use of state capitalism, by means of which they also secure their control over the local governments and state apparatus in general.

But these and many other means the United States of America employs do not solve the problems arising from the grave economic and political crisis which has the Latin-American countries also in its grip.

Now that the local capitalists and landowners cannot exist without being dependent on, or having the support of, American imperialism, the idea of the revolution, as the only and indispensable means to gain national and social liberation, is becoming ever more deeply and widely implanted in the consciousness of the proletariat, the working peasantry, the progressive intelligentsia, and the masses of the youth of these countries.

In order to avert the revolutions, the American imperialists and the local capitalists resort to two main methods. One is to establish military-fascist regimes through a <<pronunciamento militar>> (military putsch) when they see that their positions are more immediately threatened. This is what they did in Brazil, Chile, Uruguay, Bolivia and elsewhere. The other method is to organize democratic-bourgeois regimes with marked limitations and large gaps in fundamental freedoms, as in Venezuela, Mexico, or as they are doing now in Brazil, trying, in this manner, to ease the revolutionary tensions and give the impression that the bourgeoisie of these countries and, to an even greater extent, the administration of the United States of America and its president are allegedly concerned about human rights.

However, such means and manoeuvres cannot solve the problems of the crisis, cannot avert revolutionary situations, cannot wipe the revolution off the agenda.

The proletariat and all the revolutionary forces in the Latin-American countries are faced with very important revolutionary tasks. In order to perform such tasks, that is, to carry out the revolution, to win their complete national independence, to establish democratic freedoms and socialism, they have to fight in many directions, against the local bourgeois and latifundist oligarchy, against US imperialism, as well as against various lackeys of capital, imperialism and sozial-imperialism, such as the pro-Soviet and Castroite revisionists, the pro-Chinese revisionists, the Trotskyites, etc. They must not only cope with the diversionist and splitting activity of various shades of opportunists and revisionists, but also free themselves from petty-bourgeois influences such as expressed by a number of putschist, foquist, adventurist concepts and practices which have become a kind of tradition, but which have nothing in common with the true revolution, and on the contrary, cause it great damage. However, this question requires careful handling.

In regard to the militant tradition of the peoples of Latin America the positive, revolutionary aspect is predominant. It constitutes a very important factor that must be used to the best advantage and as widely as possible in the preparation and development of the revolution while giving the tradition a new content, free from the negative pistolero and foquist elements.

The Marxist-Leninist parties of the working class will play a decisive role in carrying out these great tasks. Now, not only have such parties been created in almost every country of Latin America, but most of them have taken important steps forward in the work of preparing the proletariat and the masses of the people for revolution.
In irreconcilable struggle against the revisionists and other opportunists, against all the lackeys of the bourgeoisie and imperialism, against Castroite, Khrushchevite, Trotskyite, <<three worlds>>, and other such views and practices, they have worked out a correct political line and accumulated sufficient experience in the struggle to put this line into practice, becoming the bearers of all the revolutionary tradition of the past, in order to use it and develop it further to the advantage of the workers' and liberation movement, the preparation and raising of the masses in revolution. The revolutionary situations existing today make it essential for these parties to maintain the closest possible contacts and consult with one another as frequently as possible, to be able to gain the maximum benefits from one another's experience and co-ordinate their stands and actions on the common problems of the struggle against the reactionary bourgeoisie and imperialism, against Soviet, Chinese and other brands of modern revisionism, and on all the problems of the revolution. Now that the peoples have awakened and refuse to live any longer under the imperialist and colonial yoke, now that they are demanding freedom, independence, development and progress, and are seething with anger against foreign and internal oppressors, now that Africa, Latin America and Asia have become a boiling cauldron in the old and new colonialists are finding it difficult, if not impossible, to dominate and exploit the peoples of these countries by means of the previous methods and forms. They are quite unable to do without their plunder and exploitation of the wealth, the toil and the blood of these peoples. That is why all these efforts are being made to find new methods and forms of deception, plunder and exploitation, to dispense some alms, which, again, do not benefit the masses, but the bourgeois-land owner ruling classes. Meanwhile the question has been made even more complicated, because Soviet social-imperialism long ago began to penetrate and entrench itself more and more deeply in the former colonies and semi-colonies, and because social-imperialist China has begun to make feverish efforts to get in there, too. The revisionist Soviet Union carries out its expansionist interference under the guise of its allegedly Leninist policy of aid for the peoples' liberation struggle, posing as the natural ally of these countries and peoples. As a means to penetrate into Africa and elsewhere, the Soviet revisionists employ and spread slogans of a socialist colour in order to deceive the peoples who aspire to liberate themselves, to liquidate oppression and exploitation, and who know that the only road to complete national and social liberation is socialism. The Soviet Union also involves its allies, or better, its satellites in its interference. We are seeing this concretely in Africa, where the Soviet social-imperialist and their Cuban mercenaries are intervening on the pretext that they are assisting the revolution. This is a lie. Their intervention is nothing but a colonialist action aimed at capturing markets and subjugating peoples. The intervention of the Soviet Union and its Cuban mercenaries in Angola is of this nature. They have never had the slightest intention of assisting the Angolan revolution, but their aim was and is to get their claws into that African country which had won a certain independence after the expulsion of the Portuguese colonialists The Cuban mercenaries are the colonial army dispatched by the Soviet Union to capture markets and strategic positions in the countries of Black Africa, and to go on from Angola to other states, to enable the Soviet social-imperialists, too, to create a modern colonial empire. Under the cloak of aid for peoples' liber the Soviet Union and its mercenary, Cubal are intervening in other countries with armies equipped with artillery and machine-guns, allegedly to build socialism, which does not exist in either the Soviet Union or Cuba. These two bourgeois-revisionist states intervened in Angola in order to help a capitalist clique seize power, contrary to the aims of the Angolan people who had fought to win their freedom from the Portuguese colonialists. Agostinho Neto is playing the game of the Soviets. In the struggle against the other faction, in order to seize power for himself, he called in the Soviets to help him. The struggle between the two opposing Angolan clans did not have anything of a people's revolutionary character.
The fight between them was a struggle of cliques for power. Each of them was supported by different imperialist states. Agostinho Neto emerged the winner from this contest, while socialism did not triumph in Angola. On the contrary, following the intervention from abroad, Soviet neo-colonialism has been established there.

Social-imperialist China, too, is making great efforts to penetrate into the former colonial and semicolonial countries.

An example of how China intervenes is provided by Zaire, a country ruled by the clique around Mobutu, the wealthiest and most bloodthirsty clique on the African continent. In the fighting which flared up in Zaire recently, the Moroccans of the Sherifian Kingdom of Morocco, the French air force, and China, too, all rushed to the aid of Mobutu, the murderer of Patrice Lumumba. The assistance given by the French is understandable, because with their intervention they were defending their concessions and concerns in Katanga, and at the same time, protecting their men, as well as Mobutu and his clique. But what do the Chinese revisionists want in Katanga? Whom are they assisting there? Are they helping the people of Zaire who are being suppressed by Mobutu and his clique and by the French, Belgian, US and other concession holders? Or are not they, too, assisting the blood-thirsty Mobutu clique? The fact is that the Chinese revisionist leadership is assisting this clique not indirectly, but quite openly. To make this assistance more concrete and more demonstrative, it sent its foreign minister, Huang Hua there, as well as military experts and military and economic aid. Thus, it acted in an anti-Marxist, anti-revolutionary way. China's interference has exactly the same features as that of King Hassan of Morocco and that of France.

The Chinese social-imperialists are interfering not only in the affairs of that country, but also in other affairs of the peoples and countries of Africa and other continents, especially in those countries into which they are striving to penetrate in every way, in order to establish economic, political and strategic bases there.

Even the United States of America dare not assist Pinochet, the fascist hangman of Chile, so openly as China is doing. Indeed, the Americans do not assist the reactionary rulers of other countries in this way, even although they have great interests at stake there. This does not mean that the US imperialists are renouncing their own interests. They do defend these interests, defend them very strongly, but in more subtle ways.

With the stand it is maintaining, the so-called socialist China is going against the interests and aspirations of the peoples, the communists, the revolutionary elements, against the aspirations of all the progressive people of Latin America.

China is taking under its protection the various dictators who are ruling the peoples and, with terror and any other means, are suppressing the efforts of revolutionaries, the proletariat and the Marxist-Leninist parties that are fighting for national and social liberation. With such stands, it has taken the road of counter-revolution. Under the guise of Marxism-Leninism it is trying to show that it is allegedly exporting the idea of the revolution to various countries, but in fact, China is exporting the idea of the counter-revolution. In this way it is helping US imperialism and the fascist cliques in power.

The imperative or social-imperialist powers are striving to the same extent to prevent the African, Asian, or Latin-American peoples from developing their revolutionary struggle stage by stage, against the oppression and savage exploitation by their leaderships and the imperialists, who are ruling in agreement with them and sucking their blood.

The duty of revolutionaries, progressives, and patriots in the countries with a low level of socioeconomic development and dependent on the imperialist and social-imperialist powers is to make the peoples conscious of this oppression and exploitation, to educate, mobilize and organize them and hurl them into the liberation struggle, always bearing in mind that it is the broad masses, the peoples, that carry out the revolution. To this end it is necessary to make thorough analyses of the internal and external situation in each country, of its socioeconomic development, the ratio of class forces, the antagonisms among classes, and the antagonisms between the people and the reactionary cliques in power, as well as between the people and the imperialist states.
On this basis correct conclusions can be drawn about the step which must be taken and the tactics which must be employed. What is required from the revolutionary forces is intensive work, determination and wisdom, and first and foremost, thorough understanding of the fact that the liberation struggle in their countries can achieve true victory, only by linking this struggle with the cause of the proletariat, the cause of socialism.

Therefore, the proletariat in each country must create its own revolutionary party, which must be capable of applying the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin faithfully, linking them closely with the conditions of each country, with the situation of each individual people. It is absolutely essential that each of these parties has a profound knowledge of the mentality of the masses and the economic, political, ideological and cultural development of its country, and does not act in a capricious and adventurist way, in a Blanquist way, but fights persistently to rally round itself the allies of the proletariat, the broad masses of the people.

The revolutionaries and the masses of the people need to prepare themselves persistently, bearing in mind the activities of the reactionary bourgeoisie and the big landowners in power, and the foreign oppressors, as well as the intrigues of neo-colonialists. These are important factors, which the revolutionary elements and the peoples must face up to with maturity, with sound organization and revolutionary tactics.

Naturally, not only are ties of cooperation, co-ordination and exchange of experience not excluded, but it is essential to establish them between the revolutionary forces and elements of various countries. This is made easier because they have many similar conditions, such as oppression and exploitation by neo-colonialist and the reactionary bourgeoisie, and a common culture, as well as the common goal of liberation from this oppression and exploitation. The conditions and interests they have in common impel the revolutionary and progressive elements of all these countries to hold consultations, to develop cooperation and coordination in their activities, with which they counter the actions of the enemies who oppress them.

Viewing the situation of the peoples languishing under neo-colonialist domination from the Marxist-Leninist standpoint, the task facing all genuine revolutionaries is to give the revolutionary and liberation struggle of these peoples unreserved support and backing, so that it advances consistently and the revolution builds up ceaselessly, to its complete victory.

**Genuine Revolutionaries Call on the Proletarians and Peoples to Rise up for the New World, the Socialist World**

As we explained in the foregoing, the crisis of capitalism is growing ever deeper. As a result, the proletariat, the oppressed classes and peoples are refusing to endure the exploitation any longer, demanding a change in their lives, demanding the overthrow of the bourgeois order, the abolition of neo-colonialism and imperialism. But these aspirations can be realized only through the revolution. No victory can be achieved without clashing with, and attacking, the internal and external class enemies.

The genuine Marxist-Leninist parties of the working class, as the leaders of the revolution, make the proletariat, the toiling masses, and the peoples conscious and prepare them politically, ideologically and militarily for these clashes.

The Marxist-Leninist parties, all revolutionaries, however few in numbers, establish themselves among the people, organize the masses systematically, with great care and patience, convince them that they are a great force, that they are able to overthrow capital, to seize state power and wield it in the interest of the proletariat and the people. Such parties do not think that, being small, they cannot stand up to the coalition of the parties of the bourgeoisie and the opinion formed by them.
The task of the revolutionaries is to prove to the broad masses of the people that this opinion created by the bourgeoisie is wrong, that it must be demolished and that the true revolutionary opinion, which represents a great transforming force, must be formed.

To carry out their mission successfully, the Marxist-Leninist parties consider that, first of all, they must have a revolutionary strategy and tactics, a correct political line, which must respond to the interests and aspirations of the broad popular masses, and the revolutionary solution to the problems and tasks which the struggle to destroy the bourgeois order and the foreign imperialist domination presents.

**Marxism-Leninism is the only science which gives the revolutionary party of the working class the possibility to work out a correct political line, to define the strategic aim and tasks clearly, and apply revolutionary tactics and methods for their realization.**

Enlightened by Marxism-Leninism and in conformity with the concrete socio-economic and political conditions of the country and the international circumstances, the Marxist-Leninist party knows how to orientate itself and stand at the head of the masses at any time and at every stage of the revolution, be it a democratic, national liberation, or socialist revolution. A revolutionary strategy and a correct political line based on Marxism-Leninism, the revolutionary practice of the world proletariat and the class struggles of its own country, makes it possible to clearly define the strategic aim at the given stage, to determine who are the chief internal and external enemies against whom the main blow should be struck, who the internal and external allies of the proletariat are, etc. The Marxist-Leninist parties have as their aim the overthrow of the capitalist order and the triumph of socialism, whereas, when the revolution in their country is confronted with tasks of a democratic and anti-imperialist character, they aim to develop it unceasingly, to raise it to a socialist revolution, to go over as quickly as possible to the fulfilment of socialist tasks.

Both the strategic aim of the Marxist-Leninist parties and the roads to achieve it are totally different from those of the false communist and workers' parties. The former cannot conceive of achieving this aim except by overturning the capitalist relations of production and destroying the old state apparatus, the whole bourgeois superstructure, to its foundations. They adhere to the teachings of Lenin who says,

<<The essence of the revolution is that the proletariat destroys the 'administrative apparatus' and the entire state apparatus, replacing it with a new apparatus comprised of the armed workers>>.  
*Lenin*

The latter preach the preservation of the old state apparatus, though in words they claim that they stand for socialism. According to them, socialism can be established through reforms, through the parliamentary road, even by using the old state machine.

A number of so-called communist parties are now proving to be even more zealous than the declared bourgeois parties in their defence of the existing capitalist order. For instance, the revisionist party of Ibarruri-Carillo brazenly defends the monarchic regime of Juan Carlos, at a time when some Spanish bourgeois parties are demanding its replacement with a republican regime. Likewise, the revisionist party of Berlinguer comes out as a fervent champion of the oppressive laws of the Italian capitalist state, which are aimed against democratic freedoms, at a time when various bourgeois parties are not doing this openly. The Chinese revisionists, for their part, instruct the parties which follow the Chinese line in the capitalist countries that they must fight together with the most militarist circles to strengthen the armies and the bourgeois apparatus of violence, allegedly to defend the homeland, but in reality to suppress the revolution, if it should break out.

In their aims to undermine the revolutionary and liberation movement and to perpetuate capitalism and imperialist domination, the bourgeoisie and its followers, especially the modern revisionists, are trying by all manner of means to confuse and split the revolutionary forces while erasing the distinction between the friends and the enemies of the revolution.
Typical of this are the preachings of the Chinese revisionists who present the big monopoly bourgeoisie, the reactionary and fascist regimes, NATO and the European Common Market, and even American imperialism, as allies of the proletariat and the oppressed peoples.

As for the Marxist-Leninist parties, they consider that an absolutely essential condition for building a genuinely revolutionary strategy is the establishment of a clear-cut dividing line between the motive forces of the revolution and its enemies and a clear definition of the main internal and external enemy against whom, as Stalin pointed out, the main blow must be aimed, without underrating and overlooking the fight against the other enemies.

In our time, in the conditions of imperialism, the main internal enemy of the revolution, not only in the developed capitalist countries, but also in the oppressed and dependent countries, is the local big bourgeoisie which stands at the head of the capitalist order and fights with all its means, with violence and oppression, demagogy and deceit, to preserve its domination and privileges, to smother and extinguish any movement of the working people which jeopardizes its state power and class interests in the slightest degree. On the other hand, in the actual conditions, the main external enemy of the revolution and the peoples is world imperialism, the imperialist superpowers, in particular. To advise and call on the proletariat and the oppressed peoples to rely on one superpower to fight the other, or to enter into alliance with the imperialist powers for the sake of allegedly defending national freedom and independence, as the Chinese revisionists advocate, is nothing but betrayal of the cause of the revolution.

The revisionists have made the hegemonic role of the working class in revolution, which constitutes one of the fundamental questions of the revolutionary strategy, their special target.

<<The main thing in the doctrine of Marx,>> wrote Lenin, <<is the explanation of the world historic role of the proletariat, as the creator of socialist society>>. Lenin described the negation of the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary movement as the most vulgar expression of reformism.

Among the modern revisionists, some strive to prove that the working class is allegedly being deproletarianized and transformed into <<co-manager>> of enterprises, hence there is no longer a place for the proletarian revolution, no need for a social order different from the existing one. Others claim that not only the workers, but everybody engaged in work and cultural activities, all wage and salary earners are now proletarians, and that not only the working class, but also other classes and strata of the society are interested in socialism. Therefore, they conclude, the hegemonic role of the working class in the revolutionary movement today has lost its meaning. The Soviet revisionists do not deny the leading role of the working class in words, while they have liquidated it in practice, because they have deprived this class of any possibility to lead. But even in theory they eliminate this role, in as much as they defend the ill-famed theory of <<the party and state of the entire people>>. The Chinese revisionists, as the pragmatists they are, sometimes put the peasantry, sometimes the army, sometimes the pupils and students, etc., which ever suits the occasion, at the head of the revolution.

The Party of Labour of Albania resolutely defends the Marxist-Leninist thesis that the working class constitutes the decisive force in the development of society, the leading force for the revolutionary transformation of the world, for the construction of socialist and communist society.

The working class remains the main productive force of society, the most advanced class, the class more interested than any other in national and social liberation, in socialism, and is the bearer of the finest traditions of revolutionary organization and struggle. It has the only scientific theory for the revolutionary transformation of society and its own militant Marxist-Leninist party which guide it towards this goal. Objectively history has charged it with the mission of leading the entire struggle for the transition from capitalism to communism.
The hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution is decisive for the solution of the fundamental question of the revolution, the question of political power, in its own favour and that of the masses of the people.

The new power may pass through different phases and may be given various names, in keeping with the concrete conditions in which the revolution is carried out and the various stages it may go through, but there can be no development of the revolution towards the triumph of socialism without the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Marxism-Leninism teaches us this, and the experience of all triumphant socialist revolutions also demonstrates it. Therefore, whatever the circumstances in which the revolution may be carried out, the Marxist-Leninist party never renounces its aim of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat.

All the revisionists of various hues and trends without exception, in one way or another, deny the need to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, because they are against the revolution, because they stand for the preservation and perpetuation of the capitalist order.

The proletariat with its Marxist-Leninist party goes into battle together with its allies. This, too, is one of the most important questions of the revolutionary strategy.

The natural and close ally of the proletariat is the poor peasantry, which is linked with it not just by the immediate strategic aim but also by the distant and ultimate strategic aim. Such allies are the poor strata of the urban working people too. The proletariat, together with the poor peasantry and the other oppressed and exploited working people, constitute the main motive forces of the revolution.

The urban petty-bourgeoisie also, which is constantly in the grip of big capital and under threat of total expropriation, can and should become an ally.

The proletariat also tries and struggles to make allies of other strata of the population, such as the progressive section of the intelligentsia, which is exploited by internal and foreign capital. The weight of the intelligentsia has increased in capitalist and revisionist countries. But despite all the changes its position, character and the role of its work have undergone, it does not and never, can constitute a class in itself, and neither is it nor can it be merged with the working class, as various revisionists claim. Therefore, as Lenin has shown and history has proved, the intelligentsia cannot be an independent socio-political force. Its role and place in society are determined by its socio-economic position and ideological and political convictions. No matter how much this position and these convictions may change, the intelligentsia can never replace the working class in its role of leading the revolution. The task of the proletariat is to win the progressive section of the intelligentsia over to its side, to convince it of the inevitability of the collapse of the capitalist system and the triumph of socialism, and make it an ally in the revolution.

In the countries of Africa, Latin America, Asia, etc., with little socio-economic development and more dependent on foreign capital, and where the democratic and anti-imperialist tasks of the revolution have special importance, the middle peasantry and that section of the bourgeoisie, which is not linked with foreign capital and which aspires to an independent development of the country, can also be allies of the proletariat.

The uniting of this section of the bourgeoisie with the democratic and anti-imperialist revolution depends on the correct strategy and tactics of the proletariat, the skilful and intelligent manoeuvring of the revolutionary party of the working class. In this way, the proletariat with its party can convince not only the petty-bourgeoisie, but also this bourgeoisie, to place itself under the leadership of the proletariat and rise to abolish the foreign domination and liquidate the savage capitalist big bourgeoisie, a tool of imperialism which oppresses and exploits the people, demoralizes them and corrupts their pure feelings, and centuries-old culture.

To win over the other classes and strata which are interested in achieving the strategic aim at a given stage of the revolution as its allies, the proletariat has to do battle with the big bourgeoisie and the other reactionaries, as over every other issue.
Forseeing their defeat, the reactionary bourgeoisie and the big landowners make a thousand attempts and manoeuvres to draw the petty-bourgeoisie, the peasantry and the progressive intelligentsia to their side, and to prevent them from becoming allies of the proletariat. They even try to deceive the working class itself, so that the revolution will not break out and, if it does, to ensure that it will not be carried through to the end, but will become bogged down or make an about-turn.

For their part, the proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist party, work for and have all the possibilities to achieve unity of their allies around themselves against the common enemies, such as the big bourgeoisie, the big landowners, the imperialists and social-imperialists, and to prevent the strata of the peasantry and the petty-bourgeoisie from becoming a reserve of big capital or the fascist dictatorship, as occurred in the time of Hitler in Germany, Mussolini in Italy, and Franco in the Spanish War.

The Marxist-Leninist party maintains a cautious and flexible attitude, especially towards its wavering, possible, or temporary allies, including the various strata of the middle bourgeoisie, which are linked by numerous threads, various interests, traditions and prejudices with the world of capital and imperialism. The proletariat and its vanguard, the Marxist-Leninist party, without ever budging from their principled positions, are interested in attracting such forces, too, in spite of their wavering and instability, to the side of the revolution or the liberation struggle, or at least in neutralizing them, so that they do not become a reserve of the enemy.

The laws of the revolution operate in the countries where the revisionists are in power also, as everywhere else. What is the position of the new bourgeoisie that is developing in the revisionist countries of Europe? It aspires to free itself from the all-round, savage oppression of the Soviet bourgeoisie, from Soviet social-imperialism, but the two sides have fundamental interests in common. The bourgeoisie of these countries could not exist apart from the Soviet bourgeoisie. And even if it were to detach itself from this savage social-imperialist big bourgeoisie, there is no doubt that it would soon come under the domination of the bourgeoisie of the developed capitalist states of Western Europe and US imperialism.

As well as this, in the revisionist countries which are being economically, politically and militarily integrated into the great Soviet social-imperialist state, other strata of the population, besides the proletariat, are discontented because of the exploitation they are subjected to by the new bourgeoisie and the domination by Soviet social-imperialism. For this reason they hate both their own ruling bourgeoisie and Russian hegemonism and neo-colonialism. The proletariat of these countries needs to be awakened and made conscious of the historical necessity of coming out once again on the battlefield, of hurling itself into the fight to overthrow and rout the traitors in order to carry out the proletarian revolution again, to re-establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. It must create its new Marxist-Leninist parties and unite all the popular masses around itself.

While adhering consistently to the principle that the decisive factor for the triumph of the revolution is the internal one, the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and the people of the country themselves, whereas the external factor is of an auxiliary and secondary nature, the Marxist-Leninist parties do not ignore or underrate in the least the external allies of the revolution. At the same time, they take a principled and flexible stand towards the external allies, just as they do towards the internal allies.

In accordance with the teachings of Lenin and Stalin and basing themselves on the existing conditions, they see the proletariat and its revolutionary movement in other countries, the revolutionary anti-imperialist movement of the oppressed peoples of the world and the genuinely socialist countries as the natural and reliable external allies of the revolutionary movement in each country.

In particular cases, circumstances can also be created in which a socialist country, or a people fighting imperialist or social-imperialist aggression, may find themselves on a common front even with various' countries of the capitalist world which also are fighting the same enemy, as occurred in the period of the Second World War.
In such cases, it is of first-rate importance to ensure that the interests of the revolution are always kept in mind, are never forgotten, obscured or; sacrificed for the sake of the common front or alliance with these temporary allies, to ensure that this front or alliance is not transformed into an aim in itself. It is especially important not to allow such allies to intervene to sabotage the revolution and to wrest the victory from it. The experience of the Cominist Party of Albania in its stand towards the American and British allies in the years of the Anti-fascist National-Liberation War is significant. This stand was salutary for, the fate of the revolution in Albania.

The revolutionary strategy is indivisible from the revolutionary tactics employed by the Marxist-Leninist parties to achieve the aim and to fulfil the tasks of the revolution. While being part of strategy and in its service, tactics may change according to the ebb and flow of the revolutionary tide, the concrete circumstances and conditions but always within the limits of the revolutionary strategy and Marxist-Leninist principles.

<<The task of tactical leadership,>> says Stalin, <<is to master all forms of struggle and organization of the proletariat and to ensure that they are used properly so as to achieve with the given relation of forces the maximum result necessary to prepare for strategic success>>.

Stalin

While adopting skillful tactics and forms of struggle to d'arré forward the cause of the revolution, the true Marxist-Leninist parties always loyally uphold revolutionary principles. They reject and combat any tendency to abandon principles for the sake of tactics, they are the most resolute opponents of any unprincipled pragmatic policy based on passing circumstances, which characterizes the entire activity of revisionists of all trends.

The revolution is always the deed of the masses led by the revolutionary vanguard. Therefore, the Marxist-Leninist party cannot fail to devote great attention to the revolutionary organization of the masses in appropriate forms, proceeding from the concrete conditions and circumstances, the traditions existing in each country, etc. Without organized links of the party with the masses it is idle even to talk of raising, preparing and mobilizing them in revolutionary struggle.

Precisely for this reason the Marxist-Leninist party attaches great importance to the creation of organizations of the masses under its leadership. Certainly, this is not a question which is solved easily, especially today, when many kinds of tradeunion, co-operativist, cultural, scientific, youth, women's and other organizations exist in all the capitalist and revisionist countries. Most of these organizations are under the leadership and influence of the bourgeois, revisionists and the church. However, as Lenin teaches us, the communists must get in and work wherever the masses are. Therefore they cannot fail to work also in the mass organizations led or influenced by the bourgeoisie, social-democrats, revisionists, etc. The Marxist-Leninists work in them to undermine the influence and leadership of the bourgeois and reformist parties, to spread the influence of the revolutionary party of the working class among the masses, to expose the fraudulent character of the programs and activity of the chiefs of these organizations, and to give the activities of the masses an anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist, antirevisionist political character. Through the revolutionary work they carry out in the ranks of the masses, revolutionary factions can also be formed within these organizations, indeed the possibilities may be created to take over the leadership of these organizations and to set them on a correct course.

But in any case the Marxist-Leninist party never gives up the aim of setting up revolutionary organizations of the masses under its leadership.
The most important organizations of the masses are the trade-unions. Generally speaking, in the capitalist and revisionist countries today, these organizations serve the bourgeoisie, revisionism, to keep the proletariat and all the working masses in bondage. In his time, Engels said that the trade-unions in Britain had been transformed from organizations which terrified the bourgeoisie into organizations which served capital. The tradeunion organizations have bound the worker with a thousand threads, with a thousand coils of the chain of enslavement, so that when the isolated worker revolts, he can easily be suppressed. The opportunist trade-union leaders work so that the revolts of the workers of one or more enterprises, who go on strike or hold demonstrations, are kept under control and assume only an economic character. The worker aristocracy works very hard to manipulate things in this direction. In the capitalist countries, this aristocracy plays a major role in eroding, suppressing, and misleading the revolt of the masses and has long become a fire brigade to quell the flames of the revolution.

In all the capitalist countries today, the main and revisionist parties have their own trade-unions. These trade-unions, are now acting in unity and have established close collaboration in order to hold back the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, and corrupt the working class politically and morally.

In France and Italy, for instance, the tradeunions of the revisionist parties are large and powerful unions. But what do they do? They try to keep the proletariat in bondage, to lull it to sleep and, when it grows angry and rebellious, to set it on the course of negotiations with the boss class and to shut the mouths of the workers with some very small crumbs from the capitalist suerprofits. And what they give them is then taken back by raising prices.

Therefore, to free itself from capitalism, it is essential for the proletariat of every country to shake off the yoke of the trade-unions dominated by the bourgeoisie and opportunists, as well as that of any kind of social-democratic and revisionist organization or party. All these organisms support the owning class in various ways and try to create the illusion that <<they are a great force>>, that they are a brake., that -they can impose themselves on the big capitalists- allegedly in favour of the proletariat. This is nothing but a big fraud. The proletariat has to smash these organisms. But how?

It must destroy them by fighting the leadership of these trade-unions, by rising against their treacherous connections with the bourgeoisie, by breaking up the <<calm>>, the <<social peace>> which they want to establish, a <<peace>> which is disguised with the alleged revolts against the owning class which the unions engage in from time to time.

It is possible to work to destroy these tradeunions by getting into them in order to fight and erode them from within and oppose their unjust decisions and actions. This activity must involve the biggest and most powerful groups possible of workers in the factories. In every case the aim must be to achieve a steel unity of the proletariat in the fight not only against the employers but also against their agents, the trade-union bosses. The forceful exposure of all the traitor elements at the head of trade-unions, of the bourgeois degeneration of the trade-union leadership and the reformist trade-unions in general, frees the workers from many illusions they still have about this leadership and these trade-unions.

While infiltrating the existing trade-unions, the Marxist-Leninists never descend to the tradeunionist, reformist, anarcho-syndicalist, revisionist positions, which characterize the leadership of these trade-unions. They never become partners with the revisionists and the other bourgeois and opportunist parties in the leadership of tradeunions. Their aim is to expose the bourgeois character and reactionary role which the tradeunions, in general, have today in the capitalist and revisionist countries, to undermine these organizations in order to open the way to the setting up of genuine proletarian trade-unions.

The organization of the masses of the youth is of special importance to the Marxist-Leninist parties. The role of the youth in the revolutionary movements has always been great. From its very nature the youth is for the new and against the old, and shows itself ready to fight for the triumph of everything progressive, revolutionary. However, on its own, it is incapable of finding the right road.
Only the party of the working class can show it this road. When the inexhaustible revolutionary energies of the youth are united with the energies of the working class and the other working masses to wipe out oppression and exploitation, for national and social liberation, there is no force which can stop the triumph of the revolution.

However, in the capitalist and revisionist countries today, the majority of the youth expend their energies in wrong directions. They are misled by the bourgeoisie and revisionism and often turn to adventurism and anarchism or fall into utopia and despair, because they have been disoriented and bemused and take a gloomy view of the future, the -prospects for the fulfilment of their political, material and spiritual demands.

The Marxist-Leninists always pay very great attention to the youth, try to enlighten them and convince them that the aspirations and desires of the youth can be fulfilled only on the road Marxism-Leninism shows them, and under the leadership of the working class and its party. They are working to free the youth from the influence of the bourgeoisie and revisionists, from the <<leftist>>, Trotskyite, or anarchist movements, and to mobilize them in revolutionary organizations, to draw them on to the road of the revolution.

The genuine Marxist-Leninist party and the revolutionary communists take part actively in the workers' strikes and demonstrations and fight to turn, them into political strikes and demonstrations, so as to make life impossible for capitalism, the employers, cartels, monopolies and the trade-union chiefs. In the course of this broad activity the proletariat come to grips more often and more openly with the armed forces of the bourgeois order, but from these clashes it will learn to fight better. In the course of the struggle it also finds what forms of organization and revolutionary struggle are possible, correct, and appropriate. <<You cannot learn to swim without getting into the water.>> goes a popular saying. Without fighting by means of strikes, demonstrations, without active involvement in actions against capitalism in general, the struggle for the final victory cannot be organized and intensified, the bourgeois order cannot be overthrown.

The revolution is not prepared by merely talking, like the various revisionists, or by theorizing about the,<<three worlds>>, like the Chinese revisionists. It cannot triumph on the peaceful road. Lenin did speak of this possibility, in specific instances, but he always put the main stress on revolutionary violence, because the bourgeoisie never surrenders its power voluntarily. The history of the international workers' and communist movement, of the development of revolutions and the victories of the working class in a number of former socialist countries, and in our socialist country, shows that up till now revolutions have triumphed only through armed insurrection.

Revolutionary armed insurrection has nothing in common with military putsches. The former has as its aim the radical political overthrow of the old regime, smashing it to its very foundations. The latter do not, and cannot, lead to the overthrow of the order of oppression and exploitation, or the liquidation of imperialist domination. The armed insurrection is based on the support of the broad masses of the people, whereas the putsch is an expression of mistrust of the masses, of isolation from the masses. Putschist tendencies in the policy and activity of a party which calls itself a party of the working class are a deviation from Marxism-Leninism.

In accord with the concrete conditions of a country and the situations in general, the armed uprising may be a sudden outburst or a more protracted revolutionary process, but not, an endless one without perspective, as advocated by Mao Tsetung's,<<theory of protracted people's war>>. If you compare the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on the revolutionary armed insurrection with Mao's theory on -people's war-, the anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist, anti-scientific character of this theory becomes clearly apparent. The Marxist-Leninist teachings on the armed insurrection are based on the close combination of the struggle in the city with that in the countryside under the leadership of the working class and its revolutionary party.

Being opposed to the leading role of the proletariat in the revolution, the Maoist theory considers the countryside as the only base of the armed insurrection and neglects the armed struggle of the working masses in the town.
It preaches that the countryside must keep the city, which is considered as the stronghold of the counterrevolutionary bourgeoisie, besieged. This is an expression of distrust in the working class, the negation of its hegemonic role.

While adhering unwaveringly to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the violent revolution as a universal law, the revolutionary party of the working class is resolutely opposed to adventurism and never plays with armed insurrection. In all conditions and circumstances, it carries out an unceasing revolutionary struggle and activity in various forms, in order to prepare itself and the masses for the decisive battles in the revolution, for the overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie with revolutionary violence. But only when the revolutionary situation has fully matured does it put armed insurrection directly on the order of the day and take all the political, ideological, organizational and military measures to carry it through to victory.

**Propaganda is a powerful means in the hands of a Marxist-Leninist party for the preparation of the masses for the revolution**, but it must be fiery, clear and convincing. Revolutionary propaganda is worthless if it is only phrase-mongering. Only an incisive propaganda, closely linked with the problems of life, with the general problems and local questions, a propaganda which creates and encourages the spirit of initiative among the broad masses, can educate the proletariat and the other working masses politically and ideologically, can get them into action and prepare them for revolution.

Apart from the great means of force it has at its disposal, like the army, the police, etc., the capitalist bourgeoisie in all countries also has wide experience of the struggle against the proletariat and its activity. Likewise, it possesses an entire propaganda network, including the press, radio, television, films, theatres, music, etc. All this propaganda has such power to corrupt that it is capable of temporarily disorientating, perverting and weakening the efforts of the proletariat and its struggle for liberation.

In the states of so-called bourgeois democracy, where a measure of democratic freedom also exists, it is not enough to carry on only the normal journalistic propaganda against capitalism in general. The newspapers of various bourgeois and revisionist parties are constantly raising a hue and cry, not against the bourgeois order, of course, but against individuals, those who try to grab more than their share of the cake at the big table where they all sit down together to gorge themselves at the expense of the people.

The propaganda, especially the press of the new Marxist-Leninist parties, is faced with a very great task: to expose the falsity of bourgeois <<democracy>>, to tear the mask from all its manoeuvres, as well as from the demagogy of the revisionists and other lackeys of capital. The Marxist-Leninist propaganda and press tell the naked truth, show the road to social and national liberation through revolution, while the bourgeois and revisionist propaganda and press deceive people, lull them to sleep and disorientate them, in order to divert the masses from the revolution, to lead them up blind alleys, to keep them enslaved.

But in order to enlighten the masses, to convince them of the correctness of the political line of the party of the working class, to prepare them for the revolution, propaganda alone is not sufficient. Lenin says that to prepare the revolution,

<<...the political experience of these masses themselves is necessary>>. Lenin

**Propaganda becomes effective, hits the target, only when it is carried on together with revolutionary action.** Without action, thought withers away. This activity is not and must not be an adventure, but a stern struggle, a fierce clash with the class enemies, which passes from a simpler to a higher form, which overcomes numerous difficulties and accepts all the sacrifices the revolution demands.

The genuine Marxist-Leninists parties stand in the vanguard and not at the tail-end of revolutionary action. The temporarily limited possibilities of the struggle and efforts by means of which they must and do oppose the great force of capitalist reaction, do not discourage them.
They teach, their members to be courageous and to bear in mind that a correct, well-considered, mature, and determined action on their part has profound repercussions among the masses who see it and hear about it. When the communists act in this way, the masses realize that the aims of this or, that revolutionary action are in the interest of the proletariat and the exploited. Courage and maturity in actions are of great importance, because in this way, little by little, ground is gained and progress made in building up the surge of the revolution. Revolutionary action links the parties of the working class with the masses, brings them to the head of the masses, and enables them to triumph over the reformist, revisionist parties.

<<Every step taken by a genuine movement,>> says Marx, <<is worth more than a dozen programs>> *Marx e Engels

Apart from the revolutionary forces led by the Marxist-Leninist party, in the capitalist countries there are also other forces which fight and clash with the police, the gendarmerie, etc. Many of the actions and attacks by these forces have a terrorist, adventurist, and anarchist character. They are presented under all sorts of colours and labels and are guided by various ideologies. Such actions are often organized at the instigation and with the funds of the secret services of capitalist countries and, among other things, are aimed at discrediting the Marxist-Leninist parties by attributing such actions to these parties. The fascist elements or the secret agents of the bourgeoisie, who frequently organize and lead these actions, try to take advantage of the discontent, the anger and the courage of the proletariat, school pupils and students, the youth in general, in order to involve the various groups and movements emerging from these masses in actions which not only have nothing in common with the genuine revolutionary movements, but also seriously jeopardize them. The impression that the proletariat is degenerating and has become a lumpen proletariat. Paying the proper attention to this question, the Marxist-Leninist parties, on the one hand, must convince the masses, from their own experience, that revolutionary actions have a completely different character from terrorist and anarchist actions, and on the other hand, must fight to win the revolutionary elements, who have been deceived, away from the ranks of terrorist and anarchist groups and the fascist elements and secret agents of the bourgeoisie operating in these groups.

The Marxist-Leninist parties are parties of revolution. Contrary to the theories and practices the revisionist parties, which are totally immersed in bourgeois legality and, <<parliamentary cretinism>>, they do not reduce their struggle to legal work, nor do they see this as their main activity. In the context of efforts to master all forms of struggle, they attach special importance to the combination of legal with illegal work, giving priority to the latter, as decisive for the throw of the bourgeoisie and the real guarantee of victory. They educate and teach their cadres, their members and sympathizers to know how to act intelligently, skilfully, and courageously under both legal and illegal conditions. But even when operating in the conditions of profound clandestinity, while trying to avoid exposing their forces to the enemy and to safeguard the revolutionary organization from the enemy's blows, the Marxist-Leninist parties do not shut themselves away, do not weaken, or break their links with the masses, never for a moment interrupt their live activity among the masses, and never fail to utilize all the legal possibilities, which the conditions and circumstances permit, to the advantage of the cause of the revolution.

While entertaining no illusions about the possibility of seizing power on the parliamentary road, the Marxist-Leninist party may also consider it in order, in particularly favourable instances, to take part in such legal activities as elections to municipal councils, parliament, etc., with the sole aim of propagating its line among the masses and exposing the bourgeois political order. However, the party does not transform this participation into a general line of its struggle, as the revisionists do, does not make these the main, or even worse, the only forms of its struggle.
While utilizing the legal possibilities, the party seeks, finds and applies forms and methods of a revolutionary character, from the simplest to the most complicated, regardless of the sacrifices, while trying to make these forms and methods as popular and as acceptable as possible to the masses.

In their activity, the Marxist-Leninists are not worried about breaking and violating the bourgeois Constitution, laws, rules, norms, and order with their revolutionary actions. They are fighting to undermine this order, to prepare the revolution. Therefore, the Marxist-Leninist party prepares itself and the masses to cope with the counterblows the bourgeoisie may strike in response to the revolutionary actions of the proletariat and the popular masses.

In the present conditions of development of the revolutionary and liberation movement, as a complicated process with a broad social basis, in which numerous class and political forces take part, the revolutionary party of the proletariat not infrequently comes up against the problem of collaboration and common fronts with other parties and political organizations at this or that stage of the revolution, on these or those problems of common interest. A correct, principled and at the same time flexible stand, far from any opportunism and sectarianism, on this problem is of major importance for drawing in, preparing and mobilizing the masses for the revolution and the liberation struggle. The Marxist-Leninist party is not and in principle cannot be against collaboration or common fronts with other political parties and forces, when the interests of the cause of the revolution require this and the situation makes it necessary. However, the Marxist-Leninist party never sees this as a coalition of chieftains and as an aim in itself, but as a means to unite and arouse the masses in struggle. The important thing is that in these common fronts the proletarian party must never for a moment lose sight of the class interests of the proletariat and the final aim of its struggle, must not merge itself in the front, but must preserve its ideological individuality and its political, organizational, and military independence there, must fight to secure the leading role in the front and to implement a revolutionary policy there.

For the Marxist-Leninist party to be able to work out and apply a revolutionary strategy and tactics, a correct political line to, know how to find its bearings in difficult situations, with the enemies and overcome the obstacles, it is absolutely essential that it carry out great, wide-ranging work for the study and assimilation of the Marxist-Leninist theory.

One of the reasons why the former communist parties in the capitalist countries turned into revisionist parties was precisely because they had utterly neglected the study and assimilation of Marxism-Leninism. The Marxist-Leninist doctrine was used only as an adornment, was turned into empty words and slogans, had not been implanted deeply in the consciousness of the party members, had not become part of their flesh and blood, and had not become a weapon for action. That small amount of work which was done for the study of Marxism-Leninism was aimed only at acquainting the party member with some cut-and-dried formulas, just enough to enable him to call himself a communist, to love communism in a sentimental way, while about how and in what manner this would be achieved he knew nothing, because he was not taught this.

The leaders of those parties, who were not lacking in words but were short on deeds, lived in bourgeois environment and infected the proletariat of their countries with liberal and reformist ideas.

Thus, the turn of the revisionist parties towards the bourgeoisie is a social-democratic opportunist evolution which had long been prepared by their leaders who are in fact social-democrats, the worker aristocracy, which led these so-called communist parties.

The Marxist-Leninist parties cannot fail to remember this negative experience and draw from it the lesson that they must organize the study and assimilation of Marxism-Leninism on a sound basis, always linking this study with revolutionary action.

The unity and co-operation of the Marxist-Leninist parties of different countries on the basis of the principles of proletarian internationalism is of special importance for the preparation of the revolution.
This unity will be strengthened and this cooperation will be extended in struggle against imperialism and social-imperialism, against the bourgeoisie and modern revisionism of every description, Khrushchevite, Titoite, “Eurocommunist”, Chinese, etc.
The revisionists, as enemies of the revolution, fight proletarian internationalism with all their strength and means, in order to wrest this powerful weapon in the struggle against the bourgeoisie and imperialism from the hands of the world proletariat and the proletariat of every country.
It is the duty of the Marxist-Leninist parties to expose the manoeuvres of the Titoite revisionists and the “Eurocommunists”, who call proletarian internationalism obsolete and outdated today, as well as those of the Soviet revisionists and Chinese revisionists who have distorted proletarian internationalism and are trying to use it as a weapon to realize their hegemonic, social-imperialist aims.
The Communist Party of China, which does not follow the principles of proletarian internationalism and does not support the revolutionary and liberation struggles of the peoples, has set out on the road of rapprochement and friendship with the social-democratic and bourgeois parties, including the ultra-right and reactionary ones. At the same time, it is trying to create various groups dependent on and directed by it. It needs such groupings precisely in order to sabotage the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties and the progressive elements who have set to work to awaken the people, to rouse them to revolution against the ruling cliques which are linked with the superpowers. The small groups, which call themselves parties and toe the Chinese line, as the opportunists they are, do nothing but defend and propagate the revisionist theories of the group of Hua Kuo-feng and Teng Hsiao-ping and its counterrevolutionary actions. These groups are devoid of any individuality of their own or any determination to fight according to the Marxist-Leninist theory.
The main slogan of these parties, which is also the basic slogan of the Chinese policy, is that, in the present situation, the sole and fundamental task of the proletariat is to defend national independence, which is allegedly threatened only by Soviet social-imperialism. They are repeating, almost word by word, the slogans of the chiefs of the Second International who abandoned the cause of the revolution and replaced it with the thesis of defence of the capitalist homeland. Lenin exposed this false and anti-Marxist slogan, which does not serve the defence of true independence but serves the instigation of inter-imperialist Wars. He clearly defined what the stand of the true revolutionary should be towards the conflicts between imperialist groupings. He wrote:

<<If the war is a reactionary imperialist war that is, if it is being waged by two world coalitions of the imperialist, violent, predatory, reactionary bourgeoisie then every bourgeoisie (even of the smallest country) becomes a participant in the plunder, and my duty as a representative of the revolutionary proletariat is to prepare for the world proletarian revolution as the only escape from the horrors of a world slaughter...
That is what internationalism means, and that is the duty of the internationalist, the revolutionary worker, the genuine socialist>>.

Lenin

The parties following the Chinese line have become apologists for the growth and strengthening of bourgeois armies, using the excuse that this is supposedly necessary for the defence of independence. They call on the working people to become obedient soldiers and to come out, together with the bourgeoisie, against all those who are fighting to weaken this main weapon of capitalist rule and exploitation. In a word, they want the proletariat and the working masses to serve as cannon fodder in the predatory wars which imperialism and social-imperialism prepare.
At the same time these hangers-on of the Chinese have become ardent defenders of the bourgeois capitalist state institutions, especially of NATO, the European Common Market, etc. which they consider as the main factors for the “defence of independence”. Like the Chinese leaders, they whitewash and prettify these pillars of capitalist domination and expansion. They are assisting precisely those organisms which, in reality, have seriously violated the independence and sovereignty of their countries.
For these pseudo-Marxists, alliance with the big bourgeoisie, defence of the bourgeois army, support for NATO, the European Common Market, etc., is a troublefree road because it not only does not lead them to clashes with the bourgeoisie but, on the contrary, ensures its favours. These positions of these groupist elements without a future are leading them towards unification with the parties of Eurocommunism, and the bourgeoisie, and this is bound to happen, because China itself is calling on the proletariat to unite with the bourgeoisie. Already, there is no difference whatsoever between these pseudo-Marxist-Leninists and Marchais.

The Marxist-Leninists must be very much on guard against the empty phrases which the modern revisionists, the social democrats and the pseudo-Marxist-Leninists use about proletarian internationalism, the unity of proletarians in the defence of peace, etc. Proletarian internationalism is genuine when people work self-sacrificingly to assist and carry out revolutionary actions, to create a real situation of revolutionary struggle, in their own country in the first place. At the same time, as Lenin says, they must support, with propaganda, sympathy and material aid, this struggle and line in all countries without exception. Anything else, he teaches us, is a fraud and Manilovism.

Therefore, we must be very much on our guard against such pseudo-Marxist, pseudo-revolutionary, pseudo-internationalist elements, whether individuals or small groups, or parties which call themselves Marxist-Leninist, but which, in fact, are not so, but are social-chauvinist, centrist and petty-bourgeois. All these parties which are beating their breasts about their proletarian internationalism, about the defence of peace, about reforms, etc., serve capital.

The Chinese revisionists, also, talk about proletarian internationalism at times, but they stand on nationalist and chauvinist positions. The Chinese leaders are among those who beat their breasts and swear <<to god>> that they are for proletarian internationalism, for peace, for the struggles of the proletariat and its claims, but in practice they stand aside and do nothing but issue deceptive phrases to split the revolutionary forces.

The important task the Marxist-Leninist parties are faced with is to strengthen proletarian internationalism, which must be developed amongst all parties, big or small, old or new. All of them must strengthen the unity between them and co-ordinate their political, ideological and fighting actions.

By stressing this important line, which is a primary task of the Marxist-Leninist parties in order to be able to launch a frontal attack on world capitalism, its enslaving policy, as well as on its intrigues, trickery and alliances with Soviet, Titoite, Chinese, Italian, French, Spanish and other modern revisionisms, these parties will create a powerful front which will become ever more unbreakable day by day. If they act in unity and all strike at the forces of reaction together, if they expose all the intrigues which capitalism and modern revisionism concoct in various ways in order to put down the revolution and quell the class struggle, their triumph is assured.

We Marxist-Leninists must fight and call on the workers, wherever they are, to rise up against their age-old enemies and break their chains, to carry out the revolution, and not submit to monopolies and capitalists, as the modern revisionists advocate. The task of the Marxist-Leninists, of the true revolutionaries is to call on the proletarians and the peoples to rise for the new world, for their world, for the socialist world.
PART TWO

I

THE THEORY OF <<THREE WORLDS>>
A COUNTERREVOLUTIONARY
CHAUVINIST THEORY

Today the Chinese revisionists, also, have come out openly and are fighting on a broad front against the Leninist theory and strategy of the revolution and the liberation struggle of the peoples. They are trying to oppose this glorious scientific theory and strategy with their theory of <<three worlds>>, which is a false, counterrevolutionary, and chauvinist theory.

The theory of <<three worlds>> is in opposition to the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, or more exactly, is a negation of it. It is of no consequence to know who first invented the term the <<third world>>, who was the first to divide the world in three parts, but it is certain that Lenin did not make such a division, while the Communist Party of China claims paternity to it, asserting that Mao Tsetung invented the theory of <<three worlds>>. If he is the author who first formulated this so-called theory, this is further evidence that Mao Tsetung is not a Marxist. But even if he only adopted this theory from others, this, too, is proof enough that he is not a Marxist.

The Concept of the <<Three Worlds>> - a Negation of Marxism-Leninism

The notion of the existence of three worlds, or of the division of the world in three, is based on a racist and metaphysical world outlook, which is an offspring of world capitalism and reaction. But the racist thesis which places the countries on three levels or in three <<worlds>>, is not based simply on skin colour. It makes a classification based on the level of economic development of the countries and is intended to define the <<great master race>>, on the one hand, and the <<race of pariahs and plebs>>, on the other, to create an unalterable and metaphysical division in the interests of the capitalist bourgeoisie. It considers the various nations and peoples of the world as a flock of sheep, as an amorphous whole.

The Chinese revisionists accept and preach that the <<master race>> must be preserved and the <<race of pariahs and plebs>> must serve it meekly and devotedly. Marxist-Leninist dialectics teaches us that there is no limit to development, that nothing stops changing. In this process of unceasing development towards the future, quantitative and qualitative changes occur. Our epoch, like any other, is characterized by profound contradictions which Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin defined so clearly. It is the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, hence, of great quantitative and qualitative transformations which lead to revolution and the seizure of power by the working class, in order to build the new socialist society.

The whole of Marx's theory is founded on the class struggle and dialectical and historical materialism. Marx proved that capitalist society is a society divided into exploiting and exploited classes, that classes will disappear only when the classless society, communism, has been achieved. Today we are living in the stage of the collapse of imperialism and the triumph of proletarian revolutions. This means that in present-day capitalist society there are two main classes, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, which are in irreconcilable, life-and-death struggle with each other.
Which of them will triumph? Marx: and Lenin, Marxist-Leninist science, the theory and practice of the revolution, provide us with convincing proof that, in the final analysis, the proletariat will triumph by destroying, overthrowing the power of the bourgeoisie, imperialism and all, exploiters, and will build a new society, socialist society. They teach us also that even in this new society, classes, that is, the working class and working peasantry, which are closely allied to each other, will exist for a very long time, but there will also be remnants of the overthrown and expropriated classes. During this entire period, these remnants, as well as elements which degenerate and oppose the construction of socialism, will try to regain their lost power. Hence, under socialism, too, stern class struggle will exist.

Marxist-Leninists always bear in mind that in all countries, with the exception of those where the revolution has triumphed and socialist order has been established, there are the poor classes with the proletariat at the head, and the wealthy classes with the bourgeoisie at the head.

In every capitalist state, wherever it may be, and however democratic or progressive, there are oppressed and oppressors, there are exploited and exploiters, there are antagonisms there is merciless class struggle. The varying intensity of this struggle does not alter this reality. This struggle has its ups and downs, but it exists and cannot be quelled. It exists everywhere, it exists in the United States of America between the proletariat and the imperialist bourgeoisie, it exists, likewise, in the Soviet Union, where Marxism-Leninism has been betrayed and a new bourgeoisie-capitalist class which oppresses the working people of that country, has been created. Classes and the class struggle exist also in the second world, as in France, Britain, Italy, West Germany, Japan. They exist also in the <<third world>>, in India, Zaire, Burundi, Pakistan, the Philippines, etc.

Only according to Mao Tsetung's theory of <<three worlds>>, classes and the class struggle do not exist in any country. It does not see them, because it judges countries and peoples according to bourgeois geo-political concepts and the level of their economic development.

To see the world as divided in three, into the <<first world>>, <<second world>>, and <<third world>>, as the Chinese revisionists do and not from the class angle, means to deviate from the Marxist-Leninist theory of the class struggle, means to negate the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie for the transition from a backward society to a new society, socialist society, and later to classless society, communist society. To divide the world in three means to recognize the characteristics of the epoch, to impede the advance of the proletariat and the peoples towards the revolution and national liberation, to impede their struggle against American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, capital and reaction in every country and in every corner of the world. The theory of <<three worlds>> advocates social peace, class conciliation, and tries to create alliances between implacable enemies, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the oppressed and the oppressors, the peoples and imperialism. It is an attempt to prolong the life of the old world, the capitalist world, to keep it on its feet precisely by seeking to extinguish the class struggle.

But the class struggle, the struggle of the proletariat and its allies to take power and the struggle of the bourgeoisie to maintain its power can never be extinguished. This is an irrefutable truth and no amount of empty theorizing about the <<worlds>>, whether the <<first world>>, the <<non aligned world>>, the third world, the nonaligned world, or the umpteenth world, can alter this fact. To accept such a division, means to renounce and abandon the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on classes and the class struggle.

After the triumph of the October Revolution, Lenin and Stalin said that in our time there are two worlds: the socialist world and the capitalist world, although at that time socialism had triumphed in only one country. Lenin wrote in 1921:

<< ... there are now two worlds: the old world of capitalism, that is in a state of confusion but which will never surrender voluntarily, and the rising new world, which is still very weak, but which will grow, for it is invincible >>*. Lenin
This class criterion of the division of the world is still valid today, regardless of the fact that socialism has not triumphed in many countries and the new society has not supplanted the old bourgeois-capitalist society. Such a thing is certainly bound to happen tomorrow. The fact that socialism has been betrayed in the Soviet Union and the other former socialist countries does not in any way alter the Leninist criterion of the division of the world. Now as before, there are only two worlds, and the struggle between these two worlds, between the two antagonistic classes, between socialism and capitalism, exists not only on a national scale but also on an international scale.

The Chinese revisionists, who do not admit the existence of the socialist world under the pretext that the socialist camp no longer exists as a result of the betrayal by the Soviet Union and the other former socialist countries, deliberately ignore one thing, namely, that the emergence of modern revisionism does not in the least alter the general trend of history towards the revolution towards the collapse of imperialism, regardless of the fact that capitalism still exists. At the same time, they ignore the fact that the immortal ideas of Marxism-Leninism exist, are developing and triumphing, that the Marxist-Leninist parties exist, socialist Albania exists, the peoples fighting for freedom, independence and national sovereignty exist, and that the world proletariat exists and is fighting.

The Paris Commune did not triumph, it was suppressed, but it gave the world proletariat a great example. Marx said that the experience of the Commune revealed the temporary weakness of the French proletariat, nevertheless it prepared the proletariat of all countries for the world revolution and provided a great lesson as to the conditions necessary to achieve victory. Marx raised this great experience of the communards who <<stormed the heavens>> to the level of theory and taught the proletariat that it must smash the apparatus of the bourgeois state and its dictatorship with revolutionary violence.

The modern revisionists are cowards. They think that the counterrevolutionary forces are very powerful today. But this is not at all true. They are weaker than the peoples. The peoples with the proletariat at the head, are stronger. They will crush the counterrevolutionary forces, the forces of reaction, imperialism and social imperialism. This view is based on the class analysis of the world. Any other view is wrong, regardless of how revisionists may disguise their activity and fears with revolutionary phrases.

When we Marxist-Leninists say that there are two, and not three or five, worlds, we are on the right road and, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, we must build our struggle against the capitalist bourgeoisie, American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, and against the other imperialisms. This struggle must lead to the destruction of the old bourgeois-capitalist world and the establishment of the new socialist order.

The proletariat is the motive social force of our epoch. Lenin emphasized that the motive force which drives history forward is represented that class which stands

<<....at the hub of one epoch or another, determining its main content, the main direction of its development, the main characteristics of the historical situation in that epoch, etc.>>. Lenin

Contrary to this thesis of Lenin's, however, the Chinese revisionists are trying to present the <<third world>> as the <<great motive force which is driving the wheel of history forward>>. To make such a declaration means to give a definition of the motive force which is wrong in theory and practice. How is it possible in the present epoch of social development, which has at its hub the most revolutionary class, the proletariat, to call a grouping of states, the overwhelming bulk of which are ruled by the bourgeoisie and the feudal lords, indeed, even open reactionaries and fascists, the motive force? This is a gross distortion of Marx's theory.

The Chinese leadership takes no account of the fact that in the <<third world>> there are oppressed and oppressors, the proletariat and the enslaved, poverty-stricken and destitute peasantry, on the one hand, and the capitalists and landowners, who exploit and fleece the people, on the other.
To fail to point out this class situation in the so-called <<third world>>, to fail to point out the antagonisms which exist, means to revise Marxism-Leninism and defend capitalism. In the countries of the so-called <<third world>>, in general, the capitalist bourgeoisie is in power. This bourgeoisie exploits the country, exploits and oppresses the poor people in its own class interests, to make the largest possible profits for itself and to keep the people in perpetual slavery and misery. In many countries of the <<third world>>, the governments in power are bourgeois, capitalist governments, of course, with differing political nuances. They are governments of the class hostile to the proletariat, the oppressed and poor peasantry, hostile to the revolution and liberation wars. The bourgeoisie, which has state power in these countries, is protecting precisely that capitalist society which the proletariat in alliance with the poor strata of town and countryside, seeks to overthrow. It constitutes that upper class which, proceeding from its own narrow interests, is ready, at any moment, at any turn of events, to sell the wealth of the land and the underground assets of the country, the freedom, independence and sovereignty of the homeland, to foreign capitalism. This class, wherever it is in power, is opposed to the struggle and aspirations of the proletariat and its allies, the oppressed classes and strata.

Many of the states which the Chinese leadership includes in the <<third world>> are not opposed to American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. To call such states <<the main motive force of the revolution and the struggle against imperialism>>, as Mao Tsetung advocates, is a glaring mistake that stands out like the Himalayas. There are other pseudo-Marxists, too, but they at least know how to hide and disguise themselves behind their bourgeois theories. The Chinese revisionists have the same anti-Marxist view not only of the -third world. but also of what they call the <<second world>>, where the big capitalist bourgeoisie and the big imperialists of yesterday, who are still imperialists, are ruling. In the countries of the so-called second world, there is a large and powerful proletariat, which is exploited to the bone, which is kept down by crushing laws, the army, the police, the trade-unions, by all these weapons of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Both in the countries of the <<third world>> and in those of the <<second world>>, it is the bourgeois capitalist class, the same social forces, which are ruling the proletariat and the peoples and which must be smashed. Here, too, the main motive force is the proletariat.

Just as they do in the -third world. and the ,<<second world>>, in the United States of America and the Soviet Union, too, the Chinese revisionists ignore the proletariat, which represents the great army of the revolution, negate precisely the main motive force of society, that force which has to attack the monopoly bourgeoisie, its class enemy and the enemy of the world revolution in general. Mao Tsetung's theory of three worlds denies this great reality and discounts the proletariat of Europe and the other developed countries. It is true that some degeneration also exists in the ranks of the proletariat, whether of the so-called third, second, or first world, because the bourgeoisie is not sitting idle, but is fighting its enemy, not only with weapons and oppression, but also politically and ideologically, with the way of life it creates, etc. But the fact that some stratum of the proletariat, such as the labour aristocracy, degenerates, does not mean that Marxism-Leninism should be abandoned and the decisive role of the working class in the world revolutionary process denied. Through correct Marxist-Leninist education, through their daily revolutionary activity, the genuine communists protect the proletariat of every country and every world. from degeneration and mobilize it to struggle against its oppressors, be they British or French, Italian or German, Portuguese or Spanish, American or Japanese, etc.

In the United States of America, also, which is the head of world imperialism, there is a big proletariat. Being one of the most industrialized countries of the world, it is also the wealthiest, therefore the crumbs that capital gives away to deceive the proletariat are a little bigger than those in the other bourgeois countries. In the United States of America the way of life has a greater influence on the proletariat, but we cannot, in the least, negate the role and contribution of the American proletariat to the revolution in that country.
In fact, in the United States of America also, there is a section of opinion opposed to imperialism, predatory wars, oppression by the capitalists, trusts, banks, etc. Even among the strata of the petty-bourgeoisie in that country there is a resistance to the oppression by big capital.

By negating the class struggle, the Chinese theory of <<three worlds>> also negates the struggle of the peoples to free themselves from foreign domination, to win democratic rights and freedoms, negates their struggle for socialism. This counterrevolutionary and anti-scientific theory rules out the struggle of the peoples against their enemies - imperialism, social-imperialism and the entire international big bourgeoisie.

To put the peoples into <<three compartments>> and preach that only the <<third world>> aspires to liberation from imperialism, that it alone is. supposedly the <<main motive force against imperialism>>, is a deception and a flagrant deviation. If the imperialists and capitalists are to be included in the <<first world>> and in the <<second world>>, then the question arises: where are the peoples of these <<two worlds>>, who are also fighting for their liberation against those same oppressors who are oppressing the <<third world>>, to be put? The inventors and supporters of the division of the world in three are quite unable to answer this question, because, according to their anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist concept, they merge the imperialists, the rulers and the peoples into one.

Marxist-Leninists cannot identify the Soviet peoples with the anti-Marxist, social-imperialist, double-dealers and the new capitalists who are ruling them. Likewise, they cannot mix up and confound the American people with US imperialism. If they were to act as the Chinese revisionists; are doing, then the revolutionaries would be making a gross theoretical mistake and setting themselves against the revolution; they would be supporting precisely imperialism and social-imperialism, the forces of capital against which the proletariat and the people within the lair of their enemies are also fighting.

What is the sense of the Chinese call that the .third world. should unite in alliance with the <<second world>> to fight half of the .first world., when such a division of the world confuses the individuality, aspirations and development of the peoples who are opposed to and in struggle against the oligarchy that oppresses them? The level of the peoples' resistance and revolutionary struggle is likewise different, but their ultimate aim, communism, is the same. In these conditions, we .Marxist-Leninists must carry out propaganda work and mobilize ourselves so that, through continuous class struggles against imperialism, social-imperialism, capitalism and their fraudulent ideologies, we achieve the ultimate aim.

The Chinese revisionists not only merge and unite peoples into one with the rulers in the capitalist countries, but they also want to liquidate the identity of socialist countries, when they preach that these countries, too, can be included in the <<third world>>.

How can a socialist country be identified with the <<third world>> in which antagonist classes, oppression and exploitation exist, and line up with <<kings and princes>>, as the Chinese leaders assert? The Chinese revisionists who call their country socialist, allege that they include themselves in the <<third world>> in order to assist the peoples of this <<world>>. This is a fraud by means of which they want to conceal their expansionist aim. To assist and support the peoples' struggle, a true socialist country has no need to divide the world in three, or include itself in the <<third world>>.

With our stands, guiding ourselves by class criteria, we Marxist-Leninists help the peoples, the proletariat, genuine democracy, sovereignty and freedom, and not the state where the kings, shahs and the reactionary cliques rule. We help those peoples and democratic states which want to liberate themselves from the yoke of superpowers, but we stress that this cannot be done properly, on the correct road and according to monarchs class criteria, unless they also fight the and the international monopolies that are connected with the superpowers.
The Chinese leaders claim to have solved this complicated class problem by merging, themselves in this imaginary <<third world>>. But this is an anti-Marxist solution. Contrary to what the Chinese leaders claim, most of the states and governments of the third world are not for struggle against the <<first world>> or against US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, or the second world. The trend among the peoples of the world is towards the struggle for liberation, for revolution, for socialism, but the governments of kings, emirs and reactionary cliques of the Mobutu and Pinochet type of the third world, in which China has included itself, are not included in this trend.

In regard to the states of the so-called third world, the Chinese leadership does not make any class differentiation, according to the principles of proletarian internationalism and the interests of the world revolution. It takes no account of the fact that these national states, most of which are led by the upper strata of the bourgeoisie, are under the influence of, and closely linked by many threads with, US imperialism and also with Soviet social-imperialism.

In these states there are deep internal contradictions between the proletariat and the poor and oppressed peasantry, on the one hand, and the bourgeoisie and all enslavers, on the other. The aid which a socialist country gives the peoples of these states should be a great stimulus to their progress towards the creation of a truly democratic state, without obscuring the perspective, without affecting the question of the triumph of the proletarian revolution and seizure of power by the proletariat. The revolution cannot be imported. It will be carried out by the proletariat and people of each country. Of course, the seizure of power will not be done overnight, but as Lenin teaches us, those conditions must be created so that, at each turn of history, the proletariat will be found in the forefront of the struggle to overthrow the degenerate state power of dictators and the reactionary bourgeoisie and to establish the rule of the people.

The division we communists make of the world today, on the basis of the Leninist class criterion, does not hinder us from fighting the superpowers and supporting all the peoples and states that are seeking liberation and have contradictions with the superpowers. Socialist Albania has given wholehearted and powerful support to the struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America, because this struggle is in their own interests and is directed against imperialism and foreign colonial domination. But to conceal and distort the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the ideology and policy of the party of the proletariat, as the Chinese leaders do, is an unpardonable crime against its own people, against other peoples, against the international proletariat and the world revolution.

In its division of the world into three, the Communist Party of China is advocating class conciliation.

The genuine Marxist-Leninists never forget the teachings of Lenin, who stresses that the opportunists and revisionists strive by hook or by crook to tone down the class struggle, to deceive the working class and the oppressed with <<revolutionary>> cliches, while divesting the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of its revolutionary content. This is what the Chinese revisionist leadership is doing when it preaches conciliation and peaceful coexistence between the working class and the bourgeoisie.

As Engels and Lenin teach us, the contradictions between classes or social forces with opposing fundamental interests cannot be reconciled, but on the contrary, become more and more severe and end up in socio-political conflicts. The very existence of the state proves that the antagonisms between classes are irreconcilable. Therefore, to try to mitigate these class antagonisms which can be seen in the various bourgeois and revisionist countries of the <<third>>, <<second>>, or the first world, by preaching unprincipled unity, means to deny the objective character of the existence of contradictions and to treat this problem in an anti-Marxist way.

The Chinese <<theoreticians>> try to reconcile classes that can never be reconciled, and this means that they are in revisionist, opportunist positions.
The distortion of Marx’s theory by the Chinese revisionists is quite obvious when they consider the countries which they include in the <<third world>> countries where class peace prevails,, and the state in those countries an organism of class conciliation.

To accept the notion of the <<third world>>, as the Chinese leaders advertise, means to work to create an opinion which will serve to defend those state organisms which the bourgeoisie needs to oppress the working class and the masses of the people. The thesis of the toning down of the class struggle, as Lenin said when he was attacking the revisionists, justifies and endorses this oppression. To seek unity within the <<third world>>, in fact, means to seek unity of the oppressed class with the oppressor class, that is, to try to tone down the antagonisms between the working masses and the bourgeoisie, between the people and the foreign oppressors. These sermons of the Chinese revisionists run counter to the interests of the national and social liberation of the peoples, to their aspirations for freedom, independence and social justice.

The majority of the states which allegedly make up the <<third>> or the <<non-aligned world>> are dependent on foreign finance capital which is so strong and so widespread that it has a decisive weight in every aspect of life there. These states do not enjoy complete independence. On the contrary, they are dependent on this big finance capital, which develops that policy and spreads that ideology which justify the exploitation of peoples.

The bourgeoisie and imperialism take great pains to conceal this reality, and when exposed, they contrive various <<theories>> against the independence and sovereignty of states. In order to smother the aspirations of the peoples to freedom, independence and sovereignty, the bourgeoisie and revisionist theoreticians present these aspirations as <<anachronicism>>, give them various metaphysical interpretations and counter them with the slogan of <<world inter-dependence>>, which allegedly expresses the current trend of development of human society, or with the slogan of <<limited sovereignty>>, which allegedly expresses the supreme interests of the so-called socialist community, etc.

The bourgeois-revisionist reality of the violation of the freedom, independence and sovereignty of nations and states in all forms and directions, shows the decay of the capitalist system. We are living in an epoch when the bourgeoisie is losing ground as a ruling class, while the world proletariat has become a colossal force and has entered into ceaseless, merciless struggle to get that class which exploits it off its back. Under the blows of the peoples and the class struggle of the proletariat, the bourgeoisie was compelled to renounce colonialism de jure, and to formally recognize the freedom, independence and sovereignty of many countries, which it had been occupying and exploiting to the bone for a long time.

However, for many countries the freedom, independence and sovereignty, legally recognized by the capitalist states to their former colonies, have remained formal to this day, because the capitalists and imperialists are still ruling there in new forms. To prolong their domination over the former colonies, taking advantage of the economic, political and ideological backwardness of the and the lack of organization of the revolutionary forces, these regressive forces of our time make extensive use of plots and intrigues to divide and rule, suitable terrain for which can still be found in these countries.

In dealing with this problem, it should not be thought that, since the former colonial countries have not yet won complete independence and sovereignty, their struggle has been useless. By no means. The struggle of the peoples for the emancipation of their small countries from the dictate and tutelage of the mighty - imperialism and social-imperialism - must not be underrated. On the contrary, the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian state have given and will continue to give unreserved support to this just revolutionary and liberation struggle, which they have regarded as a victory of the peoples in strengthening their political independence and breaking free from colonial and neo-colonial domination. But we are against those revisionist theoreticians who preach that now the entire revolutionary struggle should be reduced to a struggle for national independence, to win and to defend this independence against the aggression of imperialist powers, while negating the struggle for social liberation.
Only victory in this struggle guarantees genuine and complete national freedom, independence and sovereignty. These advocates of the exploiting order <<forget>> that the class struggle between the proletariat and its allies, on the one hand, and the local bourgeoisie and its external allies, on the other, is going on fiercely at all times, and some day it will lead to those moments, to those revolutionary situations, as Lenin calls them, when the revolution breaks out. The ever more favourable conditions that are being created in the world for anti-imperialist and democratic revolutions to develop on a large-scale and for their leadership by the proletariat must be utilized in order to go on from the struggle for national independence to another more advanced phase', to the struggle for socialism. Lenin teaches us that the revolution must be carried through to the end, by liquidating the bourgeoisie and its state power. Only on this basis can there be talk of true freedom, independence and sovereignty.

According to our Marxist-Leninist concept, the people cannot have freedom and sovereignty in a society with antagonistic classes where the feudal or bourgeois class holds sway. Freedom, independence and sovereignty have a concrete socio-political content. Genuine and complete freedom, and sovereignty are secured under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, while, where state power is in the hands of the exploiting class, the economic and political relations of inequality between the exploiters and the exploited and between countries lead to loss, or restriction of the freedom and sovereignty of the people. As a result, there can be no talk of real national freedom and sovereignty, and even less of people's sovereignty, in the countries which are included in the <<non-aligned>> or the third world.. Only from a scientific analysis based on the Marxist-Leninist theory is it possible to determine correctly which people is really free and which is enslaved, which state is independent and sovereign, and which is dependent and oppressed. The Marxist-Leninist theory clearly explains who are the oppressors and exploiters of the peoples, and which is the road for the peoples to become free, independent and sovereign. We Albanian communists understand the freedom, independence and sovereignty of states and peoples only in this way, in the light of Marxism-Leninism.

The Attitude of the Chinese Revisionists to Contradictions is an Idealist, Revisionist and Capitulationist Attitude

The implementation of a correct revolutionary strategy based on the teachings of Marxism-Leninism demands not only an all-sided dialectical analysis and appreciation of the motive forces of the world revolutionary and liberation trend, the correct assessment of the enemy forces, with their strong and weak aspects, but also a correct and scientific understanding of the contradictions characteristic of our time.

If we interpret the contradictions in connection with the concrete facts and the real development of the situations, according to the teachings of the Marxist-Leninist theory, then we shall not make mistakes.

In connection with the contradictions, the Chinese leaders <<theorize>>, <<interpret>>, <<philosophize>>, paraphrase and confuse many theses which the classics of Marxism-Leninism formulated so clearly. Interpreting contradictions differently from what they really are, they enter into agreements and compromises not in favour of the liberation struggle, the peoples, the revolution and the construction of socialism, but in favour of the bourgeoisie and imperialism. These leaders, who pose as Marxist-Leninist philosophers, have two masks: one to present themselves as if they are in order with the Marxist-Leninist theory, and the other to distort it in practice.
Their stand in regard to the contradictions, alliances and compromises stems from a distorted and pragmatic analysis which they make of the international situation, the contradictions that exist in the world, the contradictions among the imperialist powers, among the various capitalist states, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, etc. This stand has its roots in their idealist and revisionist world outlook.

However, the Chinese leaders' laying of the problem of contradictions, alliances and compromises on the table for discussion is not fortuitous. The Chinese leadership has now thrown off its disguise and has come out openly against the revolution. It has become a standard-bearer of right opportunism, revisionism. Like all revisionists, the leaders of the Communist Party of China, also, are trying to <<justify>> their departure from the Marxist-Leninist theory, their revisionist orientation, by using quotations from Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. Of course, they curtail cut up and take these quotations out of their context, and thus mutilated, use them to peddle their reactionary stands and theses as Marxist-Leninist. But the Chinese revisionists are neither the first nor the last to make these distortions, tendentious curtailments and interpretations of our correct theory. Long before them, the chief s of socialdemocracy, the Titoites, the Soviet, Italian, French and other revisionists did the same thing and they are still at it.

In the first place, by juggling with the contradictions, the Chinese leaders are endeavouring to justify their stand towards US imperialism, to pave the way for their rapprochement and collaboration with it.

The Chinese revisionists claim that there is only one contradiction in the world of today, and that this puts the <<third world>>, the <<second world>> and half of the <<first world>> in confrontation with the Soviet Union. Proceeding from this thesis which unites the peoples with a group of imperialists, they advocate that all class contradictions must be set aside and that the only fight must be against Soviet social-imperialism.

But let us analyse how things stand on the question of the contradictions between the peoples and the superpowers, and the contradictions between the superpowers themselves.

In the present conditions, in defining a consistent revolutionary strategy and tactics, the principled stand towards the two imperialist superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, which constitute the greatest force in defence of the capitalist system of oppression and exploitation, the main bastions of world reaction, assumes first-rate importance. They are sworn enemies, the most dangerous enemies of the revolution, socialism and the peoples of the entire world; they have taken upon themselves the odious role of the international gendarme against every revolutionary and liberation movement, and represent the most aggressive warmongering powers, which, with their actions are driving the world towards a devastating war.

No one, least of all the Party of Labour of Albania, can deny the existence of profound contradictions between the two greatest imperialist powers of our time - American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. We have continually stressed that the contradictions between the two superpowers not only exist, but are becoming deeper. Parallel with this, the superpowers, on their part, are making efforts to reach agreement over certain questions. Lenin explains this phenomenon with the two tendencies of capital. He said,

<<... two tendencies exist - one which makes the alliance of all imperialists inevitable, and the other which pits some imperialists against others....>>.

But why are there irreconcilable contradictions and antagonisms between the two superpowers? Because, since they are big imperialist powers, each of them is fighting for world hegemony, to create new spheres of influence, for the enslavement and exploitation of peoples. The appetite and greed which each of them has, is the source of bickering and severe friction between them, and even to a bloody world war.
We Marxist-Leninists must exploit the contradictions which exist between the superpowers in the interests of the revolution and the peoples' liberation struggles.

Exploiting the contradictions in the enemy camp is a component part of revolutionary strategy and tactics. Stalin described the exploitation of the contradictions and conflicts in the ranks of the enemies of the working class, within the country or among the imperialist states in the international arena, as an indirect reserve of the proletarian revolution. It is a well-known historical fact that the Soviet socialist state, under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, took into account and exploited inter-imperialist contradictions in the period after the October Revolution, or during the years of the Second World War.

But in every instance, the assessment and exploitation of the contradictions amidst the enemies by the revolutionary forces, the socialist countries, are the result of a concrete Marxist-Leninist analysis of these contradictions and their level of severity, of the ratio of forces at a given period or moment, in order to define in what way, in what form and by what means to exploit them. The principle is that these contradictions must always be exploited in favour of the revolution, the peoples and their freedom, in favour of the cause of socialism. The exploitation of contradictions amidst the enemies should lead to the growth and strengthening of the revolutionary and liberation movement, and not to making it weaken and fade, should lead to an even more active mobilization of the revolutionary forces in the struggle against the enemies, especially the main ones, without allowing any illusions about them to be created among the peoples.

The two superpowers, the United States of America and the revisionist Soviet Union, have the suppression of the revolution and socialism as, the first point in their program. Not only do the Chinese leaders not stress this fact, which is an expression of the irreconcilable contradiction between socialism and capitalism, but they even deny it in practice. Of course, it is impermissible for Marxist-Leninists to forget that the superpowers, despite the struggle between them for hegemony, despite the contradictions they have, never lose sight of their common objective of suppressing the peoples who demand freedom, and of sabotaging the revolution, and this, too, leads to general or local wars. On this question, the Chinese revisionists continue to hold their known standpoint of the fight only against Soviet social-imperialism, which, according to them, is the more dangerous, more aggressive and more bellicose. They relegate US imperialism to second place and stress that the United States of America <<wants the status quo, that it is in decline>>. From this the Chinese revisionists arrive at the conclusion that an alliance with American imperialism against Soviet social-imperialism can and should be reached.

US imperialism is not at all weakened or tamed, as the Chinese leaders claim. On the contrary, it is aggressive, savage and powerful, like Soviet social-imperialism. The fact that US imperialism no longer has that dominant position it held in the past, does not alter anything. This is the dialectics of the development of capitalism, and it corroborates Lenin's theses that imperialism is capitalism in decline, decadence. But, proceeding from this, to go so far as to underestimate the actual aggressive economic and military strength of one or the other superpower, is impermissible.

It is likewise impermissible, proceeding from a real weakening and decline of the imperialists' power, to say that one imperialism has become less dangerous and that the other is more dangerous. Both imperialist superpowers are dangerous, because neither of them ever forgets the fight against those who want to dig the grave for them, and those who want to dig the grave for the superpowers are the peoples.

To advocate the struggle against Soviet social-imperialism only, and to cease the fight against US imperialism in fact, as the Chinese leaders are doing, means to fail to uphold the fundamental theses of Marxism-Leninism. There is no doubt about the fact that Soviet social-imperialism must be fought to the finish. But to fail to fight just as hard against US imperialism, too, this is unacceptable, this is betrayal of the revolution.
If the Chinese course is followed, then it will not be clear what US imperialism is and what Soviet social-imperialism is, why these two superpowers have contradictions and what is the essence of these contradictions, what is the basis of the struggle between them, which we must deepen, and what we must do to prevent these two imperialist states from unleashing a world war, etc. If we understand these questions properly in theory, and if we act correctly on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist theory, then the absolute need for us to assist and support the peoples fighting against the two superpowers and the bourgeois capitalist cliques ruling them will become quite today is going clear. The capitalist world today is going through a grave crisis. But this crisis must be assessed in all its magnitude, and likewise, like contradictions which exist in the capitalist world must also be assessed in all their gravity.

Their pragmatic and anti-Marxist logic leads the Chinese revisionists to present the Soviet Union as a country developing without contradictions, as an imperialism which is ruling the other revisionist countries, like Poland, East Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Bulgaria, without problems. They present the Soviet bloc as, a bloc in ascendancy, and the Soviet Union as the only imperialism left in the world, bent on establishing its hegemony everywhere.

If we speak of the hegemony of the Soviet Union over the revisionist countries of Eastern Europe, this is expressed, in the first place, in the military occupation of these countries by the Soviet armed forces, in the ruthless and unscrupulous plunder of their assets by Soviet social-imperialism, which is trying to integrate them completely into the system of Soviet republics. Naturally, the revisionist Soviet Union is encountering opposition in these efforts. The time will come when this opposition and these contradictions, which exist in latent form within the revisionist pack, will become more acute and will burst out.

We have described Soviet social-imperialism as aggressive because it attacked and occupied Czechoslovakia, because it has intervened in Africa and elsewhere, and has plans and is preparing for other acts of aggression. But can it be said that US imperialism has committed fewer acts of aggression, or is less aggressive than Soviet social-imperialism?

The Chinese leadership has forgotten the aggression of the United States of America against Korea, it has forgotten the prolonged and barbaous war against Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, it has forgotten its war in the Middle East, its intervention in the republics of Central America, etc. It has erased all these things from the led and now comes out with the conclusion that US imperialism has allegedly been tamed! It forgets that US imperialism has extended its tentacles all over the world, has set up its military bases everywhere, and is developing and strengthening them. Mao Tsetung and Chou En-lai forgot this, the Chinese revisionist leadership forget this when they tell us that US imperialism has allegedly been weakened and tamed and, hence, an alliance can be concluded with it! To act in this way means to seek to extinguish the struggle against imperialism in general and against US imperialism in particular, and indeed even against Soviet social-imperialism, which China claims to be fighting so hard.

It is true that Soviet social-imperialism has a great hunger for expansion. Its intervention in Angola and Ethiopia, its attempts to establish bases in the Mediterranean and several Arab countries, to seize the Red Sea narrows or to establish military bases in the Indian Ocean, all these are blatant imperialist actions. But these positions of Soviet social-imperialism are not consolidated to the same extent that US imperialism has consolidated its neo-colonialist economic, strategic and military positions in other countries. It is precisely this situation that the Chinese leadership appears to underestimate, but in reality it recognizes and supports it.

At the same time, the Chinese revisionists cannot fail to see that, despite the contradictions existing between the capitalist states of Western Europe and US imperialism, they are closely linked with one another, linked through political, military and economic alliances, such as NATO, the European Common Market, etc. It is impossible for the Chinese leadership not to know that US capital has penetrated deeply into, the economies of the countries of Western Europe, and not only there, but also into Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.
The Chinese leadership knows full well that the United States of America has invested and continues to invest scores of billions of dollars in various countries of the world. Then what is it hoping for? Is it hoping that the western capitalist countries, with all their contradictions with the United States of America, will break away from it in order to weaken their own camp, to renounce that armed might, those economic, social and cultural ties they have with it, and leave themselves naked before Soviet social-imperialism for the sake of China's interests? This is an absurdity of the Chinese foreign policy.

As we have already stressed, there is no doubt that the contradictions existing between the two superpowers and the other imperialist and capitalist-revisionist countries should be exploited by the revolutionary and liberation forces. But it is important that this should be understood correctly, should always be seen from the angle of the interests of the revolution and subordinated to them. The exploitation of contradictions among the imperialist powers and groups, the capitalist-revisionist states, etc., can never be an aim in itself for the working class and the Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries.

To exploit the contradictions between the imperialist countries and the two superpowers means to deepen the rifts between them, to encourage the revolutionary and patriotic forces of these countries to oppose US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, which want to subjugate them, economically, politically and militarily, to exploit-, them and deny them their national identity, etc. But what is China doing?

The Chinese policy advocates the <<holy alliance>> of the western capitalist countries with the United States of America. Indeed it goes even further. It advocates the alliance of the proletariat of the countries of Western Europe with the reactionary bourgeoisie of these countries. Where is the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist line here? Where is the line of exploiting contradictions? Do the Chinese leaders think that they will be able to strengthen this bloc against the Soviets, according to their own desires, with such a policy? This is the utopia they are dreaming of, but it is a metaphysical view on their part.

The United States of America, the western capitalist countries, and along with them, Japan and Canada, too, are not so crazy as the Chinese leaders think, their policy is not so naive as the Chinese policy. For their part, they know very well how to exploit the contradictions existing between China and the Soviet Union. They know how to go about it and act in order to weaken the big aggressive power, the Soviet Union. They have long been fighting in this direction, and one cannot say that they have achieved no results. The United States of America and all the other capitalist states are inciting the contradictions between the revisionist countries of the East and the Kremlin.

Now China, too, has begun to practise this old American policy. Hua Kuo-feng's visit to Rumania and Yugoslavia was according to this course. But China's opening up to Europe, its fanning up create a favourable field of action for itself in the Balkans, all these things are not done in the interests of the peoples and the revolution. They are part of the Chinese policy of incitement to war, the aim of which is that the peoples of Europe should kill one another and become cannon fodder in an imperialist war.

<<Pravda>> has long been engaged in polemics with the United States of America, of course without effect, accusing it of a rapid build up of armaments. Its concern is not to criticize this action of the United States of America, since the Soviet social-imperialists themselves are doing the same thing. The problem is that the increase of US military potential relatively weakens Soviet fighting strength and forces the Soviet Union to follow the United States of America step by step, in order to balance its military potential and aggressive power. However, keeping up with US imperialism in the armaments race weakens the economy of the Soviet Union, because it means that large material, monetary and human funds are transferred from the economy to the army. This is what is worrying Brezhnev and company.
But the astonishing thing is that, through their newspaper <<Renmin Ribao>>, the Chinese revisionists, unreservedly take the side of the Americans, publishing article after article urging the United States of America not to lose the lead in the armaments race, but to ceaselessly increase its military potential. Thus it turns out, according to <<Renmin Ribao>>, that it is not the United States of America which is arming, but only the Soviet Union. Such an advocate of the Americans as the Chinese revisionist leadership is becoming is not to be found in any other country. The bourgeoisie tries at least to preserve a sense of proportion in its criticism and interpretations of realities, to weigh up the situations which are developing, tendentiously, of course. But to act in the way the Chinese leaders are doing, is something quite unprecedented.

At his meeting with Ten Hsia ping, the Secretary of the American Department of State; Vance, explained to him that the <<United State of America has military superiority over the Soviet Union>>. But Teng Hsiao ping told a large group of American journalists who were visiting China at that time, that <<Peking does not believe>> Vance's statement, and that the <<Soviet Union is much superior to the United States of America>>. <<None so deaf as he who does not want to hear>>, as Ahe saying goes.

The Chinese thesis, presented as an alleged Marxist thesis, which casts doubt on the fact that it is not just one but both the imperialist superpowers which are seeking the redivision of the world, to create new colonies, to oppress the peoples and extend their markets, cannot be accepted.

The Very posing of the question that one imperialism is stronger and the other weaker, ont is aggressive and the other tamed, is not Marxist-Leninist. The presentation of the question in this manner, is, a reflection of a reactionary view which leads the Chinese revisionists into alliance with the United States of America, NATO and the European Common Market, with the King of Spain, the Shah of Iran, Pinochet of Chile and all the fascist dictators! The Chinese policy, which is harmless to US, imperialism, which is harmless to the power of the banks and the biggest capital of out time, is an out-and-out bourgeois reformist, pacifist Policy, and: very stupid. The Chinese leaders cannot fail to see that American finance capital, the trusts and monopolies are by na means reducing their investments abroad, that they are not giving up their ambitions to exploit and enslave, but, on the contrary, are becoming stronger and trying to alter the ratio of forces in the world in their own favour.

The Soviet social-imperialists are doing the same thing. The aim of their economic policy, of the big trusts which exist in the Soviet Union, is to suck the blood of satellites and other countries by all manner of means. They have dressed themselves up in a new cloak and present themselves under another name, while they, too, strive to alter the ratio of forces to their own advantage, at first allegedly through agreements and negotiations, but, when the time comes, also by force, i.e., war.

With their reasoning that the United States of America <<wait the status quo>>, that <<it is on the decline>>, and that Soviet social-imperialism is the <<more dangerous, more aggressive, more bellicose>>, etc., the Chinese revisionists want to prove that the United States of America can and should become the ally of China against the Soviet Union. The various kinds of relations, which they are extending, the open support they give the increase in the war budget and the further arming of the United States of America confirm this.

The Chinese revisionists preach that the situation today is such that the Marxist-Leninists, the revolutionaries and the people can make a compromise with and rely on US imperialism. Our Party is against any compromise with ferocious US imperialism, because such a thing is not in the interests of the revolution and the liberation of the peoples. We have been, are, and will The in struggle with US imperialism until its complete destruction. Likewise, we are and will be in struggle to the end with Soviet social-imperialism.

The support which China is giving US imperialism is not in the least in favour of the revolution and the peoples, but in favour of the counterrevolution. With its reactionary political and ideological line, the Chinese leadership leaves the peoples of the world in the clutches of US imperialism.
It wants them to remain docile, not to revolt, and even to unite with US imperialism against the other superpower, which wants to grab from the United States of America the assets it has built up from the toil and sweat of the peoples. China's leadership recommends to the capitalist countries of Europe, gathered in the European Common Market, that they should unite. It also lines up the peoples in the capitalist union of Europe.

This stand means: keep quiet, no more talk about the revolution, no more talk about the dictatorship of the proletariat, but put yourselves in the service of the trusts, the capitalists and, along with them, create an even greater economic and military force to cope with Soviet social-imperialism.

The European Common Market, which China supports and is strengthening economically, is nothing but a means to preserve the maximum profits of the monopoly trusts of Western Europe and to group together the developed industrial states, in which the wealthy classes, as Lenin says, exact a colossal tribute from Africa, Asia, etc. By supporting these capitalist states, the Chinese leaders, in fact, are supporting the parasitism of a handful of capitalists at the expense of the peoples of these countries, as well as of the peoples who have fallen into their clutches.

The theory of the "three worlds" of the Chinese revisionists, by means of; which they try to justify their counterrevolutionary stands, is nothing but a variant of opportunism in the ranks of the workers' movement; which helps imperialism to create markets and exact profits at the expense of other peoples, so that the opportunists too, will receive some of the crumbs from the capitalists' table.

It is an undeniable fact that the Chinese leadership is defending the capitalist forces and states of Europe, and not supporting the revolutionary forces and proletariat, so that they rise and destroy the plans of American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, United Europe., the: European Common Market and Comecon, in a word, all the pillars of the imperialist system, which, like a great monster, sucks the blood of the peoples.

Although it includes the developed capitalist states such as West Germany, Britain, Japan, France, Italy, etc., in the "second world," and irrespective of all its talk on the theoretical plane about their "double" character, the Chinese revisionist leadership does not consider these states enemies of the revolution. On the contrary, the Chinese have found it convenient to shut their eyes to this and reach open compromises with them, allegedly in order to use them against Soviet social-imperialism.

The Chinese leadership, whose eyes have been blinded as a result of its pragmatic and anti-Marxist policy, "forgets" that such states as West Germany, Britain, Japan, France, Italy and others like these have been and are imperialist states, that the enslaving and colonialist tendencies, which have been characteristic of them traditionally, have not been and, as such, cannot be eliminated. It is true that after the Second World War these imperialist powers have been weakened, even greatly weakened, and that their former positions have changed to the advantage of American imperialism. Nevertheless, neither France, nor Britain, nor any other of them has given up the struggle to, protect its markets or gain other markets in Africa, Asia and the countries of Latin America.

Among all these capitalist and imperialist states which are not so powerful as American imperialism, there are contradictions, but, at the same time, there is also the tendency to come to terms with one another.

After the Second World War, American imperialism helped its old, former allies in Europe to recover and the American monopolies linked themselves with the monopolies of these former allies in a tangle of common interests. But contradictions have always existed among them, as each of them tries to have a free hand in monopolizing markets, importing raw materials and exporting its industrial goods. In this instance, too, the international reality confirms the correctness of Lenin's thesis on the two objective tendencies of capital.

It is likewise true that these capitalist states have contradictions not only with American imperialism but also with Soviet social-imperialism. The question arises: how should these contradictions be exploited? The inter-imperialist contradictions can by no means be exploited in the way the Chinese revisionists advocate.
We Marxist-Leninists cannot defend the various reactionaries, the clique around Strauss or Schmidt in Germany, the British Conservative or Labourite leaders, simply because they have contradictions with Soviet social-imperialism. Were we to do so and support the preachings of the Chinese to the effect that <<the capitalist states of Europe should unite in the Common Market>>, that <<United Europe>> should be strengthened so as to be able to face Soviet social-imperialism, that would mean our agreeing to sacrifice the struggle and efforts of the proletariat of these countries to break the chains of enslavement, to sabotage the future of the revolution in those countries.

By making unprincipled compromises with American imperialism, the Chinese revisionists have betrayed Marxism-Leninism and the revolution. **Marxist-Leninists interpret the thesis of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on contradictions and compromises in its true spirit. The Chinese interpret this thesis in a way diametrically opposite to the truth.** Fologing the Leninist course, our Party is. not against every kind of compromise, but is against treacherous compromises. A compromise can be made when it is necessary and serves the interests of the class and the revolution, but always bearing in mind that it must not be at the expense of the strategy and loyalty to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, must not damage the interests of the class and the revolution. In regard to the stand towards compromises, among other things, Lenin says:

<<Is it permissible for the partisan of the proletarian revolution to conclude compromises with the capitalists or the capitalist class?... to reply to this general question in a negative way would obviously be absurd. Of course, the partisan of the proletarian revolution can conclude compromises or agreements with the capitalists. Everything depends on what sort of agreement and in what circumstances it is concluded. It is here and here alone that the difference can and must be sought between that agreement which is legitimate from the viewpoint of the proletarian revolution, and that agreement which is treacherous, perfidious (from the same viewpoint)>>*. Lenin

And Lenin goes on:

<<The conclusion is clear: to completely rule out any agreement or compromise with the robbers is just as absurd as to justify participation in the robbery with the abstract thesis that, speaking in general, sometimes agreements with thieves are permissible and necessary>>**. Lenin

Lenin also said:

<<The task of a truly revolutionary party is not- to proclaim that it is impossible to abjure every sort of compromise, but to know how to maintain, regardless of these compromises, since they are unavoidable, its loyalty to its own principles, to its own class, to its own revolutionary task, towards the work of preparing the revolution and the education of the masses of the people to achieve victory in the revolution>>.

Only proceeding from these teachings of Lenin’s can compromises be permissible. But how can a compromise with American imperialism or Soviet social-imperialism be in the interest of socialism and the world revolution, when it is known that these two superpowers are the most ferocious enemies of the peoples and the revolution? Not only is this compromise not necessary, but, on the contrary, it endangers the interests of the revolution. To compromise, or to violate principles on problems of such importance, means to betray Marxism-Leninism.
If Mao Tsetung and the other Chinese leaders have had and still have a good deal to say about contradictions <<in theory>>, then they ought to speak not only of exploiting inter-imperialist contradictions and of compromises with the imperialists, but, in the first place, they ought to speak of the fundamental contradictions of our epoch, the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the contradictions between the oppressed peoples and countries, on the one hand, and the two superpowers and the whole of world imperialism, on the other, the contradictions between socialism and capitalism. But the Chinese leaders are silent about these contradictions which exist objectively and cannot be wiped off. They speak of only one contradiction, which, according to them, is that between the entire world and Soviet social-imperialism, in this way, trying to justify their unprincipled compromises with American imperialism and all world capitalism.

Marxist-Leninist class analysis and the facts show that the existence of contradictions and rifts among the imperialist powers and groupings in no way overrides or displaces to a position of secondary importance the contradictions between labour and capital in the capitalist and imperialist countries, or the contradictions between the oppressed peoples and their imperialist oppressors. Precisely these, the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between the oppressed peoples and imperialism, between socialism and capitalism are the most profound, they are permanent, irreconcilable contradictions. Consequently, the utilization of inter-imperialist contradictions, or contradictions between the capitalist and revisionist states is meaningful only if it serves to create the most favourable conditions for the powerful development of the revolutionary and liberation movement against the bourgeoisie, imperialism and reaction. Therefore, these contradictions must be utilized without creating illusions among the proletariat and the peoples about imperialism and the bourgeoisie. It is essential to make the teachings of Lenin clear to the workers and peoples, to make them conscious that only an irreconcilable stand towards the oppressors and exploiters, only their resolute struggle against imperialism and the bourgeoisie, only the revolution, will ensure them genuine social and national freedom.

The utilization of contradictions among enemies cannot comprise the fundamental task of the revolution and be counterposed to the struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the reactionary and fascist dictatorship, the imperialist oppressors.

The stand of Marxist-Leninists on this question is clear. They address themselves to the peoples, the proletariat, call on the masses to rise to their feet to smash the hegemonic, oppressive, aggressive and warmongering plans of the American imperialists and Soviet social-imperialists, to overthrow the reactionary bourgeoisie and its dictatorship, both in the West and in the East.

As far as our socialist state is concerned, it 'has always exploited the contradictions in the enemy camp. In exploiting them, our Party proceeds, from a correct assessment of the character of the contradictions existing between a socialist country and the imperialist and bourgeois-revisionist countries, and a correct assessment of interimperialist contradictions.

Marxism-Leninism teaches us that the contradictions between a socialist country and castralist and revisionist countries, which reflect contradictions between two classes with diametrically opposed interests, the working class and the bourgeoisie, are permanent, fundamental, irreconcilable. They run like a red thread through the entire historical epoch of the transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale. On the other hand, the contradictions between the imperialist powers are expressions of contradictions amongst exploiters, amongst classes with common fundamental interests. Therefore, however severe the contradictions and conflicts between the imperialist powers may be, the danger of aggressive actions by world imperialism or various sections- of. it against the socialist country, remains a permanent real danger at any moment. Rifts between imperialists, inter-imperialist quarrels and conflicts may, at the most, weaken or temporarily postpone the danger of the actions of imperialism against the socialist country, therefore while it is in the interests of this country to utilize these contradictions in the enemy ranks, they cannot eliminate this danger.
This has been forcefully stressed by Lenin who said:

<<... the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeoise states will be inevitable>>*.

These teachings of Lenin's retain their full validity today. They have been thoroughly vindicated by a sequence of historical events, such as the fascist aggression against the Soviet Union in the years of the Second World War, in the aggression of American imperialism in Korea and later in Vietnam, the imperialist and social-imperialist hostile activity and the various plots against Albania, etc. Therefore, our Party has stressed and stresses that any underestimation of the contradictions of a socialist state with the imperialist powers and the capitalist-revisionist countries, any underestimation of the danger of aggressive actions by the latter against socialist Albania, any relaxation of vigilance resulting from the idea, that the Contradictions between the imperialist powers themselves are very abrasive, and because of this they cannot undertake such actions against our Homeland, would be fraught with very dangerous consequences.

The Party of Labour of Albania also proceeds, from the fact that only the revolutionary, liberation, freedom-loving and progressive forces can be true and reliable allies of our country, as the socialist country it is. Our country maintains state. relations with different countries of the bourgeois revisionist world, it utilizes the contradictions, between the imperialist, capitalist and revisionist states and, at the same time, firmly supports the, revolutionary and liberation struggle of the working class, the working masses and the peoples of every country where such a struggle is going on, regarding this support as its lofty internationalist duty. The Party of Labour of Albania has always consistently upheld this viewpoint; at its 7th Congress it stressed once again that it will support the proletariat and the peoples, the Marxist-Leninist parties, the revolutionaries and progressives who fight against the superpowers, the capitalist and revisionist bourgeoisie and world reaction, for socialist and national liberation.

In the past, the Communist Party of China has also quoted well-known Marxist-Leninist principles and theses in regard to the contradictions. For example, in the known document entitled, <<A. Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement>>, published by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in 1963, the Chinese wrote:<< These or those necessary compromises between socialist and imperialist countries do not require that the oppressed peoples and nations also make compromises with imperialism and its stooges>>. And they added:<<Never should anybody under the pretext of peaceful coexistence, demand that the oppressed peoples and nations renounce the revolutionary struggle>>. The Chinese leadership was talking in this way then, because at that time I was the Khrushchevite leadership who wanted the peoples and the communist parties to agree that American imperialism and its chiefs had become peaceful and to submit to the Soviet policy of rapprochement with American imperialism. Now it is the leadership of the Communist Party of China which is preaching to the peoples, the revolutionaries, the Marxist-Leninist parties and the proletariat of the whole world, that they must enter into alliance with the imperialist or capitalist countries, and unite with the bourgeoisie and all reactionaries against Soviet social-imperialism. And the Chinese do not express these ideas in disguised phrases, but openly. Such vacillations and 180 degree turns have nothing to do with the principled Marxist-Leninist policy. They are characteristic of the pragmatic policy followed by all revisionists, who subordinate principles to their bourgeois and imperialist interests.

In order to justify their unprincipled compromises with American imperialism and the international bourgeoisie, the Chinese leaders and all the advocates of the theory of .Kthree worlds- deliberately misrepresent the historical truth about the Soviet-German non-aggression pact of 1939 and the Anglo-Soviet-American alliance in the Second World War.

The Soviet-German non-aggression pact was a skilful utilization by Stalin of inter-imperialist contradictions. At that time the Hitlerite aggression against the Soviet Union was imminent.
It was the period when nazi Germany had invaded Austria and Czechoslovakia, and fascist Italy had invaded Albania, when the Munich agreement had been concluded and the German juggernaut of war was racing towards the East. The Soviet Union did not conclude an alliance, but a nonaggression pact with Germany, after the Western powers had refused to respond to Stalin’s call for joint actions with the Soviet state to contain the nazi-fascist aggressors, and when it had become clear that these powers were urging Hitler to attack the land of the Soviets. The Soviet-German pact foiled their plans and gave the Soviet Union time to prepare to face the nazi aggression.

In regard to the Anglo-Soviet-American alliance, it is known that it was concluded when Hitlerite Germany, after having occupied France and being at war with Britain, launched its savage aggression against the Soviet Union, when the war against the Axis powers had assumed a clear and pronounced anti-fascist and liberation character. It must be pointed out that at no time and in no instance did Stalin and the Soviet Union at that time advocate or call on the proletariat and the communist parties to renounce the revolution and unite with the reactionary bourgeoisie. Indeed, when Browder renounced the class struggle and advocated class conciliation, because the interests of the Anglo-Soviet-American alliance allegedly required this, he was stigmatized by Stalin and the communist movement as a revisionist and renegade from the revolution.

As can be seen, nothing justifies the unprincipled compromises and alliances of the Chinese with American imperialism and the various reactionary forces. The historical analogy the Chinese revisionists are trying to make does not hold water.

In their propaganda, the Chinese leaders try to give the impression that we Albanians are allegedly against any compromise and do not strive to utilize the contradictions as we should. Naturally, they know that on these questions we take the standpoint of Marxism-Leninism, but they continue to propagate this crooked line in order to conceal their departure from the scientific Marxist-Leninist theory and the road of revolution. They act in this way in order to denigrate the correct policy and stands of the proletarian party and state. Their accusations are groundless. Let us refer to the facts. Our Party has always energetically supported the just cause of the Arab peoples, without exception, and will continue to do so to the end. We support the struggle of the Palestinian people against Israel, which long ago became a blind tool, a gendarme of US imperialism in the Middle East. It has been charged with the task of defending the rich Arab oil fields for the big monopoly companies of the United States of America and maintaining the status quo, as the Chinese revisionists call it. Despite the fact that President Sadat and his government were formerly in alliance with the Soviet Union, we supported the struggle of the people of Egypt to regain the territories occupied by Israel. However, we exposed the aims of the Soviet Union against Egypt, and its game in the Middle East in general. Not for one moment have we remained silent about the colonialist aims of the Soviet Union towards Egypt. We have done the same thing in supporting the Egyptian people just as consistently in their fight against US imperialism and Israel.

While defending the interests of the Egyptian people and the other Arab peoples, our Party and people also expose the manoeuvres which US imperialism together with Israel is engaged in at present. We cannot approve of any course, any line of compromise with aggressor Israel, under the pretext that this is allegedly in favour of the Egyptian people.

The Chinese leadership, however, does not expose American imperialism. It applauds the Israeli-Egyptian agreements and urges the Arab peoples to come to terms, to make a compromise with American imperialism and Israel, which are their main enemies. Such a stand is not Marxist-Leninist. Such a compromise à la the Chinese is not in the interest of the peoples. The Chinese absurdity that breaking with one imperialism to throw yourself into the arms of another imperialism <<is acting in the interests of the freedom of the peoples>>, is totally inadmissible. These typically bourgeois manoeuvres and intrigues cannot be called Marxist-Leninist actions which help to deepen the contradictions between the two imperialist superpowers. The Albanian Party and people are against predatory imperialist wars and resolutely support just national liberation wars which are, and must always be, to the advantage of the peoples, in favour of the revolution.
They are not against supporting even a bourgeois state, when they see that those who rule this state are progressive persons and fight in the interests of the liberation of their people from imperialist hegemony. But our country cannot make common cause, or a compromise, as the Chinese revisionists call it, with a state ruled by a reactionary clique, which, in the interests of its own class and to the detriment of the interests of the people, enters into an alliance with one or the other superpower. Likewise, socialist Albania is not against maintaining normal diplomatic relations with the states of the <<third world>>, or the <<second world>>. It is against such relations only with the two superpowers and the fascist states. But in developing our diplomatic relations, just as in our trade, cultural and other relations, we work according to principles, having regard, first of all, for the interests of our country and the revolution, contrary to which we have never acted, and will never do so. We Marxist-Leninists who have come to power have to establish diplomatic relations with the bourgeois-capitalist states, because these relations are in our interests, and theirs, too. These interests are reciprocal. Marxist-Leninists should always remember principles. They cannot trample upon principles because of circumstances which are created in one period or another. We must keep in mind that in the countries where the upper strata of the bourgeoisie are ruling, they are permanently in struggle against the people, the proletariat and the poor peasantry, the urban petty-bourgeoisie. Therefore, both when the socialist country maintains state relations with the bourgeois countries, and when it does not, it must make clear to the peoples that it supports their struggle, that it does not approve the reactionary, anti-popular actions of their rulers.

We Marxist-Leninists must recognize and bear in mind not only the contradictions which exist between the oppressed classes and their oppressors, but also the contradictions which arise between states, that is, between the governments of these countries and American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, the other capitalist countries, etc. We must always pursue such a policy that we do not defend a reactionary government simply because, for its own interests and those of the class in power, it breaks temporarily with American imperialism in order to throw itself into the lap of another imperialism, for example, British, Soviet, or some other imperialism. We must exploit the contradictions which exist among them with the aim that our stand assists the strengthening of the struggle of the proletariat and the oppressed masses of that country against its reactionary government. If contradictions have arisen between the reactionary and oppressive capitalist government of a country of the second or the <<third world>>, and the government of a country of the <<first world>>, according to the division made by the Chinese revisionists, it must not be taken for granted that these contradictions are always in favour of the liberation of the people of this country from the yoke of capital, the yoke of the reactionary bourgeois ruling there. In this case we have to do mainly with bourgeois class interests, with the interests of governments which represent the exploiting classes, with the question of who gives more and who gives less, who best defends their being in power, and who wants to kick them out in order to bring in his own men.

In dealing with the struggle of the proletariat, the stand towards the bourgeoisie must not be confused with the diplomatic, trade, cultural and scientific relations between the socialist country and states with another social system. These interstate relations are necessary and must be developed, but the socialist country should be clear about its aims in establishing them. The ideological, political, moral and material life of the socialist country must be a mirror for the peoples of those states with which it maintains relations, and in which, through the development of these relations, the peoples of the non-socialist states can see the blessings and advantages of the socialist system. Naturally, whether or not they follow the socialist road, is their affair, but it is the duty of the socialist country to set the good example.

On all these political, theoretical, and organizational problems not only are the Chinese leaders unclear but, far from clarifying them, they deliberately make them even more obscure, because, as Mao Tsetung says, we must stir things up in order to clarify them. This thesis is not correct. On the contrary, we must clarify things and convince people to carry out the revolution, because, as for turmoil, this exists already. If the question is to stir things up, then let us stir things up even more for imperialism, which is giving up the ghost, and not to help it and provide it with crutches to keep
it going. We should cut short the existence of capitalism so that the peoples, the proletariat will be liberated and the prospect of socialism and communism will be brought nearer. This is our revolutionary road, the road of Marxism-Leninism. There is no other road. The Chinese leaders formerly used the expression, a tit for tat struggle against American imperialism, but they did not apply it then, and are certainly not applying it today. They are not waging a tit for tat struggle, since they are drawing closer to American imperialism and are in alliance with the United States of America.

China's diplomatic, commercial and cultural relations with the imperialist states and the other states of the world are on a capitalist basis. China's objective in these relations is to strengthen its economic and military positions through the aid it wants to receive from the powerful imperialist states so that it, too, can compete with the other two superpowers. China's propaganda over the radio and by other means is designed to create the impression in the world not only that China is a big, powerful state with an ancient culture, but also that the present Chinese policy is progressive, indeed Marxist-Leninist. However, this activity of the Chinese revisionists does not and cannot by any means serve as an example which the peoples of the world should follow in their struggle to, destroy the capitalist and imperialist power.

**The Chinese View about the Unity of the Third World Is Reactionary**

The Chinese leadership seeks the unity of all the countries of the third world., which are heterogenous from any point of view: in regard to their economic, social and cultural development, the time needed and the road followed by each of them to win that degree of freedom and independence it enjoys today, etc.

But how does China imagine this unity it preaches? The Chinese leadership does not conceive this unity as achieved in the Marxist-Leninist way and in the interests of the revolution and the liberation of the peoples. It sees it from the bourgeois point of view, that is, as a unity by mean's of treaties and agreements concluded and rescinded by the rulers of these countries, who are linked with one imperialist power today, but who tomorrow may denounce the agreements they have themselves concluded in order to link up with another.

The Chinese revisionist leadership forgets that the unity of these national states can be ensured only through the struggle of the proletariat and the working masses of each particular country, in the first place, against the external imperialism which has penetrated into that country, but also against the internal capitalism and reaction.

Only on this basis can the unity of these countries be brought about. Only on this basis can the united front against foreign imperialism, as well as against the kings, the local reactionary bourgeoisie, feudal landlords and dictators, be achieved.

Under capitalism unity is realized only from above, at the top, in order to safeguard the victories of the bourgeoisie and to protect them from the revolution. Whereas genuine unity, a people's unity, must be achieved mainly from below, with the proletariat at the head of this unity.

Of course, the tactics which the proletariat of a country of the so-called third world, or the proletariat of all these countries may employ to unite with other political forces against imperialism cannot be rejected out of hand. The unity of the revolutionary forces even with the bourgeois leadership of a country, at a given moment, when a deep contradiction arises with a foreign imperialism or with a reactionary leadership of one of the countries of the third world, cannot be neglected, either.

All these opportunities and possibilities must be seen and exploited by the revolutionary forces. That is why Lenin says that the aid of the socialist country and the International proletariat should be differentiated and conditional.
The Chinese leaders, however, advocate precisely an unconditional alliance among reactionary governments, allegedly to face up to imperialism. And when they talk against imperialism, they do not mean imperialism is general, but only Soviet social-imperialism.

The weakening of imperialism and capitalism is the main trend of world history today. The efforts of various states to free themselves from the influence of imperialism also constitute another tendency which leads to the weakening of imperialism. But this second tendency, as the Chinese revisionist leadership absolutizes it unconditionally, without making any differentiation among countries, without studying the general and particular situations, does not lead to the correct course of the unity of the peoples in struggle to free themselves from imperialist interference and domination. Likewise, the view of the Chinese revisionists, who consider Europe a continent of "second world" countries, which they put in alliance with the "third world", cannot lead to the correct road, either. This grouping of capitalist states can never be for the general weakening of world capitalism. To say that such a thing can be achieved with the assistance and collaboration of the aristocratic bourgeoisie of Britain, the revanchist bourgeoisie of Western Germany, the cunning French bourgeoisie and the other big capitalist groups, is deplorable naivety.

The supporters of the theory of "three worlds" may claim that, by advocating the unity of these capitalist countries, they intend to weaken imperialism. But which imperialism will this unity weaken? That imperialism with which the theory of "three worlds" calls for the creation of a united front against social-imperialism? That imperialism with which the capitalist countries of Europe are in alliance, despite their contradictions with it? Obviously, advocating the strengthening of this group of states is advocating strengthening the positions of US imperialism, strengthening the positions of the capitalist states of West Europe.

On the other hand, when the Chinese leadership talks about the creation of the alliance between the states of the "second world" and the states of the so-called third world, it means the alliance among the ruling circles of these countries. But to claim that these alliances will help the liberation of the peoples is an idealist, metaphysical, anti-Marxist view. Therefore, to deceive the broad masses of the peoples, who are seeking liberation, with such revisionist theories is a crime committed against the peoples and the revolution.

The Communist Party of China thinks that imperialism does not know, does not see, does not understand and does not exploit the contradictions which exist among the countries that have only just thrown off the yoke of colonialism and have fallen under the yoke of neo-colonialism. The facts show that imperialism exploits these contradictions continuously, every day, to its own advantage. It urges and incites these countries and their peoples to fight one another, to split, to quarrel and fail to achieve unity even on certain specific problems.

Imperialism, too, is waging a life-and-death struggle, striving to prolong its existence and, when it sees that it cannot achieve this through the usual means, then it throws itself into open war and aggression to regain its superiority and hegemony.

The Chinese leaders want to unite the countries of the "third world" not only with one another, but also with the United States of America, against Soviet social-imperialism. In other words, the Chinese revisionists openly tell the peoples of the "third world" that Soviet social-imperialism is their main enemy, therefore, at the present time, they must not rise against US imperialism or against its ally, the reactionary bourgeoisie which is ruling in their own countries. According to the Chinese "theory", the states of the "third world" have to fight not to strengthen their freedom, independence and sovereignty, not for the revolution which overthrows the rule of the bourgeoisie, but for the status quo. It is understandable that, by advocating agreement with the United States of America, contrary to the interests of the revolution and the cause of national liberation, the Chinese revisionists are pushing these states into a treacherous compromise.

The genuine Marxist-Leninist parties have the internationalist duty to encourage and inspire the proletariat and the peoples of all these countries to make the revolution, to rise against foreign and local oppression and enslavement, in whatever form they present themselves. Our Party thinks that this is the only way that the conditions can be created for the peoples to fight both imperialism and
social-imperialism, with which the capitalist bourgeoisie of most of these countries tries of the "third world" is linked in all sorts of ways.

But what does China do? China defends Mobutu and the clique around him in Zaire. Through its propaganda China is trying to create the impression that it is allegedly defending the people of that country against an invasion of mercenaries engineered by the Soviet Union, but in reality it is defending the reactionary Mobutu regime. The Mobutu clique is an agency in the service of US imperialism. Through its propaganda and "pro-Zaire" stand, China is defending Mobutu's alliance with US imperialism, with neocolonialism, and striving to prevent any change in the status quo of that country. The duty of the genuine revolutionaries is not to defend the reactionary rulers, the tools of the imperialists, but to work to inspire the people of Zaire to fight for their freedom and sovereignty against Mobutu, local capital and US, French, Belgian and other imperialisms.

Just as we are against Mobutu in Zaire, we are also against Neto and his abettors in Angola, because the Soviet Union and Neto are doing the same thing in Angola as the United States of America and Mobutu are doing in Zaire. From examination of the development of the situation in the above two states it is obvious how the rivalry between the superpowers over the division of colonies and markets is raging there. We defend neither Neto nor the Soviet Union, but while fighting them, we cannot support US imperialism and its mercenaries, enemies of the Angolan people. In any situation, under any circumstances and at any time, we must support the revolutionary peoples, and, in the case of Zaire and Angola, we must support only the peoples of these two countries in their efforts to throw off the yoke the superpowers are putting around their necks.

What should be recommended to the revolutionaries of Zaire? To make a compromise with Mobutu so that the people of this country will be even more oppressed by imperialism, as the Chinese revisionists advise? No, Marxist-Leninists cannot recommend this sort of compromise to the people of Zaire, or to any other people.

Let us take as an example China's policy in Pakistan. The Pakistan of the khans, where the rich bourgeoisie and the big latifundists have always ruled, has allegedly been an ally of China. China's aid to this country has not been aid in the revolutionary direction. It has assisted the strengthening of Pakistan's reactionary latifundist bourgeoisie which savagely oppresses the people of that country, just as the clique of Nehru, Gandhi and the other reactionary magnates oppresses the Indian people. The government of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was no exception. First, East Pakistan broke away from West Pakistan. India knew how to exploit the great contradictions which existed between the people of East Pakistan and the reactionary bourgeoisie ruling in West Pakistan. It fanned up these contradictions to the point of leading the people of East Pakistan into an insurrection against the Pakistan of Ali Bhutto. At that time in East Pakistan, which took the name of Bangladesh, the government of Mujibur Rahman, who allegedly fought for democracy and the interests of the people, was formed. But one morning Mujibur Rahman was murdered by elements closely linked with US imperialism. Now Ali Bhutto, too, has been toppled. Thus, China's friend and ally, Pakistan's greatest landowner and richest man, has been overthrown by other reactionaries in a coup d'état.

But what is this opposition which came to Power, and who are those who take part in it? This, too, is a reactionary force, made up of the military-men, capitalists and big landowners. Impelled by their class interests and the links they, too, have with the United States of America, the Soviet Union, or China, they are trying to keep the reactionary power firmly in their hands. In these conditions, to speak to the people of Pakistan about close alliance with and support for one or the other bourgeois political force, of replacing one clique of rulers with another, as the Chinese leaders are doing, is not showing them the correct course of the revolution. The correct course is to call on the people, caught between two fires, Bhutto's and his opponents', to kindle the powerful fire of the revolution, to stamp out the two former fires, to overthrow the two cliques of the same mould that exist in Pakistan. In this fight on two flanks the Pakistan people themselves will have to know how to utilize the contradictions.
The same applies to many countries of the so-called third world, or non-aligned world.
Thus the Chinese leadership is having no luck, not only in its alliances and friendship with the Marxist-Leninists, but also in its alliances with the bourgeois-capitalist states. But why is it having no luck? Because its policy is not Marxist-Leninist because the analyses it makes and the deductions it draws from them are wrong. In these conditions, what trust can the peoples of the <<third world>> have in China, which is aiming to take these countries under its wing?

Only the dictatorship of the proletariat, only the Marxist-Leninist ideology, only socialism, engender sincere love, close friendship and steel-like unity among the peoples, by eliminating everything which splits and divides them. In order to create unity and friendship among the peoples, to solve problems in the way that is best and most suitable to their interests, aid and concessions should in no way be granted to such degenerate bourgeoisie as Mobutu, Bhutto, Gandhi and others, alleged for the sake of establishing a political equilibrium which is an expression of the anti-scientific, anti-popular and opportunist theory of <<equilibrium>>, which serves to maintain the status quo and slavery.

We Marxist-Leninists fight against neo-colonialism, against the oppressive capitalist bourgeoisie of any country, that is, against those who oppress the peoples. This struggle can be waged if the genuine communist parties inspire, organize and lead the proletariat and the working masses. Leadership of the proletariat and the masses by the party is successfully achieved only when the party has a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary inspiration and not an equivocal inspiration with a hundred meanings, with a hundred flags. In its actions the Marxist-Leninist party of the genuine socialist country does not proceed only from the interest of its own state, but always takes account of the interest of the world revolution, too.

The Chinese Theory of the <<Third World>>
and the Yugoslav Theory of the <<Non-aligned world>>
Sabotage the Revolutionary Struggle of the Peoples

All the renegades from Marxism-Leninism, the Soviet, Titoite, Chinese and other modern revisionists, are doing their utmost to fight Marxism-Leninism, the triumphant theory of the proletariat. Our Party's exposure of the theory of <<three worlds>> has put the Chinese revisionists in a difficult position, because they are unable to reply to our opposition and exposure theoretical y, and this is not because they are afraid of us, but because they are afraid of their lack of arguments. Mao Tsetung and Teng Hsiao-ping, who enunciated or adopted the notion of the <<third world>>, did not want to support this theory with theoretical argument, for they could not, and this was not without a purpose. Why did they not do this? This <<oversight>> of theirs is a trick and its aim is to deceive people, to make them accept an absurd thesis without discussion, simply because Mao Tsetung produced it. Mao Tsetung could not explain the theoretical basis of this <<philosophical>> or <<political>> notion, because there is no way it can be explained. He and his disciples propagate their concept of the division of the world into three simply by proclaiming it, but without defending it, because they themselves know that this thesis is indefensible.
The Chinese <<third world>> and the Yugoslav <<non-aligned world>> are almost one and the same thing. The aim of both of these <<worlds>> is to provide a theoretical justification for extinguishing the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and to assist the big imperialist and capitalist powers to preserve and perpetuate the bourgeois system of oppression and exploitation.

As a false, anti-Marxist theory, totally devoid of any theoretical basis, the theory of the <<third world>>, the myth the Chinese revisionists have created around it, has no effect at all, either on the broad masses of the proletariat and the suffering peoples in the countries of the third world, or on the leaders of these countries.
These leaders, whom the Chinese leadership is trying to take under its umbrella, have their own deeply implanted views, have their own ideology and definite orientations, therefore the Chinese tales do not go down with them. Teng Hsiao-ping and company think that China with its vast territory and population can impose itself on these countries. To a certain degree, and as long as it does not jeopardize its plans, the Chinese theory of "three worlds" suits American imperialism. This theory fosters the creation of confused situations in the world of which both American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism take advantage to extend their own hegemony, to link together and enter into more alliances and agreements with the capitalist and bourgeois landowner heads of the countries of the so-called third world and make them even tighter. This situation also serves the social-imperialist aims of the Chinese revisionists.

In regard to the theory of the "non-aligned world", the Yugoslav revisionists raise it to a universal theory which is supposed to replace the Marxist-Leninist theory which, in their view, has become "obsolete", is no longer "relevant", because the peoples and the world have allegedly changed. They do not denounce Marxism-Leninism openly, as Carrillo does, but they fight it by defending their theory of the "non-aligned world", whereas those who defend Marxism-Leninism, according to the Yugoslav revisionists, always repeat the same "mistake", they do not agree that the principles and norms of this revolutionary doctrine must be corrected, hence they are "recidivists". According to them, the Party of Labour of Albania (which is the target of their attack) is a "recidivist", party because it wants to apply the scientific principles, methods and doctrine of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin to "a world entirely different from that of their time".

The Titoite views are totally anti-Marxist. And the analysis they make of the process of world development today proceeds from these positions. Modern revisionism, in general, and Yugoslav and Chinese revisionism, in particular, are against the revolution. The Yugoslav and Chinese revisionists consider American imperialism a powerful force which can adopt a more logical course, can "help" the present world which, according to them, is developing and does not want to be aligned. But the Yugoslav theory is unable to make a proper definition of the term "nonaligned" itself. From what point of view are the countries it includes in this world it advocates nonaligned, politically, ideologically, economically or militarily? The Yugoslav pseudo-Marxist theory does not touch on or mention this question, because all these countries, which it is seeking to lead under the guise of a new world, cannot extricate themselves from their many and various forms of dependence on American imperialism or Soviet social-imperialism. The Yugoslav "theory" makes great play with the fact that now the colonialism of the old type has been abolished, in general, but it does not say that many peoples have fallen into the clutches of the new colonialism. We Marxist-Leninists do not deny the fact that colonialism in the old forms has been abolished, but we stress that it has been replaced by neo-colonialism. The same colonialists of yesterday are still oppressing the peoples today, through their economic and military potential, and disorganizing them politically and ideologically by introducing their corrupt way of life.

The Titoites call such a situation a great transformation of the world and add that neither Marx nor Lenin, let alone Stalin, whom they reject altogether, conceived such a possibility. According to them, the peoples are now free, independent, and aspire only to non-alignment, while the wealth of the world should be divided in a more rational and just manner.

For this "aspiration" to be realized, the Yugoslav "theoreticians" ask the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists and the developed capitalist countries, out of the kindness of their hearts to contribute, through international conferences, debates, and the concessions which the countries will make to one another, to the transformation of the present world, which they say, "has reached such a level of consciousness as to be able to go to socialism".

This is the "socialism" the Titoite revisionist preach, a sermon they encourage to distract the peoples as much as possible from the reality. Being against the revolution, they are for the preservation of social peace so that the bourgeoisie and the proletariat can reach agreement on the
improvement of the living standard of the lower classes. That is, they humbly beg the upper classes to become generous and hand out something from their profits to the wretched of the earth.

Tito wants to turn the theory of the non-aligned world into a universal doctrine, which, as we mentioned above, allegedly suits the situation in the world today. The peoples of the world have awakened and want to live free, but according to Tito's theory, this freedom is not complete now because of the existence of the two blocs, the NATO bloc and the Warsaw bloc. Tito poses as the leading figure and standard-bearer of the anti-bloc policy. It is true that his country is not a member of NATO or the Warsaw Treaty, but it is linked with these military organizations by many threads.

The Yugoslav economy and policy are not independent, they are conditioned by the credits, aid and loans they receive from the capitalist countries and, first of all, from American imperialism. That is why he relies mostly on this imperialism. However, Tito also relies on Soviet imperialism and all other big capitalist powers. So Yugoslavia, which claims to be non-aligned is aligned, de facto if not de jure, with the aggressive organizations of the superpowers.

There are many leaders in various countries of the world like Tito, whom he wants to gather together in the so-called non-aligned world. These personalities, in general, are bourgeois, capitalist, non-Marxist, many of whom are fighting the revolution. The labels socialist, democrat, social-democrat, republican, independent republican, etc., that some of these personalities assume, in most cases serve to deceive the proletariat and the oppressed people, in order to keep them in bondage, and play politics at their expense.

Anti-Marxist capitalist ideology prevails in the non-aligned states. Many of these states have links and entanglements with the superpowers and all the developed capitalist countries of the world in the same way as Titoite Yugoslavia. The only basis for the grouping in the non-aligned world, under Tito's leadership, which he advocates for all countries of the world, is the aim and activity to quell the revolution, to stop the proletariat and peoples from rising in insurrection to overthrow the old capitalist society and establish the new society, socialism.

This is the idea and the main principle which guides Tito in bringing these countries together. He pretends that he has managed to group them together and assume the leadership of them, but in fact, no such thing exists, as nobody gives the Titoite theory of the non-aligned world, or the Chinese theory of three worlds, the importance which their standard-bearers desire and strive for. Everybody goes his own way on the road that brings him the greatest and most immediate gains.

All the indications show that American imperialism and world capitalism prefer the, non-aligned world of Tito rather than the third world of the Chinese. Although they support the Chinese theory of three worlds, the developed capitalist countries and American imperialism are, however, a bit wary and hesitant, because the strengthening of China may lead to undesirable situations and eventually become dangerous to the Americans themselves. Whereas the non-aligned world of Tito poses no danger at all to the United States of America. That is why, during Tito's last visit to the United States of America, Carter extolled his role in creating the non-aligned world and described the movement of the non-aligned countries as a very important factor in solving the major problems of the present-day world.

The non-aligned countries, most of which are capitalist countries, have cast the dice. They know how to manoeuvre in politics, and they side with those imperialist and capitalist powers which give them most aid. According to the bourgeois and capitalist view, to engage in politics means to deceive, to trick, to outwit the others as heavily and as often as possible. This policy is a policy of prostitution, which, in certain moments and according to passing circumstances, is aimed at getting at least a little hard cash from a more powerful state in the interest of one's class, in the interest of the bosses of this class. Titoism, with its theory of the non-aligned world, preaches precisely this policy. But it does not have the same orientation everywhere, as Tito makes out. The non-aligned states do not consult Tito as to what they should do and how they should act.
With a few exceptions, the rulers of these states are trying to consolidate their capitalist power, to exploit the people, to be on friendly terms with a big imperialist country, to prevent or suppress the outburst of any people's revolt and insurrection, any revolution. This is the whole policy of the Titoite <<non-aligned world>>. The Chinese theory of the <<third world>> is also for the status quo. The purpose of the Titoite <<non-aligned world>> is to beg credits from American imperialism and the other capitalist countries to enrich the bourgeois class and keep it in power. With its theory of the<<third world>>, China, too, wants to enrich itself, to strengthen itself economically and militarily in order to become a superpower, to dominate the world. The aims of both these worlds. are anti-Marxist. They are pro-capital, pro-American imperialism.

As Tito's visit to China and Hua Kuo-feng's visit to Yugoslavia showed, the Yugoslavia revisionists are lavishing praises and cunning flattery on China, well-adapted to the character, of the Chinese revisionists and intended to lure them to the Yugoslav positions, so that the theory of the <<non-aligned countries>>, will find not only understanding, but also complete acceptance in Peking. Although they do not renounce their theory of the <<third world>>, the Chinese revisionist leaders, headed by Hua Kuo-feng and Teng Hsiao-ping, have come out in open support of the Titoite theory of the<<non-aligned world>>. They have demonstrated that they want to work closely with the Yugoslav revisionists along the same lines, on two parallel rails, with the anti-Marxist common aim of deceiving the peoples of the <<third world>>. The Yugoslav leaders are now elaborating these views in defence of China. In defending it, however, they have raised some arguments- which are offensive to China, as the megalomaniac state it is. The Titoite come out in support of China and defend it against the exposure which our Party makes of the Chinese leadership, by saying that China's present policy is allegedly realistic.

China, say the Yugoslavs, is a big country, which from its very nature has to be developed, as it is still backward, a developing country. The Marxist-Leninist parties, such as the Party of Labour of Albania, are wrong, the Titoites claim, when they attack China over its just aspirations to development and non-alignment, over the aid it gives national liberation wars, etc., etc. Yugoslavia has the ambition to make China one of its satellites. For the Yugoslav revisionists the important thing is that China should adopt their anti-Marxist views without any hesitation.

With the theory of the <<non-aligned world>>, Yugoslavia, with Tito at the head, has always faithfully served American imperialism. Tito and his group are performing this kind of service now, too, by trying to push China towards rapprochement and alliance with the United States of America. This was the main aim of Tito's going to Peking and of his talks there, which resulted in a close friendship, which, with Hua Kuo-feng's visit to Yugoslavia, has taken the form of wideranging collaboration, not only between the two states, but also between the two parties. During Tito's visit to Peking, the Chinese leaders half admitted that the League of Communists of Yugoslavia was a Marxist-Leninist party and that genuine socialism was being built in Yugoslavia. When Hua Kuo-feng went to Belgrade, they stated this completely and officially.

In other words, the Maoists have done just what Mikoyan and Khrushchev did in their time, when they gave Tito full recognition as a <<Marxist>>, and declared that <<socialism is being built in Yugoslavia>> and that the <<Communist Party of Yugoslavia is a Marxist-Leninist party>>.

The United States of America pulls either the Tito string, or the Hua Kuo-feng and Teng Hsiao-ping strings, according to its wishes. This pair are marionettes which do not come out openly on the stages of children's theatres, but remain in disguise and, when their theories are attacked and they find no facts to back their arguments, they declare that <<they do not engage in polemics>>! Why do they not engage in polemics with socialist Albania, when it and the Marxist-Leninist Party of Labour expose them badly before world opinion? What are they waiting for? They do not engage in polemics because they fear that their treacherous game against Marxism-Leninism and the revolution will be exposed. When the Chinese leaders, through the Yugoslavs and others, say that China will not reply to the Albanian polemics, their purpose is to cover up the truth.
The United States of America, the Soviet Union and other capitalist countries are continually holding various bilateral, or multilateral meetings, all kinds of conferences, congresses, adopting resolutions, making speeches and organizing press conferences, telling many lies and spreading false hopes, making threats and resorting to blackmail. All these things are being done to get out of the crisis in which they are bogged down, to suppress the feelings of revenge of the suffering oppressed peoples, to outwit the broad working masses and the proletariat, and deceive the progressive democrats. The Yugoslav and Chinese revisionists, too, are playing their cards in all this devious and filthy game.

The theory of the <<developing world>> is also, one of the cards of this game which has the same anti-Marxist aim of befuddling people's minds. This theory makes no mention of political problems because to do so would be in vain. Only the <<economic problem>> and the <<problem of development>> in general exist for this theory. But what kind of development the theory of the <<developing world>> is after, this nobody defines. Naturally, the various countries of the world want to develop in the economic, political, cultural, and all other fields. The peoples of the world, with the proletariat at the head, want to overthrow the old, rotten, bourgeois capitalist world and build the new world, socialism, in its place. But the theories of the ,non-aligned world. and the developing world. make no mention of this world. When we Marxist-Leninists speak of the various countries, we also give our opinions of them, make assessments of the level of development of one country or the other, of the possibilities of each state to develop in this direction. We say that the people of each country must carry out the revolution and build the new society, relying on their own forces. We say that in order to be free, independent and sovereign, every state must build a new society, must fight and overthrow its oppressors, must fight any imperialism which enslaves it, must gain and defend its political, economic and cultural rights, and build a completely free, completely independent homeland where the working class must rule in alliance with all the working masses. This is what we say and we are resolute defenders of the Leninist thesis about two worlds. We are members of the new socialist world and we are fighting the old c world to the death.

All other <<theories>> which divide the world into the <<first world>>, <<Second world>>, <<third world>>, <<non-aligned world>>,<< developing world>> or any other <<world>> which may be invented in the future, serve capitalism, serve the hegemony of the great powers, serve their aims of keeping the peoples in bondage. This is why we combat these these reactionary anti-Marxist theories with all our strength.

The whole world and, especially, the countries of the so-called third world, non-aligned world, or developing world are following the struggle of our Party with sympathy. In our Marxist-Leninist views, in the ideological and political stand of our Party, the peoples of these countries whom the Chinese, Titoite and Soviet revisionist theories, and the theories of American imperialism, etc., are intended to deceive, see a correct stand which corresponds to the correct course for their liberation from oppression and exploitation once and for all. Precisely because of this the enemies of Marxism-Leninism and our Party try to level the accusation at us that we are sectarian, ultra-leftist, Blanquist., that we do not make a correct analysis of the international situation but stick to some outmoded schemata, etc. It is clear that they are referring to our revolutionary doctrine, which they call <<Marxist-Leninist schematism>>,<<Stalinist schematism>>, etc.

They accuse us of allegedly calling on the countries which have escaped from the form of exploitation by old colonialism and which have entered the form of exploitation of the new colonialism, to go over immediately to socialism, to carry out the proletarian revolution immediately. They think they are striking a blow at us with this, by presenting us as adventurers.
But our Party stands loyal to the Marxist-Leninist theory, the theory which has correctly defined the road of the revolution, the stages this revolution must go through, and the conditions which must be fulfilled for this revolution, either national-democratic and anti-imperialist or socialist, to be carried out successfully. We stood loyal to this theory during our Anti-fascist National Liberation War, we are standing loyal to it now, in the construction of socialism, we stand loyal to it in our ideological struggle and foreign policy. Our analysis is correct, therefore no calumny can shake it.

II

CHINA'S PLAN TO BECOME A SUPERPOWER

In the beginning, while analysing the global strategy of US imperialism and Soviet socialimperialism for world domination, while analysing the emergence and development of the different variants of modern revisionism, as well as the struggle of all these enemies against Marxism-Leninism and the revolution, we also dwelt on the place and strategy of Chinese revisionism. China styles its political line Marxist-Leninist, but the reality shows the opposite. It is precisely the true nature of this line that we MarxistLeninists must lay bare. We must not allow the Chinese revisionist theories to pass for Marxist theories, we must not allow China, on the course it has adopted, to pose as if it is fighting for the revolution, whereas in reality it is against it. With the policy China is pursuing, it is becoming even more obvious that it is trying to strengthen the positions of capitalism at home and to establish its hegemony in the world, to become a great imperialist power, so that it, too, occupies, so to say, the <<place it deserves>>.

History shows that every big capitalist country aims to become a great world power, to overtake and surpass the other great powers, and compete with them for world domination. The roads the big bourgeois states have followed to turn into imperialist powers have been various; they have been conditioned by definite historical and geographical circumstances, by the development of the productive forces, etc. The road of the United States of America is different from that followed by the old European powers like Britain, France and Germany, which were formed as such on the basis of colonial occupations.

After the Second World War, the United States of America was left the greatest capitalist power. On the basis of the great economic and military potential it possessed, and through the development of neo-colonialism, it was transformed into an imperialist superpower. But before long another superpower was added to this, the Soviet Union, which after Stalin's death and after the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism by the Khrushchevite leadership, was transformed into an imperialist superpower. For this purpose it exploited the great economic, technical and military potential built up by socialism.

We are now witnessing the efforts of another big state, today's China, to become a super power because it, too, is proceeding rapidly on the road of Capitalism. But China lacks colonies, lacks large-scale developed industry, lacks a strong economy in general, and a great thermo-nuclear potential on the same scale as the other two imperialist superpowers.

To become a superpower it is absolutely essential to have a developed economy, an army equipped with atomic bombs, to ensure markets and spheres of influence, investment of capital in foreign countries, etc. China is bent on ensuring these conditions as quickly as possible. This was expressed in Chou En-lai's speech in the People's Assembly in 1975 and was repeated at the 11th Congress of the Communist Party of China, where it was proclaimed that, before the end of this century, China will become a powerful modern country, with the objective of catching up with the United States of America and the Soviet Union. Now this whole plan has been extended and set out in precise detail in what is called the policy of the <<four modernizations>>. But what road has China chosen so that it, too, will become a superpower?
At present, the colonies and markets in the world are occupied by others. The creation of an economic and military potential equal to that of the Americans and Soviets, within 20 years, and with their own forces, as the Chinese leaders claim they will do, is impossible.

In these conditions, in order to become a superpower, China will have to go through two main phases: first, it must seek credits and investments from US imperialism and the other developed capitalist countries, purchase new technology in order to exploit its local wealth, a great part of which will go as dividends for the creditors. Second, it will invest the surplus value extracted at the expense of the Chinese people in states of various continents, just as the US imperialists and Soviet social-imperialists are doing today.

China's efforts to become a superpower are based, in the first place, on its choice of allies and the creation of alliances. Two superpowers exist in the world today, US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. The Chinese leaders worked out that they must rely on US imperialism, on which they have pinned great hopes of getting assistance in the fields of the economy, finance, technology and organization, as well as in the military field. In fact, the economic-military potential of the United States of America is greater than that of Soviet social-imperialism. This the Chinese revisionists know well, though they say that America is declining. On the course which they are following, they cannot rely on a weak partner, from which they cannot gain much. Precisely because it is powerful, they have chosen the United States of America to be their ally.

The alliance with the United States of America and the accommodation of the Chinese policy to the policy of US imperialism also has other aims. it contains in itself the threat against Soviet social-imperialism, which is plain from the deafening propaganda and the feverish activity the Chinese leaders are carrying out against the Soviet Union. With this policy it is pursuing, China is letting the revisionist Soviet Union know that its links with the United States of America constitute a colossal force against it, in case an imperialist war breaks out.

The present-day Chinese policy is also aimed at establishing friendships and alliances with all at the other developed capitalist countries, from which it seeks political and economic benefits. China wants and is trying to strengthen the US alliance with these countries of the second world., as it calls them. It is encouraging their unity with, or more accurately, their subjection to, US imperialism, which it regards as its senior partner.

This is the explanation for all those close links that the Chinese government is bent on establishing with all the wealthy capitalist states, Japan, West Germany, Britain, France, etc., this is the explanation for the frequent visits to China of government economic, cultural and scientific delegations from the United States of America and all the other developed capitalist countries, whether republics or kingdoms, as well as the visits of the Chinese delegations to those countries. This is the explanation for China's systematic actions to demonstrate its stand in favour of the United States of America and the other industrialized capitalist states at every opportunity, by trying to bring to notice everything that is written, said and done in these states against Soviet social-imperialism.

This policy of the Chinese leaders cannot fail to attract attention and find due support from the United States of America. As is known, at the time of the Second World War in the American State Department there were two lobbies over the Chinese issue: one pro Chiang Kai-shek and the other pro Mao Tsetung. Of course, at that time the Chiang Kal-shek lobby triumphed in the American State Department and Senate, while the Mao Tsetung lobby triumphed on the spot, in mainland China. Among the inspirers of this lobby were Marshall and Vandemeyer, Edgar Snow and others, who became friends and advisers of the Chinese, the instigators and inspirers of all kinds of organizations in new China. Today the threads of those old ties are being revived, strengthened, intensified and materialized. Now everybody sees that China and the United States of America are drawing ever closer to each other. Some time ago, one of the best-informed American newspapers, <<The Washington Post>>, wrote: <<There is now an American consensus which is supported even by the Right, even by those who have little sympathy for Peking.>>
According to this consensus, whatever might have happened in the past, there is no, longer any reason for China to be considered a threat to the United States of America. Except for Taiwan, there are few things on which the two governments are not in agreement. In fact, both sides have agreed to put aside the Taiwan question with the aim of gaining advantage in other fields.

The issue of Taiwan which is raised in the relations between China and the United States of America, has remained something formal. China is not insisting on this question now. It is not worried about Hong-Kong and is not in the least concerned that Macao is still under the domination of the Portuguese. The Chinese government does not accept the offer of the new Portuguese government to restore this colony to China, saying that *(a gift is not taken back..* The existence of these colonies is an anachronism, but this does not upset the pragmatic policy of the Chinese leaders. So long as Hong-Kong and Macao remain colonies, why should Taiwan, too, not be a colony? Apparently China is greatly interested that Taiwan should remain as it is in the future, too. Besides its open relations it carries on in the light of the day, it is interested in developing its disguised trafficking with the American imperialists, the British, Japanese and other imperialists.

Therefore, the nonsense Teng Hsiao-ping and Li Hsien-nien try to put across that Sino-American relations allegedly depend on the stand of the Americans towards Taiwan, is nothing but a smoke-screen to conceal the course on which China has set out towards rapprochement with the United States of America in order to become a superpower.

Carter has declared that the United States of America will establish diplomatic relations with China. As far as Taiwan is concerned, it will adopt Japan's stand, i.e., formally it will break off diplomatic relations with the island, without breaking off economic and cultural relations, and under cover of them, military relations. In fact, China is interested in the military relations of the United States of America with Taiwan. It wants the United States of America to maintain forces in Taiwan, Japan, South Korea and the Indian Ocean, because it thinks that this is to China's advantage, for thus a counter-weight is created against the Soviet Union.

All these stands are connected with the course the Chinese leadership has chosen for China to become a superpower, by trying to develop its economy and increase its military potential through credits and investments from the United States of America and other big capitalist countries. It justifies this course by claiming that it is allegedly applying a correct policy, the <<Marxist>> line of Mao Tsetung, according to whom <<China ought to benefit from the world's great successes, new patents and technologies, making foreign things serve its internal development>>, etc. The articles of <<Renmin Ribao>> and the speeches of the Chinese leaders are full of such slogans. According to the Chinese concept, to benefit from the inventions and industrial achievements of other states means to take credits and accept investments from the United States of America, Japan, West Germany, France, Britain and all the other capitalist countries, for which it is lavish with praise.

The Chinese leaders have adopted the revisionist theories that big countries such as China, which have many assets, can take credits from American imperialism or any powerful capitalist state, trust or bank, because they allegedly have the possibilities to repay the credits. The Yugoslav revisionists have come out in defence of this view. By advertising their experience of the <<construction of specific socialism>> with aid from the world financial oligarchy and especially US capital, they are providing the example and encouraging China to proceed on this course without hesitation.

The big countries may repay the credits they receive, but the imperialist investments which are made in these big states, such as the revisionist Soviet Union, China, or anywhere else, cannot fall to leave grave neo-colonialist consequences.

The wealth and toil of the peoples are exploited also in the interest of the foreign capitalist concerns and monopolies. The American imperialists, as well as the developed capitalist states of Western Europe or Japan, which are making investments in China and in the revisionist countries, intend to dig themselves in there, to interlock the concerns of their countries in close collaboration with the trusts and branches of the main industries in these countries.
The question of capital investment by imperialist states in China is not so simple as the revisionists strive to make out when they call this penetration of capital into their countries harmless because, allegedly, it is not coming in through interstate relations (although top Chinese leaders have recently declared that they will accept government credits from abroad), but through private banks and companies without political implications and interests. The incurring of heavy debts by any country, big or small, to one imperialism or another, is always fraught with unavoidable dangers to the freedom, independence and sovereignty of the country which embarks on this course, especially of economically poor countries such as China. A true socialist country has no need to incur such debts. It finds the resources for its economic development at home, in its wealth, in its internal accumulation and in the creative force of the people. The example of Albania, a small country, shows very clearly what inexhaustible means, resources and capacities a socialist country has for its development. And the means and resources of a big country are much greater still, if it marches consistently on the road of MarxismLeninism.

The opening up of the Chinese market to American imperialism and the big American and other Western companies has been welcomed with unrestrained delight by the imperialists of the United States of America and all the international bourgeoisie. The multinational companies, the industrialists of the United States of America, have a good knowledge of China's economy and its great assets, therefore they are doing their utmost to build up their economic network there, to set up joint companies and extract large profits. Not only the big American companies but also the companies of Japan, Germany and the other developed capitalist countries are operating in China in this way. China has already concluded a contract with Japan for the delivery of up to 10 million tons of oil per year. A big team of representatives of the Italian ENI went to China to offer licences for Oil prospecting instruments there, but they found themselves forstalled by large groups from the American oil companies which had earlier entered into agreements with China on the joint extraction and exploitation of oil. This is what China is doing also in other mining sectors like iron and other minerals, large resources of which are already known or may be discovered there. The German coal magnates are now in China and have concluded contracts worth scores of billions of marks. Chinese ministers are going back and forth to Japan, America and Europe in order to get credits, to sign contracts for modern technological equipment, to buy modern weapons, to conclude technical-scientific agreements, etc. The doors of all Chinese institutions and enterprises have been opened to the businessmen from Tokyo, Wall-Street and the European Common Market, who are hurrying to Peking, vying with one another to secure contracts for the large <<modernization>> projects the Chinese government is offering them. In this way China, too, is entering the whirlpool of imperialist greed, the great imperialist hunger for minerals and raw materials, and the exploitation of Chinese labour power.

Everyone knows that the capitalist does not give anyone aid without first considering his own economic, political and ideological interests. It is not simply a question of the percentage of profit he makes. Along with the credit it gives, the capitalist country also introduces its way of life, its capitalist way of thinking, into the country which receives its <<aid>>, it sets up bases and spreads out insidiously, like oil in cabbage, expands its spider's web with the spider always there in the centre, ready to suck the blood of all the flies which become entangled in its web, as has happened with Yugoslavia and is happening now with the Soviet Union. The same will happen with China, too. Consequently, China will give way, as it is doing already, on political and ideological questions, and the Chinese market will become a very important debouché for American imperialism and the other industrialized capitalist powers.

The American, West-German, Japanese and other credits and investments in China cannot fail to affect its independence and sovereignty to one degree or another. Such credits make every recipient state dependent, for the lender imposes his own policy on it. Therefore, any state, big or small, which gets caught up in the mechanism of imperialism suffers curtailment or loss of its political freedom, its independence and sovereignty.
Even the Soviet Union has been reduced to this state of curtailed sovereignty, although when it embarked on the course of the restoration of capitalism, it was far more powerful economically and militarily than present-day China, which is setting out on the same course.

Naturally, when they get themselves caught up in the mechanism of imperialism, the small countries lose their freedom and independence more quickly than big countries like China and the Soviet Union, which may lose them more gradually, not only because they have greater economic and military potential, but also because, relying on this potential, they struggle to protect their markets and seize new ones, to create and expand their spheres of influence in order to bring pressure to bear upon one another, and even go to war when they find no other way out. But still this does not save them from the chains of the credits and investments which bind them hand and foot. The credits must be repaid with interest. However, when you are unable to pay them, you will incur new debts. Debts pile up and the capitalist demands his payment and when you cannot pay he will put the pressure on you. The American monopoly companies, for example, which impose their policy on the government, force it to protect their capital by every means, even to declare war, if need be, to defend them.

Judging by the zeal the Chinese leaders are displaying in their attempts to base themselves on American imperialism, on the capitalists of the United States of America, for the development of the economy of their country, all their deafening clamour about the weakening of this imperialism falls flat. Their allegations about the weakening of American imperialism are only a bluff, like their declaration about relying on their own forces. The Chinese revisionists think the opposite of what they say, as everybody can see from their practice.

The official Chinese newspapers often voice their concern about the credits the social-imperialist Soviet Union receives from the American, WestGerman, Japanese and other banks. They warn the United States of America and the other developed capitalist countries to be careful because the Soviet Union uses the technological assistance and credits they provide to develop and strengthen its economic and military potential, and that this aid and these credits increase the danger threatening them from social-imperialism, which, according to the Chinese leaders, today has taken the place of the Third Reich. Therefore, they call for these credits to be cut off as soon as possible.

The Chinese press speaks in the same terms as Strauss, the notorious West-German nazi and revanchist.

It is not difficult to deduce the real meaning of the <<concern>> which the Chinese leaders display about the credits which the Soviet Union receives. Naturally, they are not worried about the capitalist nature of these credits, nor about the danger they pose to the sovereignty of the Soviet state. But they want to tell the magnates of American capital and the government of the United States of America, the capitalists and the governents of the other imperialist countries, that they must give these credits and this aid not to the Soviet Union, but to China, which is no source of danger to them, but a source of profits. This is one aspect of the Chinese plan to become a superpower. The other aspect is the attempts to dominate the less developed countries of the world, to become the leader of what China calls the <<third world>>.

The group ruling today in China lays great stress on the <<third world>> in which, not fortuitously and not without a purpose, it includes China, too. The <<third world>> of the Chinese revisionists has a well-defined political aim. It is part of the strategy which aims at transforming China into a superpower as quickly as possible. China wants to rally round itself all the countries of the <<third world>> or the non-aligned. countries or the <<developing countries>>, in order to create a large force, which will not only increase the overall Chinese potential but will also help China to counterpose itself to the other two superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, to carry greater weight in the bargaining over the division of markets and spheres of influence, to gain the true status of an imperialist superpower.
China is trying to realize its aim of rallying as many states of the world as possible round itself under the slogan that it is allegedly for the liberation of the peoples from neo-colonialism, and their transition to socialism through the struggle against imperialism. China speaks about this imperialism somewhat in the abstract but it emphasizes that Soviet imperialism is the most dangerous.

China has launched this demagogic slogan, devoid of any theoretical content, in the hope of using it as a means to realize its hegemonic aims. As a start, it intends to establish Chinese domination over the so-called third world and then to manipulate this <<world>> for its own imperialist interests. For the time being, China is trying to conceal this with its reputation as a socialist country. It is speculating with the assumption that a socialist country could have no intentions of enslaving or leading others by the nose, of blackmailing, fighting, oppressing and exploiting them. It is using this slogan and backing it up with the reputation that the Communist Party of China, created by the <<great>> Mao Tsetung, is allegedly a Marxist-Leninist party which faithfully adheres to the theory of Marx and Lenin, a theory which is against all the evils of the capitalist system, colonial exploitation, etc. Disguised as something which it is not, hiding behind the phrase the <<third world>>, and including itself without any criterion or class definition in this <<world>>, China thinks that it will more easily realize its strategic aim of establishing its hegemony over this world. The Soviet Union has practised the same deception on other countries. All the Khrushchevite revisionists prate night and day that they are <<communists>> and that their parties are <<genuine Marxist-Leninist parties>>. The Soviet revisionists also are trying to establish their hegemony over the world under this disguise. Consequently, we may say that there is no essential difference between the actions of the Chinese and those of Soviet social-imperialists.

All this development of the Chinese policy and actions fully confirms the description Marxism-Leninism gives of imperialism as the domination of the financial oligarchy which is bent on capturing markets, dominating the world and establishing its hegemony everywhere. On this road, China too is trying to penetrate and get a foothold in the countries of the <<third world>>. But this <<foothold>> has to be gained through great sacrifices. To penetrate the <<third world>>, to capture markets, requires capital. The ruling classes in power in the countries of the <<third world>> want investments, credits and <<aid>>. However, China is not in a position to give them. It is on a large scale, because it does not have the necessary economic potential. It is precisely this potential that it is now trying to build up with the aid of American imperialism. In these conditions, the bourgeoisie ruling in the countries of the <<third world>> is well aware that, for the time being, it cannot gain much from China economically, technologically, or militarily. It can gain more from American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism which have great economic, technical and military potential.

However, like every country with imperialist aims, China is fighting and will fight harder still for markets in the world. It is striving and will strive harder still to spread its influence and extend its domination. These plans are apparent even now. China is opening its own banks, not only in Hong Kong, where it has had them for a long time, but also in Europe and elsewhere. It will strive especially to open banks in and export capital to the countries of <<the third>> world. For the present it is doing very little in this field. China's <<aid>> amounts to the building of some cement factory, railway, or hospital, for its possibilities are limited. Only when the American, Japanese and other investments in China begin to yield the fruits it desires, that is, when its economy, trade and military technology are developed, will China be able to embark on a venture of real large-scale economic expansion. But to achieve this, time is needed.

Until that time it will have to manoeuvre, as it has begun doing already, by means of a policy of aid and credits either interest-free or at low rates of interest, at a time when the Soviets and Americans are demanding much higher interest rates. As long as Chinese capital cannot flow out of its country, the revisionist Chinese leadership will focus its attention on the propaganda aspect of the small amount of <<aid>> and credits it accords the <<developing countries>>, extolling its
<<internationalist character>> and <<disinterested aims>>, accompanying this with the motto of <<self-reliance>> for the liberation and construction of one's country.

The more China develops economically and militarily, the more it will want to penetrate into and dominate the small and less developed countries by means of its exports of capital, and then it will no longer charge a 1-2 percent interest for its credits, but will act like all the others.

But all these plans and efforts cannot be carried out easily. The developed imperialist and capitalist countries, which have influence in the countries of the so-called third world, will not allow China to capture the markets they conquered long ago through predatory wars, so easily. Not only are they strongly defending their old positions but they are also trying in every way to capture new ones, and are not allowing China to lay its hand on these countries.

Imperialism is ruthless towards any of its partners, when it is in difficulties or when it is flourishing. Sometimes, from necessity and in order to make greater profits, it may make some concession, but mostly it tries to reinforce its chains, not only a weak countries, but also against the developed ones, like the industrialized capitalist states. For example, the United States of America has always pursued this policy towards its capitalist allies, when they have found themselves in difficulties in the imperialist wars that have broken out amongst them. But even after these wars, when they have been making efforts to recover, American imperialism has done its utmost to prevent them from penetrating into the other countries of the world, where it had established its domination. Thus, after the Second World War, the United States of America, while pretending to assist Britain and France, which had emerged from the war weakened, penetrated deeply into the markets of the sterling, franc and other areas. The American monopolies and cartels of metallurgy, chemicals, transport and many other branches of vital importance for the development of capitalism, penetrated the monopolies and cartels of Britain, France, etc., in overwhelming proportions, making these countries subservient to American imperialism. This savage and insatiable imperialism, as any other imperialism, cannot act otherwise with China, either.

Taking account of the difficulties of economic and military penetration into the countries of the <<third world>>, China thinks that its hegemony over them may be secured by establishing its political and ideological influence. It thinks that this will be attained by operating in three directions: to refrain from fighting American imperialism and the ruling cliques in the capitalist counties, to enter into alliance with this imperialism and these cliques instead; to combat Soviet social-imperialism which it has on its borders, in order to weaken and destroy its bases in Asia, Africa and Latin America; to deceive the proletariat and the long-suffering peoples of these continents by means of pseudo-revolutionary and pseudo-socialist demagogy and manoeuvres, while undermining any revolutionary liberation movement.

American imperialism and the other imperialist powers, together with social-imperialism, are well aware of these aims of China's. The countries of the third world. also understand them, hence they are suspicious of China and see that it is working a bluff with them, that its aim is not to support and assist them, but to become a superpower itself. Most of the leaderships which are ruling in the countries of the so-called third world, have long been linked closely with American imperialism or with the developed capitalist powers, such as Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, Japan etc. Therefore China's flirtation with the <<third world>> does not worry the developed imperialist and capitalist states in the least.

China's efforts to join the <<third world>> through its policy and its ideology, the so-called Mao Tsetung thought, cannot succeed, also, because its ideology and political line are chaotic. The political line of China is confused, it is a pragmatic line which wavers and changes according to passing circumstances and momentary interests. The ruling classes in the states of the <<third world>> are not afraid of this ideology, because they understand that it is not for the revolution and the true national liberation of the peoples. In order to exercise its oppression and exploitation of these peoples more easily, the bourgeoisie in these countries has created its own parties under all sorts of labels. These parties, which are closely linked with the foreign capital invested in the states of the so-called third world, have no difficulty in combating and exposing the Chinese line.
Therefore, the Chinese revisionist leaders have chosen a course of smiles towards the parties of these countries and are trying in every way and in every instance to be <<as sweet as honey>> with them.

Having its plan to dominate the <<third world>>, China is doing its best to channel the movements of the working masses in that <<world>> in its own interests. Today, however, the oppressed peoples, with the proletariat at the head, are no longer in the situation they were at the end of the 19th century or the beginning of the 20th century. They oppose any policy of hegemony and subjugation by the big imperialist powers, old or new, whether American, Soviet or Chinese. Today, the broad masses of the peoples of the world, in general, have awakened and, through their struggles, have managed in one way or another to gain a certain consciousness about defending their economic and political rights. The peoples of the so-called third world cannot fail to see that China is working not to carry the ideas of the revolution and national liberation to their countries, but to extinguish the revolution, which hinders the penetration of Chinese influence. The Chinese course of the alliance with the United States of America and the other neo-colonialist countries also exposes Chinese social-imperialism in the eyes of the peoples.

China cannot carry on positive revolutionary propaganda in the countries of the <<third world>>, also, because it would come into collision with that superpower from which it is hoping to get investments of capital in China and advanced technology. China cannot conduct such propaganda, also, because the revolution would overthrow precisely those reactionary cliques ruling in a number of countries of the so-called third world, which China is supporting and helping to stay in power.

The great ambition of the Chinese leaders to transform their country into a superpower as soon as possible and to establish its hegemony everywhere, especially in the so-called third world, has impelled them to make incitement of inter-imperialist war the basis of their strategy and foreign policy. They greatly desire a frontal clash between the United States of America and the Soviet Union in Europe, during which China, from a comfortable distance away, would warm its hands at the atomic holocaust that would destroy its two main rivals and leave it the all-powerful, sole ruler of the world.

Until it feels strong enough to compete with the other superpowers, until it wins the <<place it deserves>> as a superpower, China will seek peace for itself and war for the others. Connected with their present need for peace are the overt diplomatic manoeuvres of the Chinese revisionists to incite war between the United States of America and the Soviet Union in such a way that they themselves can keep out of it and get on with their <<modernizations>>. Teng Hsiao-ping’s declaration that there will be no war within 20 years, is not fortuitous. With this he wants to tell the superpowers and the other imperialist countries, not to be afraid of China during these 20 years. At the same time, the Chinese leaders are inciting war between the superpowers in Europe, far from China and the danger of its involvement in it. To what extent this will be possible is another matter. But the Chinese leaders are working in this direction, because they feel the indispensable need for peace for the period they think they need for the realization of their aims of transforming China into a superpower.

China is loudly advocating the strengthening of <<European unity>>, <<the unity of the developed capitalist countries of Europe>>. It supports this unity on all questions, presuming to teach the old wolves and foxes how they should strengthen their military and economic unity, their state organizational unity, etc., in face of the great danger from Soviet social-imperialism. But they have no need for these lessons from China because they are in a position to know, and do know very well, where the danger comes from. The developed countries of the West are not so naive as to apply the Chinese advice and desires <<a la lettre>>. They are strengthening themselves to cope with an eventual danger from the Soviet Union, but at the same time, they are also making considerable efforts not to aggravate their relations with it, not to go too far and anger the <<Russian bear>>. This, naturally, runs contrary to China’s desire.
China's incitement of their contradictions with the Soviets is to the liking of the capitalist states and the United States of America, because it enables them to tell the Soviets indirectly, <<Your main enemy is China, whereas we, together with you, want to establish détente, peaceful coexistence, irrespective of what China says>>.

On the other hand, while making believe that they want peace, these states are arming themselves to strengthen their hegemony and military unity against their main enemy - the revolution. This is the aim of all the meetings, such as those of Helsinki and Belgrade, which drag on and on endlessly, like the Vienna Congress after the defeat of Napoleon, which is known as the congress of balls and soirées.

The Chinese leaders, as Teng Hsiao-ping declared officially in the interview he gave the director of AFP, are calling for the creation of a <<broad front which will include the third world, the second world and the United States of America>>, in order to combat Soviet social-imperialism.

The strategy of the revisionist leadership of China of instigating US imperialism, Western Europe, etc., to war against Soviet social-imperialism is fraught with the danger of a war between China and the Soviet Union rather than a war between the Soviet Union and the United States of America and its NATO allies.

What China is doing by inciting the others to war is precisely what US imperialism, the developed capitalist countries and all the other countries, where bourgeois capitalist cliques are in power, are doing, too, in inciting both China and the Soviet Union against each other.

Therefore, it is most likely that the policy of the United States of America and the wrong strategy of China itself, may impel the Soviet Union to increase its military strength even further, and as the imperialist power it is, to attack China first.

On its part, China has a marked inclination to attack the Soviet Union when it feels strong enough, because it has great territorial ambitions towards Siberia and other territories in the Far East. It raised these territorial claims long ago, but it will push its claims rather more when it is ready, when it has built up an army equipped with all kinds of weapons. This is the implication in Hua Kuo Feng's statement to the former conservative Prime Minister of Britain, Heath, when he said: <<We hope that we shall see a united and powerful Europe; we believe that on its part Europe, too, hopes to see a powerful China>>. In a word, Hua Kuo-feng says to the big European bourgeoisie: <<Build up your strength and attack: the Soviet Union from the West, while we the Chinese, will strengthen ourselves and attack it from the East>>.

The Chinese policy opened up a broad and very profitable avenue for the United States of America, an avenue which was initially opened up, by Mao Tsetung, Chou En-lai and Nixon. Many bridges were built between the United States of America and China, camouflaged bridges, but effective and fruitful. Nixon preached: <<We must, build up a bridge long enough to link San Francisco, with Peking>>. The invitation that Mao Tsetung and Chou En-lai extended to Nixon after the Watergate scandal, and Nixon's reception by Mao were, not without a reason and without a purpose.

This meant that the friendship with the United States of America was not just a temporary friendship between persons, but a friendship between countries, between China and the United States of America, although the president who opened this road had been removed from his post for his corrupt practices.

Now that Carter has come to power, the ties of friendship between China and the United States of America are being consolidated. The United States of America is greatly interested in the present-day stand of China and Carter is encouraging its strategy in many ways.

The United States of America is interested in giving China all-round political, military and economic aid to incite it against the Soviet Union. It has given China atomic secrets. This is now clear. The United States of America has also supplied it with the most up-to-date computers which serve nuclear war. China has received complete data so that it can build its own nuclear submarines. Now there is open official talk in Washington of supplying China with modern weapons. All these <<blessings>> the United States of America is offering China, naturally, are not given with the purpose of helping it become such a big land and naval power as to endanger even the United States
of America, as Japan did during the Second World War. No, US imperialism carefully calculates the so-called aid it gives anywhere in the world, and especially to China. In this way, the aim and feverish efforts of China to become a superpower which will counterbalance both the United States of America and the Soviet Union, cannot fail to lead to new frictions, conflagrations, wars, which may have a local character or the character of a general war. The whole theory of the three worlds, its entire strategy, the alliances and <<fronts>> it advocates, the objectives it seeks to achieve, are incitement to imperialist world war. Nikita Khrushchev and the modern revisionists elaborated the ill-famed theory of Khrushchevite <<peaceful coexistence>>, which advocated <<social peace>>, <<peaceful competition>>, <<the peaceful road>> of the revolution, <<a world without arms and without wars>>. It was intended to weaken the class struggle by concealing and smoothing over the fundamental contradictions of our epoch. In particular, Khrushchev advocated the dying out of contradictions between the Soviet Union and American imperialism and the contradictions between the socialist system and the capitalist system in general. He fostered the view that, after the changes that had occurred in the world at that time, the historical contradiction between socialism and capitalism would be resolved through peaceful competition in the economic, ideo-political, cultural, and other fields. <<Let us leave it to time to prove and then we shall see who is right>>, said Khrushchev and in this competition the peoples <<in sacred peace>> would freely choose the most suitable regime. Nikita Khrushchev advised the peoples to sell their riches to the superpowers and wait to secure their freedom, independence and well-being as a result of this famous peaceful competition. Of course this anti-Marxist policy was exposed, and it was our Party that first attacked it. The Communist Party of China has been following a policy like that of Khrushchev since the time when Mao Tsetung was alive. This policy, too, calls on both sides, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the peoples and their rulers, to cease the class struggle, to unite against Soviet social-imperialism only, and forget about American imperialism. The theory of three worlds. is a reactionary theory just as Khrushchev's theory of <<peaceful coexistence>> was. But while Khrushchev and his followers, the champions of modern revisionism, on the face of it seemed to be pacifists, Mao Tsetung, Teng Hsiao-ping, Hua Kuo-feng, etc., present themselves openly as warmongers. They want to give the imperialist-capitalist coalition, in which China includes itself, the colour and significance of an organism of revolutionary struggle, a struggle for the victory of the proletariat and the liberation of the peoples. In reality, however, the <<theory>> of Mao Tsetung and the Communist Party of China about the three worlds. calls not for revolution but for imperialist war. The exacerbation of contradictions and rivalries among imperialist powers and groupings is fraught with the danger of armed conflicts, of predatory wars of enslavement. This is a wellknown thesis of Marxism-Leninism which history has proved to the hilt. Present-day international developments also demonstrate its correctness. Many a time the Party of Labour of Albania has raised its voice to expose the deafening pacifist propaganda which the superpowers spread in order to lull the peoples and the freedom-loving countries to sleep and blunt their vigilance, in order to bemuse them with illusions and catch them unawares. More than once it has drawn attention to the fact that American imperialism and Russian social-imperialism are leading the world towards a new world war and that the danger of the outbreak of such a war is real and by no means imaginary. This danger cannot fail to be a matter of constant concern to the peoples, the broad working masses, the peace-loving forces and countries, the Marxist-Leninists and the progressive people everywhere in the world, who, in the face of this danger cannot stand by passively and do nothing. But what should be done to stay the hand of the imperialist warmongers? This cannot be achieved through a course of capitulation and submission to imperialist warmongers, or of toning down the struggle against them. The facts have proved that the unprincipled compromises and concessions of the Khrushchevite revisionists did not make American imperialism any tamer, better behaved, or more peaceful, but on the contrary they made it more
arrogant and voracious. But the Marxist-Leninists are not for pitting one imperialist state or groups against the other, nor do they call for imperialist wars, for it is the peoples who suffer in them. The great Lenin pointed out that our policy is not aimed at inciting war, but at preventing the Imperialists from uniting against the socialist country.

<<...if we were really driving workers and peasants to war;>> he said, <<that would be a crime. All our politics and propaganda, however, are directed towards putting an end to war and in no way towards driving nations to war. Experience has shown very clearly that the socialist revolution is the only way out of eternal warfar>>. Lenin

Hence, the only correct course is to raise the working class, the broad strata of the working people and the peoples in revolutionary actions to stay the hand of the imperialist warmongers in their own countries. Marxist-Leninists have always been and are the most determined opponents of unjust wars. Lenin taught the communist revolutionaries that their duty is to smash the warmongering plans of imperialism and prevent the outbreak of war. If they cannot achieve this, then they must mobilize the working class, the masses of the people, and transform the imperialist war into a revolutionary liberation war. The imperialists and social-imperialists have aggressive war in their bloodstream. Their ambitions to enslave the world lead them to war. But although it is the imperialists who unleash imperialist world war, it is the proletariat, the peoples, the revolutionaries and all progressives who pay the price in blood. That is why the Marxist-Leninists, the proletariat and the peoples of the world are against imperialist world war and fight relentlessly to foil the plans of the imperialists so that they do not drive the world to a new Slaughter. Hence imperialist war must not be advocated as the Chinese revisionists are doing, but must be combated. The duty of Marxist-Leninists is to raise the proletariat and the peoples of the world in struggle against oppressors to wrest their power and privileges from them and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. China is not doing this, the Communist Party of China is not working for this. With its revisionist theory, this party is weakening and delaying the revolution, splitting the vanguard forces of the proletariat, the Marxist-Leninist parties which will organize and lead this revolution.

The course which the Chinese leadership advocates is a fraud. It is a course which does not conform to our doctrine, Marxism-Leninism. On the contrary, the Chinese revisionist line weakens, breaks up the proletariat and the peoples, threatens them with bearing the burden of a bloody war, an imperialist, a criminal war, so greatly detested by the proletariat and the peoples.

For this reason, too, Mao Tsetung's theory of <<three worlds>> and the political activity of the Communist Party of China and the Chinese state cannot in any way be called Marxist-Leninist and revolutionary. When Khrushchev advocated economic, ideological and political competition between socialism and imperialism, the Chinese leaders were allegedly against this thesis and said that for genuine peaceful coexistence to be realized, imperialism must be fought, because <<coexistence>> cannot destroy imperialism, cannot lead to the triumph of the revolution and liberation of the peoples.

But these declarations remained only words on paper. In reality the leadership of the Communist Party of China has been and is also in favour of peaceful coexistence of the Khrushchev type. The document we quoted, <<A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement>>, reads: <<A principled policy is the only correct policy... What does a principled policy mean? It means that in laying down and elaborating any kind of policy, we must take the proletarian standpoint, must proceed from the basic interests of the proletariat and be guided by the theory and the fundamental theses of Marxism-Leninism>>. This is what the Communist Party of China stated, but what has it done and what is it doing now? It has done and is doing quite the opposite.

In the above mentioned document and on other occasions, the Communist Party of China has stated, American imperialism must be exposed as the greatest enemy of the revolution, socialism and the peoples of the entire world.
Among other things it has added, one must not rely on American imperialism, nor on any other imperialism, one must not rely reactionaries. But the Communist Party of China has not implemented these theses. The Party of Labour of Albania, which bases itself firmly on the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, resolutely upholds the struggle against imperialism and social-imperialism. It is precisely over this question that socialist Albania is in opposition to China, and the Party of Labour of Albania is in opposition to the Communist Party of China. The Chinese leaders level the accusation at us Albanians that allegedly we do not make a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the international situation and contradictions, and as a consequence, do not follow the Chinese line calling on United Europe, the European Common Market and the proletarians of the world to unite with the Americans against the Soviets. Their conclusion is that since we do not support American imperialism, United Europe, etc., we allegedly favour Soviet social-imperialism. Not only is this stand of theirs revisionist, disguised under the cloak of anti-revisionism, but it is also hostile and slanderous to socialist Albania. American imperialism is aggressive, bellicose and warmongering. The United States of America does not want just the status quo, as the Chinese claim, it wants expansion. Otherwise there is no reason why it should have contradictions with the Soviet Union. The quotation of Mao, which they refer to, that America has become like a rat with the whole world chasing it in the street, shouting: 'Kill it! Kill it!', is intended to prove that only the Soviet Union wants war, while the United States of America does not. This softness towards the United States of America is to discourage any attack on this state, which has been reduced to a rat but which has to become China's ally. This is the anti-Marxist strategy of the Marxist Mao!

The Chinese strategy, founded on their analysis based on the theory of the three worlds, has definitely defined that the rivalry between the two superpowers is centered in Europe. Strange! But why precisely in Europe and not in some other part of the world such as in Asia, Africa, Australia or Latin America, where the Soviet Union is seeking expansion? The Chinese theoreticians do not explain this. This is how they argue their case: the chief rival of the United States of America is the Soviet Union. These two superpowers, of which one is for the status quo and the other for expansion, will unleash the war in Europe, as in the time of Hitler. He, too, wanted expansion and domination of the world, but in order to achieve this, he had first to defeat France, Britain and the Soviet Union. For these reasons, Hitler started the war in Europe and not elsewhere. And further, the Chinese revisionists reason that Stalin relied on Britain and the United States of America. Then, the on the United States of America? But as we explained above, they forget that the Soviet Union linked itself with Britain and the United States of America only after Germany had attacked the Soviet Union and not before.

When the Germany of Wilhelm II attacked France and Britain, the heads of the Second International advocated defence of the bourgeois homeland. Both the German and the French socialists fell into this position. How Lenin condemned this and what he said against imperialist wars is common knowledge. Now when they preach unity of the European peoples with imperialism in the name of defence of national independence, the Chinese revisionists, too, are acting in the same way as the partisans of the Second International. Contrary to the theses of Lenin, they are inciting the future nuclear war which the two, superpowers are trying to launch, and issuing patriotic calls to the peoples and the proletariat of Western Europe to put aside their petty differences with the bourgeoisie (over oppression, hunger, murders, unemployment), to refrain from threatening its state power and unite with NATO, United Europe, the Common Market of the big bourgeoisie and the European concerns, and fight only against the Soviet Union, and become disciplined soldiers for the bourgeoisie. Even the Second International could not have done better.

But what advice has the Chinese leadership to offer the peoples of the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries of the Warsaw Treaty and Comecon? None at all! It is rather quiet on this subject and takes no account at all of these peoples.
From time to time it urges the revisionist cliques ruling in these countries to break away from the Soviet Union and unite with America. In fact it tells these peoples: keep quiet, submit, and become cannon fodder for the blood-thirsty Kremlin clique! This line of the Chinese revisionist leadership is anti-proletarian and warmongering.

All this shows that the Chinese leaders are deliberately complicating the international situations. They see these situations according to their own interests of making China a superpower and not according to the interests of the revolution. They see them from the angle of their imperialist state and not of the liberation of the peoples, from the angle of extinguishing the revolution in their own country and revolutions in other countries, and not from the angle of the organization and intensification of the struggle of the proletariat and the peoples against the two superpowers, as well as against the bourgeois capitalist oppressors of other countries, they see them from the angle of inciting imperialist world war and not of opposing it. China's course of becoming a superpower will have grave consequences, first of all for China itself and the Chinese people. The Marxist-Leninist analysis of the Chinese policy leads to the conclusion that the Chinese leadership is driving China into an impasse. By serving American imperialism and world capitalism it thinks it will draw some profits for itself, but these profits are dubious and will cost China dear. They will bring the country to catastrophe and, of course, will have considerable repercussions in other countries as well.

**China's policy of becoming a superpower, which is inspired by an anti-Marxist ideology, is being exposed and will be exposed still more in the eyes of all peoples, but particularly the peoples of the so-called third world.** The peoples of the world understand the aims of the policy of each state, whatever it be, socialist, revisionist, capitalist or imperialist. They see and understand that, though China poses as a member of the <<third world>>, it does not have the same aspirations and aims as these peoples. They see that it is pursuing a social-imperialist policy. Therefore, it is understandable that this unpopular policy, which encourages social and national oppress, is unacceptable to the peoples. It is a policy in the interests only of the reactionary cliques, of those who are dominating and oppressing the peoples. China supports and supplies arms to Somalia which, at the instigation of the United States of America, is fighting Ethiopia. Meanwhile, Ethiopia is being supported and supplied by the Soviet Union to gobble up Somalia. This is what is happening with Eritrea, too. Thus, China takes one side, the Soviet Union takes the other. If anyone in Somalia looks on China with a kindly eye, it is those who are in power, but not the people of that country who are being killed. It is not looked on with a kindly eye either by the leadership of Ethiopia which has the support of the Soviets or by the Ethiopian people, who are being egged on against the Somalis who allegedly want to occupy Ethiopia. Thus China has no influence at all, either in Ethiopia or in Somalia. But it is not looked upon with a kindly eye in Algeria, either. The latter supports the <<Polisario>> front, whereas China takes the side of Mauritania and Morocco, that is, the side of US imperialism.

In its foreign policy China pursues an allegedly pro-Arab course. But this policy consists solely of the issue of uniting the Arab peoples against Soviet social-imperialism. Thus, it is selfevident that China assists every rapprochement of the Arabs with the United States of America, first of all. In regard to Israel. the Chinese leadership has a great deal to say against it. But, in reality, with its strategy, it is pro-Israeli. The Arab peoples, and particularly the Palestinian people, have taken note of this. In the countries of Asia, we may say that China has no obvious and lasting influence. China is not in sincere and close friendship with its neighbour countries, let alone with the other, more distant countries. The policy of China is not and cannot be correct so long as it is not a Marxist-Leninist policy. On the basis of such a policy it cannot be in sincere friendship with Vietnam, Korea, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, etc. China poses as wanting friendship with these countries, but, in fact, disputes over political, territorial and economic questions exist between China and these countries.

With the policy it is following, China has now come into open conflict with Vietnam. Grave incidents are occurring on the border between these two countries.
The Chinese social-imperialists have been interfering seriously in the internal affairs of Vietnam, and are fanning up the conflict between Cambodia and Vietnam, etc., for their own expansionist objectives. When the Chinese leadership behaves in such a way towards Vietnam, which until yesterday it considered a fraternal country and close friend, what must the Asian countries think about the Chinese policy? Can they trust it?

It would be a waste of time to speak about China's influence in the countries of Latin America. It has no influence there, either political, ideological or economic. The sum total of China's influence rests on its friendship with a certain Pinochet, who is a rabid fascist hangman. This stand of China has incensed not only the peoples of Latin America, but the whole of world opinion. They see that the Chinese leadership is pro oppressive rulers, pro dictators and generals ruling over the peoples, pro US imperialism which has gripped the peoples of this continent by the throat. Thus we can say that China's influence in the countries of Latin America is insignificant, without strength or substance.

The policy of the Chinese leaders does not enjoy the sympathy and support of the peoples, but on the contrary, will lead China to ever greater isolation from the progressive states and the world proletariat. No people, no proletariat or revolutionaries can support China's policy, when they see former German nazi generals, former Japanese militarist generals and admirals, Portuguese fascist generals, etc., etc., standing beside the Chinese leaders on the Tien An Men tribune, as happened on National Day, October 1, 1977.

China cannot go ahead with its course of transforming itself into a superpower without intensifying the exploitation of the broad working masses at home. The United States of America and the other capitalist states will seek to secure superprofits from the capital they will invest there, they will also press for rapid and radical transformations of the base and superstructure of Chinese society in the capitalist direction. The intensification of the exploitation of the multimillion strong masses to maintain the Chinese bourgeoisie and its gigantic bureaucratic apparatus and to meet the repayment of the credits and interest to the foreign capitalists, will undoubtedly give rise to deep contradictions between the Chinese proletariat and peasantry, on the one hand, and the bourgeois-revisionist rulers, on the other. This will bring the latter into confrontation with the working masses of their own country, a thing which cannot fail to lead to sharp conflicts and revolutionary outbursts in China.

III

<<MAO TSETUNG THOUGHT>> - AN ANTI-MARXIST THEORY

The present situation in the Communist Party of China, its many zig-zags and wavering, opportunist stands, the frequent changes of its strategy, the policy the Chinese leadership has been and is following to make China a superpower, quite naturally raise the problem of the place and role of Mao Tsetung and his ideas, the so-called Mao Tsetung thought, in the Chinese revolution. <<Mao Tsetung thought>> is a <<theory>> devoid of the features of Marxism-Leninism. All the Chinese leaders, both those who were in power before and those who have seized power today, have always made great play with the <<Mao Tsetung thought>>, in their forms of organization and ways of action, their strategic and tactical aims, in order to put their counterrevolutionary plans into practice. Seeing the dubious activity, wavering and contradictory stands, the lack of principles and the pragmatism of Chinese internal and external policy, its deviation from Marxism-Leninism and the use of left phrases to disguise it, we Albanian Communists have gradually formed our opinions and conviction about the danger presented by <<Mao Tsetung thought>>. When our Party was founded, during the National Liberation War, as well as after Liberation, our people had very little knowledge about China. But, like all the revolutionaries of the world, we, too, had formed an opinion that it was progressive: <<China is a vast continent. China is fighting, the revolution against foreign imperialism, against concessions is seething in China>>, etc., etc.
We had some general knowledge about the activity of Sun Yat-sen, about his connections and friendship with the Soviet Union and with Lenin; we knew something about the Kuomintang, about the Chinese people's war against the Japanese and about the existence of the Communist Party of China, which was considered a great party, with a Marxist-Leninist, Mao Tsetung, at the head. And that was all.

Our Party had closer contacts with the Chinese only after 1956. The contacts steadily increased due to the struggle our Party was waging against Khrushchevite modern revisionism. At that time our contacts with the Communist Party of China, or more accurately, with its leading cadres, became more frequent and closer, especially when the Communist Party of China, too, entered into open conflict with the Khrushchevite revisionists. But we have to admit that in the meetings we had with the Chinese leaders, although they were good, comradely meetings, in some ways, China, Mao Tsetung and the Communist Party of China, remained a great enigma to us.

But why were China, its Communist Party and Mao Tsetung an enigma? They were an enigma because many attitudes, whether general ones or the personal attitudes of Chinese leaders, towards a series of major political, ideological, military, and organizational problems vacillated, at times to the right, at times to the left. Sometimes they were resolute and at times irresolute, there were times, too, when they maintained correct stands, but more often it was their opportunist stands that caught the eye. During the entire period that Mao was alive, the Chinese policy, in general, was a vacillating one, a policy changing with the circumstances, lacking a Marxist-Leninist spinal cord. What they would say about an important political problem today they would contradict tomorrow. In the Chinese policy, one consistent enduring red thread could not be found.

Naturally, all these attitudes attracted our attention and we did not approve them, but nevertheless, from what we knew about the activity of Mao Tsetung, we proceeded from the general idea that he was a Marxist-Leninist. On many of Mao Tsetung's theses, such as that about the handling of the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as non-antagonistic contradictions, the thesis about the existence of antagonistic classes during the entire period of socialism, the thesis that <<the countryside should encircle the city>>, which absolutizes the role of the peasantry in the revolution, etc., we had our reservations and our own Marxist-Leninist views, which, whenever we could, we expressed to the Chinese leaders. Meanwhile, certain other political views and stands of Mao Tsetung and the Communist Party of China, which were not compatible with the Marxist-Leninist views and stands of our Party, we considered as temporary tactics of a big state, dictated by specific situations. But, with the passage of time, it became ever more clear that the stands maintained by the Communist Party of China were not just tactics.

By analysing the facts, our Party arrived at some general and specific conclusions, which made it vigilant, but it avoided polemics with the Communist Party of China and Chinese leaders, not because it was afraid to engage in polemics with them, but because the facts, which it had about the erroneous, anti-Marxist course of this party and Mao Tsetung himself, were incomplete, and still did not permit the drawing of a final conclusion. On the other hand, for a time, the Communist Party of China did oppose US imperialism and reaction. It also took a stand against Soviet Khrushchevite revisionism, though it is now clear that its struggle against Soviet revisionism was not dictated from correct, principled Marxist-Leninist positions.

Besides this, we did not have full knowledge about the internal political, economic, cultural, social life, etc. in China. The organization of the Chinese party and state have always been a closed book to us. The Communist Party of China gave us no possibility at all to study the forms of organization of the Chinese party and state. We Albanian communists knew only the general outlines of the state organization of China and nothing more; we were given no possibilities to acquaint ourselves with the experience of the party in China, to see how it operated, how it was organized, in what directions things were developing in different sectors and what these directions were concretely.

The Chinese leaders have acted with guile. They have not made public many documents necessary for one to know the activity of their party and state. They were and are very wary of publishing their documents. Even those few published documents at our disposal are fragmentary.
The four volumes of Mao's works, which can be considered official, are comprised of materials written no later than 1949, but besides this, they are carefully arranged in such a way that they do not present an exact picture of the real situations that developed in China. The political and theoretical presentation of problems in the Chinese press, not to speak of literature, which was in utter disarray had only a propaganda character. The articles were full of typically Chinese stereotyped formulas expressed arithmetically, such as <<the Three Goods and the Five Evils>>, <<the Four Olds and Four News>>, <<the Two Reminders and Five Self-controls>>, <<the Three Truths and Seven Falses>>, etc., etc. We found it difficult to work out the <<theoretical>> sense of these arithmetical figures, because we are used to thinking, acting and writing according to the traditional Marxist-Leninist theory and culture.

The Chinese leaders did not invite any delegation from our Party to study their experience. And when some delegation has gone there on our Party's request, the Chinese have engaged in propaganda and taken it here and there for visits to communes and factories rather than give it some explanation or experience about the work of the party. And towards whom did they maintain this strange stand? Towards us Albanians, their friends, who have defended them in the most difficult situations. All these actions were incomprehensible to us, but also a signal that the Communist Party of China did not want to give us a clear picture of its situation.

But what attracted our Party's attention most was the Cultural Revolution, which raised a number of major questions in our minds. During the Cultural Revolution, initiated by Mao Tsetung, astonishing political, ideological and organizational ideas and actions came to light in the activity of the Communist Party of China and the Chinese state, which were not based on the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. In judging their previous dubious actions, as well as those observed during the Cultural Revolution, and especially the events following this revolution up till now, the rises and falls of this or that group in the leadership, today the group of Lin Piao, tomorrow that of Teng Hsiao-ping, a Hua Kuo-feng, etc., each of which had its own platform opposed to the other's, all these things impelled our Party to delve more deeply into the views and actions of Mao Tsetung and the Communist Party of China, to get a more thorough knowledge of <<Mao Tsetung thought>>. When we saw that this Cultural Revolution was not being led by the party but was a chaotic outburst following a call issued by Mao Tsetung, this did not seem to us to be a revolutionary stand. It was Mao's authority in China that made millions of unorganized youth, students and pupils, rise to their feet and march on Peking, on party and state committees, which they dispersed. It was said that these young people represented the <<proletarian ideology>> in China at that time and would show the party and the proletarians the <<true>> road!

Such a revolution, which had a pronounced political character, was called a cultural revolution. In our Party's opinion, this name was not accurate, since, in fact, the movement that had burst out in China was a political, not a cultural movement. But the main thing was the fact that neither the party nor the proletariat were in the leadership of this <<real proletarian revolution>>. This grave situation stemmed from Mao Tsetung's old anti-Marxist concepts of underestimation of the leading role of the proletariat and overestimation of the youth in the revolution. Mao wrote: <<What role did the Chinese young people begin to play since the 'May 4th Movement'? In a way they began to play a vanguard role - a fact recognised by everybody in our country except the ultra-reactionaries. What is a vanguard role? It means taking the lead...>>. *Mao

Thus the working class was left on the sidelines, and there were many instances when it opposed the red guards and even fought them. Our comrades, who were in China at that time, have seen with their own eyes factory workers fighting the youth. The party was disintegrated. It was liquidated, and the communists and the proletariat were totally disregarded. This was a very grave situation. Our Party supported the Cultural Revolution, because the victories of the revolution in China were in danger. Mao Tsetung himself told us that power in the party and state there had been usurped by the renegade group of Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping and the victories of the Chinese revolution were in danger. In these conditions, no matter who was to blame that matters had gone so far, our Party supported the Cultural Revolution.
Our Party defended the fraternal Chinese people, the cause of the revolution and socialism in China, and not the factional strife of anti-Marxist groups, which were clashing and fighting with one another, even with guns, in order to seize power.

The course of events showed that the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was neither a revolution, nor great, nor cultural, and in particular, not in the least proletarian. It was a palace Putsch on an all-China scale for the liquidation of a handful of reactionaries who had seized power. Of course ’this Cultural Revolution was a hoax. It liquidated both the Communist Party of China, and the mass organizations and plunged China into new chaos. This revoltion was led by non-Marxist elements, who have been liquidated through a military putsch staged by other anti-Marxist and fascist elements.

In our press Mao Tsetung has been described as a great Marxist-Leninist, but we never used and never approved the definitions of the Chinese propaganda which described Mao as a classic of Marxism-Leninism, and <<Mao Tsetung thought>> as its third and higher stage. Our Party has considered the inflation of the cult of Mao Tsetung in China to be incompatible with Marxism-Leninism.

The chaotic development of the Cultural Revolution and its results further strengthened the opinion, still not fully crystallized, that Marxism-Leninism was not known and was not being applied in China, that in essence, the Communist Party of China and Mao Tsetung did not hold Marxist-Leninist views, regardless of the facade and the slogans they used about <<the proletariat, its dictatorship, and its alliance with the poor peasantry>>, and many other such shibboleths.

In the light of these events, our Party began to look more deeply into the causes of the vacillations which had been observed in the stand of the Chinese leadership towards Khrushchevite revisionism, such as the instance in 1962, when it sought reconciliation and unity with the Soviet revisionists, allegedly in the name of a common front against American imperialism, or in 1964, when, continuing the efforts for reconciliation with the Soviets, Chou En-lai went to Moscow to hail the coming to power of the Brezhnev group. These vacillations were not accidental. They reflected the lack of revolutionary principles and consistency. When Nixon was invited to China, and the Chinese leadership, with Mao Tsetung at the head, proclaimed the policy of rapprochement and unity with American imperialism, it became clear that the Chinese line and policy were in total opposition to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Following this, China's chauvinist and hegemonic ambitions began to become clearer. The Chinese leadership started to oppose the revolutionary and liberation struggles of the peoples, the world proletariat, and the genuine Marxist-Leninist movement more openly. It proclaimed the so-called theory of the <<three worlds>>, which it was trying to impose on the entire Marxist-Leninist movement as its general line.

For the sake of the interests of the revolution and socialism, and thinking that the mistakes observed in the line of the Communist Party of China were due to incorrect assessments of situations and to various difficulties, the Party of Labour of Albania has tried, more than once, to help the Chinese leadership correct and overcome them. -Our Party has openly expressed its views, in a sincere and comradely way, to Mao Tsetung and other Chinese leaders, and on many of China's actions which directly affected the general line of the Marxist-Leninist movement, the interests of the peoples and revolution, it has made its remarks and disagreement known to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China officially and in writing. welcomed to correct and principled remarks of our Party. It has never replied to them and has never agreed even to discuss them. Meanwhile the anti-Marxist actions of the Chinese leadership at home and abroad became more flagrant and more obvious. All this compelled our Party, like all the other Marxist-Leninists, to reappraise the line of the Communist Party of China, the political and ideological concepts by which it has been guided, its concrete activity and its consequences. As a result we saw that Mao Tsetung thought-, by which the Communist Party of China has been and is being guided, represents a dangerous variant of modern revisionism, against which an all-round struggle on the theoretical and political plane must be waged.
"Mao Tsetung thought" is a variant of revisionism, which began to take shape even before the Second World War, especially after 1935, when Mao Tsetung came to power. In this period Mao Tsetung and his supporters launched a "theoretical" campaign under the slogan of the struggle against "dogmatism", "ready-made patterns", "foreign stereotypes", etc., and raised the problem of elaborating a national Marxism, negating the universal character of Marxism-Leninism. Instead of Marxism-Leninism he preached the "Chinese way" of treating problems, and the Chinese style "... lively and fresh, pleasant to the ears and eyes of the Chinese people"* (Mao), in this way propagating the revisionist thesis that in each country Marxism should have its individual, specific content.

"Mao Tsetung thought" was proclaimed as the highest stage of Marxism-Leninism in the present era. The Chinese leaders have declared that "Mao Tsetung has achieved more than Marx, Engels, and Lenin...". The Constitution of the Communist Party of China, approved at its 9th Congress, which was held under Mao Tsetung's leadership, says that "Mao Tsetung thought is the Marxism-Leninism of the era...", that Mao Tse-tung "...has inherited, defended and developed Marxism-Leninism and has raised it to a new higher stage". Basing the activity of the party on "Mao Tsetung thought" instead of on the principles and norms of Marxism-Leninism opened the doors even more widely to opportunism and factional struggle within the ranks of the Communist Party of China. "Mao Tsetung thought" is an amalgam of views in which ideas and theses borrowed from Marxism are mixed up with idealist, pragmatic and revisionist principles from other philosophies. It has its roots in ancient Chinese philosophy, and in the political and ideological past, in the state and militarist practice of China. All the Chinese leaders, those who have taken power at present as well as those who have been in and who have fallen from power, but who have manoeuvred to put their counterrevolutionary plans into practice, have had and have "Mao Tsetung thought" as their ideological basis. Mao Tsetung himself has admitted that his thoughts can be exploited by all, both by the leftists and the rightists, as he calls the various groups that comprise the Chinese leadership. In the letter he wrote to Chiang Ching on July 8, 1966, Mao Tsetung affirms, "the rightists in power might use my words to make themselves powerful for a certain time, but the left can use other words of mine and organize itself to overthrow the rightists"*(Le Monde dec. '72). This shows that Mao Tsetung was not a Marxist-Leninist, that his views are eclectic. This is apparent in all Mao's "theoretical works" which, although camouflaged with "revolutionary" phraseology and slogans, cannot conceal the fact that "Mao Tsetung thought" has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism.

A critical survey of Mao's writings, even of part of them, of the way he treats the fundamental problems concerning the role of the communist party, the questions of the revolution, the construction of socialism, etc., makes the radical difference between "Mao Tsetung thought" and Marxism-Leninism completely clear. Let us first consider the question of the organization of the Party and its leading role. Mao pretended to be for the application of the Leninist principles on the party, but if his ideas on the party and, especially, the practice of the life of the party are analysed concretely, it becomes evident that he has replaced the Leninist principles and norms with revisionist theses.

Mao Tsetung has not organized the Communist Party of China on the basis of the principles of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. He has not worked to make it a party of the Leninist type, a Bolshevik party. Mao Tsetung was not for a proletarian class party, but for a party without class restrictions. He has used the slogan of giving the party a mass character in order to wipe out the distinction between the party and the class. As a result, anybody could enter or leave this party whenever he liked. On this question "Mao Tsetung thought" is identical with the views of the Yugoslav revisionists and the "Eurocommunists".

Besides this, Mao Tsetung has always made the building of the party, its principles and norms dependent on his political stands and interests, dependent on his opportunist, sometimes rightist and sometimes leftist, adventurist policy, the struggle among factions, etc.
There has been and there is no true Marxist-Leninist unity of thought and action in the Communist Party of China. The strife among factions, which has existed since the founding of the Communist Party of China, has meant that a correct Marxist-Leninist line has not been laid down in this party, and it has not been guided by Marxist-Leninist thought. The various tendencies which manifested themselves among the main leaders of the party were at times leftist, at times right opportunist, sometimes centrist, and going as far as openly anarchist, chauvinist and racist views. During the whole time Mao Tsetung and the group around him were at the head of the party, these tendencies were among the distinctive features of the Communist Party of China. Mao Tsetung himself has advocated the need for the existence of <<two lines>> in the party. According to him, the existence and struggle between two lines is something natural, is a manifestation of the unity of the opposites, is a flexible policy which unites in itself both loyalty to principles and compromise. <<Thus,>> he writes, <<we have two hands to deal with a comrade who has made mistakes: one hand to struggle with him and the other to unite with him. The aim of this struggle is to uphold the principles of Marxism, which means being principled; that is one aspect of the problem. The other aspect is to unite with him. The aim of unity is to offer him a way out, to reach a compromise with him>>.

These views are diametrically opposed to the Leninist teachings on the communist party as an organized vanguard detachment which must have a single line and steel unity of thought and action. The class struggle in the ranks of the party, as a reflection of the class struggle going on outside the party, has nothing in common with Mao Tsetung's concepts on the <<two lines in the party>>. The party is not an arena of classes and the struggle between antagonistic classes, it is not a gathering of people with contradictory aims. The genuine Marxist-Leninist party is the party of the working class only and bases itself on the interests of this class. This is the decisive factor for the triumph of the revolution and the construction of socialism. Defending the Leninist principles on the party, which do not permit the existence of many lines, of opposing trends in the communist party, J. V. Stalin emphasized:

<< ... the communist party is the monolithic party of the proletariat, and not a party of a bloc of elements of different classes.>> Mao

Mao Tsetung, however, conceives the party as a union of classes with contradictory interests, as an organization in which two forces, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the <<proletarian staff>> and the ,<<bourgeois staff>>, which must have their representatives from the grassroots to the highest leading organs of the party, confront and struggle against each other. Thus, in 1956, he sought the election of the leaders of right and left factions to the Central Committee, presenting to this end, arguments as naive as they were ridiculous. <<The entire country,>> he says, <<the whole world knows well that they have made mistakes in the line and the fact that they are well known is precisely the reason for electing them. What can you do about it? They are well known, but you who have made no mistakes or have made only small ones don't have as big a reputation as theirs. In a country like ours with its very large petty-bourgeoisie they are two standards.>> While renouncing principled struggle in the ranks of the party, Mao Tsetung played the game of factions, sought -compromise with some of them to counter some others and thus consolidate his own positions. With such an organizational platform, the Communist Party of China has never been and never Could be a Marxist-Leninist party. The Leninist principles and norms were not respected in it. The congress of the party, its highest collective organ, has not been convened regularly. For instance, 11 years went by between the 7th and the 8th congresses. and after the war, 13 years between the 8th and the 9th congresses. Besides this, the congresses which were held were formal, more parades than working meetings. The delegates to the congresses were not elected in conformity with the Marxist-Leninist principles and norms of the life of the party, but were appointed by the leading organs and acted according to the system of permanent representation.
Recently, <<Renmin Ribao>> published an article by a so-called theoretical group on the <<General Directory>> of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China*. (Always Keep in Mind the Teachings of Chairman Mao - Sept. '77) This article says that under the name of the <<General Directory>>, Mao had set up around himself a special apparatus which kept the Political Bureau, the Central Committee of the Party, the caeres of the state, the army, the security service, etc., under surveillance and control. Entry to this Directory and knowledge of its work was forbidden to all, including the members of the Central Committee and the Political Bureau. Here plans for the bringing down or elevation of this or that factionalist group were worked out. The men of this Directory were present everywhere, they eaves-drooped, watched, and reported independently, Outside the control of the party. Apart from them, this Directory had at its disposal entire armed detachments, hidden under the name of the <<Guard of Chairman Mao>>. This praetorian guard more than 50,000 strong went into action whenever the chairman wanted <<to act with one blow>>, as has frequently occurred in the history of the Communist Party of China and as occurred recently with the arrest of <<The Four>> and their supporters by Hua Kuo-feng. Under the pretext of maintaining contacts with the masses, Mao Tsetung had also created a special network of informers among the population who were charged with the task of keeping the cadres of the base under surveillance and investigating the conditions and state of mind of the masses, without anybody's knowledge. They reported directly to Mao Tsetung alone, who had severed all means of communication with the masses and saw the world only through the reports of his agents of the <<General Directory>>. Mao said, <<For myself, I am a person who does not listen to the radio, either foreign or Chinese, but I only transmit>>. He also said, <<I have stated openly that I shall no longer read the newspaper 'Renmin Ribao'. I told its Editor-in-chief 'I do not read your paper'>>.* (From Mao conversation with comrades from our Party, Feb. 3, 1967. Central Archivals of the Party of Labour of Albania).

The article of <<Renmin Ribao>> provides new information which enables one to understand even more clearly the anti-Marxist direction and personal power of Mao Tsetung in the Chinese party and state. Mao Tsetung did not have the slightest respect for either the Central Committee or the congress of the party, let alone the party as a whole and its committees at the base. The party committees, the leading cadres and the Central Committee itself received orders from the <<General Directory>>, this <<special staff>>, which was responsible to Mao Tsetung alone. The party forums, its elected organs, had no authority whatsoever. The article of <<Renmin Ribao>> says, <<no telegram, no letter, no document, no order could be issued by anybody without first going through Mao Tsetung's hands and being approved by him>>. It turns out that as early as 1953, Mao Tsetung had issued a clear-cut order: <<From now on, all documents and telegrams sent out in the name of the Central Committee can be dispatched only after I have gone over them, otherwise they are invalid>>*. (Mao) Under these conditions there can be no talk of collective leadership, democracy within the party, or Leninist norms.

Mao Tsetung's unlimited power was so farreaching that he even appointed his heirs. At one time he had appointed Liu Shao-chi as his successor. Later he declared that his heir to the state and the party after his death would be Lin Piao. This, a thing unprecedented in the practice of Marxist-Leninist parties, was even sanctioned in the Constitution of the party. Again it was Mao Tsetung who designated Hua Kuo-feng to be chairman of the party after his death. Having power in his hands, Mao alone criticized, judged, punished and later rehabilitated top leaders of the party and state. This was the case even with Teng Hsiao-ping, who, in his so-called self-criticism of October 23, 1966, stated: <<Liu Shao-chi and I are real monarchists. The essence of my mistakes lies in the fact that I have no faith in the masses, do not support the revolutionary masses, but am opposed to them. I have followed a reactionary line to suppress the revolution. In the class struggle I have been on the side not of the proletariat, but of the bourgeoisie... All this shows that... I am unfit to hold posts of responsibility>>.* (From the self-criticism of Teng Hsiao-ping). And despite these crimes which this inveterate revisionist has committed, he was put back in his former seat.
The anti-Marxist essence of <<Mao Tsetung thought>> on the party and its role is also apparent in the way the relations between the party and the army were conceived in theory and applied in practice. Irrespective of the shibboleths of Mao Tsetung about the <<party being above the army>>, <<politics above the gun>>, etc. etc., in practice, he left the main political role in the life of the country to the army. At the time of the war, he said, <<All the army cadres should be good at leading the workers and organizing trade-unions, good at mobilizing and organizing the youth, good at uniting with and training cadres in the newly Liberated Areas, good at managing industry and commerce, good at running schools, newspapers, news agencies and broadcasting stations, good at handling foreign affairs, good at handling problems relating to the democratic parties and people's organizations, good at adjusting the relations between the cities and the rural areas and solving the problems of food, coal and other daily necessities and good at handling monetary and financial problems>>. (Mao)

So the army was above the party, above the state organs, above everything. From this it emerges that Mao Tsetung's words regarding the role of the party, as the decisive factor of the leadership of revolution and socialist construction, were only slogans. Both at the time of the liberation war and after the creation of the People's Republic of China, in all the never-ending struggles that have been waged there for the seizure of power by one faction or the other, the army has played the decisive role. During the Cultural Revolution, too, the army played the main role; it was Mao's last resort. In 1967, Mao Tsetung said, <<We rely on the strength of the army... We had only two divisions in Peking, but we brought in another two in May in order to settle accounts with the former Peking Party Committee>>. (From the conversation of Mao tsetung with the friendship Delegation of the PRA, dec. 18, 1967).

In order to liquidate his ideological opponents, Mao Tsetung has always set the army in motion. He raised the army, with Lin Piao at the head, against the Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiaoping group. Later, together with Chou En-lai, he organized and threw the army against Lin Piao. Inspired by <<Mao Tsetung thought>>, the army has played the same role even after the death of Mao. Like all those who have come to power in China, Hua Ktio-feng, also, relied on and acted through the armymen, Yeh Chien-ying, Wang Tung-lisin and others, engineered the putsch and arrested his opponents. Power in China is still in the hands of the army, while party tails behind it. This is a general characteristic of countries where revisionism prevails. Genuine socialist countries strengthen the army as a powerful weapon of the dictatorship of the proletariat in order to crush the enemies of socialism in case they rise up, as well as to defend the country from an eventual attack by the imperialists and foreign reaction. But, as Marxism-Leninism teaches us, for the army to play this role it must always be under the direction of the party and not the party under the direction of the army.

At present the most powerful factions of the army, the most reactionary ones, which aim to turn China into a social-imperialist country, are making the law in China. In the future, along with the transformation of China into an imperialist superpower, the role and the power of the army in the life of the country will steadily increase. It will be strengthened as a praetorian guard, armed to the teeth, for the defence of a capitalist regime and economy. It will be the tool of a bourgeois capitalist dictatorship, a dictatorship which, if the people's resistance is strong, may even assume open fascist forms.

By preaching the need for the existence of many parties in the leadership of the country, the so-called political pluralism, <<Mao Tsetung thought>> falls into complete opposition to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the indivisible role of the communist party in the revolution and socialist construction. As he declared to E. Snow, Mao Tsetung considered the leadership of a country by several political parties, after the American model, the most democratic form of government. <<Which is better in the final analysis,>> Mao Tsetung asked, <<to have just one party or several?>>. And he answered, <<As we see it now, it's perhaps better to have several parties. This has been true in the past and may well be so for the future; it means long-term coexistence and mutual supervision>>. Mao regarded the participation of bourgeois parties in the state power and
the governing of the country with the same rights and prerogatives as the Communist Party of China as necessary. And not only this, but these parties of the bourgeoisie, which according to him <<were historical>>, should wither away only when the Communist Party of China also withers away, that is, they will coexist right up till communism.

According to <<Mao Tsetung thought>>, a new democratic regime can exist and socialism can be built only on the basis of the collaboration of all classes and all parties. Sue a concept of socialist democracy, of the socialist political system, which is based on <<long-term coexistence and mutual supervision>> of all parties, and which is very much like the current preachings of the Italian, French, Spanish and other revisionists, is an open denial of the leading and indivisible role of the Marxis-Leninist party in the revolution and the construction of socialism. Historical experience has already proved that the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot exist and socialism cannot be built and defended without the indivisible leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party.

<<...the dictatorship of the proletariat,>> said Stalin, <<can be complete only when it is led by a party, the party of the communists, which does not and should not share the leadership with other parties>>*. (Stalin)

The revisionist concepts of Mao Tsetung have their basis in the policy of collaboration and alliance with the bourgeoisie, which the Communist Party of China has always applied. This is also the source of the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist course of <<letting 100 flowers blossom and 100 schools contend>>, which is a direct expression of the coexistence of opposing ideologies. According to Mao Tsetung, in socialist society, side by side with the proletarian ideology, materialism and atheism, the existence of bourgeois ideology, idealism and religion, the growth of <<poisonous weeds>> along with <<fragrant flowers>>, etc., must be permitted. Such a course is alleged to be necessary for the development of Marxism, in order to open the way to debate and freedom of thought, while in reality, through this course, he is trying to lay the theoretical basis for the policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie and coexistence with its ideology. Mao Tsetung says, <<... it is a dangerous policy to prohibit people from coming into contact with the false, the ugly and the hostile to us, with idealism and metaphysics and with the thoughts of Confucius, Lao Tze and Chiang Kai-shek. It would lead to mental deterioration, one-track minds, and unpreparedness to face the world...>>*. (Mao) From this Mao Tsetung draws the conclusion that idealism, metaphysics and the bourgeois ideology will exist eternally, therefore not only must they not be prohibited, but they must be given the possibility to blossom, to come out in the open and contend. This conciliatory stand towards everything reactionary goes so far as to call disturbances in socialist society inevitable and the prohibition of enemy activity mistaken. <<In my opinion,>> says he, <<whoever wants to provoke trouble may do so for so long as he pleases; and if one month is not enough, he may go on for two, in short, the matter should not be wound up until he feels he has had enough. If you hastily wind it up, sooner or later trouble will resume again>>*. (Mao)

All these have not been academic contributions to a -scientific- discussion but a counterrevolutionary opportunist political line which has been set up in opposition to Marxism-Leninism, which has disorganized the Communist Party of China, in the ranks of which a hundred and one views and ideas have been circulating and today there really are 100 schools contending. This has enabled the bourgeois wasps to circulate freely in the garden of 100 flowers and release their venom.

This opportunist stand on ideological questions has its roots, among other things, also in the fact that throughout the whole period from its foundation up till it achieved the liberation of its country and later, the Communist Party of China has made no effort to consolidate itself ideologically, has not worked to inculcate the theory of Marx, Engels. Lenin and Stalin into the minds and hearts of its members, has not struggled to master the fundamental questions of the Marxist-Leninist ideology and apply them consistently, step by step, in the concrete -conditions of China.
"Mao Tsetung thought" is opposed to the Marxist-Leninist theory of revolution. In his writings Mao Tsetung makes frequent mention of the role of revolutions in the process of the development of society, but in essence he adheres to a metaphysical, evolutionist concept. Contrary to materialist dialectics, which envisages progressive development in the form of a spiral, Mao Tsetung preaches development in the form of a cycle, going round in a circle, as a process of ebb and flow which goes from equilibrium to disequilibrium and back to equilibrium again, from motion to rest and back to motion again, from rise to fall and from fall to rise, from advance to retreat and to advance again, etc. Thus, upholding the concept of ancient philosophy on the purifying role of fire, Mao Tsetung writes: "It is necessary to 'set a fire going' at regular intervals. How often? Once a year or once every three years, which do you prefer? I think we should do it at least twice in the space of every five years, in the same way as the intercalary month in a lunar leap year turns up once in three years or twice in five". Thus like the astrologists of old, on the basis of the lunar calendar, he derives the law on the periodical kindling of fire, on the development which goes from "great harmony" to -great disorder- and again to "great harmony", and thus the cycles repeat themselves periodically.

In this manner, "Mao Tsetung thought" opposes the materialist dialectical concept of development, which, as Lenin says

"...gives us the key to understand the 'selfmovement' of every existing thing;... gives us the key to understand the 'leaps', 'the interruption of graduality', 'the transformation into the opposite', the abolition of the old and the emergence of the new,

with the metaphysical concept which "is lifeless, pale and dry". This becomes even more obvious in the way Mao Tsetung handles the problem of contradictions, to which, according to Chinese propaganda, Mao has allegedly made a "special contribution" and developed materialist dialectics further in this field. It is true that in many of his writings, Mao Tsetung frequently speaks about opposites, contradictions, the unity of the opposites, and even uses Marxist quotations and phrases, but, nevertheless, he is far from the dialectical materialist understanding of these problems. In dealing with contradictions, he does not proceed from the Marxist theses, but from those of ancient Chinese philosophers, sees the opposites in a mechanical way, as external phenomena, and imagines the transformation of the opposites as a simple change of places between them. By operating with some eternal opposites taken from ancient philosophy, such as above and below, backward and forward, right and left, light and heavy, etc., etc., in essence Mao Tsetung negates the internal contradictions inherent in things and phenomena and treats development as simple repetition, as a chain of unchangeable states in which the same opposites and the same relationship between them are observed. The mutual transformation of the opposites into each other, understood as a mere exchange of places and not as a resolution of the contradiction and a qualitative change of the very phenomenon which comprises these opposites, is used by Mao Tsetung as a formal pattern to which everything is subject. On the basis of this pattern, Mao goes so far as to declare that "When dogmatism is transformed into its opposite, it becomes either Marxism or revisionism", "metaphysics is transformed into dialectics, and dialectics into metaphysics", etc. Behind such absurd assertions and this sophistical playing with opposites, lurk the opportunist and anti-revolutionary concepts of Mao Tsetung. Thus, he does not see the socialist revolution as a qualitative change of society in which antagonistic classes and the oppression and exploitation of man by man are abolished, but conceives it as a simple change of places between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. To confirm this "discovery", Mao writes: "If the bourgeoisie and the proletariat cannot transform themselves into each other, how does it come that, through revolution, the proletariat becomes the ruling class and the bourgeoisie the ruled class?... We stand in diametrical opposition to Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang. As a result of the mutual struggle and exclusion of the two contradictory aspects with the Kuomintang we changed places...". (Mao)
This same logic has also led Mao Tsetung to revise the Marxist-Leninist theory on the two phases of communist society. <<According to dialectics, as surely as a man must die, the socialist system as a historical phenomenon will come to an end some day, to be negated by the communist system. If it is asserted that the socialist system and the relations of production and superstructure of socialism will not die out, what kind of Marxist thesis would that be? Wouldn't it be the same as a religious creed or theology that preaches an everlasting god?>> (Mao)

In this way, openly revising the Marxist-Leninist concept of socialism and communism, which, in essence, are two phases of the one type, of the one socio-economic order, and which are distinguished from each other only by the degree of their development and maturity, Mao Tsetung presents socialism as something diametrically opposite to communism.

From such metaphysical and anti-Marxist concepts, Mao Tsetung treats the question of the revolution in general, which he regards as an endless process which is repeated periodically throughout the whole period of the existence of mankind on earth, as a process which goes from defeat to victory, from victory to defeat, and so on endlessly. Mao Tsetung's anti-Marxist concepts, sometimes evolutionist and sometimes anarchist, about the revolution are even more apparent when he deals with the problems of the revolution in China.

As emerges from his writings, Mao Tsetung did not base himself on the Marxist-Leninist theory in analysing the problems and defining the tasks of the Chinese revolution. In his speech delivered at the enlarged working conference called by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, in January 1962, he himself admits: <<Our many years of revolutionary work have been carried out blindly, not knowing how the revolution should be, carried out, and against whom the spearhead of the revolution should be directed, without a concept of its stages, whom it had to overthrow first and whom later, etc.>>. This has made the Communist Party of China incapable of ensuring the leadership of the proletariat in the democratic revolution and transforming it into a socialist revolution. The entire development of the Chinese revolution is evidence of the chaotic course of the Communist Party of China, which has not been guided by Marxism-Leninism, but by the anti-Marxist concepts of <<Mao Tsetung thought>> on the character of the revolution, its stages, motive forces, etc.

Mao Tsetung was never able to understand and explain correctly the close links between the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the proletarian revolution. Contrary to the Marxist-Leninist theory, which has proved scientifically that there is no Chinese wall between the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the socialist revolution, that these two revolutions do not have to be divided from each other by a long period of time, Mao Tsetung asserted: <<The transformation of our revolution into socialist revolution is a matter of the future... As to when the transition will take place... it may take quite a long time. We should not hold forth about this transition until all the necessary political and economic conditions are present and until it is advantageous and not detrimental to the overwhelming majority of our people>>. (Mao)

Mao Tsetung adhered to this anti-Marxist concept, which is not for the transformation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution socialist revolution, during the whole period of the revolution, even after liberation. Thus, in 1940, Mao Tsetung said: <<The Chinese revolution must necessarily pass through... the stage A New Democracy and then the stage of socialism. Of these, the first stage will need a relatively long time...>>. (Mao)

In March 1949, at the plenum of Central Committee of the Party, at which Mao Tsetung submitted the program for China's development after liberation, he says: <<During this period all the elements of capitalism, of town and countryside, must be permitted to exist>>. These views and <<theories>> brought about that the Communist Party of China and Mao Tsetung did not fight for the transformation of the revolution in China into a socialist revolution but left a free field for the development of the bourgeoisie and capitalist social relations.
On the question of the relationship between the democratic revolution and the socialist revolution, Mao Tsetung takes the standpoint of the chiefs of the Second International, who were the first to attack and distort the Marxist-Leninist theory about the rise of the revolution and came out with the thesis that between the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the socialist revolution, there is a long period, during which the bourgeoisie develops capitalism and creates the conditions for the transition to the proletarian revolution. They regarded the transformation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into socialist revolution, without giving capitalism the possibility to develop further, as something impossible, as skipping stages. Mao Tsetung, too, fully endorses this concept, when he says: "It would be a sheer utopia to try to build socialism on the ruins of the colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal order without a united new-democratic state, . . . without the development of the private capitalist economy..."*(Mao)*

The anti-Marxist concepts of "Mao Tsetung thought" about the revolution are even more obvious in the way Mao has treated the motive forces of the revolution. Mao Tsetung did not recognize the hegemonic role of the proletariat. Lenin said that in the period of imperialism, in every revolution, hence, also in the democratic revolution, the anti-imperialist national liberation revolution and the socialist revolution, the leadership must belong to the proletariat. Although he talked about the role of the proletariat, in practice Mao Tsetung underestimated its hegemony in the revolution and elevated the role of the peasantry. Mao Tsetung has said: "....the resistance to Japanese occupiers now going on is essentially peasant resistance. Essentially, the politics of New Democracy means giving power to the peasants"*.(Mao)*

Mao Tsetung expressed this petty-bourgeois theory in his general thesis that the "countryside must encircle the city". "...revolutionary villages", he wrote, "can encircle the cities... rural work should play the primary role in the Chinese revolutionary movement and urban work a secondary role"**.(Mao)**

Mao expressed this idea also when he wrote about the role of the peasantry in the state. He has said that all other political parties and forces must submit to the peasantry and its views. "... millions of peasants will rise like a mighty storm, a force so swift and violent that no power, however great, will be able to hold it back...,>> he writes. "They will put to the test every revolutionary party and group, every revolutionary, so that they either accept their views or reject them"***.(Mao)

According to Mao, it turns out that the peasantry and not the working class should play the hegemonic role in the revolution.

Mao Tsetung also preached the thesis on the hegemonic role of the peasantry in the revolution as the road of the world revolution. Herein lies the source of the anti-Marxist concept that considers the so-called third world, which in Chinese political literature is also called "the countryside of the world", as the "main motive force for the transformation of present-day society". According to the Chinese views, the proletariat is a secondrate social force, which cannot play that role which Marx and Lenin envisaged in the struggle against capitalism and the triumph of the revolution, in alliance with all the forces oppressed by capital.

The Chinese revolution has been dominated by the petty-and middle bourgeoisie. This broad stratum of the petty-bourgeoisie has influenced the whole development of China. Mao Tsetung did not base himself on the Marxist-Leninist theory which teaches us that the peasantry, the petty-bourgeoisie in general, is vacillating. Of course, the poor and middle peasantry play an important role in the revolution and must become the close ally of the proletariat. But the peasant class, the petty-bourgeoisie, cannot lead the proletariat in the revolution. To think and preach the opposite means to be against Marxism-Leninism. Herein lies one of the main sources of the anti-Marxist views of Mao Tsetung, which have had a negative influence on the whole Chinese revolution. The Communist Party of China has not been clear in theory about the basic revolutionary guiding principle of the hegemonic role of the proletariat in the revolution, and consequently it did not apply it in practice properly and consistently. Experience shows that the peasantry can play its revolutionary role only if it acts in alliance with the proletariat and under its leadership. This was proved in our country during the National Liberation War.
The Albanian peasantry was the main force of our revolution, however it was the working class, despite its very small numbers, which led the peasantry, because the Marxist-Leninist ideology, the ideology of the proletariat, embodied in the Communist Party, today the Party of Labour, the vanguard of the working class, was the leadership of the revolution. That is why we triumphed not only in the National Liberation War, but also in the construction of socialism.

Despite the innumerable difficulties we encountered on our road we scored success one after another. We achieved these successes, in the first place, because the Party thoroughly mastered the essence of the theory of Marx and Lenin, understood what the revolution was, who was making it and who had to lead it, understood that at the head of the working class, in alliance with the peasantry, there had to be a party of the Leninist type. The communists understood that this party must not be communist only in name but had to be a party which would apply the Marxist-Leninist theory of the revolution and party building in the concrete conditions of our country, which would begin the work for the creation of the new socialist society, following the example of the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union of the time of Lenin and Stalin. This stand gave our Party the victory, gave the country the great political, economic and military strength it has today. Had we acted differently, had we not consistently applied these principles of our great theory, socialism could not have been built in a small country surrounded by enemies, as ours is. Even if we had succeeded in taking power for a moment, the bourgeoisie would have seized it back again, as happened in Greece, where before the struggle had been won, the Greek Communist Party surrendered its weapons to the local reactionary bourgeoisie and British imperialism. Therefore, the question of hegemony in the revolution is a very important matter of principle because the course and development of the revolution depend on who is leading it.

"<Renunciation of the idea of the hegemony, >> stressed Lenin, "<is the most vulgar form of reformism>".

The negation by <<Mao Tsetung thought>> of the leading role of the proletariat was precisely one of the causes that the Chinese revolution remained a bourgeois-democratic revolution and did not develop into a socialist revolution. In his article <<New Democracy>>, Mao Tsetung preached that after the triumph of the revolution in China a regime would be established which would be based on the alliance of the <<democratic classes>>, in which, besides the peasantry and the proletariat, he also included the urban pettybourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. "<Just as everyone should share what food there is,>> he writes, "<so there should be no monopoly of power by a single party, group or class>>". (Mao) This idea has also been reflected in the national flag of the People's Republic of China, with four stars which represent four classes: the working class, the peasantry, the urban petty-bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie.

The revolution in China, which brought about the liberation of the country, the creation of the independent Chinese state, was a great victory for the Chinese people, and for the world anti-imperialist and democratic forces. After the liberation, many positive changes were made in China: the domination by foreign imperialism and big landowners was liquidated, poverty and unemployment were combated, a series of socio-economic reforms in favour of the working masses were carried out, the educational and cultural backwardness was fought against, a series of measures were taken for the reconstruction of the country ravaged by the war, and some transformations of a socialist character were made. In China, where people died by millions in the past, starvation no longer existed, etc. These are undeniable facts, and are important victories for the Chinese people.

From the adoption of these measures and the fact that the Communist Party came to power, it appeared as if China was going to socialism. But things did not turn out that way. Having <<Mao Tsetung thought>> as the basis of its activity, the Communist Party of China, which after the triumph of the bourgeois-democratic revolution ..Ought to have proceeded cautiously without being leftist and without skipping the stages, proved to be <<democratic>>, liberal, opportunist, and did not lead the country consistently on the correct road to socialism.
The non-Marxist, eclectic, bourgeois political, and ideological views of Mao Tsetung gave liberated China an unstable superstructure, a chaotic organization of the state and the economy which never achieved stability. China was in continuous disorder, even anarchic disorder, which was encouraged by Mao Tsetung himself with the slogan "things must first be stirred up in order to clarify themm." In the new Chinese state Chou En-lai played a special role. He was an able economist and organizer, but was never a Marxist-Leninist politician. As the typical pragmatist, he knew how to implement his non-Marxist views and adapt them perfectly to each group that took power in China. He was a poussah, tiao always managed to stay on his feet, although he always rocked from the centre to the right, but never to the left. Chou En-lai was a pastmaster of unprincipled compromises. He las supported and condemned Chiang Kai-shek, Kao Gang, Liti Shao-chilh, Teng Hsiao-ping, Mao Tsetung, Lin Piao, "The Four," but he has sever supported Lenin and Stalin, Marxism-Leninism. After liberation, as a result of the views and stands of Mao Tsetung, Chou En-lai and others, many wavering in alldirections were observed in the political line if the Party. The tendency advocated by "Mao Tsetung thought" that the bourgeois-democratic stage of the revolution had to continue for a long time, was kept alive in China. Mao Tsetung insisted that in this stage the remises for socialism would be created parallel with the development of capitalism, to which he priority. Also linked with this, is his thesis on the coexistence of socialism with the bourgeoisie for a very long time, presenting this as something beneficial both to socialism and to the bourgeoisie. Replying to those who opposed such a policy and who brought up the experience of the October Socialist Revolution as an argument, Mao Tsetung says: "The bourgeoisie in Russia was a counterrevolutionary class, it rejected state capitalism at that time, organized slow-downs and sabotage and even resorted to the gun. The Russian Proletariat had no choice but to finish it off. This infuriated the bourgeoisie in other countries, and they became abusive. Here in China we have been relatively moderate with our national bourgeoisie who feel a little more comfortable and believe they can also find some advantage." (Mao) According to Mao Tsetung such a policy has allegedly improved China's reputation in the eyes of the international bourgeoisie, but in reality it has done great harm to socialism in China.

Mao Tsetung has presented his opportunist stand towards the bourgeoisie as a creative implementation of the teachings of Lenin on the New Economic Policy (NEP). But there is a radical difference between the teachings of Lenin and the concept of Mao Tsetung on allowing unrestricted capitalist production and maintaining bourgeois relations in socialism. Lenin admits that the NEP was a step back which allowed the development of elements of capitalism for a certain time, but he stressed:

"... there is nothing dangerous to the Proletarian state in this so long as the proletariat keeps political power firmly in its hands, so long as it keeps transport and big industry firmly in its hands." (Lenin)

In fact, neither in 1949 nor in 1956, when Mao Tsetung advocated these things, did the proletariat in China, have political power or big industry in its own hands. Moreover, Lenin considered the NEP as a temporary measure which was imposed by the concrete conditions of Russia of that time, devastated by the long civil war, and not as a universal law of socialist construction. And the fact is that one year after the proclamation of the NEP Lenin stressed that the retreat was over, and launched the slogan to prepare for the offensive against private capital in the economy. Whereas in China, the period of the preservation of capitalist production was envisaged to last almost eternally. According to Mao Tsetung's view, the order established after liberation in China had to be a bourgeois-democratic order, while the Communist Party of China had to appear to be in power. Such is "Mao Tsetung thought." The transition from the bourgeois-democratic revolution to the socialist revolution can be realized only when the proletariat resolutely removes the bourgeoisie from power and expropriates it.
As long as the working class in China shared power with the bourgeoisie, as long as the bourgeoisie preserved its privileges, the state power that was established in China, could not be the state power of the proletariat, and consequently, the Chinese revolution could not grow into a socialist revolution.

The Communist Party of China has maintained a benevolent opportunist stand towards the exploiting classes, and Mao Tsetung has openly advocated the peaceful integration of capitalist elements into socialism. Mao Tsetung said: "Actually all ultra-reactionaries of the world are ultra-reactionaries, and they will remain such tomorrow and the day after tomorrow, they will not remain such unto death, and in the end they change... Essentially, ultra-reactionaries are die-hards but not stable... It may happen that ultra-reactionaries may change for the better... they come to see their mistakes and change for the better. In short, ultra-reactionaries do change>>*. (Mao)

In his desire to provide a theoretical basis for this opportunist concept, and playing on the <<transformation of the opposites>>, Mao Tsetung said that through discussion, criticism and transformation, antagonistic contradictions are transformed into non-antagonistic contradictions, the exploiting classes and the bourgeois intelligentsia can turn into their opposite, that is, become revolutionaries. "However, given the conditions of our country," Mao Tsetung wrote in 1956, "most of the counterrevolutionaries will eventually change to a greater or lesser extent. Thanks to the correct policy we have adopted towards counterrevolutionaries, many have been transformed into persons no longer opposed to the revolution, and a few have even done some good to it>>*. Proceeding from such anti-Marxist concepts, according to which with the lapse of time the class enemies will be corrected, he advocated class conciliation with them and allowed them to continue to enrich themselves, to exploit, to speak, and to act freely against the revolution. To justify this capitulationist stand towards the class enemy, Mao Tsetung wrote: "We have a lot to do now. It is impossible to keep on hitting out at them day in day out for the next fifty years. There are people who refuse to correct their mistakes, they can take them into their coffins when they go to see the King of Hell>>**. (Mao)

Acting in practice according to these views of conciliation with the enemies, the state administration in China was left in the hands of the old officials. Chiang Kai-shek's generals even became ministers. Indeed, even Pu Yi, the emperor of Manchu-kuo, the puppet emperor of the Japanese occupiers, was protected very carefully and turned into a museum piece so that delegations could go to meet and talk with him and see how such people were re-educated in "socialist" China. Besides other things, the aim of the publicity given to this former puppet emperor was to dispel even the fears of kings, chieftains, and puppets of reaction in other countries, so that they would think that Mao's "socialism" is fine and have no reason to fear it.

Stands which do not smack of class struggle have been adopted in China also towards those feudal lords and capitalists, who have committed innumerable crimes against the Chinese people. Elevating such stands to theory and openly taking counterrevolutionaries under his protection, Mao Tsetung stated: "we should kill none and arrest very few... They are not to be arrested by the public security bureaus, prosecuted by the procuratorial organs or tried by the law courts. Well over ninety out of every hundred of these counterrevolutionaries should be dealt with in this way>>*. (Mao)

Reasoning as a sophist, Mao Tsetung says that the execution of counterrevolutionaries does no good, that such an action allegedly hinders production, the scientific level of the country, and will give us a bad name in the world, etc., that if one counterrevolutionary is liquidated, "we would have to compare his case with that of a second, of a third, and so on, and then many heads would begin to roll... once a head is chopped off it can't be restored, nor can it grow again as chives do, after being cut>>*. (Mao)

As a result of these anti-Marxist concepts about contradictions, about classes, and their role in revolution that "advocates, China never proceeded on the correct road of socialist construction. It is not just the economic, political, ideological and social remnants of the past that have survived and continue to exist in Chinese society, but the exploiting classes continue to exist there as classes, and still remain in power. Not only does the bourgeoisie still exist, but it also continues to gain income from the property it has had.
Capitalist rent has not been abolished by law in China, because the Chinese leadership has adhered to the strategy of the bourgeois-democratic revolution formulated in 1935 by Mao Tsetung, who said at that time: <<The labour laws of the people's republic... will not prevent the national bourgeoisie from making profits...>>.** (Mao) In conformity with the Policy of the equal right to land>>, the kulak stratum, in the forms which have existed in China, has retained great advantages and profits. Mao Tsetung himself gave orders that the kulaks must not be touched, because this might anger the national bourgeoisie with which the Communist Party of China had formed a common united front, politically, economically and organizationally*. (Mao)

All these things show that, <<Mao Tsetung thought>> did not and could not guide China on the genuine road to socialism. Indeed, as Chou En-lai declared in 1949, when secretly applying to the American government to help China, neither Mao Tsetung nor his chief supporters were for the socialist road. <<China,>> wrote Chou En-lai, <<is not yet a communist country, and if the policy of Mao Tsetung is implemented properly, it will not become a communist country for a long time>>*. (Internationale Herald Tribune, August 14, 1978)

In a demagogic way, Mao Tsetung and the Communist Party of China have subordinated all their declarations about the construction of the socialist and communist society to their pragmatic policy. Thus, in the years of the so-called great leap forward, with the aim of throwing dust in the eyes of the masses, who, emerging from the revolution, aspired to socialism, they declared that within 2-3 five-year periods, they would pass directly over to communism. Later, however, in order to cover up their failures, they began to theorize that the construction and triumph of socialism would require ten thousand years.

True, the Communist Party of China called itself communist, but it developed in another direction, on a chaotic liberal course, an opportunist course and could not be a force capable of leading the country towards socialism. The road it followed, and which was concretized even more clearly after Mao's death, was not the road of socialism, but the road of building a great bourgeois, social-imperialist state.

As an anti-Marxist doctrine, <<Mao Tsetung thought>> has substituted great state chauvinism for proletarian internationalism. From the very first steps of its activity, the Communist Party of China displayed open nationalist and chauvinist tendencies, which, as the facts show, could not be eradicated during the succeeding periods, either. Li Ta-chao, one of the founders of the Communist Party of China, said, <<the Europeans think that the world belongs exclusively to the whites and that they are the superior class, while the coloured peoples are in ferior. The Chinese people,>> Li Ta-chao continues, <<must be ready to wage a class struggle against the other races of the world, in which they will once again display their special national qualities.>> The Communist Party of China was imbued with such views right from the beginning. Such racist and nationalist views could not have been eliminated completely from the mentality of Mao Tsetung, let alone that of Liu and Teng. In the report which he delivered to the Central Committee of the Party in 1938, Mao Tsetung said, <<Contemporary China has grown out of the development of the China of the past...We should sum up our history from Confucius to Sun Yat-sen... and take over this valuable legacy. This is important for guiding the great movement of today>>*. (Mao)

Of course, every Marxist-Leninist party says that it must base itself on the legacy of its own people from the past, but it also bears in mind that it must base itself not on everything inherited but only on what is progressive. Communists reject the reactionary legacy in the field of ideas, as well as in any other field. The Chinese have been very conservative, even xenophobic, in regard to their old forms, content, and ideas. They preserved the old as a treasure of great value. From the talks we held with them, it turns out that the Chinese placed little value on all the revolutionary experience of the world. To them only their own policy, their struggle against Chiang Kai-shek, their long march, the theory of Mao Tsetung, were of value. As for the progressive values of other peoples, the Chinese considered them of little or no worth, indeed they did not take the trouble to study them.
Mao Tsetung proclaimed, <<the Chinese should cast aside the formulas created by foreigners>>. But precisely which of these formulas, he does not define. He has condemned <<all the clichés and dogmas borrowed from other countries>>. Here the question arises: is the theory of scientific socialism, which was not worked out by the Chinese, also included in these <<dogma>> sand <<clichés>> alien to China?

The leadership of the Communist Party of China considered Marxism-Leninism the monopoly of the Soviet Union, towards which Mao Tsetung and company nurtured chauvinist views, great . state views, and had, you might say, a sort of bourgeois jealousy. They did not consider the Soviet Union of the time of Lenin and Stalin the great fatherland of the world proletariat, on which proletarians of all the world had to rely in order to carry out the revolution, and which they had to defend with all their strength against the furious onslaught of the bourgeoisie and imperialism. Decades ago, Mao Tsetung and Chou En-lai, the two chief leaders of the Communist Party of China, spoke and acted in opposition to the Soviet Union which was led by Stalin. They even spoke against Stalin himself. Mao Tsetung accused Stalin of subjectivism, saying, <<he failed to see the connection between the struggle of opposites and the unity of opposites>>, (Mao) that he allegedly made <<a number of mistakes in connection with China. The 'Left adventurism' pursued by Wang Ming in the latter part of the Second Revolutionary Civil War period and his Right opportunism in the early days of the War of Resistance Against Japan can both be traced to Stalin>>, that Stalin's actions towards Yugoslavia and Tito were wrong, etc.

Although for the sake of appearances Mao Tsetung would now and then speak in defence of Stalin, saying that he was only 30 percent bad, in fact he mentioned only Stalin's mistakes. Mao's statement at the Moscow Meeting of the communist and workers' parties in 1957, when he said, <<in Stalin's presence I felt like the pupil before his teacher, whereas now that we meet Khrushchev, we are like comrades, we are at ease>>, is not fortuitous. With this he publicly hailed and approved Khrushchev's slanders against Stalin and defended the Khrushchevite line.

Just as the other revisionists, Mao Tsetung used the criticisms against Stalin in order to justify his deviation from the Marxist-Leninist principles which Stalin consistently defended and further enriched. With their attack against Stalin, the Chinese revisionists intended to disparage his work and authority, to raise Mao Tsetung's authority to the rank of a world leader, a classic of Marxism-Leninism, who allegedly has a ways pursued a correct and infallible line! These criticisms also expressed their accumulated discontent against Stalin over the censure and criticisms he and the Comintern made of the leadership of the Communist Party of China and Mao Tsetung over their failure to implement the principles of Marxism-Leninism consistently on the leading role of the proletariat in the revolution, proletarian internationalism, the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary struggle, etc. Mao Tsetung expressed this discontent openly saying, <<Stalin suspected that ours was a victory of the Tito type, and in 1949 and 1950 his pressure on us was very strong indeed>>. (Mao) Likewise, during his talks with us here in Tirana, Chou En-lai said, <<Stalin suspected us of being pro-American or that we might go the Yugoslav way>>. Time has proved that Stalin was completely right. His forebodings about the Chinese revolution and the ideas guiding it turned out to be accurate. The contradictions between the Communist Party of China, led by Mao Tsetung, and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, led by Stalin, as well as those between the Communist Party of China and the Comintern, were contradictions over principles, over fundamental questions of revolutionary Marxist-Leninist strategy and tactics. For instance, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China ignored the thesis of the Comintern on the correct and consistent development of the revolution in China, its orientation about joint action of the working class in the city and the liberation army, the theses of the Comintern on the character and stages of the Chinese revolution, etc. Mao Tsetung and the other leaders of the Communist Party of China have always spoken disparagingly of the delegates from the Comintern to China, calling them <<stupid>>, <<ignorant>> people, who <<did not know the Chinese reality>>, etc. Regarding each country as <<an objective reality in itself>>, <<closed to others>>, Mao Tsetung considered the assistance of the delegates from the Comintern unnecessary, and simply impossible.
In his speech to the Enlarged Working Conference of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in January 1962, Mao Tsetung said: "China, as an objective world, was known by the Chinese and not by the comrades from the Comintern who were engaged with the question of China. These comrades from the Comintern knew little or nothing about Chinese society, the Chinese nation and the Chinese revolution. Thus why should these foreign comrades be referred to here?"

When speaking about their successes, Mao Tsetung leaves the Comintern out. Whereas for the defeats and deviations of the Communist Party of China, for the failure to understand and draw correct deductions from the situations which developed in China, he casts the blame on the Comintern and its representatives in China. He and other Chinese leaders accuse the Comintern of having allegedly impeded and complicated things for them in the waging of a consistent struggle for the seizure of power and the construction of socialism in China. But the facts of the past and especially the present Chinese reality confirm that the Comintern's decisions and directives about China were correct in general, and that the Communist Party of China did not act on the basis and in the spirit of the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

The consequences of the narrow nationalism and big state, chauvinism which characterize "Mao Tsetung though", that have been and are at the basis of the activity of the Communist Party of China, are also reflected in the stands towards, and activity of that party in, the international communist movement.

This is apparent concretely in the stand of the Communist Party of China towards the new Marxist-Leninist parties which were created after the Khrushchevites' betrayal. From the very start the Chinese leadership had not the least confidence in them. This view was expressed openly by Keng Piao, the person in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, who makes the decisions on relations with the international communist movement. He has said, "China does not approve the creation of Marxist-Leninist parties and does not want the representatives of these parties to come to China. Their coming is a nuisance to us but," he stressed, "we can do nothing about them, for we cannot send them away. We accept them just as we accept the representatives of bourgeois parties".* (From Keng Piao's conversation with comrades from our Party in Peking, April 16, 1973)

Such a policy, which had nothing in common with proletarian internationalism, was followed at the time Mao Tsetung was alive, when he was fully capable of thinking and directing, hence it had his full approval. When, contrary to the desires of the Chinese leaders, these new Marxist-Leninist parties began to grow strong, then they pursued another tactic, the recognition of all new parties and every group without exception and without any distinction, provided only that they called themselves "Marxist parties", "revolutionary parties", "red guards", etc. The Party of Labour of Albaniaia has criticized this stand and tactic of the Communist Party of China. The other genuine Marxist-Leninist parties have done the same thing. Nevertheless, the revisionist Chinese 'readership has continued on the same course. Later, in conformity with their pragmatic policy towards the newly formed parties and groups, the Chinese leaders adopted differentiated attitudes. They called the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties their enemies, whereas RIM groups and parties which opposed these parties, came to be very dear to them. At present, the Chinese revisionists not only maintain ties with these anti-Marxist parties and groups, which laud "Mao Tsetung thought" to the skies, but also invite their representatives one by one to Peking, where they work on them, give them financial assistance and political and ideological instructions and brief them on how to act against the Party of Labour of Albania and the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties. They require them to propagate "Mao Tsetung thought", the theory of "three worlds" and, in general, the foreign policy of China, to create the cult of Hua Kuo-feng and Teng Hsiao ping and condemn "The Four". To the Chinese revisionists, that party which meets these demands is "Marxist-Leninist", while those parties which oppose them are declared anti-Marxist, adventurist, etc.
All this shows that in their relations with the Marxist-Leninist parties, the Chinese revisionist leaders have not implemented the Leninist principles and norms which regulate relations between genuine communist parties. Like the Khrushchevite revisionists, proceeding from the anti-Marxist concept of the <<mother party>>, they have resorted to dictate, pressure and interference in the internal affairs of the other parties, and have never accepted comradely advice and suggestions from sister parties. They have opposed the multilateral meetings of Marxist-Leninist parties, meetings to discuss the great problems of the preparation and triumph of the revolution, the fight against modern revisionism for the defence of Marxism-Leninism, to exchange experience and co-ordinate actions, etc. The reason for such a stand, among other things, is that they have been afraid to confront the genuine Marxist-Leninists in multilateral meetings, because their anti-Marxist and revisionist theories in the service of world capital and of the strategy intended to transform China into a superpower, would be exposed and unmasked.

Another indication of the anti-Marxist essence of <<Mao Tsetung thought>> is the relations the Communist Party of China has maintained and continues to maintain with many heterogenous fascist, revisionist and other parties and groups. Now it is striving to prepare the ground to infiltrate or build relations also with the old revisionist parties of various countries, as for example those of Italy, France, Spain and the other countries of Europe, Latin America, etc. The Chinese revisionists are attaching ever greater importance to these relations because, ideologically, they are all in line with the Communist Party of China, regardless of the differences they have in tactics, which depend on the nature, strength and power of capitalism in each country. The ties of the Communist Party of China with these traditionally revisionist parties will gradually be expanded, their actions will be concerted while it will continue to use the small groups, which call themselves <<Marxist-Leninist>> and follow the Chinese line, to fight and disrupt the existing genuine Marxist-Leninist parties, which remain unwavering in their stand, as well as the other parties which are being born or will be born. With these actions the Chinese revisionists are openly assisting capitalism, the social-denioicrafic and revisionist parties, sabotaging the outbreak and triumph of the revolution and, especially, the preparation of the subjective factor, the strengthening of the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties which will. lead this revolution. The Communist Party of China applied this same tactic in its relations with the so-called League of Communists of Yugoslavia, which has worked with all its might to split the international communist movement and has fought socialism and Marxism-Leninism relentlessly. The present Chinese leaders want to march together with the Yugoslav revisionists and co-ordinate their actions with them in the struggle against Marxism-Leninism and all the Marxist-Leninist parties, against the revolution, socialism and communism. Mao Tsetung and the Communist Party of China have maintained a pragmatic stand towards Yugoslav revisionism and have made a great evolution in their views about Tito and Titoism. At first, Mao Tsetung said that Tito was not wrong, but it was Stalin who had been wrong about Tito. Then the same Mao Tsetung ranks Tito with Hitler and Chiang Kai-shek and says that <<such people... as Tito, Hitler, Chiang Kaishak and the Czar cannot be corrected, they should be killed>>. However, he changed his stand again and expressed his great desire to meet Tito. Tito himself declared recently: <<I was invited to China when Mao Tsetung was alive. During the visit of the Chairman of the Federal Executive Veche, Djemal Myedich, to China, at that time, Mao Tsetung expressed to him his desire that I should visit China. Chairman Hua Kuofeng also told me that, five years ago, Mao Tsetung said that he should have invited me for a visit, stressing that in 1948, too, Yugoslavia was in the right, a thing which he (Mao Tsetung) had declared even then, to a narrow circle. But, taking into consideration the relations between China and the Soviet Union at that time, this was not said publicly>>*. (From Tito's speech at the meeting of activists of the SR of Slovenia, September 8, 1978).

The revisionist leadership of China is loyally carrying out this <<will>> of Mao Tsetung. Hua Kuofeng seized the opportunity of Tito's visit to China, and especially of his own visit to Yugoslavia, to eulogize Tito, to present him as a <<distinguished Marxist-Leninist>>, a <<great leader>> not. only of Yugoslavia but also of the international communist movement.
In this way the Chinese leadership also openly endorsed all the attacks of the Titoites on Stalin and the Bolshevik Party, on the Party of Labour of Albania, the international communist movement and Marxism-Leninism. The close political and ideological relations of the Chinese revisionists with the Titoites, <<Eurocommunists>>, like Carrillo and company, the backing they give the anti-Marxist, Trotskyite, anarchist and social-democratic parties and groups, show that the Chinese leaders, inspired and guided by <<Mao Tsetung thought>>, are setting up a common ideological front with the renegades from Marxism-Leninism, against the revolution, against the interests of the peoples' liberation-struggle. That is why all the enemies of communism are rejoicing over the Chinese <<theories>>, because they see that <<Mao Tsetung thought>>, the Chinese policy, are directed against the revolution and socialism.

These questions which we have analysed do not cover all the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist content of <<Mao Tsetung thought>>. However, they are sufficient to permit the conclusion that Mao Tsetung was not a Marxist-Leninist, but a progressive revolutionary democrat, who remained for a long time at the head of the Chinese Communist Party and played an important role in the triumph of the Chinese democratic anti-imperialist revolution. Within China, in the ranks of the party, among the people and outside China, he built up his reputation as a great Marxist-Leninist -and he himself posed as a communist, as a Marx-Leninist dialectician. But this was not so. He was an eclectic who combined some elements of Marxist dialectics with idealism, with bourgeois and revisionist philosophy, indeed, even, with ancient Chinese philosophy. Therefore, the views of Mao Tsetung must be studied not only in the arranged phrases of some of his published works, but in their entirety, in their practical application, while also considering the practical consequences they have brought about.

In appraising <<Mao Tsetung thought>> it is also important to bear in mind the concrete historical conditions under which it was formed. Mao Tsetung's ideas were developed at the time of the decay of capitalism, that is, at the time when proletarian revolutions are on the agenda and when the example of the great October Socialist Revolution, the great teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin have become an unerring guide for the proletariat and the revolutionary peoples of the world. The theory of Mao Tsetung, <<Mao Tsetung thought>>, which was born in these new conditions, had to try to deck itself out, as it did, in the garb of the most revolutionary and scientific theory of the time, Marxism-Leninism, but in essence it remained a <<theory>> opposed to the cause of the proletarian revolution and which comes to the rescue of imperialism in crisis and decay. Therefore, we say that Mao Tsetung and <<Mao Tsetung thought>> are anti-Marxist.

When one talks of <<Mao Tsetung thought>> it is difficult to discern a single clear line in it, since, as we said at the beginning, it is an amalgam of ideologies, from anarchism, Trotskyism, modern revisionism à la Tito, à la Krushchev, à la <<Eurocommunist>>, and down to the use of some Marxist phrases. In all this amalgam the old ideas of Confucius, Menclus, and the other Chinese philosophers, who have directly influenced the formation of the ideas of Mao Tsetung, his cultural and theoretical development, also occupy an honoured place. Even those aspects of Mao Tsetung's views which come out in the form of a distorted Marxism-Leninism bear the seal and features of a certain <<Asiocommunism>> with heavy doses of nationalism, xenophobia and even Buddhist religion, and were bound to come into open opposition with Marxism-Leninism eventually.

The revisionist group of Hua Kuo-feng and Teng Hsiao-ping, which is ruling in China today, has <<Mao Tsetung thought>> as the theoretical basis and ideological platform for its reactionary policy and activity. In order to strengthen its shaky positions, the group around Hua Kuo-feng and Yeh Chien-yi, which came to power, unfurled the banner of Mao Tsetung. Under this banner it condemned the Tien An Men demonstration and liquidated Teng Hsiao-ping, to whom they attached the label of the revisionist, which he deserved. Under this banner this group seized power in a putsch and smashed <<The Four>>. However, the chaos which has always characterized China, continued at an even greater intensity.
This troubled situation brought Teng Hsiao-ping to the fore and imposed his return to power, and he set out again on his course of right extremism with fascist methods. Teng's objective was to strengthen the positions of his own group, to follow his undisguised course of alliance with American imperialism and the reactionary world bourgeoisie. Teng Hsiao-ping brought out the program of the <<four modernizations>> put an end to the Cultural Revolution, liquidated all that mass of cadres promoted to the organs of state power, the party and the army by this revolution, and replaced them with the men of the blackest reaction, who have been exposed and condemned in the past.

Now we are witnessing a period which is characterized by the big character posters against Mao Tsetung with which Teng Hsiao-ping's followers are decorating the walls of Peking. It is the period of <<revenge>> which has two aims: first, to liquidate the <<prestige>> of Mao and eliminate the obstacle of Hua Kuo-feng and, second, to make Teng Hsiao-ping an all-powerful fascist dictator and to rehabilitate Liu Shao-chi. Against this background of reactionary manoeuvres there are those in China, as well as abroad, who draw a comparison between Teng Hsiao-ping's struggle against Mao, who was never a Marxist-Leninist, and the crime of Khrushchev, who threw mud at Stalin, who was and remains a great Marxist-Leninist. No one, however little the brain in his head, can accept such an analogy. The most correct comparison possible is that, just as Brezhnev and the revisionist group around him toppled Khrushchev, now, the Chinese Brezhnev, Teng Hsiao-ping, is toppling the Chinese Khrushchev, Mao Tsetung, from his pedestal.

This whole business is a revisionist game, a struggle for personal power. It has always been so in China. There is nothing Marxist about it. Only the Chinese working class and a true Marxist-Leninist party purged of <<Mao Tsetung thought>>, <<Teng Hsiao-ping thought>>, and all other such anti-Marxist, revisionist, bourgeois thoughts, will correct this situation. It is the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin which can rescue China from this situation through a genuine proletarian revolution. But we are confident that one day Marxism-Leninism and the proletarian revolution in China will triumph and the enemies of the Chinese proletariat and people will be defeated. Of course, such a thing will not be attained without a fight and bloodshed, because it will take many efforts to form the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary party in China, the leader indispensable to victory over the traitors and the triumph of socialism.

We are convinced that the fraternal Chinese people, the genuine Chinese revolutionaries will free themselves from illusions and myths. They will come to understand politically and ideologically that in the leadership of the Communist Party of China there are no Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries, but men of the bourgeoisie, of capitalism, who are pursuing a course which has no for the masses and the revolutionaries to understand this, it is necessary that they realize that not Marxism-Leninism, <<Mao Tsetung thought>>is not a Marxist-Leninist and that Mao Tsetung was not a Marxist-Leninist. The criticism we Marxist-Leninist make of <<Mao Tsetung>> has nothing in common with the Tsetung attacks which are aimed at Mao Tsetung by the Teng Hsiao-ping in the struggle it is waging for power. By speaking out openly and frankly about these questions, we Albanian communists are fulfilling our duty in defence of Marxism-Leninism, and at the same time, as internationalists, also helping the Chinese people and revolutionaries to find the correct path in these difficult situations they are going through.
THE DEFENCE OF MARXISM-LENINISM
A MAJOR DUTY FOR ALL GENUINE
REVOLUTIONARIES

The present international situation is turbulent, the crisis in the capitalist-revisionist countries is getting worse, the aggressive policy of the superpowers more and more each day is creating new great dangers for the freedom and independence of the peoples and the general peace. The bourgeois and Khrushchevite, Titoite, <<Eurocommunist>>, revisionist theories and, together with them, the Chinese theories, too, are part and parcel of the great strategic plan of imperialism and modern revisionism to destroy socialism and strangle the revolution.

In these conditions, the defence of Marxism-Leninism and the principles of proletarian internationalism, a consistent revolutionary stand towards the major world problems, today constitute a fundamental task for our Party, as well as for all genuine Marxist-Leninists. Our just struggle must build up the confidence of the peoples and progressive mankind in the triumph of the cause of the revolution, socialism and the liberation of the peoples. Our Party is on the correct road and it will triumph because the revolutionaries and the peoples of the world, and the Marxist-Leninist truth are on its side.

The Marxist-Leninists and the revolutionaries throughout the world see that the Party of Labour of Albania defends Marxism-Leninism when the others attack it, that it defends the principles of proletarian internationalism when the various revisionists have thrown these principles overboard. They see that in its stands the Party of Labour of Albania not only proceeds from the interests of its own country, but also expresses and represents very great interests, near and dear to the entire proletariat, the interests of genuine socialism, the interests of all those who base themselves on and are guided by Marxism-Leninism for the revolutionary transformation of the world. At the same time, we notice that the policy China is following in its relations with US imperialism as well as with Soviet social-imperialism, is arousing doubts, discontent and constant criticism everywhere, especially in the countries of the so-called third world. This is natural, because the honest people in these countries see that the Chinese policy is not correct, that it is a policy which supports an imperialism which is oppressing them, that much of what the Chinese leaders preach does not conform to their deeds and the concrete reality. The peoples see that China is following a social-imperialist policy which threatens their interests.

In this direction, too, our Party is also making its modest contribution. The peoples trust it because it speaks the truth, and the truth has its source in the Marxist-Leninist theory which has been concretely applied in Albania. The development of our country, its liberation wars, its social, economic, political and spiritual situation in the past, have much in common with many countries of the world which have suffered or are suffering the savage oppression of internal rulers and foreign imperialist rulers. The experience accumulated by our Party in the seizure of power by the people, in the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the construction of socialism is a concrete example and aid to these peoples. The victories and successes achieved in the People's Socialist Republic of Albania have their basis in the Marxist-Leninist theory, by which it is inspired and which the Party of Labour of Albania applies in practice.

Apart from lackeys and ultra-reactionaries, no one is directly defending the bankrupt Chinese theory of <<three worlds>>. The policy of rapprochement of the Chinese with US imperialism revives the spectres of imperialist wars which nobody wants to see, deepens the colonial and neocolonial darkness which nobody can endure, and supports the capitalist exploitation which everyone wants to get rid of.

The Party of Labour of Albania has fought, is fighting and will always fight resolutely in defence of the purity of Marxist-Leninist ideas, it is and will always be against all those who strive to distort them and replace them with bourgeois, revisionist, counterrevolutionary ideas. Our Party is a proletarian party, a Marxist-Leninist party, an active participant in the world revolution, for which it is determined to make any sacrifice, just as it has done up till now.
There is no force that can make our Party deviate from this fully internationalist, glorious and honourable course. There is no force which can intimidate or conquer it. Our Party cannot reconcile itself to any kind of opportunism, to any kind of deviation from Marxism-Leninism, to any distortion of it. It will fight with determination against Chinese revisionism, too, just as against revisionism of any other kind.

Ours is a Marxist-Leninist party, and because we are such a party, we must not be afraid to speak the truth openly. Our Party is small in regard to the number of members in its ranks, but it is a Party toughened in many battles. It has always had the courage to state matters openly in defence of the purity of Marxism-Leninism, the revolution and socialism. The facts show that our fight against Chinese revisionism is correct, that it is essential, therefore it is approved and supported by the genuine Marxist-Leninist and revolutionaries.

A true revolutionary party, as our Party is, does not renounce its principled viewpoints in any instance. We cannot retreat just because others might consider courage, the virtue of our Party, conceit. The has not taught its members to be conceit but it has taught them to be always resolute just and stern against the class enemy. On these questions there is no room for discussion about whether the party is big or small. The communists, the genuine revolutionaries, the Marxist-Leninists must thoroughly understand how the situation are developing in the world today. They do not develop in a stereotyped form. If the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, the experience of the revolutionary struggle of the world proletariat and the experience of every genuine Marxist-Leninist party are studied, understood and assimilated properly, then these situations which, are developing can be properly understood and the revolution will be given a powerful boost.

We Albanian communists; must understand well that it is absolutely necessary to master Marxism-Leninism. The capitalist-revisionist encirclement and the pressure it exerts on us must never be underrated. We must not be foolishly overconfident in our understanding of these questions and in the real fight we must wage against the enemies surrounding us. The revolution has run into rocks and there are more ahead which must be blown up with explosives. Some must be blown up directly, some must be broken down piecemeal, while some others must be outflanked and then given the finishing blow. This is what understanding the strategy and tactics of the revolution means. In order to create confidence in the victory of the revolution, it is essential to organize the broad masses of the people, to make the proletariat conscious of the unwavering leadership of its genuine Marxist-Leninist party, because otherwise it may become involved in adventurist actions and compromise the victory of the revolution. The communists and the oppressed masses of the people have to realize that imperialism and world capitalism have great experience in oppressing the masses, in organizing the counterrevolution. Therefore, the tactics and strategy of the enemies, too, must be understood and coped with, because our ideology, our policy, our strategy and tactics are more powerful than any enemy, for they serve a just cause, the cause of communism.

Now for our Party, as well as for all the Marxist-Leninist parties in the world, the struggle against Chinese revisionism should be given the greatest attention. This is an important question, but this does not mean that while dealing with it, we are permitted to forget Soviet revisionism, Titoite revisionism, or <<Eurocommunism>>, which are very dangerous variants of modern revisionism. In regard to their tactics and strategy, all these anti-Marxist trends, regardless of the differences in their forms of struggle, are on the one course, have the same objective, and are same struggle.

For all these reasons, we must never divert our attention either from the struggle which must be waged against American imperialism and all the reactionary capitalistic bourgeoisie of the world or from the struggle against the Soviet, Yugoslav, Chinese, and other shades of revisionism. Despite all the contradictions they have among themselves, all these enemies are linked by the one cord - the fight against the revolution, against the Marxist-Leninist parties and their unity, against the general organization of the proletariat and the entire working masses in order to launch themselves into revolution.
The struggle against modern revisionism, and especially against Soviet, Titoite and Chinese revisionism, is not an easy matter. On the contrary, this struggle is and will be stern and protracted. For it to be waged successfully, for victories to be gained step by step, the communists, the cadres, the intelligentsia and all the working masses of our country must be imbued with the ideology of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin and must also study the rich experience of our Party in the struggle against modern revisionism. Only in this way will we be able to overcome the obstacles and emerge unscathed from the great hostile forest with all its thorns.

As always, our Party of Labour must maintain clear, resolute, bold stands on the correct Marxist-Leninist line. This line of our Party, with its clearly defined objectives, will help to expose American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, as well as Chinese social-imperialism, and to wage the merciless struggle against them successfully. The task of our Party, and of all the genuine communists of the world, is to fight with dedication to defend our Marxist-Leninist theory and cleanse it of all the distortions which the bourgeoisie, the modern revisionists and all opportunists and traitors make of it.

Marxism-Leninism is the triumphant ideology. He who embraces, defends and develops it, is a member of the glorious army of the revolution, of that great and invincible army of genuine communists, who are leading the proletariat and all the oppressed to transform the world, to destroy capitalism and to build the new world, the socialist world.

THE <<8 NENTORI>> PUBLISHING HOUSE (Tirana 1979)
ENVER HOXHA
EUROCOMMUNISM IS ANTI - COMMUNISM

At the 9th Congress of the Communist Party of Spain, in April 1978, the Carrillo revisionists declared that their party was no longer a Marxist-Leninist party, but a <<Marxist democratic revolutionary party>>. <<To consider Leninism the Marxism of our time>> declared Carrillo, <<is unacceptable.>>

The French revisionist leaders proposed to their 23rd Congress, held in May 1979, that they should give up referring to Marxism-Leninism in the documents of their party and use the term <<scientific socialism>> instead.

The Italian revisionists too, at the 15th Congress of their party in April 1979, removed from their Constitution the requirement that the members of the party should master Marxism-Leninism and apply its teachings. <<The formula of 'Marxism-Leninism' does not express the whole wealth of our theoretical and ideological heritage>> said the followers of Togliatti. Now anyone can take part in the Italian revisionist party, regardless of the ideology to which he adheres or which he applies.

In this way the Eurocommunist revisionists formally and publicly have sanctioned the final break with Marxism-Leninism, which in practice they had done years ago. Very pleased with this rapid and complete social-democratic transformation of these parties, the bourgeois propaganda called 1979 <<the year of Eurocommunism>>.

In a situation when the European bourgeoisie is in great difficulties because of the grave economic and political crisis, when the revolt of the masses against the consequences of this crisis and capitalist oppression and exploitation is mounting to ever higher levels, nothing could serve it better than the anti-Marxist views and anti-worker activity of the Eurocommunists. Nothing could give greater assistance to the strategy of imperialism for the suppression of the revolution, the undermining of liberation struggles and domination of the world than the revisionist, pacifist, capitulationist, collaborationist trends, including Eurocommunism.

The Western bourgeoisie does not conceal its enthusiasm over the fact that now the Eurocommunist revisionists have lined themselves up with the social-democrats, and the fascists to attack the revolution, Marxism-Leninism and communism jointly, with all their weapons. The capitalists are overjoyed that they are preparing new administrators of their affairs to gradually replace the social-democrats, whose long service in the apparatuses of the bourgeois state and open struggle against the working class and the cause of socialism in many countries, has led them into the ranks of extreme reaction and compromised them deeply in the eyes of the workers. Today the social-democrats, have become identified, not only ideologically and politically, but also from the social viewpoint, with the big bourgeoisie. Now the bourgeoisie has great hopes that the Eurocommunist revisionists will become the main warders of the capitalist order, the banner-bearers of counterrevolution. But the great lords of capital are a little hasty in beating the victory drum.

For more than a century now, communism has been terrifying the capitalist bourgeoisie and landowners, imperialists and opportunists, and renegades from Marxism-Leninism. For more than a hundred years Marxism-Leninism has been guiding the proletarians in their battles to overthrow capitalism and for the triumph of socialism. Its triumphant banner waved for a long time in many countries, and the workers, peasants, people's intellectuals, women and the youth tasted the fruits of that free, just, equal and human life for which Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin had fought. Although socialism has been overthrown in the Soviet Union and other countries where the counter-revolution triumphed, this does not prove that Marxism-Leninism has been defeated and invalidated, as the bourgeoisie and the revisionists claim.

The great leaders of the proletariat, Marx and Lenin, pointed out and stressed that the revolution is not a triumphant march in a straight line. It will have victories but also setbacks; it advances in
zigzags and mounts step by step. The history of the development of human society shows that the replacement of one social system by another, higher system, is not done within one day, but covers a whole historical epoch. In many instances and in many countries the bourgeois revolutions, which replaced the feudal system of exploitation with the capitalist system of exploitation, were unable to escape the counter-revolution, either. An example of this is France, where the bourgeois revolution, although it was the most profound and radical revolution of the time, was unable to establish and consolidate the capitalist order immediately. After the initial victory of 1789, the bourgeoisie and the working masses had to rise again in revolution to overthrow the feudal monarchy of the Bourbons and the feudal system in general and finally restore the bourgeois order.

The epoch of proletarian revolutions has just begun. The advent of socialism represents an historical necessity which results from the objective development of society. This is inevitable. The counter-revolutions which have been carried out and the obstacles which emerge can prolong the existence of the old exploiting system to some extent, but they are powerless to halt the march of human society towards its socialist future.

Eurocommunism labours to raise a barrier of thorns and brambles to the revolution, in order to defend the capitalist system. But the flames of the revolution have swept over and destroyed not only such barriers, but also whole fortresses erected by the bourgeoisie.

The revisionists and the Eurocommunists in particular, are not the first to attack Marxism-Leninism and to pronounce the gravest anathemas against it. The bourgeois reaction and imperialists have massacred, tortured and killed in prisons thousands and hundreds of thousands of communists, and fighters for the revolution, who had embraced the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and fought for the liberation of the proletariat and the peoples. The fascists have burned the books of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin in the city squares, and in many countries still people are sent to the firing squad when it is discovered that they read their books or whisper their names with hope and admiration, even in secret. No library could hold all the books, magazines, newspapers and other publications which attack Marxism-Leninism, no one can calculate or even imagine the quantity and extent of the anti-communist propaganda of imperialism.

Nevertheless, Marxism-Leninism has not disappeared, it is living and flourishing as an ideology and a reality, materialized in the socialist social system constructed according to its teachings. Examplifying this is socialist Albania, the Marxist-Leninist parties, and those millions and millions of workers and peasants who are fighting every day for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, for democracy and national liberation. No force, no torture, no intrigue, no deception can eradicate Marxism-Leninism from the minds and hearts of men.

The doctrine of Marx and Lenin is not a scheme drafted in the studies of philosophers and politicians. It is a reflection of the objective laws of the development of society. Even without knowing Marxism-Leninism, the working people struggle to escape from oppression and exploitation, to overthrow the bosses and tyrants, in order to live in freedom and enjoy the fruits of their toil. But by acquainting themselves with the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, they find the right road in the struggle, find the compass which guides them in the capitalist jungle and gain the light which shows them the certain socialist future.

The revisionists want to smash this compass of the workers, want to dim this light so that they lose this perspective. Until recently the revisionist parties of the West were united in the Khrushchevite-imperialist anti-communist campaign against Stalin. They spoke with great enthusiasm about <<liberation from Stalinism>>, allegedly to return to Leninism, which, according to them, had been distorted by Stalin. Now they preach abandoning Leninism <<in order to go back.>>, to the founders of scientific socialism - Marx and Engels.

These renegades are trying to present their rapid descent down the steps of betrayal of Marxism-Leninism as a painful ascent of the mountain to find the source of the communist truth. However, all revisionists, whether Khrushchevite or Eurocommunist, fight with equal ferocity and cunning both against Stalin and against Lenin and Marx. The initial concentration of their fire against Stalin, leaving Lenin out of it for the time being, was simply tactical. Their class logic told the imperialists
and revisionists that at the given moment it was preferable first to destroy socialism in the Soviet Union, first to attack Marxism-Leninism where it had been applied in practice. The bourgeoisie and reaction understood that the capitalist degeneration of the Soviet Union would greatly assist their struggle to bring about the degeneration of communist parties which were not in power. The name and work of Stalin were linked with the establishment of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union and the construction of socialism in that country. By denigrating Stalin and the social system for which he fought and worked throughout his life, reaction and all the anti-communist scum wanted to destroy not only the greatest and most powerful base of socialism, but also the communist dream of hundreds and hundreds of millions of people throughout the world. With their attack on Stalin and his work, they wanted to create an atmosphere of pessimism among the fighters for the revolution, the bitter disappointment of someone who unwittingly, has been guided by a false ideal. However, besides all the great hopes they had pinned on the campaign against Stalin, despite the victory of the counter-revolution in the Soviet Union and other countries, the revolution was not conquered, Marxism-Leninism was not eliminated, and socialism was not snuffed out. The Khrushchevite, betrayal was a major one, bit it could never pull down the glorious banner A Marxism-Leninism which the genuine revolutionaries, millions of people who believe in its inexhaustible power, always hold high. While Khrushchevism was unmasked as a counterrevolutionary ideology of the restoration of capitalism and as a great power policy for the domination of the world, Marxism-Leninism remained the ideology which leads to the triumph of the revolution and the liberation of the peoples.

Now the revisionists have turned against Leninism. It is natural to ask- why is this attack against Leninism undertaken and why are precisely the Eurocommunists the standard-bearers of this attack? Like Khrushchev, who with his attack against Stalin wanted to attack the theory and practice of the construction of socialism, the Eurocommunists, with their attack on Lenin, want to attack the theory and practice of the proletarian revolution. The work of Lenin is very wide-ranging, but it is closely linked precisely with the preparation and carrying out of the revolution. Therefore, like Khrushchev who could not destroy socialism in the Soviet Union without getting rid of Stalin, the Eurocommunists cannot thoroughly undermine and sabotage the revolution without eradicating Lenin from the minds and hearts of the working people.

In the struggle to deny and denigrate Marxism-Leninism, the bourgeoisie has always had the support of opportunists and renegades of every kind and every hue, according to the time. All of them have proclaimed the end of Marxism. They have described it as unsuitable for the new times, while they have advertised their <<modern>> ideas as the science of the future. But what became of Proudhon, Lassalle, Bakunin, Bernstein, Kautsky, Trotsky and their supporters? History has nothing positive to say about them. Their preachings have served only to hold back and sabotage the revolution, to undermine the struggle of the proletariat and socialism. They were defeated in the struggle with Marxism-Leninism and ended up in the rubbish basket. From time to time new opportunists drag them out of this basket, trying to peddle the bankrupt and discredited formulae and theses of the latter as their own and to oppose Marxism-Leninism. This is what the Eurocommunists are doing today.

The Eurocommunists are not the first and by no means original in their efforts to negate Marxism-Leninism on the grounds that it is <<outdated>> and that allegedly new theories have been discovered for everyone, proletarians and bourgeois, priests and police, to go over to socialism together, without class struggle, without revolution, without the dictatorship of the proletariat. Our Party of Labour long ago analysed and unmasked the anti-Marxist theories and counterrevolutionary actions of the Yugoslav and Soviet revisionists. It has also refuted the opportunist and bourgeois views land stands of the Chinese revisionists. It has not refrained from criticizing the ideological and organizational degeneration of the communist parties of Western Europe, either. In this book, however, we shall deal in greater detail with the examination and criticism of the anti-communist concepts and theses of the revisionist current which is doing great harm to the cause of the revolution and socialism not only in Europe but throughout the world.
Its capitalist godfathers have baptized this trend of modern revisionism Eurocommunism, whereas for us Marxist-Leninists it is anti-communism.

I

THE NEW IMPERIALIST STRATEGY AND THE BIRTH OF MODERN REVISIONISM

Opportunism - a Permanent Ally of the Bourgeoisie

The birth of modern revisionism, like the birth of the old revisionism, is a social phenomenon conditioned by many different historical, economic, political and other causes. Taken as a whole, it is a product of the pressure of the bourgeoisie on the working class and its struggle. Opportunism and revisionism, from the start to this day, have been closely linked with the struggle of the bourgeoisie and imperialism against Marxism-Leninism, have been a constituent part of the capitalist grand strategy to undermine the revolution and perpetuate the bourgeois order. The more the cause of the revolution has advanced, and the more Marxism-Leninism has been spread among the broad masses of the working people, so much the greater has been the attention which imperialism has devoted to the use of revisionism as its favourite weapon to oppose and undermine the triumphant ideology of the proletariat.

This is what happened at the beginning of the second half of the 19th century, after the publication of the <<Communist Manifesto>> and other works of Marx and Engels, and the growth of the influence of Marxism among the working masses of Europe. Precisely at this time reformist trade-unionist currents were spread in Britain, the petty-bourgeois views of Proudhon in France, the petty-bourgeois concepts of Lassalle in Germany, the anarchist ideas of Bakunin in Russia and elsewhere, and so on. This phenomenon appeared again after the heroic events of the Commune of Paris, when the bourgeoisie, mortally afraid of the spread of the great example it set, encouraged the new opportunist trend of Bernstein, who tried to strip Marxism of its revolutionary content and make it harmless to the political domination of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

At the beginning of the 20th century, when the political and economic conditions were becoming more and more ripe for the revolution and the seizure of power by the proletariat, the bourgeoisie gave all-out support to the opportunist trend of the Second International and used it extensively in its manoeuvres for the preparation for and launching of the First World War.

After the historic victory of the October Revolution, when socialism was transformed from a revolutionary theory and movement into a socioeconomic system which had triumphed in one sixth of the world, capitalism was forced to alter its strategy and tactics. Internally, it stepped up its violence and terror even further, began to use the most ferocious means to strengthen its rule even by bringing fascism to power. First of all, it further whipped up its demagogy and propaganda in order to denigrate and distort Marxism-Leninism by inventing new, pseudo-Marxist <<theories>>, by slandering the Soviet Union and preparing for war against it. At that time Lenin wrote that imperialism

<<...just because it feels that Bolshevism has become a world force, is trying to throttle us as fast as possible in the hope of dealing first with the Russian Bolsheviks, and then with its own.>>

(Lenin)

In 1918 the British, American, French and Japanese imperialists began their military intervention in Russia. The struggle against the first state of workers and peasants brought all the reactionary forces into a single camp. The opportunists and renegades from Marxism also hurled themselves into the attack on the October Revolution and the proletarian state power. Kautsky in Germany, Otto Bauer
and Karl Renner in Austria, Léon Blum and Paul Boncourt in France, rose in fury against the October Revolution and the Leninist strategy and tactics of the revolution. They called the October Revolution unlawful, a diversion from the course of historical development and a deviation from the Marxist theory. They preached the peaceful revolution without violence and bloodshed, the taking of power through the majority in parliament; they were against the transformation of the proletariat into a ruling class. They praised bourgeois democracy to the heavens and attacked the dictatorship of the proletariat.

When the armed intervention against Soviet Russia failed and when social-democracy was unable to stop the creation of new communist parties and the great revolutionary drive of the working masses of Europe, the bourgeoisie pinned all its hopes on breaching the communist front
<<...from within and is looking for champions among the leaders of the RCP (B).>> (Stalin)
The Trotskyites again brought up <<the theory of permanent revolution>>, according to which socialism could not be built in the Soviet Union without the triumph of the revolution in other countries. They amalgamated in a single front with the struggle of the bourgeoisie against socialism. Stalin very correctly pointed out that a single enemy front had been created, including everybody, from Chamberlain to Trotsky. The rightists, the Bukharinites also went on the attack against socialism. They were for extinguishing the class struggle, and preached the possibility of the integration of capitalism into socialism.

The strategy of imperialism assumed a more marked counterrevolutionary and anti-communist character, especially after the Second World War, as a result of the alteration in the ratio of forces in favour of socialism and the revolution, which shook the whole capitalist system to its foundations. These changes put the question of the revolution and the triumph of socialism on the order of the day, no longer in just one or two countries, but in whole regions and continents. Imperialism, headed by American imperialism, this time based its greatest hope on the militarization of the whole of its life, on military blocs and pacts, on violent intervention and open war against socialism and the revolutionary and liberation movements of the peoples. However, it pinned very great hopes also on the invigoration and activation of all the opportunist forces in order to undermine the socialist countries and communist parties from within and to bring about their degeneration.

The Victory over Fascism and the Counter-offensive of Imperialism

The imperialist powers and the whole of world capitalism encouraged and launched the Second World War with the aim of directing it against the Soviet Union and socialism. This war, however, not only failed to overthrow the first socialist state, but also dealt imperialism heavy blows, causing it great damage which put its whole system in jeopardy.
Not only were the armies of fascism routed on the battlefield, but the anti-communist ideology of world imperialism and the counterrevolutionary policy of international opportunism were defeated, too. The fascist powers, Germany, Italy, Japan, which comprised the main striking forces of the attack of international capitalism on socialism and communism, were defeated. The British and French empires, which up till that time had been the <<big noises>>, in world politics, declined in power and weight and tailed along behind the policy of the United States of America. The anti-communist front was thoroughly breached and the <<cordon sanitaire>> set up against the Soviet Union was smashed to smithereens.

The Soviet Union, which carried the main burden of the war and played a decisive role in the victory over fascism and the liberation of enslaved peoples, emerged from the war strong and with an indisputable international prestige. In the great clash with imperialism, the socialist system gave historical proof of its superiority, stability and invincibility. As a result of the conditions which were created and their anti-fascist national liberation war led by the communist parties, a series of
other countries broke away from the capitalist system and set out on the road to socialism. The socialist camp was created and this was the greatest event after the October Revolution. The communist parties of all countries had an unprecedented growth. Standing in the forefront of the fight against fascism, they had proved through the blood of their members and their stands that they were the political forces most consistently loyal to the interests of the peoples and the nations, the most resolute fighters for freedom, democracy and progress. Marxism-Leninism spread throughout the whole world, the international communist movement extended its authority and influence to all continents. The great ideas of freedom, independence and national liberation, which inspired the antifascist war, pervaded not only Europe, but also Asia, Africa and the Latin-American continent. The victory over fascism and the creation of the socialist camp awakened the peoples in the colonies. The colonial system of imperialism entered its greatest crisis. The powerful national liberation movement in the colonies, which accounted for almost half of mankind, burst out like a volcano. The rear of the capitalist system, the colonial and semi-colonial regimes began to collapse. Weakened by all these defeats, the imperialist system began to be shaken to its foundations.

All these changes constituted a great victory, not only for the Soviet Union, not only for the countries of people's democracy, not only for the peoples of the world, but also for the immortal theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, the vitality and accuracy of which was confirmed once again with new force in the greatest war which mankind has seen to this day, during which two worlds - the socialist world and the capitalist world, clashed. All the changes which occurred after the Second World War proved in practice the theses of Marx and Lenin that the capitalist world was in decay and heading for collapse, while the revolution and socialism were on the ascent.

It was these great victories of socialism, the peoples, and the Marxist-Leninist theory which compelled world imperialism to draft its new defensive and offensive strategy in order to resist the mounting waves of the revolution and the struggle of the peoples, in order to prop up the shaky foundations of the capitalist system.

The joint line, which the imperialist powers worked out after the war, was characterized by two fundamental directions:

**First,** they mobilized all their forces, every means at their disposal to restore their economic, political and military potential damaged by the war, to strengthen the capitalist system which was being shaken by the great attack of peoples' revolutionary liberation struggles. They set to work to consolidate the existing anti-communist alliances and to form new ones, and made great efforts to preserve colonialism by means of neo-colonialism.

After the Second World War, American imperialism found itself in a dominating position from the point of view of economic power, and to some extent from the military viewpoint, in regard to Europe and Asia which were ruined by the war. The militarized American economy was very powerful. The United States of America tried to establish its economic, military and political hegemony over the whole world, with the overriding aim of encircling and weakening the Soviet Union, which emerged triumphant from the Second World War and which certainly would be quickly restored from the economic aspect and would assist in the consolidation and progress of the new states of people's democracy, which had been created in Europe and Asia. To this end, the imperialist tactics of the political-ideological struggle and the economic struggle, as well as the military tactics, were built up. The latter were the further continuation of the American plans worked out during the Second World War, those plans which had made the United States of America a great power for the production of modern weapons, as well as for the discovery and production of the atomic bomb, which was dropped for the first time on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The United States of America became the leadership of the capitalist world and took upon itself the role of its <<saviour>>. Thus the pretentions of American imperialism to world domination were placed on the agenda. <<The victory in the Second World War,>> declared Harry Truman, who replaced Franklin Roosevelt as president, <<faced the American people with the permanent and urgent task of becoming the world leader>>. In essence this was a call for struggle against the
revolution and socialism, to win new dominant economic and military positions throughout the whole world, to restore its partners and to save the colonial system. In order to realize this strategy, UNRRA was used, the <<Marshall Plan>> was drafted, NATO was created, and other aggressive blocs of American imperialism were set up.

**Second**, the fundamental question for capital was to build up the undermining work against the Marxist-Leninist ideology on all fronts, in order to remove the most revolutionary section of the working people from its influence, and to cause the degeneration of socialism.

Along with the unrestrained armaments race, the militarization of the economy and the economic blockades against the socialist countries, imperialism also mobilized many means of propaganda, philosophers, economists, sociologists, writers and historians for the furious campaign against the revolution and socialism, in order to present capitalism and the capitalist state as changed, as <<people's capitalism>>, as <<a state of general well-being>>, etc. The bourgeoisie also exploited the favourable post-war economic circumstances to clamour about the <<prosperity of capitalism>>, to spread illusions among the masses about the elimination of crises, anarchy, unemployment and other ills of capitalism, about the alleged superiority of capitalism over socialism, which was presented as a <<totalitarian>> order behind the <<iron curtain>>, etc.

In order to hinder the peoples' liberation struggle, to strangle the proletarian revolution, to destroy socialism, and defend and consolidate its own position, the bourgeoisie in the moments of its agony and the general crisis of its capitalist system, incites, encourages and sets in motion the various opportunist and revisionist currents, along with other means. These enemies of the proletariat and the revolution set to work with all their strength, first of all, to attack Marxism-Leninism, the ideology which makes the working class conscious of its social situation and its historic mission, in order to distort this ideology, to make it harmless to the bourgeoisie and worthless to the proletariat. The new trends of revisionism which emerged after the Second World War and which were called for short <<modern revisionism>> undertook this despicable role of betrayal.

Modern revisionism, which is the continuation of the anti-Marxist theories of the parties of the Second International, of European social-democracy, adapted itself to the times after the Second World War. It has its source in the hegemonic policy of American imperialism. All the variants and currents of modern revisionism have the same base and the same strategy, and differ only in the tactics which they apply and the forms of struggle which they use.

**Modern Revisionism in Power - a New Weapon of the Bourgeoisie against the Revolution and Socialism**

The first current which preceded the modern revisionism in power was **Browderism**. This current was born in the United States of America and took its name from the former general secretary of the Communist Party of the USA, Earl Browder.

In 1944, when the victory of the peoples over fascism was clearly on the horizon, Browder came out publicly with a program which was reformist from start to finish. He was the first herald of that line of ideological and political capitulation which American imperialism was to strive to impose on the communist parties and the revolutionary movement. Under the pretext of the alleged change in the historical conditions of the development of capitalism and the international situation, Browder proclaimed Marxism-Leninism <<out-dated>>, and called it a system of rigid dogmas and schemes. Browder advocated giving up the class struggle and called for class conciliation on a national and international scale. He thought that American capitalism was no longer reactionary, that it could cure the ills of bourgeois society, and could develop in democratic ways for the good of the working people. He no longer saw socialism as an ideal, as an objective to be achieved. American imperialism with its strategy and policy had disappeared completely from his field of vision. For Browder, the big monopolies, the pillars of this imperialism, constituted a progressive force for the
democratic, social and economic development of the country. Browder denied the class character of the capitalist state, and considered American society a unified and harmonious society, without social antagonisms, a society in which understanding and class co-operation prevailed. On the basis of these concepts Browder also denied the need for the existence of the revolutionary party of the working class. He became an initiator of the disbanding of the Communist Party of the United States of America in 1944.

"The Communists," he wrote, "foresee that the practical political aims they hold will for a long time be in agreement on all essential points with the aims of a much larger body of non-Communists, and that, therefore, our political actions will be merged in such larger movements. The existence of a separate political party of Communists, therefore, no longer serves a practical purpose but can be, on the contrary, an obstacle to the larger unity. The Communists will, therefore, dissolve their separate political party, and find a new and different organizational form and name, corresponding more accurately to the tasks of the day and the political structure through which these tasks must be performed."*(E. Browder)

Browder took the Conference of allied powers which was held in Teheran in 1943 as his starting point and justification for the formulation of his bourgeois liquidatory theory and made a completely distorted and anti-Marxist analysis and interpretation of the results of this conference. Browder presented the agreement of the anti-fascist allies to carry the war against Hitlerite Germany through to the end as the beginning of a new historical epoch, in which socialism and capitalism had found the way to co-operation within "one and the same world", as he expressed it. Browder presented it as a duty to ensure that the spirit of co-operation and peaceful coexistence between the allied powers, which emerged from Teheran, should be applied not only between the Soviet socialist state and those capitalist states, but also within the capitalist country in relations between antagonistic classes. "Class differences and political groups now no longer have any importance," said Browder. He considered the achievement of "national unity", without incidents and in an atmosphere of class peace, the sole objective which the communists, should set themselves, and he understood this national unity as a bloc uniting the groups of finance capital, the organizations of monopolists, the Republican and Democratic parties, and the communists and tradeunion movements, all of which, without exception, he considered "democratic and patriotic" forces. For the sake of this unity Browder declared that communists must be ready to sacrifice even their convictions, their ideology and special interests, that the American communists have applied this rule to themselves first of all. "The political aims which we hold with the majority of the Americans," says he, "we will attempt to advance through the existing party structure of our country, which in the main is that of the peculiarly American 'two-party' system."*(E.Browder)

Confused by the relatively peaceful development of American capitalism following the well-known reforms which the American President Roosevelt undertook in order to emerge from the economic crisis at the beginning of the 30's, as well as by the rapid growth of production and employment during the war period, Browder drew the conclusion that American capitalism had allegedly been rejuvenated, that now it would develop without crises and would ensure the raising of the general well-being, etc. He considered the American economic system to be a system capable of resolving all the contradictions and problems of society and fulfilling all the demands of the masses. He equated communism with Americanism and declared that "communism is the Americanism of the 20th century". According to Browder, all the developed capitalist countries could resolve every conflict and go gradually to socialism by using bourgeois democracy, for which American democracy had to be the model. Therefore, Browder considered that the task of American communists was to ensure the normal functioning of the capitalist regime, and declared openly that they were ready to co-operate to ensure the efficient functioning of the capitalist regime in the post-war period, in order to "ensure the greatest possible lightening of obligations which are a burden on the people".
According to him, this lightening of burdens would be done by the <<reasonable>> American capitalists, to whom the communists must extend the hand of friendship. In conformity with his ultra-rightist concepts and submitting to the pressure of the bourgeoisie, after the disbanding of the Communist Party, in May 1944, Browder announced the creation, in place of the party, of a cultural and illuminist association called the <<Communist Political Association>>, justifying this with the argument that the American tradition allegedly demanded the existence of only two parties. This association, organized as a network of clubs, was to engage mainly in <<activity of political education on a national, regional and local plane>>.

The Constitution of this association says: <<The Communist Political Association is a nonparty organization of Americans which, basing itself upon the working class, carries forward the tradition of Washington, Jefferson Paine, Jackson and Lincoln under the changed conditions of modern industrial society,>> that this association <<...upholds the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights, and the achievements of American democracy against all the enemies of popular liberties.>>* (The Path to Peace, Progress and prosperity, New York 1944 pp.47-48)

Browder wiped out all the objectives of the communist movement. In the program of the Association there is, no mention of Marxism-Leninism, the hegemony of the proletariat, the class struggle, the revolution or socialism. National, unity, social peace, defence of the bourgeois Constitution and the increase of the capitalist production became its only objectives.

In this way, Browder went over from open revision of the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary strategy and tactics to the organizational liquidation of the communist movement in the United States of America. Although the party was re-formed at its 13th Congress in June 1945, and the opportunist line of Browder was formally rejected, his influence was never eliminated in the Communist Party of the USA. Later, especially after 1956, the ideas, of Browder flourished again and John Hayes in an article entitled <<The Time for Change Has Come>>**, (Political Affairs, October 1956) once again demanded in the spirit of Browderism the turning of the Communist Party of the USA into a cultural and propaganda association. And in fact, that is what the Communist Party of the USA is today an organization in which the revisionism of Browder combined with that of Khrushchev prevails.

With his revisionist concepts about the revolution and socialism, Browder gave world capitalism direct aid. According to Browder, socialism arises only from some great cataclysm, from some catastrophe, and not as an inevitable result of historical development. <<We do not desire any catastrophe for America, even if such a thing would lead to socialism,>>, he said. While presenting the prospect of the triumph of socialism as very remote, he advocated class collaboration in American society and throughout the world. According to him, the only alternative was that of development by evolution, through reforms and with the aid of the United States of America.

According to Browder, the United States of America, which possessed colossal economic power and great scientific-technical potential, had to. assist the peoples of the world, including the Soviet Union, for their <<development>>. This <<aid>>, said Browder, would help America maintain high rates of production after the war, ensure work for all, and preserve the national unity for many years. To this end, Browder advised the magnates of Washington that they should set up a <<series of giant industrial development corporations for the various devastated and undeveloped regions of the world, Europe, Africa, Asia, Latin America.>>*(The Path to Peace, Progress and Prosperity, New York 1944, pp.21) <<If we can face realities without flinching, and revive in modern terms the grand tradition of Jefferson, Paine, and Lincoln, then America can face the world united, assuming a leading part... in the salvation of mankind...>>** (E.Browder, Theheran, Our Path in war and Peace, New York 1944 p.128) In this way, Browder became the spokesman and propagandist of the grand strategy of American imperialism, and its expansionist neo-colonialist theories and plans.

Browderism directly assisted the -Marshall Plan- through which the United States of America aimed to establish its economic hegemony in the different war-devastated countries of Europe, Asia, Africa, etc.
Browder advocated that the countries of the world, and especially the countries of people's democracy and the Soviet Union, ought to soften their Marxist-Leninist policy and accept the altruistic aid of the United States of America, which, according to him, has a colossal economy and huge surpluses which can and should serve all peoples(!). Browder tried to present his anti-Marxist and counterrevolutionary views as the general line of the international communist movement. Under the pretext of the creative development of Marxism and the struggle against dogmatism, he, like all the earlier revisionists, tried to argue that the new epoch after the Second World War required a communist movement which would reexamine its former ideological convictions and relinquish its old formulas and prejudices, which, according to him, cannot help us at all to find our way in the new world. This was a call for rejection of the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

Browder's views encountered the opposition of the communist parties of several countries, as well as of the revolutionary American communists themselves. Browderism was exposed relatively quickly as undisguised revisionism, as an openly liquidationist current, as a direct ideological agency of American imperialism.

Browderism did great damage to the communist and workers' movement of the United States of America and some Latin-American countries. Upsets and splits occurred in some of the old communist parties of Latin America, and these had their source in the activity of opportunist elements who, weary of the revolutionary struggle, grasped at any means with which American imperialism provided them to quell the revolts of the peoples and the revolution, and to spread decay in the parties, which were working for the education and preparation of the peoples for revolution.

In Europe, Browderism did not have the success it had in South America, although this seed of American imperialism was not left unabsorbed by those disguised anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist reformist elements who were awaiting or preparing the suitable moments, to deviate openly from the scientific Marxist-Leninist ideology.

Although in its own time Browderism did not manage to become a revisionist current with broad international proportions, the other modern revisionists who came later revived its views and made them their own. These views, in various forms, remain the basis of the political and ideological platforms of the Chinese and Yugoslav revisionists, as well as of the Eurocommunist parties of Western Europe.

Not only Browderism, but also Mao Zedong thought, the theories and line which the Chinese leadership followed, responded to the American strategy for restraining communism and for the establishment of the hegemony of the United States of America over the post-war capitalist world.

At the beginning of 1945, at the time when Browder appeared on the scene and when a new American strategy under Truman was assuming its complete form, the 7th Congress of the Communist Party of China was held in that country. The Constitution which this congress adopted, states: The Communist Party of China is guided by the ideas of Mao Zedong in all its activity. Commenting on this decision, in the report which he delivered at the congress, Liu Shaoqi declared that Mao Zedong had allegedly refuted many outdated concepts of the Marxist theory and replaced them with new theses and conclusions. According to Liu Shaoqi, Mao Zedong had managed to give Marxism a Chinese form. He says: The ideas of Mao Zedong are Chinese Marxism.

These new theses and conclusions of Marxism had nothing at all to do with any creative application of Marxism-Leninism in the concrete conditions of China, but were a denial of its universal fundamental laws. Mao Zedong and his comrades had a bourgeois democratic concept of the development of the revolution in China. They were not for raising it to a
socialist revolution. For them the model was the <<American democracy>> and they reckoned on the support of American capital for the construction of new China. There were great affinities between the ideas of Mao Zedong and the opportunist ideas of Browder who, it must be said, had studied and thoroughly understood the anti-Marxist concepts of the Chinese leaders. Browder wrote: <<What is called the 'Communist' camp in China, because it is led by outstanding members of the Chinese Communist Party, is much closer to American concepts of democracy than is the so-called Kuomintang camp; it is closer in every way, including the wider scope given to 'free enterprise' in the economic life.>> *(E. browder, Teheran, Our Path in War and Peace, New York 1944, p.26)

Mao Zedong was for the unrestricted free development of capitalism in China in the period of the state of the type of <<new democracy>>, as he called that regime which was to be established after the departure of the Japanese. At the 7th Congress of the CPC he said, <<Some think that the communists are against the development of private initiative, against the development of private capital, against the protection of private property. In reality, this is not so. The task of the order of new democracy, which we are striving to establish, is precisely to ensure the possibility for broad circles of Chinese to freely develop their private initiative in society, to freely develop the private capitalist economy.>> In this way, Mao Zedong took over the anti-Marxist concept of Katitsky, according to which, in the backward countries the transition to socialism cannot be achieved without going through a lengthy period of free development of capitalism which prepares the conditions to go over to socialism later. In fact, the so-called socialist regime which Mao Zedong and his group established in China, was and remained a bourgeois-democratic regime.

In practice, the line which the Chinese leadership, headed by Mao Zedong, began to follow for restraining the revolution in China and shutting off its socialist perspective assisted American imperialism, which wanted to extend its domination, and the other imperialist powers, which were seeking to preserve their old domination.

In the post-war years, the anti-colonialist national liberation movements surged ahead on all continents. The British, French, Italian, Dutch, and Belgian colonial empires were collapsing one after the other under the waves of the popular uprisings in the colonies. The revolutions in most of these countries were bourgeois-democratic. However, in some of them, the objective possibilities existed for the revolution to be raised and assume a socialist character. Mao Zedong, with his views and activities, advocated the diversion of the anti-imperialist revolutions from the right course of their development; he wanted them to stop halfway, not to go beyond the bourgeois framework, so that the capitalist system was perpetuated. If we bear in mind the importance of the Chinese revolution and its influence among the colonial countries, the damage which the -theories>> of Mao Zedong caused was great.

Mao's line was that China, and following its example, Indochina, Burma, Indonesia, India, etc., had to rely on the United States of America and American capital and aid for their development. In fact this was acceptance of that new strategy which had been formulated in the departments of Washington and which Browder had begun to advocate in his own way.

The American envoys attached to Mao Zedong's staff in the years 1944-1949 have described in detail the views, attitudes, activity and demands of Mao Zedong towards the United States of America. One of these envoys was John Service, political adviser to the commander of the American forces on the Burma-China front and later secretary of the American Embassy to the Chiang Kai-shek government in Chongqing. He was one of the first of the American intelligence agents who made official contact with the leaders of the Communist Party of China, although there were continual unofficial contacts. Speaking about the Chinese leaders, Service admits: <<=Their outlook impresses one as modern. Their understanding of economics, for instance, is very similar to ours.>> *(J. Service, Lost Chance in China, New York 1974, p.195) <<It is not surprising,>> he continues, <<=that they had favourably impressed most or all of the Americans who have met them during the last seven years: their manners, habits of thought, and direct handling of problems seem more American than Oriental.>> *(Ibidem, p.198)
In essence, the liquidationist views of Browder about the party are found in the theories of Mao Zedong too. Just as Chinese communism was a wash-out, the Communist Party of China, too, was such only in name. Mao Zedong did not work to build a genuine Marxist-Leninist proletarian party. From its class composition, its organizational structure and the way it was built and the ideology which inspired it, the Communist Party of China was not a party of the Leninist type. Moreover, Mao Zedong had no consideration even for this party such as it was. He did whatever he wanted. During the so-called Cultural Revolution, he completely disbanded it, concentrating everything in his own hands and putting the army at the head of affairs.

Like Browder, who presented Americanism as the ideal model of the society of the future, Mao Zedong too, considered American democracy the finest example of state and social organization for China. Mao Zedong admitted to Service: <<After all, we Chinese consider you Americans the ideal of democracy.>>*

Along with their acceptance of American democracy, the Chinese leaders sought the establishment of close and direct links with American capital, sought American economic aid. Service writes that Mao Zedong told him, <<China must industrialize. This can be done - in China only by free enterprise and with the aid of foreign capital. Chinese and American interests are correlated and similar... <<The United States would find us more cooperative than the Kuomintang. We will not be afraid of democratic American influence - we will welcome it... <<America does not need to fear that we will not be co-operative. We must co-operate and we must have American help.>>> *(J. Service, lost Chance in china, New York 1974, p.307)

Today we hear such statements and requests every day from the disciples and collaborators of Mao Zedong, such as Deng Xiaoping, Hua Guofeng, and others who are achieving in practice the all-round links with American imperialism dreamed of and initiated by Mao Zedong. Now the Chinese strategy is orientated completely towards co-operation with the United States of America in particular, and world capitalism in general, and they began to support China politically and to influence it ideologically, so that it would obliterate any shadow of Marxism-Leninism from the minds and hearts of common people and thus carry out thorough-going political and organizational transformations towards the capitalist system, whether in the economic field, in the state organization, or in the organization of the party. Objectively, the whole line of Mao Zedong for the construction of China and his concept of the development of the countries, which liberated themselves from colonialism has served and gone along with the strategy of American imperialism. If close collaboration between China and the United States of America was not established at the start, this is explained by the fact that in the post-war years the Chiang Kai-shek lobby triumphed in America. At that time the <<cold war>> war was at its height and Macarthyism prevailed in America. On the other hand, immediately after the war, the United States of America gave priority to Japan, thinking that first of all, it had to aid Japan or subjugate it from every point of view, to make it a powerful and obedient ally, to reconstruct the Japanese economy, and turn that country into a great bastion against the Soviet Union, and eventually against Mao Zedong's China. Apparently, the USA was not sufficiently powerful to be able to provide aid for all parts of the world and to prepare them against the Soviet Union, against the system of socialism, therefore, it gave preference to preparing Europe and Japan, where the destruction was great and where socialism, had become dangerous to world capital.

Without doubt, these were the factors that made the heads of American imperialism refuse to grasp the hand Mao Zedong held out to them immediately. Considerable time had to pass. The Chinese revisionist leaders had to give new proofs, of their <<love>> for America before Nixon could go to Beijing and the Americans and all the others understand that China had nothing at all to do with socialism.
After the Second World War the Yugoslav revisionists were included in the great campaign of American imperialism and other reactionary forces that gathered around it, in the struggle against socialism and the revolution. This current, which represented revisionism in power, emerged at a crucial moment of the struggle between socialism and imperialism.

The period after the Second World War could not be a period of tranquility either for imperialism or for socialism. In the new conditions which had been created, imperialism had to cope with situations which were mortally dangerous to it, while socialism had to be consolidated, had to radiate and give its aid in the right way for the liberation and the progress of the peoples of the world. It was a time when not only the wounds of the war had to be treated and healed, but the class struggle had to be waged correctly, too, both within the countries where the proletariat had taken power and in the international arena. The victory over fascism had been achieved, but the peace was relative, the war continued with other means.

The socialist countries and their communist parties were faced with the task of working to consolidate their victories on the Marxist-Leninist road and to become examples and mirrors for the peoples and the other communist parties which were not in power. The communist parties of the socialist countries, also, had to temper themselves further with the Marxist-Leninist ideology, taking care that this was not turned into a dogma, but preserved as a revolutionary theory for action, a means to achieve profound social transformations, which is what it is in fact. In particular, after the historic victory over the fascist coalition, the socialist countries and the communist parties had to avoid becoming conceited, thinking that they were infallible, and forgetting or weakening the class struggle. This is the important thing Stalin had in mind when he stressed the need for the continuation of the class struggle in socialism.

Precisely in these circumstances the Titoites came out against Marxism-Leninism. Titoism did not throw off its disguise and come out openly against the revolution and socialism at the start, but, on the contrary, tried to camouflage itself while continuing to prepare the terrain for taking Yugoslavia back into the road of capitalism and its transformation into a tool of world imperialism.

It is a recognized fact that Titoism leaned spiritually, politically and ideologically towards the West, towards the United States of America, that right from the start it maintained numerous political contacts and achieved secret combinations with the British and other representatives of world capitalism. The Yugoslav leaders opened all the doors to UNRRA, and by this means and under the pretext of aid with the stockpiles of clothing and food left over from the time of the war, the American-British imperialist tried to infiltrate into many countries of the world, and especially into the countries of people's democracy. The aim of the imperialists was to prepare a more or less suitable terrain for operations of a more wide-ranging plan in the future. The Yugoslavs benefited greatly from the things UNRRA gave them, but for its part, UNRRA was able to exert its influence on the still incompletely built state mechanisms of the newly formed Yugoslav state. Right from the start, American imperialism and the whole of international reaction gave Titoism all their support because they saw in it the course, the ideology and the policy which led to the degeneration of the countries of the socialist camp, to the splitting and disruption of their unity with the Soviet Union. The activity of Titoism conformed completely to the aim of American imperialism to undermine socialism from within. But Titoism was also to serve the strategy of imperialism of paralysing the liberation struggles and weaning new states, which had just thrown off the colonialist Yoke, away from the revolutionary movement.

From the beginning, the Yugoslav revisionists were against the theory and practice of the genuine socialism of Lenin and Stalin on all questions and in all fields. Tito and his group linked the country with the capitalist world and set themselves the task of transforming everything in Yugoslavia, including its policy, ideology, state organization, the organization of the economy and the army, in the direction of the Western capitalist states. Their aim was to transform Yugoslavia into a bourgeois capitalist country as quickly as possible. Browder's ideas, which were the ideas of American capitalism, found a place in the political and ideological platform of Titoism.
First of all, the Titoites revised the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism about the role and mission of the revolutionary state power and the communist party in socialist society. They attacked the Marxist thesis about the leading role of the communist party in all fields of life in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Following the example of Browder in America, they liquidated the party in practice, not just because they changed its name, calling it the League of Communists, but because they also changed the aims, functions, organization and the role which this party was to play in the revolution and the construction of socialism. The Titoites transformed the party into an educational and propaganda association. They eliminated the revolutionary spirit of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and de facto went so far as to eliminate the influence of the party and to raise the role of the Popular Front above it.

On the cardinal question of the party, in connection with the leading factor of the revolution and the construction of socialism, there is a community of political, ideological and organizational views between Browderism and Titoism. Since Titoism, like Browderism, is liquidationist and anti-Marxist on the decisive platform of the vanguard role of the party of the working class in the revolution and construction of socialism, it is such in all its platforms.

The similarity of the views of the Titoites and those of Browder is apparent also in their stand towards <<American democracy>> which the Titoites took as a model for the construction of the political system in Yugoslavia. Kardelj himself has admitted that this system is <<... similar to the organization of the executive power in the United States of America>>.* *(E. Kardelj, Directions of the Development of the Political System of Socialist Self-administration, Rilindja, Prishtina 1978, p.235)

Following the liquidation of the party and the break with the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy, Yugoslavia has been writhing in a chaos of economic-organizational operations. The Titoites proclaimed the state property <<social>> property, and camouflaged the capitalist relations of production under the anarcho-syndicalist slogan of <<factories to the workers>>, and set the detachments of the working class one against the other. The collectivization of small producers was called the <<Russian way>> and was opposed with the <<American way>> of the creation of capitalist farms and the encouragement of private peasant economies.

This transformation in the economic, political and ideological fields was bound to bring about the subsequent transformation of the state organization, the organization of the army, and the organization of education and culture and so it did. In the fifties they proclaimed their so-called self-governing socialism, which was used to disguise the capitalist order. This <<specific socialism>>, according to them, was to be built by relying not on the socialist state, but directly on the producers. On this basis, they preached the withering away of the state in socialism, denied the fundamental Marxist-Leninist thesis about the need for the existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat during the whole period of the transition from capitalism to communism.

In order to justify their course of betrayal and to throw dust in people's eyes, the Titoites presented themselves as <<creative Marxists>> who opposed only <<Stalinism>> but not Marxism-Leninism. Thus, they proved once again that the slogan of <<the creative development of Marxism and the struggle against dogmatism>> is the favourite slogan common to every variant of revisionism.

The United States of America, Britain, European social-democracy, etc., gave Titoite Yugoslavia all-round political, economic and military aid and kept it alive. The bourgeoisie was not opposed to Yugoslavia formally retaining its <<socialist>> appearance, indeed it was interested in this. However, this kind of <<socialism>> had to be completely different from the socialism envisaged and built by Lenin and Stalin, which the Yugoslav revisionists began to attack, to call a <<low form of <<socialism>>, <<state socialism>>, <<bureaucratic>>, ... and <<anti-democratic>>. Yugoslav <<socialism>> had to be a hybrid capitalist-revisionist society, but essentially bourgeois-capitalist. It had to be a <<Trojan horse>> which would get into the other socialist countries, in order to divert them from the road of socialism and link them with imperialism.

And in fact Titoism became the inspirer of revisionist and opportunist elements in the former socialist countries.
The Yugoslav revisionists carried out extensive undermining and sabotage work in these countries. Suffice it to mention the events in Hungary in 1956, in which the Yugoslav Titoites played a very active role to open the way to the counter-revolution and take Hungary into the camp of imperialism.

In his well-known speech at Pula in 1956, Tito himself has clearly and openly explained the place which Titoism occupies in the overall strategy of imperialism in undermining the socialist countries from within. At that time he declared that the Yugoslav model of socialism was valid not only for Yugoslavia, but also for other socialist countries, which ought to follow and apply it. The Titoite concepts and theories about world development and international relations also conformed to the strategy of American imperialism. In his speech delivered in Oslo in October 1954, the main theoretician of Yugoslav revisionism, Kardelj, came out openly against the theory of the revolution, while advertising the solutions which capitalism had allegedly found. Distorting the essence of state monopoly capitalism, which assumed wide proportions in many capitalist countries after the Second World War, he proclaimed it an element of socialism, while he called classical bourgeois democracy "a regulator of social contradictions in the direction of the gradual strengthening of socialist elements". He declared that today "is taking place, and this he called "an historical fact" in a series of capital ist states. These revisionist concepts, which in essence are identical with those of Browder, were included in the program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and became a means of ideological and political diversion against the revolutionary and liberation movements of the proletariat and peoples.

On this basis the Yugoslav revisionists elaborated their theories and practices of "non-alignment", which came to the aid of the strategy of American imperialism to restrain the impulse of the anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples of the so-called third world and to undermine their efforts to defend their freedom, independence and sovereignty. The Titoites advised these peoples that their aspirations could be fulfilled by applying the policy of non-alignment, that is, of not opposing imperialism. According to the Titoites, the road to the development of these countries had to be sought in "active cooperation", in "ever more extensive co-operation" with the imperialists and big world capital, in the aid and credits which they should take from the developed capitalist countries.

As to where the course which the revisionists of Belgrade advocate leads, the present-day reality of Yugoslavia makes this very clear. The collaboration with American imperialism, with Soviet social-imperialism and the other big capitalist states, the large amount of aid and credits which they have received from them have turned Yugoslavia into a country which is dependent on world capitalism for everything, into a country with its independence and sovereignty crippled.

The strategy of American imperialism and the whole struggle of the international bourgeoisie against the revolution and socialism received further, extremely great and much desired aid with the emergence on the scene of Khrushchevite revisionism. The Khrushchevite betrayal was the heaviest and most dangerous blow which has ever been struck at socialism and the peoples' revolutionary liberation movement. It transformed the first socialist country, the great centre of the world revolution, into an imperialist country and a hotbed of counter-revolution. The repercussions of this betrayal on the national and international scale have been truly tragic. Not only have the peoples' revolutionary liberation movements suffered from its consequences, and they are still suffering from them, but international peace and security have been placed in great danger.

As an ideological and political current, Khrushchevism has no great difference from the other currents of modern revisionism. It is the result of the same external and internal pressure of the bourgeoisie, of the same deviation from the principles of Marxism-Leninism, and of the same aim of opposing the revolution and socialism and preserving and strengthening the capitalist system. The difference which does exist has to do only with the level of the danger which it represents. Khrushchevite revisionism always remains the most dangerous, the most fiendish, the most
threatening revisionism. This is for two reasons: first, because it is a disguised revisionism. It retains its external socialist appearance and in order to deceive people and lure them into its traps, makes extensive use of Marxist terminology, and according to the need and the occasion, even of revolutionary slogans. By means of this demagogy it seeks to spread a thick fog so that the present-day capitalist reality of the Soviet Union will not be seen, and above all, its expansionist aims will be hidden in order to mislead the revolutionary liberation movements, and turn them into instruments of its policy. Second, and this is more important, Khrushchevite revisionism has become the ruling ideology in a state which represents a great imperialist power, a thing which gives it many means and possibilities to manoeuvre in broad fields and in large proportions.

Khrushchevism and the other revisionist currents have in common the liquidation of the communist party and its transformation into a political force which serves the bourgeoisie. In the Soviet Union too, the Communist Party of Lenin and Stalin has been liquidated. It is true that the party there did not change its name, as occurred in Yugoslavia, but it was stripped of its revolutionary essence and spirit. The role of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union altered, and its work for the strengthening of the Marxist-Leninist ideology was replaced with the distortion of the Marxist-Leninist theory, under different disguises, through empty phraseology and demagogy. The political organization of the party, like the army, the police and the other organs of the dictatorship of the new bourgeoisie, was transformed into an organization to oppress the masses, not to mention the fact that it also became the bearer of the ideology and policy of their oppression and exploitation.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, like Browder, Tito, Togliatti, etc., who preached the transformation of their parties into <<associations>>, <<leagues>>, <<mass parties>>, allegedly to adapt them to the new social changes which ad occurred as a result of the development of capitalism, the growth of the working class and its political and ideological influence, etc., Khrushchev too justified the change in the character of the party as an alleged adaptation to the situation created in the Soviet Union, where allegedly the construction of socialism had been completed and the construction of communism had begun. According to Khrushchev, the composition of the party, its structure, role and place in society and the state had to alter in conformity with this <<new epoch>>.

When Khrushchev began to advocate these theses, the construction of communism in the Soviet Union not only had not begun, but moreover, the construction of socialism was not yet completed. True, the exploiting classes had been eliminated as classes, but there were many remnants of them still existing physically, let alone ideologically. The Second World War had hindered the broad emancipation of relations of production, while the productive forces, which constitute the necessary and indispensable basis for this, had been gravely impaired. The Marxist-Leninist ideology was predominant, but this does not mean that the old ideologies had been completely eradicated from the consciousness of the masses. The Soviet Union had won the war against fascism, but another war, with other means, and no less dangerous, had commenced against it. Imperialism, headed by American imperialism, had proclaimed the <<cold war>> against communism and all the poisoned arrows of world capitalism were aimed at the Soviet Union first of all. Great pressure was exerted on the Soviet state and the Soviet peoples, with the aim of instilling the fear of war amongst them, diminishing their revolutionary enthusiasm, and restraining their internationalist spirit and opposition to imperialism.

In the face of these internal and external pressures, Khrushchev surrendered and capitulated. He began to present the situation in rosy colours, in order to conceal his own pacifist illusions. His theses about the <<construction of communism>>, the <<end of the class struggle>>, and the .final victory of socialism>, looked like something new, but in fact they were reactionary. They were the expression of the concealment of a new reality which was being created, of the birth and
The development of the new bourgeois stratum and its pretensions to establish its own power in the Soviet Union.

The line and program which Khrushchev presented at the 20th Congress of the CPSU constituted not only the line of the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, but also the line of undermining the revolution, and of the subjection of the peoples to imperialism and the working class to the bourgeoisie. The Khrushchevites preached that at the present stage, the main road of transition to socialism was the peaceful road. They advised the communist parties to follow the policy of class conciliation and collaboration with social-democracy and other political forces of the bourgeoisie. This line assisted the attainment of those objectives for which imperialism and capital had long been fighting with every means, including arms and ideological diversion. It opened broad roads to bourgeois reformism and gave capital the possibility to manoeuvre in the difficult economic, political and military situation created for it after the Second World War. This is the explanation for all that great publicity which the bourgeoisie gave the 20th Congress of the CPSU all around the world and which called Khrushchev <<a man of peace>> who <<understands the situation>>, unlike Stalin who was for <<communist orthodoxy>>, <<incompatibility with the capitalist world>>., etc.

With their preachings of the peaceful road to socialism, the Khrushchevites sought to impede the communists and the revolutionaries of the world from preparing for and carrying out the revolution, and wanted them to reduce all their work to propaganda, to debates and electoral manoeuvres, to trade-union demonstrations and day-today demands.

This was the typical social-democratic line which Lenin had fought so fiercely and the October Revolution had overthrown. The Khrushchevite views, which were borrowed from the arsenal of the chiefs of the Second International, aroused dangerous illusions and discredited the very idea of the revolution. They did not prepare the working class and the working masses to be vigilant and to oppose the bourgeois violence, but urged them to remain submissively at the mercy of the bourgeoisie. This was also proved in the events in Indonesia and Chile, etc., with the communists and peoples of those countries paying very dearly for the revisionist illusions about the peaceful road to socialism.

Equally in favour of imperialism and the bourgeoisie and harmful to the revolution was the other thesis of the 20th Congress of the CPSU about <<peaceful coexistence>>, which the Khrushchevites tried to impose on the whole communist movement, extending it even to relations between classes, and between the peoples and their imperialist oppressors. According to the Khrushchevites, who presented the problem as <<either peaceful coexistence or devastating war>>, there was no other solution for the peoples and the world proletariat but to bend their backs, to give up the class struggle, the revolution and any other action which <<might anger>> imperialism and provoke the outbreak of war.

In fact the Khrushchevite views about <<peaceful coexistence>>, which were closely linked with those about the <<changed nature of imperialism>>, were practically identical with the preachings of Browder that American capitalism and imperialism had allegedly become a factor of progress in post-war world development. The prettifying of American imperialism and the false image created about it slackened peoples' vigilance towards the hegemonic and expansionist policy of the United States of America and sabotaged the peoples' anti-imperialist liberation struggle. Both as an ideology and a practical political line, Khrushchevite <<peaceful coexistence>> urged the peoples, especially in the new states of Asia, Africa and Latin America, etc., to extinguish the <<hotbeds from which the flames of war might burst out>>, to seek rapprochement and conciliation with imperialism, to take advantage of <<international co-operation>> for the <<peaceful development>> of their economy, etc. In its expressions, terms and other formulas, this line was the same as that preached by Browder, that in the conditions of the <<peaceful coexistence>> between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, wealthy America could assist restoration and advance of the whole world. It was the same line which Tito advocated and applied in Yugoslavia, which had opened the doors of that country to American aid, credit and capital.
It was the same desire, which Mao Zedong and other Maoist leaders had, to build up China with American aid, but which the different circumstances and events bad hindered up to that stage. And the Soviet Union cannot escape American aid and the aid from the other Western countries any more than the Titoites, or today the Maoists can escape them. The integration of the Soviet Union and other revisionist countries linked with it into the world capitalist economy has assumed large proportions. These countries have become some of the biggest importers of Western capital. Their debts, at least those which are made public, amount to tens of billions of dollars. Sometimes because of changing circumstances, such as those caused by the events in Afghanistan at present, this process is slowed down, but it never stops. The capitalist interests of the two sides are so great that in special situations they override all their frictions, rivalries and clashes.

The Soviet revisionists used the thesis about "peaceful coexistence" not only to justify their policy of concessions to and compromises with American imperialism. This line 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 Khrushchevite revisionist line assisted imperialism and reaction to take advantage of the situation in order to launch an all-round attack on communism. Of particular assistance to this new attack on the revolution and socialism were the attacks and the slanders of the Khrushchevite revisionists on Stalin and his work.

The Khrushchevite revisionists started their campaign against Stalin in order to justify the anti-Marxist course which they had begun to follow inside and outside the country. They could not negate the dictatorship of the proletariat and transform the Soviet Union into a bourgeois-capitalist state, could not strike bargains with imperialism, without negating the work of Stalin. This is also the reason why the campaign against him was conducted with the accusations borrowed from the arsenal of imperialist and Trotskyite propaganda which presented the past of the Soviet Union as a period of "mass reprisals", and the socialist system as "suppression of democracy" and a "dictatorship like that of Ivan the Terrible" etc.

But for all the slanders and attacks of imperialists, revisionists and other enemies of the revolution, the name and work of Stalin remain immortal. Stalin was a great revolutionary, an outstanding theoretician, who ranks with Marx, Engels and Lenin.

Life has proved the correctness of the analyses of the Party of Labour of Albania and its stands towards Khrushchevite revisionism and is confirming them every day. In the Soviet Union socialism has been destroyed and capitalism has been restored. Meanwhile, in the international arena, the stands and actions of the Soviet leadership have more and more revealed the socialimperialist character of the Soviet Union and its reactionary great power ideology. Thus, Khrushchevite revisionism has become not only the ideology of the restoration of capitalism and sabotage of the revolution and the peoples' liberation struggle, but also the ideology of socialimperialist aggression.

II
EUROCOMMUNISM - AN IDEOLOGY OF SUBMISSION TO THE BOURGEOISIE AND IMPERIALISM

As we mentioned above, modern revisionism emerged in the period of the sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism. It became an ally of the bourgeoisie and imperialism and joined in their efforts to contain and divert the great tide of proletarian revolutions, national liberation struggles and the peoples' anti-imperialist democratic movement. As such, the new revisionism could not fail to assume different forms and appearances, to use methods and tactics adapted to the needs of capital
in each country. It assumed its greatest development, its extension in the communist and workers’
movement after Khrushchevite revisionism emerged on the scene. The betrayal which took place in the Soviet Union was of incalculable assistance to the bourgeoisie
and imperialism at the moments most difficult for them. It gave big capital possibilities to attack the
Marxist-Leninist theory and the practice of socialist construction, to create doubts about the
revolutionary strategy of the proletariat, and to cause the ideological and political degeneration of
the communist parties. Above all, the communist and workers’ parties of Western Europe which
followed the treacherous line of Tito and Khrushchev, were severely shaken ideologically. In these
parties, the terrain had long been prepared for them to embrace the Khrushchevite revisionist ideas
and practice and carry them further. Their organizational and ideological degeneration to different
degrees and in various ways had begun earlier. Pseudo-revolutionary theories and practices had
long been applied in their ranks.

The Beginnings of Modern Revisionism in the Communist Parties of Western Europe

During the Second World War many positive factors which made the transformation of the anti-
fascist war into a profound popular revolution both possible and necessary, had emerged in Europe. Fascism had eliminated not only the national independence of the occupied countries, but also all
democratic freedoms, and had even buried bourgeois democracy itself. Therefore, the war against
fascism had to be not only a war for national liberation but also a war for the defence and
development of democracy. As regards the communist parties, the achievement of these two
objectives had to be linked with the struggle for socialism. In the countries of Central and South-eastern Europe, the communist parties knew how to link the
tasks of the war for independence and democracy with the struggle for socialism. They worked out
and applied a policy which led to the establishment of the regimes of the new people's democracy. Meanwhile, the communist parties of Western Europe did not prove capable of utilizing the favourable situation created by the Second World War and the victory over fascism. This showed that they had not properly understood and did not apply the directives of the 7th Congress of the
Communist International*. *(The congress was held July 25 to August 21, 1935) This congress instructed
that in the course of the opposition and fight against fascism, in certain conditions, the possibilities
would be created for the formation of united front governments which would be entirely different
from the social-democratic governments. They were to serve the transition from the stage of the
fight against fascism to the stage of the fight for democracy and socialism. In France and Italy,
however, the war against fascism did not lead to the formation of governments of the type which the
Comintern wanted. After the war, governments of the bourgeois type came to power there. The
participation of the communists in them did not alter their character. Even the French Communist
Party, which up to the end of the Second World War had a correct line in general, was unable to
overcome and correct its mistakes, weaknesses and deviations on certain problems, which stemmed
among other things from lack of realistic analyses of the internal and external situations.
The French Communist Party played a primary role in the creation of the Popular Front in France. It
launched the slogan of the Popular Front at its Congress of Nantes in 1935, a slogan which quickly
found an echo among the broad masses of the French people. The Comintern made a high valuation
of the efforts and work of the French Communist Party for the creation of the Popular Front. However, it must be said that the party did not know how or was unable to take advantage of the
situation and utilize it in favour of the working class. The Communist Party spoke openly about the danger threatening France from internal and external
fascism, denounced this danger and came out in the streets in demonstrations, but it expected the
measures against fascism and everything else from the <<legal>> governments, from the bourgeois
governments, formed by combinations in the bourgeois parliament. This was apparent at the time of
the creation of the Popular Front which was a success for the French Communist Party, because in
the complicated situation of that time it blocked the way to the setting up of a fascist government in France. Although it took some measures in favour of the working class, the Blum government violated and betrayed the program of the Popular Front in its internal and foreign policy. The Communist Party, which did not take part in the Popular Front government, but supported it in Parliament, was unable to stop this process. The struggle of the masses, strikes, demonstrations and actions were replaced by the once a week meetings which Léon Blum held in his home with Thorez and Duclos.

The leader of the Popular Front government was a socialist, and the socialists made up a large part of the government, but the government apparatus at the centre and the base remained what it was. The army remained <<la grande muette>>. *(French – the great mute; here the meaning is that the army was not supposed to get involved in politics)*. It was commanded, just as under all former governments, by the reactionary caste of officers trained at the bourgeois military schools for the purpose of suppressing the French people and occupying colonies, but not fighting fascism and reaction.

The French Communist Party did not carry its actions through to the end, it was not organized for real struggle against fascism and reaction. The propaganda and agitation, the demonstrations and strikes it led, were not on the line of the seizure of power from the hands of the bourgeoisie. Irrespective of the fact that the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism were not denied, the activity and struggle of that party unwittingly and unconsciously assumed the nature of the struggle for reforms, for economic demands on the trade-union level. Of course, the trade-unions, play a revolutionary role when they are under correct leadership and a revolutionary situation is created in them, otherwise the trade-union movement is turned into a routine concocted by the trade-union chiefs through stands which are sometimes correct, sometimes deviationist, sometimes liberal, sometimes opportunist, but which, in the final analysis, end up in fruitless talks and compromises with the employers.

When the war broke out in Spain, the French Communist Party actively assisted the Communist Party of Spain and the Spanish people in the war against Franco with agitation and propaganda and material aid. It called for volunteers to go to Spain, a call to which thousands of members of the party and other French anti-fascists responded, and three thousand of them fell martyrs on Spanish soil. The main leaders of the party took part directly in the war or else went to Spain on various occasions. Most of the volunteers, who set out from many countries to join the International Brigades in Spain, passed through France. It was the French Communist Party which organized their passage.

During the Spanish War the communists and the working class of France gained new experience in battle, and this was added to the old tradition of the revolutionary struggles of the French proletariat. This constituted a great capital, a revolutionary experience gained in organized frontal class battles against the savage Franco reaction, Italian fascists and German nazis, as well as against French and world reaction. This revolutionary capital should have served the party in the critical moments of the Second World War and the occupation of France, but in reality it was not utilized.

The French Communist Party exposed the policy of Munich with which the Daladiers and Bonnets made concessions to Hitler, selling out the interests of the Czechoslovak people with the aim of turning the Hitlerite war machine against the Soviet Union. It unwaveringly defended the Soviet-German non-aggression pact and withstood the slanders and persecutions of the bourgeoisie. It called for resistance and rose boldly in the fight against the German occupiers and their collaborators of Vichy. This struggle, which began with actions, strikes, demonstrations and sabotage, was steadily extended. The FTP* *(Francs Tireurs et Partisans - french partisans forces led by the FCP)* created by the Communist Party, were the only formations which fought the occupiers, while the Gaullist reseaux, as the name shows, were nothing but a network of the Secret Service to gather military information useful to the Allies. While the Gaullists advocated waiting for a landing before going into action, the Communist Party fought valiantly for the liberation of the country.

In the liberation war the French Communist Party organized and developed the resistance against the occupiers, and tried to and did achieve something in connection with the anti-fascist front.
However, as the events showed, it had not considered and had not planned the seizure of power, or if it had planned this, it abandoned the idea. This is confirmed by the fact that during the war the party created many committees for national liberation, but it did not give any attention to them and did not take any measures to ensure that these committees affirm themselves as the nuclei of the new state power. From beginning to end the partisan formations remained small and without organic links with one another. At no time did the party raise the question of the creation of big formations of a real national liberation army.

The French Communist Party carried on an anti-fascist liberation war which it led itself, but it did not turn this war into a revolutionary war of the whole people. Moreover, it considered it more appropriate and <<revolutionary>> to beg De Gaulle to be allowed to send one of its representatives to his <<Free France Committee>>. All this meant, <<Please, Mr. De Gaulle, accept me into your Committee too.>> This meant, <<Mr. De Gaulle, the French Communist Party and the partisan forces are going under your command and the 'Free France Committee'>> This meant, <<Mr. De Gaulle, we communists have no intention of carrying out any revolution or of seizing power, all we want is that the old game of parties, the 'democratic' game, will be played in the France of the future and that on the basis of polling we too will take part in the future government.>>

While the French communists were acting in this way, the bourgeoisie was preparing and organizing its forces to seize power in France, which it would assume when the Anglo-American allies landed there. The National Committee, created and led by the De Gaulle group in London, and turned into a government in Algiers, would be the most suitable force to take over this power. Of course, it would do this together with the internal forces which the bourgeoisie had prepared and set in motion together with the old army commanded by generals who after having served Petain, had placed themselves into the service of De Gaulle, when it became clear that the German ship was sinking.

This was a dangerous situation, which the French Communist Party did not appreciate and assess correctly, or did not analyse thoroughly. It was afraid of complications with the allied forces which were landing, it was afraid of De Gaulle and the forces gathered around him, hence it was afraid of civil war, and especially of war with the Anglo-Americans.

The Communist Party forgot the example of the heroic communards, who encircled by Bismarck's German armies, rose in revolt against the Versaillese, <<storming the heavens>>, as Marx said, and created the Commune of Paris. Theoreticians may try to justify this fatal mistake of the French Communist Party during the Second World War by saying: <<The strength of the forces had to be taken into account.>> Of course, the strength of the forces had to be taken into account. But since the communards, without a party, without organization, without links with the peasantry and the rest of France, and encircled by foreign occupation troops, launched the attack and seized power, the French working class with its party at the head, tempered in battle, enlightened by Marxism-Leninism, and having such a great and powerful ally as the Soviet Union in its struggle, at the head of the working masses and the genuine patriots, could have carried out the immortal deed of the communards a hundred times more successfully.

The leadership of the Communist Party in general proved hesitant and weak in fulfilling with courage and wisdom the desires and aspirations of the French communist militants and proletariat, who fought with determination and heroism against the Hitlerite occupiers. It did not proceed on the Marxist-Leninist road, on the road of revolutionary struggle. It did not follow in the footsteps of the communards.

The anti-fascist war in Italy had its own characteristics and features, but the objectives which the leadership of the Italian Communist Party had set itself, its vacillations and concessions are similar to those of the French Communist Party.

The start of the Second World War found most of the leading cadres of the Italian Communist Party in France. Nearly all of them fell into the hands of the police. Amongst them was the general
secretary of the party, Palmiro Togliatti, who as soon as he was released from jail, in March 1941, went to the Soviet Union.

Although the Italian Communist Party took a correct stand towards the aggressive war which the fascist powers launched, and condemned it as a predatory imperialist war, its activity remained restricted. All the efforts of this party were centered on the creation of a coalition of the antifascist parties in exile, on issuing a number of appeals, resolutions and propaganda publications.

In March 1943, the party, which had begun to develop its activity within the country from the middle of 1942, managed to organize a series of powerful strikes in various zones, which testified to the rise of the anti-fascist people's movement. These strikes accelerated the developments which led to the overthrow of Mussolini.

Fear of the revolution had made the Italian bourgeoisie and the symbol of its rule, the king, summon Mussolini to power in 1922. This same fear made the bourgeoisie and the king remove Mussolini from power in July 1943.

The overthrow of Mussolini was carried out by means of a coup d'état of the ruling caste. The takeover was the work of the king, of Badoglio, and other leading figures of fascism. Seeing the inevitability of Italy's defeat, by so doing they wanted to forestall the danger that the working class and the people of Italy would rise in struggle and revolution, which would not only overthrow fascism and the monarchy, but would place the domination of the Italian bourgeoisie as a class in jeopardy.

The resistance movement of the Italian people against fascism assumed great development especially after the capitulation of Italy. In Northern Italy, which was still occupied by the Germans, on the initiative of the party, the liberation war, which included the broad masses of antifascist workers, peasants, intellectuals and others, was organized. Big regular partisan formations were created, the overwhelming majority of them under the leadership of the party.

Likewise on the initiative of the Communist Party, national liberation committees were formed in Northern Italy, along with the partisan units and detachments. The party struggled to make these committees new organs of the democratic power, but in fact they remained coalitions of different parties. This did not permit them to be transformed into genuine organs of the people's power.

Whereas in Northern Italy the struggle of the party in general was developed on the right road, and could have led not only to the liberation of the country but also to the establishment of the people's power, in the South and on a national scale the party did not raise the question of the seizure of power. It sought only the formation of a strong government with authority, and did not fight for the overthrow of the monarchy and Badoglio. At a time when favourable conditions existed in the country to carry forward the revolution, the program of the Communist Party was minimal. The party was for a parliamentary solution within the framework of the laws of the bourgeois order. Its maximum claim was for its participation in the government with two or three ministers.

In this way, the Italian Communist Party involved itself in bourgeois political combinations and made unprincipled concessions one after the other. On the eve of the liberation of the country it had great political and military strength which it did not know how to use or did not want to use, and it disarmed itself voluntarily to the bourgeoisie. It abandoned the revolutionary road and set out on the parliamentary road, which gradually transformed this party from a party of the revolution into a bourgeois party of the working class for social reforms.

In regard to Spain, it must be said that the directives of the 7th Congress of the Communist International had greater results than in France or Italy. The effect of them was especially apparent during the Civil War. At first the communists did not take part in the Popular Front government, but gave it their support. Nevertheless, the Communist Party criticized the government for its irresolute stand and demanded that it take measures against the fascist danger, against the activity which the fascists carried out, especially the caste of officers, who constituted the immediate danger at that time.
On July 17, 1936 the fascist generals launched their "Pronunciamento". The fascists' plot was well co-ordinated. They had acted under the nose of the leftist government and the authorities established by a government which had emerged from the coalition of the Popular Front. All the anti-fascist forces lined up against this danger. In November the government headed by Largo Caballero was formed with two communist ministers included. Thus a common front was formed to defend the Republic even with arms. The government granted autonomy to the Basques, confiscated the lands of fascists in favour of poor peasants and nationalized all their property.

Right from the start, the Communist Party called on the working class and the people for resistance. The Communist Party did not content itself with appeals, however, but went into action. The members of the party went into the barracks to explain the situation to the soldiers, telling them what the fascists were and what a threat they presented to the workers, the peasants and the people. In Madrid, the capital of Spain, the fascist coup failed.

In other cities, the people, and first of all the working class, attacked the military units which had risen against the Republic and paralysed them. In Asturia the fight of the miners against the fascist troops raged for a month and this province remained in the hands of the people. The fascists could not pass there. The same thing occurred in the Basque region and many parts of Spain.

In the first days of August it seemed that the fascist generals were on the way out and their defeat would have been complete had the troops of fascist Italy and nazi Germany not gone to their assistance immediately, together with the troops recruited in Spanish Morocco and those sent by fascist Portugal.

In a country where the army was led by an old caste of reactionary royalist and fascist officers the fate of the country could not be left to the army, of which a part followed the fascist generals while the rest began to fall apart. Therefore, the Communist Party called for the creation of a new army, an army of the people. The communists set to work to create this army and within a short time managed to set up the Fifth Regiment. On the basis of this regiment, which achieved great fame during the Spanish War, the people's army of the Spanish Republic was built up.

The resolute stand of the Communist Party against the fascist attack, the bold example it set by placing itself at the head of the masses to prevent the advance of fascism, the example which its members set, 60 per cent of whom went to the different fighting fronts of the war, greatly increased the authority and prestige of the party among the masses of the people.

A party grows, wins authority and becomes the leadership of the masses when it has a clear line and hurls itself boldly into struggle to implement it. During the Civil War the Communist Party of Spain became such a party. Between the beginning of the fascist insurrection in July 1936 and the end of that year, the Communist Party increased the number of its members three fold. And despite the fact that in those days people turned to the party, not to cast votes in elections but to give their lives, at no time has any other party, whether the so-called communist party of Carrillo or the other revisionist parties which have opened all their doors to anyone, with religious beliefs or otherwise, workers or bourgeois, who want to join them, been able to show such a growth of its authority and influence as that which the Communist Party of Spain achieved during the time of the Civil War.

The Spanish War came to an end at the beginning of 1939, with the extension of Franco's rule over the whole country. In that war the Communist Party of Spain did not spare its efforts or forces to defeat fascism. If fascism triumphed, this is due, apart from various internal factors, first of all to the intervention of Italian and German fascism, as well as to the capitulationist policy of "non-intervention" followed by the Western powers towards the fascist aggressors.

Many members of the Communist Party of Spain gave their lives during the Civil War. Others fell victim to the Francoite terror. Thousands and thousands of others were thrown into prison where they languished for many years or died. The terror which prevailed in Spain after the victory of the fascists was extremely ferocious.

The Spanish democrats who managed to escape arrest and internment took part in the French resistance and fought valiantly, while the Spanish democrats who went to the Soviet Union entered the ranks of the Red Army and many of them gave their lives fighting against fascism.
Although in extremely difficult conditions, the communists continued the guerrilla war and the organization of resistance within Spain. The majority of them fell into the hands of the Francoite police and were condemned to death.

Franco dealt a heavy blow to the revolutionary vanguard of the working class and the masses of the Spanish people and this had negative consequences for the Communist Party. Losing its soundest, most ideologically prepared, most resolute and courageous element in the armed struggle and during the fascist terror, the Communist Party of Spain came under the negative and destructive influence of the cowardly petty-bourgeois and intellectual element, such as Carrillo and company, who became dominant. They gradually transformed the Communist Party of Spain into an opportunist and revisionist party.

Unity with the Khrushchevite Revisionists in the Struggle against Marxism-Leninism and the Revolution

The economic and political conditions which were created in Western Europe after the Second World War were even more favourable to the consolidation and spread of those mistaken opportunist views which had existed previously in the leaderships of the communist parties of France, Italy and Spain and further encouraged their spirit of concessions to and compromises with the bourgeoisie.

Amongst others, such factors were the abrogation of fascist laws and of other measures of restriction and compulsion which the European bourgeoisie had adopted from the first days after the triumph of the October Revolution and had maintained up to the outbreak of the war, with the aim of restraining the upsurge of the revolutionary drive of the working class, to hinder its political organization and prevent the spread of the Marxist ideology.

The re-establishment on a more or less extensive scale of bourgeois democracy, by completely legalizing all political parties except the fascist parties; permitting their unhindered participation in the political and ideological life of the country; giving these parties possibilities for active participation in the electoral campaigns, which were now held on the basis of less restrictive laws, for the approval of which the communists and other progressive forces had waged a long struggle, created many reformist illusions among the leaderships of the communist parties. The view began to establish itself among them that fascism was now finished once and for all, that the bourgeoisie was no longer able to restrict the democratic rights of the workers, but on the contrary would be obliged to allow their further development. They began to think that the communists, emerging from the war as the most influential and powerful political, organizing and mobilizing force of the nation, would compel the bourgeoisie to proceed on the course of extending democracy and permitting the ever greater participation of working people in running the country, that through elections and parliament they would have possibilities to take power peacefully and then go on to the socialist transformation of society. These leaderships considered the participation of two or three communist ministers in the Post-war governments of France and Italy not as the maximum formal concessions which the bourgeoisie would make, but as the beginning of a process which would develop gradually up to the creation of a cabinet consisting entirely of communists.

The development of the economy in the West after the war also exerted a great influence on the spread of opportunist and revisionist ideas in the communist parties. True, Western Europe was devastated by the war but its recovery was carried out relatively quickly. The American capital which poured into Europe through the <<Marshall Plan>> made it possible to reconstruct the factories, plants, transport and agriculture so that their production extended rapidly. This development opened up many jobs and for a long period, not only absorbed all the free labour force but even created a certain shortage of labour.

This situation, which brought the bourgeoisie great superprofits, allowed it to loosen its pursestrings a little and soften the labour conflicts to some degree. In the social field, in such matters as social
insurance, health, education, labour legislation etc., it took some measures for which the working class had fought hard. The obvious improvement of the standard of living of the working people in comparison with that of the time of the war and even before the war, the rapid growth of production, which came as a result of the reconstruction of industry and agriculture and the beginning of the technical and scientific revolution, and the full employment of the work force, opened the way to the flowering amongst the unformed opportunist element of views about the development of capitalism without class conflicts, about its ability to avoid crises, the elimination of the phenomenon of unemployment etc. That major teaching of Marxism-Lehinism, that the periods of peaceful development of capitalism become a source for the spread of opportunism, was confirmed once again. The new stratum of the worker aristocracy, which increased considerably during this period, began to exert an ever more negative influence in the ranks of the parties and their leaderships by introducing reformist and opportunist views and ideas.

Under pressure of these circumstances, the programs of these communist parties were reduced more and more to democratic and reformist minimum programs, while the idea of the revolution and socialism became ever more remote. The major strategy of the revolutionary transformation of society gave way to the minor strategy about current problems of the day which was absolutized and became the general political and ideological line.

In this way, after the Second World War, the Italian Communist Party, that of France, of Great Britain and after this, that of Spain too gradually began to deviate from Marxism-Leninism, to adopt revisionist views and theses and to take the course of reformism. When Khrushchevite revisionism emerged on the scene, the terrain was suitable for them to embrace it and unite firmly with it in the struggle against Marxism-Leninism. Apart from the pressure of the bourgeoisie and social democracy within their own countries, the decisions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU exerted a great influence on these parties to go over completely to anti-Marxist, social-democratic positions. The first to embrace the line of the 20th Congress of the CPSU were the Italian revisionists who immediately after that congress, loudly proclaimed the so-called Italian road to socialism. As soon as fascism had been overthrown, the Italian Communist Party had come out with an opportunist political and organizational platform. When Palmiro Togliatti landed in Naples on his return from the Soviet Union in March 1944, he imposed on his party the line of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie and its parties. In the plenum of the National Council of the Party which was held at that time, Togliatti declared, "We do not put forward the seizure of power as the objective of our struggle, because of international and national conditions; we want only to destroy fascism completely and to create a 'truly progressive, anti-fascist democracy'. The ICP 'must view every problem from the angle of the nation, of the Italian state'." * (By P. Spriano, The History of The Italian Communist Party, Turin 1975).

In Naples Togliatti put forward for the first time the idea, and indeed the platform, of what he called the "new party of the masses", which differed in class composition, ideology and organizational forms from the communist party of the Leninist type. It was natural that, for a policy of unprincipled alliances and a policy of reforms which Togliatti wanted, he needed a reformist party, a broad unrestricted party which anyone could enter or leave whenever he liked. Many years later a collaborator of Togliatti wrote, "His notion of a mass party which has its roots in the people assumes all its proper value if we link it closely with the national component of the communists’ struggle. Their objective, in fact, is to achieve profound changes in society...by means of reforms."

* * * (By G. Ceretti, In the Shadow of the two T, Paris 1973). With the liberation of the country, the working class of Italy hoped for profound social justice, expected that things would change and that at last it would have its say. But this did not occur. And this was because of the organization and management of the life of the country by the different bourgeois parties, including the Communist Party. To deceive the masses and to give them the impression that their voice was being heard in the governing of the country, they arranged political life with majority and minority parties, with parties in office and parties in opposition, with all the parliamentary games and tricks, with all their lies and humbug.
At first the Italian Communist Party received two unimportant portfolios, which the big bourgeoisie allowed it within the <<democratic>> game, in order to strengthen its position, restore its army, the police and all the network of suppression, and in order to use the presence of communists in the government to strangle and paralyse any tendency of the working class and the Italian people to settle accounts with those who exploited them, oppressed them and sent them to rob other peoples of their freedom, leaving the bones of their sons in Abyssinia, Spain, Albania and the Soviet Union. Then, in May 1947, when they no longer wanted them, the bourgeoisie threw the communist ministers out of the government. The possible danger of an attack by the workers had been averted. The working class had been <<lined up>>, incorporated in different unions according to party colours, and thus the struggle for votes, the parliamentary struggle, began.

After the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Togliatti and the Italian Communist Party publicly proclaimed their old revisionist stands. Not only did they approve every sign of liberalism which came from Moscow, but they raced ahead so fast that they put the Khrushchevite revisionists in difficulties, and thus the Italian Communist Party began to become a worry to them. The Togliatti supporters approved the revisionist course of <<destalinization>>, applauded the Khrushchevites' mud slinging at Stalin and bolshevism, applauded the Khrushchevites' course for the destruction of the socialist foundations of the Soviet state, were in favour of revisionist reforms and the policy of opening up to the capitalist states, especially the United States of America. As revisionists, Togliatti and his supporters were fully in agreement with Khrushchevite peaceful coexistence and rapprochement with imperialism. This was their old dream of collaboration with the bourgeoisie on the national and international plane.

On the course on which the Khrushchevite revisionist party had set out in the Soviet Union it needed unity and friendship with the Italian Communist Party, it needed the support, in particular, of the two revisionist parties of the West, of France and Italy, which were two big parties with a certain international authority. This was the reason for the <<honours>>, which the Khrushchevites paid these two parties, and together with the <<honours>>, which were obvious, went big subsidies under the lap. Just as the Khrushchevites hastened to turn the Soviet Union into a capitalist country, so Togliatti and company hastened to integrate themselves into the Italian capitalist order. In June 1956, in the report submitted to the CC of the Italian Communist Party under the flamboyant title <<The Italian Road to Socialism>>, Palmiro Togliatti launched a series of theses so blatantly anti-communist that Khrushchev was compelled to tell him that he should restrain himself and should not cross his bridges so hastily.

At that time Togliatti put forward the question of the integration of socialism into capitalism, as well as the thesis denying the role of the communist party as the sole and indispensable leader of the struggle of the proletariat for socialism. He said that the impulse towards socialism might come even where there was no communist party. These theses were identical with those of the Yugoslav revisionists.

It is not accidental that the Italian revisionists proved to be ardent supporters of the rehabilitation of the Yugoslav revisionists. Togliatti personally went to Yugoslavia to bend the knee to Tito and to help make him <<acceptable>> in the international communist movement. The Italian Communist Party and Togliatti spoke out against Moscow being <<the only centre of international communism>>. They preached <<polycentrism>>, the aim of which was the creation of a new revisionist bloc, headed by the Italian Communist Party, which by opposing the Soviet revisionist bloc, would raise the authority of the Italian Communist Party in the eyes of the Italian and world bourgeoisie. Togliatti thought that he would win the trust of the Italian monopoly capital in this way and be invited to join in its dance. Khrushchev saw the danger of the revisionist parties, both those of the countries which were members of the Warsaw Treaty and those which were outside it, breaking away from the tutelage of Moscow, therefore he tried to preserve <<unity>>.
However, Togliatti’s <<polycentrism>> and Khrushchev's <<unity>> were opposing and unreal things. Revisionism splits and does not unite. The revisionist party of Togliatti today, under Longo and Berlinguer, has steered an obscure and by no means clear course. Intellectualist and social-democratic views have made deep impressions on its line and stands. The leader of the Italian Communist Party, Palmiro Togliatti, manifested these views with increasing stridency, up to his famous <<testament>>, which he wrote a short time before he died in Yalta. This <<testament>>. represents the code of Italian revisionism on which the views of Eurocommunism. in general are based today. After the 20th Congress of the CPSU modern revisionism found an environment suitable for its spread in the French Communist Party also. The idea of parliamentarianism, the idea of <<alliances>> with social-democracy and the bourgeoisie, of struggle for reforms, had long been implanted in the leadership of this party. This was not proclaimed openly as it is now, that is, it was not raised to a theory. But the opposition to and struggle against fascism, the struggle for the defence and development of democracy, for the improvement of the situation of the working people, all of them actions correct in principle and also correct as tactics, were not linked by the French Communist Party with the final aim, with the socialist perspective. For the leadership of the French Communist Party, this perspective was obscure, or something which was accepted in theory but was considered to be unrealizable in the conditions of France.

The French Communist Party, as we said, had avoided changing the war for national liberation into a people's revolution, had turned away from the struggle for the armed seizure of state power. The working class and its party shed their blood, but for whom? In fact, for the French bourgeoisie and the Anglo-American imperialists. How should this course of the French Communist Party be described? Bluntly: betrayal of the revolution. Politely: an opportunist liberal line. It is true that the French Communist Party was not liquidated either by the German occupiers or by reaction, but the negative phenomenon occurred that, with the liberation of the country, the partisan forces which were led by the party were disarmed by the bourgeoisie, or more precisely, the leadership of the party itself took the decision that <<they should be disarmed>> since <<the Homeland had been liberated>>.

With the liberation of the country, the bourgeoisie again took power while the communists were left out of the banquet. The victor's carriage was prepared for De Gaulle, who was proclaimed the saviour of the French people. To avoid the resistance and strikes of disillusioned and revolted workers, De Gaulle summoned Maurice Thorez; and one or two other communists to the government. The Communist Party paid for this place at the bottom of the table which the bourgeoisie gave it, by adopting stands contrary to the interests and will of the French working class. One mistake inevitably leads to another. Dizzy with the electoral success which they achieved in the elections of November 10, 1946, where the communists and socialists won the absolute majority of seats in the National Assembly, the leaders of the French Communist Party went even further down the road of reformism. Precisely at this time Maurice Thorez gave an interview to the correspondent of the British newspaper <<The Times>>, in which he said that the development of democratic forces throughout the world and the weakening of the capitalist bourgeoisie after the Second World War induced him to envisage for France <<... the transition to socialism on roads other than those which the Russian communists followed thirty years ago... In any case, the road can be different for each country.>>> *(By M. Thorez, The sons of the people, Paris 1960).

Perhaps this road to socialism, about which Thorez spoke at that time, was not exactly the Khrushchevite road, the contours of which were laid out later. But in any case <<the different road>>, which Thorez sought then, was not that of the revolution. The French bourgeoisie and American imperialism did not allow Thorez and the leadership of the French Communist Party to live long with their dreams of the parliamentary road to socialism. Not
much later, through a simple decree of the socialist premier of that time, Ramadier, the communists were thrown out of the government.

At its meeting in October 1947, the Central Committee of the French Communist Party was obliged to make self-criticism about its mistaken Stands and actions at that period, about its incorrect evaluation of the situation, the ratio of forces, the policy of the Socialist Party etc.

Thus, beginning from the end of 1947, the French Communist Party began to see certain questions more correctly. It raised the working class in important class battles and big strikes, which had a pronounced political character, especially those of the years 1947 and 1948, which caused panic among the French bourgeoisie. At that time the French Communist Party fought against the Marshallization of France and the warmongering policy of American imperialism. It opposed the establishment of American bases in France and rose against the new colonial wars of French imperialism. The party called on the working class to oppose the colonial war in Vietnam, not merely with propaganda but also with concrete actions.

In this struggle the French working class produced from its ranks such heroes and heroines as Raymonde Dien, who lay down on the rails to stop a train loaded with arms for Vietnam.

The French Communist Party took an active part in the meeting of the Information Bureau which examined the situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. It condemned and sternly denounced the betrayal by Tito and his group.

However, after the death of Stalin and Khrushchev's advent to power, vacillations and deviations appeared again in the line of the French Communist Party and the stands of its leaders. These vacillations were apparent as early as 1954, in its attitude towards the liberation war of the Algerian people.

What did the French Communist Party do to assist this war? It waged only a propaganda campaign and nothing more. It was its duty to display its internationalism towards the liberation war of the Algerian people in deeds, because in this way it would have fought for the freedom of the French people too. It did not do this because it was guided by opportunist and nationalist stands. The French Communist Party went even further. It stopped the Communist Party of Algeria from taking part in the war. The facts show that when the flames of the national liberation war were sweeping Algeria, the Algerian communists did nothing, while the general secretary of the party, Larbi Buhali, went skiing and broke his leg in the Tatra Mountains of Czechoslovakia.

When Khrushchev and the Khrushchevites began their activity to seize power and bring about the capitalist degeneration of the Soviet Union, when they launched their attack against Stalin at the 20th Congress, it seemed that, in general, the French Communist Party was opposed to Khrushchevite revisionism and the Italian Communist Party. Apparently, Thorez and the leadership of the French Communist Party regarded the changes which were taking place in the Soviet Union with suspicion.

This could be seen in their stand towards the question of Stalin, when they did not associate themselves with Khrushchev's slanders; it was apparent at the time of the events in Poland and Hungary in 1956, when, in general, they maintained correct stands.

However, after Khrushchev and his group liquidated Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovich and others, after he consolidated his position in the party and the state and took the bit between his teeth, it was seen that the leadership of the French Communist Party headed by Thorez was wavering. Little by little and from concession to concession, it went over from its anti-Khrushchevite position to the position of Khrushchev. Was this fortuitous? Was it an aberration by Thorez? Was it a retreat on his part or on the part of Duclos and the other leaders in the face of the pressures, praises and blandishments of Khrushchev and his other putschist methods? Of course, those methods were used and had their influence in the transition to, and later, the uninterrupted march of the French Communist Party towards revisionism. But these do not account for everything. The true causes must be sought within the French Communist Party itself, in its earlier stands, in its internal structure and organization, in its composition and in the external environment which exerted its own pressure on that party.
The process of the descent of the French Communist Party into revisionism did not take place within one day. Quantity was transformed into quality over a relatively long period. The parliamentary reformist road, the Thorez road of "the extended hand"**, his admiration for and concessions to a series of intellectuals, some of whom were expelled after their betrayal, while others remained in the party, and developed defeatism, spreading all sorts of theories which distorted Marxism-Leninism, brought the French Communist Party to revisionist positions. The French Communist Party lived surrounded by a bourgeois, revisionist, Trotskyite, anarchist, political and ideological environment which beat ceaselessly at its walls, which penetrated them and caused the party great damage.

Major international events also created great upheavals in the French Communist Party. The publication of Khrushchev's secret report against Stalin, which was exploited by all the European and world bourgeoisie, also created a turbulent situation in the French Communist Party. The stand which this party adopted towards events in Hungary and Poland encountered the stern opposition of the big bourgeoisie of France, the middle bourgeoisie, the liberal intellectuals, as well as opportunists outside and also inside the party.

The events which occurred in France in connection with the war in Algeria also brought about that the old opportunist views and stands again came to the surface and became predominant in the French Communist Party.

All these factors taken together transformed the French Communist Party, from one of the parties with the greatest authority, as it had been known in the past, into a social-democratic reformist revisionist party. In a word, the French Communist Party turned back to the former traditions of the old socialist party from which it had broken away at the Congress of Tours in 1920.

One of the revisionist parties which has come out most fervently with the banner of Eurocommunism is the party of Carrillo. How did it come about that the Communist Party of Spain, a party which distinguished itself for its resolute stand at the time - of the Popular Front and the Civil War, -became united with the Khrushchevites and reached the state of corruption, degeneration and treachery it is in today? The changes did not and could not come about all at once, without a protracted process of decline and degeneration within the Spanish party and especially in its leadership.

In the early years after the Second World War the leadership of the Communist Party of Spain and the majority of its members were in France, where they lived A more or less legal life. The Spanish Republican government was in exile too. This was the time when the communists were, still in the governments of countries like France and Italy. The Spanish communists too, began to act like their French and Italian comrades. In 1946 the Spanish Republican government in exile was re-formed in Paris. The Communist Party of Spain sent Santiago Carrillo as its representative to this government. When the communist ministers were expelled from the governments in France and Italy in May 1947, the situation began to become difficult for the Communist Party of Spain and its cadres and militants, also. In August of the same year the Spanish communists were expelled from the government in exile. The police searches, arrests and other measures against them began anew. The infiltration of French and Francoite police into the ranks of the Spanish communists and democrats became more intensive.

It became ever more difficult for the leaders and cadres of the party to stay and work in France, therefore, they went to Prague, East Berlin, and other countries of people's democracy. Their exodus towards these countries more or less coincided with the time when the Khrushchevite revisionist scum began to surface in the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe. The meetings of the Political Bureau and the Central Committee of the Party began to be held far away from Spain. Those communists, who had known the harsh conditions of the Civil War and illegal life in Spain, the difficulties and privations of life in exile in France, began to get the taste for the luxury and comfort of the castles of Bohemia and Germany, to become acquainted with the blandishments an praise, as well as with the various pressures of the Khrushchevite revisionists, the
apparatchiki and their secret agents. As events showed, the leadership of the Communist Party of Spain became one of the most obedient blind tools of Nikita Khrushchev and those of his group. In 1954 the 5th Congress of the Communist Party of Spain was held. At that congress the first elements of the spirit of pacifism and class conciliation became apparent, of that spirit which, a little later, was to become the platform of Spanish revisionism and would find its most complete expression in Carrillo's ultra-revisionist work of betrayal.

Adopting the Khrushchevite road of peaceful transition to socialism, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Spain published a document in June 1956, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the Civil War, in which it formulated its policy of "national reconciliation". The Communist Party of Spain expressed its support for an agreement between forces which 20 years earlier had fought one another with opposing armies. "A vengeful policy will not help to get the country... out of this situation. Spain needs peace and reconciliation between its sons..." (By C. Colombo, The History of The Spanish Communist Party, Milan 1972.) said this declaration.

The time of the resolute stands of the Spanish communists against the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera (2) The dictatorial fascist regime of Primo de Rivera ruled in Spain from 1923-1930. and the generals' pronunciamento, stands which had increased the influence of the communist party among the masses and had strengthened and tempered it, had passed. Now was the time of the line of the most vulgar opportunism, of blandishments and of bending the knee to the bourgeoisie and its parties, to the Catholic Church and the Spanish army, a line which was to rank the party of Dolores Ibarruri and Carrillo among the typically social-democratic parties.

We were unaware of the internal process of retrogression which had occurred in the Communist Party of Spain, but at the Meeting of the communist and workers' parties in Moscow in. November 1960, when the Party of Labour of Albania openly exposed modern revisionism and especially Soviet revisionism, headed by the traitor to and renegade, from Marxism-Leninism, Khrushchev, the Communist Party of Spain and Ibarruri personally attacked us in the most vicious way.

Thus, when it came to defending Marxism-Leninism, the leaders of the Communist Party of Spain savagely attacked the Party of Labour of Albania and defended Khrushchev and his group of traitors to Marxism-Leninism. Time proved that our Party of Labour was on the right road, on the Marxist-Leninist road, while the Communist Party of Spain, headed by Ibarruri, had lined up totally in the camp of renegades from and enemies of communism.

After 1960 major quarrels and differences emerged in the Communist Party of Spain which led to its splitting, as a result of which two anti-Marxist revisionist groups were created: the pro-Soviet, with Lister at the head, and the other, a faction led by Ibarruri and Carrillo, which sought independence from Moscow in order to adopt the line which later took the name Eurocommunism.

The line of Carrillo became more and more identical with the line of the Italian Communist Party and that of the French Communist Party. Likewise, it conformed with the line of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. Thus a still structureless unity began to crystalize between Titoism, the Italian revisionist party, the French revisionist party, and the Spanish revisionist party of Ibarruri.

At the time when this grouping of West-European revisionists, including Tito, which wanted to break away from Moscow, was being formed, Mao Zedong's Communist Party of China welcomed Carrillo to Peking and had close and intimate talks with him. What the content of these talks was has not been revealed, but time is showing that the Chinese revisionists and the Spanish revisionists have many things in common. Therefore, open official links between the Chinese revisionist party and the Spanish revisionist party will be established before long.

Carrillo also adopted the political orientations, the aims, strategies and tactics of the Italian and French revisionist parties for the establishment of close collaboration with the reactionary bourgeoisie and the bourgeois capitalist states. However, the Communist Party of Spain still did not have legal status. For this reason, even under Franco, it made great efforts to be legalized within Spain. Francoism and Franco did not allow such a thing. After the death of Franco, with the coming to power of King Juan Carlos, Carrillo achieved some results in the direction of legalizing the party. However, in return for this legality, he had to make such statements and such colossal concessions
in principle that even the French Communist Party and the Italian Communist Party had not permitted themselves to make to the capitalist bourgeoisie of their countries. In order to return to Spain and legalize the party, Carrillo agreed to recognize the regime of King Juan Carlos, indeed he went so far as to praise it and call it <<democratic>>, and accepted the monarchy and its flag. After this submission, the monarchists gave him carte blanche. The Communist Party of Spain was legalized. Carrillo and Ibarruri returned to Spain together with the whole herd of Spanish traitors.

As soon as they returned to Madrid, the revisionist chiefs openly denied the Republic and declared that the Spanish War now belonged to history. Coalition with the other bourgeois parties and the struggle for participation in the government of the country was proclaimed as the foundation of their line. In the various elections which have been held in Spain, Carrillo's party has not won more than 9 per cent of the votes and has a few deputies in parliament. Carrillo has described this as a <<great democratic victory which will change the face of Spain>>. But in fact, the Spanish revisionists can never clean up the face of Spain because what Ibarruri, Carrillo and company have in their hands is not soap but tar. They have rejected the red flag of the revolution and have shamelessly trampled underfoot the blood of tens and hundreds of thousands of heroes of the Spanish War.

In the reformist and opportunist transformation of the communist parties of the Western countries, the line which the Soviet revisionist leadership established in its relations with them played an important role. The aim of the Khrushchevite revisionists of the Soviet Union was to compel the revisionist parties of the different countries to follow them in the policy of establishing their socialimperialist hegemony over the whole world. They demanded that these parties become their assistants in the fiendish activity they had engaged in. Naturally, the American imperialists and their allies could not approve the hegemonic and expansionist aims of the Soviet social-imperialists. Nor could the revisionist parties of different countries agree with the Soviet policy. Urged by the bourgeoisie of their own countries, they began ever more openly to carry on separate activities independently of the revisionist party of the Soviet Union.

One after the other, the revisionist parties of Western Europe, Latin America and Asia rose to a greater or lesser extent against the Khrushchevite Soviet hegemony, at the same time bringing out new anti-Marxist theories. The theories of the big revisionist parties of Western Europe, which took the name Eurocommunism, very quickly became the most complete and most publicized of these theories. As soon as it emerged on the scene, Eurocommunism, like Titoite and Khrushchevite revisionism, began a frontal struggle against Marxism-Leninism, with the aim of revising and discrediting its fundamental principles in the eyes of the workers.

**From Revisionist Opportunism to Bourgeois Anti-Communism**

Eurocommunism is a variant of modern revisionism, a hotch-potch of pseudo-theories opposed to Marxism-Leninism. Its aim is to hinder the scientific theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin from remaining a strong and unerring weapon in the hands of the working class and the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties for the destruction of capitalism, its structure and superstructure, to its foundations, for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the construction of the new socialist society.

The Italian revisionists have defined Eurocommunism as <<a third road, different from the experience of the parties of social-democracy and different from those which have been promoted since the October Revolution in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries>>. As the theses of the 15th Congress of the Italian Communist Party have it, this <<third road>> is presented as <<a solution which is adapted to the national characteristics and the conditions of the present epoch, to
the essential features and demands which are common to developed industrial societies, which are based on parliamentary democratic institutions, as the countries of Western Europe are today.>>* (The politics and the organization of the italian communists, Rome 1979). Hence, as the Eurocommunists themselves admit, this <<third road>>, this so-called Eurocommunism, has nothing at all to do with the genuine scientific communism elaborated by Marx and Lenin, embodied in the October Revolution and in the other socialist revolutions that followed it, and confirmed by the class struggle of the international proletariat. Eurocommunism can be described accurately and correctly as European revisionism number three.

Now the French Communist Party, the Italian and Spanish parties, have only the name communist, because the three of them are floundering in the stinking waters of the bourgeoisie which they serve. The programs of the revisionist parties of the Western countries are typically reformist programs, which do not differ from the programs of the bourgeois parties, socialist and social-democratic, which sing the same refrain. Indeed, it is the latter which inspire the revisionists. Their objective is not the proletarian revolution and the socialist transformation of society, but the creation of the opinion among the broad masses that they should abandon the revolution, which, they say, has become unnecessary and inappropriate. But what should be done, according to them? "We must transform our life-style", "we must change our way of life", "we must think about the day-to-day problems", "we must not attack present-day capitalist society", "we must carry out a cultural revolution in place of the proletariat revolution", explain these anti-Marxist parties day and night. "We must live better, must protect our wages and not allow them to be reduced, must have paid holidays and guaranteed jobs", "what more can we ask??" they say to the workers. The Italian and French revisionist parties deal with these questions at every meeting and every congress and feed this stuff to the proletariat and the workers in order to win their votes.

The classical revisionism of the social-democratic type has been integrated into modern revisionism. The theories of Bernstein and Kautsky in various forms, sometimes openly and sometimes modified, are found in the revisionist Browder, are found in Khrushchevite revisionism, in Titoite revisionism, in French revisionism and in the Italian revisionism of Togliatti, in the so-called Mao Zedong thought, and all revisionist currents. These innumerable anti-Marxist currents, which are developing in the present-day capitalist and revisionist world, are the fifth column in the ranks of the world revolution to prolong the existence of international capitalism by fighting the revolution from within.

Negation of Marxism-Leninism is the objective which capitalism and imperialism have always wanted and want to achieve. In this direction modern revisionism is helping them with all its means and ways, open and disguised, with all kinds of pseudo-scientific philosophical theories and slogans.

At the 22nd Congress of the French Communist Party, Marchais declared that they would go to socialism without class struggle, and that the dictatorship of the proletariat was no longer needed to build it. He admitted that in his <<socialism>> there would be not merely different parties, but even parties of reaction. Thus, for Marchais, as for Brezhnev and Tito, socialism has already begun to be built in many countries where capital rules, and all that is necessary is to put the signboard <<socialist country>> over the gate.

In other words, since all countries are going to socialism spontaneously, as the revisionists preach, no one allegedly has any need for Marxism-Leninism as the science of revolution and socialism, for it now belongs to the past, and therefore should be abandoned.

The various revisionists allege that Marxism-Leninism <<is in its dotage>>, that it is no longer capable of solving the problems which the developed society of the present day raises, that it is no longer suitable to present-day civilization. According to them, modern society has absorbed all that it can absorb from Marxism-Leninism, and this has entered the ranks of outdated philosophies such as Kantism, positivism, Bergsonian irrationalism and other idealist philosophies. The ultrarevisionist Milovan Djilas writes openly that Marxism-Leninism, a philosophy elaborated in
Proceeding on this road, during the last two or three years, the Italian, French and Spanish revisionists have made great efforts to formulate in theory their opportunist views and stands, which they call Eurocommunism, and to give them the character of a separate ideological and political doctrine, which allegedly represents "a new development of Marxism". In the recent congresses which these parties have held, and in the programs which were adopted, Eurocommunism assumed a completely defined form. These three parties have officially rejected Marxism-Leninism. The French of Marchais, who consider the theory of Marx a theory with dry and dogmatic concepts, a closed system of unalterable rules, say that the new "theory" which they have created, has "its sources in the philosophical and political currents of our nation".* *(Cahiers du communisme, juin-juillet 1979, p.392) It is self-evident that the French revisionists are not referring to those revolutionary progressive philosophical contributions which Marx included in a critical way in his work, but precisely to those views which he exposed and refuted and which the revisionists have now made their own.

The revisionists' removal of any reference to Marxism-Leninism in their Constitutions, programs and other documents, is not an act of just a formal character, which sanctions what they had done in practice long before. Likewise this act does not represent only the implementation of the will of the bourgeoisie, its demand that the revisionist parties must no longer mention "the spectre of communism". Neither is it only an act which officially expresses the open transition of modern revisionism to the ideological positions of European social-democracy. The abandonment of any reference to Marxism-Leninism by the revisionist parties, which up till now have used it as a disguise to deceive the working people, shows that they have commenced an open struggle against it from the positions of bourgeois anti-communism. The fact is that on the ideological plane, it is precisely the Eurocommunists who are carrying the banner of struggle against Marxism-Leninism, socialism and the revolution today. The publicity which the big bourgeois press, the publishing trusts, the radio and the television are giving to the articles, books, speeches and congresses of the revisionists is truly astounding. Figures such as Berlinguer, Marchais, and even Carrillo have been transformed by the big propaganda machine into personalities who outstrip not only the film "stars" but even popes and heads of the biggest states. Journalists and writers pursue them at every step and never allow them to drop a word without publishing it in the biggest headlines on the front pages of newspapers.

All this advertisement, all this clamour, is evidence of the great joy of the bourgeoisie, which has found zealous lackeys who are fighting communism from the left, as they say, at a time when its open anti-communist weapons had become rusty and broken. Capital could not find anything better or more effective in the difficult situations it is experiencing than the service which the revisionists offer. Therefore, the praise which the bourgeoisie is heaping on the demagogy and deception, the theoretical speculations and practical activity with which the revisionists are manoeuvring to deceive and disorganize the workers, is completely understandable and justifiable.

### The Bourgeois Conception of Bourgeois Society

The Eurocommunists try to paint a distorted picture of the present-day capitalist society and its contradictions, to present it as a society which has evolved so greatly since the time of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin that their fundamental analyses and teachings about it "are out-of-date and no longer valid".

They see present-day capitalist society as unified and no longer distinguish its polarization into proletarians and bourgeois, no longer see the contradiction between these two classes as the fundamental contradiction, and consequently do not see the class struggle as the main motive force of this society. For the Eurocommunists, of course, there are certain contradictions, which they call contradictions of "development", of "progress", of "wellbeing", of "democracy", etc.,
which have allegedly replaced the old contradictions, especially the contradiction between labour and capital, on which the whole Marxist-Leninist theory about the role and the historic mission of the proletariat, the revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism is based.

Today, they say, the proletariat of the time of Marx and Lenin no longer exists, the classes have changed and they are no longer those which Marx and Lenin knew and about which they spoke. Nowadays, say the Eurocommunists, even the bourgeois class has dissolved as a class, has been transformed into <<workers>> and all the wealth has been gathered in the hands of a small clique of capitalists who preserve and defend this property. Marchais, for example, has <<discovered>> that in France today the bourgeoisie <<that counts>> has been reduced to only 25 financial and industrial groups, while the others are <<workers>>. Consequently, stress the revisionist renegades, the present-day bourgeois capitalist state has changed, because society itself has changed and the classes have changed. Therefore, they reason, Marx and Lenin, who did not know the present-day capitalist state, which is entirely different from that of their time, foresaw another role for the proletariat, which differs from that of the present day, another method for the seizure of power by the proletariat, another method of struggle to go over to socialism.

For the Eurocommunist revisionists, all the classes and strata of capitalist society today, and especially the intelligentsia, have been identified with the proletariat. With the exception of a small handful of capitalists, in their eyes all the others, without distinction, want to change society from a bourgeois society into a socialist society. And in order to carry out this change, according to the Eurocommunists, the old society has to be reformed and not overthrown.

Hence, they imagine that state power must be taken gradually, through reforms, through the development of culture, and through the close collaboration of all classes without exception, both those who hold and those who do not hold this power.

All the revisionists follow the course of Marcuse, who when he speaks about the American proletariat, tries <<to prove>> that in the <<highly industrialized American society>>, a proletariat in the Marxist sense does not exist, because, according to him, this proletariat now allegedly belongs to history.

To Marcuse, Garaudy, Berlinguer, Carrillo, Marchais, and their company, this means that the -consumer society-, -<<developed industrial society>> has not only changed the form of the old capitalist society but has also levelled out the classes, and as Georges Marchais in particular has declared, now <<we can no longer talk about the French proletariat, but about the French working class>>.

Marx said that

<<...our 'proletarian' is economically none other than the wage-labourer who produces and increases 'capital', and is thrown out on the streets as soon as he is superfluous for the needs of aggrandissement of 'Monsieur capital'...>>

What has changed in France that Marchais can no longer see proletarians? Are there no longer wage-labourers who produce surplus value and increase capital, are there no longer unemployed whom <<Monsieur capital>>has thrown out on the streets as unwanted?

In socialist Albania, certainly, the proletariat no longer exists in the sense that this notion has in the capitalist countries, because in our country the working class has the state power in its hands, is the owner of the chief means of production, is not oppressed or exploited, and works freely for itself and for the socialist society.

The matter is quite different in the capitalist countries where the working class is deprived of the means of production and, in order to live, is obliged to sell its labour power and submit to capitalist exploitation, which is continuously increasing its intensity. Besides being savagely oppressed and exploited to the bone, the proletariat in those countries also suffers the oppression of the bourgeois army and police. Although the proletariat in the capitalist states may be dressed in the nylon materials which the <<consumer society>> produces, in fact it remains the proletariat.
It is not without purpose that the modern revisionists change the name of the proletariat. If one speaks of the proletariat, which in capitalism possesses nothing but the strength of its arms, it is self-evident that this proletariat has to fight its exploiters and oppressors. It is precisely this struggle, which has the objective of destroying the old state power of capital to its foundations, that terrifies the bourgeoisie and precisely in this context the revisionists assist the bourgeoisie with all the means they possess.

The denial of the existence of the proletariat as a class in itself, as the most advanced class of society, charged by history with the glorious mission of eliminating the exploitation of man by man and building the new, truly free, equal, just and humane society, is nothing new. The various opportunists were preaching it at the time when Marxism was emerging as a philosophic doctrine and a political movement. Marx and Engels refuted these views and gave the proletariat weapons and arguments to fight not only these, but also the other lackeys of the bourgeoisie, the future apologists of capitalism, such as the modern revisionists today.

One of the greatest merits of Marxism is that it saw in the proletariat not just an oppressed and exploited class, but the most progressive and revolutionary class of the time, the class which history had charged with the mission of the gravedigger of capitalism. Marx and Engels explained that this mission stems from the socio-economic conditions themselves, from the place which the proletariat occupies and the role which it plays in the process of production and socio-political life, from the fact that it is the bearer of the new relations of the future socialist society, that it has its own scientific ideology which illuminates its way has its own leading staff - the communist party.

Despite the changes which have occurred in the development of the economy and the social composition of capitalist society, the overall conditions of the existence, the work and the life of the proletariat today remain those which Marx analysed. No other class or social stratum can replace the proletariat as the main and leading force of the revolutionary processes for the progressive transformation of society.

The teachings of Marx on this question remain unshaken. In the Marxist theory the proletariat finds its own spiritual weapon, just as this theory finds its material weapon in the proletariat. Marx said that the proletariat is the heart of the revolution while philosophy is its head. Marx's <<Capital>> is the beacon light for the world proletariat, which shows it scientifically in what manner and in what forms the bourgeoisie exploits it. The capitalists chain the proletariat to the factories and machines, but <<Capital>> teaches the proletariat how to break these chains.

The revisionist theses about the change in the nature of the proletariat and its historic mission have long existed in the communist parties of the Western countries, but the first to come out with them publicly and officially was Roger Garaudy. Garaudy was one of the first revisionist <<theoreticians>> to develop the theory that one could no longer talk about the impoverishment of the French proletariat and that the various classes and strata of the population were already moving towards blending and unification.

The thesis of Garaudy, now repeated and applied by the other revisionists, is that <<in the present situation, there is no longer any need for violent revolution, because the workers are gradually sharing actively in the profits of the big capitalist enterprises, which now are no longer run by the bourgeois owners, but by the technicians who have replaced them>>. This is a great fraud, because these technicians and specialists are under the thumb of a single management, they are the servants of the big capitalist trusts and monopolies which are the real owners of the means of production.

In the capitalist world, despite the changes which have taken place in the social class structure, nothing has altered in regard to the positions of classes and class relationships. The theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin about classes and the class struggle in bourgeois society retains its full freshness and validity.

A series of other <<theories>> similar to that of Garaudy emerged in the West from both the <<new>> French pseudo-philosophers and from their German, American, Italian and other counterparts. All these theories carry the brand of revisionism, Trotskyism, anarchism and social-democracy. The moment arrived when all these theories became completely the private property of
the French, Italian, Spanish, British and other revisionist parties, which gathered up all this revisionist and opportunist refuse and codified it in a banal way.

Daily life, the struggle of the working class, has exposed these theories and continues to do so. It has revealed their reactionary counterrevolutionary aim. It proves that the working class is impoverished the more the capitalists are enriched, that it properly understands what Marx said, that the more wealth each worker produces the poorer he becomes, that the more commodities the worker makes the more he reduces his own value as a commodity, that the proletariat cannot escape from exploitation without taking over the means of production and without destroying the state power of the bourgeoisie.

Today, the modern revisionists such a Marchais, Berlinguer, Carrillo and company, reject this scientific view of Marx. Today, they say, the process of the relative and absolute impoverishment of the proletariat no longer exists because of the development of the technical-scientific revolution and the gains which the workers have achieved through reforms. They want to tell the proletarians that all their demands and needs are being fulfilled from the hand-outs which capitalism gives them, therefore they have no reason to rise in revolution.

Some other revisionist <<theoreticians>>, faced with the undeniable facts of life, declare that it is true that Marx spoke about the exploitation of the working class, but what he said is equally valid for both the capitalist and the socialist countries. Consequently, the working class has no reason to rise against capitalist exploitation because allegedly it can never escape it! This is a distortion of the reality and a slander. The position of the working class in capitalism and its position in socialism are diametrically opposite.

In the capitalist and revisionist countries the worker is not free, either in work or in life. He is a slave to the machine, to the capitalist and the technocrat, who squeeze out the last drop of his labour power and from this create surplus value for capital. Only in the genuine socialist order, in which the working class is in power, do the teachings of Marx, properly applied, provide the possibility for the proletariat to become conscious and completely the master of the means of production and, through its dictatorship, to gain all its political, economic and democratic freedoms and rights.

The binding of the working class with economic chains, with which capitalism shackles it, is the main thing in bourgeois society. The whole capitalist system has been built on this bondage. However, the bourgeois and revisionist theoreticians, being quite unable to deny this great truth, try to obscure the question of economic exploitation about which Marx speaks and which is primary, and to interpret it through a series of concocted theses and false views. Being unable to refute the binding of the worker to capital, these <<theoreticians>> preach that allegedly there is no longer any need to point out how much the owner in the capitalist order squeezes and enslaves; men, but what should be pointed out is that his link with capital is allegedly in favour of the worker because it keeps him alive. Their aim is to divert the proletariat from the class struggle against capitalism by trying to focus its attention on the <<blessings>> of the <<consumer society>>. The modern revisionists have invented many deceptive theses to divert attention from economic oppression and exploitation. They give great publicity to their thesis that in the <<consumer society>> the worker enjoys so many things that he regards the economic problems as coming at the bottom of the list. According to them, almost his only worries are the problems of religion, the family, his wife, his TV-set, his car, etc. And as a result the problem of economic exploitation is allegedly no longer the basic problem of the class struggle and revolution. However, they do all these things in order to water down the wine and divert the working masses from the struggle to overthrow the bourgeois order.

In breaking with Marxism-Leninism and wanting to create a new <<theory>> which is distinct from the doctrine of Marx and Lenin on all fundamental questions, the Eurocommunists have got themselves into a great mess and confusion, into profound incoherence and great contradictions. They are practically unable to explain any contradictions of the present-day capitalist world or to give answers to the problems which arise from them. True, they speak about such phenomena as <<crisis>>, <<unemployment>>, the <<degradation and degeneration>> of bourgeois society, but
they content themselves with general observations which no one, not even the bourgeoisie, denies. However, they consciously try to cover up the cause of these phenomena, the savage capitalist exploitation, and to avoid showing that this exploitation can be eliminated only through the revolution, with the overthrow of all the old relations which keep the system of capitalist oppression on its feet.

With their theses about the <<dying out of the class struggle>> as a consequence of the <<essential changes>> which capitalist society has allegedly, undergone because of the development of the forces of production, the technical-scientific revolution, the <<restructuring of capitalism>>, etc.; with their preaching of the need to establish extensive class collaboration, because now allegedly it is not only the working class and working masses who are interested in socialism but also nearly all the strata of the bourgeoisie, except for a tiny group of monopolists; with their claim that the transition to socialism can be made through reforms, because present-day capitalist society is allegedly developing on the road of peaceful integration into socialism, etc., the Eurocommunists have identified themselves, not only in theory but also in their practical activity, with old European social-democracy and have amalgamated with it in a single counterrevolutionary current in the service of the bourgeoisie.

Their stand towards the working class and its leading role has been the touchstone for all revolutionaries at all times. Abandonment of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary movement, pointed out Lenin, is the most vulgar form of reformism. But this vulgarity does not worry the Italian revisionists. Indeed they proclaim their reformism so bombastically that they make themselves truly ludicrous. <<The leading role of the working class in the process of leaving capitalism behind and building socialism,>> they declare, <<can and must be achieved through collaboration and agreement between different parties and currents which aspire to socialism, and within the framework of the democratic system in which all constitutional parties enjoy full rights, even those who do not want the socialist transformation of society and oppose it, of course, while always respecting the democratic constitutional rules.>> *(The politics and the organization of the italian communists, Rome 1979)

This <<original Marxist>> vision, add the supporters of Berlinguer, is not a new discovery, but the development of the thinking of Labriola and Togliatti. In this case, they themselves admit the source of their ideas. However, it should be added that Labriola, whom they are now making a classic, was not a consistent Marxist. He remained far removed from the revolutionary activity and problems of the revolution. As for Togliatti, his work already shows that he was a deviator and an opportunist.

By referring to Labriola or Togliatti, the Italian revisionists and their counterparts in France or Spain want to leave in oblivion Lenin's theory about the necessity for the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution and the construction of socialism. In all his work of genius Lenin defended and developed Marx's theory about the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution, abandoned by the European social-democrats. The social-democratic views on this question have been now revived by the revisionists. He proved that in the new conditions of imperialism, the hegemony of the proletariat is essential not only for the socialist revolution but also for the democratic revolution. He explained that the establishment of this hegemony is essential because the proletariat is interested more than any other social class in the complete triumph of the revolution, in carrying it through to the end. With the theory of Lenin the proletariat has gone into the revolution and has won, while with the theories that the revisionists preach, it remains oppressed by the bourgeoisie.

The Leninist theory about the undivided hegemony of the working class has found a brilliant confirmation and application in the carrying out of the revolution and the triumph of socialism in Albania, too. To the Albanian communists it was clear from the start that only one party, the Communist Party, could lead the National Liberation War through to complete victory, that only one class, the working class, could be the leader in this struggle, that the main ally of this class would be the poor and middle peasantry, that the youth and the students would be the main support
of the Party and, together with the Albanian women, would comprise the fighting strata of the people's revolution.

The small number of the working class in Albania did not hinder it in the least from playing its hegemonic role because it had at the head its Communist Party, which was guided by the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. The correct line of our Party, which responded to the situation and the interests of the broad working masses, made it possible to achieve the great unity of the people around the working class in a single front under the sole and undivided leadership of the Communist Party.

The correct line and leadership of our Party led to the extension of the struggle, which gradually built up until it assumed the form of a general uprising, a broad people's armed struggle, up to the liberation of Albania and the establishment of the people's power.

In negating the hegemonic and leading role of the working class in the revolution and the construction of socialism, the Eurocommunists, could not but abandon also the role and mission of the communist party, as it is defined by Marxism-Leninism and as it has been confirmed by the long history of the world revolutionary and communist movement.

The heses of the 15th Congress of the Italian Communist Party say that now a <<new party>> has been built. What is this <<new party>>? <<The Italian Communist Party,>> says its Constitution, <<organizes the workers, the working people, the intellectuals and the citizens who fight within the framework of the Republican Constitution for the consolidation and development of the anti-fascist democratic regime, for the socialist rejuvenation of society, for the independence of the peoples, for the reduction of tension and for peace, for cooperation among all nations ...>> The Constitution continues, <<the Italian Communist Party is open to all citizens of 18 years of age, who irrespective of race, philosophical views and religious belief, accept the political program and undertake to act to carry it out by militating in one of the organizations of the party..>>*(The politics and the organization of the italian communists, Rome 1979).

We quoted this long clause of the Constitution of the Italian revisionist party, which is almost identical with those of the French and Spanish revisionist parties, in order to show how far the Eurocommunist revisionists have departed from the concepts of the Leninist party and how closely they have approached the models of socialist and social-democratic parties. They speak about a <<new party>>, wanting it to be distinct from the party of the Leninist type, but in fact their party which they call new is an <<old party>> of the type of the parties of the Second International, against which Lenin fought and on the ruins of which he built the Bolshevik Party which became an example and the model for all other genuine communist parties.

The statement placed at the beginning of the Constitution, that anyone, irrespective of his philosophical views and religious belief, can enter the party, requires no comment to prove that the philosophy of Marx is alien to this party, that its eclecticism is blatant, that the line of compromises of every kind is part of its strategy, that the Italian Communist Party is a liberal social-democratic party, with its line, policy and stands determined by the changing political circumstances. Its liberal policy ensures that at times it will get votes, but not that it will take and hold power. It makes the bourgeoisie praise it, and the priests in the churches and the monks in the monasteries sympathize with it.

Lenin's fundamental idea about the party is, that it must be a conscious vanguard detachment of the working class, a Marxist detachment of it.

<<.... the role of vanguard fighters. Lenin said, can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by the most advanced theory.>>* *Lenin

This revolutionary vanguard theory, a reliable guide to victory, is Marxism. Not only have the revisionists abandoned the fundamental condition for a communist party to be such, i.e., acceptance of Marxism, but they permit all the bourgeois, opportunist, reactionary or fascist philosophical
views to coexist in their party, and this they have sanctioned in their Constitution. The thing that characterizes, that distinguishes the communist parties, is Marxism-Leninism, the sole ideology by which they are guided and to which they loyally adhere in all their activity. Without Marxism-Leninism there cannot be a communist party. The genuine communist parties are parties to carry out the revolution and build socialism, while the so-called Italian, French and Spanish communist parties and others of this type are parties of bourgeois reforms. The former are parties for the overthrow of the bourgeois order and the construction of the new world, the latter are parties for the defence of the capitalist order and the preservation of the old world. At the time when Lenin was fighting against the opportunists for the construction of the Bolshevik Party, he said:

<<...give us an organization of revolutionaries. and we will overturn Russia!>> *Lenin

He built such a party and led the Russian working class to the glorious victory of the October Revolution. But where do Berlinguer's revisionists want to lead the Italian working class? <<We must fight within the framework of the Republican Constitution>>, they say. And the bourgeoisie says, <<Fight as much as you like within the bars of the cage of my Constitution because this does me no harm.>>

The bourgeoisie maintains the army, the police, the courts, etc., to defend its Constitution, laws and institutions. Lined up beside them now is the revisionist party which is struggling to keep the working class oppressed and enslaved, to corrupt it ideologically and confuse it politically. It has transformed itself into an institution of the bourgeois state to extinguish the revolutionary spirit of the working class, to obscure the socialist perspective, to prevent it from understanding the miserable condition in which it is living and from rising in resolute struggle to overthrow the bourgeoisie.

The Eurocommunists' <<Socialism>> Is the Present Capitalist System

How do the Eurocommunists envisage socialism? Although they are obliged to speak about socialism for demagogy, the <<socialism>> which they want to build is simply a fraud and deception. It is known that not only now, but for years, many bourgeois and petty-bourgeois philosophers and ideological trends have speculated greatly with the idea of socialism. Many utopian schemes and endless misrepresentations have been concocted about socialism. Marx rejected all the old forms of socialism and taught the world proletariat that it should organize and fight to establish the new social order based on genuine scientific socialism. As early as in the first programmatic document of Marxism, the <<Communist Manifesto>> Marx and Engels made an all-round criticism of various pseudo-socialist theories, such as <<feudal socialism>>, <<petty-bourgeois socialism>>, German <<genuine socialism>>, <<conservative or bourgeois socialism>>. They revealed their class essence as antiscientific theories which served the interests of the bourgeoisie. In struggle against bourgeois and petty-bourgeois opportunist and anarchist theories which hindered the emancipation of the proletariat and its struggle, the <<Manifesto>> taught the working class that it could escape bourgeois oppression and exploitation only by means of the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat and that it could not liberate itself without, at the same time, liberating the whole of society. History has proved that since the birth of Marxism, every other ideological trend which has come out with socialist slogans, has turned into a reactionary current in the process of the class struggle.
Marxism alone provides the accurate idea of the genuine socialist society. No socialism can be achieved or built without being based on this theory.

The first great confirmation of the Marxist theory formulated in the <<Communist Manifesto>> came in the revolutionary events of 1848-1849, which shook the whole of Europe.

Revolutions not only open the way to social progress but they always become the grave of utopian, revisionist and other false doctrines. This occurred with the doctrines of <<bourgeois socialism>>, <<petty-bourgeois socialism>>, etc., which were buried by the revolutions of 1848-1849.

The main evil of those so-called socialist doctrines was that they completely ignored the revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat and envisaged socialism as the realization of this or that system, invented by this or that <<theoretician>>. This was the source of all those illusions that the creation of associations supported by the state, restriction of inheritance rights, establishment of progressive tax scales would gradually lead to socialism in a peaceful way. Proudhon and Louis Blanc, the German <<genuine>> socialists and utopian communists like Waitling, Cabets, Desamis and others had preached and were preaching this; <<doctrinaire socialism>>.

The working class leaves this doctrinaire socialism to the petty bourgeoisie, says Marx, while

<< ... the proletariat rallies more and more round revolutionary socialism, round communism... This socialism,>> he continues, <<is the declaration of the permanence of the revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as the necessary transit point to the abolition of class distinctions generally, to the abolition of all the relations of production on which they rest, to the abolition of all the social relations that correspond to these relations of production, to the revolutionizing of all the ideas that result from these social relations>>

At present the new Proudhonists, such as Georges Marchais, Enrico Berlinguer, Santiago Carrillo and others are trying to impose on the West-European proletariat these old philosophies which were refuted by Marx, dressed up in different cloaks. All the revisionists want to deceive the masses with their <<theories>> by eliminating the scientific foundations of Marxism. They are simply telling lies when they say that <<they are objective in their recognition of the laws which make society advance>>! In reality they have become lackeys of the <<consumer society>> created by the capitalist and imperialist bourgeoisie to ensure maximum profits from the exploitation of the working class and all the working masses. These revisionists also want to consume something from the surplus value which is extracted from the Proletariat of their countries.

The question of what socialism is, what socialist society is, what it represents and achieves at present is not a question of the future, but a concrete reality, a whole historical practice, a tangible social system. Genuine scientific socialism, that advocated by the great geniuses of the revolution, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, was achieved and existed for a long time in the Soviet Union and many other former socialist countries, and it exists and is advancing in socialist Albania. The efforts which the Eurocommunists are making today <<to prove>> that genuine socialism has allegedly never existed anywhere, that the socialist society built in the Soviet Union by Lenin and Stalin was allegedly a <<distortion of socialism>>, indeed a <<failure>> of the concepts and ideas which Marx and Lenin had of socialism, are nothing but expressions of their hostility to communism, expressions of their desire to keep the existing bourgeois society intact.

The Italian, French and Spanish revisionists have travelled a long road to reach the point of their denial of socialism. At first, they claimed that socialism in the Soviet Union was divided into two parts, a <<Leninist socialism>> which was good, just, but conditioned by the special historical conditions of czarist Russia, therefore unsuitable for the developed capitalist countries, and a <<Stalinist socialism>> which was bad, because allegedly it was a distortion of the former, deformed, bureaucratized, and so on. This evolution in judgements is not accidental. If the <<Leninist experience>> were accepted, even with reservations, if the justice of the use of the revolutionary violence for the seizure of power were accepted, for example, then there would be no place left for the Eurocommunists' <<model>> of socialism. Lenin's theory on the revolution and
the construction of socialism, which is a further development of Marx’s teachings, is so much a whole, so coherent, so scientific and logical that it must be accepted as it is or not accepted at all. It cannot be chopped into pieces without falling into irreconcilable contradictions and absurdities of logic.

Thus the Eurocommunists are now no longer opposed only to Stalin, but have abandoned Leninism too, thinking that with this they have escaped and found the way to preach <<Eurocommunist socialism>>. But if they have abandoned Leninism, the proletariat has not done so. Leninism is a living science, the militant ideology of the proletariat, the banner of the revolution and the construction of socialism. Leninism is that powerful weapon with which all genuine revolutionaries, all those who want communism and are striving for socialism, fight against all enemies, against the bourgeoisie and its collaborators. Leninism is the mirror which brings to light the true features of the Eurocommunists and all other revisionists, which reveals the falsity of their opportunist <<theories>>, which shows up their reactionary activity against the proletariat, socialism and the peoples’ cause.

In order to avoid the dissatisfaction of the rank and file of their parties, the doubts which the <<theories>> they propose about <<socialism>> and their confused, contradictory theses in general arouse, the Eurocommunists declare that their socialism still does not represent a <<model>>, is not Yet something clear and defined, but only an expression of the <<need to find the way>> towards this society which must be discussed. In other words, it is just beating the air, because nothing is being achieved.

The <<socialism>> envisaged by the Eurocommunists is a society in which socialist and capitalist elements are combined and coexist in the economy and politics, in the base and superstructure. In their <<socialism>> there will be both <<socialist property>> and Capitalist property, hence there will also be exploiting and exploited classes; alongside the party of the working class there will also be bourgeois parties; the proletarian ideology will coexist with the other ideologies; in this <<socialism>> the state will be a state in which all parties and classes have power.

The Eurocommunists can dream as much as they like about such a hybrid capitalist-socialist society, but this society which they propose can never be achieved. Socialism and capitalism are two different social systems which are mutually exclusive. Capitalism exists as long as it keeps, the proletariat and the working masses oppressed and exploited, while socialism is built and advances only on the ruins of capitalism, after it is completely overthrown.

In order to justify their profoundly opportunist views, the Eurocommunists overrate the role of equipment, of means of production in the development of society, thus slipping into the so-called theory of productive forces, which was the ideological basis of all the opportunism of the Second International.

According to them, the impulse towards socialism comes automatically and spontaneously from the development of productive forces. Therefore, they claim, for the transition to socialism there is no need for class struggle or proletarian revolution. Moreover, according to the Eurocommunists, even in those countries where the revolution has been carried out and socialist relations of production have been established, if there is a relatively low level of productive forces, there can be no talk of genuine socialism there.

In order to see how far the Eurocommunists have departed from the idea of socialism and what sort of socialist society they pretend that they have to build, one need only examine some of their main theses, about which they beat the big drum so loudly as the highest development of the progressive thought of present <<day human society.>> <<An integral nationalization of the means of production is not necessary to achieve a socialist society.>> declare the Italian revisionists. <<Alongside of a public sector... private initiative will operate... Freely united peasant property; crafts; small and middle industry; the private initiative in the tertiary field... will play a special role. In this concept of the transformation of society in the socialist sense, there must be a linking of the economic system in order to ensure an integration between programing and the market, between public and private initiative ...>>*

*
The French revisionists also proclaim such a "socialism". This society, they say, "requires a sufficient body of democratic nationalizations, along with other forms of social property and an economic sector based on private property".* *(L’Humanité, January 13, 1979) Carillo says, "This system, which will have a mixed character in the field of the economy, will be expressed in a political regime in which the owners will be organized not only economically but also in one or more political parties, which represent their interests. This situation will become one of the components of political and ideological pluralism."** *(S.Carillo, <<Eurocomunisme>> et Etat, france 1977, pp.121-122)

It requires no special knowledge of social laws to understand that the tableau of the socalled socialist society which the Eurocommunists present is nothing other than the precise and most typical tableau of present-day bourgeois society. The basic element which determines a social system is the ownership of the means of production. If the ownership of the means of production is private, then we have to do with a system in which man exploits man, in which wealth is accumulated in the hands of the minority at one pole, while the overwhelming majority of the people live in poverty and want at the other pole. It has already been proved that socialism cannot exist without the elimination of capitalist property and the smashing of the bourgeois state. There can never be socialism without the establishment of social ownership of the means of production in all sectors without exception, without the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The proletariat has fought with courage, sacrifice and abnegation to overthrow the relations of capitalist ownership of the means of production. To this end, it has elaborated its own ideology, Marxism-Leninism, which must guide it in the revolution and the establishment of social ownership of the means of production, in the elimination of the exploitation which arises from private ownership of these means, and in the elimination of poverty. The proletariat realized this objective in those countries where the revolution triumphed and socialism was established. This experience, which the construction of socialism in Albania is confirming more and more each day, shows that the fundamental condition for the construction of socialist society is precisely the expropriation of the bourgeoisie and the transformation of the whole economy of the country on a socialist basis, the establishment of social ownership of the means of production.

Liberation found Albania a backward country from the socio-economic and cultural viewpoint, mainly an agricultural country, almost without industry, with a very low level of development of the productive forces. Did this constitute an obstacle to the construction of socialist relations of production? Of course. It did, indeed a major obstacle, but not an insurmountable one. Our Party could not wait for the productive forces to be developed to a high level, and then commence the establishment of socialist relations. Among the first and most important measures which our people's state power took were the liquidation of foreign capital and the transformation of its enterprises into socialist state property, the implementation of an extensive and radical land reform, which not only liquidated the large-scale property of the feudal lords and the estate-owners, but also greatly restricted the property of the rich peasants. These measures of a profoundly revolutionary character created important premises for the gradual socialist transformation of the countryside, for the development of the cooperative movement there.

Having the unerring guide of Marxism-Leninism, as well as the experience of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, the Party of Labour of Albania put forward the liquidation of the economic base of capitalism and the construction of the economic base of socialism in town and countryside as a main objective. The socialization of the main means of production was carried out relatively quickly, by means of nationalization without compensation. In 1946, two years after Liberation, the banks, industry, the mines, power stations, transport, communications, foreign trade, internal wholesale trade, part of the retail trade, the machine and tractor stations, the forests, waters and underground assets, were socialist state property. Thus the socialist sector of the economy occupied the commanding position.
A major problem for every socialist revolution is the agrarian problem. The development of the whole economy and the stability of the people’s state power itself depend on the correct solution of this problem. In Albania, where the peasantry comprised the overwhelming majority of the population and agriculture was the main branch of the economy, the agrarian problem was extremely acute and decisive. The course which our Party followed to resolve this cardinal question was the Leninist course of socialist co-operation.

Adhering strictly to the principle of the free will of the peasantry to unite in cooperatives, the process of the collectivization of agriculture, which began almost immediately after the liberation of the country, and went on for about 15 to 20 years, was carried out without first nationalizing the land. This was done only after collectivization had been completed, with the approval of the new Constitution in 1976.

With the construction of the economic base of socialism in town and countryside, the exploiting classes were liquidated as classes, and the exploitation of man by man was wiped out. Only two friendly classes remained, the working class and the cooperativist peasantry, linked with each other by common ideas, aims and interests, along with the stratum of the socialist intelligentsia from the ranks of the working people and created during the years of the people’s state power.

The construction of socialism cannot be carried out either through decrees or in a spontaneous way. Socialism is built with multiplied forces, with the participation of all the working people, and with a co-ordinated, centralized, overall plan.

By implementing a correct policy for the industrialization of the country, it was possible to transform Albania quickly, from a backward agri-cultural country into a country with developed industry and agriculture, with advanced education and culture, a country in which the people live in true freedom and happiness.

The Eurocommunists do not accept our experience, or that of the Soviet Union or other countries when they were socialist. They want to invent a <<new>> socialism. However, you need a crippled logic in order to accept the existence of private ownership of the means of production in society and at the same time think you can avoid the exploitation of man by man, and to speak about <<socialist transformations>>, <<equality>>, <<justice>>, etc., such as the Eurocommunists preach. The preservation of private ownership of the means of production, of <<private initiative>>, that is, the possibility of capitalist accumulation in the society which the Eurocommunists, propose, means in fact that the capitalist system will be retained completely intact and inviolate.

In all their philosophical fantasies, as well as in the programs which their parties proclaim, the Eurocommunist revisionists do not touch at all on the question of what will be done with the multinational companies and foreign capital. Since they do not mention it, this means that they will remain integral parts of the <<socialist>> society which they advocate, this means that big American, West-German, British, French and other capital will no longer think of super-profits, but will serve socialism. This is just day-dreaming. on this question, Carrillo, Berlinguer, Marchais are not as progressive as those circles of the bourgeoisie in many developing countries, which, although they are not for socialism, demand the expulsion of foreign monopoly capital and liberation from the multinational companies.

In regard to the so-called public sector, the existence of which <<Eurocommunist socialism>> foresees, here we have to do simply with a speculation in terms, with a vulgar attempt to peddle the sector of state capitalism, which exists to this or that degree in all the bourgeois countries, as a socialist sector of the economy.

The state capitalist sector, or the <<public sector>>, as the bourgeoisie calls it, has been created in ways and for reasons that are known.

State capitalism in the industrial countries of Europe existed previously, but it assumed an obvious development, especially after the Second World War. It was created as a result of a number of factors. In Italy, for example, it was set up by the bourgeoisie, as a result of the exacerbation of the class struggle, and the great pressure of the working masses, who demanded the expropriation of big capital, especially that linked with fascism, which was responsible for the catastrophe which the
country suffered. In order to escape the further radicalization of the struggle of the working masses and to avoid revolutionary outbursts, the weak Italian bourgeoisie carried out the nationalization of some big industries, a nationalization which fulfilled the minimum demands of the communist and socialist parties, which emerged from the war strengthened. In Britain, the creation of the <<public sector>> like that of railways or coal came as a result of big capital's abandoning some backward and unprofitable branches. It handed these over to the state, which subsidized them from the budget, from the tax-payers, while it invested its capital in the sectors of new industries with a high level of technology, in which great super-profits were secured more easily and quickly. Nationalizations of this kind have been and are still being carried out for this or that reason in other countries, too, but they have not changed and can never change the capitalist nature of the system in power, cannot eliminate capitalist exploitation, unemployment, poverty and the lack of freedoms and democratic rights.

As very lengthy experience has already proved, state capitalism is supported and developed by the bourgeoisie, not to create the foundations Of socialist society, as the revisionists think, but to strengthen the foundations of capitalist society, of its bourgeois state, in order to exploit and oppress the working people more. Those who run the <<public sector>> are not the representatives of the workers, but the men of big capital, those who have the reins of the whole economy and the state in their hands. The social position of the worker in the enterprises of the <<public sector>> is no different from that of the worker in the private sector; his relationship to the means of production, to the economic management of the enterprise, the policy of investments, pay, etc., is the same. The bourgeois state, i.e., the bourgeoisie, appropriates the profit of these enterprises. Only the revisionists are able to find some distinction between the <<socialist>> character of the enterprises of IRI and the <<bourgeois>> character of FIAT, between the <<free>> workers of Renault and the <<oppressed>> workers of Citroen.

The society of <<democratic socialism>>, which the Eurocommunists preach today, is the bourgeois society which exists at present in their countries. They just want to touch it up a bit, so that the old European bourgeoisie, with one foot in the grave, will look like a young bride, full of life and vitality. According to the Eurocommunists, all that is needed is a bit of retouching, retaining the state capitalist sector alongside the private sector, creating some workers' consultative councils attached to the management of enterprises, allowing the trade-union bosses to call for justice and equality in meetings in the squares, giving the revisionists a few seats in the government and... socialism will come of its own accord.

With their unrestrained zeal to fight and deny Marxism-Leninism, the Eurocommunist revisionists, prettify the present-day reality of capitalist society in every way. To them, the existing social system in Italy, France, Spain and elsewhere, the state which rules in these countries, is a kind of supra-class democracy, a democracy for all. In this society and this state they see only a few difficulties, a few mistakes, a few distortions at the most, but nothing more. On this basic concept and premise they build up their schemes of their <<democratic socialism>>, which in essence will be the same present-day bourgeois society, but without the <<defects>>, <<restrictions>> and <<difficulties>> which it has today. The revisionists declare that in their osocialism- more than one party will exist and function, along with the possibility of their alternation in government. It must be said that on this question the Eurocommunists are really coherent. It is natural that in this society, in which there will be antagonistic classes, different strata of the bourgeoisie, groups of capitalists with separate interests, there also will be different parties, and that the practice which has existed up to now in capitalist society, that the different parties alternate at the head of this state, according to the occasion and the need, will certainly exist. But where the Eurocommunists deliberately misrepresent matters is that they present this <<pluralism>>, that is, the practice of changing the horses in the chariot of the bourgeois state, as the culmination of democracy, as a situation which creates the possibility to solve all social problems. Their aim is to distort the very concept of socialist society and to present bourgeois democracy and its institutions as capable of realizing socialist aims, with no need for the
revolution, without the need to smash the old bourgeois state apparatus. In fact, their ideal state is the current American, or more particularly, the German political system, in which two big bourgeois parties, which alternate with one another at the head of the government, rule. They want two big parties in Italy, France, or Spain too: one of them openly bourgeois, democratic or liberal, and the other a workers’ party, whether they call it socialist, communist, labour, or what you will, as well as a few other unimportant small parties, just for the sake of variety. And in this way, <<Italian socialism>>, <<French socialism>>, <<Spanish socialism>> would be created, just as <<Swedish socialism>>, Norwegian socialism., and so on, have been created.

In <<democratic socialism>> the state must not be the state of workers and peasants, that is, it must not be like the state advocated by Marx and Lenin, which would bring the workers from the factories and the peasants who work the land into leadership. The Eurocommunists want a state which will be the state of <<everybody>>, and the government of this state likewise will be of <<everybody>>. But a state of <<everybody>> as never existed and never will exist.

The Eurocommunists’ concepts about the state are very close to those of Proudhon and Lassalle, refuted by Marx more than a century ago. Lassalle, for example, preached that through reforms, in peaceful ways, through general elections, and with the aid of the bourgeois state and of associations of producers, which would have to be created, the reactionary Prussian state could be transformed into a free popular state. He presented this kind of <<state>> as a model for the new socialist state for which the workers ought to fight.

The Lassallian concept of the <<popular state>> denied the class character of the state as a dictatorship of a given class.

Marx, especially in his outstanding work <<The Critique of the Gotha Programme>>, confronted the Lassallian concept of the <<free popular state>> with the concept of the state as a class organ, with his concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

<<...one does not get a flea-hop nearer to the problem by a thousandfold combination of the word 'people' with the word 'state',>> says Marx.

<<...between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformations of one on to the other. Corresponding to this is also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.>>

The Marxist theoretical theses and doctrine on the state, proclaimed in the monumental works of Marx: and Engels, found brilliant confirmation in the events of the Commune of Paris.

The Commune of Paris showed that the proletariat cannot retain the old bourgeois state machine and use it for its own purposes, to overthrow the capitalist order. The Commune destroyed that machine and, in place of it, created state organisms and institutions entirely new in content and form. The Commune was the first form of the political organization of the proletarian state power. As Lenin stressed, the Commune of Paris showed the historical limitations

<<...and limited value of the bourgeois parliamentary system and bourgeois democracy....>>

*Lenin

It was proved in practice that the state which the Commune of Paris set up represented the highest type of democracy, that of the overwhelming majority of the people. it put into practice the great democratic rights and freedoms which the bourgeoisie proclaims but never realizes.

Later Lenin, in struggle with the opportunist distortions of the chiefs of the Second International, brilliantly defended Marx’s theory on the state.

He refuted their concepts that allegedly the state is not an organ of the domination of one class over another, but an organ of class conciliation, that the apparatus of the bourgeois state should not be destroyed, but should be used in the interests of the working people. In his famous book . <<The
State and Revolution, Lenin showed that the state is a product of contradictions between classes and an expression of the irreconcilability of these contradictions. He proved that the bourgeois state apparatus, an apparatus set up to keep the working class and the working masses oppressed and exploited, could not be used by them for the elimination of oppression and exploitation. The proletariat has to build its own state, new in form and content, in structure and organization, in the people who run it and in their methods of work, a state which will ensure the freedom of the working masses and suppress the efforts of enemies of socialism to restore the capitalist system.

Lenin's book <<The State and Revolution>> and the Leninist theses on the dictatorship of the proletariat played an important role in the preparation for the October Revolution and the establishment of the Soviet state power in Russia. They remain powerful weapons in the hands of genuine revolutionaries to combat the theorizing of modern revisionists, who are trying to revive the old views of Kautsky and company about the state, which Lenin exposed and defeated.

The theorizing of the Eurocommunists about the state is a consequence of the anti-Marxist line of these renegades, who pretend that not class struggle but class peace exists in capitalism, that the army and the police are no longer retrogressive forces of the bourgeoisie, therefore, there is no need for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the genuine democracy which the proletariat establishes. They want only one state, one democracy - the state of bourgeois-revisionist democracy.

**The <<Democratic>> Road to Socialism - a Disguise to Protect the Bourgeois State**

The question of state power has always been the fundamental question of the ideology and policy of every party, irrespective of what class interests it represents. Eurocommunism could be no exception to this. It began its struggle precisely in this field, becoming a new weapon in the hands of the bourgeoisie to protect its power of oppression and exploitation, and to prevent the proletariat from carrying out the revolution, destroying this power and establishing socialism.

In their propaganda against Marxism-Leninism, the Eurocommunists, insist that in the conditions of modern society, as they call the presentday capitalist society, the theory of Marx about the overthrow of capitalism by means of violent revolution needs new <<interpretations>>. Among the first who began the frontal attack on, to describe as invalid and violate, the thesis of Marx and Lenin about the necessity for the violent revolution, a thesis which they totally distorted, were the Soviet revisionists, as we mentioned above. In order to make their theory of peaceful transition to socialism <<convincing>>, they went so far as to claim that the October Revolution was a peaceful revolution, contrary to what history recognizes it as the first revolution which overthrew the Russian bourgeoisie with violence and established the dictatorship of the proletariat. At the same time they began to propound the theory that the dictatorship of the proletariat was a temporary phenomenon which gave way to the so-called state of the whole people. With these theories, they aimed to minimize and negate the revolutionary class content of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This deliberate distortion of Marxism-Leninism by the Soviet revisionists became the basis on which the Eurocommunist theories on this question were built up. The Khrushchevite theses that with the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union the class struggle no longer existed, that the triumph of socialism was guaranteed and there was no danger of any reversal, that there was no longer any need for the dictatorship of the proletariat, or for the party of the working class, became an inspiration and encouragement for the other revisionists to go even further. Misrepresenting the significance of the changes which have taken place in the world and misinterpreting a correct phrase of Lenin's about the special features of the road to socialism, they stress that at the present time it is possible to go to socialism through parliamentarianism and reforms.

The Eurocommunists present the course of transformation of capitalist society into socialist society as the development of bourgeois political democracy through to the end, as they say, as a peaceful course which does not lead to a qualitative change but only to a quantitative change.
The Italian revisionists say, <<Political democracy presents itself as the highest institutional form of
the organization of the state, even of a socialist state.>> *(The politics and the organization of the italian communists, Rome 1979)*

If we analyse this so-called thesis, it turns out that <<political democracy>> for the working people
allegedly exists already in capitalism and that socialism is allegedly reached by extending this
democracy and, finally, that the fundamental feature of socialist society allegedly is bourgeois
democracy which is identified with socialist democracy.

Meanwhile the Spanish revisionists, for their part, claim that <<socio-political democracy is not a
third road, either capitalist or socialist, but is a transitional stage between capitalism and socialism.>> *(The ninth Congress of The Spanish Communist Party, Barcelona 1978) <<Democracy is simultaneously the aim and the means of transformations,>> *(L'Humanité, February 13, 1979)* says Marchais.

As can be seen, in order to justify their revisionist views Berlinguer, Carrillo, Marchais and others
present very confused ideas about democracy and the state. Such reasoning, which is not based on
the class relations that exist in bourgeois society, which is outside the connection between the
capitalist economic base and superstructure, outside reality and any logic, has the aim of proving
allegedly that genuine democracy is not that which the dictatorship of the proletariat establishes, the
democracy of the great majority of the exploited masses over the minority of the capitalist
exploiters, or their remnants, but democracy à la Marchais and Carrillo, that is, <<democracy for
all, where everyone lives in peace and class harmony>>. However, history has proved that there is
not and cannot be bourgeois democracy without the bourgeois dictatorship, just as there cannot be
socialist democracy without the dictatorship of the proletariat. The rights and duties of citizens are
related directly to the domination of the class which is in power. Where the capitalist class rules,
there are rights for the bourgeoisie, and restriction of rights, oppression and denigration of the
masses, while where the working class rules, there are rights and freedoms for the workers, and
restriction and compulsion for the minority of former rulers and exploiters, as well as for the
enemies of socialism.

The Eurocommunists are not the first opportunists to deny the need for the revolution as the only
basic means for the overthrow of capitalism and the construction of socialism. Before them, a
similar thing was done by Proudhon, whom Marx exposed, and by Bernstein and company, who
ended up openly defending the capitalist system.

Bernstein, for example, preached that by improving the labour legislation, by increasing the role
and activity of trade-unions and cooperatives, by increasing the representation of the working class
in parliament, all the economic, political and social problems of the proletariat could be solved
peacefully and on the evolutionist course. He stated explicitly that the working class need win the
simple majority in parliament, get 51 per cent of the votes, and it could achieve all its aims. Since
the <<will of the majority>> rules in democracy, he said, the state loses its class character, is
transformed from an organ of the class rule into an organ which stands above classes and represents
the interests of the whole society. In such a state, he said, the working class and its party can and
must collaborate with all the other classes and parties. Together, they must defend and strengthen
this state against <<reactionaries>>.

Bernstein preached that the road of the transformation of society was the road of partial and gradual
reforms, the road of evolution, of the gradual integration of capitalism into socialism. Therefore,
according to him, the party of the working class must be a party not of social revolution, but of
social reforms. Lenin strongly criticized and pointed out the utter falsity of these views of
Bernstein, which Kautsky and company took over later. The Great October Revolution gave the
historic verdict in the great debate between the Marxists led by Lenin, who defended the idea of the
revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the revisionist opportunists, who were
partisans of the peaceful, reformist road, of <<pure>> democracy, etc.
This revolution showed the proletariat and peoples of the world that the road to victory over imperialism and capitalism does not run through reforms and agreements with the bourgeoisie, but through violent revolution.

<<Arguing>> in support of their opposition to the Marxist-Leninist theory on the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Eurocommunists claim that Marx himself allegedly <<only once mentioned this term>>! However, it is known that the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat constitutes the fundamental question of the whole of Marx's doctrine on socialism. In 1852 Marx wrote,

<<What I did that was new was to prove: 1) that the existence of classes is bound up with particular historical phases in the development of production; 2) that the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat; 3) that this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the abolition of all classes and to a classless society. ...>>

Marx did not regard the dictatorship of the proletariat as a simple alternation of some people in the government, but as a qualitatively new state, which is built on the ruins of the old bourgeois state. He considered the smashing of the old bourgeois state machine with violence an essential for the triumph not only of the proletarian revolution, but of any genuine people's revolution led by the working class. Lenin called this conclusion, put forward by Marx in his outstanding work <<The 18th Brumaire of Luis Bonaparte>>, << gigantic step forward>>. It is precisely this foundation stone of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine that all the old revisionists have attacked and denied, and which all the new Eurocommunist revisionists attack.

The stand of the Eurocommunists towards the question of the revolution, the state and democracy coincides in essence with that Of the Soviet revisionists, who have declared that now the <<communist>> party in the Soviet Union has allegedly been transformed into a <<party of the entire people>> and that the dictatorship of the proletariat has been replaced with the <<state of the entire people>>. On the basis of these statements of the Soviet revisionists Marchais and Carrillo have the right to reason: <<If you can allegedly transform the party and the state of the proletariat into a party and state of the entire people, why shouldn't we in the West have the right to carry out such a thing, but without violent revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat? We are going to proceed in 'pluralism' and understanding with the bourgeoisie, by building up opinion for a 'genuine democracy', which has not been achieved in your country. It is in vain for you to claim the existence of democracy in your country while you are strengthening oppression.>>

In regard to the Titoites, they too are in difficulties with the Eurocommunists in connection with <<democracy>> and <<pluralism>>. The Yugoslav revisionists speak about the unity of the ..Knon-aligned world., and with this formula -<<eliminate>> the class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat. They demand from imperialism and world capitalism only that the <<non-aligned countries>> <<should remain within their present status quo and be assisted economically.>> In this direction the Titoites are of the same opinion as the Eurocommunists, with the one difference that, while the Yugoslavs speak about alleged <<independence from superpowers and blocs>>, the Eurocommunists do not do this even formally.

Without attacking them directly, but through the ideas they express, the Eurocommunists tell the Yugoslav revisionists that the existence of only one party in Yugoslavia is not the road of genuine democracy, therefore the political system in Yugoslavia too must undergo changes. While directly attacking Lenin and the whole Marxist-Leninist theory on the state and the revolution, Berlinguer, Marchals. Carrillo and company call on the Khrushcheevites to carry their betrayal through to the end. telling them that it is not only the <<mistakes>> of Stalin which is the problem for their filthy undertaking, but the socialist system itself, which, although it was an appropriate system after the October Revolution, is not right at the present time, because it allegedly denies democracy.
Without doubt, this thesis is not to the advantage of the Khrushchevites who, in order to conceal their betrayal and to pose as Marxist-Leninists, still maintain some allegedly Leninist forms. In order to retain this disguise, from time to time the Brezhnev group makes some feeble criticism of the disobedient parties and advises them that they must allegedly safeguard the class principles of Lenin on the road and the forms of transition to socialism. However, the revisionist parties of the Western countries do not fail to reply to Brezhnev that they are doing nothing more than what the Soviet revisionists have done, that they are acting according to their conditions, which allegedly dictate the peaceful road, the road of democratic reforms, political and ideological pluralism, etc., etc. Berlinguer, Marchais and Carrillo, who have gone further than Togliatti, tell the Soviets: <<Isn't it you who have spoken about peaceful coexistence? Then, come on, let us create this coexistence and carry it through to the end.>> And with whom are we to peacefully coexist? With the opponents of communism, that is, with the capitalist bourgeoisie, American imperialism, etc. However to achieve peaceful coexistence, they say first we must revise the <<dogmas>> in policy, in ideology, in the economy and in art, because the <<dogmas>> cannot be adapted to present-day society. Since the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on the dictatorship of the proletariat, the class struggle, and the seizure of power with violence are allegedly <<dogmas>>, then they are not suitable, either, therefore power must be taken not through violence, but in the parliamentary way, through general elections, through the coming to power of the working class and removal of the bourgeoisie from power in democratic ways.

For the sake of demagogy, and to throw dust in the eyes of the masses, the Eurocommunists mutter in an undertone that the <<third way>>, or <<democratic socialism>>, is not social-democracy, because it <<has not carried society beyond the logic of capitalism>>.* *(The politics and The organization of the italian communists, Roma 1979)

Nevertheless, they add immediately, we must unite with social-democracy and the other political forces, and together with them must exert influence on the state apparatus of the capitalist bourgeoisie, through propaganda, reforms, the church, culture, etc., and not destroy it, as the classics of Marxism-Leninism say. so that gradually this state power will assume a truly democratic form, so that it will serve the whole of the society and create the conditions to build <<socialism>> in a peaceful way. In other words, they advocate the creation of a bastardized social order which will have nothing in common with scientific socialism.

The theses of Togliatti and his supporters, the line of the Italian Communist Party, have become the ideal of all the Eurocommunist revisionists, to such an extent that they have aroused the envy of Carrillo and Marchais. Georges Marchais writes in <<L'Humanité>>, <<In 1956 we were slow to draw lessons from what had occurred in the Soviet Union. and work out the French road to socialism>>, that is, as Togliatti did. When Marchais or Carrillo say that the police are with the Italian Communist Party, and that in Rome they vote for this party, they are praising the efforts and achievements of Berlinguer in the direction of collaboration with social-democracy, the Christian Democrats, and the socialists on public questions, and also in the administration of the affairs the bourgeoisie.

The <<successes>> of Berlinguer in these directions, that is, in submission to Italian and world capitalism, serve the other revisionists as practical support for their opportunist political theses. Berlinguer works with great zeal. He does not attack the bourgeois Constitution, does not attack the power of the bourgeoisie, does not even mention overthrowing this power and its apparatus, does not speak about destroying the Italian oppressive army, but on the contrary, signs statements together with the parties of reaction that the army must be strengthened, that the American bases must remain, that the power and funds of the police must be increased, that the police must have the right, outside the law, to check up on anything which is suspicious, even to bug telephone conversations and open private correspondence.

Now the program and activities of the Italian revisionists are ready and tested for the other revisionists too. In Italy, Spain and France, the integration of revisionism into capitalism, and not of
capitalism into socialism, as the Eurocommunists preach in their programs and speeches, is developing and taking a concrete form.

The Italian, French and Spanish communist parties say nothing at all about the Chinese revisionists. Their whole struggle is spearheaded against Marx Engels, Lenin and Stalin, and for their own ends, sometimes against the Soviet revisionists, too. They are in accord with the Chinese revisionists on all fronts. The Chinese revisionists are struggling for an alliance with the United States of America, the developed capitalist countries and the ruling cliques in the neo-colonial countries.

Such an alliance is on the course of the Eurocommunist renegades. The fact is that the Chinese foreign policy conforms completely with the policy which the Eurocommunists preach about the unity of revisionist parties with the bourgeois-capitalist regimes in power. The Chinese revisionists and the Communist Party of China also are for pluralism in socialism. In China the parties of the bourgeoisie not only exist, but they participate in the state power and the leadership, together with the Communist Party, which cannot exist and run things without collaboration with them. On these fundamental questions the Chinese revisionists are in agreement with the European revisionists.

On the other hand, Chinese private enterprises, Chinese-foreign capital joint private enterprises, purely foreign private enterprises, cooperativist sectors, etc., exist alongside of the state capitalist sector in China. This conforms completely with the "third road", with the "socialism" which the Eurocommunists propagate.

Mao Zedong proclaimed his "theory" about the "blossoming of a hundred flowers and contention of a hundred schools". What does this mean? This means that all idealist, social-democratic, republican, religious and other ideas, are permitted and develop in China. "Let all the schools contend, this is dialectical," says Mao Zedong. But since pluralism allegedly becomes dialectical, a thing which the Eurocommunists preach, too, then it must be possible to go to socialism together and in unity with the bourgeoisie and its parties in peace and peaceful competition.

When bourgeois parties exist and take part in the leadership in China, along with the Communist Party, then the state cannot be the dictatorship of the proletariat, but must be a hybrid organism, which is a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat only in words, while in reality it is a bourgeois democracy.

The Chinese practice responds to the line of the Eurocommunists and serves as a "confirmation" of how the transition to socialism can be carried out without revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Someone may say: "But China went to socialism through the revolution", "China has a dictatorship of the proletariat- etc. This is not true. The truth is that China fought against the Japanese occupiers and the Kuomintang, but the dictatorship of the proletariat was never established and socialism was never built there. The state power in China was called the dictatorship of the proletariat, but its content was different, and now we are seeing that the disguises which the Communist Party of China and the Chinese state had put on, are falling off one after the other. Following the death of Mao Zedong, who was an eclectic, and of Zhou Enlai, who was a bourgeois democrat, we see that China is revealing its true features, emerging as a bourgeois republic and an imperialist state.

In regard to the contradictions the Eurocommunists have with the Soviet revisionists over the character of the state in socialism, these are not in the least of a principled nature. They attack the revisionist Soviet state, presenting it as a distortion which, as they put it, neither Marx nor Engels would approve, and indeed, even Lenin would not consider many things right. But this is a vulgar speculation. The present Soviet state is not a socialist state. It has been transformed into a dictatorship of the revisionist bourgeoisie which oppresses and exploits the working masses. With this speculation, the Eurocommunists want to prove that their pluralist line is the only "scientific Marxist" line, the only line suitable for the construction of true socialism. According to them, this line is a dialectical consequence of the materialist development of history, which allegedly Marx and Engels "did not foresee" and which allegedly "Lenin did not foresee", either. However, it has been allegedly discovered by Berlinguer, Marchais, Carrillo and the other revisionists of
Western Europe who are beating their breasts and saying: "It is we who envisage the genuine transformation of society and who analyse the phenomena of the present-day world to their roots".

In fact, they are opposed to any kind of revolutionary transformation. They want to preserve the present-day bourgeois "consumer" society, to preserve the domination of capitalism and the exploitation of the working people. This is their ideal and their aim. For this they are working and struggling. All the rest is just propaganda, demagogy, deception, means which the bourgeoisie uses to fight socialism and the revolution.

The Eurocommunists' "Independence" Is Dependence on Capital and the Bourgeoisie

The struggle against imperialism in general, and its tools in every country is one of the fundamental questions of the strategy of every communist party, and one of the decisive conditions for the triumph of any revolution, whether people's democratic, anti-imperialist or socialist. At the same time, its attitude to imperialism serves as a touchstone to evaluate the political and ideological position of every political force which operates either within the national framework of each country, or on an international scale. In other words, the stand towards imperialism has always been a line of demarcation which divides the genuine patriotic and democratic revolutionary forces, on the one hand, from the forces of reaction, counter-revolution and national betrayal, on the other hand. What is the stand of the Eurocommunists on this vital question of such major importance of principle?

Commencing from the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, when Khrushchev came out with the line of conciliation and rapprochement with American imperialism, and put this forward as a general line for the whole communist movement, the revisionist parties of the Western countries abandoned any anti-imperialist position, on both the theoretical and practical planes. It seemed as if they were liberated from their shackles to rush into conciliation with the big imperialist, colonialist and neocolonialist bourgeoisie. The new strategy which Khrushchev presented to the communist movement was that which the leaders of the Western communist parties had long desired, which they had begun to apply in practice, but which, you might say, had not yet received the seal of official approval.

Even before the 20th Congress of the CPSU, because of various vacillations and concessions, in France and Italy the struggle against NATO, against the revival and rearmament of German imperialism, against the interference of American capital and its military bases in Europe and so on, had begun to decline. If something was done at that time, it was only in the field of propaganda, without any action. On the Algerian question, the French Communist Party was in almost the same position as the bourgeois parties of the country. But its chauvinism and nationalism on this question, more and more softened its stand towards the big ally of the French bourgeoisie - American imperialism and its economic and political expansion. Since "French Algeria" had to be defended, "French Africa" had also to be defended, and a blind eye and a deaf ear turned to "British Asia" and "American America".

The Italian revisionists, who were trying in every way to convince the bourgeoisie of their sincerity and loyalty, tried to give the maximum proofs precisely in not opposing the foreign policy of the Christian Democrat government, which was a policy of unconditional alliance with American imperialism, total submission to NATO, the opening of doors to American big capital, and the transformation of the country into a big military base of the United States of America.

In regard to the Spanish revisionists, their sole preoccupation at that time was to achieve the legalization of the party and return to Spain. Thinking that the "democratization" of Spain could be done only through the pressure of the United States of America, which, according to them, was interested in removing the "obstacle" Franco, they did not even see the American policy of expansion and hegemony, let alone fight it.
<<The national roads to socialism>>, which the revisionist parties of the countries of Western Europe adopted in the spirit of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, led to their submission, not only to the national bourgeoisie but also to the international bourgeoisie, first of all, to American imperialism. At the same time, it was natural that their abandonment of Marxism-Leninism, the revolution and socialism could not fail to be accompanied by their abandonment of the principles of proletarian internationalism, of aid to and support for the revolutionary and liberation movements. Although the French, Italian and Spanish revisionist parties began gradually to keep a certain distance from the Soviet Union, to criticize Moscow over certain aspects of its internal and external policy, to disapprove of some of its actions in international relations, they never reached the point of describing and condemning the present-day Soviet Union as an imperialist country. True, they condemned its aggression in Czechoslovakia, for example, but on the other hand, they approved the Soviet intervention in Africa; true, they demanded the withdrawal of the Soviet fleet from the Mediterranean, but were silent about the dispatch of Soviet weapons to all parts of the world. According to the Eurocommunists, the Soviet policy within the country is anti-democratic, but abroad in general it is socialist and anti-imperialist. This stand has led and leads the Eurocommunist parties to support the hegemonic and expansionist policy of the Soviet Union in general, despite some opposition.

In this way, just as the revisionist parties of Western Europe became defenders of the bourgeois order within their own countries, they became no less ardent fighters for the preservation of the imperialist system on an international scale. The Eurocommunists became champions of the bourgeois imperialist status quo on all fronts.

If the Eurocommunists still retain some disguise, try to appear as opponents, though feeble ones, of the bourgeoisie and the capitalist order on internal problems, in relations between the revolution and international capitalism on a world scale, between the oppressed peoples and imperialism, between socialism and capitalism, they are openly against any change. Today, the revisionist parties of Italy, France, Spain and the other parties of the Eurocommunist trend have been transformed into pro-imperialist political forces which, in their line and activities, are indistinguishable from the bourgeois parties of those countries. Let us take their stand towards NATO and the European Common Market, which represent two of the basic political, economic and military factors on which the domination of the European big bourgeoisie and the hegemony of American imperialism in Europe are founded and realized.

From the time it was created to this day, NATO has changed neither its nature, its aims nor its objectives. The agreements remain those which were signed in 1949. Everyone knows the purpose for which the Atlantic Pact was created and why it is maintained. Even if people did not know them, the Pentagon and the staff in Brussels remind them of this day by day. NATO was and still is a political and military alliance of American and European big capital, first of all to preserve the capitalist system and institutions in Europe, to prevent the revolution from breaking out and to strangle it violently if it begins to advance. On the other hand, this counterrevolutionary organization is an armed guard of neo-colonialism and the spheres of influence of imperialist powers, and a weapon for their political and economic expansion. To hope to achieve the transformation of West European capitalist society and the construction of socialism while having NATO and the American bases in the country, is to daydream. The attempts of the Eurocommunists to stress only the anti-Soviet function of NATO and to forget its mission of suppressing the revolution in Western Europe have the aim of deceiving the workers and preventing them from seeing the reality.

The Eurocommunists do not want to see the existence of a major national problem, the question of American domination in Western Europe and the need for liberation from it. From the end of the Second World War down to this day, American imperialism has bound this part of Europe with all kinds of political, economic, military, cultural and other chains. Without breaking these chains you cannot have socialism, or even that bourgeois democracy which the Eurocommunists praise to the skies. American capital has penetrated so deeply into Europe, is so closely combined with local
capital that where one begins and the other finishes can no longer be distinguished. The European armies have been so completely integrated into NATO, in which the Americans dominate, that in practice they no longer exist as independent national forces. An ever greater integration is developing in the financial and monetary field, in technology, culture, etc.

It is true that between the European NATO member countries and the United States of America there are various contradictions. These are normal and inevitable between big capitalist groups and groupings, but it is a fact that on all the major world political and economic questions the NATO countries have always submitted to Washington. When it comes to choosing between class interests and national interests, the European big bourgeoisie, like the bourgeoisie of all other countries, always tends to sacrifice the latter. This is why the communists have always fought to defend the national interests, seeing them as closely linked with the cause of the revolution and socialism.

The Eurocommunists' denial of the existence of a national problem in their countries, concretely, the need to fight the American domination and dictate and to strengthen the national independence and sovereignty, is further proof of their political and ideological degeneration and their betrayal of the cause of the revolution. Today, the Italian revisionists not only insist that Italy must stay in NATO, but have become even greater supporters of the Atlantic Treaty than the Christian Democrats and the other pro-American bourgeois parties. <<Italy must stay in the Atlantic Alliance.>> say the Italian revisionists, <<because of the need to preserve the balance of power on which the preservation of peace in Europe and the world depends.>> *(The politics and the organization of the italian communists, Rome 1979)*

With this thesis, Berlinguer and company tell the workers: Don't oppose NATO, don't demand the withdrawal of the Americans from Naples and Caserta, don't condemn the stationing of atomic missiles near your homes, say nothing about the American aircraft which stand in the Italian airports ready to fly wherever the interests of the American imperialists are affected. Let the national interests of Italy be sacrificed for the sake of the hegemonic American policy, say the Italian revisionists; let Washington dictate who should govern, Italy and how they should govern it, let Italy be consumed in an atomic holocaust, as long as the balance between the two superpowers is maintained.

The thesis about the balance between big powers as a factor or means for the preservation of peace is an old imperialist slogan with which the world, and Europe especially, are very well acquainted. It has always been used to justify the hegemonic policy of big imperialist powers and the right which they give themselves to interfere in the internal affairs of others and dominate them.

To accept the need for the existence and strengthening of imperialist blocs, allegedly as a means for the preservation of peace, as the revisionists do, also means to approve their policy. The imperialist military blocs exist not to preserve the peace and to defend the freedom, independence and sovereignty of their member countries, as the Eurocommunist revisionists proclaim, but to rob them of these things, to preserve the domination and hegemony of the superpowers in those countries. It is known that one of the main aims of American imperialism when it created NATO was to defend the interests of United States' capital in Europe politically, but also with arms, and to put down any revolution which might break out there with fire and steel. These are the objectives of NATO which the Eurocommunist revisionists support.

The policy of blocs is an aggressive policy of the superpowers. It results from their hegemonic and expansionist strategy, from their ambitions to establish their complete and undivided rule over the whole world. The Eurocommunists do not see or do not want to see this predatory nature of imperialism, because, according to their <<theories>>, big capital, which is its foundation, is becoming <<democratized>>, is becoming <<people's>> capital, because the big bourgeoisie is being <<integrated into socialism>>.

In regard to their loyalty to NATO, the French revisionists are no different from their Italian counterparts, but in order to be in unison with the Giscardians or the Gaullists, they too speak about the special position which France should have in these organizations. For its part, Carrillo's party is
striving with all the means it possesses to seize the banner of the struggle to get Spain into NATO. In this way Franco’s unrealized dream will be achieved.

For the Eurocommunists, the European Common Market and United Europe, this great combine of capitalist monopolies and multinational companies for the exploitation of the peoples and the working masses of Europe and the peoples of the world, are a <<reality>> which must be accepted. But 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 multinational companies dominated by American big capital.

The Eurocommunists’ slogans alleging that their participation in <<the Parliament and other organs of the European Community will lead to their democratic transformation>>, to the creation of a <<Europe of working people>>, are nothing but demagogy and deception. The speeches of the Eurocommunists and the propaganda meetings of the Parliament of United Europe can no more transform Europe into a socialist society than the <<democratic road>> can transform the capitalist society of each country into such a society. Therefore, the stand of the Eurocommunists towards the European Common Market and United Europe is a stand of opportunists and scabs, which results from their line of class conciliation and submission to the bourgeoisie. It is intended to bemuse the working masses, to break their militant drive in defence of their own class interests and the interests of the whole nation.

Their reformist ideology, submission to the bourgeoisie and capitulation to the imperialist pressure have transformed the Eurocommunist parties into parties which are not only anti-revolutionary but also anti-national. Even amongst the ranks of the bourgeoisie it is rare to find people who call themselves politicians and who accept the concept of <<limited sovereignty>>, as Carrillo does. <<... we are conscious that this independence will always be relative....>> he writes. In the <<democratic and socialist>> Spain, which he proposes in his program, <<... investments of foreign capital and the functioning of multinationals will not be prohibited...>>. <<However,>> he adds, <<for a very long time to come we must pay a tribute to foreign capital in the form of surplus value ... but this will serve the development of those sectors which correspond to the national interest.>> *(S. carillo, <<Eurocommunisme>> et Etat, france 1977, pp.157-160)*

With their stands in defence of the monopolies and the interests of imperialist powers, the Eurocommunists have, set themselves against the anti-imperialist and democratic traditions of the French, Spanish and Italian workers. They have also set themselves against the patriotic traditions of the struggle which the workers and progressives of these countries have waged against NATO, the American bases in Europe and the interference and pressure of American imperialism. The Eurocommunists have abandoned these positions and gone over to the camp of reaction. The idea of class conciliation and submission to foreign domination, which pervades the entire political and ideological line of the Eurocommunists, emerges clearly also in the stand which they take towards the anti-imperialist national liberation revolutionary movements. Not being for the revolution in their own countries, they are not for the revolution in other countries, either. They do not want the weakening of their imperialist and neo-colonialist bourgeoisie, therefore they can never see the revolution in the oppressed countries as a direct aid for the overthrow of the capitalist system. For them, the unified process of the revolution, the natural connection between its different currents, the indispensable reciprocal aid, do not exist. Sometimes they say the odd propaganda word in favour of anti-imperialist movements, just for the sake of appearances. But this is only empty phraseology with no concrete content and, above all, not accompanied with political action. Their <<support>> is, at most, a slightly leftist pose, a way of appearing progressive and democratic.

Taken as a whole, in their stand towards the revolutionary liberation movements the Eurocommunists have embraced the ideology of non-alignment, which is extremely convenient for them in order to justify the subjugation of peoples to the domination of imperialist powers and to
proclaim neo-colonialism as a way for the former colonial countries to emerge from poverty and develop. In the theses for their recent congress, the Italian revisionists wrote, <<the struggle for the construction of a new international system and order in the economic field is a moment of more and more fundamental importance in the struggle for peace, for international co-operation and the policy of peaceful coexistence.>> * *(The politics and the organization of the italian communists, Rome 1979)

They are consistent in their opportunist line. They think that the exploiting character of the international economic relations of the capitalist system can be changed with some reforms, in the same way as they seek to reform the capitalist order within the country. Carrillo also talks about a new world economic order, or how the Eurocommunists envisage it. Indeed, he puts the matter more clearly: <<In any case we must proceed from an objective reality; although imperialism is no longer a unified world system, a world market always exists, regulated by the objective laws of the exchange of commodities, laws which, in the final analysis, are capitalist.>>.* *(S. Carillo, <<Eurocomunisme>> et Etat, France 1077, p.159)

According to Carrillo, these objective capitalist <<laws>> cannot alter or be replaced even in the conditions of socialism. In order to <<support>> this thesis he quotes the example of the capitalist character of relations between revisionist countries in the economic field. In other words, according to Carrillo, it turns out that it is in vain for the peoples to rise in struggle against national and neo-colonialist oppression, against unequal exchanges between the developed capitalist countries and the undeveloped countries, which are expressed especially in the savage plunder of the raw materials of the latter. This is the international order which Carrillo wants to retain and to which Berlinguer wants to do some retouching, so that it looks shiny and new.

A line which is opposed to the genuine national interests of the country, a line which defends imperialist hegemony and expansion, which praises neo-colonialism and sanctifies foreign capitalist exploitation is doomed to failure. The objective laws of the development of history cannot alter. The new world order for which the proletariat and the peoples are fighting is not the imperialist order which the Eurocommunists advertise, but the socialist order to which the future belongs.

In recent years, the stand of the Italian, French and Spanish revisionist parties towards the Soviet Union and their relations with it have become a major object of discussion and interpretation by the whole international bourgeoisie. The attempt of the Eurocommunists to describe themselves <<independent>> of Moscow, <<original>> and even <<opponents>> of the Soviet Union appears to be made allegedly to deceive the bourgeoisie of their countries, but in reality it is made to deceive the proletariat of their own countries and the international proletariat. It is by no means impossible that this could be a manoeuvre on the part of the Soviet revisionists to create the impression of the existence of allegedly profound differences and contradictions of <<principle>> between them and the communist parties of Western Europe, especially with the Italian and French parties, with the aim of facilitating the participation of these parties in the bourgeois governments of the respective countries. If this could be achieved, this would be in the interests of Soviet social-imperialism, in the interests of its world domination, because it weakens its rivals while increasing its influence and hegemony in different countries. The Khrushchevite revisionists need this also' to support their anti-Marxist thesis that <<state power can be taken in a peaceful way>>, and thus <<prove>> what they failed to prove in Chile. Indeed, at the 25th Congress of the CPSU, Brezhnev said that the Chilean experience does not rule out the theory of taking power in parliamentary ways.

On the other hand, Eurocommunism is a kind of idea that suits the European big capitalist bourgeoisie which is encouraging and fanning up the contradictions between the Eurocommunists and Soviet socialimperialists in every way, because it is interested in weakening the revisionist ideological power and influence of the Soviet Union. It tries to present the Italian, Spanish, French and other revisionisms as an ideological bloc which is being created in Europe in opposition to the Soviet revisionist bloc. And since they are talking about an anti-Soviet ideological grouping, it is self-evident that the reactionary bourgeoisie of the industrialized countries of Europe has this Eurocommunism under its influence.
However, the Kremlin would not like Eurocommunism to break away completely from its influence. Therefore, the propaganda being spread in the West about Eurocommunism as an <<independent>> ideological current annoys Moscow. This annoyance also stems from the fact that in this way the split, which has long existed between the revisionist parties of Western Europe and the revisionist party of the Soviet Union and its satellites in Eastern Europe, is made public.

These parties have never had, do not have and never will have unity. However, it pleases the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to maintain a superficial appearance of unity amongst the revisionist parties not only of Europe, but of the whole world. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union tries to maintain its ideological hegemony over all the other revisionist parties of the world in disguised ways. It is eager to sign joint declarations and communiques with them, in order to give the appearance of the existence of unity and the respect which these parties have for the Soviet leadership.

There have been splits and disagreements between the Italian Communist Party and the French Communist Party and the Khrushchevite revisionists since the time of Togliatti and Thorez, and these disagreements and differences have steadily increased and extended. However, they did not reach then such a degree of acuteness as they have reached today. Now the worsening of relations has come out openly. <<Pravda>> attacked Carrillo and condemned Eurocommunism. Carrillo replied just as sharply to Moscow. He dotted the i's of the revisionist ideological and political orientation of his party and broke off the connections of dependence on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Following <<Pravda>>'s criticism and Carrillo's reply, the League of Communists of Yugoslavia came out as an ardent defender of the Communist Party of Spain. The Yugoslav revisionists openly took Carrillo's side, because they have always been for the split, for the breaking away of revisionist parties from Moscow, and they have always struggled to bring this about.

In regard to the French and Italian revisionist parties they are somewhat more cautious in this polemic. Sometimes they raise it, sometimes they lower it and at other times they extinguish it altogether. This is explained not by any particular <<moderation>>, but apparently by the existence of certain material and other links, which they want to preserve because they bring them profits. Precisely for the preservation of these threads linked with rubles, which have long existed between them and the Soviets, they want the tempers to be cooled a little so that the polemic with the Khrushchevites does not assume uncontrollable proportions. The visits of Berlinguer, Pajetta, etc., to Moscow were made for this purpose. The Italian revisionist leaders declared that they were going to Moscow to explain to the Soviet leaders that there should not be a bitter polemic and that Moscow did not have the right to meddle or interfere in the line of the communist party of another country, because each of them had the right to define its own strategy and line on the basis of the situation in the country, and allegedly also bearing in mind the experience of the world communist movement. Moscow is ready to put its signature to these theses, but in return demands recognition of its <<socialism>> and, above all, approval of the main direction of its foreign policy. When Marchais applauds the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan and acclaims the expansionist policy of the Kremlin as the highest expression of <<international solidarity>>, Brezhnev cannot fail to reward him by approving the <<democratic road>> so dear to the French revisionists, which is completely in accord with the theses of the Khrushchevites' 20th Congress.

Although they have an identical strategy today, the Italian, French and Spanish revisionist parties differ a little in their tactics, because of the specific features of the bourgeoisie in these three countries. The French bourgeoisie is strong - a bourgeoisie with long experience. It also has great political and ideological power, not to speak of its economic strength and the military and police power which it has at its disposal. The Italian bourgeoisie, however, is not so strong as the French one. Although it has power in its hands, it has many weak points. This has made it possible for the Italian revisionist party to enter into negotiations and to establish collaboration in many forms, indeed even in parliamentary forms, with other parties, not to mention their collaboration through
the trade-unions with the Italian capitalist bourgeoisie, and first of all with its Christian Democratic Party.

This is why Berlinguer's party will try to move closer to the bourgeoisie, but at the same time try and play a policy <<de bascule>> between Moscow and the bourgeoisie of its country, the more so when the Italian bourgeoisie also has its own interests in regard to the Soviet Union. We must not forget the large investments which the Italian bourgeoisie has made there. The French bourgeoisie also, which knows what the revisionist Soviet Union is, does not proceed blindly in its policy, as the Chinese revisionists would like and advocate when they demand that France should take a hard line in its relations with the Soviet Union. Of course, the relations between these two countries are not all sweetness and honey, but neither are they as tense as the Chinese would like. Meanwhile, the French Communist Party, too, in its policy of agreement with the socialists, has in mind that it must not put itself in open and clear-cut opposition to Moscow, but should maintain a certain status quo with it at a time when it is moving towards lining up and unity with the French bourgeoisie.

With the Spanish bourgeoisie the situation is different. After Franco, the Suarez party, which is in power in collaboration with the other parties, is the representative of a bourgeoisie which has its own traditions, but which are mostly the traditions of the fascist dictatorship. It is a bourgeoisie which has experienced many disturbances, which have not allowed it to create that stability which the French bourgeoisie has created, and to a lesser extent, the Italian bourgeoisie. Now it is in the process of revival. Carrillo, with his revisionist ideology, has been included in this process, in the process of consolidation and strengthening of a capitalist regime which is closely linked with American imperialism and which is making efforts to join NATO, United Europe, etc. All these factors restrict the field of manoeuvre for both the bourgeoisie and the Spanish revisionist party, whose game with Moscow is lacking in amplitude. The Communist Party of China too, likes Eurocommunism, both as an ideology and as a practical activity. It agrees with the name and with the content of the line of these three parties. China, as a state, and the party which defines the line and strategy of this state, proceed according to the world contingencies which alter every hour and minute. In the grouping called Eurocommunism the Communist Party of China sees an ideological opponent of the Soviet Union which it considers the number one enemy. Therefore, just as it supports without the slightest hesitation, and assists without the slightest reserve every force (with the exception of genuine Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries), which appears to be against the Soviet Union, China supports and approves Eurocommunism, too. The Communist Party of China long ago established relations with Carrillo, as it is doing now with Berlinguer, too. It took a step by sending the Chinese ambassador in Rome to attend the recent congress of the Italian Communist Party as the official representative of the Communist Party of China. Recently it welcomed Berlinguer to Beijing. There is no doubt that it will establish relations with the French revisionist party, too. These links will be gradually increased and strengthened. This cannot fail to happen in as much as they have identical strategies and similar tactics. The delay in establishing close links comes from China, which hesitates to go too far in the direction of the Eurocommunist parties in order to avoid angering the top circles of the bourgeoisie ruling those countries, especially the parties of the right, to which it gives priority and considers its closest allies. The genuine Marxist-Leninist parties of Europe and of all continents are not misled by the tactics and manoeuvres of the Soviet revisionists who allegedly have entered into polemics and opposition with the so-called Eurocommunism. They do not think that they can find a breach here. In principle, there is no breach among the revisionists. They are tactically split in order to better achieve their strategy, which has the aim of the global domination of modern revisionism over the world proletariat. Therefore, the Marxist-Leninist parties expose and fight Soviet modern revisionism, Yugoslav, Chinese and Eurocommunist revisionism equally. They do not and must not have any illusions on this question.
III

REFORMIST IDEOLOGY AND POLITICAL OPPORTUNISM - FUNDAMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EUROCOMMUNIST PARTIES

As we saw, modern revisionism is expressed in various currents and assumes different appearances according to the concrete political and socio-economic conditions of each country or group of countries. This is the case also with the parties which are now known under the name of Eurocommunist parties. Although they represent a separate current of modern revisionism, a current which conforms more to the interests of the bourgeoisie of the developed capitalist countries, such as the countries of Western Europe, the Italian, French and Spanish revisionist parties also have certain specific features.

The Constitution of the Bourgeois State - the Basis of Togliatti's "Socialism"

Speaking about the third road, which consists of the new strategy of Eurocommunist revisionism, in his report entitled "For Socialism in Peace and Democracy...", delivered at the 15th Congress of the ICP, Berlinguer, gives a rather more complete explanation of what he and his associates mean by this third road. "In referring..." he says, "to a fortunate expression... which we have accepted... We have had the experience of the Second International: the first phase of the struggle of the workers' movement to emerge from capitalism... But this experience... capitulated in the face of the First World War and various kinds of nationalism. "The second phase..." continues Berlinguer, "opens with the Russian Revolution of October..." *(By E. Berlinguer, for the Socialism in the peace and the Democracy throughout Italy and Europe).

But this, too, according to him should be looked at critically in view of the history and the reality of the Soviet Union, because this experience is not valid, either. And it results that the third phase has begun now with Eurocommunism. The task of the workers' movement in Western Europe, Berlinguer declares, is "to find new roads of advance towards socialism and the construction of socialism..." *(By E. Berlinguer, for the Socialism in the peace and the Democracy throughout Italy and Europe).

According to the Italian revisionists, the road to achieve this "society" is "the line laid down by the Republican Constitution to lead Italy to the road of its transformation into a socialist society based on political democracy..." *(The politics and the organization of the Italian communists, Rome 1979).

Whereas the French revisionists, who cannot present the De Gaulle Constitution as the basis of their socialism, since not only did they not take part in drafting it, but they also voted against it, do not mention it, although in practice they do not negate it.

The Italian revisionists worked out their idea of achieving "socialism" through the bourgeois Constitution a long time ago. In his speeches, as early as 1944, Togliatti declared that allegedly "the times had changed, the working class had changed and the ways to the seizure of power had also changed. With this he meant that "(the time of revolutions was over and the time of evolutions had come), that "power cannot be seized except by way of reforms, on the parliamentary road, through votes."*

Later, at the meeting of the CC of the Italian Communist Party on June 28, 1956, immediately after the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Togliatti said: "we must foresee a socialist advance which takes place precisely on the terrain which the Constitution determines and
envisages, which is the terrain of democratic freedoms and progressive social transformations... This Constitution is not yet a socialist Constitution. But since it is an expression of a broad unitary movement of rejuvenation, it differs profoundly from the other bourgeois Constitutions, and represents an effective base for the development of Italian society on the road towards socialism.>> That the Italian Constitution differs, for example, from the Constitution of the time of the monarchy and fascism, that a series of democratic principles figure in it, this is understandable, because these principles have been imposed on it by the struggle of the working class and the Italian people against fascism. But the Italian Constitution is not the only one which contains such principles. After the Second World War, the bourgeoisie in all the capitalist countries of Europe tried, to this or that degree, to outflank the working class by giving it certain rights on paper and taking them away in practice.

Those things which the Italian Constitution envisages are formal freedoms and rights which are violated everyday by the bourgeoisie. For example, it envisages a certain restriction of private property. But this has not stopped the FIATs and Montedisons from becoming more and more wealthy and their workers becoming ever more Impoverished. The Constitution envisages the right to work, but this stops neither the capitalist employers, nor their state from throwing about 2 million people out of work. The Constitution guarantees a series of democratic rights but this has not stopped the Italian state, the carabinieri or the police, basing themselves on the rights which the Constitution provides, from acting almost openly to set up that mechanism which is ready for the establishment of a fascist regime. The various fascist commandos, from those of the extreme right to those who call themselves the <<Red Brigades>> and the terrorists of the Fontana Square, also find their justification in the Italian Constitution.

To think, as the followers of Togliatti do, that the Italian bourgeoisie drafted its well-known Constitution to lead the society towards socialism, is simply absurd. The Italian Constitution, like the other fundamental laws of bourgeois countries, sanctions the undivided political, legislative and executive rule of the bourgeoisie in the country, sanctions the protection of its property and its power to exploit the working masses. It gives a legal basis for the organs of violence to restrict the freedom and democracy of the people, to suppress all and rule over everything. <<Beautiful>>, words such as freedom, equality, fraternity, democracy, justice, etc., may be written in the Constitution for two hundred years, but in practice they will not be realized for another two thousand years, if the capitalist bourgeoisie is not overthrown together with its Constitution and laws.

For the Italian revisionists the existing Constitution is their Bible and the bourgeoisie could not find better advocates to defend it or more zealous propagandists to advertise it. The ardent defence which the Italian revisionists make of the Constitution of their capitalist state shows that they cannot conceive any other social system outside the existing bourgeois society, outside its political, ideological, economic, religious and military institutions. To them socialism and the present-day Italian capitalist state are the same thing. The opportunism in which the leaders of the Italian revisionist party were born and raised, has clouded their eyes and shut off all horizons to them. The Italian revisionists have become the guardians of the capitalist order. They even present this role as a virtue and mention it in their documents. <<...in these30 years,>> say the theses for the 15th Congress of the ICP, <<the Communist Party has followed a line of the consistent defence of democratic (read- bourgeois) institutions; a line of the organization and development of democratic life amongst the masses of workers and citizens, a line of struggles for individual and collective freedoms, for observance and the application of the Constitution. The ICP has implemented this policy through continually seeking unity with the ISP', with the other democratic forces, secular and Catholic, and seeking every possible convergence even with Christian Democracy itself, even from the opposition, with the aim of avoiding the damage to the democratic constitutional framework>>.

*(The politics and the organization of the italian communists, Rome 1979).

*(Italian Socialist Party) It couldn't be stated more openly. A more servile testimony of loyalty to the bourgeoisie could not be given. <<Avoiding the damage to the democratic constitutional...
framework>> means to avoid the overthrow of the existing bourgeois order, to avoid the revolution, to avoid socialism. What more could the bourgeoisie ask of the revisionists? For 35 years on end the Italian bourgeoisie, revisionists, the Church, and so on, have been deceiving the Italian people by telling them that the hard life which they lead, the poverty in which they live, the savage exploitation, corruption, terror, and all the other social evils that characterize Italy are the result of <<failure to implement the Constitution consistently>>. But the situation in Italy has been and still is deplorable, not from failure to implement the Constitution, but because of the system which the Constitution defends. The present situation is the result of the whole development of Italy after the war.

Italy, which suffered the evils of the royal regime of the Savoy dynasty, which experienced the horrors of the fascist regime, which came to know the economic poverty and moral and political degeneration which this regime brought, which suffered the devastation of the Second World War, came out of this war economically ruined and entered a grave political and moral-social crisis which continues to this day.

After the end of the war, Italy was turned into chaos, but also into a circus, in which the role of acrobats and clowns was played by the new hierarchs decked out in the robes of re-constituted parties with <<brilliant>>, titles such as socialist, social-democrat, Christian Democrat, liberal, communist, etc. One posed as the continuer of the party of Gramsci, the other of Don Sturzo, the one of Croce, the other of Mazzini. From a country of silence and closed mouths, which Italy was in the time of fascism, it turned into the country where a deafening clamour is traditional.

If American capital has got one foot in the door in the different countries of Europe, it has both feet firmly planted in Italy. This has occurred because the bourgeoisie of that country is more degenerate, more cosmopolitan, more unpatriotic, and more given to all-round corruption.

The Christian Democrats have always held the reins of Italy in their hands. The other bourgeois parties also want their share in this bargaining, where everything, including Italy itself, is up for sale, wholesale and retail. The innumerable frequent changes of governments are an expression of the struggle for power, of the competition and rivalry between parties. Changes are made, but the Christian Democrat Party always remains the pivot which takes the lion's share. The Christian Democrats have proved to be skilful tight-rope walkers in the formation of ministerial councils, giving their rivals carefully measured rations of authority and leaving the impression that they are and are not the incontestable rulers of the country. In this way they bring on stage sometimes the <<centre-left>>, sometimes the <<centre-right>>, setting up a cabinet sometimes <<monotone>> in colour, sometimes <<two-tone>>. All these are conjuror's tricks to show that they are allegedly finding a solution to the chaos, poverty, hunger, unemployment, to the terrible all-round crisis the country is in.

At present all sorts of crimes are flourishing in Italy. The new fascism has organized itself in parliamentary parties and possesses countless terrorist squads and groups, which the Italians call the <<lambs>> of the general secretary of the fascist party, Almirante. The criminal mafia has its claws deeply implanted everywhere, and crime, thefts, murders, kidnappings, have been raised to a modernized industry. No Italian is certain of tomorrow. The army, the carabinieri and the organs of the secret police have become so inflated that the country can hardly breathe. They have been increased allegedly to defend the people and <<the democratic order>> from the members of the ultra-left and ultra-right brigades. But the truth is that without these organs the big thieves and murderers who occupy the soft seats in parliament or in the staffs of the army, police etc., could not protect themselves. At the same time, Italy is up to its ears in debt while its currency is one of the weakest of all the currencies of Western Europe. Today it is called the <<sick man>> of the European Nine. No one trusts this Italy, with this rotten regime it has, this Italy which may take a course dangerous not only for the Italian people but also for its neighbours.

The various Italian governments, not to mention the period of Mussolini fascism, have in general maintained unfriendly stands towards Albania, either openly or in disguise. The treacherous Albanian reaction which fled on board the British ships was gathered together in Italy, was
organized and trained by the post-war governments of that country, by the permanent enemy of Albania - the Vatican, as well as by the Anglo-Americans, to operate against the new Albania. In the first years after Liberation, our people had to wage a stern fight against wreckers who landed in our country from Italy. What end they met, is known. However, the end of the others was no better. Some of the fugitive Albanian traitors remained in Italy, the others dispersed to the United States of America, Belgium, Britain, Federal Germany and many other countries where the imperialist espionage services sent them.

Seeing that they could achieve nothing against the new Albania with acts of diversion, the Italian governments began to maintain an <<indifferent>> political stand towards our country. True, diplomatic relations between the two countries were established, but other relations always remained at a low level. The Italian governments never showed any desire to develop them. No government has ever publicly condemned Mussolini’s barbarous acts against Albania. However, these governments did interest themselves in taking the bones of the Italian soldiers killed by our partisans during the National Liberation War from their graves and sent them to Italy to consecrate them as <<heroes who had fought for the greatness of Italy>>, and every year they pay homage to them. Most of the Italian press rarely publishes any positive article about Albania. It has distinguished itself above all the world press for its stand of denigration and misinformation about our country.

The stand of the Italian revisionists has not been and is not any different from this stand of the government leaders and the press of Italy. In 1939, the leaders of the Italian Communist Party stood back and watched the fascist armies which were going to rob a small neighbouring people of their freedom. They did not prove to be even at the level of the Italian socialists, who condemned the imperialism of their country at the time of the war of Vlora in 1920. Even after the war, the main leaders of the Italian Communist Party did not deign to come to Albania, to condemn the crimes of fascism and express their solidarity with the Albanian people who had faced death and destruction and had fought heroically against Italian fascism.

The Italian Communist Party fought and is fighting to eliminate the revolutionary spirit from its members and the Italian proletariat, to foster the idea of class conciliation and wipe out all thought of seizing power from the hands of the capitalists through violence. It is nothing but a social-democratic party like the others, but has been left in opposition and has not been invited to take part in the dance, because it was formerly in the Third International, and because, apparently, the bourgeoisie requires still greater proofs of loyalty from it.

The Italian <<democratic>> bourgeois state gives billions of lire in subsidies to the Italian Communist Party, as well as to other parliamentary parties. However, the revisionist party also has other large sources of income from trading companies, as well as from various subsidies in the form of commissions. It has its aristocracy and its plebs: the aristocrats are the deputies, senators, chairmen and councillors of municipalities and the permanent functionaries.

The 10th Congress of the Italian Communist Party, which was held in 1962, codified the ideas of Togliatti, his social-democratic line and open departure from Marxism-Leninism. Togliatti was a reformist intellectual and this is what he remained to the end of his life, up till the <<Testament of Yalta>> in which he re-emphasized his <<polycentrism>> and pronounced himself in favour of the <<pluralism>> of parties allegedly to go to socialism, of the <<freedom of religion>>, <<freedom of speech>>, <<human rights>>, etc. This was the road of the so-called Italian socialism.

The 10th Congress presented the <<Italian road to socialism>> as an original road, as a new development of Marxism, as a superseding of the teachings of the October Revolution and the experience of all the socialist revolutions up to that time. In reality, it was the road of <<structural reforms>> the revisionist, opportunist road adopted to suit the needs and the situation of Italian monopoly capital.

According to the <<theory>> of <<structural reforms>> the transition to socialism will be made through gradual reforms which will be forced from monopoly capital in a peaceful way. These gradual reforms will be made only by means of parliamentarianism, through power of the vote,
regardless of the fact that the capitalist monopolies have in their hands the wealth of the country, the weapons, and the running of parliament and the administration. According to the Italian revisionists, the reforms of socio-economic structures which it is allegedly possible to carry out within the framework of the bourgeois state, will wipe out exploitation and class inequalities and will make it possible to gradually overcome the gap between those who rule and those who are ruled, and move towards the complete liberation of man and society.

*(The politics and the organization of the Italian communists, Rome 1979)*

The Italian revisionists have slipped completely into the positions of trade-unionism and social-democracy. They restrict the workers’ struggle merely to economic and democratic demands, and think that the consequences of the capitalist order can be avoided while leaving this order intact. However, history has proved this to be utopian, because the consequences cannot be eliminated without eliminating their causes which lie in the capitalist system itself.

Now the Italian revisionist chiefs themselves accept this open transition to the positions of social-democracy, and indeed they even boast that they have been able to take this step. At the recent congress of the Italian Communist Party, Ingrao, the former chairman of the Italian Parliament and member of the leadership of the party, declared: We have much to learn from social-democracy. It is true that the leaders of the Italian revisionist party are still young pupils, compared with the old social-democratic professors, in revising Marxism-Leninism and in the struggle against the revolution. However, they can be considered their equals in their unrestrained zeal to serve the bourgeoisie unconditionally and in a servile manner.

The Italian revisionists can preach night and day, can foam and shout in all the squares and pray in all the churches of Italy, but they will never be able to achieve their reformist dreams of the transition to socialism through parliament, the Constitution and the bourgeois state.

The follow-on from Togliatti’s line of structural reforms, has now become the historic compromise with the bourgeoisie, proclaimed by Berlinguer. This slogan, with which the Italian revisionist leadership is now comforting itself, was launched precisely at the time when the Italian capitalist bourgeois state was in a very deep crisis. Through the historic compromise the Italian Communist Party offered Christian Democracy, the representative of big capital and the top clerical hierarchy, its co-operation in order to get out of this situation and rescue this state.

Berlinguer’s historic compromise is the continuation of the old orientations of the Italian Communist Party which immediately after the war sought participation in the bourgeois state, and unification with the socialists of Nenni. It is the continuation of its notorious flirtation with the then chairman of the Christian Democrats, Alcide de Gasperi, it is the hand of friendship of Togliatti-Longo offered to the Catholics. Berlinguer turned this orientation from a tactic into a strategy. The historic compromise, proposed by the Italian Communist Party is the old liberal policy which has always fitted Italy like a glove (French in the original).

Berlinguer’s historic compromise was an effort and a hope born under the influence of events in Chile. When the Italian revisionists saw that the socialist Allende was unable to remain in office without the co-operation of the Christian Democratic Party of Frey, they thought that they, too, could neither come to power nor remain in office without the support and collaboration of the Christian Democrats. Fear of the establishment of fascism with the aid of American imperialism led them to major retreats and concessions in principle and practice, to abandoning even that slightly independent position which they had maintained until that time, when they thought they could win the parliamentary majority and govern jointly with a left coalition. Since that time, in order to avoid the events of Chile in Italy, they accepted to play the secondary and subsidiary role in a coalition, no longer of the left, but of the right, together with the Christian Democrats.

When the Italian Communist Party launched the slogan of the historic compromise Italy gave the impression that it was being transformed into a powerful industrialized country. At this period,
not only to reaction, but also to the Italian <<communists>> themselves, the <<historic compromise>> seemed like a long-term <<strategy>>. However, the crisis came and fascism was revived, became threatening; the bombs began to burst, people were murdered and disappeared. The <<historic compromise>> began to become more immediate and to seem <<reasonable>> even to a part of the bourgeoisie and some Christian Democrats. Aldo Moro was a representative of this current, but he was liquidated, because the Christian Democrats were not and are not yet ready to enter this compromise, regardless of the losses they have suffered in elections.

In the present crisis situation, the Christian Democrats have found some ways and forms of coordinating activities with the <<communists>> on certain questions, at the trade-union level and the party level, but still they are afraid of even an Italian Communist Party <<à l'eau de rose>>.

Will Italian monopoly capital accept the hand which the Italian Communist Party is offering it? It wants the revisionists to support the government in parliament, to vote for its program and laws, to come into the <<parliamentary majority>>, into the <<government majority>>, but not into the government, not into power, not into the centres where political decisions for running the country are taken. The United States of America has expressed its opposition to the presence of the European revisionists in the governments of the NATO member countries. The Italian bourgeoisie is carrying out this order of its patrons.

Whenever parliamentary elections are held the Italian Communist Party is faced with a great dilemma. It does not know how to act in case it wins a greater number of votes than the Christian Democrats. Berlinguer, frightened, adheres to the formula that in any case a broad government should be formed of all the parties of the <<democratic arch>>, which would carry out some reforms, of course, in a <<pluralist democracy>>, and Italy would not leave NATO.

Why does Berlinguer hold out this prospect? Because this is the revisionist line of the Italian Communist Party, which is afraid to accept the responsibility in the face of the crisis and bankruptcy of the bourgeois system which cannot be cured with reforms. On the other hand, the Italian Communist Party is afraid of the masses of the workers and working people of Italy, who if this party should win, will demand not cooperation with the employers, but the seizure of power. The Italian Communist Party does not want this situation and will never permit it. But neither does the American and the Italian monopoly bourgeoisie want it, and they will do everything in their power to avoid such a situation.

An anti- historic compromise might be made in the beginning if the Italian Communist Party wins on the votes, but this compromise- will be ephemeral, just to calm public opinion, until the screws can be tightened. Capital never hands over its weapons, if they are not taken from it by force. The Italian Communist Party is not of those parties which go into revolution. It is not, and never has been, for the establishment of a Socialist society in Italy, either today, tomorrow, or ever.

The Successors of Proudhon in France

Togliatti and his Italian acolytes long ago carried out the theoretical elaboration of the <<roads>> to the <<new socialist society>> which the Eurocommunists advocate. At present, however, it is the French revisionists who are making megalomaniacal <<philosophical>> speeches, who are trying to make up for lost time and emerge as the banner-bearers of Eurocommunism, as those who interpret and state its laws. This role they have undertaken makes them ridiculous and exposes them even more in the eyes of the working class of their own country and the working people of the whole world. Georges Marchais has become a zealous follower of the theories of Roger Garaudy, who made the law ideologically in the French Communist Party in the time of Thorez and who was expelled from that party later. Garaudy strove to <<prove>> that in the developed capitalist countries the proletariat allegedly no longer exists, that it has been put on the same level as the working people of the administration, the engineers and technicians who according to Garaudy, are all equally exploited. Now Georges Marchais has taken over this theory as his own and has carried it even further. According to him, everyone, not only the working class,
not only all the working people, but even the bourgeoisie, and indeed the army and police, are allegedly for the <<socialism>> which he preaches. In his discourses he says repeatedly, <<We want to advance to socialism, but we are hindered by just 25 families, which comprise the strength of capital in France.>> <<How is it possible that we, all this force, should not be able to have our say and overcome this caste which remains in power?>> wonders Marchais. And he provides his own answer, that to advance to socialism France requires only economic and political reforms. He deals with the question of overthrowing capital as something which can be easily achieved, just with a few words, by puffing out one's cheeks and blowing it over. Whatever else it may be, the road which the French revisionists advocate can be anything but it has nothing at all to do with the genuine road to socialism.

Marchais compares and equates the present representatives of state power in France with the French aristocracy before the time of the triumph of the bourgeoisie, two centuries ago, and refers to its leaders as <<these princes who govern us>>. However, the French revisionists are not even in the positions of those people who carried out the French bourgeois revolution of 1789. It is known that this revolution cut off the heads of the king and the queen, and of all those <<princes>> who governed France at that time. The progressive bourgeoisie of that period, which overthrew the monarchy and feudalism, did not stop at that, but carried the revolution further by cutting the heads of all the leaders of the reactionary factions of the bourgeoisie which were emerging: the Feuillants, the Vergniauds and Dantons. This revolution reached its culmination in the dictatorship of the Jacobins led by Robespierre whom bourgeois reaction sent to the guillotine.

Marchais describes Prince Ponyatowski, Giscard d'Estaing's former minister of the interior, as a Versaillese. However, he forgets the Commune of Paris which fought with arms against Thiers and the Versaillese. <<The Communards stormed the heaven,>> said Marx, while Marchais, with his revisionist theories, wages against the Ponyatowskis <<la guerre en dentelles>> *(a fight with lace handkerchiefs - french in the original)*

The leaders of the French revisionist party try to explain <<the underlying reasons- for the decline of France. The theses for the 23rd Congress of the French Communist Party say: <<Since 1976, inflation practically stands at a high level; unemployment has increased about 30 per cent; the buying power of the working people has declined; economic growth has ceased... Austerity, unemployment and the super-exploitation of the working people are accompanied with an increase in the capitalists' profits... In France, which has a multi-branched industrial economy, whole branches, such as iron-steel, shipbuilding, machine building, textile, footwear, etc., are being ruined today. The number of workers employed in industry has fallen by more than 500,000.>> These things about the situation in France are known. The problem is not to observe the grave situation of the economy and the workers in France, but how to change this situation. Marx did not restrict himself merely to making his diagnosis of capitalist society, but also defined the road to overthrow it. The modern revisionists have abandoned this scientific road and only prattle to deceive the party and the working class that they are allegedly concerned about its situation.

The French revisionists also speak about the grave crisis which the capitalist world is experiencing today. <<The present crisis of the capitalist countries is an international crisis,>> says Georges Marchais, <<it is in the final analysis a crisis of the system of exploitation, domination and plunder of the workers and the peoples.>> Very good, but how does he intend to utilize this key moment, which not only France, but the whole world is experiencing? With what kind of struggle? With class struggle, or with discourses? Does he hope that with his speeches he will liquidate the French monopoly bourgeoisie which oppresses the proletariat and working people of France with all that army and police force which Marchais thinks he has on his side? No, he indulges in demagogy which is meant, on the one hand, for the <<gallery>> and on the other, to tranquilize the employers. Such revisionists base themselves on the pseudo-theories which they have concocted themselves, according to which the situation has now allegedly matured to the point that there is no longer any need for the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat in order to build the new socialist
society. Now, according to them, every class in society, indeed every individual, thinks as a socialist. For them, socialism has become so deeply implanted in the consciousness of man that it has become part and parcel of his consciousness. The Resolution adopted by the 23rd Congress of the French Communist Party says, "Socialism is already being realized, and moreover, being realized in a great diversity of forms." *(Cahiers du communisme, juin-juillet, Paris 1979, p.371)

The purpose of these pseudo-theories is to tell the workers that what Lenin did through revolution and bloodshed has now been achieved, moreover under the savage oppression of capital, without revolution and without violence.

The revisionist leaders of the French Communist Party are trying to convince the workers that in the existing society of France, Europe and the world, man has managed to understand that industrial society is no longer a society based on capitalist profit. This is an utterly false theory, because monopoly capital which prevails in this society demands not merely profits, but maximum profits. Georges Marchais also speaks about the export of capital, but he does not say that this export is a means of barbarous exploitation, not only of the workers of the metropolises, but also of the workers of the backward or developing countries. Today the export of capital has become a fundamental feature of neo-colonialism. Georges Marchais goes so far as to claim that in the existing situation, imperialism is obliged to seek new international solutions which correspond to the needs of the peoples. How humanitarian this imperialism has become that acts according to the needs of the peoples! However, imperialism remains imperialism and does not change with the words and analyses of sophists. By preaching such stuff the French Eurocommunist revisionists are simply assisting imperialism by prettifying it, by spreading and nurturing the illusion that it desires to remake a new world.

In a long tirade, at the 22nd Congress of the FCP, Marchais goes so far as to say that the accusation of allegedly wanting to eliminate the wealthy, levelled against the French revisionists, is without foundation. Considering it a slander, he declares openly that they want private property to exist, want the middle bourgeoisie to exist with all its property and want the landed peasantry to exist; that they want only to nationalize all the common state assets and to have all these administered by the people. Social-democracy also defends these capitalist structures which Marchais defends. In this instance he has the right to be angry with those who accuse him of not being one hundred per cent loyal to the bourgeoisie like his social-democratic brothers.

At the beginning of 1979, Georges Marchais wrote: "We want a social democracy, an economic democracy, a political democracy, and we wish to go further, to a radical transformation of social relations so that we can make it possible for the French people to live in a democratic self-administrative socialism." *<<L'Humanité>>

Thus, Marchais emerges as a follower of Tito who has implemented in Yugoslavia precisely the anarcho-syndicalist theories of Proudhon and Bakunin on "worker self-administration", which Marx and later Lenin sternly condemned. Now Georges Marchais, under the cloak of "creative" Marxism but never "deigning" to use any of the statements of the great teachers of Marxism, does not dare to defend the anti-Marxist views of Proudhon openly and say that he is his disciple. However, in demanding "self-administration", he simply is changing the terms while he carries on the petty-bourgeois theory of Proudhon.

The leaders of the French Communist Party speak a great deal about wages and raise the problem of the reformist struggle for raising them. The buying power of the workers and their families must be increased by giving more to those who get the least, they say. The measures to minimize the inequalities in incomes as well as in bonuses must be increased. The range of wage differentials must be reduced by raising the lower wages. The revisionists raise these problems because at the present time increased pay is a universal demand of the masses.

Georges Marchais asks in amazement how the phenomenon can exist that workers and the elderly do not have the possibility to live properly, do not have the right to speak on the radio and television.
They must win all these things, he says. "My Party has fought and is fighting to increase wages, to reduce taxes, to ensure that parliament will no longer be as it is at present, with intolerable conditions imposed on its functioning and its prerogatives restricted," says he. While restricting the struggle of the working class simply to day-to-day demands, the French revisionists neglect the teachings of Marx who has explained that in a disguised way, wages hide the exploitation of the workers by the capitalists who appropriate a part of the labour, precisely the unpaid labour of the workers, which creates surplus value for the capitalist. They deliberately say nothing about the idea of Marx who says that the solution to the problem does not lie in raising wages, or in equalizing them, as Proudhon, that classic reformist, believed. Marx said that to restrict the struggle of the working class merely to wages was nothing but an attempt to prolong the existence of wage slavery. The final elimination of the exploitation of wage labourers, says Marx, is the only correct and radical solution to the problem.

The French revisionists leave in obscurity Marx's theory about the social character of production and the capitalist, private character of the means of production in capitalism and the relations of production between classes. They deliberately do not mention the fact that these questions involve the interests of different classes which are constantly in struggle with one another to alter the character of ownership. They deal with these problems in general terms, simply as economic questions, just as the theoreticians of economism did. Their "theory" is not the theory of Marx, but the theory of deviators who came after Marx. Marchais reduces the mission and the struggle of the proletariat to a struggle for economic rights and not for the overthrow of the power of capital. In the "Manifesto of the Communist Party" Marx issued the call: "Workers of all countries, unite!" But why? To carry out the revolution. While Marchais says: Workers, peasants, bourgeois, police, soldiers and officers, unite. . . to carry reforms! The notion "proletariat" is considered by the French revisionists to be a romantic notion about which to create poetry.

Instead of fighting to ensure that the proletariat is in the forefront of the revolution and in close alliance with the working people of town and countryside, the French revisionists try to unite it in "another historic bloc", in a "union of the left", as the French revisionists call their collaboration with the bourgeois parties, or in the "historic compromise", as the Italian revisionists call such a thing.

The French revisionists promote this theory on alliances on the basis of their view that in the present-day capitalist order, the workers everyday "see that the conditions of life are improving" and that "the proletariat, in the true meaning of the term, is disappearing." This is the thesis of the revisionist Garaudy whom the French revisionists keep outside the party in vain. Whether he is inside or outside it, it is all the same so long as the revisionist leaders of the French Communist Party agree that the bourgeois parties should join them in the dance in order to go to socialism. That is where Garaudy and company vegetate, too. The French revisionist leadership criticized and expelled Garaudy from the party, not proceeding from principled positions, but because he came out prematurely with and raised the banner of "the new line", something which according to rank, was up to Marchais and other leaders more senior than he. This leadership is acting in the same way today with Ellenstein and Althuser who want to proceed more quickly on the revisionist road. However, there is no doubt at all that the leadership of the French Communist Party will quickly come to terms and unite, not only with Garaudy and Ellenstein, but also With Mitterrand, Rocard and all the social-democrats. Whether they will pass first through a "union of the left", a "Joint program" or through some other form is of no importance. Since they have the same views and aims, everything else will come about automatically.

The revisionists in general and the French ones in particular in their theories are opposed to the management of the economy by the state in socialism. Marchais says: "We are fighting today against authoritarianism and suffocating centralism... On the contrary, we want the state enterprises to be autonomous in their administration... we want the working people - the workers, the clerks, the engineers and the cadres to take part more and more actively in this administration. We also
want the communes, districts and regions to become real centres for decision making and

These views of revisionists in the French Communist Party are totally in accord with the line of
Yugoslav <<self-administration>> and the federalism of Proudhon who said, <<there should be
only an industrial democracy, a positive anarchy. Whoever speaks of freedom speaks of federalism,
or says nothing, whoever speaks of republic, speaks of federalism, or says nothing, whoever speaks
of socialism, speaks of federalism, or says nothing.>> Hence for Proudhon, the federal principle is
applied in the economy and in politics. Perhaps Georges Marchais does not describe these questions
in the terms which Proudhon used, but when he speaks of his <<democratic socialism- he says, -We
want a fine society, with justice, freedom, etc.-, and asks whether it is reasonable that the workers
should be suppressed for these simple aspirations and that these aspirations should remain only a
dream.

Proudhon demanded democracy and freedom, and according to him, these could be won very
easily, could be taken from the hands of the capitalists without any trouble. Marchais does not
restrict himself merely to this, but stresses that the workers in bourgeois democracy had greater
freedom two hundred years ago, they took part in the affairs of the state and the factories, and
finally, he is <<indignant>> that they do not have these freedoms today. However, he goes no
further than indignation. And Marchais goes no further, because he does not want to do battle with
the capitalists but wants to co-exist with them in peace. All this is like a fairy tale for the
<<gogos>>. *(the innocent)

Marchais preaches that even in the conditions of the existence of the capitalist order, by means of
reforms it can be brought about that the proletariat takes part in the management of the economy.
He dreams and says that within this order there can be a social democracy in which all the workers,
without exception, can benefit from wealth, that there can be a political democracy in which every
citizen can control, manage, and truly be in the leadership, in other words <<self-administration>>.
Is this not completely the theory of Proudhon?

In connection with the democratic socialism he advocates, Marchais also deals with the question of
property and the planned running of the economy. He divides property in this society into state and
private Property, but the property which he leaves to private owners is colossal. With this he wants
to tell the ruling bourgeoisie, don’t accuse us French revisionists in vain, because we respect private
property, we are not for the for proletarian revolution, we are no longer for <<raising the fist>>), but
for <<holding out the hand of friendship>>. Marchais speaks about municipal, departmental,
regional property. He does not use Proudhon’s term <<federalism>>, but it amounts to the same
thing. When Marchais says, we fight against authoritarianism and suffocating centralism, he implies
the struggle against democratic centralism, contrary to the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and
Stalin. And he stresses, we must build up the plan in a democratic way, ensuring that not only the
workers and other working people, but also those who have property will take part.

Marchais knows that the planning of the economy is not a method which can be applied in any
social system depending on the good will of those who are in the leadership of the country. Unified
central planning becomes possible only where complete social ownership has been established over
the means of production, and this is characteristic only of socialism. Private property, in whatever
form, has not submitted and never will submit to centralized planning. These are objective truths
and they cannot change just because this would please Marchais and other Eurocommunist
<<theoreticians>>.

Modern revisionism, not only in France but in all capitalist-revisionist countries, is also attacking
Marxism-Leninism in the field of literature and the arts, because it wants to use them as means to
poison the minds of people and make them degenerate. The revisionist writers, poets and artists
have taken the road of bourgeois degeneration. Today it is difficult to distinguish an Aragon from a
Beauvoir and an André Stil from a Sagan. This is not referring to a similarity in style and form, but
to an identity in the content and purpose of their works which are inspired by anti-Marxist
philosophical trends, in order to emerge on the same course, to fight the revolution, to tame the spirits, to make them <<dead spirits>>, equally degenerate.

All the revisionist <<theoreticians>> advocate the thesis that Marx and Engels allegedly gave very little attention, if any at all, to aesthetics. The aesthetes of the French Communist Party go even further. They try to <<prove>> that Marx was allegedly not interested at all in art or did not understand it. Contrary to the facts, they allege that Marx <<was unable to understand what it was that gave art an everlasting value irrespective of the historical moments, and was unable to understand how Greek art, linked with the infrastructure of that time, continues to arouse emotions>>. Such a distortion of Marx is not done without a purpose.

On the one hand, they want to create the impression that there is no Marxist opinion about art and that allegedly the revisionists are elaborating this, and, on the other hand, they are trying to deny the class character of art and to start discussion about whether art is part of the superstructure or the structure, whether or not it is an ideology, whether or not it is linked with the class and the revolution, to what degree and to what point, etc.

A series of <<theoreticians>> of the French Communist Party have had different opinions about literature and art at different periods, and this has brought about confusion and chaos in the ranks of the party and its militiants and vallations in the creative literary and artistic work of communist writers and artists. At one period, the French Communist Party fought for that creative work which was based on the people's art, on revolutionary art, and later, on socialist realism. At a later stage anti-Marxist trends penetrated the creative work of communist artists.

With its decadent art, the bourgeoisie exerted an influence not only on the rank-and-file members of the communist party, but also on the cadres engaged in agitation and propaganda. Influenced by this art, these elements profound theories, gave distorted and incorrect interpretations of Lenin, who pointed out that the revolution creates its own art and that the communists do not reject the progressive heritage of the people from the past. These individuals also interpreted in bourgeois and revisionist ways the statements of Lenin, Stalin and Zhdanov, that in socialist society the writers and artists should be free in their creative work, should have personal initiative, but always be realist and create works which truly serve the revolution and socialism.

Certain pseudo-Marxist aesthetes went so far as to defend the thesis that Lenin had allegedly advocated absolute freedom in creative work. The anti-Marxist philosopher Garaudy proclaimed <<unlimited realism>>. Others defend the thesis that when ideology and the party prevail in literature and art, there is no freedom and therefore, no creative work.

What else could one expect in the field of aesthetics, when such people as André Gide, Malraux or Paul Nizan had influence in the French Communist Party and posed as communists. Together with Aragon, they took part in the First Congress of the Soviet writers in Moscow, but in the end betrayed and became open anti-communists. Such <<theoreticians>> in France, inside and outside the Communist Party, could have no idea of the value of art based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism. The purpose of these elements was to separate art and literature from politics and ideology, of course, from proletarian politics and the Marxist ideology. They struggled to clear the way for the spread of bourgeois ideology and politics, for the development of decadent art, psychoanalyst, sexual, crime and pornographic novels, so that the markets, book-shops, show-cases, theatres and cinemas would be filled with such works.

Let us take Picasso. He was a member of the French Communist Party till he died, but he never became a Marxist. This is reflected in his works, while the French Communist Party boasted of him and the only criticism which they made of him was for a scrawl which was called <<Portrait of Stalin>>, and which his friend and comrade Aragon published in the newspaper <<Les lettres françaises>> of which he was director.

Socialist realism was not supported by th-French Communist Party strongly and with conviction. Some of the writers, philosophers and critics who were party members, such as Marguerite Daras and Claude Roys, deserted. After Khrushchev's slanders against Stalin, the French Communist Party was shaken and such intellectuals were the first to capitulate. It launched the slogan of <<complete
freedom in art and culture>>, and such former defenders of socialist realism as Aragon, André Stil, and André Wurmser not only changed their coats but even sold their souls and their hides to revisionism. Thus the French pseudo-communist literary figures began to fall in love with the Lukaces, the Kafkas and the Sartres. Critical discussions began throughout the whole party on the platform which the bourgeoisie desired, such as, <<what is the relation between literature and ideology?>>, <<what form should be accepted in art, 'sectarianism in interpretation' or 'opportunist eclecticism'?>>. Speaking as an <<authority>>, Roland Leroy pronounced the conclusion that, <<there cannot be a specific form of proletarian art or art which is completely revolutionary>>.

Wallowing in opportunism and revisionism, the French Communist Party allowed these antirevolutionary theses to ooze like stagnant waters and become predominant amongst its creative artists.

As a conclusion, we can say that the line of the French Communist Party in literature and art has had its ups and downs. But it has always been wobbly. Its vacillation has been caused by its <<orthodoxy>> in the preservation of principles, on the one hand, and by the direct and indirect influence of bourgeois ideology in literature and art amongst its intellectuals, on the other hand.

In general, the intellectuals who worked in the field of artistic creativeness have played a role more negative than positive for the French Communist Party. Irrespective of their class origin, they completed their schooling and sought <<fame>>. The party never influenced and guided them with the proletarian ideology and culture. To these intellectuals of the party it was their free, subjective, individual, creative work, and never the true interests of the proletariat and the revolution, that was important. These elements lived and worked far removed from the working class and isolated from it. For them, the class was the <<economy>>, while the intellectuals were the <<godhead>> that had to guide the <<economic factor>>. The intellectuals of the French party had been raised and inspired in the Bohemia of Montparnasse, in <<closerie des Lilas>> <<Pavillon de Flore>>, <<Bateau-Lavoir>> and in other clubs in which all kinds of decadent trends came together, trends from which emerged the Aragons, the Picassos, the Elsa Triolets and many other friends of the Lazareffs, the Tristan Zaras, the dadaists, cubists, and a thousand and one decadent schools of literature and art. This tradition and this road continued uninterruptedly within the French Communist Party, until it arrived at its 22nd Congress at which the revisionist Georges Marchais flaunted all the anti-Marxist corruption which had long been festering in the French Communist Party.

At this congress, the French revisionists came out officially against the leading role of the party of the working class in the field of art and against the method of socialist realism. Under the pretext of the struggle against <<uniformity>> they claimed that socialist culture should be open to all currents, to all kinds of experiments and creations.

In the book which contains his report to the 22nd Congress, the pseudo-Marxist Georges Marchais published a poem by Aragon taken from his book <<Elsa's Madman>>. Elsa was Aragon's wife. Here is what Aragon, a member of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party, says in this verse: <<Will there always be fighting and feuds/ Regal behaviour and bowed heads! Children born of mothers unwanted/Wheat destroyed by the locusts?/ Will there always be prisons and torture/ Always massacres in the name of idols (the idols are Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin)/ A mantel of words cast over the corpses/ A gag in the mouth and nailed hands?/ But a day will come with orange colours...>> This is Aragon's way of saying that he and his party have abandoned the red colour, communism.

In this way, the French revisionists threw overboard the principles of the immortal theory of Marxism-Leninism. Now their party is floundering in a revisionism which is a mixture of the old utopian theories of Bernstein, Proudhon, Kautsky, and anarchism. Unitig the ideology of other bourgeois parties, it is fighting to create the idea in France and elsewhere that Marxism has become obsolete, and Eurocommunism must come to the fore instead.
In 1968 the students in Paris clashed with <<the forces of law and order>>. The Trotskyites, Sartre, the theoretician of existentialism, Simone de Beauvoir, Cohn-Bendit and others seized on to these clashes to give them an anarchist colour.

And in fact they took place in great disorder. The French Communist Party did not participate. Why did it not participate? Was it that in principle it was opposed to anarchism? I think this is not the reason. The reason is that it did not want to unite with the student youth, which was attacking the De Gaulle government. In fact, it was this movement which forced De Gaulle to hold the referendum, and when he did not win in the way he wanted, he retired to Colombay-Les-Deux-Eglises, where he died.

The French Communist Party stopped the working class from going into action and taking over the leadership of the uprising. The party had the strength to ensure that the flames were spread throughout France, and if not to seize power, at least to shake the power of <<princes>>, or the power of <<barons>>, as they called it at that time. It did not do this, because it was for that road and for those methods which the petty-bourgeois revisionist Georges Marchais advocates.

The French Communist Party has great hopes in a <<coalition of the left>>, which it tried to create with the socialist party of Mitterrand in the elections for the president of France and in the parliamentary elections. The French Communist Party and the French Socialist Party reached a certain agreement, but this was temporary. Not only did they not win in the voting, but after the elections and the triumph of Giscard d'Estaing, it was seen that the love between the communists and the socialists was cooling, and indeed they began to attack one another. Neither the big bourgeoisie, nor its parties, nor even the Socialist Party of Mitterrand will ever want a communist party, even one of an orange colour, such as Aragon describes it, to take part in the government of France. This did not take place with the Popular Front, when Uon Blum was at the head of the Socialist Party, is not taking place today, when Mitterrand is at the head of the Socialist Party, and neither will it take place when someone else emerges at the head of it.

The interests of the French capitalist bourgeoisie and of the two hundred families, which Marchais has reduced to 25 in order to give the impression that today they are dealing with a small reactionary force, are closely linked together to protect their privileges, to protect their great possessions and capital, to increase their profits at the expense of the proletariat and all the working people of France. Of course, the socialists have contradictions with the other parties of the bourgeoisie, but when it comes to the issue that the bourgeois power is threatened by the proletariat, then unity is achieved, not between the communists and the socialists, however, but between the socialists and the bourgeoisie. This is occurring in Italy with the Socialist Party which is uniting with the Christian Democrats, the Liberal Party and the Social-Democratic Party, and is not making a common front even with Togliatti's <<communists>>.

However, assuming for a moment that a cartel of the <<left>> in France could manage to take Power, for the French communists, even with their orange colour, this would be ephemeral and would change nothing. Why is this? Because this is what happened when De Gaulle, in order to get out of his difficulties, accepted a few communists headed by Thorez in the government, and threw them out again after he had used them as firemen. And when did he do this? He did this at a time when the French Communist Party had emerged from the Second World War with no small authority, as the only party which had fought the occupier consistently. Therefore, Marchais' pretentions that he <<is going to take power and build socialism>> now, with the Eurocommunist strategy, with the, revisionist ideology of Proudhon and Bernstein, will never be realized. The most that the heads of the French Communist Party might achieve is to; become share-holders in plundering the sweat and' toil of the French proletariat and people, to strengthen the fire brigades of the counter-revolution, but nothing more.
Revisionism with the Gloves off

The line of the Spanish revisionists is worthy of special attention, not because these revisionists are different from the Italian and French variety, but because of the special role they have undertaken, as spokesmen and kite-fliers for all revisionists. Carrillo and company speak with the gloves off, speak openly, and whether or not the other revisionists headed by the Soviet revisionists like it, they express the true opinion of modern revisionism. If the Soviet revisionists, sometimes <<criticize>> Carrillo, they do this not because of his treacherous revisionist ideas, but because he blurs out the opinions and aims of all revisionists. Carrillo is a product of the corrupt bourgeois capitalist society in decay, a product of lumpenintellectuals in the service of the capitalist bourgeoisie.

He has lived in France, and apparently, while there, was profoundly influenced by Sartrist, anarchist, Trotskyite, and all sorts of other corrupt anti-Marxist theories. Now he is developing these theories in the speeches and interviews with which he fills the pages of the bourgeois press, and especially in his much advertised book <<Eurocommunism and the State>>. In this utterly anti-Marxist <<work>>, the general secretary of the Communist Party of Spain has summarized and systematized the opportunist theses and views of Togliatti, Berlinguer, Marchais, Krushchev, Tito and other chiefs of modern revisionism. His main aim is to justify his deviation from Marxism-Leninism, to attack the idea of the revolution and socialism, and legitimize revisionism.

Carrillo called his book <<Eurocommunism and the State>>, as a counter to Lenin's famous and brilliant work <<The State and Revolution>>, in which he put forward the strategy of the socialist revolution and the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This megalomaniac, Carrillo, pretends that with a mishmash of phrases gathered from all the renegades from communism, he can knock down one of the mightiest monuments of the Marxist thinking such as <<The State and Revolution>>, which life and revolutionary practice have stamped with the great seal of history, making it immortal.

According to the renegade Carrillo, who propagates the theses of petty-bourgeois intellectuals, the proletariat today is allegedly no longer the most revolutionary class of society which leads the struggle for socialism, but all classes to some extent and, first of all, the intelligentsia, lead this struggle. He claims that in Lenin's time the proletariat was allegedly a backward class, while today, this renegade says, the working class is very advanced and the intelligentsia has grown up alongside it. In other words, he, too, associates himself with the theses of the revisionist philosopher Roger Garaudy. According to Carrillo, the communists must take power today, not through violence, not by destroying the bourgeois power and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, but by using other forms, appropriate to the changes which the capitalist system has undergone. Allegedly, present-day bourgeois society contains within itself the kernel of socialism, therefore the proletariat is not the only class interested in the establishment of socialism.

We must understand, says Carrillo, that the capitalist state has changed today, and he goes on to claim that the others do not see this change in the capitalist state, but his mind reveals it. And what it reveals is an imaginary reality on which he proceeds to build up his whole worthless <<theory>>. According to him, the capitalist state has nationalized a series of enterprises which have assumed other forms which differ from those of the old concerns of capitalism or imperialism. The state administers these enterprises more or less correctly, through functionaries who have a bourgeois mentality. Now, according to Carrillo, all that has to be done is to change this mentality and everything will be in order. This bourgeois mentality of the functionaries, says Carrillo, has undergone radical changes, but more must be done to reach the stage at which the bearers of this mentality understand the need for further reforms to advance to socialism.

Carrillo tries <<to prove>> that the present-day state in the capitalist countries allegedly does not represent the power of the bourgeoisie, its apparatus of violence to protect its property and rule, but is a supra-class power belonging to all classes. Being unable to make black entirely white, lie admits only that there is a certain superiority of the bourgeoisie in this state, which he regards as
something left over from the historical conditions in which this state was created, but which now can be set right. 

But how is this change to be made? How is this superiority to be eliminated and the state of "democratic socialism" to be created? Obviously, according to him, the Leninist theory, which allegedly was valid for the past periods, cannot be applied, because the economic, social and other conditions have changed. Now another theory is needed, and Carrillo has it ready. 

The ownership of the means of production, he says, is now not only that of the bourgeoisie. Along with it exists state ownership, which Carrillo considers "socialist", cooperativist ownership, etc. The proletariat no longer exists, because it has merged with all the intelligentsia, the office workers, the priests, the judges, the gendarmes, etc. Meanwhile, the capitalists remain a small group of stubborn bourgeois who still cling to the old. In these conditions, according to Carrillo, the institutions of the bourgeois superstructure must be democratized through reforms and education, and this process has already commenced. Thus the only task left for the communists to carry out is, to accelerate this process. 

According to the renegade Carrillo, the conflict between the working masses and the bourgeois state today has radically changed. This conflict is no longer what it was before, because now allegedly the state is an employer which no longer defends the interests of the bourgeoisie as a whole, but only of a fraction of it, that fraction which controls the big monopoly groups. Therefore, he says, now the state is no longer in opposition only to the advanced proletarians, but also directly to the broadest social classes and strata, including a big section of the bourgeoisie itself. The element of different classes, which is in opposition to the big financial oligarchy and the employing state, not only can penetrate the state apparatus, he declares, but already has penetrated it. Through this "progressive element" it is possible to take power by means of reforms. 

"To confirm" these dreams, Carrillo quotes the example of Italy, where as he says, even the police in Rome vote for the Italian Communist Party. With this he wants to arrive at the conclusion that the forces of compulsion and oppression of the capitalist bourgeoisie have undergone changes also. True, he says, they frequently act according to the desire of capital, but they do this allegedly contrary to their conscious will, because, when the occasion arises to express this consciousness without exposure to the capitalist state, they act in opposition to the will of this state. 

The position is similar in regard to the law courts. The courts, says Carrillo, naturally carry out the laws of the bourgeoisie, but there too, the consciousness of the courts has begun to undergo a metamorphosis. 

He deals with the problem of religion and the church in the same spirit. The church, he says, has changed and is no longer that dogmatic church of the past. Today the clergy themselves are for amendment of the dogmas, are no longer opposed to science but in favour of it. This being the case, they are in favour of a life entirely different from that which the Bible and the Vatican formerly preached, and the Vatican has allegedly made an evolution towards a more progressive and human society, towards a society in which there will bea greater and more complete democracy. 

According to Carrillo, even the church makes. its contribution to the social transformations towards socialism! Basing himself on this fantasy, he arrives at the conclusion that the top clerical hierarchy, without as yet going so far as to accept socialism and Marxism, has allegedly begun to, raise doubts about the possibilities of capitalism as a Way to solve the problems for the future. He declares that he takes his hat off to the clergysince they have made an evolution in their dogmas, therefore the Eurocommunists must reject their own "dogmas", i.e., Marxism-Leninism, in order to be more "progressive" than the church and the Vatican. 

Education, one of the most consistent ideological apparatuses of the bourgeoisie, does not present any problem to Carrillo, because it has just about been transformed already. He claims that education today, while having become available to the masses, has also changed its ideological content.
As to the family, according to Carrillo, it has completely changed its way of life and thinking. Present-day children not only do not listen to their parents, but they are opposed to their ideas. Mentally, they are virtually living in socialism already.

In other words, for Carrillo, the whole of capitalist society has been transformed, is no longer that society of the time of Marx and the time of Lenin, is no longer that decayed state of 1917, when the Great October Socialist Revolution overthrew czarism. Carrillo links both the October Revolution in the Soviet Union and the revolutions which triumphed in other countries with the world wars, thus perpetrating a monstrous slander against genuine revolutionaries, which, according to him, are in favour of war in order to ensure the triumph of the revolution. It is true that by exacerbating -the social contradictions to the maximum, and by increasing the sufferings of the masses to an unprecedented level, world wars hasten and accelerate the outburst of the revolutions, as the only way to escape wars and the order which gives birth to them. But world wars and local wars are not the cause of social revolutions. The underlying cause of the revolution is the contradictions of the capitalist system itself, especially the conflict between old relations of production and new productive forces, a conflict which can be solved even without being associated with inter-state wars, as history has proved.

Socialism, declares Carrillo, cannot be linked with world war, because such a war in our time would lead to the total destruction of the human society. Thus Carrillo does not fail to make him-self a propagandist of imperialism's atomic black-mail. Following in the footsteps of Khrushchev, he says that it is not necessary to carry out revolutions or liberation wars in the conditions when the atomic bomb exists, because they might become the cause for nuclear wars in which neither side will win. If we speak about a world without weapons, without wars., says Carrillo, then we must carry this idea 'through to the end. Since we want to build a world without wars, as was said at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, let us work in this direction, not only by demanding disarmament and making speeches in favour of peace, but also by undermining and sabotaging the revolution every-where.

On the other hand, to Carrillo violent revolution is a closed road because allegedly American imperialism will not permit such a thing. Carrillo wants to raise his own petty-bourgeois fear to the level of theory and to transform his capitulation to imperialism and the bourgeoisie into a norm. The threat of intervention to suppress any revolution on the part of imperialism, and not only American imperialism., but the whole of world reaction, has existed for a long time and this is part of the aggressive strategy of the American and other imperialists. However, history has proved that the peoples have risen into revolution, have clashed with the American intervention, and have triumphed. Let us take the Iranian revolution as a recent example. American imperialism used all its threats, but does not dare to intervene directly with arms, because it senses that, faced with the determination of the Iranian people, it will suffer a bigger defeat than that it and the gendarme Shah, whom it had armed to the teeth with the most modern means, suffered.

What is new in Carrillo's sermons is that he has become the spokesman for and champion of the imperialist policy, a spreader of panic and a tool of reaction to sow the seed of demoralization and capitulation among the masses. And whom does he warn that they should fear foreigners? He is addressing the heroic Spanish people, who fought so boldly and valiantly not only against Franco, but also against the armed intervention of Hitler and Mussolini, and against the socialists like Blum, who sabotaged the revolution in Spain, and whose pupil Carrillo has now become.

To Carrillo it seems unnecessary for the bourgeoisie to maintain a large police force and apparatus of oppression. Why does it need this when public opinion does not want such a thing? asks Carrillo. The state power of the financial oligarchy and capital ought to come to terms with the workers, preaches this new Christian priest. According to him, strikes can continue to be held, but should be done in co-ordination with and organized by the employers and the representatives of the workers, that is, by the worker aristocracy. It is very easy, says Carrillo, for the managers to reach agreement with the workers and put aside their arrogance and not impose their dictate.
According to him, this can be achieved simply and without difficulty. But he is reckoning without his host. He is speaking without those who have power and are holding on to it, who have the apparatus of oppression, the propaganda machine, the church, etc., in their hands. They do not swallow these tales of Carrillo's, but they support him so that he will create such concepts and spread them in the ranks of the working class and the strata of working people so that the latter will live with the dreams of Carrillo.

In regard to the army, the problem is quite simple to Carrillo. The present-day army must be transformed on the basis of a democratic policy, he writes in his book. This does not mean to give it another political colour, he says, let it retain the colour it has (i.e., reactionary), but it must never think about military plots, or about a present-day repetition of the history of the 19th century and part of the 20th century. To Carrillo, insurrections and civil wars must be avoided. Likewise to be eliminated is the historical binomial: the oligarchy plus the armed forces equals conservatism and reaction; an identification of the army and civilian society must be achieved, an identification which will allegedly facilitate the advance of the progressive forces towards democracy, a society of equality and justice.

According to him, no pretext must be given for the army to be set in motion by one side or the other, but work must be carried out for a <<democratic transformation>> of the military mentality, so that the army will understand that war should no longer exist in society, because otherwise it will be suicide. The doors of this army of capital should not be opened only to the cadres of the bourgeoisie, but also to the broad strata of the people, so that the ideology of the masses, the socialist ideology, etc. can penetrate it, and it will no longer be a reserve of the police, but simply a weapon in the service of public order. How this is to be done is another matter. However, Carrillo thinks that, since he preaches it, the bourgeoisie should accept his <<wise>> council, should peacefully relinquish the main weapon of its power, and one fine day, after it has been convinced that <<this is what justice requires>>, will say to Carrillo, <<come and take power, we are withdrawing, lead all of us towards socialism!>>

In support of his thesis about the possibility of the democratization of the army and its transformation into an army which serves the people, Carrillo produces a number of arguments which are as naive as they are ridiculous. The French army, he says, was democratized after the war in Algeria, because its regulations were redrafted and new ones were established <<which have created a democratic spirit in it>>. To claim that the French bourgeois army has changed its world outlook and is no longer a weapon in the hands of the big bourgeoisie, but a weapon in the hands of public opinion, is betrayal.

According to this revisionist, the military doctrine and the army itself in the capitalist states are in crisis, because in its ranks, in the ranks of the military cadres there are both hawks and doves. Hence, says Carrillo, we must work in a peaceful way to turn the hawks too, into doves. To this end, Carrillo thinks that the communist parties should have a separate military policy, but should never consider carrying politics into the army. He says that efforts should be made to draw the military theme into the field of the policy of the left, so that it will be a monopoly of neither the right nor the left. According to Carrillo, such a policy on the part of the communist parties would draw the army away from the policy of the right, and the army would go over more to the side of the nation. Thus, both the left and the right together should struggle against and control each other and, in the traditional way, should control the state, too, not the bourgeois state, but Carrillo's state, which is to be created through reforms.

As a conclusion of these <<analyses>> of present-day capitalist society and the bourgeois state, Carrillo, who poses as the ideologist and theoretician of Eurocommunism, also builds up his strategy to go over to socialism. The strategy of revolutionaries today, says Carrillo, is not to overthrow the state power of the bourgeoisie, because state power no longer belongs to the bourgeoisie, neither is it to overthrow the bourgeois relations of production, since they have changed already. The only thing which should be done is to gradually transform the existing
political and ideological institutions through reforms, in order to bring them into conformity with the social reality and turn them in favour of the people. The head of the Spanish revisionists preaches that now it is completely possible to gradually transform the capitalist superstructure into a socialist superstructure, without altering its base. This is anti-dialectical and contrary to simple logic. However, Carrillo is not interested in science, but in the schemes he has concocted. This is because his aim is not to indicate the solution of problems, but to obscure their solution, to set the proletariat on a wrong road, to lead it up a blind alley and turn it away from the revolution.

As we said, Carrillo has been inspired by all the <<theories>> of the Khrushchevites, the Trotskyites, Browder and a thousand and one other traitors to the working class. However, he demands that things should be said openly, that the i's should be dotted, in other words, that the revisionists' actions should be unified with capitalism and world imperialism. First of all, allegedly with theoretical arguments, he calls on all the revisionists and pseudo-communists of the world to rise against Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. He distorts and interprets as he pleases Marx's writings on the events of 1848, on the June Uprising in France, on the Paris Commune and goes so far as to admit openly that he is taking his treacherous theses from Trotsky or Kautsky. By mentioning these renegades and notorious and discredited opponents of Marxism, he shows from which stable he comes and where the sources of his <<theoretical>> discoveries lie. Total denial of the class struggle is the foundation of all Carrillo's ideas. In his view, all classes are together at the head of the bourgeois state today. But to Carrillo the stratum of intellectuals is everything, is the cleverest, the most knowledgeable, the most capable and the best administrator. If one had said these things in the time when Marx, Engels and Lenin were alive, declares Carrillo himself, they would have called them utopian ideas. Our classics would not just have called these counterrevolutionary ideas utopian, but would have described them as betrayal, just as they described the predecessors of Carrillo as traitors. Carrillo is a revisionist whose betrayal knows no bounds. All revisionists are traitors, but in one way or another they have tried to disguise their betrayal. They have hesitated to attack Marx, Engels and Lenin so openly as all of them have attacked Stalin.

But Carrillo goes further in his road than Khrushchev and many others. Although he tried, Khrushchev did not dare to publicly rehabilitate Trotsky. By calling Stalin a criminal, by rejecting all the revolutionary trials which were held in the time of the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union, in practice Khrushchev rehabilitated Kamenev and Zinoviev. He also rehabilitated many other traitors such as Rajk and so on. However, Carrillo was not satisfied with Khrushchev. In his book, he rebukes him as if to say: <<When you have rehabilitated all these fine people whom Stalin had shot, when you have betrayed Marx, Engels and Lenin, why have you not rehabilitated your father Trotsky?>> Therefore, Carrillo calls for Trotsky to be rehabilitated and for a campaign to do justice to the <<merits>> of Trotsky.

In other words, Carrillo is one of the dirtiest, one of the most bare-faced agents of world capitalism. However, his <<theories>> will not do capitalism much good because, as Carrillo presents them, they are a real exposure of the pseudo-Marxism of the modern revisionists. On the one hand, Carrillo serves imperialism and world capitalism, because he opposes the revolution, and denies the Marxist-Leninist ideas which inspire the proletariat and the peoples throughout the world, but on the other hand, he tears the mask from the other modern revisionists and exposes them, discloses their true aims to the proletariat and the peoples.

Santiago Carrillo, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Spain, is a bastard of revisionist bastardy. He took all the vilest and most counterrevolutionary things from modern revisionism and made himself the apologist of utter betrayal and capitulation.
ONLY THE MARXIST-LENINISTS HOLD HIGH THE BANNER OF THE REVOLUTION AND CARRY IT FORWARD

Present-day capitalist society, both bourgeois and revisionist, is pregnant with revolution and the revolution always has been and always will be guided only by the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. All the different ideas which seek to revise our great theory will end up in the rubbish bin of history, just as they have always done. They will be smashed, together with capitalism, imperialism and social-imperialism, by the great power of the world proletariat which leads the revolution and is inspired by the immortal doctrine of Marxism-Leninism.

The tactics and manoeuvres of the Eurocommunists cannot overshadow our great doctrine and they will never get established. Only those who are imbued with the Marxist-Leninist doctrine and remain loyal to it see what dangerous and cunning opportunists they are confronted with in their gigantic struggle for the triumph of the new world, the socialist world, without oppressors, exploiters, war-mongering imperialists and socialimperialists, without revisionists, demagogues and traitors, either old or new.

In France, Italy, Spain and the other capitalist countries, it depends greatly on the proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist parties to ensure that the anti-class, anti-revolutionary, anti-Marxist theories of the revisionists are defeated. Without a genuine Marxist-Leninist party to lead the proletariat in class battles and revolution, these anti-Marxist theories which have been spread by the revisionist parties cannot be combated and the power of the bourgeoisie cannot be liquidated.

Conscious of the great loss which the birth and spread of modern revisionism, especially Khrushchevite modern revisionism, brought to the cause of the revolution and communism, the Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries knew how and were able to resist this great counterrevolutionary tide and to organize themselves and fight resolutely against it.

With a lofty sense of responsibility to the proletariat of their own countries and the world, they placed themselves in the forefront of the stern, principled struggle for the exposure of the revisionists' betrayal and set to work to create new Marxist-Leninist organizations and parties.

The Marxist-Leninist movement was born and developed in this great process of differentiation from modern revisionism and the struggle for the cause of communism, and took upon itself to raise and carry forward the banner of the revolution and socialism, betrayed and rejected by the former communist parties, which the revisionist degeneration had transformed into firemen to quell the flames of the revolution and the peoples' liberation wars. The formation of new Marxist-Leninist parties was a victory of historic importance for the working class of each country, as well as for the cause of the revolution on a world scale.

The parties in which Browderite, Khrushchevite, Titoite, Eurocommunist, Maoist modern revisionism became established were liquidated as communist parties. Revisionism stripped them of the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary spirit, transformed them from organized detachments of the working class to carry out the revolution into weapons for <<extinguishing>> the class struggle, for establishing class <<peace>>, for sabotaging the revolution and destroying socialism.

Bearing in mind the struggle which the modem revisionists wage against the Leninist theory and practice on the party, the genuine communist revolutionaries fight for the defence, strengthening and development of proletarian parties built on the basis of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. They are conscious that without such a party, without an organized vanguard detachment of the working class, the revolution cannot be carried out, the national liberation struggle cannot be waged correctly through to the end and the bourgeois-democratic revolution cannot be deepened and go over to the proletarian revolution.

The Marxist-Leninist party does not emerge and is not created accidentally or for no purpose. It emerges and is created as a result of certain very important objective and subjective factors. The Marxist-Leninist party emerges from the ranks of the working class, represents its highest
aspirations, its revolutionary aims and wages and carries forward the class struggle. Without the working class, without its revolutionary objectives, without the Marxist-Leninist theory, which is the theory of the working class, there can never be a Marxist-Leninist party.

A party of the working class becomes its truly organized detachment, its supreme staff when it is educated with and masters the Marxist-Leninist theory and when it uses, this powerful and irreplaceable weapon competently, in a creative way, in the class struggle for the triumph of the revolution, for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the construction of socialism.

That party which assimilates this theory but does not apply it, or applies it incorrectly and continues to fail to correct the mistakes it is making, will not advance on the right road, but will deviate from Marxism-Leninism.

The genuine Marxist-Leninist party is characterized by the clear-cut and resolute stand which it maintains towards modern revisionism, towards Khrushchevism, Titoism, Mao Zedong thought, Eurocommunism, etc. The establishment of a clear line of demarcation over this question is of major principled importance.

If a party permits illusions to be created in its ranks, for example, that irrespective of the Khrushchevite ideology, socialism is being built in the Soviet Union that there are bureaucrats in the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union but there are revolutionaries and Marxist-Leninists as well, then willy-nilly such a party is no longer in a Marxist-Leninist position, but has deviated from the revolutionary strategy and tactics, and if not openly at least indirectly, has been transformed into a pro-Soviet party, irrespective of the fact that in words it might be against the theses of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Khrushchevism. Revolutionary experience has proved that you cannot fight against Khrushchevism if you do not also fight against the chauvinist and social-imperialist hegemonic policy which the leaders of the present-day capitalist and imperialist Soviet Union, Brezhnev, Suslov and company, follow.

The views of those who divide the reactionary line and the pro-imperialist policy of the current Chinese leaders from Mao Zedong and Mao Zedong thought are of the same nature and equally harmful. The counterrevolutionary stands of Deng Xiaoping and Hua Guofeng cannot be opposed and unmasked if the ideological basis of their actions, which is Mao Zedong thought, is not fought and unmasked.

The Party of Labour of Albania has reached this conclusion after making a profound analysis, of Mao Zedong thought and the line which the Communist Party of China has followed. To defend Mao Zedong and his ideas without going deeply into and seriously analysing the events and facts means to fall into a revisionist deviation. As long as you do not clear up this position you cannot be in a genuine Marxist-Leninist position.

The Marxist-Leninist parties and the proletariat of each country never underestimate the pressure of the bourgeoisie and its ideology, the oppressive force of capitalism, imperialism, social-imperialism, and deceptive revisionist ideologies. This pressure and these negative influences, become harmful, very dangerous, if the party of the proletariat does not wage a resolute struggle, against them and does not have a strong organization and iron proletarian discipline, and if it is not characterized by a steel unity of thought and action, which excludes any spirit of factionalism and groups.

This is why, along with raising their ideological level and waging the struggle against revisionism and the influences of the bourgeois ideology, the Marxist-Leninist parties devote the greatest care to their internal organizational strengthening on the basis of the Leninist norms and principles. The party is and becomes revolutionary when tested, active, dedicated, revolutionary elements militate in its ranks. They resolutely combat the sectarian intellectualist concepts which frequently, hiding behind the requirement to admit trained elements, close the doors of the party to the workers and sound elements from the other strata of the working masses who, by militating in the ranks of
the party, can gain all those qualities which must characterize the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat.

Sentimentality, liberalism, the tendency to seek numbers in order to give the impression that the ranks of the party are increasing with new members, are harmful and have grave consequences. Such admissions without strictly applying the Marxist-Leninist norms not only do not hinder the influence and pressure of the bourgeoisie from attacking the party from outside but allow the party to be infiltrated by various elements which divide and liquidate it.

The Marxist-Leninist parties in the capitalist countries are working and fighting in difficult conditions and encounter many dangers which come from various directions. These dangers are not imaginary. They are real, are encountered every day, in every step and in every action. They cannot be withstood if the communists do not understand that the program of action and struggle of the party is founded on the need for sacrifice for the great ideals of the cause of the proletariat and communism, if these sacrifices are not consciously accepted and made unhesitatingly at any moment, in any situation or circumstances which the major interests of the proletariat and the people require.

In the capitalist countries, the existence of many parties causes great confusion in people's minds. These parties are parties for votes; they are in the service of local and world capital. This united capital rules with the aid of state power and money, with the organized force of the army, the police and other organs of violence. The parties, which are linked with capital, with the various multinational concerns and companies, play the game of <<democracy>> with the aim of diverting the masses from the main objective of their struggle - throwing off the yoke of capital and seizing state power, that is, carrying out the revolution.

It is not without purpose that the bourgeois parties apply certain organizational and political orientations and forms. For example, they allow anyone to enter or leave their ranks whenever he wants. All are <<free>> to talk and shout, to deliver discourses at meetings and rallies, but no one is allowed to act, to go beyond the bounds of the so-called freedom of speech. The transition from freedom of speech to concrete actions is classified and treated as an act of anarchists, criminals and terrorists.

The Marxist-Leninist party can never be such a party. It is not a party of words, but a party of revolutionary action. If its members are not engaged in concrete actions and struggle it will not be a genuine Marxist-Leninist party, but a Marxist-Leninist party only in name. At given moment such a party will certainly be split into different factions, will have many lines which will coexist, and it will be turned into a liberal, opportunist and revisionist party. Such a party is neither suited to or needed by the working class.

A revolutionary Marxist-Leninist party cannot reconcile itself either to reformism or to anarchism and terrorism. It is against all these counterrevolutionary trends in whatever form they present themselves. The party must always bear in mind that it is impossible for the bourgeoisie not to attack it, that it is impossible that it will not call its actions the actions of anarchists and terrorists. However, this does not make the party tail behind events and the movement of the masses, give up actions and enter the vicious circle of revisionist and reformist parties.

The Marxist-Leninist party leads the complex actions of the political, ideological and economic struggle of the Marxist-Leninist parties at the head of the working class against the bourgeoisie, social-democracy, revisionism and the bourgeois state, which allow the masses to determine whether or not these activities are truly revolutionary in character. The masses know how to distinguish genuine revolutionary actions which are in their interests from terrorism and anarchism. Therefore they join in the revolutionary actions which the Marxist-Leninist parties lead and rise against the power of the bourgeoisie regardless of the blows and the harsh oppression of the capitalist bourgeoisie, which goes as far as undertaking bloody actions against the working class and genuine communists.

The Marxist-Leninist communist party is not afraid of civil war, which the savage oppression and violence of the bourgeoisie lead to. It is known that civil war is not waged between the working class and honest working people, but is waged by the working masses against the ruling capitalist
bourgeoisie and its organs of oppression. The revolutionary struggle of the proletariat must lead to the violent seizure of power. It is precisely this development of which the capitalists, the bourgeoisie and the revisionists are afraid. That is why social-democracy and the modern revisionists strive to prevent the working class from gaining revolutionary consciousness, from understanding the significance of economic, political and ideological problems, and reaching that revolutionary maturity and sound organization which help in the creation of the subjective conditions for the struggle for the seizure of power.

The strategy and tactics of the bourgeoisie, which the Eurocommunists have made their own, aim to split the working class so that they will not be faced with a unified striking force. The Marxist-Leninist parties, however, fight for the opposite, for the unity of the working class.

The bourgeoisie fears the revolutionary organization and unity of the proletariat, which, contrary to the preachings of the Eurocommunists and other revisionists, remain the main revolutionary motive force of our time. Therefore, it tries, to maintain continuous control over tradeunion organizations, over trade-union centres, which can be numerous in the capitalist parties, with names and programs which appear different, but which have no essential differences between them. Through the bourgeois and revisionist parties and its own state structures, the bourgeoisie has encouraged as never before the diversionist role of the trade-unions which are openly manipulated by them.

As the facts show, trade-unions of this kind in many countries have become completely integrated into and become appendages of the economic and state organization of capitalism. The ever more open collaboration of the trade-union centres with the owning class, with finance capital and the bourgeois governments is a notorious fact. As it is now, the trade-union movement does not challenge capitalism, but works for it, tries to subjugate the proletariat and to restrict and undermine its struggle against capitalism. Some of them are more like big capitalist concerns than trade-union organizations.

It is a fact that, as a result of this undermining activity carried out but the revisionists and social-democracy, by the bourgeois-reformist trade-union centres, the European proletariat remains split, and an important section of the workers is manipulated by these centres. The control of revisionists and social-democrats over the trade-union movement is a major obstacle to the development of the class struggle and the formation and tempering of the revolutionary consciousness of the working people. Therefore, the only road for the Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries, a road which is imposed on them, is to expose the activity of revisionists, to disintegrate their positions in the trade-union movement and to create revolutionary trade-unions. Obviously, these new trade-unions cannot but have the objective of achieving the unity of the working class, against the power of capital, against its demagogy and that of the bourgeois and revisionist parties.

To fight against the so-called traditional trade-unions does not mean that you are opposed in principle to the existence of unions as organizations of the masses with a broad character, as centres of the organization and resistance of the working class, historically inevitable and essential in the conditions of capitalism for uniting the working class and throwing it into the class struggle against the bourgeoisie.

While putting forward the task of creating revolutionary unions, the Marxist-Leninists in no way abandoned their work in the existing unions in which there are large masses of workers, because otherwise they would have left the tradeunion bosses a free hand to manipulate the working class and to use it in their own interests and the interests of capital. Participation of communists in the existing unions is not determined by contingency and is not a <<tactic>> as the Trotskyites try to present it, but a stand of principle which stems from the Leninist teachings on the need for unity of the working class, which cannot be achieved without working among the masses and without freeing them from the influences of the bourgeoisie and various opportunists.

Of course, the struggle of the Marxist-Leninist party within the reformist and revisionist trade-union centres does not have the aim of correcting or educating the trade-union bosses, or improving and reforming them. Such a stand would be a new reformism. The Marxist-Leninist work with the masses of trade-unionists in order to educate and prepare them for anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist
and anti-revisionist revolutionary actions. The unity and cohesion of the proletariat is brought about in the process of work and struggle. However, as Marxism-Leninism teaches us, the unity of the working class is achieved, first of all, in the field of practice, through political actions and economic claims properly harmonized with one another, giving priority to political actions. Taking a firm revolutionary class stand, the Marxist-Leninists fight to link economic claims with political claims, and in this terrain denounce and expose the treacherous activity of the trade-union bosses who, through various trade-union manoeuvres, sacrifice the major fundamental interests of the proletariat.

At present, there are millions who come out on strikes, in demonstrations for economic claims, which also have a political character, because they are fighting capitalism which refuses to recognize the rights of workers. However, all these end up in an agreement between trade-union bosses and capitalists, who make the strikers some minor concession, just to give them a certain satisfaction. However, if these claims are given a real political character, the tools of capital in the trade-unions and capital itself are placed in great difficulties. The worker aristocracy and the capitalist bourgeoisie are very much afraid of the linking of the economic struggle with the political struggle. They fear the political struggle, because it leads the working class a long way, and even leads it to clashes and battles. Political actions, properly carried out, weaken the leadership of the capitalist bourgeoisie in the trade-unions, break the rules, the laws, and everything else it has established in order to enslave the working class, and opens the eyes of the class.

The working class is the leading class, and as such, it must break its links with the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois psychology. In order to do this, it is necessary to fight both against liberalopportunist views, which lead to rightist tradeunionist deviations, and against sectarian views which isolate the genuine Marxist party from vigorous concrete work with the masses. Both these types of views have extremely harmful consequences for the cause of the revolution. Just as the reduction of the trade-union movement merely to struggle for economic demands must be combated, hesitation to fight for economic demands, for fear of going over to opportunism and the simple trade-union struggle, must also be avoided.

While fighting for the unity of the working class, the Marxist-Leninist parties see this as the basis for the unity of all the masses of the people, which is quite the opposite to those unprincipled, counterrevolutionary combinations and alliances which the Eurocommunists advocate. The deepening of the crisis, which the capitalist-revisionist world is experiencing, is extending the social and class basis of the revolution. Apart from the working class, other strata of society exploited by capitalism, such as the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia and the students, the youth and the masses of women, are taking part ever more actively in the revolutionary movement. Therefore, the question of linking up with these masses and leading them becomes a task of first-rate importance for the Marxist-Leninist parties. Direct work by the Marxist-Leninist party and its members in the ranks of the masses is indispensable and of great value, but it is insufficient to extend the influence of the party among the broad working masses, if the levers of the party, the organizations of the masses, such as those of the youth, women, etc., are not organized and set into action. The Marxist-Leninist party works wherever the masses are, even in the organizations which are run and manipulated by the bourgeois and revisionist parties, in order to separate them from the influence of the reactionary and opportunist ideology of these parties, just as, it works also to create the revolutionary organizations of the masses which militate on the line of the party and act with conscious conviction under its leadership.

In the countries where capital rules, the youth, the women and other working masses are a major reserve of the revolution. Today there are millions of youth and women unemployed, abandoned and left without hope by the bourgeoisie, therefore they are seething with revolt and the elements of revolutionary outbursts are accumulating. Regarding the movements of the youth, students, intelligentsia and progressive women as important component parts of the broad democratic and
liberation revolutionary movements in general, the Marxist-Leninists try to unite the drive and revolutionary aspirations of these broad masses with the drive and aspirations of the working class, in order to organize, educate and lead them on the right road. When the inexhaustible energies of the youth, the women and the other masses are united with the energies of the working class under the leadership of the proletarian party, there is no force which can stop the triumph of revolution and socialism.

The hegemony of the proletariat will not be complete and effective if it is not extended over all the strata of the population interested in the revolution, especially over the peasantry which in the overwhelming majority of countries, represents the main and most powerful ally of the working class. At the same time, the alliance of the working class with the peasantry is the basis for uniting in a broad front all the working masses, all those who in one way or another are fighting against capitalism and imperialism, against oppression and exploitation by monopolies and multinational companies.

At the present time, many rallies and demonstrations are being held in the streets of cities and villages of the capitalist countries. Naturally, these are organized by the bourgeois, social-democratic and revisionist parties, which have certain aims when they bring the masses out in the streets. Above all, they want to keep the revolted masses of working people under their control and to confine their demands within the economic framework permitted by the bourgeoisie. The task of the communists is not to stand apart from these demonstrations because the bourgeois and revisionist parties organize them, but to take part in these mass movements and turn them into political demonstrations and clashes with the bourgeoisie and its lackeys.

Inactivity, apathy and fruitless discussions are lethal to a Marxist-Leninist party. If a Marxist-Leninist party is not continually active, in movement with agitation and propaganda, if it does not take part in the different manifestations of the working class and the other working masses, irrespective that they may be under the influence of reformist parties, it will not be possible to alter the direction which the reformist parties give the movement of the masses.

The correct line of the Marxist-Leninist party, cannot be carried among the masses by means of its press alone, which is usually very restricted. The communists, sympathizers, and members of the mass organizations carry the line of the party among the masses precisely during the activities and actions of the working class and the other working masses when they are in movement, in struggle and battle for their economic rights, and even more for their political rights.

Such vigorous revolutionary action ensures two important objectives: on the one hand, it tempers the party itself in action together with the masses and raises its authority and influence, and on the other hand, it creates possibilities for the party to see the most politically and ideologically sound and advanced elements of the working class in action, those who will be the best and the most resolute militants of the party in the future. From these elements, the Marxist-Leninist parties secure the new blood for their ranks, and not from a few discontented intellectual elements, or some unemployed workers who demand justice, who are revolted, but are not so stable and do not accept the iron discipline of a Marxist-Leninist proletarian party.

The leaders of revisionist parties think that the whole work of the party consists of endless discussions, fruitless theorizing and empty contests over one question or another. Nothing comes out of such sterile work. The revisionist parties work on the masses through their press which, it must be admitted, is extensive. These parties themselves are big capitalist trusts, and they have paid workers especially to turn out their propaganda. They have become very skilful at preaching to the working masses what they should and what they should not do. With their demagogy they obscure the final aim of the working masses, which is the overthrow of the capitalist system, and make them believe that what is achieved with a normal strike is everything. This big lie is in favour of the capitalist bourgeoisie. That is why the bourgeoisie is not worried by the words, the articles and the discourses of the salaried revisionist propagandists, or by the strikes which are held under the leadership of their parties.
The Marxist-Leninist parties never descend to these forms of the stale propaganda of the revisionist parties. They know that the uprising and the revolution do not come about automatically. They must be prepared. The best preparation is through actions. But together with action, the theory which guides these actions is necessary. Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin teach us that without revolutionary action there is no revolutionary theory and without revolutionary theory there is no revolutionary action.

The work of the Marxist-Leninist party among the masses, uniting them around concrete political objectives, is an important task, because the revolution is not carried out by the working class alone, and even less so by its vanguard, the communist party alone. To carry out the revolution, the working class enters into alliance with other social forces, with progressive parties and factions of them, with progressive individuals, with whom it has interests in common on various problems and at different periods. Broad popular fronts with definite political programs are created with these forces. The party of the working class is not dissolved in these fronts, but always retains its organizational and political independence.

The question of alliances is a very acute and delicate problem. The Marxist-Leninist party must follow, study and define the tendencies, demands and contradictions which exist within the movement of the masses, in other words, the dialectics of the class struggle. On this basis the communists choose the right road to achieve various alliances. The maturity of the Marxist-Leninist party is expressed in its sound analysis and assessment of the situation which exists in the ranks of the masses and amongst different political groupings for the creation of necessary alliances. Only with a correct policy and an accurate foresight of how events will develop will the party of the working class be able to maintain its individuality in these alliances and increase its influence among the masses which it wants to rally and throw into revolution.

The creation of different alliances and, on this basis, the creation of broad popular fronts becomes an imperative duty, especially in the conditions when in many countries the danger of fascism is great and immediate, and the pressure and interference of the superpowers against all countries have increased. The fact that the national issue is assuming a special and steadily increasing importance in the revolutionary process today favours the achievement of this unity and these alliances.

This is linked with the intensification of the expansionist, hegemonic and aggressive policy of the imperialist powers. But the occupation of a country is not always done through military aggression. This enslavement, colonization, oppression and exploitation is also carried out in other <<modern>>, economic, cultural, political forms, which disguise savage imperialist domination.

That is why, when we say that the revolution is on the order of the day, this is also linked with the national issue, that is, with the occupation of one or some countries by the big capitalist and imperialist powers, either through direct military occupation or through indirect means and ways. In this sense, countries like Italy, Spain, Portugal, etc., although they are not occupied by the armed force of foreign armies, still suffer from foreign domination and interference.

The Eurocommunists can prattle as much as they like that their countries are free and sovereign, but in fact the Spanish, Italian, Portuguese and other peoples are oppressed and exploited. A bourgeois democracy exists in each of their countries, but the state there is bound hand and foot to foreign capital. The people, the working class do not enjoy genuine democracy and sovereignty, they are not free because everything is controlled by foreign capital.

During the Second World War, at the time when many countries were occupied by the German nazi or the Italian fascist armies, the quislings and collaborators united with the occupiers. Today, too, other quislings and collaborators, with different disguises and slogans, are in power and are bound to the new modern occupiers, the neocolonialists and their capital, with a thousand threads.

Very important for the preparation and carrying out of the revolution is the revolutionary work in the ranks of the bourgeois armies, which Lenin called

<<...the chief instruments of state power>>.

Lenin has provided the answer to many theoretical and practical problems linked with the necessity of revolutionary work in the ranks of the bourgeois armies and has defined the ways to attack, demoralize and disintegrate them. This question assumes special importance in the present conditions when the revolutionary situations in many countries are maturing rapidly. In general, the bourgeois army is the bourgeoisie armed to the teeth which confronts the proletariat and the popular masses.

The large armies of the capitalist countries create the impression that in such circumstances the revolution and the smashing of the state of oppression and exploitation become impossible. These views are spread and propagated especially by the Eurocommunists who do not attack the bourgeois army even with feathers. In regard to the number of troops in the army, this does not make any great difference to the revolution, while it creates worrying problems for the bourgeoisie. The extension of the army with many elements from various strata of the population creates more favourable conditions for demoralizing the army and turning it against the bourgeoisie.

In this way the revolution encounters two major problems. On the one hand, it must win over the working class and the working masses, without whom it is impossible to go into the revolution and, on the other hand, it must demoralize and disintegrate the bourgeois army which suppresses the revolution. In the trade-unions, the bourgeoisie uses the worker aristocracy for its own ends, while in the army it uses the caste of officers who carry out the same functions there as the trade-union bosses in the trade-unions.

The principles, laws and organizational structures in the bourgeois armies are such that they allow the bourgeoisie to exert control over the army, to maintain and train it as a means to suppress the revolution and the peoples. This shows the markedly reactionary class character of the bourgeois army and exposes the efforts to present it as <<above classes>>, <<national>>, <<outside politics>> <<respecting democracy>>, etc. Regardless of the , <<democratic traditions>>, the bourgeois army in any country is anti-popular and destined to defend the rule of the bourgeoisie and to carry out its expansionist aims.

However, the bourgeois army does not constitute a compact mass; there is not and cannot be unity in it. The antagonistic contradictions between the bourgeoisie, either capitalist or revisionist, on the one hand, and the proletariat and the masses, on the other, are reflected in the armies of these countries, too. The masses of soldiers, made up of the sons of workers and peasants, have interests diametrically opposed to the character of the army and the mission the bourgeoisie charges it with. Like the workers and other working people, the masses of soldiers are interested in the overthrow of the exploiting order, and that is why the bourgeoisie shuts it up in barracks and isolates it from the people, turning the army, as Lenin pointed out, into a <<prison>> for millions of soldiers.

This is the basis of the conflict which grows constantly deeper between the soldiers, who are the sons of the people, and the commanding body, the officers, who are the executive hand of the capitalist bourgeoisie, trained and educated to serve the interests of capital zealously. The work of the Marxist-Leninist party aims to make the soldier revolt against the officer, so that he does not carry out the orders, does not observe the discipline and the laws of the bourgeoisie, and sabotages the weapons in order to prevent them from being used against the people. Lenin said,

<<Not a single great revolution has ever taken place, or ever can take place, without the 'disorganization' of the army. For the army is the most ossified instrument for supporting the old regime, the most hardened bulwark of bourgeois discipline, buttressing up the rule of capital, and preserving and fostering among the working people the servile spirit of submission and subjection to capital.>>


Of course, the methods, forms and tactics to bring about the disorganization and disintegration of the army are many and varied, depending on the concrete conditions. The conditions are not identical in every country today and, therefore, the tactics of the Marxist-Leninists differ from one country to another. There are countries where fascist dictatorships and terror have been established
openly, and there are others where those few legal forms of bourgeois democracy can and must be utilized. In general, however, personal work with individual soldiers, both inside and outside the barracks, the stern struggle of the workers, the continual strikes, demonstrations, rallies, protests, etc., play an important role, both for the mobilization of the masses and for the disorganization of the bourgeois army.

<<...all these, so to say, test battles and clashes,>> pointed out Lenin, <<are inexorably drawing the army into political life and consequently into the sphere of revolutionary problems. Experience in the struggle enlightens more rapidly and more profoundly than years of propaganda under other circumstances.>>


Work must be done with the soldier, the son of the people, before he joins the army, and later, when he is carrying out his military service, which is the most decisive phase, and finally, when he completes his service and becomes a reservist. Work with the lower ranking officers, in order to separate them from the caste of senior officers and to convince them not to raise their hand against the people, must not be excluded, either.

Of course, political work in the army is as dangerous as it is important. Whereas the worst that can happen to you for political activity and propaganda in the ranks of the trade-unions is to be dismissed from your job, in the army where political work and propaganda are sternly prohibited, the punishment could be to face the firing squad. However, revolutionary communists have never lacked the spirit of sacrifice, or the conviction that without working in this sector the way to the revolution cannot be opened.

At the same time, the disorganization of the bourgeois army is a component part of the strategy aimed to ruin the war-mongering plans of the capitalist bourgeoisie, to sabotage its predatory wars and transform them into revolutionary wars. This is how the bolsheviks acted with the czarist army in the time of Lenin. The overthrow of Kerensky and his government which wanted to continue the imperialist war, Lenin's policy on peace, on the agrarian question and the distribution of the land among the poor peasants, etc., brought the soldiers over to the side of the revolution, while the officer caste remained with the White Guards, on the side of the counter-revolution. The Leninist strategy and tactics of struggle against the bourgeois army make it easier to encourage and mobilize the working class and the peoples for the revolution, for the anti-imperialist and the national liberation wars.

The world revolutionary movement has rich experience of work in the ranks of the bourgeois armies. In the czarist army in Russia in 1905, revolutionary committees of soldiers were created under the leadership of the Russian Social-democratic Party, of which Lenin was the leader.

In the February Revolution of 1917, and especially in the October Revolution, party cells and soviets of soldiers and sailors were formed in the detachments and units of the czarist armed forces, and these played the decisive role in taking the bulk of the bourgeois army over to the side of the revolution.

During the Anti-fascist National Liberation War in Albania, the Communist Party of Albania worked in deep illegality within the ranks of the army, and even in the gendarmerie, police, etc., in order to paralyse those weapons and to bring about disorder in and desertions from their ranks. This compelled the enemy to distrust, and in some cases, to intern whole detachments of the old Albanian army which was in the service of the occupier. At the same time, many militarymen from the old army went over to our National Liberation Army.

Let us take another more recent example, that of the army of the Shah of Iran and his caste of officers, which notwithstanding that it was armed to the teeth with the most sophisticated weapons, was incapable of operating effectively and suppressing the anti-imperialist and anti-monarchist uprising of the Iranian people.
The Pahlavi regime was one of the most barbarous, blood-thirsty and corrupt regimes of exploiters of the modern world. The savage Pahlavi dictatorship was based on the feudal lords and the very wealthy stratum which the regime created, on the reactionary army and its officer caste, and on SAVAK which, as the Shah himself described it, was a "state within the state". The Pahlavis who ruled through terror were partners with and sold out to the American and British imperialists, the most heavily armed gendarmes of the Persian Gulf under the orders of the American CIA. Nevertheless, the great terror, the army, SAVAK and all the rest were unable to quell the revolt of the Iranian people, which in different forms and intensities continued until it was raised to quality and overcame the stage of fearing violence. In this process the army and SAVAK, the shields of the blood-thirsty regime of the Shah, disintegrated, part of the army went over to the side of the people who seized the weapons and are holding on to them. This is an experience which proves that the army and the police, however numerous and well armed, cannot stop the revolution when the people rise in a united bloc, when careful work is done for the demoralization and disintegration of the bourgeois army and police.

It has now become fashionable in the capitalist countries for all sorts of people to speak about the "revolution" and to carry out allegedly revolutionary activities. The so-called "leftists" scream for "revolutionary measures" but then immediately set a limit to them. They "explain" that revolutionary measures should not be undertaken everywhere and in every field, but only some "alterations" should be made. Hence, an illusion should be created to deceive the masses that are seeking radical revolutionary changes.

Like the bourgeoisie, the "leftists" see the army as an "impregnable fortress" and never even raise the task of disintegrating, demoralizing and destroying it. The Marxist-Leninist parties, however, without neglecting the other directions of the struggle, regard the struggle for the unity of the working class and the disintegration of the bourgeois army as two directions of decisive importance for the triumph of the revolution.

"Of course," said Lenin "unless the revolution assumes a mass character and affects the troops, there can be no question of serious struggle."


The purpose of the work of the Marxist-Leninists in the ranks of the bourgeois and revisionist armies is to draw the military men into conscious revolutionary activity, and not simply to organize coups d'état. Marxist-Leninists have never regarded the overthrow of the capitalist order as a question of putsches and military plots, but as a result of the conscious activity and active participation of the masses in the revolution.

Coup d'état, plots organized by the officer caste have become fashionable in many countries of the world. By these means the monopoly groups bring down one government and replace it with another in their service. By means of military coups, the American imperialists and Soviet socialimperialists have placed reactionary cliques in their service at the head of the state in many countries of the world. In these cases, the mass of soldiers has frequently blindly served the interests of the local ruling classes and imperialist superpowers.

In such instances, the genuine revolutionaries make things clear to the masses of soldiers, so that they will not be deceived by the reactionary propaganda which presents the military coups as actions "in the interests of the nation", "in the interests of the people and defence of the nation", etc. They make clear also that anarchism, terrorism and gangsterism, which are assuming extensive proportions in the capitalist and revisionist countries, have nothing in common with the revolution, either. Daily facts prove that the groups of anarchists, terrorists, and gangsters are used by reaction as an excuse and a weapon for the preparation and the establishment of the fascist dictatorship, to intimidate the petty bourgeoisie and to make it a tool and a hotbed of fascism, to put pressure on the working class and keep it bound with the chains of capitalism under the threat that it will lose those few crumbs which the bourgeoisie "has given it".
All these currents and groups are disguised behind alluring names, such as <<proletarian>>, <<communists>>, <<red brigades>> and other labels which sow total confusion. The activities of these groups have no links with Marxism-Leninism, with communism. In its propaganda, the bourgeoisie accuses the communists, those who are genuinely for revolution and socialism, for the overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie, of being terrorists, anarchists and gangsters, and tries to build up opinion against the genuine revolutionary organizations of the proletariat and its vanguard. This is one of the main purposes for which it incites terrorism and gangsterism, which in such countries as Italy is assuming major proportions. The Marxist-Leninists always take account of these manoeuvres and tricks of the bourgeoisie and struggle to expose and defeat them. They reject the attacks, accusations and slanders of the bourgeoisie and its lackeys who call the illegal activity of the Marxist-Leninist parties terrorism and gangsterism.

Whether the Marxist-Leninist party is illegal, either partly or completely, depends on the concrete conditions of a particular country. Irrespective of these conditions, however, the organization of illegal work is the greatest guarantee that the victory will be secured. Without this organization the great striking force of the bourgeois dictatorship wrecks havoc and gravely damages the proletariat and its vanguard at the moments the dictatorship finds it suitable to do so. A party of the working class, which does not foresee moments of fierce attacks and clashes with the forces of the capitalist bourgeoisie, is not a genuine revolutionary party. For such a party, the theoretical principle that power cannot be seized from the bourgeoisie except by violence, by fighting and making sacrifices, remains an empty phrase, a mere slogan. Moments of fierce struggle are inevitable and in these moments of fierce struggle legal propaganda bases alone are not sufficient. At these moments, the communist party must have its fighting bases, must have created its striking forces, must have its rear secure and equip them with the necessary political, ideological and material means. The coming action will require sacrifices, there will be people who are hurt, who are killed or imprisoned. Therefore, work must be done to build up around the party a great mass of dedicated people, resolute revolutionaries who listen to the party and will hurl themselves into revolutionary action together with it.

Meanwhile, the Marxist-Leninist parties know they must also take advantage of bourgeois <<democracy>> and the possibilities which legal work and struggle provide for the preparation of the revolution. Even when they operate legally, they make efforts to ensure that their activities serve to fulfil the requirements and tasks of the revolution, the ideological, organizational and military preparation of the party and the masses for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, regardless of what the bourgeois laws permit or do not permit.

On all occasions and under all conditions, the genuine revolutionary parties know that they must combine the organization and development of illegal and legal struggle correctly, using only those forms of work and revolutionary tactics which do not obscure their strategy with illusions about bourgeois legality and democracy.

<<In all countries, even in those that are freest, most 'legal', and most 'peaceful' in the sense that the class struggle is least acute there,>> said Lenin, <<it is now absolutely indispensable for every Communist Party to systematically combine legal and illegal work, legal and illegal organizations.>>


At first sight, it seems that the working class in Western Europe is bound tight in the chains which social-democracy and the revisionists called Eurocommunists have rivetted on to it, and that the workers' movement is strongly under the influence of bourgeois and revisionist ideology. However, this appearance does not reflect the reality. Moreover, it does not indicate the tendencies of social development, the processes which are seething in the ranks of the working masses, the historical necessity and imperative demands of the time.
The bourgeoisie, the revisionists and all the other opportunists are trying to restrain the revolution and to extinguish the communist ideal. At given stages and in special historical conditions, they even manage to bemuse and confuse the proletariat and working masses, and to obscure the prospects of the socialist future to some degree. But this is a temporary and passing phenomenon. The revolution and socialism as a theory and practical activity cannot be imposed on the masses from outside by isolated individuals or groups of people. The revolution and socialism represent the only key which the proletariat and the masses need to solve the irreconcilable contradictions of capitalist society, to put an end to their exploitation and oppression and establish genuine freedom and equality. As long as there is oppression and exploitation, as long as capitalism exists, the thinking and struggle of the masses will always be directed towards the revolution and socialism.

The Eurocommunists have rejected the banner of Marxism-Leninism, the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. They preach class peace and sing hymns to bourgeois democracy. However, the ills of bourgeois society are not cured and its contradictions are not resolved with sermons and hymns. History has already proved this and its lessons cannot be set aside. The proletariat, the oppressed and the exploited are moving naturally towards the revolution, towards the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism. Just as naturally they are seeking the road which leads to the fulfilment of these historical aspirations, the road which the immortal theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin shows them. It is the duty of the new Marxist-Leninist communist parties to take over the leadership of class battles which the Eurocommunists have abandoned, to provide the proletariat and the masses with that militant fighting vanguard which they are seeking and accept as their leadership.

The situation is not easy, but let us recall the optimistic words of Stalin, that <<there is no fortress which the communists cannot take>>. This revolutionary optimism stems from the objective laws of the development of society. Capitalism is an order condemned by history to liquidation. Nothing, neither the frenzied resistance of the bourgeoisie nor the treachery of modern revisionists can save it from its inevitable doom. The future belongs to socialism and communism.
I. GEOGRAPHICAL POSITION, SIZE, BORDERS, NATURAL RESOURCES

The People's Socialist Republic of Albania extends over an area of 28,748 square kilometres. It lies on the western side of the Balkan Peninsula and along the coastline of the Adriatic and Ionian Seas. To the north and north-east, Albania is bounded by Yugoslavia and to the south and south-east by Greece.

RELIEF. Albania is mainly a mountainous country in which 76.6 per cent of its territory is mountains and hills over 200 metres above sea level, while the true plains under 200 metres above sea level occupy only 23.4 per cent. The average altitude of Albania (708 m.) is about twice that of Europe.

The mountains are not very high, about 2,000 metres, and their maximum height does not exceed 2,751 m. The hills lie mainly on the western part of the territory. Most of them are not higher than 400 m. The plains below 200 metres above sea level are also in the western part of Albania. However there are also some plains in the interior of the country, either in the form of valleys (the plains of Elbasan and Dropull), or in the form of depressions formed during the Quaternary period (the Korça plain).

On the basis of the geological features of the territory and the structure of the relief, we distinguish four well characterized natural regions, namely, the Alps of Albania, the Central Mountain Region, the Southern Mountain Region, and the Western Lowlands.

The Albanian Alps, situated north of the Drin River, present the smallest natural unit, but also the most rugged mountain region of the territory because of their tectonic and geological structure, as well as of the intensive action of external forces. Most of the Alps exceed 2,000 metres above sea level (the highest peak being that of Jezercë, 2,693 m.). There is a striking contrast between the mountains in the form of pyramids and the deep valleys between them which have the form of narrow gorges or deep hollows (The Theth gorge, the Boga hollow and so on). Now, motor-roads have been opened along the principal valleys leading to the heart of the Alps. From the point of view of nature, the Alps make up an important scenic region with typical alpine landscapes. Tall forests and alpine pasture lands make up the principal surface resources of this region.

The Central Mountain Region, which lies between the Drin valley in the north and the central Devoll and the lower Osum valleys in the south, is quite different. The forms of its relief are less rugged, not only because of the prevalence of magmatic formations, but also because of the less intensive action of external forces. Like the Alps, the mountains of the Central Mountain Region are also covered with dense forests; but because of some wider valleys, agriculture is of greater importance here than in the alpine region. The central Mountain Region is characterized by its great underground riches with minerals like chromium, iron, nickel and copper. The Central Mountain Region is rich in big lakes of tectonic origin (the Ohri and Prespa Lakes) and in smaller glacial
lakes (the Lura, Martanesh and other lakes) as well as in flowing waters which impart special beauty to this region.

The Southern Mountain Region, lying south of the Central Mountain Region, presents a more regular tectonic form, which is characterized by an alternation of limestone mountain ranges and valleys of chalky sandstones and shales. Most of the ranges rise 2,000 m. above sea level with some of the nearly 2,500 m. high (the Peping summit 2,495 metres), but there are also valleys below sea level (the Delvina basin). Towards the west, the ranges of mountains of the Southern Mountain Region run right down to the Ionian coast, along which lies the Albanian Riviera with its mild Mediterranean climate and landscape. The arable land is concentrated in valleys and on the hillsides, terracing of the land being more typical here than in the other parts of the territory.

In the western part of the territory, along the Adriatic sea coast, lie the Western Lowlands, the only true lowland plains. This area extends over a distance of 200 kilometres from north to south and eastward up to 50 kilometres into the interior of the country. It is characterized by little slope. For this reason the subsoil waters are near the surface and the rivers meander widely along shallow courses. Along the seaboard there are many lagoons, strips of sand and dunes. The sand strips form beaches which extend for kilometres along the coast where bathing centres, which are frequented more and more by the workers of the country, have been set up (Shëngjin, Durrës, Vlora and Saranda). Before Liberation, the lowlands of the Adriatic seaboard were covered with marshes and swamps, and little used for cultivation. But, with the establishment of the People's State Power and thanks to big land improvement projects and the straightening, deepening and stop-banking of river beds, the marsh lands have been drained and turned into arable land. On the other hand, the construction of an extensive network of irrigation canals and reservoirs, has solved the problem of irrigating the lands under cultivation.

The hills which rise in the middle of the Western Lowlands have been formed by relatively new folding of the earth's crust. They are covered with Mediterranean shrubs which are increasingly being replaced by vineyards and blocks of olive, citrus, and fruit trees systematized in terraces. As a result of the great work done during our People's State Power, the Western Lowland Region has become the granary of our country and the most important region for industrial plants like cotton, sunflower and tobacco. Cattle raising, too, has undergone great development. Not only the rich agricultural resources, but also the mineral ones like petroleum, bitumen, and coal, as well as the favourable geographical position and communications have favoured industrial activity here. For these reasons the Western Lowland Region is the most densely populated region in Albania.

THE CLIMATE. Albania is situated in the Mediterranean climatic belt. But because of the mountainous character of the territory and, especially, of its many divisions, the climate varies from region to region. It is warmest in the western part of the territory which is mainly under the influence of the warm air masses from the sea. Here the winter is moderate, the temperature rarely falling below zero. The summer is hot and, on some occasions, very hot (the maximum July temperature recorded is 44°C). Whereas, in the eastern part of Albania, which is mainly under the influence of the continental air masses, the winter is cold. Negative temperatures in winter are frequent and the minimum recorded is 26°C below zero. The summer is hot in the valleys where the maximum July temperature is up to 35°C. Rainfall in Albania is abundant (1,300 mm. a year) but irregularly distributed during the year. In general, summer is a dry season, receiving not more than 2.5 to 14 per cent of the annual rainfall, while 40 per cent falls in winter. Summer droughts are more pronounced towards the south-west. Most of the precipitation is in the forar of rain. As a rule, snow falls in the interior of the territory and the mountains. Because of the divisions of the territory, the geographical distribution of rain is unequal. Average annual precipitation is over 2,000 mm. in the Alps in Northern Albania and from 650 to 700 mm in the valleys of the interior. Typical of Albania is the small amount of cloud for most of the year, with the sky almost always clear.
HYDROGRAPHY. The territory of Albania is rich in rivers and streams. Because of the irregular rainfall and the very rugged relief, they are torrential with high erosive power and carry large amounts of alluvium. The rivers of Albania constitute an important source of hydroelectric power. During the years of our People's State Power they began to be utilized with the building of a number of hydro-electric power plants of different capacities. The most important in this regard is the Drin River, on which one hydropower plant with a capacity of 250,000 kw has already been built; a higher one, with a capacity of 450,000 kw will soon be completed, and it is planned to build several others in the future. The rivers of the country are of major importance also for irrigation purposes. At present, more than 50 per cent of the land under cultivation is irrigated mainly with the water from rivers and artificial reservoirs.

In the territory of Albania there are a number of lakes of varying origin: lakes of glacial origin in the highlands, of which there are many; lakes of Karst origin in the hills, and there are many of these, too; tectonic lakes (the Shkodra, Ohri and Prespa lakes), which are the largest in size and most important for fishing; lakes of the lagoon type in the lowlands, which are large reserves for fishing. The lakes of the highlands and hills are used for irrigation purposes. In addition to these natural lakes, during the years of our People's State Power, hundreds of artificial lakes have been built for irrigation and hydroelectric power purposes. Such artificial lakes are those of Ulza, Shkopet, Vau i Dejës, Gjonc, Thana and others. With the building of the Fierza hydropower plant, a new artificial lake will be formed, which will inundate the old town of Kukës, which has already been replaced with the new town of Kukës.

The seacoast of Albania is 470 kilometres long and, besides navigation and fishing, it is a valuable tourist attraction both for the many beaches that lie along it and for its natural beauty.

THE NATURAL RICHES OF THE LAND AND UNDERGROUND. The variable conditions of the relief, climate, hydrography and soil of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania account for the variety of its plant and animal life. Thousands of different kinds of plants grow in the territory, of which there are many; lakes of Karst origin in the hills, and there are many of these, too; tectonic lakes (the Shkodra, Ohri and Prespa lakes), which are the largest in size and most important for fishing; lakes of the lagoon type in the lowlands, which are large reserves for fishing. The lakes of the highlands and hills are used for irrigation purposes. In addition to these natural lakes, during the years of our People's State Power, hundreds of artificial lakes have been built for irrigation and hydroelectric power purposes.

Such artificial lakes are those of Ulza, Shkopet, Vau i Dejës, Gjonc, Thana and others. With the building of the Fierza hydropower plant, a new artificial lake will be formed, which will inundate the old town of Kukës, which has already been replaced with the new town of Kukës.

The seacoast of Albania is 470 kilometres long and, besides navigation and fishing, it is a valuable tourist attraction both for the many beaches that lie along it and for its natural beauty.

I. A BRIEF HISTORICAL SURVEY
The discoveries to date about the beginnings of human life on Albanian soil take us back to the end of the middle Paleolithic Age and the beginning of the Iron Age. Valuable materials of the prehistoric period have been found at Xara, Butrint and Finiq of the Saranda district, at the foot of Mt. Dajt in Tirana, at Gruemira and Dukagjin of the Shkodra district and at Nepravisht in the Gjirokastër district. Of special importance has been the discovery of the prehistoric centre of habitation at Maliq of Korça. This centre, which was discovered by workers while draining a swamp, is of special importance to the study of the prehistory of the Balkans.

The ancestors of the Albanians were the Illyrians. It is thought that during the Bronze Age and the beginning of the Iron Age, these people dwelt in Central Europe and, later, spread south to the western part of the Balkan Peninsula down to the Gulf of Arta (in Northern Greece).

The Illyrians had their own language, but so far no written text has been found. A number of words quoted by ancient authors as well as many names of persons, centres of habitation, rivers etc., are known. The first historical documents about the Illyrians begin from the 7th and 6th century before our era. On the basis of various documents, the Illyrians enjoyed a relatively well developed economy and, as a consequence, a high level of culture and social organization. The development of the meanß of production brought about class differentiation within the tribes and among them. This led also to the subjugation of some tribes by others. The most important communities are the Encheleans, Taulantes, Dardans, Liburnians, Ardians, and so on. These changes brought about the establishment of the relations of slave ownership in the society of the Illyrian groups. Cities like Shkodra, Amantia (in the Vlora district), Bylis (in the Mallakastra district), Finiq (in the Saranda district) etc. sprang up. From the beginning of the 4th century these cities minted their own coins. The federations of tribes later led to the setting up of Illyrian States. History speaks especially of the State of the Encheleans (south-eastern Albania), that of the Taulantes in the coastal region as well as that of the Molosses in the south down to the Gulf of Arta. These Illyrian States flourished during the 5th, 4th and 3rd centuries before our era. We find them in good relations with the neighbouring States as well as in relations of rivalry and war. At the head of these States stand out such political and military leaders as Bardylis, Pyrrhus and Glaukos.

During the 3rd century before our era there was also another outstanding Illyrian State, that of the Ardians, which extended from the Dalmatian coast to the south, subjugating the State of the Taulantes. Shkodra became the capital of this kingdom. The State of the Ardians reached the peak of its power during the reign of King Agron, who died in the year 221 before our era, leaving his wife, Teuta, at the head of his kingdom. The State of the Ardians, which had succeeded in conquering Greek colony cities along the Adriatic coast and on a number of islands of the Adriatic, also became a naval power of considerable strength. This was very disturbing to Rome which at that time was rising to the height of its power and intended to extend it to the eastern shores of the Adriatic and Ionian seas, and to conquer the Balkan Peninsula. This led to war in September of the year 229 before our era. The war between the Illyrians and the Romans continued up to 167 before our era when Rome succeeded in occupying the entire kingdom of the Ardians and those of Epirus and Macedonia. For the Illyrians a difficult period of five centuries of Roman bondage began. The invaders ransacked and plundered nearly 100 cities and made slaves of over 150,000 men and women.

During the first centuries of Roman occupation, Illyria became the starting point of the main highways which linked Rome with the eastern provinces of the Empire. The occupationists tried to romanize the Illyrian regions, but the natives resisted romanization, especially the mountain tribes which became the bastion of the valuable traditions and priceless values of the spiritual creativeness of the people. The historians make mention of these tribes. Ptolemy, the historian of Alexandria, speaks also of the tribe of Albanoi, between present-day Durrës and Dibra. The name Albania comes from this tribe (today the Albanians call their land Shqipëri).* *(The Albanians are one of the few peoples in Europe for whom there exist two national names, one for internal use and the other by which they are known to the outside world.

The Albanian calls himself Shqiptar, his country Shqipëri, but from ancient times the Albanians have been known in the world as Albanian, Albanese, etc., and the country as Albania, Albanie. This double appellation has its
own reasons. It is connected with certain circumstances of an ethnographic character which are specific to Albania and its historical past.

Proceeding from the facts, it will be observed, first that although in Albania itself Shqiptar is the national name of the people and Shqipëri the name of the country in the Albanian colonies in Italy and Greece this name is unknown. The Albanians in southern Italy and Sicily, descendants of people displaced from Albania mainly during the first wars with the Turks under the command of George Kastriot, alias, Scanderbeg during the 15th and 16th centuries, call themselves and, in general, the people of their old homeland, Arbërësh, and this country, Arbër, Arbërë. These names are in use to this day by the descendants of those Albanians, who migrated somewhat earlier, during the 14th and 15th centuries, from Albania to Greece, who also use “Arbëreshë” for Albanian, “Arbërishte” for the Albanian language.

In 441, the Illyrian province of Dardania (present-day southern Albania) was overrun by the Huns under the command of George Kastriot, alias, Scanderbeg during the 15th and 16th centuries, who devastated Illyria, Macedonia, and Greece. The conditions of its enslavement remained nearly as before, except that now the Illyrian provinces were no longer at the ventre but on the western periphery of the Empire. At first this new situation exerted a positive influence on the economic and social development of the country. The Illyrian ports became important centres of trade, which linked the East with the West. Dyrrachium (Durrës of our time) reached the height of its prosperity. The same is true of Finiq in the south and other cities. Later, the Illyrian provinces, which lay in the western part of the Byzantine Empire, were the first to have to face the furious onslaught of the so-called barbarian tribes, which came from the Appennine Peninsula or down the Dalmatian coast. In the year 395 the hordes of Visigoths headed by Alaric descended upon the Balkans plundering and devastating Illyria, Macedonia, and Greece.

In 395 a.d. the Roman Empire was split into two parts. Illyria remained in the Eastern Empire. The decisions of the Provincial Council in 1706, along with Arbinëni (Albania) and Arbëreshi (The Albanian) we also come across the language of the Shqiptarëve. In regard to the words Shqip, Shqiptar, Shqipëri, Shqipmi from which comes the verb shqipëroj (explain, make clear), their origin remains in doubt.

Frequent powerful uprisings, which shook Rome broke out in Illyria. The uprising headed by the Illyrian leader Bato, set in motion about 200,000 Illyrians, who liberated many districts and made preparations to cross over to the Appennine Peninsula. In spite of this, the Illyrians took an active part in the political and social life of Rome. Rome considered the Illyrian military contingents as very reliable detachments in defending the borders from the onslaught of the barbarians. Many Illyrian military leaders even succeeded in being chosen as Emperor. History records seven Emperors of Illyrian origin, the most prominent of whom was Diocletian. Of course, as the ruler of the Illyrian provinces for centuries on end, Rome also assimilated the physical and mental energies of the inhabitants of the occupied countries. Illyrian master craftsmen left their mark on the monumental works of Roman architecture, in arts and crafts, and many other fields.

In 395 a.d. the Roman Empire was split into two parts. Illyria remained in the Eastern Empire. The conditions of its enslavement remained nearly as before, except that now the Illyrian provinces were no longer at the ventre but on the western periphery of the Empire. At first this new situation exerted a positive influence on the economic and social development of the country. The Illyrian ports became important centres of trade, which linked the East with the West. Dyrrachium (Durrës of our time) reached the height of its prosperity. The same is true of Finiq in the south and other cities. Later, the Illyrian provinces, which lay in the western part of the Byzantine Empire, were the first to have to face the furious onslaught of the so-called barbarian tribes, which came from the Appennine Peninsula or down the Dalmatian coast. In the year 395 the hordes of Visigoths headed by Alaric descended upon the Balkans plundering and devastating Illyria, Macedonia, and Greece.

In 441, the Illyrian province of Dardania (present-day Kosova) was overrun by the Huns under
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Attila, while the Ostrogoths came in 461. Towards the end of the 5th century, groups of Turanian-Bulgarian barbarians attacked the Byzantine Empire from the East and reached the Adriatic. These onslaughts continued during the 6th century. Especially during the 7th century groups of Slavs came and settled in the various districts of Albania. They created many villages and began to till the soil. In spite of this, the bulk of the population, which was made up of natives, was concentrated mainly in the rugged mountain regions and engaged in raising livestock. This colonization by the Slavs created a danger of its own, that of assimilation. But the natives overcame this danger, too. Thus they entered the mediaeval period under a new name, that of «Albani, Albanese».

During the 10th and 11th centuries, the old slave-owning system was in complete collapse in Albania, and now elements characteristic of the period of feudalism appeared. But social development was hampered by the ceaseless wars, by the oppressive measures of the Empire, and by the influx of foreigners. In 1082 Albania was invaded by the Normans. Fourteen years later, the hordes of the First Crusade passed through it. During the 12th century, it was again overrun by two Norman onslaughts.

During the 12th century, the feudal system had crystalized onore clearly in the remote regions of Albania. A feudal nobility of purely Albanian origin was created in these zones. Gradually gaining strength, these nobles came into conflict with the power of the princes of the Byzantine and Slav occupations. The native feudal chiefs increasingly aimed at settling accounts with the foreigners and establishing an independent state. The opportunity presented itself towards the end of the 12th century when the Byzantine Empire was plunged into a deep political crisis. In 1190, the Albanian feudal chiefs set up an independent principality, the first Albanian feudal state we know of. This principality extended over Albania, with Kruja as its capital. However this principality could not be consolidated because of conflicts with the other feudal principalities and foreign powers at the time of the 4th Crusade and because of the growing strength of the Venetian Republic.

The 13th and 14th centuries are characterized by rapid economic development of the Albanian provinces. More land was brought under cultivation, the production of grain, olives, grapes and livestock products increased. Artisan production trade flourished in the cities. The situation also brought about pronounced class differentiation and increased the political and economic potential of the locai feudal chiefs. Thus a powerful stratum of Albanian nobility was created. From 1330 there were a few outstanding feudal families like the Topias, who ruled the region between the Mat and the Shkumbin rivers, the Muzákas, between the Shkumbin and Seman rivers, and the Dukagjinis in the north. In the 14th century, following the collapse of Stephan Dushan's Serbian Empire, there began to come into prominence other Albanian feudal families, which, having ousted the Serbian rulers, extended their power greatly. But these feudal families which allo attaCked the coimercial cities, came into conflict with one another. This created a grave situation of feudal anarchy from which the strongest gained. Some of these feudal dynasties began to rise to the rank of principalities, like the Topias, Balshas, Muzakas, Shpatas in the south, and others.

Towards the end of the 14th century, a new invasion threatened Albania, that of the Ottoman Turks. During the 80's of the 14th century, the Tunkish forces entered the Albanian provinces on two occasions. In 1389 a coalition was formed in the Balkans for delence against the Turks. The decisive battle was fought on the plain of Kosova and was won by the Turks. In the battle they lost their Sultan Murat I. The end of the 14th and the beginning of the 15th centuries mark the invasion of the Albanian districts, partly by the Turks and partly by the Venetians. In the course of the conflicts among the big feudal chiefs during the 14th century, at the beginning of the 15th century three new dynasties appeared: the Dukagjinis in the north, the Kastriots in Central Albania and the Aranitis in the south. These dynasties were to play an important role in the major political and military events of the 15th century, during the legendary wars for freedom of the Albanian people led by George Kastriot, whom the Turks called Scanderbeg. The savage Ottoman rule, during the first part of the 15th century, sparked off powerfw revolts and uprisings in various districts of Albania. The most powerful of these risings was that of the Aranitis, which broke out in 1432.
For two years the Albanians of the southern provinces scored brilliant victories which echoed throughout the whole country, as well as in Europe. But these uprisings were only the forerunners of that great 25-year long fight which the Albanians waged under the leadership of Scanderbeg against the furious assault of the Ottoman forces led by two of the most powerful Sultans, Sultan Murat II and Mohamed II - the Victorious.

George was the youngest son of Gjon Kastriot. He is believed to have been born in 1405. He was still very young when, together with his brothers, he was taken hostage by the Sultan. He was brought up at the Sultan's court and attended a military school there. He stood out for his keenness of mind, his powerful physique and his military talent. He won fame and glory in various battles. But he never forgot his own country and his people. He found the opportunity in November 1443, at the time of the defeat of the Turkish army in the battles against the Hungarian forces, when he and a handful of loyal supporters came to Kruja and seized power. On November 28, 1443, the flag of the Kastriots, a red flag with a black, double-headed eagle in the middle, which later became the National Flag of Albania, was raised over Kruja castle.

The most urgent problem on the order of the day for Scanderbeg and the country as a whole was to unite the forces and prepare them to face the fury of the Sultans, which would not be long in bursting upon them. This was the purpose of the Council of Lezha, which was opened on March 2, 1444 in the city of Lezha (ancient Lissus).

Three months later the Turkish armies were at the gates of Albania. The first battle between the Albanian forces under Scanderbeg and those of the Turks under Ali Pasha took place on the Torvoll Plain, east of the present town of Librazhd. The Turkish forces numbered 25,000 men, while Scanderbeg had about 10,000 fighters. The Albanians scored a brilliant victory. This strengthened the unity of the country and aroused confidence among the people. It had loud repercussions in Europe, too, which was feverishly preparing to face the Turkish menace.

Two further Turkish expeditions were dispatched during 1445 and 1446. While the forces of the «Albanian League» were busy defending themselves, from the Ottomans, the Republic of St. Mark was hatching up intrigues behind their backs. The Venetians were afraid that the strengthening of Scanderbeg's position might endanger their colonies, the commercial cities on the coast. This circumstance led to open war between Venice and Scanderbeg's forces, which continued throughout the years 1447 and 1448.

Meanwhile, a huge Ottoman army of 100,000 men led by Sultan Murat II himself, had set out for Albania in the spring of 1448. The situation was becoming very serious for the Albanians, who would soon be between two fires. With lightning speed, Scanderbeg undertook a vigorous operation in the Shkodra region and smashed the Venetian forces on July 23. After a series of fierce battles with the Albanian forces, Sultan Murat Wilid to achieve any success and returned to his capital to make preparations against the renewed offensive which Hunyadi of Hungary was about to launch against him. The Turks smashed the Hungarian forces in October 1448. The Albanians now remained alone to face the Ottoman hurricane. With a new army of about 100,000 men, Sultan Murat now returned to Albania. Scanderbeg was able to mobilize only about 18,000 fighters. After fierce fighting, in May the Ottoman troops laid siege to Kruja, which was defended by a small garrison of Albanians. Scanderbeg, with most of his forces, remained outside the siege, launching surprise attacks on the invaders from the rear. After trying in vain all through the summer to take Kruja castle, the Turkish forces were obliged to withdraw after losing one-fifth of their forces in battle.

Simultaneously with his military activities, Scanderbeg had also to develop a very clever diplomacy in order to create alliances with those foreign forces, especially in Italy, who were interested in Scanderbeg's victory. Good relations were created, especially, with the kingdom of Naples, a rival of the Republic of St. Mark.

On the other hand, it was also necessary to overcome the resistance of certain local feudal chiefs who feared the growth of Scanderbeg's authority and tried to prevent the establishment of his centralized power. Some of these feudal chiefs went so far as to betray and place themselves in the
service of the enemy. Scanderbeg was able to overcome this threat and managed to form a centralized Albanian state.

The 12 years of continued wars and the complicated internal and external situation had created a very grave situation for Albania. Precisely at this moment, Sultan Mohamed II, who four years before had conquered Constantinople, the capital of the Byzantine Empire, decided to put an end to the Albanian resistance. Towards the end of spring in 1457, a Turkish army, 80,000 strong, under the command of the famous General, Isa Bey Evrenos, set out for Albania. The Turkish army entered Albania, sowing terror and devastation. Scanderbeg had to resort to a very clever tactic. After short battles he left the impression on the enemy that he had been defeated. And precisely when the unsuspecting enemy were celebrating their "victory", he launched a surprise attack on them on the plain of Albulena, completely destroying the invading forces. This brilliant victory had great repercussions, not only from the military, but also from the political point of view. After undertaking a number of other futile expeditions, Sultan Mohamed II proposed an armistice for three years. Scanderbeg accepted this offer with a view to gaining time to consolidate the economy of the country and reorganize his forces. He took the opportunity to go to the aid of his ally, the King of Naples, who was in a critical situation (1461).

But on the urging of Venice, the Sultan broke the terms of the armistice in 1462. Scanderbeg hastened back home and smashed three new Turkish expeditions. In 1463, Sultan was obliged to seek a 10 year peace agreement with Scanderbeg. Scanderbeg accepted it. However, the peace did not last long. At the end of 1463 the fighting began again. The years 1464 to 1465 were years of fierce battles. The Ottoman expeditions failed, one after the other. In June 1466, on the eve of the harvest, Sultan MOhamed II himself came to Albania at the head of an army of 150,000 men. Kruja was besieged again. The situation became very critical. Scanderbeg sought aid in weapons and provisions from Venice, Naples, and Rame. He, himself, went to Italy. They paid him great homage, but gave him no aid. Nevertheless, after fierce battles under the walls of Kruja, the Albanians forced the Turks to abandon the field of battle in April 1467. But in July, Sultan Mohamed II with all his army appeared in Albania again, and after bloody battles, once more succeeded in laying siege to Kruja. He suffered very heavy losses, and three weeks later lifted the siege and departed from Albania.

In spite of the victories scored in the field of battle, the situation in Albania had become very alarming. There were shortages of arms, foodstuffs, and men. Scanderbeg strove to renew the Albanian League of the year 1444. He called the Albanian princes together in Lezha in January 1468, but just at this time he fell gravely ill and died in Lezha on January 17, 1468. For Albania, Scanderbeg's death was a very great loss. For a quarter of a century, Albania had managed to withstand the waves of the Ottoman invasion. However, even after Scanderbeg's death for a few more decades, it managed to continue the armed struggle. Sultan Mohamed II had to come back again to Albania in person, in 1478. Kruja fell in July of that year. The Sultan turned on Shkodra, which resisted until January 1479. Partial, but fierce uprisings, continued up to 1505.

The 25 years war of the Albanians under Scanderbeg became a source of inspiration for the ensuing generations through the centuries. The leader of these battles, Scanderbeg, became the symbol of the resistance of the Albanian people. Writers and artists of various genres have produced hundreds of artistic works about him, and are still doing so to this day.

During these periods, tens of thousands of Albanians with their families were driven abroad to foreign lands, mainly to Southern Italy. To this day they preserve Albanian ethnic features. The invaders established their savage military rule in Albania, although some regions, like Himara, Dukagjin, the Shkodra highlands, Dibra, etc., did not submit to Ottoman law. During the 16th and 17th centuries, these regions became centres of resistance against the invaders. In June 1594, basing their hopes on the coalition of the European countries against Turkey, the chiefs of the Albanian highlands assembled in the Mat region and sought supplies of weapons from the coalition. But no aid was given. Again in 1601 a similar convention was organized, which sent a delegation to
Europe, but it was unable to secure any aid. The invaders organized a number of operations during the years 1610, 1612 and 1615.

The 17th century saw the positions of the military authorities in the outlying districts of the Empire become greatly weakened, while those of the local chiefs became stronger and stronger. The cities, too, marked good progress, especially in the extension of artisan production and trade. Shkodra, Prizren, Berat, Gjirokastra, Elbasan and Voskopoja are mentioned at this period; some elementary schools also began to be opened. But the development of education was hampered by religion, which split the people into three groups: Moslems, Orthodox and Catholics, and the school teachers were trained either in the Islamic oriental culture, or in Greek or Latin culture. In the city of Voskopoja there was even a secondary school called the “New Academy”. In 1720 a printery which published books was opened in that city.

Although the 17th and 18th centuries marked some degree of economic and cultural progress in the country, the development of national culture was impeded in every way by the foreign rulers and religious obscurantism. According to documents discovered, the Albanian language began to be written from the 16th century. In 1555 Gjon Buzuku published a religious book, which is considered the first book written in Albanian. Other patriots, like Pjetër Budi (1566-1622), Frang Bardhi (1606-1645), Pjetër Bogdani (1625-1684) also wrote in Albanian. Many other Albanians displayed their talents in painting, architecture, and other fields. The people preserved in their bosom a priceless treasury of folklore, which became their spiritual nourishment for centuries on end, and protected them from assimilation by foreigners.

From the end of the 18th century, the central power of the Turkish Empire had become weaker. Separatist trends had gained strength among the big feudal chiefs who had greatly enriched and strengthened themselves during conflicts with their weaker neighbours. In the Albanian regions two great feudal duchies had emerged: that of the Bushatllis of Shkodra in the north and that of Ali Pasha Tepelena gin the south. A series of very prominent figures headed the Shkodra duchy, but the most famous of them was Kara Mahmud Pasha Bushatlli, who ruled from 1775 to 1796. Having conquered his feudal rivals, he began to openly oppose the authority of the Sublime Porte. The Sultan sent repeated expeditions to subjugate the Shkodra duchy but failed to achieve his end. The Turkish armies were defeated time and again. Kara Mahmud Pasha extended his domain from Montenegro to Central Albania and Kosova. Within his duchy the economy began to develop and trade and social life flourished. The same phenomenon as in northern Albania took place also in southern Albania. By means of guile and his daring actions, Ali Tepelena, the son of a minor feudal chieftain, left fatherless when still a child, exploited situations and managed to win such favour with the Sultan that he was entrusted with important posts. But when he felt strong enough, he turned his back on the Sultan. He began to act entirely independently, not only in internal affairs, but also in foreign policy. His duchy with Yannina as its centre, extended from Vlora and Berat to Qamëria and Thessaly. Yannina became a centre with a lively international diplomatic movement, while the Pasha became a romantic figure. Thus in 1812, the whole territory of Albania was included in the two above mentioned duchies.

Having overcome the difficulties of the wars, which burst out against it from the beginning of the 19th century, the Sublime Porte took energetic measures against the Bushatllis and Ali Pasha Tepelena. In 1820, the Turks laid siege to Yannina. After a long resistance, which continued for nearly two years, the Turks managed to kill Ali Pasha in January 1822, thus putting an end to the duchy of Yannina. After this, the Sultan turned his attention to the Bushatllis, and in 1831 reestablished the central authority in the duchy of Shkodra, too.

In order to strengthen its central authority, the Sublime Porte proclaimed the reforms known as the «Tanzimat». Among the Albanians these reforms aroused all-round opposition. In the 40's of the 19th century, whole regions rose in arms, both in the south and in the north. But the objectives of these uprisings were limited. They were directed only against the reforms, against taxes and military service. In the most progressive Albanian circles inside the country and abroad, it became clear that these limited movements had no powerful political backing nor any clear perspectives. It
was necessary to strive to give the movement a national basis according to the most advanced ideas of the time in Europe, a national basis and an objective of separation from Turkey. Thus began the first efforts for the Albanian national movement with its earliest representatives, Naum Veqilharxhi (1797-1859) and later, Jeronim de Rada, who crystallized in their writings the idea of the Albanian national movement and the necessity of spreading education in the Albanian language. Veqilharxhi even worked out a special alphabet for this purpose.

But the Albanian national movement underwent rapid development especially during the second half of the 19th century. The struggle of the Albanians against the Turkish reforms was followed with interest both in the Balkans, as well as by the European Powers. The latter, both before and after the Russo-Turkish Crimean war, were for keeping Turkey as a counterbalance to the Russian intentions in southeastern Europe and the Mediterranean. However no one thought about the demand of the Albanians, and neither the Big Powers nor the neighbouring countries supported the struggle of the Albanians for the creation of an Albania detached from Turkey. Indeed the intention of the ruling circles of the neighbouring countries was to partition Albania among themselves. In 1861, secret negotiations were held between Serbia and Greece aiming at dividing the Albanian territory between them as soon as the Turks withdrew.

But among the Albanians, national consciousness had been awakened. The best representatives of the country fully understood the danger threatening the nation and thus began that great movement, which is known in the history of Albania as the Albanian National Renaissance. The ultimate objective of this movement was to ensure the independence of Albania, to set up an Albanian state which would develop as the other states in Europe. The movement developed in three main directions: first, struggle to preserve the territorial integrity of Albania against the chauvinist aims of the neighbouring states and the deals between the Big Powers; second, struggle for separation from Turkey, and third, towards the national awakening, the spread of education and culture in the Albanian language and on the basis of ancient Albanian traditions. Of special importance at this stage of history was the «Albanian League» the 100th anniversary of which will be commemorated in 1978. It was set up in Prizren and was an Albanian patriotic organization, which arose as an historical necessity to direct and organize the movement. This organization emerged on the initiative of a secret committee formed in Constantinople in 1878, and made up of outstanding patriots like Abdyl Frashëri, Pashko Vasa, Sami Frashëri, Jani Vreto, and others. This was the time when, after the Balkan crisis of the years 1875 and 1876, Turkey was obliged to recognize the establishment of autonomous provinces in the Balkans. Later, after Russia went to war with Turkey in 1877, the vanquished Turks were compelled to revise the clauses of the St. Stephano on March 3, 1878. In this treaty Albania was not even mentioned. Indeed many Albanian provinces were annexed to Serbia, Montenegro and Bulgaria. This aroused a wave of irrepressible indignation in the Albanian provinces. In order to revise the clauses of the St. Stephano Treaty, the European Great Powers decided to call the Congress of Berlin in June 1878. The Albanian Committee in Istanbul saw the urgency of summoning an Albanian assembly as widely representative as possible in order to raise before the world the rights of the Albanian nation. This convention met in the city of Prizren (now Yugoslavia), only three days prior to the opening of the Berlin Congress. The convention created the *League of Prizren- with branches in all the provinces of Albania. It immediately dispatched a memorandum to the Congress of Berlin. But the Albanian claims were not taken into account. Then it became necessary to fight, arme in hand, to defend every inch of Albanian territory. Worthy of mention were the battles fought in defence of the northern provinces of Plava and Gucija, Hot, Gruda, Ulqin, etc. On the other front of the struggle for the autonomy of Albania, the patriots encountered innumerable difficulties and the rabid opposition of the Sublime Porte. This struggle, like that to prevent the dismemberment of Albania, was combined with the struggle to spread education, knowledge and the national consciousness. Such distinguished personahties as the great poet Naim Frashëri (1846-1900), Sami Frashëri (1850-1904), Andon Zako Qajupi (1856-1930) became the ideologists and fiery promoters of patriotic sentiments, standard bearers of the unity of the Albanian nation without distinction as to religion or social standing.
three decades, this fierce struggle continued in the three directions mentioned. The movement gained momentum. The fight for territorial integrity was waged in all fields, with arms and in the political and diplomatic fields. Books in the Albanian language were published abroad in Rumania, Bulgaria, Egypt, Italy, and elsewhere; newspapers and magazines dealing with Albanian problems began to be published and distributed illegally. The first Albanian school was opened at Korka on March 7, 1887. Towards the end of the 19th century, the Albanian question was battled back and forth through the diplomatic chancellories of the Great Powers. In April 1900, the Albanian patriot, Ismail Qemal, who up to that time had carried out important functions in the Ottoman administration and was known throughout the Empire as a progressive politician and an outstanding diplomat, left Turkey in a demonstrative manner. In exile he carried out all-round activity to invigorate and direct the national movement. During the early years of the 19th century, the Balkans were seething with passions and conflicts among states wanting to grab territories from one another. The Albanian provinces in particular, became the prey of chauvinistic activities of neighbours, who devastated whole regions by activities of banditry and killed Albanian patriots. Faced with such a situation, the Albanian national movement had to step up its armed actions against the forces of occupation as well as against the chauvinistic bands of the neighbours. New patriotic figures began to appear. A group of young patriots with revolutionary tendencies formed a secret committee in Manasfir (Bitolje) in November 1905, and created branches throughout Albania. This committee, together with its regional sub-committees, in collaboration with the patriotic societies abroad, carried out a great deal of propaganda work for the mobilization of the people to undertake military activities for the independence of the country. The President of the Manastir Committee, Bajo Topulli, a former director of the Turkish secondary school in Manastir, personally took the initiative to form a fighting unit (geta), an initiative which was quickly followed by the other committees in the country. Fighting actions began to be carried out everywhere. The movement of the «Young Turks» and the proclamation of the «Constitution» by Sultan Abdyl Hamid, created some illusions among certain Albanian patriotic circles. But this situation did not last long. The disillusionment caused very strong indignation and revolt throughout the country. It was clearly seen that the Albanians could solve their problems only by relying on their own armed struggle.

At the same time, the legal means were utilized to extend the patriotic movement, to open clubs, Albanian schools, the alphabet which is used today was laid down definitively. The first Albanian secondary school was opened in Elbasan in December 1909. Through their acts of oppression and exploitation, the Young Turks sparked off the outbreak of a powerful uprising, which started first in the district of Prishtina in the Spring of 1910, and later in that of Peja, and spread all over the province of Kosova. The Turks dispatched a special army corps under the command of Shefqet Turgut Pasha, a General of the Prussian school, against the rebels. A bloody battle took place at the end of April 1910, at the Kaganik Pass. After heroic resistance, the Albanian insurgents commanded by Idriz Seferi were forced to withdraw, but the movement was so widespread that the Turkish Minister of War came himself, leading fresh troops, to reinforce Turgut Pasha's contingent. Having overrun kosova, the Turks then turned to the district of Shkodra and Central Albania, spreading destruction and terror everywhere. Faced with this situation, the Albanian patriots saw the vital need to unite all their forces in a single armed national movement and to launch an offensive without waiting for the opponent to attack. On April 6, 1911, Ded Gjo Luli, the leader of the uprising in the Shkodra Highlands, was forced by King Nicola of Montenegro, who had given the Highlanders refuge, to start the uprising prematurely. This confused the plans of the general uprising. The insurgents of the Shkodra Highlands fought heroically against the Turkish divisions. The Turkish Government was unable to carry its military operation right through to the end. The Albanian patriots, headed by Ismail Qemal and a new figure, which was making a name in the movement, Luigj Gurakuqi (1879-1925), gathered at Gërça in Montenegro on June 23, 1911, sent a memorandum to the Turkish Government demanding the territorial and administrative autonomy of Albania. Such Albanian patriots continued the political struggle for the
autonomy of Albania also within the Turkish parliament. But in 1912, the situation in the Balkans had again become acute. Taking advantage of the difficulties of Turkey, which was in conflict with Italy over Tripoli, the Balkan Kings thought that the time was ripe to satisfy their greed by annealing the Albanian territories. New uprisings broke out. In April 1912, that of the Gjakova Highlands began and spread to the whole of Kosova, then to Southern Albania, to Central Albania and to the north. The insurgents in Kosova led by Hasan Prishtina, Bajram Curri, and others marched on Shkup, in Macedonia, which they captured on August 12, 1912. Likewise other forces liberated the towns of Fier, Përmet, etc.

In October 1912, the Balkan states declared war on Turkey with the aim of dividing among them the territories which Turkey still held in the Balkans. They turned their greedy eyes especially towards the Albanian territories. The situation became very critical for the Albanians. Towards the end of October, in pursuit of the Turkish army, the armies of the Balkan states entered the Albanian territories. It was precisely at this time that Ismail Qemal left Turkey and visited a number of countries in Europe. He was well aware that it was necessary to act quickly and with determination no longer for the autonomy of Albania, but for the complete detachment of Albania from Turkey and for independence. He took this initiative on his own, and at the same time when the Greek, Serbian and Montenegrin armies had occupied almost the whole of Albania, he came to Albania and with a group of patriots hoisted the national flag in Vlora on November 28, 1912. Albania was proclaimed an independent state. After nearly five centuries of bondage, the Albanian people had succeeded in setting up their first Government, headed by Ismail Qemal.

Right from the start, the new Albanian State had to face many difficulties. The intrigues of foreign powers and its internal differences gave the country no time to consolidate its victory. During the year 1913, after many negotiations, the imperialist Great Powers defined, at the London Conference of Ambassadors, the boundaries of the Albanian State. These boundaries included no more than half the Albanian territory, nearly 28,000 square kilo-metres, with a population of about 800,000.

Under the pretext of calming the situation in Albania, the Great Powers decided on July 29, 1913, to send a German Prince, Wilhelm Wied, to rule in Albania. Ismail Qemal was forced to resign from the Vlora Government. But the foreign Prince did nothing to put the life of the country in order, to liberate the territories which had been left outside the borders and unite them with the Albanian State. He set up a Government with feudal elements. Because of a big uprising of the peasantry, on September 3, 1914, the Prince had to leave Albania. During World War I, the situation was further complicated. Albania was occupied by the belligerent Powers. On April 26, 1915, the Four Powers of the Entente signed the secret Treaty of London, which divided Albania among Italy, Greece, Serbia and Montenegro.

When the World War I was over, the three signatory Powers of the secret Treaty of London, Britain, France and Italy, as well as the USA agreed that the clauses of the Treaty about the partition of Albania should be implemented. Russia, where the power of the Soviets had now been established, opposed the Treaty. Indeed Lenin made this Treaty known world-wide by publishing it in the press. This critical situation impelled the Albanian patriotic circles to take measures and act quickly in order to save the homeland. A patriotic Government had to be set up to take the fate of the country into its own hands. But under the conditions in which the Italian army held the whole of Albania under occupation (with the exception of Korga and Shkodra where there were French troops), the setting up of such a government was very difficult.

At the Peace Conference, which was held at Versailles on January 18, 1919, an Albanian delegation took part. The Conference failed to solve the Albanian problem, and afterwards the situation remained very tense. At the beginning of 1920, the Albanian patriots organized a national Congress which was to take measures to save the nation. The Congress was opened in the town of Lushnja on January 28, 1920, and took decisions of historic importance. The Congress also formed a new government and a delegation to the Peace Conference. After it was shifted from Lushnja to Tirana, the new government began to exercise its functions. Among other things, it demanded the withdrawal of foreign forces from Albania. Italy concentrated these forces in the zone of Vlora with
a view to annexing it. It was clearly seen that the Italian troops could be driven out of Vlora only by force of arms. For this purpose a «Committee of National Defence» was secretly set up inside the city. This committee, in secret agreement with the Tirana Government, issued the call for an armed uprising against the Italian imperialists. Thousands of armed volunteers from all over Albania gathered around the zone occupied by the Italians. On June 3, the Committee sent the Italian command an ult-natum, which it refused to accept. The assault for the liberation of Vlora began on June 5. From the very first days, the Albanian patriots scored major successes against two Italian divisions well protected in strongly fortified positions. The war of Vlora raged fiercely for weeks on end. The Albanian patriots displayed rare heroism and reached the outskirts of the city. Italy was compelled, at last, to sign an agreement with the Tirana Government and to withdraw its troops from Vlora. However it kept the island of Sazan at the entrance to the Bay of Vlora.

Meanwhile, the armed forces of the Tirana Government under the command of the patriot Bajram Curri, had launched a large-scale operation against the rebellion of Esad Pasha Toptani's forces. Esad Pasha was forced to flee the country, only to concoct new intrigues abroad, but he was shot dead in Paris on June 13, 1920, by Avni Rustemi (1895-1924), a young patriot, who was emerging as an outstanding figure in the democratic and revolutionary movement.

The victory in the war of Vlora consolidated the international position of Albania. Now the Tirana Government and the patriotic forces turned their attention towards strengthening the internal situation. The problems to be solved were very complicated since neither Yugoslavia nor Greece had given up their intrigues and their old aims. In the struggle to take over the Government of the country two distinct political groups emerged: the Progressive Party, which represented the interests of the big land owners, the conservatory bourgeoisie and the top clergy, and Popular Party, which was based on the broad masses of the people. The political struggle between these two main trends, became more and more acute. These two trends also produced their most conspicuous representatives. Among the democratic forces Luigj Gurakuqi, Bajram Curri, the young patriot Avni Rustemi, Fan S. Noli and others, played a special role. From the reactionary side, a young feudal chieftain, Ahmet Bey Zogolli or Ahmet Zog, as he preferred to call himself, began to emerge as a prominent figure. Ambitious and an intriguer, he managed to occupy important posts in the Tirana Government, and gradually to take the power into his own hands. Faced with such a situation, the democratic forces of the Popular Party, led by Fan S. Noli, Luigj Gurakuqi and others, formed a new opposition front in parliament. In October a political organization «Bashkimi» (Unity), headed by Avni Rustemi, was formed outside parliament.

Through intrigues and Buonapartist actions, Zog concentrated all power in his own hands. The forces of the opposition understood clearly that the country could be saved from the feudal dictatorship of Zog only through energetic action. On April 20, 1924, Zog's agents made an attempt on the life of the patriot, Avni Rustemi, who died two days later from the wounds he received. Public outrage against the assassination of Avni Rustemi led to an uprising against the Zogist clique. On June 10 the democratic forces entered Tirana. Ahmet Zog and his clique of beys were obliged to flee abroad. On June 16 the democratic Government headed by Fari Noli was formed. The program of the Fan Noli Government contained the main principles of a bourgeois-democratic state. On the other hand, Ahmet Zog was making preparations in Yugoslavia for revenge whereas the Government failed to take the necessary steps to forestall the danger. In December 1924, with the direct assistance of the Yugoslav ruling circles, Ahmet Zog entered Albania by force, overthrew the Noli Government and proclaimed himself President of the Republic. Thus began the period of Zogist clique's savage rule, which continued up till April 1939 when Albania, sold out by that clique, was occupied by the Italian fascist troops. Zog pursued the policy of ruthless suppression of every democratic movement. On March 2, 1925, his agents killed Luigj Gurakuqi in Bari of Italy. On March 29, 1925, they besieged and killed Bajram Curri in the Tropoja district. Zog threw open the doors to the foreign imperialists to come and exploit the resources of the country and the Albanian people. He rewarded Yugoslavia by giving it part of the territory of Albania. On November 27, 1926, Zog signed a «Pact of Friendship and Security» with Italy, while one year
later, on November 22; 1927, he signed the Second Tirana Paet, called the «Treaty of the Defence Alliance» for a 20 year period. Thus, from that time, Italy took over the economy of the country and the equipment, and the instruction of the army. Vlora remained an open port for the Italian navy. In internal affairs the Zog regime increased the oppression and exploitation of the broad working masses of town and countryside even further. The heavy taxes had the same form as those left by the regime of Ottoman occupation. Culture and education remained in a backward state. The regime gave the imperialist powers a free hand to exert their influence through the schools and education. The rapprochement with Italy and the many economic and political concessions which Ahmet Zog, as President of the Albanian Republic, made to Mussolini, enabled him to realize one of his cherished ambitions. On September 1, 1928, the Constituent Assembly proclaimed Albania a Kingdom and Alunet Zog «King of the Albanians». By demagogy, Zog I (this was what the king was now called) tried to quell the indignation of the masses. He loudly proclaimed a number of reforms, and drafted some laws on the pattern of the laws of the Western bourgeois States. But almost none of them were implemented. The land reform about which there was so much boasting affected only about eight thousand hectares of state or private land nearly all swamp. On the problem of foreign concessions, too, the reign of Zog did nothing but concentrate these concessions in the hands of Italian capital.

Despite the savage Zogist reaction, the democratic and revolutionary movement was not wiped out. The oppressed masses expressed their protest against the exploitation by foreign capital and against the regime in various ways. In 1928, some progressive elements formed the first communist cell in Korça. Communist ideas had long begun to spread in Albania, but from that time onward, the revolutionary forces within the country began to organize. In June 1929, the representatives of the Korça communist cells held a meeting and set up a committee. This marked the creation of the first communist group in Albania, which was followed by other groups later. Under the influence of these groups, associations of workers and artisans were created. The communist, Ali Kelmeni played an important role in the ideological and organizational orientation of the Korça group and the other communist groups. While abroad, he had been in contact with the Comintern and he returned to Albania where he helped in the formation of the communist movement.

Anti-Zogist elements attempted a number of times to overthrow the Zogist regime. But these attempts were more of the nature of plots and failed. In Albania the world economic crisis lasted longer than in other countries. In an artificial way, fascist Italy, which had the keys to the economy in its hands, created such conditions as to compel Albania to grant further concessions. At first Zog tried to resist with the aim of preserving something for himself, but finally he was obliged to submit to Mussolini's political, military and economic pressure. From this period, 1934 to 1935, Zog put Albania in complete subservience to Italy.

In August 1935, anti-Zogist elements again tried unsuccessfully to overthrow the regime. The uprising, which is known as the «Fier Uprising» insufficiently organized and including wavering elements, was crushed right at the start. In order to calm the situation, in October 1935, Zog appointed a new «liberal- government. But the liberalism of this government was entirely formal, because when the workers of the Kugova oil fields called a strike in order to demand their rights from the Italian proprietors, the government took sides with the latter and put down the workers' movement with violence. The situation which was created imparted a fresh impulse to the clandestine development of the communist movement, the only revolutionary movement with a perspective to save the country both from the Zogist oppression and from the menace of fascist occupation. The communist elements abroad, like Ali Kelmeni and others, helped in spreading communist ideas and in organizing the movement. Many communists and revolutionary elements Went to the aid of the Spanish people fighting to defend the Republic from the intervention of the fascists and nazis.

Zog sensed the danger of the communist movement in Albania. On the eve of the occupation of Albania by fascist Italy, the organs of his dictatorship launched a savage campaign against the
communist movement; they made many arrests and imprisoned or interned a large number of revolutionary elements.

The economic and political agreements concluded between Rome and Tirana in March 1936 paved the way for the Italian military occupation of Albania. Mussolini now awaited only the opportune moment to act. Having received Hitler’s support for his aggressive plans, and having ensured the silent approval of the Western Powers, at the beginning of 1939 he began to carry out his plans. Through the agents of his fifth column in Albania, Mussolini had taken measures to sabotage the resistance of the Albanian people. At dawn on April 7, 1939, the fascist troops began to land on the Albanian shores. The Albanian army had been left without ammunition, the few pieces of artillery had been sabotaged by the fascist instructors. Nevertheless, in Durrës, Vlora, Saranda, Shëngjin and everywhere the invading Italian troops encountered the armed resistance of the Albanian patriots. Groups of soldiers and volunteers who managed to secure some ammunition made the enemy bleed. The Italian fleet bombarded Durrës and the other ports. The Italian airforce carried out incursions over the cities of Albania. King Zog I with his royal family and his clique abandoned the country - and fled abroad.

With demagogy and terror, Italian fascism tried to suppress any expression of patriotic feeling or resistance among the people. It tried to create the illusion that under Mussolini’s Empire, Albania would develop and flourish. But in fact this demagogy was very soon shown up in its true colours. The Albanian people were well aware that fascist Italy had occupied the country. It was preparing for new adventures against the other Balkan countries. The hatred of the people for the fascist invaders, which was expressed in those April days with demonstrations and bullets, mounted ceaselessly. The most consistent communists placed themselves in the forefront of the political struggle and the fighting with arms. Outstanding among them was the thirty-year-old communist, Enver Hoxha (born in the city of Gjirokastra on October 16, 1908), who led the efforts to form the Albanian Communist Party, and to organize the Anti-fascist National Liberation War. Units (çeta) of fighters were set up, which carried out actions against the fascist troops, like that of Peza, which during the years 1940-41, inflicted losses on the invaders. In May 1941, Victor Emmanuel III, Emperor of Italy, came on a visit to Albania, in the centre of Tirana the worker Vasil Lagi, fired shots at him.

The efforts of the most resolute communists, headed by Enver Hoxha, overcoming many difficulties, succeeded in creating the conditions for the merger of the communist groups, which were acting separately. On November 8, 1941, the representatives of the groups gathered in Tirana in the greatest secrecy, and formed the Communist Party of Albania. The Party took upon itself the great historic task of organizing and leading the general armed uprising against fascism for the liberation of the country and the establishment of the People’s State Power. The meeting elected the Provisional Central Committee. Enver Hoxha was charged with the leadership of the Central Committee. Two weeks after the founding of the Communist Party, on November 23, 1941, and also in Tirana, the organization of the Communist Youth of Albania was formed, with the young man, Qemal Stafa, member of the CC of the Communist Party of Albania as its political secretary. The formation of the Communist Party of Albania was accompanied with militant activities. In the cities powerful anti-fascist demonstrations broke out, which ended in bloody conflicts. The communist worker Kog Bako was killed in the demonstration on November 8 1941. With their exemplary bravery and courage, the communists won the sympathy of the broad masses of workers and the revolutionary and patriotic youth.

The fascist ruling circles in Albania could not agree with the new situation which was being created, and immediately began to take energetic measures. The Quisling Government of the big feudal lord Shefqet Vërnlaci, as any other anti-popular reactionary government could being not capable of strangling the Albanian resistance, was replaced by another fascist government, that of Mustafa Kruja, an old agent of fascism, notorious for his barbarity towards the freedom fighters and the people. The ruthless measures taken by the new fascist government further aggravated the
situation in the country. The Communist Party extended its armed struggle in the cities through guerrilla units, partisan and volunteer detachments were set up and the acts of sabotage and diversion became more widespread. On May 5, 1942, Qemal Stafa, Political Secretary of the Communist Youth organization, was killed in battle with the fascists in Tirana. The Party was shedding the blood of its finest sons and daughters for the cause of freedom. One and a half months later, three communists, Perlat Rexhepi, Branko Kadia and Jordan Misja, besieged in a house in Shkodra, fought the fascist troops with unprecedented heroism for hours on end.

Armed actions were carried out everywhere. On the instructions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Albania, the guerrilla units, the partisan detachments and the volunteers from the people, destroyed the telegraph and telephone line network throughout all Albania on the night of July 24-25, 1942. This greatly alarmed the fascists. On August 25, 1942, the first number of «Zëri i popullit» (The People's Voice), organ of the Albanian Communist Party, was published illegally. In September 1942, the Albanian National Liberation Conference was held at Peza, a village 18 km southwest of Tirana. The Conference of Peza, which was organized on the Albanian Communist Party, laid the basis for the union of the Albanian people in a single national liberation front. The program adopted at the Conference of Peza laid down the task of waging uncompromising war against fascism and the traitors for a free, independent and democratic Albania. It also laid down the task of forming national liberation councils everywhere as organs of the union and mobilization of the people in the war and as organs of the People's State Power.

The Conference of Peza had wide repercussions. All over the country the anti-fascist movement and the war assumed a fresh impulse. From day to day the partisan units were increased and the armed struggle extended. By the end of 1942, the number of partisans reached 2,000 fighters, besides several thousand others who took part in the guerrilla units of the cities and the village detachments. Whole districts like Peza, Kurvelesh, Skrapar and others had been liberated.

In order to destroy the partisan forces, from September to December 1942, the occupiers, using big forces carried out punitive operations in 27 districts of Albania, burning whole villages and massacring the population.

The foreign occupationists and the local reactionaries accompanied these military operations with political activities especially by setting up collaborationist organizations like that called «Balli Kombëtar» (National Front). The Communist Party acted with great maturity towards this organization, which at first, included elements misled by enemy propaganda, exposing the real aims of this organization and enlightening those who had been deceived.

Later the «Balli Kombëtar» was obliged to come out in its true colours and was abandoned by the rank-and-file people who had been misled by the pseudo-nationalist demagogy of its leaders.

The successes which the National Liberation movement scored in 1942, made it possible, in the Spring of 1943, to place on the agenda the organization of the general armed uprising against the invaders. This task was concretized at the First National Conference of the Albanian Communist Party which was held at Labinot in the Elbasan district from March 17 to 22, 1943.

Meanwhile, under the new conditions of the situation, the fascist circles, tried, at the beginning of 1943, to take certain new political measures in order to stop things which in fact were developing to their disadantage. The government of Mustafa Kruda was replaced by several other governments one after the other. Rame promised that it would make some changes in its economic policy towards Albania; Francesco Iacomoni, who had been at the head of the Italian Diplomacy in Albania before the occupation, was removed from his post asiceroy; the Albanian Fascist Party was replaced by a similar organization under a new label.

The good work done by the National Liberation Front under the guidance of the Albanian Communist Party brought about a big increase in the number of partisan units and battalions during Spring in 1943. Now the actions carried out were no longer isolated ones against fascist troops where they were stationed or in transit, but actions skillfully coordinated by the CC of the Albanian Communist Party and, led by it, by the Regional Party Committees. Such were a number of operations carried out from the end of June to the end of July 1943. While the Gelieral Staff of the
National Liberation Army with the Secretary General of the Central Committee of the Albanian Communist Party, Enver Hoxha as its Commissar, was set up at Labinot (near Elbasan) a number of operations against the fascist troops were taking place at Krraba Pass (on the Tirana-Elbasan highway), at Pajuška of Pogradec, at Leskovik, at Kuqar of Përmet, up to Mezhgoran and Kçokë Pass near the town of Tepelena. At the same time, the Italian fascists carried out operations against the population in the districts of Peza, Mallakastra, etc. The creation of the General Staff on July 10, 1943, made it possible to concentrate the military, strategic and operational leadership of the National Liberation Army in one supreme organ. At the time when the General Staff was set up, the National Liberation Army included in its ranks 10,000 fighters organized in regular partisan units. A few days prior to the formation of the General Staff, the partisan units launched their first attack on German troops on a motorized column which came from Macedonia and entered Albanian territory on its way to Yannina (Greece). The attack was launched on July 6, 1943 at the village of Sarmash in the Kolonja district. Taken by surprise, the Nazis suffered heavy losses in men and military equipment. In reprisal they burned the entire village of Borova and killed all the inhabitants they managed to capture (107 men, women and children). The setting up of the General Staff, the rapid increase of partisan formation, battalions, and groups, the preparations for the formation of the First Shock Brigade, which was formed on August 15, 1943, greatly alarmed the Italian command in Albania. It took new measures in order to destroy the National Liberation Army. Four divisions, reinforced by artillery troops and supported by aircraft, began a new operation in the Mallakastra zone and later in other zones. The local situation was complicated also because at this time the Allied troops landed in Sicily. The «Balli Kombetar», which now saw that fascist Italy was on the eve of total defeat in expectation of an Allied landing on the Albanian coast, hastened to launch open attacks against the partisan forces in collaboration with the Italian army. Italy's capitulation on September 8, 1943 created entirely a new situation in the country. On instructions from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Albania and the General Staff of the National Liberation Army, the partisan units called on the Italian troops to stop their military operations and join the partisans in order to fight the German nazis who were hurriedly taking the place of the Italians. The Italian command refused, and most of the Italian troops surrendered to the Nazi forces. A number of army men were dispersed and found shelter among Albanian peasant families, who displayed a fine spirit of magnanimity to the defeated enemy. The people shared their meagre food with these former soldiers. A small number of Italians joined the Albanian partisans and later formed a partisan detachment of their own, which took the name of «Antonio Gramsci». The Nazi troops, who came to Albania, encountered armed resistance from the forces of the National Liberation Army everywhere. The heaviest fighting took place in the vicinity of Vlora and extended over more than twenty days. Under conditions of the relentless war with the partisan forces, the Nazis tried to stabilize the situation in Albania. They very quickly came to terms with the «Balli Kombëtar» and all the reactionaries. In the early months of the occupation, they tried demagogy to create the impression that they supported the initiative of the «Nationalists» (implying the collaborationists) for the creation of an «independent» Albanian State. At the same time, another organization was set up, instigated in particular by the Anglo-Americans, which had the aim of rallying the former sympathizers of King Zog. This organization is known as «Legaliteti» (Legality). By mid-October 1943, the partisan units had liberated whole districts, and even certain number of towns, while Tirana itself was surrounded by the partisan forces. On October 18, on the eve of the opening of the so-called « Constituent Assembly», under the protection of German bayonets, the partisan artillery of the 3rd Shock Brigade shelled the palace where the meeting of the traitors was to be held. It was clear to the Germans that the partisan forces were so strong that, in order to cope with them, it was necessary to engage in major military operations themselves. For this purpose parallel with demagogic measures, the German command quickly prepared a large scale military operation which is known in the history of the National Liberation War as «The Winter Campaign of 1943-44». In this campaign, which started in October 1943 and ended in February 1944, four Hitlerite divisions
were engaged as well as a large number of collaborationist troops from the Quisling Government, «Balli Kombëtar», «Legaliteti» etc. These troops numbered 45,000 men against 10,000 partisans included in the units of the National Liberation Army. The enemy tried to liquidate the partisan units, to destroy their bases in the countryside, to liquidate the leadership of the National Liberation Movement, the Central Committee of the Albanian Communist Party and the General Staff. The partisans and the people as a whole demonstrated unprebedented heroism at this stage of the war. The march of part of the 1st Brigade in February and March 1944, which penetrated deep to the rear of the enemy from Southern Albania to regions of Central Albania, has become a legend.

The «Winter Campaign» was a total failure for the Germans and their collaborators. Although it had to pass through very difficult situations, although it lost about 1,000 partisans killed or died under the difficult conditions of the winter, the National Liberation Army emerged stronger than ever. Instead of the three -brigades which it had in autumn 1943, it now had seven brigades of partisans in action. The National Liberation Army launched a counter-offensive, and in a very short time liberated all the districts which the enemy had moved into during the operation.

The victories scored by the National Liberation Army in spring 1944, enabled the Albanian Communist Party to take new political initiatives of decisive impartance for the future of the country. In the conditions when the Red Army under J. V. Stalin, was striking crushing blows at Hitler's army in the East and when the allied armies were fighting in Italy, major problems arose for our country. The reactionaries, in contact with the reactionaries abroad, tried to manoeuvre so that they, with the aid of the Anglo-Americans, would take power into their hands once the Germans had been defeated. In these conditions, preparations were made for calling HThe First Anti-fascist National Liberation Congress. which. met in the liberated town of Përmet on May 24, 1944. The Congress took decisions of extreme importance for the future of Albania. It solved the problem of political power in favour of the insurgent people, and- founded the first Albanian State of People's Democracy. The .decisions of the Congress formed the basis of the Constitution of the People's Republic of Albania.

Before the proceedings of the Congress ended, the National Liberation Army had received orders to launch the general offensive for the complete liberation of Albania. The 1st Division of the National Liberation Army was created and set out for action in Central and Northern Albania in order to strengthen the movement even in those regions where the reactionaries had dug themselves in. In this undertaking the command of the National Liberation Army encountered the opposition of the AngloAmerican Mediterranean Command, which aimed at preserving the positions of the reactionaires in Albania. But those plans came to naught. After successfully coping with a new enemy operation (the German operation of June 1944) involving 50,000 enemy troops (four and a half German divisions and some thousands of collaborationists), the National Liberation Army liberated the districts of Central Albania, Dibra, Mirdita and the north. Autumn, 1944 also saw the liberation, one after another, of thecieties of Albania.

On October 22, 1944, at its second meeting, held inthe liberated city of Berat, the AFNLC decided to change the Anti-fascist Committee into the Democratic Government of Alb nia. The forces of the National Liberation Army fought an heroic battle lasting 19 days against the Hitlerite troops for the liberation of the capital, Tirana. Tirana was liberated on November 17, 1944. The Democratic Govern-. ment entered Tirana on November 28, 1944. The next day, the partisan brigades also liberated Shkodra, the last city held by the Germans. T hat day marked the complete liberation of Albania.

On orders from the Commander-in-Chief of the Na- tional Liberation Army, Enver Hoxha, and in the spirit of proletarian internationalism, two Divisions of the National Liberation Army crossed the borders of Albania to Yugoslavia, where they took part zn the fighting for the liberation of Macedonia, Kosova, Montenegro up to Southern Bosnia. Thus, even outside Albania, hundreds of sons and daughters of our people gave their life's blood. for the great cause of the peoples, the victory over fascism.
In this way, the Albanian people, led by the Communist Party of Albania, scored the most brilliant victory in their history. They took political power into their own hands, opening the way for the triumph of the revolution and socialist construction in Albania.

Although Albania then had a population of only one million, it made a valuable contribution to the cause to defeat fascism. It pinned down 15 Italian and German divisions, putting out of action 70,000 enemies killed, wounded and taken prisoner. 700,000 fascist troops trampled the 28,000 square kilometres which is the total area of Albania. For every square kilometer one freedom fighter gave his life. Whole districts and cities were razed to the ground. The economy of the country was totally devastated.

On the eve of liberation, the Albanian National Army had in its ranks 70,000 partisans incorporated in three army corps (six divisions).

The great victories of the National Liberation War became the basis of the post-Liberation victories. Always under the leadership of the Communist Party (now the Party of Labour) of Albania, Albania is marching with sure steps towards the complete construction of socialism.

II. POPULATION

Albania has about 2,430,000 inhabitants (census of 1975). This population is more than double that of 1938. At present the number of births is 30.6 per thousand and that of deaths 7.2 per thousand. Males make up about 51.5 per cent of the population.

The density of population is 84 persons per square kilometre as against 39 in 1945. The greatest density of population is to be found in the western part of the territory. Our policy of socialist industrialization and the harmonious development of the districts has brought about a large increase of population in certain districts which used to be less densely populated. For instance, the Myzeqeja zone, which used to be very backward, has now become one of the most densely populated, with over 100 inhabitants per square kilometer, because of the land improvement schemes carried out and the creation of important industrial centers during the years of our People's State Power.

As a result of the concern for the health and wellbeing of the people, the average life span has reached 69 years as against 38 in 1938.

A characteristic of the period of our People's State Power is the increase of the number of workers, and especially the increase of the participation of women in production. At present, women make up 47 per cent of the total number of workers and employees.

The class structure of socialist society in Albania is characterized by the existence of two friendly classes, namely the working class and the cooperative peasantry as well as the stratum of the people's intelligentsia. The working class is the leading class. Its specific weight in our population has constantly increased as a result of the socialist industrialization of our country. The working peasantry has turned into a cooperative peasantry. For several years now socialist relations of production have been fully established in agriculture. The stratum of intellectuals has also undergone major qualitative changes during the period of our People's State Power. Under the care of the Party of Labour of Albania, a new people's intelligentsia, originating mainly from the working class and the working peasantry, has been created.

In 1975 the urban population made up 34.4 per cent of the population of the country, as against 15.4 per cent in 1938. The number of towns now is nearly threefold that of 1945. The old towns are being reconstructed, too, with wide, asphalted streets, multi-storeyed modern buildings, cultural and sports institutions, parks and gardens.

The most important cities are: Tirana (192,000 inhabitants) the capital and leading industrial and cultural centre of the country, Shkodra (62,400), Durrës (60,000), Vlorë (55,500), Elbasan (53,300), Korça (52,000), Berat (30,000), Fier (28,000), Gjirokastra (22,000) and Lushnja (21,000).
STATE ORGANIZATION

Albania is a People's Socialist Republic.
The People's Socialist Republic of Albania is the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which expresses and defends the interests of all the workers. The People's Socialist Republic of Albania is based on the unity of the people and has at its roots the alliance of the working class with the cooperative peasantry under the leadership of the working class.
The Party of Labour of Albania, the vanguard of the working class, is the sole political leading force of the state and society. Marxism-Leninism is the dominant ideology in the PSRA. On the basis of its principles, the entire socialist social order is run.
The People's Socialist Republic of Albania uninterruptedly carries forward the revolution adhering to the class struggle and it has the aim of ensuring the final triumph of the socialist road over the capitalist road and achieving the complete construction of socialism and communism.
In the People's Socialist Republic of Albania the entire state power emanates from and belongs to the people.
The working class, the cooperative peasantry and other workers exercise their power through their representative organs and directly.
The representative workers are elected by the people by general, equal, direct and secret ballot.
The electors have the right to recall their representative at any time when he has lost the political trust of the masses or when he fails to fulfill the tasks assigned to him or when he acts contrary to the law.
- The working class, as the leading class of our society, as well as the masses of the other workers exercise direct organized control over the activity of the State organs, of the economic and social organizations and their workers in order to defend the achievements of the revolution and to consolidate the socialist order.
- Citizens 18 years and over are entitled to elect and to be elected to the organs of the state power.
The people who do not have the right to vote are those who have been exempted from this right by the verdict of the court, as well as those who are mentally handicapped, proclaimed such by the court.
The representative organs are of the greatest importance in the system of state organs. These organs consisting of the People's Assembly at the center and the People's Councils at the base, are the only organs which realize the State Power in the country. They make up the whole foundations of the state apparatus, all the other state organs depend upon and render account to them.
The representative organs are real work institutions, legislative and at the same time, executive. Just as Marx and Lenin instructed on the representative institutions, which the proletariat sets up when it becomes the ruling class, the representative institutions in Albania are made up of people who themselves work, carry out their own decisions, supervise what is carried out and render direct account to their electors.
The highest representative organ of our country is the People's Assembly, which bears the sovereignty of the nation and of the state, and exercises all the sovereign rights on the basis of the Constitution. Representatives to the People's Assembly are elected every four years and carry out their activity in sessions.
During the time when the People's Assembly is not in session, the high state functions are exercised in its name by the Presidium of the People's Assembly within the limits of the competences left to it by the Constitution. The Presidium of the People's Assembly is also the leading collegial organ of the State. The Presidium is the organ of the People's Assembly itself, elected by the latter and renders account to it for all its activity.
Part of the representative organs are also the People's Councils, which exercise their functions as organs of State Power in their respective territorial-administrative units. The People's Councils are
elected every three years and enjoy important competences in all matters of socialist construction within the units where they exercise their activity.

The administrative functions are a special form of our state activity. The Council of Ministers is the highest organ of our State administration whereas at the base this function is fulfilled by the Executive Committees of the People's Councils. These organs are elected by the representative organs and render account to them; the Council of Ministers by the People's Assembly and the Executive Committees by the People's Councils.

The People's Courts engage in meting out justice. Through their activity, they exert a major educational influence not only on the persons brought before court but also on all others. Finally, the organs of the Attorney General are the fourth kind of our state organs. They handle the supervision on the accurate implementation of the law by every one, by the State organs, social organs or citizens.

Hut, although each of these state organs has its own characteristics and, on this basis, the corresponding competences, it is important to mention that all these organs are in close connection and permanent collaboration among them.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION**

The People's Socialist Republic of Albania is divided into twenty six administrative districts. The main districts from the point of view of their economic and cultural development are:

The district of Tirana which provides one fifth of the total industrial output of the Republic. All of the branches of Albanian industry, especially, the engineering, textile, building materials, chemical and food processing industries have been developed in Tirana. Tirana is also the greatest cultural centre. About one eighth of the entire population of the country live in this city.

The district of Durres is the second in the Republic from the point of view of economic development. It provides more than one-tenth of the industrial output of the Republic and is most noted for its engineering, chemical, light and food-processing industries. Durrës is the principal seaport of the country.

The district of Shkodra stands out, among other things, for the production of copper wire and electric cables, electric power production, food-processing industry and, especially, for tobacco processing.

The district of Elbasan has now become one of the most important in the country with the setting up of the metallurgical complex and other branches of industry.

The district of Fier has undergone strikingly rapid industrial development. From a completely agricultural district nowadays it is known for its electrical, oil and chemical fertilizer industries. Fier is an entirely new city. Profound transformations have been made in agriculture in this district. The former swamps and marshes have been completely drained and agricultural output has increased many times over in comparison with the past.

The district of Korca occupies an important place in the Republic for both industrial and agricultural production. This district stands out for the precision instruments industry, the sugar, knitwear, carpet, footwear and other industries. It is a very highly developed agricultural district.

The district of Viora is represented by the cement, mineral, electric lamp, chemical and food-processing industries. The port of Vlora is the second nort after that of Durrës. There are big olive and citrus fruit plantations.

In the district of Berat an important place is occupied by the textile, mining and food-processing industries. Berat is an ancient city with extremely picturesque architecture and great tourist value.

The district of Kruja used to have no industry whatsoever while at present it is the principal producer of cement and superphosphate fertilizer. At the same time it is a prosperous agricultural centre. In history it figures as the capital at the time of Scanderbeg. The castle and museum dedicated to that time are of special interest to the visitors.
The district of Gjirokastra is represented mainly by the light, food-processing and engineering industries. The city of Gjirokastra occupies a special place for its architecture. It is built around a well preserved castle and is truly a museum in this direction. The National Museum of Arms is in this city.

The district of Lushnja was entirely backward agricultural district. Now, as a result of large-scale reclamation work, it has been transformed into a main producer of food grain and industrial crops. The district of Saranda on the Ionian seacoast stands out for the rapid development of citrus orchards and its bountiful plains.

Before liberation the district of Mirdita was considered as the most backward one of the country whereas now it is the principal district for mining and processing copper. The centre of the district represents quite a new town.

The district of Puka stands out for its timber and minerals.

The district of Kukës stands out for its mineral industry, especially for mining and treating copper ore. The centre of the district is an entirely new city which keeps growing in size.

Before the establishment of our People's State power, many of our districts were particularly backward economically. They had no industry at all while their agriculture was extremely backward. In the years of our People's State Power the various regions of the country have been developed in a proportional manner and now these zones are all flourishing. This strikes one's eyes in the districts of Puka, Mat, Gramsh, Dibra, Pogradec, Kruja, Kukës, Skrapar and others. In these districts, too, alongside the all-round development of agriculture, important industrial branches have been and are being set up such as the mining electric power, engineering, cement and other industries, besides the factories to process agricultural and dairy products. Now one can no longer speak of «backward regions» in Albania.

III. THE PEOPLE’S ECONOMY

The seizure of political power by the Albanian people in November 1944 was a great historic victory. But the consolidation of this power presented very great difficulties. The new State Power and the people were faced with major economic tasks.

Before the Second World War, Albania was the most backward country in Europe economically. The plunder and devastation perpetrated by the fascist invaders made the situation even more difficult. In proportion to its population and size, Albania was one of the European countries which suffered the heaviest damages. But, under the guidance of the Communist Party (now the Party of Labour) of Albania, the people courageously set about the job of the restoration and rapid development of the economy. With confidence in their own strength, they embarked on the road of the revolution to build the economic base of socialism both in town and countryside.

During 1945, some of the factories, electric power stations, and mines were put into operation. The peasants were mobilized for the sowing and the rebuilding of houses. The youth undertook the heaviest burden of the reconstruction.

The State began to take revolutionary steps to give the working people the principal means of production which had been concentrated in the hands of foreign and local capitalists. Laws were passed to levy extraordinary taxes on those who had accumulated large profits from the war. Under the political conditions, when the State Power had begun to fulfil the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, it was possible and necessary to embark on carrying out transformations of a socialist character. Thus, a series of complex revolutionary steps were taken in the economic field. In December 1944 the mines and the property of political fugitives became state property. Later on, the National Bank, the other banks, and the assets of 111 share-holding companies owned by foreign capitalists and all the big capitalist assets passed over to the State without compensation. This meant that the key positions of the economy passed into the hands of the State. The most acute
problem in the domain of agriculture was to do away with the old agrarian relations. And this was achieved by the land reform. The land was given, free of charge, to those who tilled it. The socialist socialization of the principal means of production put an end to the economic domination of the bourgeoisie, while laying the foundations of the new socialist economy. Under these circumstances, it became possible for the economy to develop rapidly, in a planned and harmonious way. Concrete tasks were set for the development of the country for the various stages of the five-year plans. From one five-year plan to another, Albania, once a backward agrarian country, has now become an agrarian-industrial country with prospects of becoming an industrial-agrarian one with advanced agriculture.

INDUSTRY. Today the People's Socialist Republic of Albania has a highly developed modern multibranched industry. Industry has become the leading branch of the economy and gives a dynamic character to the increase of the productive forces of the country and the development of all sectors of the national economy. The average rate of increase of total industrial production for the period 1951 to 1965 was 6.8 per cent. Albanian industry turns out at present 3.9 times as much as in 1960. These high rates have brought about a considerable increase of industrial production per head of population. In 1975 the population has slightly more than doubled in comparison with 1938, while the total industrial production has increased more than 97 fold. The production of the means of production during the years of our People's State Power has increased at a higher rate than that of consumer goods, and, at present, the specific weight of the former is higher than that of the latter. This priority given to the branches producing means of production will be increased in the future since our country is moving in the direction of its further industrialization. The priority development of the industry of means of production has made it possible to achieve big successes in the industry of means of consumption. Parallel with the development of industry there has been an increase in the number of workers. In 1975 the working class was 27 times larger than in 1938. This number keeps increasing. Along with the development of production in all the branches of our economy, in the context of industrial development, special attention has been attached to the harmonious development of all the districts, to the economic uplift of the less developed districts and towns, so that industry will have a more powerful development in regard to its geographical distribution, too. Ever greater attention is being attached to the mechanization and automation of the processes of production in order to ensure higher productivity at work, for a more rapid development of the productive forces and to lighten people's work, and to raise their standard of living even higher. The industry of our country is characterized by a very great variety of products based mainly on the different local resources of mineral and agricultural raw materiales.

THE PRODUCTION OF ELECTRIC POWER. Because of the very weak industrial development of the country, as well as the failure of the former regimes to interest themselves in evaluating the resources of the country, the production of electric power, prior to the National Liberation War, was very low. With the establishment of the People's State Power, special attention was attached to the development of electric power. In 1975 the production of electric power was 177 times as high as before the war and 8.5 times greater than in 1960. Hydro-power plants hold first place in the production of electric power and their specific weight is continually increasing as a result of the construction of ever more powerful stations. The thermal and hydropower plants have been linked in a unified national power grid, which extends all over Albania. The production of electric power provides about 4 per cent of total industrial production. The electric reticulation of the entire country was completed on November 25, 1970, bringing electric light to the most remote village of Albania.
THE PETROLEUM, NATURAL GAS, COAL AND BITUMEN INDUSTRY. This provides about 8 per cent of total industrial production. The principal place is held by the extraction and refining of crude oil. The exploitation of the old oil fields, which had been reduced to the minimum on the eve of liberation, has been intensified and new oil fields have been discovered and brought into operation. The efforts have not been confined just to the extraction of crude oil, but have also been directed to processing it in the various specially built refineries. Some by-products of crude oil such as bitumen, are exported. Almost completed is a deep processing oil refinery with a capacity equal to all the existing oil refineries taken together.

Another valuable source of energy is natural gas, which is extracted not only from the oil fields but also from other places. In our country natural bitumen, which is famous for its high quality, is extracted, too.

Our coal is the lignite type. Big reserves have been discovered. The production of the coal industry in 1975 was 235 times greater than in 1938. This rapid increase has made it possible to cope with the increasing needs of industry for fuel. Today the mines are provided with electric light and power, and modern means and methods are used. Among the new projects built in this branch of industry in recent years is a big plant to process the coal.

THE MINING OF METALS AND METALLURGY.

Among the various minerals of our country, there are important industrial reserves of chromium, iron-nickel and copper ores, which constitute a sound basis for the successful development of our heavy industry. In 1975 the production of the chromium industry had increased 112 times as against 1938; that of the copper industry 65 times. In our five-year plans priority is given to the development of the mineral industry over the other branches of industry so as to strengthen the branches producing means of production. A number of plants and factories have been and are being set up to enrich and process the minerals. Thus in regard to copper, the processes run from mining the ore to producing blister copper and copper wires. Pig-iron and steel production projects are under construction in Elbasan. A metallurgical plant to handle ferro-chrome ore is also under construction.

THE MECHANICAL ENGINEERING INDUSTRY.

Before liberation the engineering industry consisted of a few workshops which engaged in repair and maintenance of motor vehicles and farm tools. Today it has a powerful technical basis and not only repairs machinery but also turns out spare parts for industry, agriculture and transport, and produces various agricultural machines, diesel engines, and various machines and mechanisms for the sectors of economy as well as precision instruments. The mechanical engineering industry produces about 13 per cent of the total industrial production, and is one of the main branches producing means of production. The output of the engineering industry in 1975 was 308 times greater than in 1938.

THE CHEMICAL INDUSTRY. The heavy chemical industry (the production of superphosphates, nitrate fertilizers, caustic soda and soda ash, oil paints etc.) holds first place. But the light chemical industry, too, (rubber and plastic goods, pharmaceutical products, perfumes) is assuming ever greater development, especially the branch of plastic products, for the development of which, in addition to the factories producing plastic goods, a plana for the production of polyvinyl chloride
(PVC) is being built. The output of the chemical industry in 1975 was 25 times greater than in 1960.

**THE GLASS AND CERAMIC INDUSTRY.** This is an entirely new industry in our country. It keeps growing. Now, by and large, it meets all the needs of the country for its products. Glassware is produced in Tirana, Korça, Durrës and other towns.

**THE BUILDING MATERIALS INDUSTRY.** This industry had been developed to a certain extent also in the past. But the setting up of new industrial projects, the development of housing, buildings for social and cultural purposes etc. have required the rapid development of the building materials industry. Thus, in 1975 the output of this industry was 185 times greater than in 1938, and has been enriched with new branches which did not exist in the past. The main branch of the building materials industry is that of the production of cement and its derivatives represented by up-to-date factories set up in Vlora, Elbasan, Fushë-Kruja etc. The production of cement in 1975 was 64 times greater than in 1938. Linked with the production of cement is the production of cement blocks and pipes, asbestos cement sheets and pipes and prefabricated details which are now produced in large quantities. The production of bricks and tiles has also increased as a result of the construction of a series of modern factories in the principal cities. A new branch, that of cutting marble slabs based on the many and beautiful marbles of the country, has been added to the building materials industry.

**THE TIMBER AND PAPER INDUSTRY.** One of the biggest resources of Albania are its forests. The value of the products of this industry has been increased manyfold and its specific weight is double that of 1938. The woodworking branch, which occupies first place, has been enriched with up-to-date combines and plants like that of Elbasan which turns out a wide range of assortments like seasoned and treated timber, plywood, veneer, parquet blocks, furniture and other timber products, that of Laç, which in addition to sawn and seasoned timber, also turns out parquet blocks, and that of Tirana, the largest of its kind in the territory for furniture manufacture which also produces seasoned timber and a type of fibre board.

The paper industry is set up anew and is represented by three factories which turn out various products such as writing and wrapping paper, paper bags, cardboard and hard board. This branch is being enlarged with a big paper mill which is almost completed and which will be producing all kinds of paper.

**LIGHT INDUSTRY.** Occupies about 1/5th of the total industrial production. It meets most of the needs of the country and increases from one year to another the number of articles earmarked for export. The most important industries of this sector are two modern textile mills of the capacity of 20 million meters of cotton fabrics a year, the knitwear combine in Korça, the rubber-processing plant in Durrës, the footwear factories, the factory for plastic goods and so on. The textile industry turns out a wide range of cotton, woolen, synthetic and silk fabrics. Clothing manufacture has been greatly extended. The textile and clothing manufacture branches also produce for export. Footwear production, which was formerly of an artisan character, has now been enriched with modern factories and meets the needs of the country.
FOOD-PROCESSING INDUSTRY. This branch continues to hold a high specific weight in global industrial production. In addition to the existing branches, many new branches like those refining sugar, canning fruit and vegetables, meats and fish, of brewing wines, of processing milk, of manufacturing washing machines, refrigerators and so on, have been set up. The food-processing industry produces also for export especially, canned fish, fruits and vegetables, alcoholic beverages etc.

TRANSPORT. The volume of internal transport of goods by motor vehicles, railroads and merchantmen in ton; kilometres in 1975 was 155 times above that of 1938 while interurban passenger transport had increased 595 times.

Pride of place is held by road transport which shifts 3/4ths of the annual total of goods and 4/5ths of the passengers. Now the total length of motor roads is more than double that of 1938. A good part of these roads have been asphalted. The number of goods and passenger transport vehicles has increased manyfold. Motor transport now penetrates deep into the mountain regions of the interior which were inaccessible before.

Rail transport holds second place. It handles about 1/4th of the total goods and about 1/5th of the passenger transport. The first railroad in Albania was built in 1948. From that date onward, rail transport has kept increasing both in the length of track in operation as well as in the number of locomotives and wagons.

Sea transport was very limited in the past and carried on mainly by foreign ships. During the Second World War, even that poor national merchant fleet was destroyed by the enemy. Thus, after liberation it was necessary to start from scratch in this direction. The ports which had been destroyed by the enemy were restored and continually improved. Shipyards were set up to build small boats while high tonnage ships were imported.

Now, our national merchant fleet plies the seas and oceans of the world and its importance in overseas transport of goods is steadily increasing. The capacity of our seaports, especially that of Durrës, which is our main port, is constantly rising.

A G R I C U L T U R E. Albanian agriculture is organized completely on a socialist basis. All the peasant economies in the lowlands and in the mountain regions, have been tanned into agricultural cooperatives.

In the past, Albania had the most backward agriculture in Europe. After the establishment of our People's State Nwer, the overthrow of feudal-bourgeois relations in the countryside as well became an urgent task. This was absolutely essential if we were to develop agriculture and create the premises for building socialism in the countryside.

The first step in this direction was the implementation of the slogan «the land belongs to him who tills it», which the Party had launched as early as during the National Liberation War.

As the first step to implement the Party program for the socialist transformation of the countryside was the application of the Land Reform laws. Considering the land reform laws as the first revolution in the social-economic relations in the countryside, comrade Enver Hoxha has emphasized: «The typical characteristic of this revolution was the democratic transformation of the relations of ownership on land, the ultimate elimination of the survivals of feudalism, the liquidation of the class of land estate holders».

The landless and land-poor peasants were impatiently waiting for the proclamation of the land reform laws and their application. The Land Reform laws were issued on August 29, 1945, only nine months after Liberation and the establishment of the People's State Power.
The basic principle of the Land Reform laws was to give the land to those who tilled it. The land, trees and draft-animals, which had belonged previously to the big estate owners, feudal gentry, merchants and other exploiters, were confiscated. They were distributed by the State to the landless or landpoor peasant families at the rate of 5 hectares per household. At the same time, the buying, selling, or alienation of land was prohibited. The old debts incurred by peasants were cancelled. The Land Reform, which was completed within 14 months, brought about a profound transformation in the social relations and the mentality of the peasantry, who saw in it the realization of their age-old dream of land and getting rid of their bondage to the landlord. The antagonistic contradictions, which had existed for centuries between the labouring peasantry and the large estate owners were solved, and the way was opened to a speedy development of the forces of production.

The Land Reform laws were of a revolutionary character also because of the method by which they were carried out. The committees of the poor peasants rendered a valuable contribution by helping in a practical way to register the lands of the large estate holders, of the enemies of the people and of all those whose lands were confiscated by law. They fought to lay bare the hostile activities of the landlords, of the wealthy peasant farmers and of other reactionary forces who rose right at the beginning against the application of the Land Reform laws.

The application of the Land Reform laws created new conditions for our countryside. With the new base which it set up for the transformation of the semi-slave into a free peasant, the Land Reform laws were a necessary premise for all the economic, cultural and social transformations which would be made during the subsequent stages in the countryside.

During the Land Reform the foundations were laid, also, for the creation of the state socialist sector in agriculture. The first State Farms were set up on part of the confiscated land, while the forests and waters were turned into the collective property of the people as a whole.

The Party of Labour of Albania was well aware that with small fragmental economies, agriculture could not get out of the deplorable backwardness, which it had inherited from the past, and the harmonious and speedy development of all the branches of our people's economy could not be ensured. Both in the city and in the countryside, the People's State Power had to have its own advanced socialist base. The collectivization of agriculture was essential and the only way to ensure the victory of socialism in the countryside. Thus, side by side with the wideranging work for land improvement and protection, the mechanization of agriculture, the development of agricultural crops, animal husbandry, and so on, a major struggle was waged for the collectivization of agriculture, which, in line with the Party's consistent and cautious directives, was gradually spread throughout the country including, in the end, even the Highlands.

The collectivization of agriculture was carried out in a number of periods. The first period lasted about ten years, from 1946 to 1955. The slogan applied during the first period was, «In the matter of collectivization we should not be hasty, but neither should we mark time».

The cooperatives which were set up in this period played a very great role in creating conviction of the superiority of the collective property on the individual economies. The ten years that followed (1956-1966) were characterized by the forming of cooperatives on a mass scale not only by the poor but also by the middle peasants, in nearly all the villages of the country with the exception of those high in the mountains.

At this time and on the basis of the socialist transformations, which had taken place in agriculture on the basis of the general development of the country, the polical-economic-social conditions had been set up to wind up the process of collectivization of the countryside also in the mountain regions. Summing up the experience gained and taking into account that the social economic conditions had already been created, the 5th Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania issued the directives in November 1966 to complete the collectivization of agriculture. The Congress stressed, «It is not the topographic factor which determines the socialist relations in production, but the economic-social premises and the conscience of the people. These premises have long existed in our country. Under these circumstances, the establishment of socialist relations in production,
through collectivization, also in mountain regions which have not yet been collectivized, depends only on the people, on their conscience».
The orientation of the Party was adopted with enthusiasm and in full consciousness by the labouring peasantry of the mountain regions. Within a very short time, in less than three months, collectivization was successfully established also in mountain regions.
The collectivization of agriculture in Albania was carried out as an uninterrupted revolutionary process, which built up steadily without any disorder. It was accompanied everywhere and always with an upsurge of the selfactivity of the peasants who took an active part in the socialist transformation of the countryside and of the country as a whole. Their political consciousness and ideological level increased day by day. At the same time, agricultural production marked a turn such as the past had never known, liquidating the devastating consequences of the foreign invasions and pulling agriculture out of the backward state in which the former anti-popular regimes had left it.
From their experience of life and thanks to the great efforts of the Party to explain things to them, the peasants were convinced of the superiority of the cooperativist order, the only order which could lift them out of want and rescue them from any exploitation. The world outlook of the peasantry underwent a radical change. The psychology of individual work of the small-scale private property and narrow personal interest began, more and more, to give way to the feeling and consciousness of the common property, collective work and large-scale socialist production.
The successful conclusion of the collectivization of agriculture was rightly called the second revolution in the social-economic relations in the countryside.
The program of the socialist transformation of the countryside was carried out in stern class struggle against the kulaks and other enemies of the People's State Power. In this struggle the labouring peasantry had the powerful backing of its ally, the working class.
The process of uniting the cooperatives, which had been set up first on the basis of the village, into larger cooperatives, was carried out step by step and in a prudent way. This process was necessary for it created new opportunities to strengthen them organizationally and economically, to make better use of the state investments and other aid, to concentrate production and take advantage of the superiority of the large-scale collective property, to put agriculture on a better scientific basis.
Today, the agricultural cooperatives have an average of over 1,000 hectares of land each. As a rule, in the lowlands the agricultural cooperatives have from 2 to 3 thousand and more hectares of land, while in the mountains they have from 600 to 800 hectares. Combining the small cooperatives into enlarged agricultural economies, also created possibilities for a more harmonious development of the villages of the same cooperative, thus further narrowing their differences in production and the social-cultural field.
Experience has shown us that the construction of socialism in the countryside does not end with the accomplishment of collectivization and the union of the cooperatives. The property of the cooperative is the property of a group and as such it is of a transient and historical character. In time, it must be turned into the property of the people as a whole. This process is relatively long and passes through a number of stages like that of approaching the two forms of ownership and then of turning the property of the group into the property of all the people, forming in this way a form of property, that of all the society.
Under the conditions of our country, it is very important and actual to map out the right course for the initial stage of this process.
The setting up of the cooperatives of the higher type in the lowlands serves this purpose. This is an original way mapped out by the Party of Labour of Albania in bringing closer the two forms of ownership: that of the group with that of the whole society. This is an intermediary form of turning the property of the group into that of the whole society. Thus, the collective property gradually loses its transient character.
Now the cooperatives of the higher type occupy nearly 18 per cent of the arable land of the Republic. The main distinctive feature of the cooperatives of the higher type is the participation of
the State in the development of production with non-repayable social means for investments, a thing which is not done in ordinary cooperatives. This participation of the State with investments is done only for the development of the productive forces.

Another feature of these cooperatives is the transition from payment on the basis of work days performed to guaranteed wages, according to quotas realized. The amount of remuneration for each cooperative is determined according to its economic potential and is guaranteed up to 90 per cent. In these cooperatives, too, the remuneration for work continues to be connected with the result attained in production.

Different from the ordinary agricultural cooperatives, those of the higher type, after setting aside their seed and the fodder for the livestock etc., repay their debts and sell all the rest of the products, including bread grain, to the State. The state organs, on their part, guarantee to supply the members with bread at a fixed price.

The collectivization of agriculture and the work done to intensify and modernize it, have brought about a new revolutionary situation in our countryside. In work and in life our cooperative peasants are being educated and tempered with the features of communist morality, with the socialist stand towards work and the collective property.

The increase of mechanization, the land improvement and irrigation projects, the large-scale use of chemicals, the ever better application of advanced agricultural technique, the extension of the network of communications etc., the increase in the number of specialized cadres and the general rise in the educational level of the peasant, have created the appropriate material conditions to carry out intensive modern agriculture in breadth and depth, to raise the cultural and living standards of the masses of the cooperative members to a higher level, to bring production and life in the countryside ever closer to that of industry and the city.

Our country has long created stability in agricultural production with an average yearly increase of 5 per cent.

Now the extensive network of scientific institutions extends all over the country. With their assistance within a record time, a series of studies decisive for the modernization and intensification of agriculture have been carried out. Such are the results of the study of soils and the drawing of the pedological-agrochemical map of every cooperative, the study of the climate of the country and the kinds of plants most suitable to it, the local production of selected seeds for all agricultural crops, including wheat yielding over 40 quintals per hectare, hybrid maize yielding from 80 to 100 quintals per hectare, tobacco resistant to blight, and so on.

As early as 1973, there were fifty times as many cadres of higher training and forty times more cadres of medium training engaged in agricultural work than before Liberation. Today in Albania there are two Higher Agricultural Institutes and about 260 agricultural secondary schools. Ten Central Scientific Institutions and 26 agricultural stations in the various districts of the country are engaged in scientific work in agriculture.

The larger agricultural economies also create many advantages for the development of animal husbandry. Now an up-to-date and complex animal husbandry sector, based on correct technological and scientific criteria, has been set up and continues to develop. The main achievements in this field are the harmonious and proportional development of all kinds of livestock, the improvement of breeds and the organization of specialized units. Some of the State Farms have large herds of milk cows and ensure regular supplies of dairy products for the city. Other enterprises specialize in raising livestock for meat. Many State Farms and agricultural cooperatives have specialized units raising pigs, sheep and goats as well as poultry.

The new Albanian socialist countryside today is in a process of rapid development and transformation affecting the field of production and the social and cultural field. This revolutionary process of development of the forces of production in agriculture and of the improvement of socialist relations in the countryside will lead, in the future, to the transformation of the agricultural cooperatives from the property of a group of persons into the property of all the people, to the
liquidation of the differences between the cooperatives and the State Farms in order to bring about the complete construction of socialism in the countryside, to gradually narrow, and then do away altogether, with the essential differences between town and countryside, between the peasantry and the working class. This has been and continues to be one of the fundamental objectives of the general line of our Party for the construction of socialism in our country. To this end, the Party of Labour of Albania has carried out and continues to carry out a broad program of measures of a profound ideological, political, economic, social and cultural character. The continuous aid of the State to the countryside in the form of agricultural machinery, chemical fertilizers, credits, cadres of higher training, the setting up of the complete network of educational and public health institutions, the building of an extensive network of buildings for social and cultural purposes and the extension of the system of pensions to the countryside, the extension of scientific work, the electrification of all the villages and building of the network of motor highways and telephone lines in the countryside and a number of other similar measures, are important steps taken to attain this objective of the Party of Labour of Albania in connection with the countryside.

The decisions of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour and the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Albania of April 1, 1975, constitute an especially important step in this direction. On the basis of the new stage of the development of socialist production in the country and the new relations between town and countryside, between the working class and the peasantry, the leading organs of the Party and of the State adopted a new program of measures which will carry the Albanian countryside further on the road to socialism. Among the decisions of April 1st, were the following measures:

«In order to further narrow the differences between town and countryside and, within the countryside, between the plains and the hilly and mountainous zones, in order to raise the economic, social and cultural level of the Peasantry more rapidly as well as to further improve the conditions of work and life in the countryside, the State is to take over in the countryside: the expenditure for out-patient and consultation centres, maternity homes, kindergartens and nurseries for children; the salaries of the personnel of houses of culture in the centres of cooperatives; the investments for building schools, kindergartens and nurseries in the villages as well as houses of culture and public health institutions in the centres of agricultural cooperatives; the expenditure for the maintenance of the electric power line network within the villages and telephone network to the centre of enlarged cooperatives.»

«The Central Committee and the Council of Ministers are in favour of raising the percentage of pensions for the cooperative members, bringing it to the same level as that of city workers; of raising the minimum pensions of cooperative members, of having the State Social Insurance meet the cost of maternity leave payments for cooperativist women; of bringing the percentage of maternity leave payments (in relation to normal earnings) to the same level as in the city.

«To increase state investments in the hilly and mountainous zones for building irrigation projects, for opening secondary canals and extending the existing network of irrigation projects; to cover partially or wholly the value of workdays in opening and systematizing new land and for creating new orchard blocks and vineyards, for financing by the State up to 50 per cent of the value of workdays spent in radical pruning of olive trees, in building retaining walls around olive trees and planting olive saplings. In order to increase the number of draft animals, the State is to help the cooperative of the hilly and mountainous regions with financial means to buy them.»

«To lower the price of nitrogenous fertilizers from 9 to 15 per cent for the hilly and mountainous agricultural cooperatives.»

«The Tractor and Machine Stations to meet the expenditure made by the agricultural cooperatives for the transport and storage of fuel and protection of agricultural machinery. Investments to build sheds for the Tractor and Machine Stations on the agricultural cooperatives to be financed by the State.»
The agricultural cooperatives of the hilly and irmountainous regions to be exempted from paying bank interest on all the credits they have received and will receive in the future and the percentage of this interest for all the other cooperatives to be reduced.

Speaking about the policy of the Party of Labour of Albania towards the countryside, comrade Enver Hoxha has said: «While attaching primary importance to the industrialization and meahanization of labour, at the same time, we, in no way underrate the countryside and are not proceeding- to depopulate it, ~but are developing agriculture in harmony with it. While speaking of high yields in the plains, we do not overlook the rapid development of agriculture in the hilly and mountainous regions. Maintenance of the right proportions in this direction is very important to the cause of building socialism in our country, while allowing the creation of disproportion is fraught with disorder and grave economic, political, class and ideological consequences».

The implementation of such a line has meant that in Albania there has been no abandonment of the countryside, no ravaging of it, but, on the contrary, it has steadly developed both in the lowlands and in the mountainous regions. While carrying out the call of the Party -to take to the mountains and hills and make them as fertile as the plains», the peasantry, backed by the State and the volunteers from the city youth, have created large plantations of fruit trees and other agricultural crops on the hills, on the mountainsides, and along the coast, which used to be barren or covered with shrub. The creation of new villages with modern town planning, of fanns on the newly brought in land, have given the map of our homeland a new appearance and have placed agriculture on the road to rapid development and prosperity.

The collectivization of agriculture in Albania has its distinctive features. It was carried out under special social and economic conditions. In the first place it was carried out under the conditions of the existence of the small private ownership of the land. The experience of our country goes to show that where the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established, the collectivization of agriculture can be carried out successfully even where the nationalization of land has not been made but the land reform laws of a thoroughly revolutionary character have been implemented. This experience constitutes a creative development of Marxist-Leninist science, it shows that the initial nationalization of the land is no longer an objective necessity for all countries in order to carry out the collectivization of agriculture.

Another distinctive feature of the socialist transformation of the countryside is that in our country we did no wait for the productive forces to develop first and then to carry out the collectivization of agriculture, but we began to build new socialist relations in production without neglecting also the development of the productive forces. Had we waited to develop the productive forces and then to begin collectivization, we would have lost time in favour of capitalism and to the detriment of socialism, we would have caused great damage to the alliance of the working class with the labouring peasantry.

Our experience of socialist construction in the countryside goes to prove that collectivization should not be hampered artificially until a rapid development of the productive forces is ensured just as it should not be forced artificially .before the necessary political, ideological and economic premises have been created.

Another distinctive feature of the collectivization of agriculture án our country is also its cautious application when the ideopolitical and social-economic conditions are ripe. The collectivization of agriculture in our country was carried out at a time when the modem revisionists had coane to power in the Soviet Union and in other socialist countries where this general law of socialist construction was sabotaged.

The collectivization of agriculture in our country was realized by ~pursuing the stime policy in the development of the class struggle: the political alienation, the economic isolation. and liquidation of the kulaks.

As a rule, in setting up agricultural cooperatives in our country, we did not wait to include all the peasants in cooperatives all at once, but we set up cooperatives with a relatively small number of peasants. This made it possible not to force collectivization in an artifical way.
The development of agriculture and the experience of building socialism in the countryside,* comrade Enver Hoxha has said, prove the universal value of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism according to which, the only course to follow in building socialism in the countryside, in countries with chopped up agricultural economies, is the collectivization of agriculture. Any other course beside collectivization leads only to the development or restoration of capitalism in the countryside.

**BASIC INVESTMENTS.** Basic investments and construction constitute one of the key problems of the economic policy of the Socialist State. They take a major place in the State Plan of Economic and Cultural Development.

The volume, structure and distribution of basic investments and construction have increased and improved in a perceptible way from one five-year period to another, a thing which has led to the increase of the main funds of the country. In 1974, gas against 1938 the total volume of investments was 259 times greater. During the stime period, the volume of capital construction was 118 times greater than in 1938.

In the distribution of basic investments and construction priority has always been given to the sphere of material production, which absorbs more than 4/5ths of the investments made in the people's economy.

Basic investments and construction increased markedly especially during the 5th five-year period (1971-75).

The fundamental characteristic of the last five-year plan period (1971-75) was the increased volume of investments for the development of heavy industry. Major work, was done on such projects as the ferrous metallurgical complex, the power industry, the non-ferrous metallurgy, chemical, and other industries. Techniques and technology of advanced world standards, with a high level of concentration and productive and processing capacities were used. The volume in value of construction and installation work on the metallurgical complex and the deep oil processing plant alone is calculated to be equal to the combined volume of construction and installation work done on about thirty major industrial projects built in our country up to 1970. Now our country is building major industrial projects in such branches of the economy as the iron and steel, chemical, hydro-electric power, and other industries, which require relatively very much larger investments and longer periods of time than the projects of industry built in the past. Large investments have been and continue to be made in agriculture for land improvement, irrigation, mechanization and the use of chemicals for increasing the fertility of the soil and breed improvement of livestock, for increasing agricultural and livestock products.

Parallel with investments in the productive sectors, large financial funds go to the development of the social-cultural sectors (education, public health, housing, municipal services, etc.)

**FOREIGN TRADE.** The foreign trade of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania reflects the uninterrupted development of our people's economy. It has increased from year to year parallel with the socialist industrialization and the development of the other branches of our economy. As compared with 1938, the rate of growth of our foreign trade has been as follows: seven fold in 1960, about thirteen fold in 1970, and about twenty-two fold in 1975.

In addition to chromium, iron-nickel, crude oil, bitumen, copper and other minerals, Albania also exports their by-products, such as concentrate of chromium ore, electric cables and wires, products of the light and food-processing industry, of the chemical industry (soda ash, hyposulphite fluosilicate, enamelled and other paints, acids), building materials (cement, silica bricks, marble slabs), oil by-products, readymade garments and knitwear, leather and plastic goods, carpets, rugs and art products, aromatic essences and oils, fresh and preserved fruit and vegetables, wine, and so on.
Albania exports electric power. With the rapid development of industry in our country, the day is not far off when new items will be added to our list of exports from the iron and steel industry, oil refining, the chemical and other industries.

In 1974, fuels, minerals and metals made up 59 per cent of our exports, while agricultural and livestock raw materials made up only 9.2 per cent of our exports, as against 32.4 per cent in 1950. The following figures show the trend of the continuous improvement of the structure of our exports; in 1975, processed goods amounted to 62.4 per cent of the total volume of our exports.

To give a better idea of the qualitative progress of Albanian exports during the years of our People's State Power, it should be pointed out that before the liberation of the country, Albania exported only a limited quantity of agricultural and livestock products, while it imported everything, from needles and buttons to fabrics and paper. Our underground resources were exploited by foreign companies.

IV. WELLBEING

The ceaseless raising of the material wellbeing and the cultural level of the broad working masses is the supreme aim of the socialist state. This stems from the very nature of the state, from the socialist system of the economy, from the fundamental economic law of socialism. In Albania the social classes and strata which linked their livelihood with oppression and exploitation have been liquidated. The establishment of the political power of the workers and peasants and the socialist social ownership over the means of production, led to the establishment of equality among the working people in regard to means of production, to the liquidation of classes with opposing antagonistic interests, while in the economic field, particularly in the field of the distribution of production for -personal use, this equality has been attained only to the extent that the economic revolution has been carried out. In the lower phase of the communist society, in socialism, the economic law of distribution according to work operates. The operation of this law is inevitable - because our socialist social-economic order emerged from the feudal-bourgeois order with a low level of productive forces, with hang-overs from the old social distribution of labour and with all those blemishes in the consciousness of the people. Consequently, there are still differences of economic level among various people, but they are being steadily narrowed.

The economic policy of the socialist state has always aimed at unceasingly raising the material and cultural level of all the working people without allowing big differences between classes, social strata, specific groups of working people, and at the same time, without falling into the positions of petty-bourgeois egalitarianism.

In conformity with this principled Marxist-Leninist stand, in Albania, during the years of the People's State Power, correct ratios have been established and applied between the increase of production and the national income, and the distribution and use of it in the funds of accumulation and consumption. The system of pay and remuneration of the working people has been constructed in such a way as to differentiate between heavy and light work, between qualified and simple work, without allowing big differences in the rewards for labour in different branches of the economy, particularly between town and countryside and within the ranks of the working people.

A decisive role in raising the wellbeing belongs to the increase of the national income. This is a very important index which clearly shows the ever increasing economic potential of the country.

In our country the national income has risen at higher rates than the natural increase of the population. Whereas the national income in 1974 had risen 10.8 times as against 1938, the population had increased 2.3 times. In 1975, the national income increased five times above those of 1938 and had nearly doubled as compared with 1960. This has made it possible to raise the people's standard of living and, in conformity with the political and economic circumstances in
which socialism is built in our country, to make new investments to exploit and put into economic circulation the natural resources and assets and thus to ensure ever higher rates of the extended socialist reproduction. Therefore, not only the increase of the national income, but also the establishment and the preservation of correct proportions in its division into the fund of accumulation and the fund of consumption is a key political and economic problem. In our country, which is building socialism relying on its own forces, the norm of accumulation has always been relatively high: from 26.9 per cent in the second five-year plan (1956 to 1960) to 28.7 per cent in the third five-year plan (1961 to 1965), to 34 per cent in the fourth five-year plan (1966 to 1970) and 34-37 per cent in the fifth five-year plan (1971 to 1975).

Along with the increase of the fund of accumulation, funds of individual and social consumption, which directly and indirectly raise the wellbeing of the people, have steadily increased. In 1974, as against 1950, the fund of individual consumption had increased 7.5 fold. In the same year as against 1970, the real income of the workers and employees had increased 9.4 per cent, whereas the income of the cooperativist peasantry had increased by 13.4 per cent. This means that the purchasing power of the population has increased at rapid rates. In 1974 as against 1938, the turnover of retail goods had increased 13.1 times over. The expenditure of the state budget for social-cultural purposes per head of population in 1975 had increased about 8 times above 1950. Compared with 1958 the prices of mass consumer goods are now from 8 to 25 per cent lower. The increase in the economic potential of the country and the national income, in the fund of consumption and purchasing power, has made the Albanian currency, the lek, a stable currency. Characteristic of the rise in the wellbeing of the working masses is not only the increase in the individual consumption fund, but also the steady increase of the social consumption fund. In our country, the monthly wage is not all the real income which the working people receive from society. An ever greater part of the national income goes in favour of the working people, such as the state expenditure on the education of the working people and their children, on social insurance and pensions, and other measures. For all of these, nothing is deducted from the pay of the Albanian worker. To finance this expenditure which goes to the benefit of the people, the state spends one quarter of its budget. And the tendency is for this item of expenditure in the state budget to increase from year to year. The stability of prices, the removal of all taxes and levies, the reduction of house rents, charges for water, lighting and other services to the minimum, the employment of all the able-bodied population, the bringing of electric right into every Albanian home with state funds, the construction of motor roads and the telephone network to connect all the villages, all these things are important achievements and indices of the constant raising of the general wellbeing. Expenditure on such things is supplementary income for the working people. Consequently in 1974, as against 1960, the fund of social consumption rose 2.6 times as against the two fold increase of the fund of individual consumption. In this way, as early as in the phase of socialism, the beginnings of the future communist society are created and, strengthened.

**MEDICAL SERVICE.** In the People's Socialist Republic of Albania medical service is given free of charge hospitalization, visits, analyses, treatment at ambulances, doctor's visit to the home of the sick and so on. Our socialist State has undertaken this humane task and has spared nothing to ensure for the people total coverage by a quali-lied medical service established on a scientific basis. Today we have extended the network of health institutions even to the most remote districts. Our hospitals are new and with all the essential services. We have sanatoria, maternity homes, day nurseries for babies, dispensaries, health institutions for scientific studies, institutions of a hygiene-sanitation character, a wide network of institutions for treatment of dental ailments, for supplying drugs, a pharmaceutical industry and so on. In Albania there is one doctor, including stomatologists, serving
every 780 persons whereas in 1938 the figure was one doctor to 8,527 persons. In comparison with 1938, the number of hospital beds today has increased 21 times. These and many other devices testify to the organization and planning on correct criteria for the proportional development of the entire medical service, providing it with the necessary conditions for normal work, the necessary personnel of higher training who constantly strive to serve the people conscientiously and with devotion.

In our treatment and prophylactic institutions a systematic struggle is waged against various diseases not only by treating but also by preventing them. Thanks to the prophylactic and curative work, from being the most malaria-ridden country in Europe, now we have not a single case of malaria in our country. We have other such major achievements in other diseases, too, which wrought havoc among our people in the past. Today, there is no trace of syphilis to be found in Albania while tuberculosis has been reduced to very few cases a year.

The mobilization of our health cadres, their continuing qualification, the political understanding of the problems of prophylaxis and health propaganda, the close contact of the doctors with the patients, their visits to peasant homes have resulted in obvious successes in recent years, especially, in creating sound convictions among the people who are carrying out better and better comrades Enver Hoxha's instruction that «... we should educate the people to go to the doctor or the public health institutions not only when they are sick, but to go time and again for consultation and examination even when they feel well so that any disorder in the or ganism may be detected in time before it causes disturbing symptoms and paro».

In 1938, the average life expectancy in Albania was only 38 years. In 1950 it rose to 53.5 years and in 1974 to 68 years.

In order to form an accurate assessment of the health service of a country, it is necessary to see, first and foremost, how the health of mother and child is looked after.

At present Albania has standards of obstetric-gynecological and pediatric services such as many other countries might envy. There are sufficient maternity beds to accommodate all the expectant mothers in both town and countryside without exception. There are midwives in every village no matter how small it may be. There are day nurseries in every city and village in which a very high percentage of our young children are growing up. There is advanced legislation for paid leave for mothers before and after childbirth, for assuring them light work during pregnancy as well as the eight to leave the job every three hours to breast feed their babies and so on. The provision of all medicines for children under one year of age, and supply of vitamins to expectant mothers and to their children after childbirth free of charge, the subsidizing of a considerable part of the cost of nurseries etc. by the State, are very important factors which exert an influence on continually improving the health of mother and child.

The State creates the best possible conditions for the broad masses so that they may spend their vacations guaranteed by law in the most cultural way at our most attractive mountain and seaside climatic resorts where very comfortable holiday homes have been set up. From year to year the number and capacity of our beaches is increasing.

The working people of town and countryside are guaranteed the necessary means of livelihood in old age, in case of illness or loss of capacity for work. Likewise, the State takes under special care the invalids of the National Liberation War, of the struggle in defense of the homeland and the invalids from work and creates conditions for their rehabilitation.

For all these obligations which our socialist State takes upon itself, large sums are spent by means of which the working people of every age and profession are assisted to maintain and strengthen their health.

The protection of the health of our people should be viewed in all its aspects.

Our State compels all investors to carry out all the measures that should be taken in order to protect the environment from pollution right from the first stages of work on new projects and so on. But in addition to investors the law also charges social organizations as well as every citizen with duties so that he himself may protect the environment from pollution and take a stand and make it a problem
when he notices any violation of this law which is related directly to the protection of the health of the working masses.

Now let us take up some special cases:

When a child is taken ill, the working mother has the right to remain at home to nurse the child for nine days in every three month period or up to thirty six working days a year. For this period she is paid. If the doctor deems it necessary, the mother can be given supplementary unpaid leave to nurse a child through a long illness. If the child has to be hospitalized, the mother, particularly if she is breast feeding the child, can stay at the hospital to assist the child for as long as the doctor recommends it. For the whole of this period she is paid on the basis of the regulations of social insurance.

According to the sanitary legislation of our country, it is compulsory for every work center to take measures for the prevention of professional diseases of the workers in accordance with the work center and the material handled by the workers. The work center must secure the respective installations for ventilation or for the suction of harmful gases, smoke, dust during production processes and to remove in good time all waste and leftovers harmful to the environment. The work centre must supply the workers with individual means and clothing for protection during production. The workers must also utilize these means during work. They are subject to periodical medical examinations to make the necessary analysis at the laboratory and so on. No new worker is accepted at work without having a medical report which proves the condition of his health.

Every woman, as soon as she suspects that she is pregnant, reports to the women's consultation rooms, both in town and countryside. The consultant keeps the mother-to-be under constant control, follows the normal development of the child and when any difficulty arises, immediately sends the woman to the respective specialist. The pregnant women prepare themselves to receive their children following the advice of the midwife or the doctor who is in charge of them. They go through a health education course called «The School of Mothers» where they learn how to bring up their babies. A working mother who is breast feeding a child has the right to leave work every three hours to feed the child.

Our State spares nothing for the life of the handicapped children. It makes huge expenditure to return them to normal life. Special institutions have been set up in Albania to correct several congenital diseases such as luxation, coxax and others. In Albania there is also a central institution for mentally handicapped children where they are submitted to a psychological pedagogical treatment and any other respective treatment. The results are very satisfactory: many of these children have entered life as all the others.

The revolutionary triangle of our school system lessons, production work and military training - operates in the Faculty of Medicine as well. Besides the lessons which are done in accordance with the teaching programs and plans, the students do also practical medical work, beginning with the first year at the Faculty. For instance, first year medical students do one month's practical work of a nurse or sanitary worker. In accordance with their subjects, the practical lessons are done in the laboratories or at the patient's bedside and under the direct supervision of the assistants. The sixth year of the Faculty is almost all practical work at the surgeries of internal surgical illnesses, pediatric and obstetric-gynecological complaints. The relations between practical and theoretical work are harmonized so that the student is as capable as possible of meeting the requirements to properly treat the patient.

The doctor-patient relations being disinterested (in our country the doctor has no financial ties with the patient) are based on mutual respect and socialist humanism. The doctors respect their patients, they listen to them carefully and do their utmost to alleviate their suffering as much as possible. The patient nourishes also a great respect for the doctors and listens to every word they say. Now it has become a part of the daily practice of our doctors to maintain constant contact with the people, they meet with groups of workers, citydwellers and villagers and hold talks with them, lectures in order to raise to a higher level the culture and the sanitary education of the workers.
PRICES POLICY. In Albania, prices are fixed and standard throughout the Republic. Everywhere, north or south, the same commodity is bought and sold at the same price. All consumers are on an equal footing. The prices are fixed in a centralized way. They are not influenced by the spontaneous supply and demand of the market.

Price is the expression of the value of a commodity in money. But this does not mean that the specific price of a commodity expresses its value, the necessary social work done for its production at all times. In our country, too, there are fluctuations of price above and below the value of the commodity, but these fluctuations do not occur under the spontaneous action of supply and demand but are done in a conscious way following well defined objectives. Thus, for instance, for the principal article of prime necessity, the selling price is always around about their value. There are commodities such as pharmaceutical, clothing and other articles for children, which are sold at prices below their value. And this is done for the purpose of stimulating their use and favouring certain groups of society such as families with many children. At the same time there are articles which are sold at prices higher than their value such as luxury goods, the use of which is not essential. This group includes alcoholic beverages and others. In the same way, the prices of cotton and woollen fabrics as well as of garments made of them, are constructed in such a way as to direct the demands of the consumers more to ready-made garments rather than to bolt material. This is done for the purpose of extending the demand for readymade garments because it is a well-known fact that the organization of serial production discloses new and greater possibilities for saving raw materials, for raising the qualification, specialization and productivity of labour, factors which tend to reduce the cost of production.

The aim of production in our country is not profit but fulfilment of the material and cultural needs of the working masses, to fulfil the needs of man. Between production and prices there is a reciprocal, dialectic connection. The lowering of prices leads to increased demand and, together with it, consumption. And this impels the producers to find new ways and -possibilities to step up production in order to meet the needs of the consumers. In our planned economy, crises of overproduction are unknown.

The workers of our country do not feel the effects of the world economic crisis which has the capitalist and revisionist countries in its grip today, in the fields of prices. The State covers the fluctuations of the prices of imported goods with its own expenditure. Thus, the prices of essential goods like sugar, vegetable oils, medicines, and so on, have not changed at all, although the prices of these goods in the international market have increased many times over in recent years. In our country retail prices have only one course, that of steady reduction. There has not been a single instance of a price rise in any commodity. On the contrary, prices have been steadily reduced. There have been a number of general reductions in retail prices, benefitting the working masses to the extent of millions of leks. Of course, this is not the only way to increase the real wages of the workers. Along with the lowering of prices, the policy of raising the lower nominal wages of the workers is followed, too.

THE COUNTRY WHERE THE PEOPLE PAY NO TAXES OR LEVIES. In the structure and application of its whole policy of taxation on the population, the Party of Labour of Albania has always been aware that taxation is a temporary historical category. Therefore, step by step and with great care, it prepared the necessary conditions for eliminating it. On November 8, 1969, a measure of great importance was taken for the total abolition of the system of direct taxation on the population.

This measure is connected with the extension of the sphere of the establishment of socialist relations in production and with the rapid development of the productive forces of the country. Thus the specific weight of taxes and levies from the population in the total income of the state budget
during the 1945-46 financial year (the first year after liberation) was 92 per cent; in 1950 it fell to 12.6 per cent; in 1960 it fell to 2.7 per cent and in 1969 to 0.1 per cent.
As can be seen, the process of abolishing taxes and levies from the population was not carried out all at once, but they were abolished step by step, parallel with the development of the socialist sector of the economy, with the elimination of the economic basis of taxation, and with the change in the class structure in our country. This constitutes a major victory achieved by our people and is a brilliant example of the consistent implementation by our Party of Labour of its general line for the construction of socialist society and constant improvement of the standard of living of the people.
Article 31 of the new Constitution says explicitly «The citizens pay no taxes or levies of any kind». The complete abolition of the system of taxes and levies, which the people used to pay in our country, is not only of major economic importance but of a major political and ideological importance as well. By eliminating taxes, the personal income which all the working people of our country, including the peasants, achieve from their work, are inviolate.

THE ELECTRIC RETICULATION OF THE COUNTRYSIDE. On October 25, 1970, the electric lights went on in the last Albanian village, which had remained without electric power. In a symbolic way and to commemorate that day, this village in the Fier district, took the name «Dawn». From that day on, Albania entered the ranks of those few states which have achieved the electrification of all the villages.
Up to 1945 no village in Albania had electric power.
To bring light to all the peasant homes was a difficult and a very costly job. Nevertheless Albania did it, because it placed the interests, wellbeing, and happiness of the peasant above everything. The electric reticulation of the countryside was done entirely at the expense of the state. The peasants paid nothing, although they assisted in the work to carry this project through. The geographic relief of our country is very mountainous. For historical-social reasons of the past, the houses of the villagers are built far away from one another. In some cases the distance between them runs to kilometres. The wire used to take the light to the countryside was enough to go several times around the circumference of the earth.
The electric reticulation of our villages paved the way to a profound revolution in the allround development and transformation of the countryside. Together with the electric light, radio, television, and many other household devices entered the peasant homes. The use of electric power in the countryside has made possible a perceptible rise in the level of mechanization of agriculture, which is increasing productivity of all agricultural crops and making the work of the peasant easier.

LABOUR LEGISLATION. The aim of Labour legislation in Albania is to ensure the full implementation, of the socialist principles «work is a duty and an honour», and «from each according to his ability, to each according to his work». Work for all and the implementation of these principles are guaranteed by the socialization of the means of production and the planned organization of our economy. In our country there are no economic crises or unemployment. Work has become the source of the wellbeing of everyone and the basis of our social system.
In the past many Albanians had to migrate in order to earn a livelihood. You would find them employed where the work was hardest and most difficult: in the coal mines of France or the United States of America, on building jobs in Australia or the farms of Argentina. Most of the families of these emigrants experienced many family tragedies. That is why the places where the emigrants were welcomed were called by the people «The meadow of tears». Many songs of sorrow have been composed about the cursed migration, about the young brides left without their husbands, the children who did not know the fathers forced to go abroad to earn their-daily bread.
In the Constitution of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania we read:
Work is the foundation of the entire economic-social life of the country. Work constitutes the main source from which every citizen ensures the means of livelihood.

Thus, as has been the case up to date, the State has put the guarantee of work for every citizen at the foundation of the whole life of the country, as a right and a duty for every citizen. This is guaranteed by the political, economic and social conditions of the socialist order. It is based on the existence of the political State Power of the working class, on the existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat which runs the economy and the whole life of the country.

The principal laws dealing with the work and life of the working people, with employment, conditions of work, wages, and social insurance, are drawn up after having solicited the opinions of the workers and trade unions. This has made it possible to divest the labour laws of unnecessary complicated formulations and make them simple, clear, and understandable to the masses, thus enabling them to check up on their application in practice.

The workers are guaranteed an 8-hour workday by law. For certain categories of workers engaged in difficult jobs the working day is reduced to 7, 6, or 5 hours, without any reduction in wages. Overtime work is not allowed except in special cases.

In addition to the weekly day-off and official holidays, the workers and employees enjoy the right to an annual vacation with pay. A good number of workers, like those working in mines, metallurgy, chemical works, the oil industry, tobacco factories, the health service, education and culture, etc. are entitled to supplementary leave of up to 36 work days a year. In order to enable the workers to spend their vacations and relax in a pleasant environment, holiday homes have been set up which are used by tens of thousands of workers every year.

In the conditions of the further revolutionization of the school, in order to make it easier for the workers to attend courses while continuing with their jobs, the hours of work for those who are studying, are reduced and supplementary leave with full pay is granted them to prepare for and sit their examinations. This supplementary leave is from three to six hours a week for part-time school attendance, from 15 to 25 days a year for sitting examinations, and up to 30 days a year for taking final examinations.

The law gives equal rights to men and to women on the basis of the principle -equal pay for equal work. The state gives special protection to women and minors. Pregnant women, nursing mothers, and people with medical certificates, are not allowed to work night shifts or overtime, or do heavy work. Nursing mothers, are entitled to not less than half an hour off work every 3-4 hours to feed their babies, plus the time necessary to travel from work to the nursery or home and back. This time off is included in their worktime. Working women also enjoy other facilities which enable them to take part en masse in production work and to carry out their duties as mothers and housewives.

In line with the principle that “people are the most precious asset,” the Labour Code and other dispositions on safety at work attach special importance to protecting the health and life of the workers. Thus, workshops, factories, and other establishments where work goes on, are designed, built and utilized according to the rules of technical safety, sanitation and hygiene. The use of machines, mechanisms and installations, which present a danger is permitted only after they have been equipped with protective devices and when the workers have been given sufficient training in the use of these devices. The workers and employees on jobs liable to endanger their health are provided, free of charge, with protective clothing and equipment (goggles, masks, helmets, earmuffs, gloves, boots and so on). In the branches of production, which emit dangerous gases and vapours, in addition to other protective devices, the workers are given antidotes. Such steps for the prevention of occupational diseases and accidents are a major factor in preventing temporary disability and invalidity from constituting a disturbing problem in our country.

In Albania, in addition to the free medical service, all workers and employees and members of agricultural cooperatives are guaranteed social insurance. The necessary funds for social insurance are provided entirely by the State and are a supplement to workers’ wages and salaries. Social insurance provides for all eventualities covering the working people from before they are born, throughout their lives, and their families after their deaths. Social insurance provides aid for the
workers in case of temporary incapacity to work, ranging from 70 to 85 per cent of their wages and payable from the first day of this incapacity. In case of incapacity because of injury at work or occupational disease, the compensation payment ranges from 95 to 100 per cent of average earnings. Women workers and cooperativists are entitled to paid maternity leave from 13 to 15 weeks, paid at the rate of 80 per cent of their average earnings.

Old age pensions for workers are differentiated on the basis of how difficult their work is. Full old age pensions are available to men who have reached the age of 50, 55 or 60 years with 20 or 25 years at work and women at 45, 50 or 55 years of age with 15 and 20 years at work. The pension is paid at the rate of 70 per cent of average earnings: Pensions are also paid to invalids, to those who lose the family breadwinner, and to those who have displayed special merits in the struggle for the freedom, independence and socialist construction of the country.

Social insurance benefits also apply in the agricultural cooperatives. Maternity leave payments and the benefit for the birth of each child, as well as pensions, are paid for the prevention of occupational diseases and accidents are a major factor in preventing temporary disability and invalidity from constituting a disturbing problem in our country.

In Albania, in addition to the free medical service, all workers and employees and members of agricultural cooperatives are guaranteed social insurance. The necessary funds for social insurance are provided entirely by the State and are a supplement to workers' wages and salaries. Social insurance provides for all eventualities covering the working people from before they are born, throughout their lives, and their families after their deaths. Social insurance provides aid for the workers in case of temporary incapacity to work, ranging from 70 to 85 per cent of their wages and payable from the first day of this incapacity. In case of incapacity because of injury at work or occupational disease, the compensation payment ranges from 95 to 100 per cent of average earnings. Women workers and cooperativists are entitled to paid maternity leave from 13 to 15 weeks, paid at the rate of 80 per cent of their average earnings.

Old age pensions for workers are differentiated on the basis of how difficult their work is. Full old age pensions are available to men who have reached the age of 50, 55 or 60 years with 20 or 25 years at work and women at 45, 50 or 55 years of age with 15 and 20 years at work. The pension is paid at the rate of 70 per cent of average earnings: Pensions are also paid to invalids, to those who lose the family breadwinner, and to those who have displayed special merits in the struggle for the freedom, independence and socialist construction of the country.

Social insurance benefits also apply in the agricultural cooperatives. Maternity leave payments and the benefit for the birth of each child, as well as pensions, are paid in a centralized way by the State Social Security organs. On the decision of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour and the Government, which came into effect on April 1, 1976, the proportion of normal earnings payable in town and countryside in maternity, child-birth, and age benefits, was equalized, and the minimum age benefit payable in the countryside was increased.

Social security payments for temporary incapacity to work are paid from the social security funds of the agricultural cooperatives themselves.

State control over the application of the Labour Code and the laws on social insurance, ordinances, decisions and instructions, is exercised by the supreme organs of the State, the social insurance organs, inspectorates of labour, safety at work and health organs. But the trade unions, the organizations of the working class, perform a very important function in this direction. They are extensively engaged in making the workers familiar with the laws so that they are rigorously applied, in fighting manifestations of bureaucracy and technocracy, and in enforcing discipline on everybody.

Under the Labour Code, a worker has the right to complain about any disagreement to the trade union organization on his work center, in the first place. In this way the role and authority of the trade unions is greatly enhanced. This is a very important democratic solution, because they are organizations of the workers themselves and have first hand knowledge of the workers' conditions and what worries them.
VI. THE EMANCIPATION OF WOMEN

The progress of the Albanian women to their emancipation under the guidance of the Party of Labour of Albania is one of the finest examples and has yielded brilliant results. The linking of the problem of women with national liberation and the treatment of this problem by the Party of Labour of Albania as an integral part of the uninterrupted socialist revolution not only ensured real conditions for the solution of all the problems of the women, but also made a contribution of great general value in this field.

Comrade Enver Hoxha has raised before the whole society that «the Party and the working class should measure the advance towards the complete construction of socialist society with the deepening and progress of the women's revolution within our proletarian revolution. If the women lag behind, then, the revolution marks time».

Before the establishment of our People's State Power the situation of the Albanian woman was appalling. Not only did she suffer oppression and poverty, as all the people suffered, but as well as this, she also suffered from discrimination, inequality with man, from feudal moral norms, from backward customs and religion. Often she was treated as a chattel - her father and his relatives sold her, her husband and his relatives bought her. Where the Moslem code prevailed, polygamy was permitted. According to these mediaeval laws, a young woman could be married off to an elderly man for the interest of the clan and for money. The birth of a girl was considered a misfortune and a burden on the family. In certain regions the woman was compelled to cover her face with a veil. Under these conditions, the participation of a woman in state employment was something quite extraordinary. Throughout Albania there were only 21 women teachers, two or three women doctors, not a single woman engineer, agronomist or chemist. No woman took part in parliament or in any more or less important job in the state apparatus. In the secondary schools, girls made up only 2.4 per cent of the students. Illiteracy, which kept the overwhelming majority of the population in darkness, weighed even more heavily on the women.

During the National Liberation War, the Party of Labour of Albania attached major importance in its program to the activization and mobilization of the women. There are many examples in the history of Albania when women have fought, arms in hand, against foreign invaders, but their participation in the National Liberation War had to become a mass phenomenon and with an entirely new content. The Party called on the women to rise and smash the shackles of fanaticism with their own hands, to line up shoulder to shoulder with their menfolk in the struggle for national liberation, and, at the same time, in the struggle for their own emancipation. For the Albanian women, their participation in the armed struggle was a sound guarantee for their complete emancipation in the future. The Party had made it clear in its program that after the establishment of the People's State Power the struggle for the emancipation of the women would continue both in breadth and depth. In this program, the Albanian women saw the way to their salvation, therefore they rose in whole-hearted struggle. About 6,000 women and girls joined the ranks of the National Liberation Army, and many of them were leaders of partisan detachments. Thousands of others took part in underground work in the cities, in the demonstrations, and clashes with the invaders. Women and girls gave the National Liberation Army massive assistance with food and clothing, by providing shelter and treating the wounded, by transporting arms and ammunition. During the war, the councils of anti-fascist women were set up in villages and cities to conduct organized work with the masses of the women, political and cultural work, courses against illiteracy and so on. The Anti-fascist Organization of the Albanian Women, which was set up in September 1943, played an outstanding role in the liberation war.

After the establishment of our People's State Power, the revolution in the economy was carried out, and this required the conscious efforts of men, women, and the entire people, to fight with self-
denial to carry out the collectivization and the socialist industrialization of the country, to safeguard, administer and strengthen the common property at a higher level. Men and women were trained at work, in schools, in qualification courses, in political and ideological study groups, to see the emancipation of women, among other problems, as a problem of the socialist revolution. To this end, special laws were proclaimed, guaranteeing the rights of women, old norms and customs were eliminated, replacing them with new norms and customs, based on raising the respect for and the dignity of the women in our society.

Today, the Albanian women play an important role in the whole life of the country. Let us refer to some figures: at present 47 per cent of the working people employed in our Republic are women and girls. In certain sectors, like the light and food-processing industry, education, the health service and trade, this figure rises from 55 to 80 per cent. Women make up 33.3 per cent of the representatives in the Supreme State organ, the People's Assembly, 25 per cent of the members of the Party of Labour of Albania, 26 per cent of the members of the Supreme Court, 41.2 per cent of the leaders of the organizations of the masses.

The People's State Power abolished capitalist exploitation, established a new legislative code, and opened the way to the operation of the objective laws of socialist society. Under the People's State Power, the new man has been educated, armed with Marxist-Leninist ideology, with new concepts about work, property, the family, the woman, and so on. The creation of these conditions brought about a situation in which a girl is no longer treated as a slave, in which love must be the basis of every marriage. All roads have been opened to the youth to guide themselves by lofty socialist motives in the creation of the family and not by material interests, careerism and other motives which humiliate the woman.

At the present stage, the problem of the Albanian woman is more of a class struggle in the ideological field. Even under these circumstances, when all these objective conditions have been created, the processes which go on within the family, must not be left to spontaneity. Therefore a direct, but tactful struggle is waged to establish socialist relations and standards in the family, such as relations of equality, love, mutual respect and aid. In order to ensure equality between the wife and the other members of the family, the struggle is now being waged in two directions: first, to make family affairs, day to day life, children and so on, as widely as possible the concern of the whole society; second, to have every member of the family understand that these things are jobs for which they are all responsible.

Under the conditions of Albania, the participation of women in the entire life of the country has become an objective necessity. The efforts, the physical and mental energies of the women, too, are necessary to promote the unceasing revolution, to strengthen the People's State Power and further democratize it through the line of the masses. The efforts of the women are necessary, too, for the strengthening and defence of the homeland against any enemy through the training of the whole people.

The emancipation of women in Albania is not a -feminist movement» as in the capitalist countries, but is the advance of the women to a high level, to full equality with men, the march of women hand in hand with their menfolk in harmony of feelings, aims, and pure ideals, the march towards communism.

V. THE RATIO BETWEEN LOWER AND HIGHER WAGES

The Party of Labour of Albania has pursued the line of the gradual narrowing of the differences in the level of income and the living standards between the working class and the cooperative peasantry and the category within them, between town and countryside; it has always been careful to maintain as close a ratio as possible between the pay of the cadres and the income of the workers.
and cooperative members, to avoid flagrant differences in income which give rise to the birth of a privileged stratum and directly endanger the dictatorship of the proletariat and the construction of socialism. At the same time, the Party has always fought against tendencies towards petty bourgeois equalitarianism in the field of remuneration which is also alien and harmful to socialism.

In accordance with this revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist line, the wage system of the workers and the employees and the system of the remuneration for work for cooperative members have been set up and systematically improved always based on the socialist law of distribution according to work. The implementation of this system in practice has made it possible for the differences between lower and higher wages, between the income of the employees and the workers and cooperative members to be narrowed and to have more correct proportions.

On this question the Party of Labour of Albania has always proceeded from the teachings of Lenin who stressed that «the corruptive influence of high wages is indisputable both on the Soviet State Power as well as on the masses of the workers. . . The principles of the Paris Commune and every proletarian State Power demand that the wage of an employee be no higher than the wage of a good worker, they demand that career seeking be fought against with actions and not with words».

In the implementation of this great teaching of V. I. Lenin, in accordance with the concrete conditions of the development of and the socialist construction in Albania, the Party of Labour of Albania step by step has continually taken measures to narrow the ratio between the medium wages of the workers and the higher wages of the employees. Nine years ago, on April 29, 1976, in the Declaration of the Central Committee of the Party and the Government it was stressed that the establishment of correct proportions between the wages of the workers and the employees and between the wages of categories of employees is a measure of principled importance which blocks the road to bourgeois degeneration, career seeking and many other evils. Following the Declaration, the differences between lower and higher wages in Albania reached the ratio of 1 to 2.5. Now following the latest decision, this ratio is narrowed even further. Today in Albania the ratio between the average wages of workers and the salary of the director of the same enterprise is 1 : 1.7; that between the average wages of the workers in general and the salary of the director in the Ministry is about 1:2; that between the lowest and highest wages of the workers within the same branch is about 1:1.5-1.65 etc. These ratios are set by law.

This is a concrete and unprecedented implementation of the Marxist-Leninist thesis, a great reality of the proletarian justice in Socialist Albania, where a post is not a privilege and where cadres are integrated with the masses. «Living standards,» commrade Enver Hoxha stresses, «should not be allowed to rise with big differences, officials should not be allowed to live far better than the workers, and the peasants to live at lower standards than their allies in the city. Our Party is fighting and will always fight to unceasingly improve not only the life of the people but the life of everybody, proceeding from the correct principle of not having equality in wages but neither privilege for anybody, and differences of wages between the workers must constantly narrow their margin.»

The lowering of higher wages, together with the measures to lift over and above the basic wage of the working people of literature and art, education and science, better harmonizing the material stimuli with the moral stimuli is an expression of the class treatment of the problem of wages. This has the aim of further revolutionizing, from the material standpoint as well, the relations between cadres and the masses, and also the relations in the very fold of the cadres, a vital premise to protect people, especially the cadres, from alien influences and degeneration. Experience shows that bureaucracy is nourished by higher wages. Bureaucratic elements always lean towards the deepening of the ratio in wages through many ways and means. The working class, under the leadership of its Party, has fought and is fighting against these tendencies maintaining a clear-cut revolutionary class stand. Therefore the measures contained in the decision of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania and of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Albania towards lowering higher wages have a profound ideo-political and social content, they have their national value, but they are also an important contribution to the treasury of
Marxism-Leninism. They express the desire and interests of the entire Party and people, the working class, the cooperative peasantry and the people's intelligentsia; therefore they have met with complete approval everywhere, and have been received with enthusiasm and high mobilization towards socialist construction and the defence of the Homeland.

VI. CADRES ENGAGE IN PRODUCTION WORK

Wherever you go in Albania, in town or countryside, you are liable to come across leading cadres of all levels, workers of the administration, people of intellectual pursuits who are working directly in production, shoulder to shoulder with the workers and peasants. The school youth works with enthusiasm in building railroads and opening mountain highways.

It is a principle in the social life of socialist Albania that, with the exception of the elderly or those whose health or physical condition does not permit it, all the cadres of administration of the State, Party or economic apparatus and organs, and social organizations, cadres of the army, intelligentsia, state enterprises and agricultural cooperatives take part regularly for definite periods in work directly in production. In addition to classroom lessons, physical and military training, direct participation in production work has been introduced as an essential component in our school curriculum.

The participation of leading cadres and all the people of mental work directly in work in production is an aspect of our social life of vital importance to the cause of socialism and firmly based on principle. With what is this connected?

Above all, it has to do with the establishment, main tenance and perfecting of genuinely socialist relations in society. In order to establish such relations it is not enough just to establish socialist ownership over the means of production. It is also essential to establish correct relations between the leading cadres and the broad masses of working people in town and countryside. This requires that on the one hand the cadres, as representatives of the dictatorship of the proletariat, must manage, lead and supervise; while on the other hand, they must consider themselves servants of the people, closely linked with the masses and integrate themselves with them, must learn from and render account to the masses and to be constantly under their effective control. This means that centralism must be correctly combined with socialist democracy.

But in socialism there exists the danger that the leading cadres may become bureaucratic, detach themselves from the masses and become opposed to them, may turn from servants of the people into rulers over them, may degenerate and thus create a new anti-socialist caste or class - a thing which leads to the liquidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the restoration of capitalism. The existence of such a danger has already been confirmed by historical experience. Failure to take it into account is fraught with fatal consequences for the future of socialism. However, this is by no means inevitable and can be avoidad if a correct Marxist-Leninist standard is maintained, and effective measures are taken to prevent it from turning into reality. Among the measures which the Party of Labour of Albania has taken to ward off this danger, of great importance are the circulation of cadres from leading posts to the base, and from the administration to production and vice versa, the bringing into the leading organs of more and more persons, who work in production, especially from the ranks of the working class; the reduction of higher salaries and putting the standard of living of the cadres in correct proportion to that of masses, the further deepening of the line of the masses in appointing cadres, intensification of the Marxist-Leninist, ideo-political education of the cadres and fighting against manifestations of technocracy, etc. The direct participation of our leading cadres in production is one of the most important steps taken in this direction. The aim of it is the revolutionary education of the cadres with correct concepts about work and the working people, to protect the cadres from bourgeoisie and bureaucratic degeneration, to link them closely with the people and their lives. Comrade Enver Hoxha says: «The cadres must get oil on their
hands and mud on their boots, so that they see the problems, the needs, the work, not just from above, but from down below, because this is how we wipe out bureaucracy, symptoms of conceit and arrogance, the diseases of commandism and cronyism among the people who run things, because these problems arise most among those who, vested with power, think that it is they alone who create everything, that the work wouldn't go on without them.

The participation of the leading cadres and the intellectuals in productive labour is a matter of great principle also, because it leads to the further strengthening of the moral-political unity of the people in the struggle for the cause of the construction of socialism, serves to overcome the separation of theory from practice which, as Lenin points out, is one of the greatest evils and misfortunes inherited from the old capitalist society. It constitutes one of the concrete and effective ways of gradually narrowing the essential distinctions between physical and mental work.

VII. CULTURE AND EDUCATION

THE LANGUAGE. A glance over the history of the Albanian language, no matter how hurried and brief, cannot fail to bring out two contradictory aspects: on one hand, a language documented in writing very late (the first book in Albanian is that by Gjon Buzuku in 1555) and on the other, and ancient people autochthonous in the Balkans since the mists of prehistory.

How is this to be explained?

Historically it is a wellknown fact that the Albanians and the Greeks were the earliest inhabitants of the Balkan Peninsula. Our people have been living in these parts for well over three thousand years. From one generation to another they have spoken their own language which with the changes it has undergone in time, is spoken today by the Albanians.

Hence, here we have a language so ancient as a spoken language and so recent as a written language. The five hundred-year period of the written Albanian language should be viewed only as a small part of the history of the Albanian language, as the most recent stage of its historical development.

Albanian is a member of the Indo-European languages.

The first to prove scientifically that Albanian is a member of the family of Indo-European languages was the German scholar Franz Bopp. Other scholars before him like Xylander, Rasmus Rask, Schleicher and others had made separate observations regarding the relationship of Albanian to the other Indo-European languages, but Bopp dedicated a complete monograph, entitled «On Albanian in connection with its affinities», published in 1854, to this problem. As far back as 1843 Bopp had delivered a dissertation at the Berlin Academy on the numerals and pronouns of the Albanian language claiming with certainty that it belonged to the family of Indo-European languages. But in 1854 he examined a broader range of material. He made a thorough scientific analysis of the Albanian language and arrived at the conclusion that it belonged, incontrovertibly, to the family of Indo-European languages.

As the Albanian Prof. Eqrem Cabej has pointed out, when speaking of the Indo-European character of the Albanian language, one should bear in mind that not all its linguistic wealth comes from the ancient Indo-European heritage. With the passage of nane Albanian, like any other language, has lost a lot from its autochthonous heritage, due to its continuous contact with the languages of other peoples; on the other hand, it has been enriched with new words, expressions and constructions from its own source and has given to and received from the other languages with which it has been in contact.

The Albanian words having corresponding forms in the other Indo-European languages are ordinary words of day to day use which serve as a basis on which others are built. Here are a few Albanian examples: ujk, ulk, Sankrit vrksh, Latin lupus, Greek Lykos, Russian volk, Albanian ditë,
Sanskrit dinam, Lithuanian diens, Latin dies, Russian, den; Albanian mi, Sans'krit muh, Armenian mukn, Greek mys, Latin mus.

Bopp's assertion that Albanian has no successional connection with the other sister languages of our continent remains correct. The connections it has with other languages are not filial but of another character.

In his article «The Place of the Albanian Within the Circle of Indo-European Languages», the well-known Albanologist, Gustav Mayer, accurately defined the position of the Albanian in this linguistic family. He places the Albanian close to the eastern and northern Indo-European languages. When we say that the Albanian pertains to this or that group of languages, we have in mind that in certain features it has followed the same course of development. For instance, in northern irido-European languages the short Indo-European «o» has changed to «a», while in the southern ones it is kept as «ö». On this point the Albanian joins with the first group. Thus we have Albanian natë, German nacht, Lithuanian naktis, while Latin nox, noctis. The relations of the Albanian with these languages have been studied more concretely by other scholars among whom we should mention Holger Petersen and Nobert Jokl, who with their fruitful studies have rendered a valuable contribution to Albanological science.

Following the triumph of the people's revolution, very favourable conditions were created in Albania for the development of the science of the Albanian linguistics, so that Albania has become the epicenter of studies in this field. Today, tens of Albanian scholars are engaged in studying the problems of the history of the Albanian language. Through many works illuminating various aspects of the historical development of the Albanian language, they are rendering a valuable contribution in this field.

Among other things, new facts and proofs have been brought forth on the Indo-European nature of the Albanian language. A more profound argumentation has been provided for the conclusions reached and perceptible results have been achieved in defining the various laws that have acted in the evolution of the phonetic and morphological structure of the Albanian language in relation to the structure of the other Indo-European languages. Further studies have been conducted on its relations with the other Indo-European languages, on the problems connected with the pre-Balkan cradle of the Albanians, with the origin of the Albanian language, with the country of its formation, with the autochthony of the Albanians and so on.

In connection with the origin of the Albanian language, as is known, three different theses have long been advanced, on its Illyrian origin, its Thracian origin or its Illyro-Thracian origin. The theses on the Illyrian origin of the Albanian language is gaining ground thanks to the studies of the Albanian linguists coupled with the results of our archaeology in the material field. More and more convincing proofs are being advanced in favour of this thesis. The fact that the pre-contact Albanians dwell where the Illyrian tribes used to dwell, and that the history of our people records no later migrations into these regions, supports the thesis that the Albanians are the descendants of the Illyrians and the Albanian is the offspring of the Illyrian language. On the other hand, those few linguistic elements which modern science has at its disposal about the Illyrian language find their explanation through the Albanian. The Albanian historical toponomy is of special interest in throwing light on such an important problem of the history of our people. The comparison between the ancient forms of place names and the present forms show that the latter are the uninterrupted continuity of the former in line with the historical phonetics of the Albanian language. This proves that the Albanians are natives of their present territories, at least since the Greco-Roman period. And when it is known with certainty that Illyrian tribes inhabited the Albanian territory, this shows that the Albanians are the offspring of the Illyrians and that the Albanian is the continuity of the Illyrian language.

It can be said that during these thirty-two years of our People's State Power, studies in the field of the history of the Albanian language have had two main objectives, namely, first to sum up in a creative way what had been achieved by the science of linguistics before liberation from the middle of the 19th century when F. Bopp finally established that the Albanian language is part of the family
of «Indo-European languages», second, to make a more thorough examination and analysis of many problems dealt with earlier, as well as to raise and solve a series of other problems in this field.

Special care has been devoted to the study of the Albanian language after the 16th century, with the scholars concentrating their efforts on discovering the special phonetic and morphologic features of the language of our authors of the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries.

While giving priority to the study of the internal history of the Albanian language, our linguistica during the years after liberation has not overlooked the study of its external history. It was precisely Albanian linguistica that clewed up and dealt more extensively with the problem of the origin of the Albanian language and the cradle of the Albanian in the Balkans, which are important, not only to the history of the Albanian language, but also to the history of the Albanian people and the peoples of the Balkan Peninsula. A complete synthesis of the studies in this field was made at the Convention of Illyrian studies (Tirana 1972) through the report on «The Problem of the Place of the Form.ation of the Albanian Language» in which in a very compelling and convincing way it was shown that the Albanians are a people autochthonous on their present territory. In throwing light on such problems, which are as important as they are complicated, Albanian linguistics has aimed to advance with cautious steps and be as objective as possible. It has made a valuable contribution to refuting the views of a certain foreign linguistics expert who considered that the Albanians had come from eastern to western regions, where they live today (G. Weigand). Bringing forward a series of new arguments from the field of toponomy and naval lexicon of the Albanian language and from the field of its reciprocal relations with ancient Greek and Latin, ALbanian linguistics shows that the thesis of Weigand and other of a similar type held by foreign scholars are now obsolete and untenable.

Of special significance in this direction are the articles and studies on the contribution of the Albanian language to the formation of the affinity of the Balkan languages and on the role of Albanian as a contributor to the neighbouring languages.

Another occasion to add contributions in this field was the Conference of Ethnographic Studies (Tirana, June 28 to 29, 1976) at which, in addition to many contributions on the various aspect of the material and social culture of the Albanian people, three papers from the field of linguistica were read, which examined problems mainly of the history of the Albanian language viewed from an ethno-linguistic angle.

The results of the work in the field of studies on the history of the Albanian language make up only one part of the successes attained by Albanian linguistica in the field of Albanological research.

Today, the Albanian language is spoken not only in the People’s Socialist of Albania but also beyond its borders. It is spoken by nearly one and a half million Albanians in Yugoslavia and Greece in the parts immediately over the borders. The Albanian is spoken also in distant settlements of Albanians who, in various periods, have emigrated from Albania, the majority of them several centuries ago, some of them during the past century and the beginning of our century.

In Yugoslavia, spoken Albanian extends over a large territory of north-western Macedonia and in the district of Kosovo, in the regions of Peshtar, Preshova and Bujanovich, as well as in Montenegro, in the regions of Plava, Gucia, Tresh, Gruda; in the mountain region of Kraja, in Ulqin and its environs. In Greece, the Albanian language is spoken in the Qamëria district, the southern border of which extends to the Bay of Preveza. It must be said that the Albanian spoken in both Yugoslav and Greece can not be separated from the spoken Albanian of the present day Albania because they have not been isolated during their development.

The Albanian language has been maintained and continues to be spoken and, partly written, in old settlements in Greece, Italy and elsewhere. On the islands of Hydra, Poro, Specia, Salamina and the districts of Athens, Euboea, the Peloponesus and elsewhere, spoken Albanian (dates back to the 14th century. Somew at later is that of the Arbëreshi who have settled mainly in the districts of Calabria and Sicily. Most of these settlements date back to the 15th and 16th centuries.
The most recent are the spoken Albanian of the Albanians in Dalmatia (Arbanas near Zara) formed towards the beginning of the 18th century, the spoken Albanian of Madrica in Bulgaria and the spoken Albanian of the Albanian settlers in the Ukraine, in the districts of Melitopol and of Odessa, which were formed at the beginning and in the middle of the 19th century.

Having been detached for a long time from their motherland, the spoken Albanian of these settlements has been developed and influenced by a foreign environment but most forms of it, especially that of the Arbëreshë in Italy, have been very well preserved and on the basis of this language has been built an artistic literature represented by well-known poets and writers like Jeronim de Rada, A. Santori; G. Rada, Z. Serembe, V. Sratigoi, V. Dorsa and many others.

In our days a whole generation of Arbëreshë like F. Solano, G. Fareco, U. Giordano, J. Farrari, V. Salvaggi and others are following the path of this pleaed of enlightened Arbëreshë, striving to preserve the language and folklore of the Arëreshi and prevent its being lost.

Outside the homeland the Albanian language is spoken also by the Albanian emigrants of the past century and the beginning of this one to Egypt, the USA, Argentina, Australia, Turkey, Rumania etc.

ALBANIAN LITERATURE. Albanian literature is not among the newest in Europe as is usually claimed, because its first book (Gjon Buzuk's Masses) belongs to the year 1555, and the earliest written document which has reached us dates back to 1462. A document of the year 1332 speaks of the existence at that time of Albanian books. At the end of the 16th century, the Arbëreshë in Italy, driven from Albania a century earlier, were still conducting their religious services in the Albanian language, while the great Albanian humanist, Marin Barleti, who wrote the history of Scanderbeg, mentions chronicles in the popular language in 1504. However the ravages of time have destroyed all these. A more or less extensive literary activity re-emerged after the Ottoman-onslaughts of the 14th and 15th centuries with authors like Pjetër Budi, Frano Bardhi, Pjetër Bogdani (17th century) and others. Their works had a religious and didactic character, with religious books and a few poems, dictionaries (the first published in 1635), grammar books (the first, published in 1716), theological tracts etc. At the start of the 18th century, after the mass conversion to the Islamic religion took place in the country, a whole literary trend began under the influence of oriental literature, with a considerable number of authors and works in a number of genres, and this trend lasted for about two centuries. It included poets in whose works there is an obvious stress on social protest (Hasan Zyko Kamberi-late 18th century) and anti-feudalism (Zenel Bastari-mid 19th century) who were the precursors of the bourgeois critical realism which developed in Albania during the first 40 years of our century.

An Albanian literature of high artistic qualities began with Albanian romanticism, a contemporary of the European romanticism of the 19th century. Its earliest outstanding work was the poem Milosao’s Songs (1836) by Jeronim de Rada (1815-1903) the author of a number of poetic works, such as «Serafina Topia» (1839), «The Unfortunate Scanderbeg» (1872-84), etc., and an outstanding publicist and patriot. But the writer, who dominated Albanian Literature in the 19th century was Naim Frashëri (1846-1900) a lyric poet («Flocks and Farming» - a pastoral poem 1886, «Summer Flowers» a collection of philosophic and patriotic poems - 1890), and epic poet («The History of Scanderbeg» 1898, his masterpiece) and other important works. In Naim Frashëri, the Albanian language found a fiery poet who also gave a fresh impetus to Albanian philosophic thought by waging a special struggle against mediaeval theological thought and by upholding and courageously spreading some of the most outstanding achievements of science, such as Darwinism. He remains the most beloved and most popular poet of our past.

Among the other authors of the time, let us mention Andon Zako Qajupi, lyricist, satyrist as well as a writer of fables, with his collection of poems «Father Tomorri» (1902) from which our critical realism begins, the lyricists Ndre Mjeda, Asdren, Zef Serembe, Gavril Dara Jr., the author of
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a very well known epic-lyric poem «Bala's Last Lay», the revolutionary novelist, Mihal Grameno, and others.

The favoured themes of this literature were those of the wars against the Ottoman invaders and especially during the time of Scanderbeg (15th century), the call for the liberation of the country, denunciation of feudalism and so on. It was a literature closely linked with the national movement and with the ideas of illuminism, a literature which led that movement in struggle against the occupiers, who had banned the writing of the Albanian language, the opening of Albanian schools and the development of culture, which took the name of the Albanian Renaissance. During this time, from the middle of last century, the Albanian press came into being, and, later, Albanian cultural societies were formed and managed to open a few schools teaching in the Albanian language. As a matter of fact, the Albanian language was known as an instructional language as far back as the 17th century, of course for religious education.

The 19th century is also regarded as the century of the beginnings of Albanian linguistic science, with such authorities on Albanian linguistics as Dhimitër Kamarda and Kostandin Kristoforidhi (the author of a famous dictionary) with so famous an encyclopaedist and thinker as Sami Frashëri, Naim's brother, who was also the principal ideologist of the Albanian national movement. His work «Albania what it was, what it is and what it will be» (1899) rightly called the «Manifesto of the National Renaissance, is one of the most valuable works of political and social prose in the Albanian language.

Following the proclamation of Independence (1912) and under the continuous threat of the partitioning of Albania or a new occupation (this was achieved by Italian fascism in 1939), Albanian literature developed along the lines of the literature of the Albanian Renaissance, as a patriotic literature with an ever stronger antifeudal and revolutionary character. The author who dominated that period, Fan S. Noli (1882-1965), leader of the 1924 revolution, was one of the most outstanding poets («Album»), a publicist, aesthete, a translator who translated works by Shakespeare, Cervantes, Ibsen etc.; an historian (his masterpiece, «The History of Scanderbeg», was first published in 1921 and then published in revised form in 1949), and a musical critic (renowned for his study «Beethoven and the French Revolution» which aroused the admiration of Bernard Shaw, Thomas Mann, Sibelius, etc.). After Kristoforidhi, Naim and Sami Frashëri, before the war, he made the most substantial contribution to literary Albanian, which achieved its complete unification during the years of socialist development in Albania. A wellknown lyricist of the time was Lasgush Poradeci. Migjeni (1911-1938) with his anthology «Free Verses» (1935) and his short stories, marked the culmination of the development of Albanian critical realism with strong accents on social revolt, which, through arare talent, heralded the Albanian literature of socialist realism. Among the prose writers of the time were the novelists, Foqion Postoli and Haki Stërmilli. Stërmilli left a novel on the very difficult situation of the Albanian women during the time of feudal and bourgeoisie domination. A participant in the National Liberation War, he also left a «Diary» from the war which is outstanding for its impressions from the life of the people who had hurled themselves into the general armed uprising.

A new epoch in the development of Albanian literature begins with the outbreak of the Anti-fascist National Liberation War of the Albanian people and with the historic triumph of the people's revolution (1944), which brought the country its national freedom, overthrew the old social order, and paved the way to processes of the construction of socialist society and socialist culture.

The revolutionary literature of the war years, which came into being in the clandestine communist press, was the expression of the anti-fascist resistance of the Albanian people, an artistic portrayal of the patriotic spirit of the masses of the people and of their aspirations to a new world. These motifs were expressed mainly in the war poetry, in the patriotic lyric, which was developed by such authors as the martyr poet Memo Meto, poets Kolë Jakova, Llazar Siliqi, Aleks Caçi, and Shefqet Musaraj, the author of the poem «Hepic of the Balli Komhëtar» (1944), one of the classic
examples of Albanian satirical poetry and the most distinguished work of the revolutionary literature of the Anti-fascist National Liberation War.

The revolutionary literature of the anti-fascist resistance was quickly changed, after the triumph of the people's revolution, into a literature of the new type, pervaded by socialist ideals and the spirit of communist partisanship. It developed the best traditions of former Albanian literature, its pathos of city life and popular, democratic spirit, its realism and close connection with the poetic tradition of the people's oral literature. Born on the basis of new ideas, on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist materialist world outlook, which throws light on the laws and processes of development of society, the new literature adopted the method of socialist realism, which opened previously unknown horizons to its enrichment and flowering. The literature of the socialist epoch in Albania constitutes the highest stage of artistic development in Albanian society. This has found expression in the richness of content and motives, in the flowering of all genres, in the variety of styles and in the high level of artistic expression. The ideas of the revolution and progress, the aspirations of the masses of the people, liberated once and for all from any sort of material and spiritual bondage, form the true content of present day Albanian literature. The object of its inspiration is the struggle of the masses for the thorough transformation of their life and themselves, for the construction of the new society, and the new man who has also become the central hero of this literature. Centering its attention on the future of the people and the revolution, the new literature portrays the masses not as victims of history but as a vigorous and active force, conscious of their historic mission of the construction of a new world, a new humane society, a new man freed from the shackles of the old world. The historical optimism and confidence in the brilliant communist future which fills the spiritual life of socialist society has been turned into an inherent element of the literature which is being developed in Albania today. One of the most active genres in present day Albanian literature is poetry, which is taken up by a number of poets of outstanding artistic individuality among whom are Dritëro Agolli, Ismail Kadare, Llazar Siliqi and Fatos Arapi. They devote their efforts mainly to the lyric-epic poem, in which the motives of building the new life, of freeing man from the old, reactionary; psychology and ideology, the ideas of the historical vitality of the Albanian people and the theme of their resistance, and the historic destiny of the nation and revolution, cast in a vivid metaphorical language and powerful poetic symbolism, have revitalized this genre of poetry and have opened wide vistas for its rapid development. The lyric-epic poem in the present Albanian poetry is developed as a synthesis of lyrical meditations and timeless experiences in an epic spirit. It is characterized by the polyphony, richness of motives and variety of tones of the poetic narration. In the artistic structure of this kind, which resembles a poetic mosaic, the laws of the association of ideas act to link the times, ideas, and the various motives, giving the poem artistic coherence and internal cohesion.

The most outstanding works of this kind are «prishtina (1949)» by Llazar Siliqi, «Of what Are These Mountains Thinking?» (1964) by I.Kadare, «Devoll, Devoll» (1964) by D. Agolli, HBloody Alarms!» (1966) by F. Arapi and others.

The epic narrative poem, which is developed on the basis of the heroic folk epic, deals mainly with the theme of the historic past of the Albanian people, of their wars and battles for freedom, and is represented by such works as «The Heroes of Vig» (1953) by K. Jakova.

Of the shorter poems, the development of lyrics of city and social life, lyrics of reflection and the landscape, is very extensive.

The best indication of the development of Albanian literature after the war, as well as of the artistic level which the present Albanian literature has reached, is prose in its two most widely used forms, the short story, and especially the novel. Today the novel has emerged as the leading form and has met with world recognition through such works as Ismail Kadare's «The General of the Dead Army» «The Bronze Bust» by D. Agolli, «The South Wind» by J. Xoxa, etc. (1971). The present Albanian novel is a realist novel which portrays the fate of man closely connected with the circumstances of the social environment, and the existing material and spiritual relations, but also under the light of the changes they will undergo in the days to come. The principal themes it treats
are from the historical past, reflected in «They Were Not Alone» (1952) by S. Spasse, «The Castle» (1970) by I. Kadare, «The Dead River» (1965) by J. Xoxe, the theme of the people's revolution and of the anti-fascist resistance reflected in -Before the Dawn» (1965) by Sh. Musaraj, -Three Colours of the Time» by Ali Abdihoxha, «The Bronze Bust» (1970) by D. Agolli, as well as the theme of the building of the new life reflected in «The Swamp» (1959) by Fatmir Gjata, «Again on his feet» (1970) by Dh. Xhuxani, and others. The works which reflect the epoch of the anti-fascist war tend towards the epic novel which takes up life in proportions of epic breadth with a few lines on the subject. Along with them is the novel with a more concentrated subject, as well as the novel without a subject in the traditional sense of that word. This kind of novel is characterized not by the movement of action but by the movement of the idea, which is revealed through an original composition through the shifting of events, which creates the impression of the action and dictates breaking the bounds of time and mixing up periods.

In the field of narratives and short stories, the writers Dhimitër Shuteriqi, Arnastas Kondo, Teodor Lago, and others are outstanding. In the new Albanian literature, drama inherited a poor tradition from the past, but, through efforts of the whole of literature, to reflect the major conflicts of the time, the drama of the old world, which was crushed and the stern struggle which gave birth to the new life. this genreDirklv set out on the road of realism and really began to flower, fostering the national theatre, which came into being in Albania after liberation. The dramas «Our Land» (1954) by K. Jakova, «The Highland Girl» (1971) by Loni Papa, or the comedy «The Carnivals of Korça (1961) by Spiro Qomora, etc., are constantly in the active repertory of the Albanian theatre. Keeping pace with the development of literature are aesthetic thought and literary criticism, which base their analysis of artistic phenomena on Marxist-Leninist methodology. Outstanding in this field are Alfred Uçi with his work, «Aesthetics, Life and Art» (1970), Dalan Shapllo with collection of criticism, «Uterary Manifestations and Works» (1974), Koço Bihiku with his collections of studies, «Literary Problems» (1975), Razi Brahimi with his essay, «Speaking of Poetry», (1972) etc.

The new Albanian literature is ceaselessly flowering and developing. It is rising on the basis of the finest traditions of the artistic culture of the Albanian people utilizing the progressive experience of world art and literature. The phenomena of the crisis, which decadent art is experiencing today, are alien to it, and all roads are blocked to the influence of this art through a ceaseless struggle for a realist humane art, which sings praises to the strength of the free man and which is permeated by the finest ideals of mankind, by the ideals of social progress and building communist society. As an artistic expression of Albanian life, present-day Albanian literature has a marked national character and a profoundly socialist content. The development of it testifies to the vitality of socialist realism as a new artistic method which gives wide possibilities for the allround reflection of life and for the flowering of creative artistic styles and individuality.

FOLKLORE. Albania has a rich beautiful heritage of folklore. In the wealth and diversity of Albanian folklore, the feelings and vitality of its people are reflected. In the first place the genius of the people themselves elaborated through the experience of so many generations contributed to this national treasure store. At the same time the social conditions exerted their influence, together with the historical, geographical and other circumstances, because various tides have ebbed and flowed through the centuries over this land situated at the crossroads between East and West, leaving, their traces in its folklore.

Musical folklore. «Variegated Songs» - this is what the people call songs of the lyrical genre. This description is a very good expression of the great diversity of this genre in Albanian foWore. All sorts of songs of various forms, content and themes have always accompanied the Albanian people at the most important moments of their lives, at work or at rest, in war or in peace, in joy or in sorrow. Through them the people have expressed their feelings and thoughts, their wishes and dreams and have given vent to the anger in their hearts and the fire in their souls. All kinds of
interesting motifs can be found in the various categories of folksongs, ranging from lullabies with which Albanian mothers rock their babies to sleep in their cradles, the nursery songs and rhymes, which bring the pleasant aroma of childhood; from gentle lovesongs, full of emotion, to humorous and satirical songs, which display the keen eye of the people to observe details and pillory various shortcomings; from wedding songs to the toasts raised at drinking bouts; from elegies to funeral lamentation. Also of interest are the motifs on certain work songs of shepherds, farmers, artisans, and others which are replete with ancient elements both in the substance of the verses as well as in the archaic manners of musical composition. Many ancient relics are to be found especially in the category of ritual songs for yearly celebrations. From this standpoint Albanian folklore can be compared to a rich mine, in which many songs and dances of ancient times, which bring us the echo of the celebrations of our pagan forefathers are preserved. These songs handed down from one generation to another, seem to be rooted deep in the hearts of our people although the new conditions of life are making an impact even in this category of songs, putting aside some obsolete manifestations and, vice-versa, developing certain new themes further. Like the genre of lyric songs, the songs of the epic genre are rich in motifs, subject matter and form. Certain popular ballads and Songs of the Knights, from the most important cycle of the legendary epic, captivate one with the fantasy of their content and their poetic expression. Besides being the poetic-musical trend of the people, they are, at the same time, a reflection of their world outlook, in which their optimism coupled with certain social manifestations - generosity, hospitality, manliness, together with many other noble virtues stand out.

With regard to the historical epic, it can be said that every important event that leaves its mark is commemorated by the Albanian people through songs. Listing epic songs of this kind in their chronological order, that is, beginning with the ballads of the period prior to the Turkish occupation in the 15th century, going on to the epic songs during the time of the Turkish occupation, which tell of the struggle for freedom, for secession from the Turkish Empire, of people's uprisings or express their social protest against oppression or exploitation (the songs of emigrants abroad) or commemorate the mighty efforts of the patriots of our National Renaissance for national independence, we arrive at the songs of the National Liberation War. All these epic songs give us valuable information about the historic circumstances that the Albanian people perpetuate. They testify to the heroic resistance of the people, who fought for centuries on end for their freedom and independence. Finally, the songs of the period of socialist construction represent the further development of the historical epic, either in the ideological theme or in their new elements of artistic expression.

To this day, from the ranks of the Albanian people there continue to emerge rhapsodists who, along with the old ballads, know how to, sing to the events of the day, responding to current events as they occur. The various genres of folksongs, the ancient heritage of many motifs, their constant elaboration, together with the new productions and a number of various factors, have enriched Albanian folk music with an extraordinary variety of artistic expressions. This music is composed in all kinds of sequences of simple, compound, mixed and irregular rhythmic measures (that is, 2/2, 2/4, 2/8, 3/2, 3/4, 3/8, 4/2, 4/4, 4/8) or compound (that is, 6/2, 6/4, 6/8, 9/2, 9/4, 9/8, 12/2, 12/4, 12/8), or mixed (that is 5/4, 5/8, 4+5 10
7/4, 7/8, 8/4, 8/8, ---------, -------- reaching higher measures
8 8
8 up to --------- In addition to these, we have irregular
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measures and «free» rhythms (ad libitum) which are not divided into definite bars. Of special interest is the polyphonic combination of voices in characteristic parts. From this standpoint, Albanian folk music is divided into two main dialects which conform to the two language dialects;
in regions north of the Shkumbin river we have homophonic (in unison) and heterophonic music while on the other side of this river we have polyphonic music, both vocal and instrumental. The style of this polyphony varies according to the district, to the number of parts (two, three and four), to the age group and the sex of the singers, and so on. The polyphonic combination of voices in songs sung by choral groups follows certain original rules set by local tradition. The study of this popular polyphony is of importance to musicology from many aspects.

In every village and city block, from time to time one hears the sounds of musical instruments without which no wedding parties nor popular celebrations take place. The various instruments used by the people give our folk music all kinds of tonal shades. From the simplest instruments used by children to those used by adults to stress the rhythm, we have a wide range of tone and timbre. There are five folk instruments from the drum family, including the tambourine, but it is in wind instruments that the widest range occurs from para-musical instruments like gourds and conch shells and horns, to various kinds of flute and pipe including the bagpipe. There are also many stringed instruments played both by plucking and with a bow. But it must be said that pride of place in our musical expression belongs to the human voice. Many interesting observations can be made about characteristic methods drawing the voice from the throat like some folk singens from the southwestern part of Albania (a kind of yodel, which suddenly changes from the deep register to falsetto) or of the outburst of powerful voices as in some songs sung by the northern mountainers.

The inclination, creative ability, temperament, endurance, optimism together with many aspects of life, are reflected also in our folk dances, which are, without doubt, among the most beautiful and the most interesting expressions of Albanian folklore. Their beauty has attracted the admiration of a number of foreign writers and artists, among whom it suffices to mention Lord Byron's picturesque description of Albanian dances in his work «Childe Harold».

Albanian folk dances vary more or less according to districts, the sex and age of the participants, their forms and content, etc. Every district, and indeed nearly every village, has its own characteristic dances. The distinctive features of every district conform to the dialectal and ethnographic branches with which a number of variants are linked. But in spite of the great variation of the dances of different districts they also contain common elements emanating from the unity of the Albanian tradition. In the part the women and men of certain districts used to dance separately, while mixer dances were rare even within the one clan. As regards distinctions according to generation there are old men's and young men's dances, old women's and young brides' dances; and then there are also children's dances.

Viewed from the number of participants, there are solo dances, which are danced in northern Albania, and in Kosova, while in southern Albania, where polyphonic music prevails, there are no solo dances.

Duo dances are danced in different ways throughout Albania, while in south Albania they exist only as an integral part of collective dances.

As a rule trio dances are danced by two women and a man or, vice-versa., by two men and a woman. Most of them are of a dramatic character.

Collective dances have more than four participants. These, too, differ both from the standpoint of form and content. The commonest form is a straight chain as, for instance, the humorous dances of the caps or coffee cups, which are danced by the peasants of northern and northeastern Albania. There are also dances in ranks, which interchange with twists and winding movements as, for instance, those danced by the Albanian settlers in Italy, in which all kinds of figures are formed. In addition, there are also dances of two facing rows, which are accompanied by songs. The commonest form is the circular dance which has spread all over Albania, as well as among the Albanians beyond its borders. The circle may be am open one, like an arch, horseshoe, spiral and so on, or a closed one of big or small diametre, according to the number of participants. The circular dances of southern Albania have two leaders as required by the parts in polyphonic songs.

It is difficult to describe in words the structure of Albanian folk dances with their movements, steps and figures accompanied by gestures and mimicry in facial expression. In general, the folk
dancers dance not only with their feet, but with the whole of their bodies, putting heart and soul into singing about their lives. Nor are arobatic elements lacking as for instance in the so-called a 'living tower', which is performed by a circle of dancers linked shoulder to shoulder, on which stands another circle of dancers.

The Albanian folk dances are not abstract performances but they express some lyric, epic, or dramatic content through plastic movements, mimicry, song and so on. Of interest from many points of view are the warlike dances which reflect strong character and manliness, the epic spirit moulded in the long resistance against every foreign occupation. Also interesting are certain dances connected with ancient habits and customs. The most complete category of dances is that represented by those which are danced to vocal music provided by the dancers themselves. In this category poetry, music and dancing are all blended into a single synthesis. We have a very interesting phenomenon in the dances of the meadow performed by the Highlanders of northern Albania in silence, without musical accompaniment, but according to the rhythm which stems from the bodies of the dancers themselves.

The diversity of rhythm and metre of our folk music enables the dancers to express all their spiritual ardour through all kinds of dynamic elements.

The National Costumes in general emphasize or, better, display the harmony of plastic movements. When one watches the Albanian folk dances in their own environment with those picturesque costumes accompanied by their characteristic music, one cannot fail to be deeply impressed. All that diversity of forms and motifs handed down from one generation to another, with those myriads of movements, steps and figures of great expressive power, are convincing evidence of the creative fantasy, mastery, artistic taste and rich spiritual world of this people.

An ever lively and interesting branch of Albanian folklore is that of dramatic performances ranging from the simplest to the more complicated forms. There are certain categories of popular performances with or without a given fable, such as humorous farces, stories dramatized in monologues or dialogues, pantomimes, performances involving song, dance and arobatic elements, up to puppet shows and shadow pantomime.

Popular prose is also a great heritage of Albanian folklore. Its subject matter and themes are varied.

The varied phenomena which our popular prose deals with form a reflection of our society in the past in many colours and from many angles. Our people have crystallized these phenomena into a number of types which, even though they often resemble one another, in both the skill with which they are developed and the action involved, have distinctive elements among them. The basic theme of our popular prose is the struggle between good and evil. In building up the events on this basis, the people have created figures, who confront one another, locked in fierce struggle until the complete triumph of good and happiness has been achieved. Along with fables, conundrums and puzzles filled with figurative expressions and metaphors created by the people as tests of ingenuity continue to thrive. Likewise proverbs and anecdotes with the profundity of their ideas and the keenness of their observation, in which is concentrated the wisdom and age-old experience of the people themselves, are constantly being enriched.

The Albanologist, Gustav Weigand, has described the Albanian language as a Balkan language «par excellence».

This description could be applied also to Albanian folklore in general, since, in addition to its national features, it has many motifs and characteristic elements in common with our neighbours. Of course these are the consequences of contacts or relations over many centuries, which have brought about many exchanges or borrowings also in folklore. By tracing the distribution of common motifs through comparative studies between Albanian folklore and the folklore of the neighbours, interesting observations can be made about a number of phenomena, indeed we can arrive at their origin, that is, among the most ancient inhabitants of the Balkan Peninsula. In this way the continuation of the Illyrians in the Albanians is brought out. Of course, what the people's traditions inherit from the distant past is not petrified in unchanging
forms, because folklore does not remain stagnant, but moves along, flowing like an inexhaustible stream into which are poured the experience of many generations. During its course through the centuries, it is constantly undergoing changes both in form and content. Thus the motifs and means of expression of folklore develop in accord with the dynamic of life.

To close this panoramic presentation we must stress the unquestionable unity of Albanian folklore with all its diversity of sources: all that host of ancient or more recent motives, borrowed or native, have been accumulated, layer upon layer, and have been merged into a single synthesis.

Their persistence in preserving the mother tongue, the habits and customs of our ancestors, our folk songs and dances, as well as all the branches of folklore, have protected our people from the process of dilution and denationalization during centuries of oppression. Our folk tradition has always been of great value to our society. Formerly, in the Dark Ages, it compensated to a certain extent for the lack of schooling by educating the younger generations with the experience and wisdom of their elders. For the patriots of the period of our National Renaissance, folklore was a powerful weapon in their struggle for national independence. The important social, artistic, scientific and political function of this national heritage continues to this day.

The history of the recording of Albanian folklore begins with a group of proverbs published in 1635 by Frano Bardhi in his Latin-Albanian dictionary. From that time on, the study of Albanian folklore encountered the difficult conditions of the Ottoman occupation. Nevertheless, many patriots of the period of our National Renaissance, especially those who had grasped the importance of folklore, strove, heart and soul, to serve in this field, too, prompted by lofty patriotic aims. In Albania, as throughout all Europe, the collection of folksongs began with the verses, thus, for a time it was only the poetic side of folklore, which was cultivated, while the musical side was left entirely fallow. The first publications on Albanian melody appeared during the 40's of this century. The collecting and study of our folk music has been actively pursued especially since the liberation of Albania. Under the care of the Party of Labour of Albania, characteristic groups of folk singers, dancers and instrumentalists were set up in the cultural centers established in the most remote corners of the homeland. From time to time local and national festivals have been organized. These festivals have been valuable in revealing previously unknown talents and beauties.

At the beginning of the 50's musical folklore was introduced into the program of the Lyceum of Arts as a separate subject of study. Meanwhile the Albanian musicologists began to publish a series of original studies about folk dances and instruments, about the themes of songs as well as about the morphology of folk music and so on. These studies are a significant proof of the rapid development of musicology which, although it is a new science in Albanian culture, has achieved a number of outstanding results.

In September 1957, the State Ensemble of Folk Songs and Dances with a vocal, instrumental and choreographic complex was set up in Tirana. This Ensemble has presented the beauties of Albanian folklore even beyond the borders of Albania, winning the admiration of many peoples of Europe, Asia, and Africa, and even being awarded top prizes. In 1960, the Institute of oral, musical and choreographic folklore with the respective archive, its collection of recorded songs and music and popular instruments was set up in Tirana. With the founding of this Institute more suitable conditions were created for the collection and study of folklore through research expeditions which are organized from time to time. The extension and deepening of the spheres of research, by adopting advanced methods and utilizing new technical devices, open wide prospects to the study of Albanian folklore.

In the period of the deepening of the cultural revolution, folklore continues to be an important factor in the ideaesthetic education of the masses, that is why it occupies a prominent place both in the repertoire of the professional artists as well as in that of the amateur groups set up in work centers or at the houses and centers of culture. Radio and television broadcast regular folklore programs. Musical folklore has been introduced as a subject of study into the programs of the secondary schools of art, as well as in that of the Higher Institute of Arts. Besides its social,
political, scientific and other values, this inexhaustible source also serves the further development of Albanian art and culture, national in form and socialist in substance.

EDUCATION. The struggle for the Albanian school has a long history. It begins as far back as the dark years of the Middle Ages, during the Ottoman occupation of the country. The Albanian has had to fight arms in hand for his education, just as for his freedom. He never separated his love for his country from his love for schooling and his mother tongue. The Albanian patriots considered the Albanian language and literature as vital to the struggle for the very existence of the nation. In 1873 they compiled a standard alphabet for the Albanian language.

Towards the beginning of 1885, patriots from the city of Korça, in the southeastern part of Albania, drew up a petition seeking the opening of an Albanian Club and Albanian schools to be run by it. After persistent efforts, they succeeded in opening the first Albanian national school in Korça on March 7, 1887 (March 7 is now commemorated every year as the «Teacher's Day»).

During its first year, the school had few pupils, but the following year their number increased to 200. It was a primary school in which the lessons were given in the Albanian language.

The opening of the first national school aroused great enthusiasm among the patriots all over the country. It prompted the opening of other similar schools in the various districts of Albania.

But, under the pressure of the Metropolitan of Korça and the Patriarch of Istanbul, the occupation authorities began to obstruct the existence of Albanian schools. Under this two-fold reaction, efforts to open other Albanian schools failed. Even the schools opened during 1888 were closed one after the other, with the exception of that of Korça, which continued to function at great sacrifice and in constant struggle with the Christian church institutions and the foreign occupiers. In 1891, the first director of this school was murdered, while the subsequent directors were imprisoned.

In 1892, the first Albanian elementary school for girls was opened in Korça. In the same year the bishop of Korça pronounced an anathema against the patriot teacher, Petro Nini Luarasi. During the final decade of the last century, the number of Albanian schools increased, while at the beginning of our century, they were opened even in some villages. They enrolled not only children but also adults for whom, special night schools were established. Since the number of teachers was limited, giving lessons in Albanian became a question of honour and a lofty patriotic duty.

In 1912, after five centuries of bondage and continuous struggles, Albania gained its independence. This marks a memorable date in the history of the country and our school. But subsequent events, both national as well as international, made it impossible for Albania to enjoy this independence. Consequently, our school, too, was unable to consolidate itself. This was a period of marked ups and downs in the progress of the school. Under these conditions it was impossible for our school to develop.

The period of the reactionary regime of Ahmet Zog (1924-1939) plus the time of the nazi-fascist occupation of Albania (1939-1944) was one of the gloomiest in the history of our school. The broad masses, over 85 per cent of the population, remained illiterate. This was because the number of schools was greatly reduced. On the other hand, the establishment of the system of school fees, meant that the doors of those few existing schools were open only to the children of the wealthy. During the period of the nazi-fascist occupation, the Italian and German policy of denationalization was stepped up. Hundreds of teachers abandoned their schools and took up the rifle to fight in the ranks of the partisan units and brigades.

The foundations of our people's education were laid during the National Liberation War. The Albanian Communist Party (now the Party of Labour) charged the National Liberation Councils nuclei of the People'S State Power, along with the organization of the war, with the task of organizing the people's education. Thus, they took up the task of opening primary schools and courses against illiteracy in all the liberated districts.
The 1944-45 school year (the first year after the liberation of Albania) was a record year for our school. Whereas during the 1938-39 school year Albania had 649 primary schools with 1349 teachers, during 1944-45 (although the country was devastated by the war) there were 928 primary schools functioning with 1743 teachers.

After liberation, our country pursued a revolutionary course to make education truly the property of the working people, of the workers and peasants.

In 1946, the school reform was carried out: education was proclaimed general and free of charge, elementary schooling was made compulsory, equal for both sexes, the State and secular character of the school was guaranteed, and so on. During the period from 1945 to 1955 a broad campaign was conducted to abolish illiteracy. 85 per cent of the people were illiterate. This campaign was turned into a major State and social activity, bringing about the complete liquidation of this age-old plague. In 1952, the law was issued making elementary general education compulsory. Now 8 grade schooling has been compulsory for several years.

Albania was the only country in Europe without a University. This was set up in 1957.

Now Socialist Albania has a complete education system with a wide network of full and part-time 8 grade and secondary schools and many higher schools, without mentioning here the large number of kindergartens for pre-school children, which constitute the first link of our school system. In proportion to its population, Albania ranks among the first countries in the world today as regards the number of persons who attend the various categories of school. Today, out of every three persons in Albania, one attends a school. The University of Tirana has eight faculties with forty five specialities and about 16,000 students, in addition to the other higher institutes and its affiliates set up in the other centers of Albania.

Every year the University of Tirana, or its affiliates, turns out six times as many cadres with higher training as the whole of Albania had in 1938.

The Albanian school is constantly strengthening its socialist features and physiognomy, its revolutionary character, both in its content and its structure. The reform which has placed the school on the basis of three components - lessons, productive labour, physical and military training with Marxist-Leninist ideology running through all of them, is being successfully carried out. This revolutionary transformation of our school was made on the basis of a broad public discussion, in which all the broad strata of the people took part. This is a real revolution for our school.

Children start school when they are six years old, both in cities and in the countryside. Earlier the starting age was 7 years. The change to 6 years was made bearing in mind two factors: first, the general cultural uplift of the population, hence, of the family, which enables them to give more help to their children and, second, the extension of pre-school education (for ages 3, 4 and 5 years). Pre-school education has now become a constituent part of the school system of Albania.

The State pays the full cost of the school system in all its links. In our country there are no fees to pay in any category of school. The State pays for school buildings, their equipment, the salaries of teachers and the auxiliary personnel.

The family pays only for textbooks. But the prices of textbooks are more or less symbolic. For instance, for pupils up to 12 or 13 years of age, the textbooks for one school year cost the family about as much as an average worker's wage for one or one and a half days. For a student at secondary school, a year's textbooks may cost as much as an average worker's wages for two days.

The kindergartens for pre-school children are of two categories: kindergartens without meals (here the family has no financial obligations) and kindergartens with meals. For the latter the family pays an amount which covers about 29 per cent of the costs of the food, while the balance is paid by the State.

The problem of bursaries to maintain secondary and higher school students is solved in this way: the State pays full bursaries to students from families with many dependants, that is, with the lowest per capita incomes. The other families make a reasonable contribution.

To train an engineer it takes four years of study at the University plus a probationary period of one year's work in production, during which time he prepares his diploma thesis.
Let us take a student on a state bursary. Every year he lives ten months in the hostel. The other two months are his summer vacation. Hence he stays forty months all told. For this student the state spends what amounts to the average pay for a worker for thirty-six months. Hence, the burden of the State is by no means light.

The student's bursary covers his expenses for board and lodging at the «Student Town», for his textbooks with some pocket money over for his minor expenses.

This does not include the probation period the student spends in production after four years, because during that period he works and receives the normal pay for his work. The Faculty he belongs to, provides him with a pedagogue who guides him in the preparation of his diploma thesis.

How many students does it take to open a school? This is not so much a problem for cities where there are groups of students, where schools are opened with normal capacities. The problem arises in the villages and not so. much for the villages of the southern districts of Albania, which are grouped together, but for those of certain districts of Central and Northern Albania, where the houses are still far from one another. As a rule, the secondary schools are opened at the centre of the cooperative, which includes from five to ten villages. The upper cycle of the 8 grade schools (for ages ranging from ten, to thirteen or fourteen years) is usually opened in all villages or one school for two neighbouring villages when the children have no difficulty in attending. In many of these villages there are classes with from ten to fifteen pupils.

The most difficult problem is that of the elementary schools with children ranging from six to nine or ten years of age. It is aimed to ensure a minimum of twelve pupils per class, but this is not always achieved, for when houses of a village are widely scattered, schools are opened in each separate section of the village, in which case classes may have only - 6.7 or 8 pupils in them. This is a sacrifice for the State, but this is done for the sake of enforcing the law of compulsory education. There are cases when, to make it easier for children to attend school, boarding schools of limited capacities are opened in mountain districts. The pupils are boarded and lodged there from Monday to Saturday spending the week-end with their families.

As we have already mentioned, 8-grade schooling is compulsory in Albania. This is fully realized both in town and countryside. After this, the students make their own choice. Most of them choose 4 year secondary education (general or vocational education, in which there are from 65 to 70 profiles and specialities to choose from). Vocational secondary schools admit students on the basis of a plan, because the State works out a correo proportion in training, for instance, nurses, electricians, teachers, engineers and others. Admission to secondary schools of general education is unrestricted.

In the rural areas, the profiles of the secondary schools conform to the needs of the countryside: agronomy, zooveterinary, fruit growing, horticulture, and so on. For the other specialities needed in the countryside, a number of peasant students are sent to city schools to be trained as mechanics, electricians, midwives, agrarian economists, and so on. Today students from the countryside in the secondary vocational schools of the Republic make up more than half the total contingent of students. This is in order to impart a greater impetus to the secondary education of the peasant students who, up to now, have not had, nor could have had, the same opportunities as those of the cities.

In addition to secondary education, the students who have been through 8-grade schooling can choose to attend 2-year courses (half teaching half work) at which they acquire a trade skill. These courses are preferred by those who want to master a skill and start a job more quickly. They are called lower vocational schools.

There are other s who, having been through 8-grade schools, that is, having completed their compulsory schooling, want to start work directly in production. But they may not yet have reached the age of 16, the lowest age at which they can be admitted as workers. In this case they are admitted as learners in workshops or factories, where they work half time (for which they receive the corresponding wages) and study the other half. They attend the system of courses which the enterprise itself opens according to its own profile.
For workers who have followed these two last systems there are part-time vocational secondary schools in which they can complete their secondary education in the profiles they have.

One detail worth mentioning is that the programs of the vocational secondary schools are such that the subjects of general culture (mathematics, physics, chemistry - for those who pursue the technical profile, and literature, history, geography - for those who pursue the social-cultural profile) are the same as those of the secondary schools of general education. These prepare the students so that they can continue with higher studies, if they want, and not feel deprived of this opportunity, as they do in many other countries.

THE PRESS AND PUBLICATIONS. The first edition of the newspaper, «Zëri i popullit», organ of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, was published on August 25, 1942. This day marks the date of the founding of the Albanian people's press. The course of 34 years which «Zëri i popullit» and all the Albanian revolutionary press has traversed, is, at the same time, the course on which the press has grown and become stronger, has increased its militant spirit and its role as a bearer of information and a collective agitator and propagandist.

During the National Liberation War, apart from «Zëri i popullit», other illegal organs were published, such as «Bashkimi», (organ of the National Liberation Front) «Kushtrimi i Lirisë» (organ of the Communist Youth), as well as organs in districts and military units.

While preserving and further developing its revolutionary traditions of the war years, during the years of socialist construction, our people's press has been increased and strengthened in quantity and quality. The numbers of newspapers, magazines, and other publications have increased and the programs of Albanian radio and television, the releases of the Albanian Telegraph Agency, etc., have been added. In Albania today, there are 25 newspapers with a total circulation of 47 million copies per year.

The newspapers, «Zëri i popullit» and «Bashkimi», are dailies. A number of other newspapers appear twice per week, such as «Puna», central organ. of the Trade Union organization, «ari i Rinisë», organ of the Central Committee of the Albanian Labour Youth Union, and «Luftëtari», central organ of the People's Army. Other important organs are the theoretical magazine, «Rruga e Partisë», organ of the CC of the P.L.A., and «Drita» and «Nëntori», both literary organs of the League of Writers and Artists, the illustrated magazine, «Yllë», the magazine, «Shqiptarja e Re», organ of the Albanian Women's Union, as well as many others aimed at different categories of readers. Local papers are published in the administrative centres of 14 districts.

In Albania before liberation, there were only six newspapers, and these were completely in the service of the antipopular regime in power. The most important newspapers of that time, «Drita», was published in only 6,000 copies a day, whereas now, «Zëri i popullit» is published in 105,000 copies per day. The number of newspapers which are distributed today, in town and countryside, all over the country, is 20 times greater than before liberation. The number of magazines published today is 9 times greater than before liberation, three times greater than in 1950, and twice as many as in 1960.

Besides magazines and newspapers, books with more than 800 different titles, totalling 8.5 million copies are published each year. The number of titles published today is more than 100 times greater than before liberation.

Radio and Television occupy an important place. Radio Tirana is a powerful station that is heard in all parts of the world. It broadcasts regularly every day, from 5 a.m. till midnight in 17 foreign languages. Four local radio stations have been set up in outlying centres, and these relay Radio Tirana or broadcast special programs according to local conditions and requirements. Although quite new, Albanian TV is very widespread both in town and countryside. With the completion of the electrification of the whole country (October 1970) radio and TV programs are followed even in the most remote parts of the country. The daily papers, too, are delivered in these zones within the day.
The magazine, «Albania Today», has now been coming out for several years. It publishes different materials about the development and socialist transformations in Albania, as well as about the determined struggle that the P.L.A. is waging against imperialism and modern revisionism. The materials in this magazine have aroused special interest among foreign readers. This organ now comes out once in two months, in five languages. The illustrated magazine, «New Albania», has a history of 30 years and is widely distributed. It is published in nine languages. The scientific magazine, «Studia Albanica», which publishes scientific studies on Albanology in the French language, is for foreign readers. The Albanian people's press is characterised by a high ideological, political, scientific, and cultural level and a militant revolutionary spirit. As a result it has been turned into an ever more powerful means in the hands of the broad masses for the education and mobilisation of the working people in the construction of socialism and the defence of the country. Our press devotes special attention to international affairs; it consistently reflects the principled struggle of our Party and the Albanian people against imperialism, revisionism, and the oppression and exploitation of different peoples of the world.

An outstanding characteristic of our people's press is that it is based firmly on the broad masses of the people. This is, expressed in the fact that our press, the radio and TV, and the various publications are not only the property of the masses, tribunes of their revolutionary thinking, but also the product of the masses and a direct expression of the line of the masses. Through the voluntary correspondents and collaborators of the press and the radio and TV service, the masses bring the thoughts, experience, and the beautiful language of the working people into the press. It is not just the professional journalist who brings out the paper or the magazine, and neither are the radio and TV broadcasts done by the staff editors alone. Large numbers of people of different categories and professions, from city and village, who are close to the life and daily struggle of the working masses, to production, write for the press and speak on the radio and TV.

Matters of the press, like all other matters in the life of the country, are regulated on the basis of special laws. The Constitution of our country sanctions the right of every citizen to have his say freely, using the organs of the press, radio and TV for this purpose. The most favourable conditions have been created for the practical implementation of this right, and the masses are urged and encouraged by every means, to exercise it.

In socialist Albania, the journalist is an honoured figure. He is esteemed and respected by the masses for his objectivity, his honesty, his lofty moral figure. On the basis of the law, the journalist also enjoys rights as all author. The people working in radio and television and on the press have their own organisation, the Union of Albanian Journalists, which publishes a monthly organ, «Tribuna e Gazetarit».

**THE FIGURATIVE ARTS AND ARCHITECTURE.** The objects of artistic interest from prehistory take us back to the 6th millennium B.C. Outstanding among them are anthropomorphic ceramics, and original objects of the Cakran-Dunavec cult (Middle Neolithic age), the great pota of Maliq and Kamnik, with painted geometric decoration (Late Neolithic age), the little terra cottas of Maliq women (Neolithic age). The vessels and the cupa with very pronounced handles on the sides, began to appear during the Bronze Age. This is evidence of the beginnings of the Illyrian tribes.

The art of Illyrian tribes is distinguished in the Iron Age.

Ilth to the 5th centuries B.C.). The ceramic material found in the tumula (burial mounds) erected everywhere within the borders of Albania today and outside them, in the villages of Barç, Kuç i zi, (near Korça), Pazhok (near Elbasan) etc., are extremely varied in forms. So is that of the South, painted in the style of goemetric designs in a brown colour against a background of light red, called the «devollit» style. The bronze weapons also have geometric decoration. The rich decoration of the bronze shaft of the weapon often ends with beautiful zoomorphic and anthropomorphic forms.

In the Illyrian cities (5th-2nd centuries B.C.) the walls made of huge quadrangular and polygonal stones are imposing. The earliest gates have the form of a pointed arch (The peak of Aitoi
near Saranda). They have majestic porticos (Dimal and Zg&desh), theatres and hippodromes (Amantia, near Vlora), monumental tombs (Selcë e Poshtme, near Pogradec) etc. There are many little votive statues, and a wealth of ornaments like the decorative plates of the bronze belt (3rd century B.C.) from the rich finds at Selca e Poshtme.

The cities of the coastal colonies (6th to 3rd centuries B.C.) that developed art of the classical style, have monumental architectural works, like the Lion Gate and the Theatre of Butrint, the Nymphium and the Monument of the Athletes in Apollonia, the amphitheatre in Durrës etc. Among the best known works of sculpture found, there are the head of Apollonia, the Goddess of Butrint (3rd century B.C.), the portrait of Agrippa (1st century B.C.), the head of Demosthenes (3rd cent. B.C.) The stelae produced in Apollonia are rich in ornamentation and reliefs, sometimes with three, one above the other. There is great variety in the many bronze statuettes, ceramics, mainly with red figures on a black background, and the terra-cottas. The most ancient mosaic is «The head of a girl» (3rd century B.C.) found in Durrës. The Roman mosaic in Apolonia, Durrës and elsewhere, is mainly in geometric designs of two or more colours.

The floors of basilicas of early Mediaeval times in central and south Albania, are paved in mosaic. In the baptistery of Butrint, (5th century A.D.), in the Basilica of Lin on lake Ohri (6th century A.D.), the mosaics represent mainly birds, vines, fish etc. Their colours blend in tonal effects. The only Byzantine wall mosaic (10th century A.D.) is found in a chapel in Durrës.

From the 6th to the 8th centuries, like the Illyrians, the early Albanian tribes built burial mounds, the majority of them in the Northern Albania (near Koman village and elsewhere). This culture is distinguished for the working of metals, and its ornaments in bronze, silver and gold. On the ear-rings, clasps and pendants there are images of the woman, the horse etc. They continue a number of the forms of Illyrian ornaments.

The monuments of the Mediaeval architecture, are to be found in abundance in the South in the Byzantine style, while in the North they are less frequent and in the Roman style. The church of Perhondi (10th century) in typical Byzantine style, is a cathedral, with a bell-tower attached, like Western churches. The church of Saint Nikolla in Mesopotam (13th century) which looks like a fortress, is rich in heraldic reliefs, capitals, etc. An outstanding monument in the typical picturesque Byzantine style of the 13th century is the church of Saint Mary at Pojan. The church of ,Saint Mëhill, erected on a rock outcrop below Berat Castle, and 'Saint Triadha within its walls, belong to the 14th century. The Icons of the 12th century are of classical Byzantine style: Saint Mary Odigitria in the Bllajshtona cave above lake Prespa, and others. In the icons of the 13th century, the religious stylization' is pronounced, whereas those of the 14th century express more intimate emotions; the Saint Mary in the church, of Saint Mary's Rest, in Berat, etc. The mural paintings of the refectory of Pojan monastery (1261-1328) are of a classic grandeur with transparent colours. The paintings of Saint Mary of Mborja 1380), and those of Saint Mary of the island of Maligrad, in lake Prespa, are remarkably expressive. The religious objects are artistically rich and skillfully executed. The epitaph of Gllanevica, embroidered to the order of Gjergj Araniti in 1373, is a document of great historical importance and a masterpiece of art.

The Albanian-Turkish wars during the 15th century, hindered the construction of monumental buildings and paintings. After the Turkish invasion, in the 16th century, iconography, mural-painting etc. were revived within the religious buildings which are not distinguished from their outward appearance. Berat is outstanding. The seven icons of «the great feastsH and the beautiful gates of Berat evangelistry are of marvelous precision: They are attributed to Onufri from Elbasan (mid. 16th century), a painter of murals in a series of churches in Kostur (Greece), Berat, and various villages of Elbasan. His paintings tend to be more materialistic, have dramatic expressions and outstandingly decorative colours. The icons and mural paintings of his son, Nikolla (the end of the 16th and the beginning of 17th centuries) have elongated and more aristocratic figures. There were a number of other distinguished painters. In the early 18th century iconography and mural painting took a new impetus, and realist elements of the baroque style were introduced into them. In 1726, David Selenicasi, painted the interiors of Saint Nikolla's of Voskopoja. From the 16th
century, buildings of the Muslim religion began to be built. The lead cupola Mosque (18th century) in Shkodra imitates Arabic architecture, but in the Dervishes' Temple in Berat (1791) and the mosque of Et-hem Bey in Tirana (1791-1821) elements of local folk art are included.

The revival of economic life and trade in the 18th and 19th centuries, brought about a growth of the cities with a spontaneous but original and rational solution to the problems of town planning, and led to the development of the popular architecture. The Gjirokaster tower house, rising three or four stories on the steep mountainous terrain evolved. A typical example is the Zekate house. The houses with porches in Berat link their white facades to form «the city of one thousand windows». Shkodra's two storied house with a balcony extends horizontally amidst a garden surrounded by very high walls. The skilled trades and artistic peasant handicrafts developed greatly. Wood carving reached a superb artistic level in the intricate three-dimensional designs of the altar screens. Notable examples are those of the seat of the Orthodox Bishop of Korca (late 18th century), Berat cathedral (1850) and that of Leus village church near Përmet (round the year 1800). The interiors of dwellings were ornamented with wood carving (the styles varying according to each district) and Albanian wood carvers became renowned all over the Balkans. The fame of weapons, such as daggers, pistols, rifles and their equipment, as well as ornamental buckles and other objects decorated with various techniques, especially in filigree, produced in Shkodra, Prizren, Elbasan and elsewhere, spread far beyond Albania. The metal ornaments worn by the women of the Northern Highlands faithfully continued the tradition of the ornaments of the Albanian culture of early mediaeval times.

The Art of the National Renaissance begins from after the year 1880, in the struggle for national independence and freedom from the Turkish rule. It is secular, breaking away from the religious iconography, and treats patriotic and ethnographic subjects. Kolë Idromeno (1860-1939) is a distinguished painter, architect and artist of this period. The portrait of his sister (1883) has social-psycological depth and a delicate artistic interpretation. Of particular interest for their portrayal of the life and customs of the country are «Shkodra wedding» as well as many realistic scenes in compositions with religious subjects, like «Two streets... The main subject of the art of National Renaissance is the figure of George Kastriot-Scanderbeg. Spiro Xega (1863-1953) an amateur painter and patriot, produced eight variants of Scanderbeg's portrait. His most original work is «Shahin Matraku's Beta>, with its subject from the life of patriotic insurgents.

After the proclamation of the independent Albanian State in 1912, the conditions created for artistic activity were not very favourable - it was left to personal initiative. From 1932 a number of monuments, works of the sculptor Odhise Paskali (1903) were erected, such as that of the «National Fighter» in Korça, a realistic statue, with a strong expression and Albanian psychological characteristics. His bust of Scanderbeg (1939) has a legendary-epic spirit. The painting of this period is realistic, but inclined towards lyricism. The motifs of Vangjush Mio (1891-1957) are mostly from the streets and environment of Korga and Pogradec, joyful landscapes, full of light and colour. «A street in Korga» is typical for his work in which, in his own way, he expresses his love for the fatherland. Varied, more demanding in its search for artistic expression, is the work of Zef Kolombi (1907-1949), astrict draftsman who uses the technique of «plain air». His portraits, such as his «Selfportrait» have dramatic force, his landscapes like «The Harvest» reflect the melancholy and stagnation of the time.

The People's State Power, born from the National Liberation War, that was established in the year 1944, and the policy of the Communist Party (today the Party of Labour) of Albania are very favourable to the development of art, which is considered as an important factor of the people's culture. In the first 10-15 years many busts and statues were erected. The monument to Scanderbeg by Janaq Pago with a popular and romantic spirit was erected in Kruja (in 1959), while the monument to Stalin, by O. Paskali (1949) and the monument to Lenin, by Kristina Hoshi (1954) were erected in Tirana. The busts of «Qemal Stafa» (1948) by J. Pago, «Vojo Kushi» (1949) by O. Paskali, are permeated by heroic and revolutionary
pathos. At this period the first compositional tableaux were painted. The National Liberation War was the predominant theme. «A story from the National Liberation War», by Nexhmedin Zajmi is of a decriptive character. While «The Liberation of Tirana» by Bukurosh Zajmi, is more of a summing up. Gradually the theme of reconstruction and socialist construction began to occupy an important place. In «Voluntary Labour at the Stalin Combine», by Abdurrahim Buza, it is reflected in an original manner. Important works with historical themes, like «Bajram Curri at the cave of Dragobia» by Guri Madhi, were created. Year by year artistic organizations and institutions have been set up and the creative activity and the number of artists have increased. According to the directives of the Party, that art should be in the service of the people and express their revolutionary aspirations. the ideals of communism, the figurative arts, too, follow the creative method of socialist realism. Since the year 1960, while the socialist construction has been advancing in fierce struggle against the internal and external class enemy, resisting the imperialist-revisionist pressure, art, in general, has become more profound in its content and artistic expression, and more firmly based on its own national experience. The compositions with themes from the National Liberation War and history, express patriotic revolutionary emotions, such as Fatmir Haxhiu's «Skrockë, February 1944» and others.

Painting gives a broader reflection of the heroism at work. While Zef Shoshi's «The Cooperativists' Return to their Village», generalizes a moment from the life of the socialist countryside. Agim Faja's «The Struggle against the Drought» is a monumental decorative (panel) with the people's solidarity at work as its theme.

In sculptural portrait, works reflecting the new features of the man moulded with the lofty ideals of socialism are being created. The bust of comrade Enver Hoxha by O. Paskali (1966) is considered one of the most important works of the art of socialist realism. The energy, profound thought, farsighted view of the leader of our people is reflected in this work. One of the monuments of this period is «The Liberating Partisan» (1964) in Përmet.

The 15th plenum of the Central Committee of the Party in 1965 reached the conclusion that, socialist realism had proved itself as a method in Albanian art and should play a still greater role in the communist education of the masses. After 1966, a series of revolutionary actions and movements led by the Party, began. Painting, sculpture and graphic art responded to the directives of the Party and the revolutionization of the country reflecting the transformations that were going on, and sharpening their proletarian partisanship. With the improvement of material conditions, the demands of the masses for art increased. Many important national and personal exhibitions were opened. Many works of major genres and proportions were created and the artistic expression was enriched. The statue «Hold High the Revolutionary Spirit», by Muntaz Dhrami (1966) quickly became a symbol of socialist Albania. In the following years, a series of important monuments have erected, some of them by groups of sculptors, like the solemn and expressive monument to Scanderbeg (1968) in Tirana, the Independence Monument in Vlora (1972), the monument to the Four Heroines (1971) in Rnëshen, the monument of Mushqeta on the outskirts of Tirana (1969), the «Monument to the War of 1920» near Vlora (1970) and «The Monument to the Martyrs of Borova» (1968) near Erseka, and others include beautiful reliefs. The bust of the heroine of the independence of the Fatherland «Shote Galica» by K. Rama is realistic, expressive, monumental. M. Dhrami's statue of the Labour heroine «Shkurte Pal Vata» is pervaded by revolutionary enthusiasm. In painting, many tableaus generalize the socialist life. The subject of many compositions is the construction of the big projects. «The Builders of Light» by Danish Jukniu is inspired by the irresistible vigour of the drive to build a gigantic hydro-electric power station. Viison Kilica's «December 1967» shows the people's solidarity to overcome the damage inflicted by natural calamities. The defence of the country is a theme extensively treated. In the conditions of the construction of socialism in Albania in unceasing struggle against the imperialist and revisionist blockade, the National Liberation War and the historical past in art, have a contemporary tone. The new man created in socialism occupies a place in the portraits. The landscapes reflect nature transformed by the hand of man. Other genres, too, like drawings, caricatures, etc, have developed.
Great changes have occurred in the planning and appearance of the city and the village, especially after the 1960's. Architecture of simple feature and popular spirit assumed a new impetus. It is seen in a series of buildings, like the building of the Central Committee of the Party, the Palace of Culture in Tirana (by a group of architects), the «V. I. Lenin Party School», the Tourist Hotel in Gjirokastra etc.

In 1973, the 4th Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania criticized bourgeois and revisionist modernist influences. The ideological struggle strengthened the art. of socialist realism, encouraged the artistic creativity and deepened its proletarian partisanship and national character. The opening of the National Exhibition of Figurative Arts dedicated to the 30th anniversary of Liberation (Tirana, November 1974) was a great success. In paintings the dynamic life and optimism of the working class and the whole people is reflected in vivid colours. Tableaus of a monumental character deal with great historical events.

THE THEATRE. The foundations of the present day Albanian theatre were laid during the period of the Anti-fascist National Liberation War.

Our first theatre is called «The People's Theatre». It was given this name because it was born as a partisan theatre, in the mountains, in the prisons, in the city quarters and villages, wherever the fight was waged against the fascist occupiers. On the 24th of May, 1944, on the eve of the liberation of the whole country, at the historic town of Përmet, the first professional theatre in the history of the country was set up.

Just as in music, dance, costumes, artistic craftsmanship, architecture etc., in the field of theatre too, the Albanian people have a rich tradition. Evidence of the preservation and development of this tradition are the amateur theatrical groups which we find in early times and which played an important role in the history of the Albanian theatre. These groups were developed especially in the main cities of the country such as Shkodra, Korka, Gjirokastra, Elbasan etc., where they functioned as groups of various patriotic and progressive associations created by the workers, craftsmen, patriotic intellectuals and progressive youth.

The progressive ideas which they brought out through a repertoire built up of original dramatic works, or by staging outstanding works of world progressive drama, strengthened the patriotic forms in their struggle against reaction. The regimes in power not only did not give any assistance to the development of these groups, but they persecuted them, dissolving the groups and condemned their representatives. Therefore the enthusiastic efforts of many amateurs of the theatre were not crowned with the creation of a professional theatre. This theatre was born much later.

At the end of the last century and up to the thirties. of this century, the world famous Albanian actor, Alek-sandër Moisiu (1879-1935) was alive and performing. Finding it impossible to realize his ardent desire to set up a na-tional theatre, he lived all his life abroad. The world progressive theatre considered Aleksandër Moisiu one of the greatest actors of the time.

Today, there are 8 drama-theatre companies in Albania, 15 «estrada» companies specializing in humour and. satire and 26 puppet theatre companies. In the tradition of the oPeople's Theatre», the other theatres also bear the names of other outstanding compatriots, who have lived at, different times. The theatre of the city of Korça, for example, bears the name of the great poet and patriot of the. National Renaissance, «A. Z. Çajupi», the theatre in the city of Shkodra bears the name of the revolutionary poet of the thirties, -Migjeni-, that of the city of Durrës, the name of the great Albanian actor, «Aleksandër Moisiu».

The number of amateur theatxe groups has increased beyond all comparison with the past. Almost every work: centre and institudon has its own amateur theatrical group,... where the lovers of dramatic art gather regularly afterwork and prepare performances which they stage hoth for their fellow workers and also for others. Festivals are organized systematically on a district, regional and. national scale. The two theatres, amateur and professional, assist, influence, and inspire each other.
While the amateurs learn acting skills from the professional theatre, the professionals, for their part, learn a great deal from the freshness, the natural acting, and the creative enthusiasm of the amateurs, and also find new talents among them. The professional theatres carry out systematic work with the amateur movement. The most experienced actors are charged with this work.

The theatre draws its new talents from the amateur movement and also from the schools. In 1946, the first secondary school of art, the «Jordan Misja» School, was opened, while in 1959, the «A. Moisiu» Higher School for actors was opened. This is one of the branches of the Higher Institute of Arts. In recent years producers have been trained at this school, too. Courses and other forms are organized for the training of directors of the amateur theatrical movement.

Although each theatre has its own premises with all the necessary facilities, both for the spectators and for the actors, the theatre companies also go out to their audiences at work and production centers, in town and countryside. Each year, every company must stage 40 to 60 per cent of its performances outside its own theatre.

The development of the theatre in breadth has brought about an improvement in its quality. The building up of the repertoires of the theatres mostly with national works has been one of the fundamental concerns of the theatre. Proceeding from the principle that there cannot be a truly national theatre without a national drama, today's theatre has completely solved this problem. This is one of its outstanding victories.

Hundreds of dramatic works have now entered the treasury of the national theatre. Our theatre cannot be conceived without such works and performances as: «The Prefect» by B. Levonja, «Our Land» by K. Jakova, «The Fisherman's Family» by S. Pitarka, «The Carnival of Korça» by S. Çomora, «The Highland Girl» by L. Papa, «The Bullet in the Dowry» by F. Kraja, etc. An important place here is occupied by the staging of outstanding works of our prose such as «The Swamp», based on the novel of the same title by F. Gjata, «The General of the Dead Army», based on the novel of the same title by I. Kadare, «The Dead River», also based on the novel of the same name by J. Xoxe.

Appreciating the values of the progressive drama of other peoples, our theatre has staged works from the treasury of world culture such as Shakespeare's Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, The Merry Wives of Windsor; Moliere's «The Miser», «Tartuff», «The Noble Bourgeois»; Goldoni's «Mirandolina»; «The Auditor» by Gogol; «The Enemies» by Gorki; «Love and Intrigue» by Schiller; «Nora» by Ibsen; «Arturo Ui» by Brecht and so on.

The Albanian theatre is a theatre of socialist realism which truthfully reflects the reality in its revolutionary development. The main aim of the actors is the faithful characterization of the figures they interpret in their dialectical development. The Albanian theatre puts the actor, the real living man, at the center of its attention, and places each of its components and the components of the scene at his service or at the service of the idea which he bears. This is also the aim of the scene painter, composer, lighting operator, etc. The Albanian theatre is waging a fierce struggle both against naturalism, melodrama, theatricality etc., and against the ugly features of the so-called «modern» theatre of today, the formalist, absurd, abstract, and «anti-everything» theatre, which has nothing in common with the realist and progressive theatre.

As an indication of the care and esteem for the place and the robe of the theatre in our society, artists may be awarded the high and honoured titles, «People's Artist», and «Merited Artist», which are held by many people of the stage. One of the highest decorations of the country is that of «Hero of Socialist Labour». There are stage artists among the ranks of the most highly honoured people who hold this decoration.

**MUSIC.** Albania, this country at the crossroads between East and West, has ancient musical traditions. Through their architecture, sculpture, ceramics, mosaics and coins with effigies of dancers and instrumentalists, the early centers of Southern Illyria, show us that musical culture has flourished here for a very long time. Along with archaeological monuments, such as the arena of
entertainment at Bylis, the stadium at Amantia, the theatres at Butrint, Orik and Durrës, the odeum at Pojan and at other centers in which concerts and musical performances were given further convincing evidence of this is provided in information from certain Greek and Roman classical authors. The cult of the Muses, itself, the legenda and myths around certain marvellously talented Illyrian artists, prove what importance was attached to music in the life of our ancestors.

Just as for Europe as a whole, for Albania, too, the early mediaeval centuries are dark and almost impenetrable. From that period there is only one prominent musician in our tradition, Niketa of Rameziana who, during the 4th century, composed a number of Paleo-Christian songs, the best known of which is «te Deum Laudamus».

From the 4th century, with the invasions of the barbarians, one of the gloomiest periods of our history began. Then, for about ten centuries on end, our country was under the bondage of the Byzantine Empire. It is not to be wondered at that we have to pass on to the 12th century to come across a musician like Jan Kukuzeli from Durrës, the outstanding master of Byzantine music, who, through his broad and manysided activity as a composer, a marvellous singer, a brilliant theoretician and reformer, opened new paths and gave a fresh impetus to musical development.

Evidence is not lacking of the development of the art of music at the time of the State of Arbër. The Albanians who emigrated from this state and settled in Southern Italy, where they founded the Arbëresh colony during the 15th century, took with them some old musical manuscripts which are a living source for the history of our music.

With the onslaught of the Ottoman Turks, Albania was afflicted with chaos for nearly another five centuries. The Turkish occupation interrupted any artistic development or manifestation for a very long time. During those dark days of oppression and ruthless exploitation, the very existence of our people was in jeopardy. When the Albanian cities gradually began to recover, music also began to revive through the setting up of the odd society, fanfare or band. The evidence we have of musical activity from that period is mainly connected with the Christian sphere where certain composers of hymns like Gjergj Papazima and Grigor Manesi (18th century) or Krisanth Mediti, former bishop of Durrës during the first half of the 19th century, were prominent. Krisanth Mediti was active in cultivating the fields of music and musicology, publishing a number of studies on Byzantine music, organizing choral groups, and training many pupils.

During the second half of the 19th century, in addition to fighting for freedom and national independence, Albanian patriots spared no efforts to promote art and culture. Overcoming many obstacles and hardships, a school for music was opened in Shkodra in 1878 and a band was set up. From that period we have some vocal and instrumental compositions by Palok Kurti. On the eve of throwing off the shackles of five hundred years of bondage, the national movement made rapid progress in all fields. However national independence in 1912 found Albania with few musicians and only a few brass bands in the main cities. At that time our country was backward from all points of view. The lack of cadres with technical-professional training, the low educational and cultural level, were, of course, not suitable conditions for the flowering of Albanian music. Under such circumstances a few composers emerged from the ranks of the people, who, in addition to vocal songs and romances, turned out some instrumental works like rhapsodies, fantasies, medleys, and the odd symphony. But the proclamation of independence did not ensure the freedom and territorial integrity of Albania. The Balkan War and, later, the First World War, turned Albania into a field of battles with all their devastating consequences. In such adverse political, economic and social circumstances, the necessary conditions for music to flourish were absent.

A new stage began for our country in 1920 when the foreign troops were driven out of Albania. At that time, Thoma Nasi, the conductor of the «Vatra» band, was very active in many directions.

During the period of Ahmet Zog's monarchic regime (1925-1939) art and culture were not supported and, as a consequence, talented composers did not find favourable conditions to exercise their artistic talents. Some of the few technically and professionally trained Albanian composers, like Fan Noli and Thoma Nasi, were obliged to emigrate abroad, instead of contributing to music in
their Homeland. Abroad, Fan Noli composed a number of symphonic poems based on Albanian themes and published his musicological study entitled «Beethoven and the French Revolution».

In 1939 new misfortunes descended upon the Albanian people, with the fascist occupation of the Homeland.

During the National Liberation War, some clandestine artistic formations were organized with a repertoire of patriotic and partisan songs. During the heat of the war, in July 1944, in the region of Opar, the Ensemble of the People's Army was set up under the direction of Gaqo Avrazi.

Right after the liberation of Albania, the State Choir was set up, and later (1941) this was incorporated in the Albanian Philharmonia.

1947 marked the inauguration in Tirana of the Lyceum of Arts which, in addition to the branches for the training of middle level music cadres, also includes a branch of ballet. Now, with the constant increase in artistic education in Albania, there are five secondary schools of art in various districts, and seven 8 grade art schools.

The Higher Institute of Arts, which includes, the Conservatorium, was opened in Tirana in 1961. It trains singers, instrumentalists, composers, conductors, musicologists, music teachers, etc.

The setting up of the Albanian Philharmonia stimulated stage performances. In 1950, a ballet group was organized and this was later incorporated in the Opera and Ballet Theatre. The Albanian work to be performed after liberation was the operetta «Dawn» (1953) composed by Kristo Kono on the basis of Kolë Jakova's libretto. In December 1958, the first Albanian Opera «Mrika», composed by Prenk Jakova, based on Lazar Siliqi's libretto was staged. A series of operettas by Albanian composers were performed, such as P. Dungu's «The Golden Neb». T. Daia's «Leila» and «Golden Autumn», T. Harapi's children's operetta «The Story of the Foresb>, N. Zoraqi's «The Idler», Kozma Lara's «Spring Days», A. Prodani's «The Bridegroom Was Transferred» and others.


Meanwhile, the genre of ballet did not lag behind. The first Albanian ballet «Halili and Hajrija» composed by Tish Daia, on the basis of the drama by Kolë Jakova, with choreography by Panajat Kanagi, was performed in January 1963. Then came «Delina» by C. Zadeja, «The Boy Partisan» by K. Laro, «The Mountain Girl» by N. Zoraqi (choreography by A. Aliaj), «The Fearless Eagle», «The Fisherman's Sons» and others.

During the years of the People's State Power, the Albanian composers have cultivated all the forms of vocal music ranging from songs and romances, to cantatas and oratorios. The main contributors in these two genres are K. Kono, K. Trako, P. Dungu, K. Ugi, R. Mara, T. Harapi, T. Hoshafi, A. Mula, V. Çangu and others. They also cultivated the forms of instrumental music, miniatures for various instruments ranging from chamber music formrrations like duets, trios, quartets, quintets and so on, in which the main contributors were T. Daia, T. Harapi, N. Zoraqi, R. Sokoli, A. Grimci, M. Kapidani, up to the major forms of instrumental music like suites, overtures, ballads, rhapsodies, symphonic dances, and so on, the main contributors of which were S. Gjoni, L. Dizdari, Sh. Kushta and others; or concertos for violin, flute, cello and piano with orchestra, and programmatic or symphonic poems etc.

All these composers have striven to enrich to the national artistic repertoire with something new and original. Of course it was no easy job for the first generation of composers after liberation to forge ahead with such small forces and without any adequate artistic heritage; while the younger generation, which has grown up in this climate, found the ground already cleaned, and they improved style, form and technique. Almost none of these composers has yet reached the peak of his achievements, which are constantly on the ascent, none has said his final word. Many genres of Albanian music are still only budding, but they are thriving well, nurtured as they are by the inexhaustible source of folk creativeness. Three decades are a very short period in the history of music but in spite of that in Albania during these last three decades an unprecedented development
has been achieved in music, which reflects the rapid development of our people in all fields of life. Basing themselves on their native soil, that is, on the folklore of the country, the Albanian composers have avoided abstract and decadent trends. Their aesthetic aim is «national in form and socialist in substance», as the basic principle of socialist realism. Meanwhile the new Albanian culture carried on the tradition or the artistic past of the country. Consequently, it developed also the branch of science, musicology, which greatly assisted the flourishing of music through conferences, creative discussions, and different publications.

Now a word or two about concert life in Albania. In September 1937, the Ensemble of Folk Songs and Dances, with a vocal instrumental and choreographic complex was set up in Tirana. This Ensemble has often presented the beauties of Albanian folklore outside the borders of the country in many countries of Europe, Asia and Africa, and has won the highest awards. Apart from this Ensemble, that of the People's Army and the collective of the Opera and Ballet Theatre, extensive artistic activity is carried on by the Radio-Television Symphony Orchestra, the orchestras of the secondary schools of art, the orchestra of the Higher Institute of Arts, as well as a number of symphony orchestras, set up in the other cities of Albania, such as Shkodra, Korça, Elbasan, Durrës etc. To these must be added forty or more bands set up in various districts, especially among army detachments as well as the smaller orchestras of thirteen professional variety theatre companies. One of the distinctive features of musical development in socialist Albania is the mass participation in scores of workers’ clubs and houses of culture in the cities, which together with some hundreds of cultural centers of the countryside, carry out a wide range of artistic activities. Every year festivals of new songs are organized by the Albanian Radio and Television Service, as well as by the houses of culture and young Pioneers' centers in the districts. Every year the May Concerts are organized in the Capital as well as national contests of variety theatre, bands, workers’ ensembles, groups from agricultural cooperatives and, especially the regional and national folklore festivals. All these contribute to the very vigorous concert life in the People's Socialist Republic of Albania.

CINEMATOGRAPHY. The first Albanian documentary film was put on the screen on May Day, 1947. This day marked the birth of cinematographic art in Albania.

The «New Albania» Film Studio which at first turned out newsreel films was founded in 1951. Later, with the creation of the material possibilities and the training of the necessary cadres, it became possible to produce feature film, a short one, was «Her Children», turned out in 1957, which deals with the struggle against the prejudices of parents, while the first full length Albanian feature film is «Tana» (1958) based on the novel of the same name by Fatznir Gjata, dealing with life in our countryside during the post-Liberation years.

Within a short period, Albanian cinematography outgrew its «infancy» and now has fully earned an important place in the field of the new socialist culture in Albania. Today our cinematography produces more than 12 feature films a year (some of them in colour) in addition to numerous documentary and newsreel films.

Up to now tens of feature films and hundreds of documentaries and newsreels have been produced. They have dealt with the most varied problems from the life of our people, giving a clear reflection of the efforts, the self-sacrifice and victories of the broad masses in their battle against everything alien and reactionary, of the revolutionary drive of our people to carry out the tasks of building the new socialist society. One of the most important themes of Albanian cinematography continues to be the National Liberation War of the Albanian people. It serves to evoke for the younger generation the most glorious page of our history. Thanks to its lofty content and richness of ideas, the Albanian film makes a major contribution to the problem of the education of the masses of the people with the moral principles and ethics of our new society.
Now the Albanian film has begun to appear on the screens abroad, in international festivals and during the Week of the Albanian Film, which has been organized in serveral countries of the world.

THE THESAURUS OF THE NATIONAL LIBRARY.

The National Library is one of the most important cultural institutions in our country, both because of the large number of books it has available and because of the work it does to publicize and spread them among the masses.

The library has a priceless collection of publications and manuscripts, which increases its scientific and bibliographic value, not only on a national level, but also internationally. This is best reflected in its collection of Albanology, which is considered the richest in the world.

Today it is a recognized fact that for anyone studying Albanological science, whether an Albanian or a foreigner, it is essential to turn to the materials in our National Library.

Of particular importance is the collection of antiquities, which includes very old and rare publications, incunabula and manuscripts of the period from the 15th to the 18th centuries, most of which refer directly or indirectly to various Albanian problems in the fields of geography, history, archaeology, ethnography, folklore, linguistics, literature and so on. In reviewing the bibliography «Albanica» the noted historian, Karl Göllner, makes this comment: «It (Albanica) astounds us with the treasures in the collection of the National Library in Tirana, of which many historians do not know», adding that «these publications are also important in regard to the history of books printed in the 15th century».

The place of honour in the collection of Antiquities is occupied by books in Albanian written by our ancient authors. Among them are the 2nd and 3rd volumes (1636 and 1664 respectively) of Pjetër Budi's work «Doktrinë së Krishterë» (The Christian Doctrine), Frano Bardhi's «Dictionarium Latino-Epirotium» (1635) and Pjetër Bogdani's «Cuneus Prophetarium» first published in 1685 and republished in 1691.

Gjon Buzuku's «Meshari» (Masses) (1555) the first book in Albanian, Budi's first publications of «Doktrina Cristiana» (1618), «Passchyra e të refuemt» (Spectrum Confessionis) (1621) and «Rituale Romanum» (1621), Frano Bardhi's work on Scanderbeg, Lek Matranga's and Jul Variboba's works are all kept in photo copies only, since the originals are in the Library of the Vatican and in the Paris National Library.

This heritage is enriched by the works of the Albanian humanists Barleti and Beçikemi. The first edition of the first work of Barleti «De obsedioni scodrensis» (1504) describing the first and second sieges of the city of Shkodra by Sultan Mohamed II (1474-1475) and (1478-1479) is kept in this library. The author himself took part in war against the Ottoman Turks.

The most important work of Barleti, which immortalized his name is his «History of Scanderbeg». The National Library has an almost complete set of volumes of this work. It was first published under the title «Historia de Vita et Getis Scanderbegi, Epirotarum Principis» (1508-1510) and was republished in Augsburg in 1533, in Strassburg in 1537, in Venice in 1554, in Frankfurt-on-Main in 1561, in Lisbon in 1567 and so on. It was also translated into many languages.

In addition to Barleti's book, the National Library has hundreds of other works about our National Hero, Scariderbeg, by such authors as Lavardin, Duponce, Biemmi, Kockert, Menezes, Pontanus, Sarocci, Whincop and others.

The history of our Illyrian ancestors is reflected in the works of ancient Latin and Greek writers, of which the oldest examples in the library are Pliny's Natural History» printed in 1516, Caesar's Commentaries (1539), Strabo's «De situ orbis, libri XVII» (1549), Aristotel's «Summi Semper Philosophi» (1550) and Diodor Siculi's «Bibliothecae historiae» (1559).

The history of the Middle Ages, together with the Turkish occupation and the struggle of the Albanians for freedom, are dealt with in the works of Byzantine and other chroniclers as well as of various travellers, and our National Library contains «Historiae Bizantinae scriptores tres greco-
latini» (1615), «Chronicorum turcicorum» (1578) and individual volumes by Ptolemy, Anna Comnena, Chalchondylos, Sansovino and others.

As Göllner remarked, the collection of ancient books and manuscripts in our National Library is also of particular interest for the study of the history of books in general. In this collection we have incunabula like that of Silvius Piccolomini, published in 1473, hence in the first period of the birth of the printing press. Amongst other things it speaks about Scanderbeg and about the struggle of the Albanians against the Turks. There are also old editions of the Bible and the Koran, books put out by famous publishing houses, such as Aldins (Aldo Manuzio) and Elzevir, illuminated books with valuable gold and silver inlaid vellum bindings, decorated with precious stones and filigree, which reflect the history of books at various stages of their development.

Mith all of these treasures, the section of Antiquities of our National Library is a precious heritage and the pride of our people.

MUSEUM - CITIES. Among the large number and many kinds of monuments, dating from the dawn of history to our days, our museum-cities occupy a special place. The underground of the city of Durrës, the old Bazaar of Kruja, the city of Berat and the city of Gjirokastra have been designated as museum-cities and placed under state protection on the basis of a special decision taken by the Council of Ministers. Special regulations in the spirit of this decision deal with the concrete problems of the administration, the preservation and restoration of these important centers of the history and material culture of our people.

Durrës is one of the most important ancient centers of our country. The new city was built long ago on the ruins of the ancient city founded as early as the 7th century B.C.

Of the ancient and mediaeval structures of this city only part of the defense structures which have resisted the ravages of time are preserved above ground level, for instance, the fortress built in the period of the Byzantine Emperor Anastas I, of Durrës origin, and a number of mediaeval turrets and walls which date back to the period from the 13th to the 14th centuries. All the other monuments of this city are preserved under the surface of the ground in such density that anywhere you dig you will find traces of them. Through excavations for new buildings, a series of important monuments have been found by chance such as the thermal baths of the Roman period in the center of the present day city, mosaics, the sewer system of the city and so on. That is why the underground of Durrës has been proclaimed a monument of culture; no new construction is allowed without the approval of the Institute of Monuments of Culture.

The Old Bazaar of Kraja, which dates back to the period from the 18th to the 19th centuries is one of the rare specimens of these beautiful architectonic complexes which, in the past, were centers of production and trade in our cities. This ensemble is outstanding for its successful functional solution through a simple architecture in which timber occupies the main place. The facades of the shops, which can be dismantled so that they can also serve for displays, and the characteristic ayes which, apart from sheltering displayed goods, can protect the buyers from the sun or rain, are made of timber. Thus, the space between the two long rows of shops covered by the eaves, turns into a sort of open, very picturesque market accessible to the customers. The Kruja Bazaar which was restored during the period from 1965 to 1967 by the Institute of Monuments of Culture, is one of the most interesting and the oldest of its kind preserved in Albania.

The museum-city of Berat is an important center for the history and material culture of the Albanian people because it preserves structures beginning with the Illyrians as early as the 4th and 3rd centuries B.C. and ending with historic monuments connected with the National Liberation War. Worthy of mention in this museum-city is the fortress in which we find many kinds of
constructions. Apart from Illyrian traces there are also constructions of the 6th, 13th, 15th, and 19th centuries. This fortress is one of the biggest of its kind and is distinguished for the great variety of contributions from various epochs. Some cult constructions of the 13th and 14th centuries, some of which also preserve mural paintings are worthy of mention for their architectonic values. The city itself, that is, the residential center as it is today, belongs partly to the 18th century and even more to the 19th century during which a vigorous process of reconstruction of old houses took place. The ensembles of the museum-city of Berat are distinguished for their close combination with the terrain which is utilized in a masterly way in the compositional volume of the buildings which, joining together, create long strips of buildings. These ensembles stand out for their architectonic coherence and their identical exterior appearance, the balanced horizontal composition and careful integration of separate architectonic elements. The many windows and the arched projections of the residential storey lighten and give variety to the dimensional composition of these compact constructions.

The museum-city of Gjirokastra is younger. Its fortress, a structure with architectonic values, appears to date back to the 9th and 12th centuries. It was the nucleus of the city which, by the middle of the 17th century, had achieved rapid and vigorous development. Apart from the fortress, the characteristic houses of Gjirokastra, which constitute a specific type within the framework of the Albanian popular house, are of very important value. These houses are distinguished for their development in height and their pronounced monumental character due to their severe outward appearance and cozy and highly ornamented interiors. The ensembles of this city stand out for their accentuated monumental and expressive character, their organic connections with the environment and variety of dimensional composition.

**SPORT.** In Albania all the younger generation is involved in sport. This is realized first of all at school, where physical training is one of the main components of the teaching process. The other masses of youth take part in sports according to an extensive calendar, which constitutes the basis for the program of national and local sports activities. This program is worked out in detail by every district, work center, institution, agricultural cooperative and enterprise, in collaboration with the broad masses of youth. It ensures not only the wide variety of sports but also the mass character of participation in them.

Our sports enthusiasts are organized in clubs and collectives on the basis of districts, schools, work centers, agricultural cooperatives and enterprises, institutions or military detachments. These clubs develop their activities by taking part in various championships. Thus, for instance, there are the National Football Championships of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd categories, the National Championships in basketball, volleyball, swimming, shooting, chess, table tennis, classical and free style wrestling, weight lifting, cycling and so on.

Great progress has been made in athletics, in which boys and girls above 12 years of age compete in various age groups. The young pioneers of both sexes have their own basketball and volleyball championships, and so do the young football players. Today about 90 teams compete in the men's and women's basketball and volleyball championships.

At the «Vojë Kushi» Higher Institute of Physical Culture there is a special branch engaged in training for athletics, gymnastics and football.

Before the liberation of Albania from the invaders and local traitors, only four official sports activities were carried on, namely, football, athletics, swimming and cycling. Only males took part in these activities because the Albanian women and girls were terribly oppressed by the backward feudal customs which prevailed at that time. Those four simple official activities with that very limited number of teams and sportsmen, very quickly, (indeed in the first years after liberation) grew to mass activities with the participation of many clubs and thousands of sportsmen and sportswomen. Another telling fact which shows how quickly and in what a revolutionary way our
women rejected fanaticism and patriarchalism is the great step which they took as far back as 1945, that is, a few months after liberation, when they came out on to the sports fields and competed in athletics, volleyball, basketball and other sports events.

The maximum figure of those engaged in sports in 1938 was 5,000. During the first year after liberation (1945) 70,000 young men and young women took part in mass road races. In 1950 over 100,000 persons took part in road races, mountaineering, organized marches, athletics and other sports events; while in 1960 - 200,000 persons, and to-day nearly 1/7th of the entre population of Albania engage in sports.

Spartakiads are the highest form of sports activities as far as mass participation and quality are concerned. In the First National Spartakiad in 1959 the number of participants was 150,000; in the Second National Spartakiad, this number rose to 200,000 persons, and in the Third it rose to 300,000 persons.

For the development of these sports activities, the People's State Power has put considerable funds at the disposal of the younger generation.

All we inherited from the time prior to the triumph of the people's revolution were 3 sports parks, 5 practice grounds, Band a few football fields and volleyball and tennis courts. During the period from 1945 to 1950 perceptible steps were taken in this field, too. Among others 2 stadiums, 27 gymnasiums, 57 practice grounds, 37 football fields etc., altogether 535 various sports facilities were built; in 1960 we had 1,042; in 1970 - 1,720, and in 1975 - over 2,100 of these. Today there are 21 stadiums and 81 sports centers, 3 sports palaces (two additional ones are under construction), 36 shooting ranges for sports purposes; 375 practice grounds, 271 gymnasiums, 366 football fields, 339 basketball and 478 volleyball courts.

Even in the most remote mountain village, together with the school, the house of culture and the electric light, you will also find the volleyball court or football field, the shooting or wrestling team. There are villages or administrative localities which have their own stadiums like Narta, Krutje and others, and which compete in sports activities on a national scale.
ON THE CENTENARY OF THE BIRTH OF JOSEPH STALIN

December 21 this year marks the centenary of the birth of Joseph Stalin, the much-beloved and outstanding leader of the proletariat of Russia and the world, the loyal friend of the Albanian people, and the dear friend of the oppressed peoples of the whole world fighting for freedom, independence, democracy and socialism.

Stalin's whole life was characterized by an unceasing fierce struggle against Russian capitalism, against world capitalism, against imperialism and against the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist currents and trends which had placed themselves in the service of world reaction and capital. Beside Lenin and under his leadership, he was one of the inspirers and leaders of the Great October Socialist Revolution, an unflinching militant of the Bolshevik Party.

After the death of Lenin, for 30 years on end, Stalin led the struggle for the triumph and defence of socialism in the Soviet Union. That is why there is great love and respect for Stalin and loyalty to him and his work in the hearts of the proletariat and the peoples of the world. That is also why the capitalist bourgeoisie and world reaction display never-ending hostility towards this loyal disciple and outstanding, resolute co-fighter of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin.

Stalin earned his place among the greatclassics of Marxism-Leninism with his stern and principled struggle for the defence, consistent implementation and further development of the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin. With his keen mind and special ability, he was able to find his bearings even in the most difficult times, when the bourgeoisie and reaction were doing everything in their power to hinder the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The difficulties facing the Russian proletariat in the realization of its aspirations were immense, because capitalism reigned in Russia and the world. But capitalism had already produced its own grave-digger the proletariat, the most revolutionary class which was to lead the revolution. This class was to fulfil its historic mission successfully, in merciless struggle against its enemies, and through this struggle, win its rights and freedoms, and take political power into its own hands. On this course, the proletariat was to wrest political and economic power from its oppressors and exploiters - the capitalist bourgeoisie, and build the new world.

Marx and Engels created the proletarian science of the revolution and scientific socialism. They founded the International Workingmen's Association, known as the First International. The fundamental principles of this first international association of workers were formulated in its Constitutional Manifesto, which defined the road of the proletariat for the liquidation of private ownership of the means of production, for the creation of the party of the proletariat to seize state power on the revolutionary road, as well as for the struggle the proletariat had to wage against capitalism and opportunism, which presented itself in different <<theoretical>> forms in different countries.
Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, the brilliant continuer of the work of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, basing himself on their major works and defending them with rare mastery, waged the struggle against the trends of revisionists, opportunists, and other renegades.

The traitors discarded the great banner of the First International and openly spurned the slogan of the Communist Manifesto: "Workers of all countries, unite!". Instead of opposing the imperialist war, these renegades from Marxism voted credits for it.

Lenin wrote major works in defence and for the development of Marxism. In particular, he enriched the ideas of Marx and Engels on the construction of socialist and communist society.

Always bearing in mind the materialist development of history, as well as the conditions of the country and the epoch in which he was living, Lenin fought for the creation and consolidation of the Bolshevik Party. Vladimir Ilyich, together with the other bolsheviks, through an intensive revolutionary struggle within Russia and abroad, in the conditions of the decay of czarism and its army, prepared and launched the Great Proletarian Socialist Revolution.

Lenin's plan of genius for the triumph of the revolution was realized. After the Great Revolution, which shook the old world and opened up a new epoch in the history of mankind - the epoch of the liquidation of oppression and exploitation, was crowned with success, Lenin continued the struggle for the construction of the first socialist state. Lenin's devoted collaborator, Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin, fought and worked together with him. It is understandable that the bourgeoisie could not fail to rise against the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin and their correct, resolute and unwavering actions in favour of the working class and the peoples, and it did so, without hesitation, savagely and consistently, never ceasing to aim its various weapons against them. This great, organized hostility of capitalism and the reactionary world bourgeoisie was confronted with the great, organized and invincible strength of the Russian proletariat in unity with the world proletariat.

This confrontation was an expression of a fierce class struggle within and outside Russia, which was apparent during that whole period in the clashes with the interventionist forces and the remnants of czarism and Russian reaction. These enemies had to be fought mercilessly.

The Bolshevik Party had to be tempered, the building of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as the principal issue of the revolution, had to be completed and the foundations of the socialist economy laid in the course of this class struggle. Therefore, fundamental reforms had to be carried out in all sectors of life, but on a new course, in a new spirit, with a new purpose; Marx's theory on philosophy, political economy and scientific socialism had to be applied in a creative manner and under the concrete conditions of czarist Russia.

All these aims were to be realized under the leadership of the proletariat, as the most advanced and most revolutionary class, relying on its alliance the poor and middle peasantry. After the creation of the new state power, a great and heroic struggle had to be waged to improve the economic and cultural life of the peoples liberated from the yoke of czarism and foreign capital of other European countries. In this titanic struggle, Stalin stood firm beside Lenin; he was a front-line fighter.

The more the new Soviet state became consolidated politically, the more industry developed in all its branches, the more the collective agriculture and the new socialist culture developed in the Soviet Union, the fiercer the resistance of the external enemies and local reaction became. The enemies intensified this struggle especially after the death of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin.

Before the body of Lenin, Stalin pledged that he would loyally follow his teachings, would carry out his behests to keep the lofty title of the Communist pure, to safeguard and strengthen the unity of the Bolshevik Party, to preserve and ceaselessly steel the dictatorship of the proletariat, to constantly strengthen the alliance of the working class with the peasantry, to remain loyal to the end to the principles of proletarian internazionalism to defend the first socialist state from the ambitions of the local bourgeois and landowner enemies and the external imperialist enemies, who wanted to destroy it, and to carry the construction of socialism through to the end in one sixth of the earth.

Joseph Stalin kept his word. At the head of the Bolshevik Party he knew how to lead the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union and to make the great Homeland of the Russian proletariat and all the peoples of the Soviet Union a colossal base for the world revolution. He
showed himself to be a worthy continuer of the work of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and gave brilliant proof that he was a great, clear-minded and resolute Marxist-Leninist.

The enemies within the Soviet Union - the Trotskyites, Bukharinites, Zinovyevites; and others, were closely linked with foreign capitalists, because they had become their tools. Some of them remained within the ranks of the Bolshevik Party in order to take the citadel from within, to disrupt the correct Marxist-Leninist line of this party with Stalin at the head, while some others operated outside the party but within the state, and in disguise or openly plotted to sabotage the construction of socialism. In these circumstances, Stalin persistently implemented one of Lenin's main instructions about unhesitatingly purging the party of all opportunist elements, of any one who capitulates to the pressure of the bourgeoisie and imperialism and any view alien to Marxism-Leninism. The struggle Stalin waged at the head of the Bolshevik Party against the Trotskyites and Bukharinutes was a direct continuation of the struggle waged by Lenin, a profoundly principled, salutary struggle, without which there would have been neither construction of socialism, nor any possibility of defending it.

Joseph Stalin knew that the Victories could be achieved and defended through efforts, sacrifices, through sweat and struggle. He never displayed ill-founded optimism over the victories that were achieved and was never pessimistic about the difficulties which emerged. On the contrary, Stalin was an exceptionally mature personality, prudent in his thoughts, decisions and actions. As the great man he was, Stalin was able to win the hearts of the party and people, to mobilize their energies, to temper the militants in battles, and uplift them politically and ideologically in order to carry out a great work, without precedent in history.

The Stalin five-year plans for the development of the economy and culture transformed the world's first socialist country into a big socialist power. Guided by the teaching of Lenin about giving priority to heavy industry in the socialist industrialization, the Bolshevik Party headed by Stalin equipped the country with a very powerful industry for the production of means of production, with a giant machine-building industry, capable of ensuring the rapid development of the entire people's economy and all the necessary means, as well as an impregnable defence. As Stalin said, the socialist heavy industry was set up "relying on the internal forces, without enslaving credits and loans from abroad". Stalin had made it clear that in setting up its heavy industry, the Soviet state could not follow the road which the capitalist countries pursue, by taking loans from other countries or plundering other countries.

After the collectivization of agriculture in the Soviet Union a modern socialist agriculture was built up with the support of a powerful base of agricultural machinery produced by the socialist heavy industry, and thus the problem of grain and other principal agricultural and livestock products was solved. It was Stalin who elaborated Lenin's cooperativist plan more thoroughly, who led the implementation of this plan in fierce struggle with the enemies of socialism, with the kulaks, the Bukharinite traitors, with the innumerable difficulties and obstacles which stemmed not only from enemy activity, but also from the lack of experience and from the feeling of private property which had deep roots in the consciousness of the peasants.

The build-up of economic and cultural strength helped the consolidation of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union. At the head of the Bolshevik Party, Stalin organized and ran the Soviet state in a masterly way, further perfected its functioning and, always on the Marxist-Leninist course, developed the structure and superstructure of society on the basis of the internal political situation and economic development, while never losing sight of the external situations, that is, the rapacious aims and the sinister intrigues concocted by the bourgeois-capitalist states in order to impede the construction of the new state of the proletarians.

World capitalism regarded the Soviet Union as its dangerous enemy, therefore from outside it endeavoured to isolate it, while it encouraged and organized the plots of renegades, spies, traitors and rightists from within. The dictatorship of the proletariat struck down these dangerous enemies without mercy. All the traitors, were put on public trial. At that time, their guilt was proved most
convincingly with incontrovertible evidence. The bourgeois propaganda raised a big fuss about the trials conducted in the Soviet Union on the basis of the revolutionary law against the Trotskyites, Bukharinites, the Radeks, Zinovyevs, Kamenyevs, Pyatakovs and Tukhachevskys. It stepped up and raised to a system its campaign of slander and denigration against the just struggle of the Soviet state, the Bolshevik Party and Stalin that defended the life of their peoples, defended the new socialist system built with the blood and sweat of the workers and peasants, defended the Great October Revolution and the purity of Marxism–Leninism.

What slander did the external enemies not invent, especially against Joseph Stalin, the continuer of the work of Marx and Lenin, the talented leader of the Soviet Union, whom they accused of being a bloody tyrant-, and murderer.. All these slanders were remarkable for their cynicism. No, Stalin was no tyrant, no despot. He was a man of principle, he was just, modest and very kindly and considerate towards people, the cadres, and his colleagues. That is why his Party, the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the entire world proletariat loved him so much. This is how millions of communists and outstanding personalities, revolutionaries and progressive people throughout the world knew Stalin. In his book entitled <<Stalin>>, Henri Barbusse says among other things: <<He established and maintains links with the workers, peasants and intellectuals of the USSR, as well as with the revolutionaries of the world, who love their homeland - that is, with many more than 200 million people>>. He added, <<This clear and enlightened person is an unpretentious man... He laughs like a child... From many aspects Stalin is very much like the extraordinary V. Ilyich: the same mastery of theory, the same practical sense, the same determination... More than in anyone else, in the person of Stalin one finds the thought and word of Lenin. He is the Lenin of today.>>

Consistent Marxist-Leninist revolutionary ideas run like a red thread through all Stalin's thoughts and Works, whether written or applied in practice. No mistake of principle can be found in the works of this outstanding Marxist-Leninist. His work was well weighed up in the interests of the proletariat and the working masses, in the interests of the revolution, socialism and communism, in the interests of national liberation and anti-imperialist struggles. He was not eclectic in his theoretical and political opinions, nor was he vacillating in his practical actions. He who relied on the sincere friendship of Joseph Stalin was confident in his onward march towards a happy future for his people. He who deviated could not escape the keen vigilance and judgement of Joseph Stalin. This judgement had its roots in the great ideas of the Marxist-Leninist theory which had crystallized in his brilliant mind and pure soul. Throughout his whole lifetime he knew how to keep a firm hold on the helm and steer a correct course to socialism amongst the waves and storms created by enemies.

Stalin knew when and to what extent compromises should be made provided they did not violate the Marxist-Leninist ideology, but on the contrary, were to the benefit of the revolution, socialism, the Soviet Union and the friends of the Soviet Union. The proletariat, the Marxist-Leninist parties, the genuine communists and all the progressive people in the world considered the salutary actions of the Bolshevik Party and Stalin in defence of the new socialist state and socio-economic order to be just, reasonable and necessary. The work of Stalin was approved by the world proletariat and the peoples, because they saw that he fought against the oppression and exploitation which they felt on their own backs. The peoples saw that the slanders against Stalin came precisely from those monsters who organized mass tortures and killings in capitalist society, those who were the cause of starvation, poverty, unemployment and so much misery, hence they did not believe these slanders. Millions of proletarians throughout the world rose against these enemies in big strikes and powerful demonstrations in the city streets, and attacked the factories and plants of the capitalists. The peoples rose in struggle against the colonizers to win their democratic freedoms and rights. These actions were, at the same time, an all-round international support for the Soviet Union and Stalin, which helped to strengthen the new state of the Soviets and enhance its great authority in the world. All the communists throughout the world who were fighting against world capitalism were called agents. of the Soviet Union and Stalin by the bourgeoisie and the renegades from
Marxism-Leninism. But the communists were honest people, they were nobody's agents, but were simply loyal supporters of the doctrine of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

They supported the Soviet Union because in its policy they saw their great support for the triumph of communist ideas, they saw a clear example of how they should develop their struggle and increase their efforts to win the battles one after the other, to defeat the enemies and rid themselves of the yoke of the power of capital and build the new, socialist social order.

While world capitalism was growing weaker as an outdated order in decay, socialism in the Soviet Union was triumphing as the new order of the future and becoming an ever more powerful support for the world revolution. In these circumstances capitalism was absolutely compelled to employ all its means to strike a mortal blow at the great socialist state of the proletarians, which was showing the world the way to escape from exploitation, therefore the capitalists prepared and launched World War II. They raised, supported, incited and armed the Hitlerites for the <<war against Bolshevism>>, against the Soviet Union, and to realize their dream of <<living space>> in the East. The Soviet Union understood the danger which threatened it. Stalin was vigilant, he knew full well that the slanders concocted against him by the international capitalist bourgeoisie, alleging that he was not fighting the rising nazism and fascism, were slogans to be expected from this bourgeoisie and the Hitlerite Fifth Column, in order to deceive world opinion and realize their plans for an attack on the Soviet Union.

The 7th Congress of the Comintern, held in 1935, rightly described fascism as the greatest enemy of the peoples in the concrete Circumstances of that time. On the direct initiative of Stalin, this Congress launched the slogan of the peoples' anti-fascist united front, which should be created in every country with the aim of exposing the aggressive plans and predatory activity of the fascist states, so that the peoples would rise against these plans and this activity in order to avert a new imperialist war which was threatening the world.

Never for any moment did Stalin lose sight of the danger threatening the Soviet Union. At all time he fought resolutely and gave clear-cut instructions that the party must be tempered for the coming battles, that the Soviet peoples must be united in a steel-like Marxist-Leninist unity, that the Soviet economy must be consolidated on the socialist road, that the defences of the Soviet Union must be strengthened with material means and cadres, and have a revolutionary strategy with revolutionary tactics. It was Stalin who showed and proved through facts from life itself, that the imperialists are warmongers and that imperialism "is the bearer of predatory wars, therefore, he instructed that people must be continuously vigilant and always prepared to cope with any action by the Hitlerite nazis, the Italian fascists, and the Japanese militarists, together with the other capitalist world powers. Stalin's word was prized above gold, it became a guide for the proletarians and the peoples of the world. Stalin proposed to the governments of the big capitalist powers of Western Europe that an alliance should be formed against the Hitlerite plague, but these governments rejected such a proposal, indeed they even violated the alliances they had previously signed with the Soviet Union, because they hoped the Hitlerites would eliminate the <<seed of Bolshevism>> and pull the chestnuts out of the fire for them.

Faced with such an extremely serious and dangerous situation, and being unable to convince the government officials of the so-called western democracies to conclude a joint anti-fascist alliance, Stalin considered it appropriate to work so that war against the Soviet Union was postponed, in order to gain time to further strengthen its defences. To this end, he signed the non-aggression pact with Germany. This pact was to serve as a modus vivendi to stave off the danger temporarily, because Stalin saw the Hitlerite aggressiveness, and had made and was continuing to make preparations against it.

Many bourgeois and revisionist politicians and historians allege that the Hitlerite aggression found the Soviet Union unprepared and forthis lay the blame on Stalin! But the facts refute this slander. Everyone knows that Hitlerite Germany, as an aggressive state, violating the non-aggression pact in a piratical and perfidious manner, took advantage of strategic surprise and the numerical superiority
of the huge force of about 200 divisions of its own and its allies, and threw them into a <<blitzkrieg>> by means of which, according to Hitler's plans, the Soviet Union was to be overrun and conquered within not more than two months!

But everyone knows what happened in reality. The <<blitzkrieg>>, which had succeeded everywhere in Western Europe, failed in the East. Being very strong behind the lines, with the support of all the Soviet peoples, in its withdrawal the Red Army exhausted the enemy forces until it pinned them down, then it counter-attacked and smashed them with successive blows, until finally it forced Hitlerite Germany to surrender unconditionally. History has already recorded the decisive role of the Soviet Union in the defeat of Hitlerite Germany and the annihilation of fascism in general in World War II.

How could Hitler's plan of <<blitzkrieg>> against the Soviet Union have been defeated and how could that country have played such a major role in saving mankind from fascist bondage without all-sided prior preparation for defence, with-out the steel strength and vitality of the socialist system which withstood its greatest and most difficult test in World War II? How can these victories be separated from the exceptionally great role played by Stalin, both in preparing the country to withstand the imperialist aggression, And in the rout of Hitlerite Germany and in the historic victory over fascism? Any diabolic attempt by the Kruschevite revisionist to separate Stalin from the party and Soviet people in connection with the decisive role of the socialist state in this victory is smashed to smithereens in the face of the historic reality which no force can refute or diminish, let alone wipe out. The war of the Soviet peoples, with Stalin at the head, led to the liberation of a series of countries and peoples from nazi bondage, brought about the establishment of people's democracy in several countries of Eastern Europe and gave a powerful impulse to the national liberation, antiimperialist and anti-colonialist struggles, so that the colonial system disintegrated and collapsed, and this created a new ratio of forces in the world in favour of socialism and the revolution.

Khrushchev was so shameless as to accuse Stalin of being a person, <<shut away>> from the reality, who allegedly did not know the situation in the Soviet Union and the world, who allegedly did not know where the forces of the Red Army were deployed and commanded them using a school globe as his map! Even such heads of world capitalism as Churchill, Roosevelt, Truman, Eden, Montgomery, Hopkins and others were obliged to recognize the incontestable merits of Stalin, although at the same time, they made no secret of their hostility towards the Marxist-Leninist policy and ideology and Stalin personally. I have read their memoirs and seen' that these heads of capitalism speak with respect about Stalin as a statesman and military strategist, describe him as a great man <<endowed with a remarkable sense of strategy>>, <<with an unrivalled sharpness of mind In the rapid comprehension of problems>>. Churchill, said about Stalin, <<...I respect this great and brilliant man..., very few people in the world could have understood the problems overwhich we had been at dL loss for months on end, like this, i n so few minutes. Re had grasped everything in a second>>. The Xhrushchevites wanted to Create the illusion that not Stalin, but they, had allegedly led the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union against nazism! But the whole world knows that during that time they were sheltering under the shadow of Stalin to whom they sang hypocritical hymns of praise, saying: <<We owe all our victories and successes to the great Stalin>>, etc., etc., at a time when they were preparing to blow up these victories. The genuine hymns, which came from the heart, were sung by the glorious Soviet soldiers who went into the historic battles with the name of Stalin on their lips. Although far from the Soviet Union, the Albanian communists and people felt the great role of Stalin very strongly and intimately, at the gravest moments our country experienced during the Italian and German fascist occupation, when the fate of our Homeland, whether it would remain in bondage or emerge into freedom and light, was decided. During the most difficult days of the war, Stalin was always beside us. He boosted our hopes, illuminated our perspective, steeled our hearts and will, and Increased our confidence in victory. Many a time, the
last words of the Albanian communists, patriots, and partisans who gave their lives on the battlefield or facing the enemy's gallows, machine-gun or automatic rifle, were: "Long live the Communist Party!". "Long Live Stalin!".

More than once it has occurred that in piercing the hearts of the sons and daughters of our people, the enemy's bullets, at the same time, pierced the works of Stalin which they guarded in their bosoms as a much cherished treasure.

Despite the open and disguised efforts of the internal and external enemies of the Soviet Union to sabotage socialism after World War II, the correctness of Stalin's policy set the tone in major international problems. The war-devastated land of the Soviets, which lost 20 million people on the battlefields, was reconstructed with astounding rapidity. This great work was carried out by the Soviet people, the working class and the collective farm peasantry, led by the Bolshevik Party and the great Stalin.

In the years of World War II revisionism emerged with the betrayal of Browder, exgeneral secretary of the CP of the USA, who, together with his revisionist associates, dissolved the party and placed themselves in the service of American imperialism. Browder was for the liquidation of any demarcation fine between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, between capitalism and socialism, for their merging in a single world, was against the revolution and civil war and for the peaceful co-existence of classes in society. We can say that With this <<white line>>, with his capitulationist policy, Browder preceded Tito, who, because of his anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist Views and stands, entered into ideological and political conflict with the Soviet Union at the time of the war, although this conflict broke out openly after the war. After many patient efforts to bring the renegade Tito into line, when they were convinced he was incorrigible, Stalin, the Bolshevik Party and the other genuine communist parties of the world unanimously condemned him. It became obvious that the work of Tito was in the service of world imperialism, therefore he relied on and was supported by American imperialism and the other capitalist states. Joining the chorus of the bourgeois propaganda and in order to earn the credits he received from the imperialists, Tito, among other things, slandered that Stalin allegedly prepared the attack against Yugoslavia. Time proved that Tito was lying. In the different talks which I have had the great honour to hold with Stalin, he has told me that there never was and never could be any thought of the Soviet Union attacking Yugoslavia. We are communists, said Stalin, and will never attack any foreign country, hence, Yugoslavia either, but we shall expose Tito and the Titoites because that is, our duty as Marxists. Whether they keep Tito in power or overthrow him in Yugoslavia, this is an internal question which it is up to the peoples of Yugoslavia to settle, it is not up to us to interfere in this affair, he said. The Nikita Khrushchev gang was encouraged and supported in its slanders against Stalin by the renegade Josip Broz Tito, who had come out openly long before, and later by Mao Tsetung and company and other revisionists of various shades. The reality, all of them were minions of capitalism, set on destroying socialism in the Soviet Union from within, preventing socialism from being built in Yugoslavia, and hindering the construeflon of socialism in China and the whole world. That is why they opposed Stalin, in whom they saw the strong man, to whom they were unable to put anything across while he was alive.

These traitors were the successors to the social democrat, revisionist, opportunist renegades of the Second International, the continuers of their inglorious work in other circumstances and conditions. They claimed that they were applying organizational forms of struggle <<appropriate>> to the situation and working out allegedly new ideas to <<correct>> and complement- Marxism-Leninism in accord with the spirit of the time, etc. Irrespective of any formal differences they manifested in their opinions and attitudes, all this scum had the one aim: to combat Marxism-Leninism, to negate the absolute necessity of the proletarian revolution, to destroy socialism, to quell the class struggle, and prevent the overthrow of the old capitalist society to its very foundations. Stalin was a genuine internationalist. He took good account of the special feature that the Soviet state was created by the union of many republics which were composed of many peoples, many nationalities, therefore he perfected the state organization of these republics while respecting their equal rights. With the
correct Marxist-Leninist policy he pursued on the national question, Stalin succeeded in moulding and tempering the militant unity of the different peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. While at the head of the party and Soviet state, he made his contribution to transforming the prison of the peoples - the old czarist Russia, into a free, independent and sovereign country, where the peoples and the republics lived in harmony, friendship, and unity with equal rights. Stalin knew the nations and their historical formation, he knew the different characteristics of the culture and psychology of each people and handled them in the Marxist-Leninist way.

The internationalism of Joseph Stalin is clearly apparent also in the relations that were established among the countries of people's democracy which he considered free, independent, sovereign states, close allies of the Soviet Union. He never envisaged these states as dominated by the Soviet Union, either politically or economically. This was a correct Marxist-Leninist policy which Stalin followed. In my memoirs I have written of the request I made to Joseph Stalin in 1947 in regard to the creation of some joint Albanian-Soviet companies, which were to utilize our underground wealth. He told me that they did not set up joint companies with the fraternal countries of people's democracy, and explained to me that even some step which had been taken at first in this direction with some country of people's democracy, they had considered mistaken and given up. It is our duty, continued Stalin, to provide the countries of people's democracy with the technology we possess and the economic aid we are able to give, and we shall always be ready to support them. This is what Stalin thought and that is how he acted.

The Khrushchevites, on the contrary, did not follow such a course. They embarked on the road of cunning capitalist collaboration, creating a military, political and economic <<unity>> with the former countries of people's democracy 'in their own interests and to the detriment of others. They transformed the Warsaw Treaty into an instrument to keep their new colonies in bondage, in forms and ways allegedly socialist. They transformed Comecon from an organization of mutual economic aid, which it was in the time of Stalin, into a means of control and exploitation of its member countries. Thus the policy of Joseph Stalin on all the major political, ideological and economic problems was one thing, while the policy of the Krushchevite and other modern revisionists is quite another thing. Stalin's policy was principled and internationalist, while that of the Soviet revisionists is a capitalist policy, enslaving for the other peoples who have fallen or are falling into their trap. The imperialists, Tito, the Krushchevites and all other enemies accused Stalin, alleging that after World War II he divided up the spheres of influence in agreement with the former anti-fascist allies - the United States of America and Great Britain. Time has consigned this accusation to the rubbish bin, just as it did with all the rest. After World War II, Stalin defended with exemplary justice the peoples, their national liberation struggle and their national and social rights against the greed of his former allies in the antifascist war. The enemies of communism, ranging from international bourgeois reaction down to the Krushchevites and all the other revisionists, have striven with every means to blacken and distort all the virtues, pure thoughts and just actions of this great Marxist-Leninist, and to discredit the first socialist state set up by Lenin and Stalin. With great cunning the Krushchevites, these new disciples of Trotsky, Bukharin, Zinoviev and Tukhachevsky, incited conceit and the feeling of superiority in those who had taken part in the war. They encouraged privileges for the elite, opened the way to bureaucracy and 'liberalism in the party and the state, violated the true revolutionary norms, and gradually managed to implant the defeatist spirit among the people. They presented all the evils of their activity as if they were brought about by the <<stern and sectarian stand, the method and style of work>> of Stalin. This diabolical deed of those who cast the stone and hid the hand, served to deceive the working class, the collective farm peasantry and the intellectuals and to set in motion all the dissident elements who had remained concealed until that time. Dissident, career-seeking and degenerate elements were told that the time of <<genuine freedom>> had come for them, and this <<freedom>> was brought about by Nikita Khrushchev and his group. This is how the ground was prepared for the destruction of socialism in the Soviet Union, for the overthrow of the dictatorship.
of the proletariat and the establishment of a state of the <<entire people>> which in fact would be nothing but a dictatorial state of the fascist type, as it is now.

All this villainy emerged soon after the death, or to be more precise, after the murder of Stalin. I say after the murder of Stalin, because Mikoyan himself told me and Mehmet Shehu that they, together with Khrushchev and their associates, had decided to carry out a <<pokushenie>>, i.e., to make an attempt on Stalin's life, but later, as Mikoyan told us, they gave up this plan. It is a known fact that the Khrushchevites could hardly wait for Stalin to die. The circumstances of his death are not clear. An unsolved enigma in this direction is the question of the <<white smocks>>, the trial conducted against the Kremlin doctors, who, as long as Stalin was alive were accused of having attempted to kill many leaders of the Soviet Union. After Stalin's death these doctors were rehabilitated and no more was said about this question! But why was this question hushed up?! Was the criminal activity of these doctors proved at the time of the trial, or not? The question of the doctors was hushed up, because had it been investigated later, had it been gone into thoroughly, it would have brought to light a great deal of dirty linen, many crimes and plots that the concealed revisionists, with Khruslichev and Mikoyan at the head, had been perpetrating. This could be the explanation also for the sudden deaths within a very short time, of Gottwald, Bierut, Foster, Dimitrov and some others, all from curable illnesses, about which I have written in my unpublished memoirs, <<The Khrushchevites and Us>>. This could prove to be the true reason for the sudden death of Stalin, too. In order to attain their vile aims and to carry out their plans for the struggle against Marxism-Leninism and socialism, Khrushchev and his group liquidated many of the main leaders of the Comintern, one after the other, by silent and mysterious methods. Apart from others, they also attacked and discredited Rakosi, dismissed him from his post and interned him deep in the interior of the steppes of Russia, in this way. In the <<secret>> report delivered at their 20th Congress, Nikita Khurslichev and his associates threw mud at Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin and tried to defile him in the filthiest manner, resorting to the most cynical Trotskyite methods. After compromising some of the cadres of the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Khrushchevites exploited them thoroughly and then kicked them out and liquidated them as anti-party elements. The Khrushchevites headed by Khrushchev, who condemned the cult of Stalin in order to cover up their subsequent crimes against the Soviet Union and socialism raised the cult of Khrushchev sky-high. Those top functionaries of the party and Soviet state attributed to Stalin the brutality, cunning perfidy and baseness of character, the imprisonments and murders which they themselves practised and which were second nature to them. As long as Stalin was alive it was precisely they who sang hymns of praise to him in order to cover up their careerism. and their underworld aims and actions. In 1949 Krushchev described Stalin as the <<leader and teacher of genius>>, and said that <<the name of Comrade Stalin is the banner of all the victories of the Soviet people, the banner of the struggle of the working people the world over>>. Mikoyan described the Works of Stalin as a <<new, higher historical stage of Leninism>>. Kosygin said, <<We owe all our victories and successes, to the great Stalin>>, etc., etc. While after his death they behaved quite differently. It was the Khrushchevites who strangled the voice of the party, strangled the voice of the working class and filled the concentration camps with patriots; it was they who released the dregs of treachery from prison, the Trotskyites and all the enemies, whom time and the facts had proved and have proved again now With their struggle as dissidents to be opponents of socialism and agents in the service of foreign capitalist enemies. It is the Khrushchevites who, in conspiratorial and mysterious ways, <<tried>> and condemned not only the Soviet revolutionaries but also many persons from other countries. In my notes I have written of a meeting with the Soviet leaders, at which Klirushchev, Mikoyan, Molotov and some others were present. As Mikoyan was to go to Austria, Molotov turned to him and said halfjokingly: <<Be careful not to make a 'mess' in Austria, as you did in Hungary>>. I immediately asked Molotov: <<Why, was it Mikoyan who made the 'mess' in Hungary?>>. He replied: <<<<Yes>>, and went on to say, <<If Mikoyan goes back there again, they will hang him>>. Mikoyan, this covert anti-Marxist cosmopolitan answered: <<If they
hang me, they will hang Kadar, too>>. But even if those two were hanged, intrigues and villainy still remain immoral.

Khrushchev, Mikoyan and Suslov first defended the conspirator Imre Nagy, and then condemned and executed him secretly somewhere in Rumania! Who gave them the right to act in that way with a foreign citizen? Although he was a conspirator, he should have been subject only to trial in his own country and not to any foreign law, court or punishment. Stalin never did such things.

No, Stalin never acted in that way. He conducted public trials against the traitors to the party and Soviet state. The party and the Soviet peoples were told openly of the crimes they had committed. You never find in Stalin's actions such Mafia-like methods as you find in the actions of the Soviet revisionist chiefs. The Soviet revisionists have used and are still using such methods against one another in their struggle for power, just as in every capitalist country. Khrushchev seized power through a putsch, and Brezhnev toppled him from the throne with a putsch.

Brezhnev and company got rid of Khrushchev to protect the revisionist policy and ideology from the discredit and exposure resulting from his crazy behaviour and actions and embarrassing buffoonery. He did not in any way reject Khrushchevism, the reports and decisions of the 20th and 22nd Congresses in which Khrushchevism is embodied. Brezhnev showed himself to be so ungrateful to Khrushchev, whom he had previously lauded so high, that he could not even find a hole in the wall of the Kremlin to put his ashes when he died! Meanwhile, neither the Soviet peoples, nor world opinion have ever been informed of the real reasons for Khrushchev's downfall. Even to this day, the <<main reason>> provided by the revisionist documents is <<his advanced age and deteriorating state of health>>!!

Stalin was not at all what the enemies of communism accused and accuse him of being. On the contrary, he was just and a man of principle. He knew how to help and combat those who made mistakes, knew now to support, encourage and point out the special merits of those who served Marxism-Leninism loyally, as the occasion required. The question of Rokossovsky and that of Zhukov are now well known. When Rokossovsky and Zhukov made mistakes they were criticized and discharged from their posts. But they were not cast off as incorrigible. On the contrary, they were, warmly assisted and the moment it was considered that these cadres had corrected themselves, Stalin elevated them to responsible positions promoted them marshals and at the time of the Great Patriotic War charged them with extremely important duties on the main fronts of the war against the Hitlerite invaders. Only a leader who had a clear concept of and applied Marxist-Leninist justice in evaluating the work of people, with their good points and errors., could have acted as Stalin did.

Following Stalin's death, Marshal Zhukov became a tool of Nikita Khrushchev and his group; he supported the treacherous activity of Khrushchev against the Soviet Union, the Bolshevik Party and Stalin. Eventually, Nikita Khrushchev tossed Zhukov away like a squeezed lemon. He did the same with Rokossovsky and many other main cadres. Many Soviet communists were deceived by the demagogy of the Khrushchevite revisionist group and thought that after Stalin's death the Soviet Union would become a real paradise, as the revisionist traitors started to trumpet. They declared with great pomp that in 1980 communism would be established in the Soviet Union!! But what happened? The opposite, and it could not be otherwise. The revisionists seized power not to make the Soviet Union prosper, but to turn it back into a capitalist country, as they did, to make it economically subject to world capital, to form, secret and open agreements with American imperialism, to subjugate the peoples of the countries of people's democracy under the guise of military and economic treaties, to keep these states in bondage, to create markets and spheres of influence in the world. Such were the Khrushchevites who exploited the successful construction of socialism in the Soviet Union, and turned these successes on to such a retrograde course that they created a new class of the socialimperialist bourgeoisie to make the Soviet Union an imperialist world power which, together with the United States of America, would rule the world. Stalin had forewarned the party of this danger. Khrushchev himself admitted to us that Stalin had said to them
that they would sell out the Soviet Union to imperialism. And this is what happened in fact. What he said has proved true.

In the existing situation the peoples of the world, the world proletariat, logical people with pure hearts, can judge for themselves the correctness of Stalin's stands. But people can judge the correctness of his Marxist-Leninist line only in a broad political, ideological, economic and military panorama. Up till yesterday, the bourgeoisie and the revisionists, falsifying history through their propaganda, have blackened Stalin's activity in people's minds, but now that people are clear about what the Khrushchevites, Titoites, Maoists, the -Eurocommunists. and others are, and what the Hitlerites were, what the American imperialists and world capitalism are, they know why Stalin fought, why the Bolsheviks fought, why the proletarians and true Marxist-Leninists, are fighting, and what their enemies, the currents and trends in the service of capitalism and the revisionists fight for. Those who think that communism has <<failed>> always have been and will surely be disappointed. Time is proving every day that our doctrine is alive and omnipotent. Any person who assesses Stalin's work as a whole can understand that the genius and communist spirit of this outstanding personality are rare in the modern world. The great cause of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, the cause of socialism and communism, is the future of the world.

We Albanian communists have successfully applied the teachings of Stalin, in the first place, in order to have a strong steel-like Party, always loyal to Marxism-Leninism, stern against the class enemies, and have taken great care to preserve the unity of thought and action in the Party and to strengthen the unity of the Party with the people. We have followed Stalin's teachings on the construction of socialist industry and the collectivization of agriculture, and have scored major successes. Our Party and people will fight for the constant strengthening of the close alliance of the working class with the peasantry under the leadership of the working class. We will never be deceived by the flattery and tricks of enemies, whether Internal or external, but will continue the class struggle, both internally and externally, and will always be vigilant towards their evil activity. Otherwise, if we had not proved vigilant, if we had not applied the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin faithfully, Albania would have sunk into the mire of modern revisionism, would no longer be independent and socialist, but slavery to the imperialist-revisionist powers.

Our Party and people will continue the road of Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, Vladimir Ulyanov-Lenin and Joseph Stalin. The future generations of socialist Albania will loyally follow the line of their beloved Party. The Albanians, communists and non-party patriots, bow in respect to the memory of the glorious teacher, Joseph Stalin. On the occasion of the centenary of his birth, we remember with devotion the man who helped us, who enabled us to multiply the forces of our people whom the Party made the all-powerful masters of their own destiny. For the deed of the liberation and the construction of socialism in our country also we are indebted to the internationalist aid of Stalin. His rich and very valuable experience has guided us on our road and in our activity. In this jubilee year, our Party is engaged in continuous wide-ranging activity to make the glorious life and work of the great Marxist-Leninist Joseph Stalin even better known. All the 'activity of our Party, from its founding to the present day, testifies to its love and respect for and loyalty to the immortal doctrine of our great classics, and hence to the ideas of Joseph Stalin. And so it will be in our country, generation after generation.

I, as a militant of the Party, as one of its leaders, whom the Party has honoured by sending me several times to meet Comrade Stalin, to talk with him about our problems, our situation and to seek his advice and help, have tried to record my recollections of these meetings at the proper time, just as I have felt and seen the behaviour of Stalin towards the representative of a small party and people like ours. In making these simple memoirs available for publication, I proceeded from the desire to help our communists, working people and youth become acquainted with the figure of that great and immortal man. In this glorious anniversary, I bow in devotion and loyalty to the Party and the people that gave birth to me, raised me and tempered me, and to Joseph Stalin who has given me
such valuable advice for the happiness of my people and left indelible memories in my heart and mind.

For us Marxist-Leninists and the innumerable sympathizers with the lofty ideals of the working class throughout the world, this centenary must serve to strengthen the fighting unity of our ranks.

Now, the commemoration of this great jubilee of Stalin's birth is the time for profound reflection by honest people everywhere in the world to find the correct road, to dispel from their minds the fog created by the capitalist bourgeoisie, the revisionist bourgeoisie, with the aim of paralysing the revolutionary drive and the revolutionary thought of the masses. Revolutionary thought and action will lead the men of good will, the just men, he men of the people, on to the road of their escape from the yoke of capital. In commemorating Stalin and his work on the centenary of his birth, we Marxist-Leninists cannot fail to address ourselves directly to the peoples of the Soviet Union to tell them in the most frank and sincere manner:

You, who fought and triumphed over the most dangerous enemies of humanity with the name of Stalin on your lips, what are you going to do, are you going to remain silent on the occasion of this great jubilee? Since they cannot conceal the name and brilliant work of Stalin, the Khrushchevite revisionists, who left nothing unsaid against him, may write some few feeble words about him. But it is up to you, who carried out the Great October Revolution, to remember your brilliant leader with profound respect. You must destroy the dictatorial fascist regime which is hidden behind deceptive slogans. You must know that those who are leading you are fascists, chauvinists and imperialists. They are preparing you as cannon fodder for a fierce imperialist war, to kill the peoples and burn and devastate countries which had great hopes in the Homeland of Lenin and Stalin. This is not what the peoples of the world want you to be. If you go on like this, they can no longer respect you, but will hate you. The peoples of the world hate your present counterrevolutionary leadership, because the atomic weapons they are producing, the parades in Red Square and the military manoeuvres they are organizing, have become threatening to the peoples and their freedom, just like those of American imperialism and world capitalism. The weapons and the army in the Soviet Union are no longer in the hands of the Soviet peoples and do not serve the liberation of the world proletariat. On the contrary, they are intended to oppress the whites and other peoples. You must understand and realize that the enemies have long since turned you from the road of the revolution. The Khrushchevite revisionists are seeking to arouse in you feelings of superiority and domination over others. They claim they are using your great strength allegedly to combat American imperialism and world capitalism, but this is false. Your rulers are in contradiction and alliance with American imperialism and world capitalism, not in the interests of the revolution, but because of their imperialist ambitions and greed for the division of spheres of influence and domination over the peoples. The peoples of the world are worried whether you, the sons, grandsons and great-grandsons of those glorious fighters who carried out the Great October Socialist Revolution, you, the Soviet proletarians, collective farmers, soldiers and intellectuals, will proceed on this course hostile to the peoples, on to which those who rule you have led you, or will rise and fight on the revolutionary road with the names of Lenin and Stalin on your lips. The hope and desire of the world is that you will take the road of the revolution and march forward, shouting like your forbears: <<za Lenina!>>, <<za Stalina!>>, for genuine socialism and against imperialism, social-imperialism and revisionism. The traitor leadership does not inform you correctly about the sufferings of other peoples who are being killed in the streets in demonstrations against the blood-thirsty capitalists and imperialists. They do not tell you the truth about why the people in Iran, thirsting for freedom and independence, rise to their feet and topple the tyrannical Shah, the tool of the American imperialists. The Khrushchevite revisionist clique keep you in the dark about the sufferings of the Arab peoples, the peoples of the American continent and all the continents of the world, because it is imperialism and your treacherous leaders who inflict these sufferings on them. They tell you nothing about how
they oppress the peoples of Africa. using your men and their vassals, you do not know about the intrigues the new CZars of the Kremlin hatch up in the world, you are not fold that the friends of the Khruishchevs, the friends, of your leadership to whom Nikita Khrusbehev and his followers, headed by Brezhnev, opened the road of betrayal, are making common cause with the capitalists to the detriment of the working class and the interests of their peoples. You don't know many things about the sufferings and persecution of honest people in your country, because the present gang which oppresses you is silent about such things. You must know that the peoples have risen in revolution, that they are fighting heroically, while you, who constitute a great force, allow your traitor leaders to oppress you, delude you and put you to sleep. A gang of overlords has turned your country into a social-imperialist power. The road to salvation is that of the revolution which Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin have taught us. The Brezhnevs, Kosygins, Ustinovs and Yakubovskys, like the Solzhenitsyns and Sakharovs, are counterrevolutionaries and as such must be overthrown and liquidated. You are a great power, but you have to gain the trust of the world proletariat, the trust of the peoples of the world, that great trust that Lenin and Stalin created through work and struggle.

You must not delay reflecting deeply about your future and that of mankind. The time has come for you to become what you were when Lenin and Stalin were alive-glorious participants in the proletarian revolution. Therefore, you must not remain under the yoke of enemies of the revolution and the peoples, enemies of the freedom and independence of states. You must never allow yourselves to become tools of an imperialism which is seeking to enslave the peoples, using Leninism as a mask. If you follow the road of the revolution and Marxism-Leninism, if you link yourselves closely with the world proletariat, then American imperialism and the decaying capitalism in general will be shaken to their very foundations, the face of the world will be changed and socialism will triumph. You, the Soviet peoples, Soviet workers, collective farmers and soldiers, have great responsibilities and duties to mankind. You can perform these duties honourably by refusing to tolerate the domination of the barbarous clique which now prevails over the once glorious Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin and over you. In your country the party is no longer a Marxist-Leninist party. You must build a new party of the Lenin-Stalin type through struggle. You must understand that the Soviet Union is no longer a union of peoples for freedom, in full harmony with one another. It was Bolshevism which succeeded in creating the fraternal unity of the peoples of the Soviet Union. Revisionism has done the opposite: it has split the peoples of your country, has aroused chauvinism in every republic, has incited hostility amongst them, has aroused the hatred of other peoples against the Russian people, who were the vanguard in the revolution under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin. Will you go on allowing yourselves to be downtrodden? Will you go on allowing the deepening of the process of bourgeois denegeration in all fields of life in your country, as the revisionists are doing? Will you accept the yoke of a new capital, under the cloak of a false socialism? We Albanian communists and people, like all the communists and freedom-loving peoples of the world, have, loved the true socialist Soviet Union of the time of Lenin and Stalin. We resolutely follow the road of Lenin and Stalin and have faith in the great revolutionary strength of the Soviet peoples, the Soviet proletariat, and that gradually express itself, through struggle and sacrifices, will be built up to the level the time demands and will smash Soviet social-imperialism to its very foundations.

The revolution and sacrifices you will make will not weaken your country but will revive the true socialist Soviet Union. They will overthrow the socialimperialist dictatorship and the Soviet Union will emerge from this stronger than ever. In this glorious work you will have the support of all the peoples of the world and the world proletariat. The strength of the ideas of socialism and communism is based on this revolutionary overthrow and not on the empty words and underhand actions of the clique ruling you. Only in this way, proceeding on this course, will the genuine communists, the Marxist-Leninists everywhere in the world, be able to defeat imperialism and world capitalism. They will assist the peoples of the world to liberate themselves, one after the other, will assist great China to set out on the genuine road to socialism and not become a superpower so that it, too, can rule the world, by transforming
itself into a third partner in the predatory wars which American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and the clique of Hua Kuo-feng and Teng Hsiao-ping which is ruling in China at present, are preparing.

In this glorious jubilee, we Albanian communists, as loyal pupils of Lenin and Stalin and soldiers of the revolution, remind you to think over these problems, vital to you and the world, because we are your brothers, your comrades in the cause of the proletarian revolution and the liberation of the peoples. If you follow the road of the predatory, imperialist war, on which your renegade leaders are taking you, then, without doubt, we shall remain enemies of your system and your counterrevolutionary actions. This is as clear as the light of the day. It cannot be otherwise.

When we are convinced that we are acting correctly, we Albanian communists, linked with our people like flesh to bone, do not heave to in the face of even the fiercest storm. And we are convinced that we shall weather any storm, just as the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet Power did, just as the great Captains of the revolution, Lenin and Stalin, weathered them.

**MEMOIRS**

From my meetings with Stalin

**FIRST MEETING**

July 1947

The external situation of the PRA. Its relations with the neighbouring states and the Anglo-Americans. The Corfu Channel incident and the Hague Court. The political, economic and social-class situation in Albania. Stalin's all round interest in and high estimation of our country, people and Party. "For a party to be in power and remain illegal, doesn't make sense". "Your Communist Party can call itself the Party of Labour".

On July 14, 1947 I arrived in Moscow at the head of the first official delegation of the Government of the People's Republic of Albania and the Communist Party of Albania on a friendly visit to the Soviet Union. The joy of my comrades and I, that we were appointed by the Central Committee of the Party to go to Moscow where we would meet the great Stalin, was indescribable. Since the time when we first became acquainted with the Marxist-Leninist theory, we had always dreamed, night and day, of meeting Stalin. During the period of the Antifascist National Liberation War this desire had grown even stronger. Next to the outstanding figures of Marx, Engels and Lenin, Comrade Stalin was extremely respected and dear to us, because his teachings led us to the founding of the Communist Party of Albania as a party of the Leninist type, inspired us during the National Liberation War and were helping us in the construction of socialism. The talks with Stalin and his advice would be a guide in the great and arduous work which we were doing to consolidate the victories achieved. For all these reasons, our first visit to the Soviet Union was a cause of indescribable joy and great satisfaction not only for the communists and for us, the members of the delegation, but also for the entire Albanian people, who had been eagerly awaiting this visit and hailed it with great
enthusiasm. As we saw with our own eyes and felt in our hearts. Stalin and the Soviet Government welcomed our delegation in a very cordial and warm manner, with sincere affection.

During the twelve days of our stay in Moscow we met Comrade Stalin several times, and the talks which we held with him, his sincere, comradely advice and instructions, have remained and will remain forever dear to us.

The day of my first meeting with Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin will remain unforgettable. It was the 6th of July 1947, the third day of our stay in Moscow. It was an extraordinary day from the outset: in the morning we went to the Mausoleum of the great Lenin where we bowed our heads in deep respect before the body of the brilliant leader of the revolution, before that man whose name and colossal work was deeply engrave in our minds and hearts, and had enlightened us on the glorious road of our struggle for freedom, the revolution and socialism. On this occasion, in the name of the Albanian people, our Communist Party and in my own name personally, I laid a wreath of many-coloured flowers at the entrance to the Mausoleum of the immortal Lenin. From there after visiting the graves of the valiant fighters of the October Socialist Revolution, the outstanding militants of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet state, buried in the walls of the Kremlin, we went to the Central Museum of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. For more than two hours we went from one hall to the other, acquainting ourselves at first-hand with documents and exhibits which reflected in detail the life and outstanding work of the great Lenin. Before we left, in the Visitors' Book of the, Museum, among others, I also wrote these words: ""The cause of Lenin will live on forever in the future generations. The memory of him will live forever in the hearts of the Albanian people"".

That same day, full of indelible impressions and emotions, we were received by the disciple and loyal continuer of the work of Lenin. Josep Vissarionovich Stalin, who talked with us at length. From the beginning he created such a comradely atmosphere that we were very quickly relieved of that natural emotion which we felt when we entered his office, a large room, with a long table for meetings, close to his writing desk. Only a few minutes after exchanging the initial courtesies, we felt as though we were not talking to the great Stalin, but sitting with a comrade, whom we had met before and with whom we had talked many times. I was still young then, and the representative of a small party and country, therefore, in order to create the warmest and most comradely atmosphere for me, Stalin cracked some jokes and then began to speak with affection and great respect about our people, about their militant traditions of the past and their heroism in the National Liberation War. He spoke quietly, calmly and with a characteristic warmth which put me at ease.

Among other things, Comrade Stalin told us that he felt deep admiration for our people as a very ancient people of the Balkan region and with a long and valorous history. ""I have acquainted myself, especially, with the heroism displayed by the Albanian people during the Anti-fascist National Liberation War,"" he continued. ""but, of course, this knowledge of mine cannot, be broad and deep enough. Therefore, I would like you to tell us a little about your country, your people and the problems which are worrying you today.""

After this, I began to speak and gave Comrade Stalin a description of the long and glorious historic road of our people, of their ceaseless wars for freedom, and independence. I dwelt in particular on the Period of the years of our National Liberation War, spoke about the founding of our Communist Party as a party of the Leninist type., about the decisive role it played and was playing as the only leading force in the war and the efforts of the Albanian people to win the freedom and independence of the Homeland, to overthrow the old feudal-bourgeois power, to set up the new people's power and to lead the country successfully towards profound socialist transformations. Availing myself of this opportunity, I thanked Comrade Stalin once again and expressed to him the deep gratitude of the Albanian communists and the entire Albanian people for the ardent support which the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet Government and he personally had given our people and Party during the years of the war and were giving after the liberation of the Homeland.

I went on to describe to Comrade Stalin the deep-going political, economic and social transformations which had been carried out and were being consolidated, step by step, in Albania in
the first years of the people's power. The internal political and economic situation of Albania. I told him among other things, has improved appreciably. These improvements have their base in the correct understanding of the need to overcome the difficulties and in the great efforts of the people and the Party to overcome these difficulties with toil and sweat. Our people are convinced of the correctness of their road and have unshakeable confidence in the Communist Party, the Government of our People's Republic, in their own constructive forces, and in their sincere friends, and day by day are carrying out the tasks set to them, with a high level of mobilization, self-denial and enthusiasm. Comrade Stalin expressed his joy over the successes of our people and Party in their work of construction and was interested to learn something more about the situation if classes in our country. He was especially interested in our working class and peasantry. He asked a lot of questions about these two classes of our society about which we exchanged many ideas that were to serve us later in organizing a sound work in the ranks of the working class and the poor and middle peasantry, and were to help us, also, in defining the stands that should be maintained towards the wealthy elements of the city and the kulaks in the countryside.

<<The overwhelming majority of our people.>> I told Comrade Stalin, among other things, in reply to his questions, <<is comprised of poor peasants, and next come the middle peasants. We have a working class small in numbers, then we have quite a large number of craftsmen and townspeople engaged in petty commerce, and a minority of intellectuals. All these masses of working people responded to the call of our Communist Party, were mobilized in the war for the liberation of the Homeland and now are closely linked with the Party and the people's power.>>

<<Has the working class of Albania any tradition of class struggle?>> Comrade Stalin asked.

<<Before the liberation of the country.>> I told him. this class was very small. It had just been created and was made up of a number of wage earners, apprentices or artisans dispersed among small enterprises and workshops. In the past, the workers in some towns of our country came out in strikes, but these were small and uncoordinated, due both to the small number of the workers and to the lack of organization in trade-unions. Irrespective of this,>> I told Comrade Stalin,<<our Communist Party was founded as a party of the working class, which would be led by the MarxistLeninist ideology and would express and defend the interests of the proletariat and the broad working masses, in the first place, of the Albanian peasantry, which constituted the majority of our population.>>

Comrade Stalin asked us in detail about the situation of the middle and poor peasants in our country.

In reply to his questions, I told Comrade Stalin about the policy which our Party had followed, and the great, all-round work it had done since its founding in order to find support among the peasantry and to win it over to its side.

<<We acted in that way.>> I said, <<proceeding not only from the Marxist-Leninist principle that the peasantry is the closest and most natural ally of the proletariat in the revolution, but also from the fact that the peasantry in Albania constitutes the overwhelming majority of the population and through the centuries has been characterized by great patriotic and revolutionary traditions.>>

Continuing our talk, I tried to describe the economic situation of the peasants after the liberation of the country, as well as their cultural and technical level. Besides affirming the lofty virtues of our peasantry as patriotic, hard-working, closely linked with the soil and the Homeland, and thirsting for freedom, development, and progress, I also spoke of the pronounced hangovers of the past and the economic and cultural backwardness of our peasantry, as well as of its deeply implanted pettybourgeois mentality. <<Our Party,>> I stressed, <<has had to fight with all its strength against this situation and we have achieved some successes, but we are aware that we must fight harder and more persistently in order to make the peasantry conscious, so that it will embrace and implement the line of the Party at every step.>>

Comrade Stalin replied: In general, the peasants are afraid of communism at first because they imagine that the communists will take the land and everything they have. The enemies.. he
continued, <<talk a great deal to the peasants in this direction with, the aim of detaching them from
the alliance with the working class and turning them away from the policy of the party and the road
of socialism. Therefore the careful and far-sighted work of the Communist Party is very important,
as you also said, to ensure that the peasantry links itself indissolubly with the party and the working
class.>>

On this occasion, I also gave Comrade Stalin a general outline of the social-class structure of our
Party and explained that this structure faithfully reflected the very social structure of our people.
<<This is the reason,>> I said, <<why communists of peasant social status at present comprise the
largest number of the members of our Party. The policy of our Party in this direction is that, step by
step, parallel with the growth of the working class, the number of worker communists should
increase respectively.>>

While assessing the policy which our Party had followed towards the masses in general and the
peasantry in particular as correct, Comrade Stalin gave us some valuable, comradely advice about
our work in the future. Apart from other things, he expressed the opinion that since the biggest
percentage of its members were peasants, our Communist Party should call itself <<The Party of
Labour of Albania>>. <<However,>> he stressed, <<this is only an idea of mine, because it is you,
your Party, that must decide.>>

After thanking Comrade Stalin for this valuable idea, I said:
<<We shall put forward your proposal at the 1st Congress of the Party for which we are preparing,
and I am confident that both the rankand-file of the Party and its leadership will find it appropriate
and endorse it>>. Then I went on to expound to Comrade Stalin our idea about making our Party
completely legal at the congress which we were preparing.
<<In reality,>> I said among other things, <<our Communist Party has been and is the only force
which plays the leading role in the entire life of the country but formally it still retains its
semi-illegal status. It seems to us incorrect that this situation should continue any longer.>>

*(1 The 11th Plenum of the CC of the CPA which met from 13-24th of September 1948 and the 1st Congress of the CPA
decided on the complete and immediate legalization of the CPA. Both the Plenum and the Congress considered the
keeping of the Party until that time in a semi-illegal status a mistake which had come about as a result of the pressure
and influence of the Trotskyite Yugoslav leadership, which, for ulterior motives, while considering the Front the main
leading force of the country, demanded that the Party should be merged with the Front, hence underrating and negating
the Communist Party itself and its leading role both in the Front and in the whole life of the country.)*

<<Quite right, quite right, replied Comrade Stalin. <<For a party to be in power and remain illegal
or consider itself illegal, doesn't make sense.>>

Going on to other questions, in connection with our armed forces, I explained to Comrade Stalin
that the overwhelming majority of our army, which had emerged from the war, was made up of
poor peasants, young workers and city intellectuals. The cadres of the army, the commanding
officers had emerged from the war and had gained their experience of leadership in the course of
the war.

I also spoke about the Soviet instructors we already had and asked him to send us some more.
<<Having insufficient experience,>> I said, <<the political work we carry out in the ranks of the
army is weak, therefore I requested that they examined this question in order to help us raise the
political work in the army to a higher level. It is true that we also have Yugoslav instructors,>> I
said, <<and I cannot say that they have no experience at all, but, in fact their experience is limited.
They, too, have emerged from a great national liberation war, nevertheless, they cannot be
compared with the Soviet officers.>>

After speaking about the high morale of our army, about its discipline, as well as a series of other
problems, I asked Comrade Stalin to assign me a Soviet comrade with whom I would talk at greater
length about the problems of our army and its needs for the future in more detail.

And then I raised the problem of strengthening our coastal defences.
<<In particular, we need to strengthen the defences of Sazan Island and the coast of Vlora and Durres>> I said <<because these are very delicate positions. The enemy has attacked us there on two occasions. Later we could be attacked there by the Anglo-Americans or the Italians.>>

<<As for the strengthening of your coastal defences,>> said Comrade Stalin among other things, <<I agree with you. For our part, we shall help you, but the arms and other means of defence must be used by Albanians and not by Soviet forces. True, the mechanism of some of them is a bit complicated but you must send your people here to learn how to use them.>>

In connection with my request about sending political instructors for the army to Albania, Comrade Stalin said that they could not send us any more, because in order to work well, they must know the Albanian language and should also have a good knowledge of the situation and life of the Albanian people. <<Therefore,>> he advised us, <<it would be better for us to send people to the Soviet Union to learn from the Soviet experience and apply this experience themselves in the ranks of the Albanian People's Army.>>

Then, Comrade Stalin inquired about the attempts of internal reaction in Albania and our stand towards it.

<<We have struck and continue to strike hard at internal reaction.>> I told him. <<We have had successes in our struggle to expose and defeat it. As for the physical liquidation of enemies, this has been done either in the direct clashes of our forces with the bands of armed criminals, or according to verdicts of people's courts in the trials of traitors and the closest collaborators of the occupiers. Despite the successes achieved, we still cannot say that internal reaction is no longer active. It is not capable of organizing any really dangerous attack upon us, but still it is making propaganda against us.>>

<<The external enemy supports the internal enemy for its own purposes. External reaction tries to assist, encourage, and organize the internal enemy by means of agents, whom it has sent in by land or by air. Faced with the endeavours of the enemy, we have raised the revolutionary vigilance of the working masses. The people have captured these agents and a number of trials have been held against them. The public trials and sentences have had a great educational effect among the people and have aroused their confidence in the strength of our people's state power, and their respect for its justice. At the same time, these trials have exposed and demoralized the reactionary forces, both internal and external.>>

In the talks that followed with Comrade Stalin we devoted an important place to problems of the external situation, especially the relations of our state with the neighbouring countries. First I outlined the situation on our borders, spoke of the good relations we had with the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, while I dwelt in particular on our relations with Greece, in order to explain the situation on our southern border. I stressed that the Greek monarcho-fascists, who failed to realize their dream of <<Greater Greece>> that is, of seizing Southern Albania, were still committing innumerable border provocations. <<Their aim,>> I told Comrade Stalin, <<is to create a conflagration on our border, and in the wake of the war, to create a tense situation in the relations between Greece and us.>> I explained that we were trying, as far as we were able, to avert the provocations of the Greek monarcho-fascists, and not respond to them. <<Only when they go too far from time to time and kill Our people,>> I went on, <<we take retaliatory measures to make the monarcho fascists understand that Albania and its borders are inviolable. If they think of embarking on dangerous activities against the independence of Albania, they must know that we are in a position to defend our Homeland.>>

<<All the aims of the monarcho-fascists and their efforts to blame Albania for the civil war which has broken out in Greece, in order to discredit our people's power at the meetings of the Security Council and at all international meetings, are instigated and supported by the imperialist powers.>>

After dwelling extensively and at length on this situation, I gave Comrade Stalin a general outline of what stands we maintained at the Investigating Commission and the sub-commissions which had been created to clear up the tense situation in the relations between Albania and Greece.
I told Comrade Stalin everything we knew about the situation of the Greek democrats and also spoke of the support we gave their just struggle.

I did not fail to inform him openly also of our opinion in connection with a series of views of the comrades of the Greek Communist Party which seemed to us to be wrong. Likewise, I also expressed my own opinion on the prospects of the struggle of the Greek democrats. Although Comrade Stalin must undoubtedly have been informed by Comrades Molotov, Vyshinsky and others, I mentioned the savage and despicable stands of the British and American imperialists towards Albania, stressing the brutal, unscrupulous and hostile stands they maintained towards us at the Paris Conference. I emphasized also that the situation between us and the Anglo-Americans had not altered in the least, that we considered their stand a constant threat. Not only were the Anglo-Americans continuing their very hostile propaganda against Albania in the international arena, but via Italy and Greece, they were committing land and air provocations, using as their subversive agents Albanian fugitives, Zogites, Ballists and fascists, whom they had assembled, organized and trained against us in the concentration camps which they had set up in Italy and elsewhere. Likewise, I spoke about the British imperialists' raising the so-called Corfu Channel incident at the Security Council of the UNO and its investigation by the International Court at the Hague. <<The Corfu Channel incident,>> I told Comrade Stalin, <<is a concoction of the British from start to finish in order to provoke our country and to find a pretext for military intervention in the town of Saranda. We have never planted mines in the Ionian Sea. The mines that exploded had either been laid by the Germans in the time of war, or were deliberately laid by the British, later, so that they could explode them when some ships of theirs were in our territorial waters heading for Saranda. There was no reason for these ships to be sailing along our coast, they had not notified us about such a movement. After the mines went off, the British claimed that they had suffered material damage and loss of life. They wanted to enlarge the incident. We do not know the British suffered the damage they claimed and do not believe that they did, however, even if they did, we are in no way to blame. <<We are defending our rights at the International Court at the Hague, but this court is being manipulated by the Anglo-American imperialists, who are trumping up all sorts of charges in order to cover up their provocation and force us pay the British an indemnity.>>

I spoke with Comrade Stalin also about the Moscow Conference*, *(The Conference of the Foreign Ministers of the Soviet Union, the United States of America, Britain and France was held in Moscow from March 10 to April 24, 1947. The Conference discussed questions related to the Peace Treaty with Germany. At this Conference the representatives of the Soviet Union, Molotov and Vyshinsky, defending Albania's right to take part in the Peace Conference with Germany. This stand was also supported by the French representative, but was opposed by the representatives of Britain and the United States of America.), argued in support of our opinion about the Truman Doctrine in connection with Greece and the interference of the Anglo-Americans in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Albania and explained our stand towards the <<Marshall Plan>>, saying that we would not accept <<aid>> under this ill-famed plan.

I also discussed with comrade Stalin the problem of the extradition of war criminals who had fled our country. In all justice, we demanded that the governments of the countries which had given asylum to the war criminals should hand them over to us, to render account for their crimes before the people, though we knew that they would not do this because they were contingents of the Anglo-Americans and fascism in general.

I also put forward to Comrade Stalin the opinion of our Party about our relations with Italy. Italy had attacked us twice. It had burned our homes and killed our citizens, but we were Marxists, internationalists and wanted to have friendly relations with the Italian people. <<The present government of Italy,>> I told Comrade Stalin, <<maintains a reactionary stand towards us; its aims towards our country are no different from those of former Italian governments. This government, under the influence of the Anglo-Americans, wants Albania to be dependent on it in one way or another, a thing which will never occur. To this end,>> I continued <<the Anglo-Americans,
together with the government in Rome, are maintaining and training on Italian soil contingents of fugitives whom they parachute into Albania as wreckers. They are making many attempts against our country, casting the stone and hiding the hand, but we are aware of all their aims. We want to have diplomatic relations with Italy, but the mentality of the Italian statesmen is negative in this direction.

After listening to me attentively, Stalin said: <<Despite all the difficulties and obstacles they are creating for you, the Americans and the British cannot attack you in this situation. Faced with your resolute stand, they cannot land on your territory, therefore do not worry. However, you must defend your Homeland, must take all measures to strengthen your army and your borders, because the danger of war from the imperialists exists.>>

<<The Greek monarcho-fascists,>> Stalin continued, <<abetted and supported by the American and British imperialists, will continue to provoke you just to harass you and to disturb your peace. The men in the government in Athens today have trouble on their hand>> he said, <<because the civil war, which has broken out there, is directed against them and their patrons - the British and the Americans.

<<As for Italy,>> Comrade Stalin continued, <<the question is as you present it. The AngloAmericans will try to create bases there, to organize reaction and strengthen the De Gasperi Government. In this direction you must be vigilant and watch what the Albanian fugitives are up to there. Since the treaties have not been concluded,> said Comrade Stalin, <<the situation cannot be regarded as normalized. I think that, for the time being, you cannot establish relations with that country, therefore don't rush things.>>

<<We agree,>> I said to Comrade Stalin, <<that we should not be hasty in our relations with Italy, and in general we shall take measures to strengthen our borders.>>

<<We have proposed to the Yugoslavs,>> I continued my exposition to Comrade Stalin, <<that we establish contacts with each other and collaborate on the future defence of our borders from some eventual attack from Greece and Italy, but they have not replied to our proposal, claiming that they can discuss the matter with us only after studying the question. The collaboration we propose consists in the exchange of information with the Yugoslavs on the dangers that may threaten us from the external enemies, so that each country, within its own borders and with its own armies, is in a position to take appropriate measures to cope with any eventuality.>> I also informed Comrade Stalin that we had two divisions of our army on our southern border.

During the conversation I underlined the fact that some Yugoslav aircraft had landed in Tirana contrary to the recognized and accepted rules of relations among states. <<From time to time,>> I said, <<without informing us, the Yugoslav comrades do some condemnable things, as in this concrete case. It is not right that the Yugoslav aircraft should fly over Albanian territory without the knowledge of the Albanian Government. We have pointed out this violation to the Yugoslav comrades and they have replied that they made a mistake. Although we are friends, we cannot permit them to infringe our territorial integrity. We are independent states, and without damaging our friendly relations, each must protect its sovereignty and rights, while at the same time, respecting the sovereignty and rights of the other.>>

<<Are your people not happy about the relations with Yugoslavia?>> Comrade Stalin asked me, and added, <<It is a very good thing that you have friendly Yugoslavia on your border, because Albania is a small country and as such needs strong support from its friends.>>

I replied that it was true that every country, small or big, needed friends and allies and that we considered Yugoslavia a friendly country.

With Comrade Stalin and Comrade Molotov we talked in detail about the problems of the reconstruction of our country ravaged by the war and the construction of the new Albania. I gave them a description of the state of our economy, the first socialist transformations in the economy and the great prospects which were opening up to us, the successes which we had achieved and the problems and great difficulties we were facing.
Stalin expressed his satisfaction over the victories we had achieved and, time after time, put various questions to me. He was particularly interested in the state of our agriculture, the climatic conditions in Albania, the agricultural crops traditional to our people, etc.

<<What cereals do you cultivate most?>> he asked me among other things. <<Maize, first of all,>> I said. <<Then wheat, rye ... >> <<Isn't the maize worried by drought?>>.

<<It is true,>> I said, <<that drought often causes us great damage, but because of the very backward state of our agriculture and the great needs we have for bread grain, our peasant has learned to get a bit more from maize than from wheat. Meanwhile we are working to set up a drainage and irrigation system, to drain the marshes and swamps.>>

He listened to my answers, asked for more detail and often spoke himself giving very valuable advice. I recall that during those talks, Stalin inquired about the basis on which the Land Reform had been carried out in Albania, about the percentage of the land distributed to the poor and middle peasants, whether this Reform had affected the religious institutions, etc., etc.

Speaking of the assistance that the state of people's democracy gave the peasantry and the links of the working class with the peasantry, Stalin asked us about tractors, wanted to know whether we had machine and tractor stations in Albania and how we had organized them. After listening to my answer, he began to speak about this question and gave us a whole lot of valuable advice.

<<You must set up the machine and tractor stations,>> he said among other things, <<and strengthen them so that they work the land well, both for the state and the cooperatives and for the individual peasants. The tractor drivers must always be in the service of the peasantry, must know all about agriculture, the crops, the soils and must apply all this knowledge in practice to ensure that production increases without fail. This has great importance,>> he continued, <<otherwise allround damage is caused. When we set up the first machine and tractor stations, it often occurred that we tilled the fields of the peasants, but production did not increase. This happened because it is not enough for a tractor driver to know only how to drive his tractor. He must also be a good fanner, must know when and how the land should be worked.>>

<<Tractor drivers,>> Stalin continued, <<are elements of the working class who work in continuous direct daily contact with the peasantry. Therefore, they must work conscientiously in order to strengthen the alliance between the working class and the labouring peasantry.>>

The attention with which he followed my explanations about our new economy and its course of development made a very deep impression on us. Both during the talk about these problems, and in all the other talks with him, one wonderful feature of his, among others, made an indelible impression on my mind: he never gave orders or sought to impose his opinion. He spoke, gave advice, made various proposals, but always added: <<This is my opinion>>, <<this is what we think. You, comrades, must judge and decide for yourselves, according to the concrete situation on the basis of your conditions.>>

His interest extended to every problem. While I was speaking about the state of our transport and the great difficulties we had to cope with, Stalin asked:

<<Do you build small ships in Albania?>>

<<No,>> I said.

<<Do you have pine-trees?>>

<<Yes, we do,>> I answered, <<whole forests of them.>>

<<Then you have a good basis,>> he said, for building simple means of sea transport in the future.>>

In the course of our talk he asked me about the situation of railway transport in Albania, what currency we had, what mines we had and whether the Albanian mines had been exploited by the Italians, etc.

I answered the questions Comrade Stalin asked. Concluding the talk, he said:

<<At present, the Albanian economy is in a backward state. You comrades are starting everything from scratch. Therefore, besides your own struggle and efforts, we, too, will help you, to the best of
our ability, to restore your economy and strengthen your army. We have studied your requests for aid, Comrade Stalin told me, and we have agreed to fulfil all of them. We shall help you to equip your industry and agriculture with the necessary machinery, to strengthen your army and to develop education and culture.

The factories and other machinery we shall supply on credits and you will pay for them when you can, while the armaments will be given to you gratis, you'll never have to pay for them. We know that you need even more, but for the time being this is all we can do as we ourselves are still poor, because the war caused us great destruction.

At the same time, Comrade Stalin continued, we shall help you with specialists in order to speed up the process of the development of the Albanian economy and culture. As for oil, I think we'll send you Azerbaijani specialists, because they are masters of their profession. For its part, Albania should send the sons and daughters of workers and peasants to the Soviet Union, to learn and develop, so that they can help the advancement of their Homeland.

During the days we stayed in Moscow, after each meeting and talk with Comrade Stalin, we had an even clearer and more intimate view of the real man - the modest, kindly, wise man, in this outstanding revolutionary, in this great Marxist. He loved the Soviet people wholeheartedly. To them, he had dedicated all his strength and energies, his heart and mind worked for them. And in every talk with him, in every activity he carried out, from the most important down to the most ordinary, these qualities distinguished him.

A few days after our arrival in Moscow, together with Comrade Stalin and other leaders of the Party and Soviet state I attended an all-Soviet physical-culture display at the Central Stadium of Moscow. With what keen interest Stalin watched this activity! For over two hours he followed the activities of the participants with rapt attention, and although it began to rain near the end of the display and Molotov entreated him several times to leave the stadium, he continued to watch the activities attentively to the end, to make jokes, to wave his hand. I remember that a mass race had been organized as the final exercise. The runners made several circuits of the stadium. At the finish, a very tall, thin runner who had lagged behind, appeared before the tribune. He could hardly drag one leg after the other and his arms were flapping aimlessly, nevertheless he was trying to run. He was drenched by the rain. Stalin was watching this runner from a distance with a smile which expressed both pity and fatherly affection.

Mily moy, he said as if talking to himself, go home, go home, have a little rest, have something to eat and come back again! There will be other races to run...!

Stalin's great respect and affection for our people, his eagerness to learn as much as possible about the history and customs of the Albanian people remain indelible in our memory. At one of the meetings we had those days, during a dinner which Stalin put on for our delegation in the Krenilin, we had a very interesting conversation with him about the origin and language of the Albanian people.

What is the origin and language of your people? he asked me, among other things, Are your people akin to the Basques? And he continued, I do not believe that the Albanian people came from the interior of Asia, nor are they of Turkish origin, because the Albanians are of a more ancient stock than the Turks. Perhaps, your people have common roots with those Etruscans who remained in your mountains, because the rest went to Italy, some were assimilated by the Romans and some crossed over to the Iberian Peninsula.

I replied to Comrade Stalin that the origin of our people was very ancient, that their language was Indo-European. There are many theories on this question, I continued, but the truth is that our origin is Illyrian. We are a people of Illyrian descent. There is also a theory which defends the thesis that the Albanian people are the most ancient people of the Balkans and that the Pelasgians were the ancient pre-Homeric forefathers of the Albanians.

I went on to explain that the Pelasgian theory was upheld for a time by many scholars, especially German scholars. There is also an Albanian scholar I told him, who is known as an expert
on Homer, who has reached the same conclusion, basing himself on some words used in the Iliad and the Odyssey, and which are in use today among the Albanian people, as for example, the word 'gur' (stone) which means 'kamenj' in Russian. Homer uses this word as a prefix to the Greek word, saying 'guri-petra'. Thus, on the basis of a few such words, bearing in mind the Oracle of Dodona, and some documents or etymologies of words, which have undergone changes, according to many philological interpretations, the scientists conclude that our ancient forefathers were the Pelasgians, who lived on the Balkan Peninsula before the Greeks.

<<However, I have not heard that the Albanias are of the same origin as the Basques,>> I said to Comrade Stalin. <<Such a theory may well exist, like the theory you mentioned, that some of the Estruscans remained in Albania, while the rest branched off to settle in Italy, with some of them crossing over to the Iberian Peninsula, to Spain. It is possible that this theory, too, may have its supporters, but I have no knowledge of it.>>

<<In the Caucasus we have a place called Albania,>> Stalin told me on one occasion. <<Could it have any connection with Albania?>>

<<I don't know.>> I said, but it is a fact that during the centuries, many Albanians, forced by the savage Ottoman occupation, the wars and ferocious persecution of the Ottoman Sultans and Padishahs, were obliged to leave the land of their birth and settle in foreign lands where they have formed whole villages. This is what happened with thousands of Albanians who settled in Southern Italy back in the 15th century, after the death of our National Hero, Scanderbeg, and now there are whole areas inhabited by the Arbereshi of Italy, who still retain their language and the old customs of the Homeland of their forefathers although they have been living in a foreign land for 4-5 centuries. Likewise,>> I told Comrade Stalin, <<many Albanians settled in Greece, where entire regions are inhabited by the Arbereshi of Greece, others settled in Turkey, Rumania, Bulgaria, America and elsewhere... However, as to the place in your country called 'Albania',>> I said, <<I know nothing concrete.>>

Then Stalin asked me about a number of words of our language. He wanted to know the names of some work tools, household utensils, etc. I told him the Albanian words, and after listening to them carefully he repeated them, made comparisons between the Albanian name for the tool and its equivalent in the language of the Albanians of the Caucasus. Now and then he turned to Molotov and Mikovan and sought their opinion. It turned out that the roots of the words compared had no similarity.

At this moment, Stalin pressed a button, and after a few seconds the general who was Stalin's aide-de-camp, a tall, very attentive man, who behaved towards us with great kindness and sympathy, came in.

<<Comrade Enver Hoxha and I are trying to solve a problem, but we cannot,>> said Stalin, smiling at the general. <<Please get in touch with professor (and he mentioned an outstanding Soviet linguist and historian. whose name has escaped my memory) and ask him on my behalf whether there is any connection between the Albanias of the Caucasus and those of Albania.>>

When the general left, Stalin picked up an orange, and said:

<<In Russian this is called 'apyelsin'. What is it in Albanian?>>

<<Portokall.>> I replied.

Again he made the comparison, pronouncing the words of the two languages and shrugged his shoulders. Hardly ten minutes had passed when the general came in again.

<<I have the professor's answer,.>>. he announced. -<<He says there is no evidence at all of any connection between the Albanias of the Caucasus and those of Albania. However, he added that in the Ukraine, in the region of Odessa, there were several villages (about 7) inhabited by Albanians. The professor has precise information about this.>>

For my part, I instructed our ambassador in Moscow, there and then, to see to it that some of our students, who were studying history in the Soviet Union should do, their practice in these villages
and study how and when these Albanians had settled in Odessa, whether they still preserved the language and customs of their forefathers, etc.

Stalin listened very attentively, as always, and said to me:

<<Very good, that will be very good. Let your students do their practice there, and moreover, together with some of ours.>>

Continuing this free conversation with Comrade Stalin, I said: <<In the past the Albanological sciences were not properly developed and those engaged in them were mostly foreign scholars. Apart from other things, this has led to the emergence of all sorts of theories about the origin of our people, language, etc. Nevertheless, they are almost all in agreement on one thing - the fact that the Albanian people and their language are of very ancient origin. However, it will be our own Albanologists, whom our Party and state will train carefully and provide with all the conditions necessary for their work, who will give the precise answer to these problems.>>

<<Albania must march on its own feet,>> Stalin said, <<because it has all the possibilities to do so.>>

<<Without fail we shall forge ahead,>> I replied.

<<For our part, we shall help the Albanian people whole-heartedly,>> said Comrade Stalin in the kindliest tone, <<because the Albanians are fine people.>>

The whole dinner which Comrade Stalin put on in honour of our delegation passed in a very warm, cordial and intimate atmosphere. Stalin proposed the first toast to our people, to the further progress and prosperity of our country, to the Communist Party of Albania. Then he proposed a toast to me, Hysni* *(Comrade Hysni Kapo, then vice-minister of foreign affairs of the PRA, was a member of the delegation which went to Moscow in July 1947) and all the members of the Albanian delegation. I recall that later during the dinner, when I spoke to him about the great resistance our people had put up through the centuries against foreign invasions, Comrade Stalin described our people as an heroic people and again proposed a toast to them. Apart from the free chat we had together, from time to time he talked to the others, made jokes and proposed toasts. He did not eat much, but kept his glass of red wine close at hand and clinked it with ours with a smile at every toast.

After the dinner, Comrade Stalin invited us to go to the Kremlin cinema where, apart from some Soviet newsreels, we saw the Soviet feature film <<The Tractor Driver>>. We sat together on a sofa, and I was impressed by the attention with which Stalin followed this new Soviet film. Frequently he would raise his warm voice to comment on various moments of the events treated in the film. He was especially pleased with the way in which the main character in the film, a vanguard tractor driver, in order to win the confidence of his comrades and the farmers, struggled to become well acquainted with the customs and the behaviour of the people in the countryside, their ideas and aspirations. By working and living among the people, this tractor driver succeeded in becoming a leader honoured and respected by the peasants. At this moment Stalin said:

<<To be able to lead, you must know the masses, and in order to know them, you must go down among the masses.>>

It was past midnight when we rose to leave. At that moment :Stalin invited us once again to take our glasses of wine and for the third time proposed a toast to <<the heroic Albanian people>>.

After this he shook hands with us one by one and, when he gave me his hand, said:

<<Give my cordial regards to the heroic Albanian people, whom I wish success!>>

On July 26, 1947, our delegation, very satisfied with the meetings and talks with Comrade Stalin, set off to return to the Homeland.
SECOND MEETING

March-April 1949

Our stand towards the Yugoslav leadership from the years of the war. The 1st Congress of the CPA. Policy of terror in Kosova. On the Yugoslav divisions which were to be deployed in Albania. The Titoites aimed to overturn the situation in Albania. On the war of the fraternal Greek people. Erroneous views of the leadership of the Greek Communist Party. The British want naval bases in our ports as a condition for recognition. The road of the economic and cultural development of Albania. On the situation of our peasantry. On the history, culture, language and customs of the Albanian people.

I went to Moscow again on March 21, 1949, at the head of an official delegation of the Government of the People's Republic of, Albania and stayed there until April 11 that year. Mikoyan, Vyshinsky, and others, as well as all the diplomatic representatives of the countries of people's democracy had come out to welcome us at the Moscow airport. We had the first official meeting with Vyshinsky the day after our arrival and on March 23, at 22.05 hours I was received by Comrade Stalin in the Kremlin, in the presence of Vyshinsky and the ambassador of the USSR to Albania, Chuvakhin. I went to this meeting with Spiro Koleka and Mihal Prifti who, at that time, was our ambassador in Moscow. Comrade Stalin received us very warmly in his office. After shaking hands with each of us in turn, he stopped in front of me:

<<You look thin in the face,>> he said, <<have you, been ill? Or are you tired?>>
<<I feel very glad and happy to meet you again,>> I replied and, after we sat down, I told him that I wanted to raise several questions with him.
<<Take all the time you need,>> he said with great goodwill, so that I would talk about anything I considered necessary.

I gave Comrade Stalin an exposition on a series of problems. I spoke in general about the situation in our Party and country, the recent events, the mistakes recognized, as well as about our stand in connection with the Yugoslav question. I told him that, as a result of the influence of the Trotskyite Yugoslav leadership on our leadership and the excessive trust of some of our leaders in the treacherous Yugoslav leadership, grave mistakes had been made, especially in the organizational line of the Party, as noted by the 11th Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Albania, the proceedings of which had been held in the light of the Letters of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) addressed to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and the Resolution of the Information Bureau <<On the Situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia>>.

<<The Central Committee of our Party,>> I told Comrade Stalin, <<fully endorsed the Resolution of the Information Bureau and we condemned the treacherous anti-Albanian and anti-Soviet course of the Trotskyite Yugoslav leadership in a special communique. The leadership of our Party,>> I pointed out, <<for many years had encountered the hostile conspiratorial activity of the Titoites, the arrogance and intrigues of Tito's envoys - Vukmanovich-Tempo and Dushan Mugosha..>> Among other things, I mentioned that on the eve of the liberation of Albania, Tito, seeking to achieve his anti-Albanian and anti-Marxist aims, sent us a delegation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, headed by its special envoy, Velimir Stoyynch. At Berat, he and his secret collaborators, the traitors Sejffulla Maleshova, Koçi Xoxe, Pandi Kristo and others, behind the scenes, prepared their reprehensible and dangerous moves which constituted a serious plot against the correct line followed by the Party during the whole period of the war, against the
independence of the Party and our country, against the General Secretary of the Party personally, etc. Although it knew nothing about the plot that was being concocted, the healthy section of the leadership of our Party there and then energetically opposed the accusations made against it and the line followed during the war. Convinced that grave anti-Marxist mistakes had been made at Berat, among other things, I subsequently presented to our Political Bureau the theses for the re-examination of the Berat Plenum, but, as a result of the feverish subversive activity of the Yugoslav leadership and its agents in our ranks, these theses were not accepted. <<The further development of events, the Letters of the Central Committee of your Party as well as the Resolution of the Information Bureau,>> I told Comrade Stalin, <<made the situation completely clear to us, the hostile activity of the Yugoslav leadership with Tito at the head was uncovered and proved and the plotters in the ranks of our Party were thoroughly exposed at the 11th Plenum of the CC of the Party. The 1st Congress of the OPA endorsed the turn taken by the 11th Plenum of the Central Committee and made it more thorough-going. It appraised the political line followed by the Party since its founding as correct, and found that the peculiar distortions which became apparent after Liberation, especially in the organizational line of the Party, were the result of the Yugoslav interference and the treacherous Trotskyite activity of Koçi Xoxe, Pandi Kristo and Kristo Themelko.>>

I mentioned that both Koçi Xoxe and Pandi Kristo were dangerous agents of the Yugoslav Trotskyites in the ranks of the leadership of our Party, that with the guidance, support and backing of the Yugoslav Titoites they had made every effort to usurp the key positions in our Party and our state of people's democracy. In all their treacherous activity they had put themselves in the service of the national-chauvinist and colonialist policy of the Trotskyite Yugoslav leadership towards the People's Republic of Albania. I added that Kristo Themelko was one of those most influenced by the Trotskyite Yugoslav leadership and had implemented its directives in the sector of the army unreservedly. <<However,>> I went on, <<after the betrayal of the Yugoslav leadership was fully uncovered, he admitted his mistakes and made self-criticism before the Party.>>

Stalin, who was listening attentively, asked: <<What are these three? Are they Slavs, Albanians or what are they?>>

<<Kristo Themelko,>> I said, <<is of Macedonian origin, whereas Koçi Xoxe is of Albanian origin, although his parents lived in Macedonia.>>

I went on to tell him about the exceptionally great importance which the Letters of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union addressed to the Yugoslav leadership and the Resolution of the Information Bureau had for our Party. <<In the light of these documents, which came out at very crucial moments for our Party and people,>> I told Comrade Stalin, <<the character and the aims of Yugoslav interference in Albania became completely clear to the Central Committee of our Party.>> After giving a general outline of the many radical measures our Party had taken to put an end to the ferocious anti-Marxist and anti-Albanian activity of these agents, I told him that, although we encountered and opposed their crooked activities as early as the waryears, still we were conscious of, our responsibility, because we should have proved more vigilant. Here Comrade Stalin interrupted me with these words: <<Our letters addressed to the Yugoslav leadership do not contain everything, because there are many matters that emerged later. We did not know that the Yugoslavs, under the pretext of 'defending' your country against an attack from the Greek fascists, wanted to bring units of their army into the PRA. They tried to do this in a very secret manner. In reality, their aim in this direction was utterly hostile, for they intended to overturn the situation in Albania. Your report to us on this question was of value, otherwise we would have known nothing about these divisions which they wanted to station on your territory. They implied that they were taking this action allegedly with the approval of the Soviet Union! As for what you said, that you ought to have shown greater vigilance, the truth is that in the relations with Yugoslavia there has been lack of vigilance not only by you but also by others.>>
Continuing my discourse, I told Comrade Stalin that the difficult moments created by the Titoites and by the monarcho-fascists who were acting against our country under orders of the American and British imperialists, were overcome successfully thanks to the correct line of the Party, the patriotism of our people and the assistance of the CP of the Soviet Union. This was a major test from which we learned a great deal to correct our mistakes, to consolidate the victories achieved up till now, and to fight to strengthen and develop them further. Our army accomplished its tasks with courage and lofty patriotism.

During the difficult period we went through, the patriotism of the masses was very great. Their trust in our Party, in its correct line and in the Soviet Union was unshakeable. The activity of the internal enemy was short-lived. I told Comrade Stalin that we had neutralized the hostile activity of those who had put themselves in the service of the Trotskyite Yugoslav leadership. We adopted differentiated stands towards those who, in one way or another, were implicated in the anti-Albanian activity of the Trotskyite Yugoslav leadership. Some of them made self-criticism over the mistakes they had committed in good faith, while those who were gravely compromised were already rendering account before the people’s court.

<<Protect your, Homeland and the Party,>> Comrade Stalin said. <<The enemy must be exposed thoroughly, with convincing arguments, so that the people can see what this enemy has done and be convinced of the menace he represents. Even it such an enemy, utterly discredited in the eyes of the people, is not shot, he is automatically shot, morally and politically, because without the people he can do nothing at all>>

<<The trial which is now going on in Tirana,>> I told Comrade Stalin, <<is being held with open doors and everything that is said in the court room is published in the newspapers.<<At the same time,>> I added, <<those who have thoroughly understood their mistakes, who have made sincere and convincing self-criticism, we have treated patiently and magnanimously, and have given them the possibility to make amends for their mistakes and faults through work, through loyalty to the Party and the people. We have even thought we should send one of them to study in the Soviet Union,>> and I mentioned one name.

<<Really?>> Stalin asked me and looked me right in the eye. <<Have you requested that this person should come here to study? Do you still have political trust in him?>>

<<We do,>> I said, <<his self-criticism has become more and more profound and we hope that he will correct himself.>>

<<But does he want to come here?>>

<<He has expressed the wish to come,>> I said.

At this point Chuvakhin added some explanations in support of my opinion.

<<Well, then, since you have weighed this matter well, Comrade Enver, let him come...>>

Continuing the conversation, I told Comrade Stalin that during the same period the Americans, from Italy had parachuted groups of saboteurs into the south and north of Albania. We killed some of these saboteurs and captured the remainder. Foreseeing the difficulties on our southern border and wanting to have the forces available for any eventuality, we first had to undertake a mopping-up operation in North Albania against the groups of political and common bandits who operated within our borders under the direction of agents sent in by Rankovich, and we did this. These bands in the service of the Yugoslavs carried out a number of assassinations. Our mopping up operation ended successfully: we wiped out some of them and all the others crossed over into Yugoslav territory, where they remain to this day.

<<Do they continue to send in other saboteurs?>> Stalin asked.

<<We think that they have not given up. The policy of Tito and Rankovich to lure Albanians into their territories in order to organize groups of saboteurs and wreckers with them, met defeat, and at present there are very few defections. Our government has taken economic measures and the political and organizational work of the Party has been strengthened. The imperialists are training groups of wreckers abroad, just as the monarcho fascists and the Titoites are doing on their part. The Italians are not lagging behind. Our present plan is to rout the remnants of the bandits at large
in our mountains for whom we have already made things very difficult, and to destroy their bases, which are among the kulaks, especially. Most of the reactionary groupings in the cities have been smashed by the State Security Forces which have scored many successes. Our Party put things in order in the Ministry of Internal Affairs, a former centre of the Titoites, and the State Security has become a very powerful and much beloved weapon of the Party and our people. The Party has set itself the task of strengthening its positions more and more each day in order to cope with and smash all the attempts and attacks our many enemies may make.

<<The Party is growing stronger from day to day,>> I went on to tell Comrade Stalin. <<In the ranks of our young Party there is great courage and great will. The ideological and cultural level of our party workers is low, but there is great eagerness to learn. We are working in this direction to improve the situation. We still have many shortcomings in the work of our Party, but with persistent efforts, with confidence in the future and with the experience of the Bolshevik Party, we shall eliminate these shortcomings.>>

In continuation of the talk, I gave Comrade Stalin a general outline of the economic situation in Albania, the results achieved and the big struggle the Party and the people had waged and were waging to cope with the difficulties created in the economy by the hostile work of the Yugoslav Trotskyites and their agents. I told him that our people were unpretentious and hard-working, and they had mobilized themselves under the leadership of the Party to overcome the backwardness and the difficulties created and to carry out the tasks set by the 1st Congress of the Party.

I told him that the 1st Congress of the Party, along with the socialist industrialization, had laid down the guidelines for the strengthening of the socialist sector in agriculture by increasing the state farms and stepping up the gradual collectivization in the form of agricultural cooperatives, which the state would support politically, economically and organizationally.

<<Have you set up many such cooperatives? What criteria do you follow?>> Comrade Stalin asked. Here I explained to him that the Congress had given the orientation that the collectivization of agriculture should be carried out gradually, patiently and on a voluntary basis. On this road we would neither rush things nor mark time.

<<In my opinion,>> said Comrade Stalin, <<you must not rush things in the collectivization of agriculture. Yours is a mountainous country with a relief that differs from one region to another. In our country, too, in mountain areas similar to those of your country, the kolkhozes were set up much later.>>

Then I went on to speak about the work that was being done in our country to strengthen the alliance of the working class with the working peasantry, about the assistance the state gave the individual peasant, the increase of agricultural production and the policy of procurement of agricultural and livestock products.

<<This has very great importance,>> Comrade Stalin said, <<and you are right to devote attention to it. If the Albanian peasants need tractors, other farm machines, draft animals, seeds or anything else, you must help them. Moreover,>>, he continued, <<you must also dig canals for the peasantry, then you will see what it will be able to do. In my opinion, it is better that the peasant pays his obligations to the state for the above aid in kind.>>

<<The state must set up machine and tractor stations,>> continued Comrade Stalin, you should not give the tractors to the cooperatives, but the state should help the individual peasants plough their land, too, if they seek this help. Thus, little by little, the poor peasant will begin to feel the need for the collectivization.

<<As for surpluses of agricultural products,>> Comrade Stalin went on, <<these the peasants must dispose of as they like, for, if you act otherwise, the peasants will not collaborate with the government. If the peasantry does not see the aid of the state concretely, it will not assist the state.>>

<<I do not know the history and characteristics of the bourgeoisie of your country,>> said Comrade Stalin and then asked: <<Have you had a merchant bourgeoisie?>>

<<We have had a merchant bourgeoisie in the process of formation,>> I said, <<but now it has no power>>.
Have you expropriated it entirely? he asked me.

In answering this question, I told Comrade Stalin about the policy the Party had followed as early as the war years in regard to the well-to-do classes, about the great differentiation which had taken place as a result of the stand of the elements of these classes towards the foreign invaders, about the fact that most of them had become collaborators with fascism and, after staining their hands with the blood of the people, had either fled together with the invaders or, those who did not manage to get away, had been captured by the people and handed over to the court. In regard to those elements, mainly of the patriotic middle and petty bourgeoisie, who were linked with the people during the war and opposed the foreign invaders, I went on, the Party supported them, kept close to them and showed them the true road to serve the development of the country and the strengthening of the independence of the Homeland. As a result of the hostile activity of Koci Hoxe and company, unjust stands and harsh measures were taken in the recent years towards some of these elements, as well as towards some patriotic intellectuals. I told Comrade Stalin, but the Party has now forcefully denounced these errors and will not allow them to occur again.

Comrade Stalin said that on this, as on any other problem, everything depended on the concrete conditions and situations of each country. But I think, he stressed, that in the first phase of the revolution, the policy followed towards the patriotic bourgeoisie which truly wants the independence of its country should be such as to enable it to help in this phase with the means and assets it possesses.

Lenin teaches us, that in the first period of the revolution, where this revolution has an anti-imperialist character, the communists can use the assistance of the patriotic bourgeoisie. Of course, this depends on the concrete conditions, on the stand of this bourgeoisie towards the most acute problems the country is faced with, etc.

In the countries of people's democracy, for example, the big bourgeoisie had compromised itself with the German invaders and had assisted them. When the Soviet army liberated these countries, the sold-out bourgeoisie took the road of exile.

He thought for a moment and added: It seems to me the Soviet army did not come to help in Albania. But did the Yugoslav army come to help your country during the National Liberation War?

No. I replied. Our National Liberation Army, with two partisan divisions, went and fought in Yugoslav territory to assist in the liberation of the peoples of Yugoslavia.

Continuing his theme, Comrade Stalin emphasized that every communist party and socialist state should be particularly careful also in their relations with the intellectuals. A great deal of careful far-sighted work must be done with them with the aim of bringing the honest, patriotic intellectuals as close as possible to the people's power.

Mentioning some specific features of the Russian revolution, Comrade Stalin stressed that at that time, Russia had not been under the yoke of any foreign imperialist power, hence they had risen only against the exploiters within the country, and the Russian national bourgeoisie, as the exploiter it was, had not reconciled itself to the revolution. A fierce struggle had been waged for several years in that country and the Russian bourgeoisie had sought the aid and intervention of the imperialists.

Hence, there is a clear difference between the Russian revolution and the struggle that is going on in those countries which have fallen victims to imperialist aggressors.

I mention this, Stalin continued, to show how important it is to bear in mind the concrete conditions of each country, because the conditions of one country are not always identical with those of other countries. That is why no one should copy our experience or that of others, but should only study it and profit from it by applying it according to the concrete conditions of his own country.

Time had slipped away unnoticed during this meeting with Stalin. I took up the thread of my discourse again and began to expound the problems of the plan for strengthening the defences and developing the economy and culture in the PRA.
"The chief of your General Staff,>> Comrade Stalin told me, "has sent us some requests for your army. We ordered that all of them should be met. Have you received what you wanted?>> "We have not yet received any information about this>>, I said.

At this moment Stalin called in a general and charged him with gathering precise information about this question. After a few minutes the telephone rang. Stalin took up the receiver and, after listening to what was said, informed me that the matériel was en route.

"Did you get the rails?>> he asked. "Is the railway completed?>> "We got them,>> I told him, "and we have inaugurated the railway,>> and continued to outline the main tasks of the plan for the economic and cultural development of the, country and the strengthening of its defences. On this occasion I also presented our requests for aid from the Soviet Union.

Just as previously, Comrade Stalin received our requests sympathetically and said to us quite openly:

"Comrades, we are a big country, but you know that we have not yet eliminated all the grave consequences of the war. However, we shall help you today and in the future, perhaps not all that much, but with those possibilities we have. We understand that you have to set up and develop the sector of socialist industry, and in this direction we agree to fulfil all the requests you have presented to us, as well as those for agriculture.>>

Then, smiling, he added:

"But will the Albanians themselves work?>> I understood why he asked me this question. It was the result of the evil-intended information of the Armenian huckster, Mikoyan, who, at a meeting I had with him, not only spoke to me in a language quite unlike that of Stalin, but also used harsh terms in his criticisms about the realization of plans in our country, alleging that our people did not work, etc. His intention was to reduce the rate and amount of aid. This was always Mikoyan's stand. But Stalin accorded us everything we sought.

"We shall also send you the cadres you asked for,>> he said, "and they will spare no effort to help you but, of course, they will not stay in Albania forever. Therefore, comrades, you must train your own cadres, your own specialists, to replace ours. This is an important matter. However many foreign cadres come to your country, you will still need Your own cadres. "Therefore, comrades,>> he advised us, "you must open your university, which will be a great centre for training your future cadres."

"We have opened the first institutes,>> I told Comrade Stalin, "and work is going ahead in them, but we are still only at the beginning. Apart from experience and textbooks, we also lack the cadres necessary for opening the university."

"The important thing is to get started,>> he said. "Then step by step, everything will be achieved. For our part, we shall assist you both with literature and with specialists, in order to help increase the number of higher institutes which are the basis for the creation of the university in the future."

"The Soviet specialists,>> Comrade Stalin went on, "will be paid by the Albanian government the same salaries as the Albanian specialists. Don't grant them any favour more than your specialists enjoy."

"The Soviet specialists come from far away>>, I replied, oand we cannot treat them the same as ours. Comrade Stalin objected at once:

"No, no, whether they, come from Azerbaijan or any other part of the Soviet Union, we have our rules for the treatment of the specialists we send to the assistance of the fraternal peoples. It is their duty to work with all their strength as internationalist revolutionaries, to work for the good of Albania just as for the good of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Government undertakes to make up the necessary difference in their salaries.>>
After I thanked Comrade Stalin, I raised the question of the teams that were needed for geological and hydro-electric studies, for the construction of railways and a series of problems of the future of our industrial development. After giving a positive answer to the matters I raised, he asked me a series of questions: "Do you have many large rivers for the construction of hydropower stations? Is there much coal in Albania?" etc.

I answered Comrade Stalin and then asked whether we could send a number of cadres to the Soviet Union to be trained as specialists for some essential urgent needs of the country. "If this is impossible," I said "then let some specialists be sent from the Soviet Union to Albania to train our cadres on the spot."

Comrade Stalin said:
"In this direction we would rather send some instructors to Albania, because were your men to come to the Soviet Union a longer time will be needed for their training, as they will have to learn Russian," etc.

Comrade Stalin recommended that we address this request to the Foreign Ministry of the Soviet Union and added:
"Comrade Vyshinsky has been charged with conducting all the talks from our side, therefore you must address any request to him."

I told Comrade Stalin that, in general, those were the questions that I wanted to discuss with him in regard to the internal situation in Albania and expressed the desire to give a brief outline of the political position of Albania in regard to the international situation. He looked at his watch and asked:
"Would twenty minutes be enough?"
"A little longer, if possible, Comrade Stalin," I replied.

After speaking about the tense situation in our relations with Yugoslavia, and the hostile activity of the Yugoslav traitors, the bands of criminals they had organized and smuggled into Albanian territory to carry out disruption and sabotage against our country, I spoke to Comrade Stalin about the policy of savage terror followed by the Tito clique against the Albanians of Kosovo, Macedonia and Montenegro.

"Are there many Albanians in Yugoslavia?" Stalin asked me. "And what religion do they profess?"
"There are more than a million of them," I said (here Vyshinsky expressed his astonishment at such a large number which, it seemed, he had never heard of before), and continued: "Almost all of them are Muslims."

"How is it possible that they have not been assimilated by the Slavs? What links do the Albanians living in Yugoslavia maintain with those in Albania?", asked Stalin again.

"At all periods, the Albanians living in Yugoslav have been outstanding for their ardent patriotism and their strong links with their Homeland and their compatriots," I told Comrade Stalin in reply to his question. They have always forcibly opposed the feverish expansionist efforts of the great-Serbian and great-Slav reactionary chauvinists and their attempts to assimilate them and have preserved their Albanian national identity in every respect, with fanaticism.

"At present the Tito clique is following the same line and the same methods in Kosovo and the Albanian-inhabited territories of Montenegro and Macedonia, as those used by their counterparts - King Alexander and others in the past. Kosova is a very weak spot for the Belgrade clique, hence it is using large-scale terror there, with mass deportations, arrests and forced labour, conscription to the army as well as expropriation of a large number of people. The Albanian element is particularly persecuted in Titoite Yugoslavia, because the present Yugoslav leaders are well aware of the patriotic and revolutionary qualities of the Albanian population there, well aware that for this population the national problem has been and still is an open wound which needs to be healed."
Apart from this, the Titoites have turned Kosova, and the other Yugoslav regions inhabited by the Albanians into important centres for essembling Albanian quislings, bandits and spies who, instructed by the men of UDB, prepare acts of terrorism, subversion, sabotage and armed attacks against our country. The Belgrade clique has set in motion former Serbian, British and American agents, as well as Italian and German agents, in order to mobilize the Albanian reaction of Kosova and, from this reaction, to organize detachments, which, together with the other Albanian bandits, enter our territory and cause disturbances.

Then I went on to give Comrade Stalin a brief account of the Greek people's war against the monarcho-fascists and the Anglo-Americans, about the political support we gave this just war of the fraternal Greek people and, among other things, pointed out that the Greek Democratic Army stood aloof from the people.

Comrade Stalin was astonished when he heard these words and asked:
<<What, what did you say?!>>
I gave him complete explanations, both about this problem and about the mistaken views of Nicos Zachariades and company on the role of the party and the commissar in the army, in the government, etc.

<<We think,>> I told Comrade Stalin among other things, that the leadership of the Greek Communist Party made grave mistakes in regard to the strengthening and expansion of the party in the countryside and the town during the war against the Hitlerites, and that these errors manifested themselves again during the war against internal reaction and Anglo-American intervention.

<<Mistakenly believing that the city would play the decisive role in the victory over the Hitlerites and internal reaction in the years of the antifascist war the Siantos* *(Former general secretary of the Greek Communist Party, an opportunist and capitulator to Anglo-American reaction.) leadership ordered the Greek proletariat to stay in the cities. This brought about that the more revolutionary part of the Greek people remained exposed to the savage blows of the internal Hitlerites, while the Greek National Liberation Partisan Army was deprived of the proletariat, which should have been the motor and the leadership of the Greek people's revolution.>> Then I pointed out that despite the savage terror and the heavy blows the Hitlerites and internal reaction had struck at the proletariat and the revolutionary elements in the cities, the latter, in general, still remained in the cities, where they were killed, tortured, arrested and interned on islands, and had not taken to the mountains en masse, because such had been the directive of the Greek Communist Party. <<Of course, even then there were important fighting actions, such as sabotage, executions of enemies, etc., carried out in the cities, but these actions were of second-rate importance in the general context of the fight of the Greek people.

<<The same weaknesses,>> I stressed further, <were observed in the countryside, too, where the extension of the party was limited, and its organization weak and lax. with the organizations of the party frequently confounded with those of EAM. There was opportunism both in the organization and in the political line of the national liberation councils at the village level. there was duality of power and coexistence with the Zervist reactionary organizations, etc., in the liberated areas and elsewhere. We told the Greek comrades that their putting the Command of the National Liberation Army under the orders of the Mediterrane. :Command, their talks and agreements of an opportunist and capitulationist character with Zervas and the reactionary Greek government in exile, the predominance of peasant elements and of the old career officers in the leadership of the Greek National Liberation Army., and so on, were grave errors which would lead the heroic struggle of the Greek people to defeat. The Varkiza agreement was the logical conclusion to all these wrong actions and views - it brought about the capitulation to British and local reaction.

<<However, we think that even after the capitulationist Varkiza agreement and the period of 'legality' of the Greek Communist Party, the leadership of the Greek Communist Party did not go deep enough into its former mistakes in order to correct them in a radical manner.>> I told Comrade Stalin. The strengthening of the party in the city and the countryside, sound links with the broad masses of the people should have been the prime concern of the leadership of the Greek Communist
Party, for it was in this that it made some of its gravest errors in the past. It did not do this, because it did not have a correct appreciation of the new situation created after the defeat of fascism, underrated the internal enemy and Anglo-American reaction and was unable to foresee the great danger that would threaten it from these forces of reaction, as it should have done. It had great hopes in 'legal' activity and parliamentarianism. As a result, the party was disarmed before the enemy, lost its sound ties with the people, the peoples' revolution in Greece went through a grave crisis, and the people were given the impression that the revolution would triumph on the parliamentary road and through elections, and when reaction struck, the people were confused, taken by surprise, and in despair. The Greek people fought heroically against the Hitlerites to win their freedom, but the victory slipped from their hands because of the mistakes of the leadership of the Greek Communist Party. All these mistakes had grave consequences in the subsequent development of events, when any illusion about victory on the legal road was over, and the party had to go underground and decided to resume the war. <<It is a fact.>> I told Comrade Stalin, that before it went underground the party managed to regroup part of the partisan forces, sent them to the mountains and recommenced the war. This was a very good thing. But we think that precisely at this point, the mistaken views of the comrades of the Greek leadership on the strategy and tactics they had to employ, the organization of the party in the city and the countryside, the organization of the party in the army, and in the first place, the links with the masses and the leading role of the party, crop up again.

The comrades of the leadership of the Greek Communist Party underestimated the strength of the enemy and thought that they would easily seize power, that they would easily liberate Greece from the Anglo-Americans and the monarcho fascists. The result of this mistaken view was that they failed to prepare themselves for a protracted, difficult war, underrated the partisan war and described the partisan forces they succeeded in regrouping as a 'regular army'. They pinned all their hopes of victory on this 'regular army', in this way neglecting the main factor - the people, and the Marxist-Leninist principle that 'the army and the people are one'. The comrades of the Greek leadership did not make a correct appraisal of the moments Greece was passing through. As a result of the defeat, the revolutionary enthusiasm of the masses, had been dampened, hence this revolutionary enthusiasm had to be revived by reorganizing the party and making it strong both in the city and in the countryside, while radically correcting the old errors, and extending the partisan war over the whole of the country.

<<Monarcho-fascism was terrified of two things: its great enemy the people. and the partisan war.>> I went on with the exposition of my idea. <<Both these factors were underrated by the leadership of the Greek Communist Party. and the enemy was able to profit from this mistake. The enemy was afraid of a partisan war, which would be extended from day to day, would gradually draw in the masses of the people of city and countryside and would assume ever larger proportions up to the general armed uprising and the seizure of power. The enemy was, spared this because of the wrong tactic of the Greek leadership which thought and still thinks that it should always station its main forces facing the enemy in a frontal war and a passive defence. That was precisely what the enemy wanted-to nail down the main forces of the Greek Democratic Army at a few points and to smash and annihilate them there by means of its superiority in men and armaments. <<Taking advantage of this grave error of the leadership of the Greek Communist Party, the monarcho-fascists deprived the Greek Democratic Army of the support of the people, parted the Greek Communist Party from its mother base. With terror and killings, monarcho-fascism drove the population from all the areas where the major and the more active part of the Greek Democratic Army was stationed, not for attack, but to defend itself. We consider this a fatal mistake. In our country, too,>> I told Comrade Stalin, <<during the National Liberation War, fascism killed and massacred the population, and put entire regions to the torch, however the people did not go into camps behind barbed wire, but took to the mountains, fought and returned to their ruined homes and there put up resolute resistance, because the Party had told them to fight and resist. Our National Liberation Army was never apart from the people, because our Party itself had its sound bases
among the people. We think that the enemy succeeded in isolating the Greek partisans among the barren mountains, because the Greek Communist Party did not have sound bases among the people. That is why I said that the leadership of the Greek Communist Party deprived itself and the Democratic Army of its mother base - the people.

In conclusion, mentioned to Comrade Stalin the threats the external enemies were making towards Albania.

He listened to me attentively and, on the problems I had raised, expressed his opinion:

"As for the Greek people's war," he said among other things, "we, too, have always considered it a just war, have supported and backed it whole-heartedly. Any people's war is not waged by the communists alone, but by the people, and the important thing is that the communists should lead it. Things are not going well for Tsaldaris and he is trying to save himself by means of the Anglo-Americans."

"As for the screams of the external enemies about partitioning Albania," he went on, "they are just to intimidate you, because I do not think there is any danger in this direction at present. This comes about not from the 'goodwill' of the enemies, but for a whole series of reasons. In the first place, Albania is a free and independent country, the people have seized power there and they will know how to defend their independence, just as they knew how to win it. Second, the external enemies themselves have contradictions with one another over Albania. None of them wants Albania to belong only to the one or the other. If Greece wants to have Albania for itself, this would not be advantageous to Italy or Yugoslavia, which would raise obstacles to this, and so on in turn. On the other hand,. Comrade Stalin pointed out, "the independence of Albania has been recognized and confirmed by the declaration of the big three - the Soviet Union, Britain and the United States of America. This declaration may be violated, but that is not so easy to do. Hence, come what may, Albania has its independence protected."

Comrade Stalin repeated several times that if the Albanian Government pursued a cautious, intelligent, and far-sighted policy, then its affairs would go well.

Continuing, Comrade Stalin advised me:
"You must consider the possibilities of establishing relations with Italy, because it is your neighbour, but first you should take measures to protect yourselves against the activity of the Italian fascists."

Speaking of the importance of the recognition of our country in the international arena, he asked:
"Which other state is knocking at your door in order to establish diplomatic relations with you? How are your relations with the French?"

"With the French," I explained, "we have diplomatic relations. They have their representatives in Tirana and we have ours in Paris."

"And what about with the United States of America and Britain?"

"We have no diplomatic relations with them," I replied.""The United States of America, in 1945, made the establishment of relations with us conditional on our recognition of the validity of all the agreements it had signed with the anti-popular government of Zog. We cannot accept these agreements as lawful, because they have an enslaving character, and because the Congress of Perrmet has explicitly prohibited this. For their part," I went on, "the British want naval bases in our ports, and only then will they recognize us. They have long been trying to realize these aims.

"At the time when we had wiped out the nazi forces and liberated almost the entire country, the British, through some military missions they had in our country and under the guise of allies in the anti-fascist war, insistently demanded that as allies', we, together with one of their commandos, should wipe out a German garrison that remained in Saranda, our southernmost port. We accepted their request on condition that, once the operation was over, they should return immediately to where they had come from, to the sea. The operation was completed and the British not only wanted to stay there, but also intended to penetrate into the interior of the country."

"The General Staff of the National Liberation Army presented them with an ultimatum, which demanded their immediate withdrawal, otherwise we would fight and drive them into the sea. After
our ultimatum the British boarded their ships and returned to Greece. But they have not given up their aims.>>
<<You must see what is best in the interests of your country.>> Comrade Stalin said, and he added:
<<As for the bases the British want to have in your ports, in no way should you agree to this. Guard your ports well.>>
<<We will never relinquish them to anybody!>>
I said. <<If the worst comes to the worst we shall die rather then relinquish them.>>
<<You must guard them and not die,>> said Comrade Stalin, laughing. <<Here diplomacy is needed.>>
Then he rose, shook hands with each of us in turn and went away.

We met again some days later at a dinner, which was put on in the Kremlin in honour of our delegation. Comrade Stalin, I and the others were seated round the table. At this dinner, just as in all other meetings we had with him, we were impressed and moved by Stalin's great love for our country and people, his interest to learn as much as possible about the history, culture, language and customs of our people. He started the conversation by asking me about some words of the Albanian language:
<<I want to hear,>> he told me, <<how the words: people, man, bread, gift, wife, husband and land, sound in Albanian.>>
I began pronouncing these Albanian words and he listened to me with great concentration. I remember that a funny situation arose over one of these words. He had asked me what was the Albanian equivalent of the Russian word <<dar>>.
<<Peshqesh!>> I was quick to reply.
<<No no!>> he said, <<Peshqesh is not Albanian, but Turkish.>> And he laughed. He had a very frank and sincere laugh, a laugh which came straight from the heart.

Listening to my pronunciation of Albanian words, Comrade Stalin said:
<<Your language is very old and has been handed down in spoken form from one generation to the other. This, too, is a fact which proves the endurance of your people, the great strength of their resistance to assimilation despite the storms that have swept over them.>>
In connection with these problems, he asked me:
<<What is the national composition of the Albanian people? Are there Serbian or Croatian national minorities in Albania?>>
<<The overwhelming majority of our people,>> I told him, <<is made up of Albanians, but there is a Greek national minority (about 28,000 people) and a very few Macedonians (five small villages all told), while there are no Serbs or Croats.>>
<<How many religious beliefs are there in Albania,>> Comrade Stalin inquired, <<and what language is spoken?>>
<<In Albania,>> I replied, <<there are three religions: Moslem, Orthodox and Catholic. The population which professes these three faiths is of the same nationality - Albanian, therefore the only language used is Albanian, with the exception of the Greek national minority which speak their mother tongue.>>
From time to time, while I was speaking, Stalin took out his pipe and filled it with tobacco. I noticed that he did not use any special tobacco, but took <<Kazbek.>> cigarettes, tore them open, discarded the paper and filled his pipe with the tobacco. After listening to my answer, he said:
<<You are a separate people, just like the Persians and the Arabs, who have the same religion as the Turks. Your ancestors existed before the Romans and the Turks. Religion has nothing to do with nationality and statehood.>>
And in the course of our conversation, he asked me:
<<Do you eat pork, Comrade Enver?>>
<<Yes, I do!>> - I said.
"The Moslem religion prohibits this among its believers," he said, "this is an old, outdated custom. Nevertheless," he went on, "the question of religious beliefs must be kept well in mind, must be handled with great care, because the religious feelings of the people must not be offended. These feelings have been cultivated in the people for many centuries, and great patience is called for on this question, because the stand towards it is important for the compactness and unity of the people."

The dinner passed in a very warm and comradely atmosphere. After proposing a toast to the Albanian army and the Soviet army, Comrade Stalin again mentioned the question of the struggle of the Greek people. He spoke with deep sympathy about the brave and freedom-loving Greek people, about their heroism, their sacrifices and the blood they had shed in their just war.

"Both we and you, all the revolutionaries and peoples are with the just struggle of the Greek people, with their demands for freedom and democracy. They will never lack our ideological and political support and backing," said Comrade Stalin among other things. "You, who border on Greece, must be particularly careful and vigilant in order to cope with any provocation of the monarcho-fascists against your country."

In the course of the dinner toasts were drunk to all the comrades in turn. A toast was drunk to Omer Nishani* (At that time president of the Presidium of People's Assembly of the PRA) too.

Raising his glass time and again, Molotov urged me to drink more and, when he saw that I was not fulfilling his desire, asked:

"Why so little?! Last night you drank more!"

"Ah, last night! Last night was another matter," I said, laughing.

Then Molotov turned to Comrade Stalin:

"Last night," he said, "I dined with Comrade Enver at Vyshinsky's. The news reached us that yesterday, March 31, a son was born to Enver Hoxha in Tirana. In our rejoicing, we drank a bit more."

"Congratulations!" said Stalin immediately, raising his glass to me: "Let us drink this to the health of your little son and your wife!"

I thanked Comrade Stalin wishing him good health and a long life for the good of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet State, for the good of the revolution and Marxism-Leninism.

Several hours passed in this warm and friendly homely atmosphere. Both my comrades and I retain indelible memories of the behaviour and features of the glorious Stalin, of that man whose name and work struck terror into the hearts of the enemies - imperialists, fascists, Trotskyites, and reactionaries of every hue, while they aroused joy and enthusiasm in the hearts of the communists, proletarians and peoples, and gave them added strength and confidence in the future.

All through the dinner he was in the best of spirits, happy, laughing, extremely attentive in the conversation between us, and trying to make all present feel completely at ease. At about 23 hours Stalin suggested:

"What about some coffee?"

We all rose and went to the adjacent room. While coffee was being served, at a table nearby two Soviet comrades were laughing and trying to persuade Xhafer Spahiu to drink a bit more. Xhafer was resisting and said something to them. This scene did not escape the ever attentive Stalin who said jokingly to the Soviet comrades:

"Oh, this is not fair! You are not on an equal footing with the guest - you are two to one!"

We all laughed and continued talking and joking just as in a circle of intimate friends. Then Stalin rose again:

"Comrades," he said, "now I invite you to the cinema."

We all rose and Stalin led us to the Kremlin cinema, where he personally chose the films our delegation would see. They were some documentary colour films with scenes from various parts of the Soviet Union, as well as the film "The Faraway Bride".

This brought our second visit to Stalin to a close.
THIRD MEETING

November 1949

A five-hour meeting at Sukhurni. A tête-à-tête talk with Comrade Stalin. Once again about the Greek problem. About the situation in Yugoslavia after Tito's betrayal. The problem of Kosova and other parts of Yugoslavia inhabited by Albanians. "To attack Albania is not easy>. "If Albania is strong internally it has no danger from abroad>>. An unforgettable dinner. Again about the economic and cultural development of Albania. Stand towards religion and the clergy. "The Vatican is a centre of reaction, a tool in the service of capital and world reaction>>.

In November 1949 I went to Moscow for the third time. On the way to the Soviet Union I stopped over at Budapest where I met Rakosi, who welcomed me very warmly and wanted to know about the economic situation of Albania, about the hostile work of the Titoites and the war of the Greek democratic forces. We had a comradely talk, exchanged a series of opinions and, as I recall, he informed me about the situation in Hungary.

Before I reached Moscow, I stopped briefly at Kiev. There I received an exceptionally warm welcome. At Moscow Lavrentyev, Marshal Sokolovsky, Orlov and other military and civilian personalities had come out to meet me. Later I met Malenkov with whom I had the first short talk. Malenkov suggested to me that if I wished and had the possibility, I should write out the questions which I had in mind to raise in the talks so that it would be easier for him to transmit them to Comrade Stalin.

"Then>>, he told me, "we shall await Comrade Stalin's reply whether you, Comrade Enver, are to go to talk personally with him in the city of Sukhumi, where he is on holiday, or are to talk with some other comrade of the Soviet leadership whom Joseph Vissarionovich will recommend.>>

That evening I wrote out the questions we intended to discuss and handed them to Malenkov. After he was informed about this, Stalin instructed that I should go to Sukhumi so that we could talk together. And this is what we did.

I met Comrade Stalin in the garden of the house where he was spending his holidays; a marvellous garden full of trees and beds of multicoloured flowers bordering the roads and paths. I saw him from a distance strolling at his usual slow pace, a little bent and with his hands behind his back. As always he welcomed me very warmly and behaved in a very comradely way. He seemed to be in very good health.

"I stay outside all day,>> he told me, "and only go inside to eat.>>

Very happy to see him again and to find him so well, I wished him:

"May you live another hundred years, Comrade Stalin!>>

"A hundred?>> he said with a laugh, narrowing his eyes a little. "That's not much. In Georgia we've old people of 145 years of age and still going strong.>>

"Another hundred Comrade Stalin, this is what our people say, another hundred above the age you have!>> I told him.

"Tak harasho!>> he said in the best of humour. "That's fine, I agree.>> We laughed.

Our talk in which only Comrade Stalin and I took part (as well as our interpreter, Sterjo Gjokoreci), was held outside on the balcony. It was nine o'clock in the evening, Moscow time. Stalin was wearing a cap in his head, a brown scarf round his neck and a brown woollen suit. When we were
about to sit down to begin the talk, out of respect I took off my hat and hung it on the rack, but he said to me:
<<Don't take your hat off, keep it on, too.>>
I protested but he insisted, being concerned that I should not get a cold because it was damp outside, and told his aide-de-camp to bring it to me.

During this unforgettable meeting I discussed a series of problems with Comrade Stalin. Among other things, I raised with him our views about the incorrect stands of leading comrades of the Greek Communist Party and the unjust accusations they had made against us. Amongst other things, I said that the Central Committee of our Party had always had close relations with the Central Committee of the Greek Communist Party, that our Party and people had always openly supported the just and heroic struggle of the Greek people for freedom and democracy, and against the Anglo-American foreign interference. <<Precisely because of the special links we have had with the Greek comrades,>> I continued, <<especially during 1949 we have seen mistakes and defects in the leadership of the Greek Communist Party and several times we have expressed our views about these mistakes to them openly, in a comradely way and in a sound internationalist spirit. We told them of our views once again after the blows which the Greek democratic forces suffered at Vitsi and Gramos. However, the leading comrades of the Greek Communist Party did not accept our comradely criticisms as correct, this time either, but considering themselves offended, went so far as to send a letter from their Political Bureau to the Political Bureau of our Party, in which they accused our leading comrades of being 'Trotskyte' and 'Titoite' in regard to our judgement about the line followed by the Greek leaders during their war.<<Our Political Bureau,>> I told Comrade Stalin, <<analysed the letter of the Central Commitee of the Greek Communist Party signed by Nicos Zachariades and arrived at the conclusion that with its mistaken views and stands, the Zachariades group had not only gravely damaged the new line which the Greek Communist Party adopted after the end of the anti-Hitlerite war but was now trying to put the responsibility on to others for the defeats and the sabotage which it had inflicted on this line itself.>>

<<When did you first meet Zachariades?>> Stalin asked me.
After I replied he said to me:
<<Comrade Zachariades has never said anything against you Albanians to our comrades,, and at this time he opened a letter which the Political Bureau of the Greek Communist Party had sent to the Political Bureau of the PLA and read it in silence.>> Then looking at me he added:
<<Here I don't see the accusations which you mention, but I read only that they accuse you of having hindered them in some technical matters.>>
<<At first,>> I said to Comrade Stalin, <<they made the accusations I mentioned orally and later in writing, in their last letter. We have sent you a copy of this letter and our reply through Ambassador Chuvakhin.>>

After asking about the dates of these letters which he had not seen, Stalin gave the order to look them up. In a little while they brought them to him. When he had read them he said to me:
<<I have been on holiday and I have not read these materials. I have read all your other letters.>> Then he added:
<<The Greeks have sought to talk and reach agreement with you.>>
<<In the opinions and criticisms which we have made of the Greek comrades,>> I told Comrade Stalin, <<we have always set out from sincere comradely aims, considering this an internationalist duty, irrespective of whether or not our opinions would be pleasing to them. We have wanted and have always tried to resolve these problems with the Greek comrades in a comradely way and a healthy communist spirit, while they for their part, have not only failed to display a similar spirit of understanding but also make accusations against us and are trying to lay the blame on others. Such views and stand are unacceptable to us.>> I said and added that Comrade Zachariades should bear
in mind and not forget that we ourselves were responsible to the Albanian Party and people for the affairs of our Party, people and Homeland just as he was responsible to his party and people. Listening to me attentively, Comrade Stalin asked:

<<Are any of the Greek democrats who were given temporary asylum in Albania still there? How do you intend to act from now on?>>

In connection with these questions, I gave Comrade Stalin a detailed explanation of our stand. Amongst other things, I said that the imperialists, the monarcho-fascists and reaction, for ulterior motives, had long been making accusations against us alleging that we were to blame for what had occurred in Greece and were interfering in the internal affairs of Greece, and so on. <<However the whole world knows,>> I said, <<that we have not interfered and never will interfere in the internal affairs of Greece.>>

<<In regard to the support which we have expressed and still express for the struggle of the Greek people, this we consider a legitimate right and a duty which every people ought to carry out in regard to the just fight of a fraternal country. But the fact that we are neighbour with Greece brought about that many innocent Greek men, women and children, maimed, terrified, and hotly pursued by the monarcho-fascists, came over our border as refugees. Towards all of them we adopted a just and very careful stand: we gave them aid and shelter and established them in allocated centres far from the border with Greece.>>

Continuing my explanation of this problem, I told Comrade Stalin that the influx of these refugees had created many acute difficulties for us and, apart from carrying out our humanitarian duty, we were being careful to avoid allowing the presence of Greek democratic refugees on our territory to serve as an opportunity for the further incitement of the anti-Albania psychosis of people in the Greek government. This was one of the main reasons why we welcomed the request of Comrade Zachariades and the Greek refugees themselves to leave Albania for asylum in other countries.

<<At present,>> I added, <<following the incorrect stands towards us by leading comrades of the Greek Communist Party and the grave accusations they are making against us, our Political Bureau thinks that the departure of those few Greek refugees who still remain in our country has become even more urgent.>> I told him that not only the democratic soldiers, but also those Greek leaders who had also been given asylum in Albania recently, ought to leave.

Continuing my presentation of our views in connection with the Greek problem, I also told Comrade Stalin about some other mistakes of the Greek comrades, such as their underestimating of protracted partisan war spread over the whole country and their reliance solely on <<frontal war>> with a <<regular army>>; their elimination of the role of the political commissar in the partisan units, etc. <<The pressure of mistaken, petty-bourgeois views of career officers who did not want or tolerate trusted party people beside them,>> I told Comrade Stalin, <<brought about that the role of the commissar in command in the Greek Democratic Army was diminished, considered of secondrate importance, and even totally eliminated. These and other such mistakes make us think that there is confusion, opportunism and false modesty in the leadership of the Greek Communist Party and hiding of the leading role of the party.>>

After listening attentively to all I put forward, Comrade Stalin, amongst other things, said to me: Like you, we too, agreed to the request of Zachariades for the departure of the Greek democratic refugees from Albania and have interested ourselves in assisting them to be settled where they wanted to go. We did this because such a stand is humanitarian. Aid for this number of people was a burden even for us, but they had to go somewhere, because they could not stay in a country bordering on Greece. <<The stand which you have adopted towards the democratic soldiers who crossed your border seems to me correct,>> added Comrade Stalin. <<As for their weapons which have been left in Albania, I am of the opinion that you Albanians should keep them, because you deserve them.>>

<<It appears,>> continued Comrade Stalin, <<that the leaders of the Greek Communist Party have not evaluated the situation properly. They have underestimated the strength of the enemy, thinking they had to do only with Tsaldaris and not with the British and Americans. As to the final
withdrawal by the Greek comrades, there are people who say that they should not have retreated, but I think that, after what had occurred, the democratic soldiers absolutely had to retreat, otherwise they would have all been wiped out.>>
<<On the other questions the Greek comrades are not right. They could not wage a frontal war with a regular army, because they did not have either an army capable of this kind of war, or a sufficient breadth of territory for this. Overestimating their strength and possibilities, they did everything openly, making it possible for the enemy to discover all their positions and their arsenal.>>
<<Nevertheless, I think you should reach agreement with the Greek comrades. This is my view. What they say about you Albanians having adopted a 'Trotskyite' and 'Titoite' stand towards them are baseless accusations.>>

At dinner Stalin asked me where and when I thought we could meet together with the Greek leaders to clear up the disagreements over principles which had arisen between us. <<We are ready to meet whenever you like,.. I said. Possibly even :in January next year and we should hold the meeting in Moscow.>>

Continuing the talk with Comrade Stalin, we spoke about the grave situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia following Tito's betrayal, about the anti-Marxist, nationalist, chauvinist policy which the Titoite clique pursued against Albania and the other countries of people's democracy. In particular I spoke about the situation of the Albanian population in Kosova and some other parts of Yugoslavia.
<<The line of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia in regard to Kosova and other regions in Yugoslavia with an Albanian population,>> I told Comrade Stalin, <<from the beginning of the antifascist war to Liberation, and even more after Liberation, Was and is chauvinist and nationalist.>>
If it were in a sound Marxist-Leninist position, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia should have devoted special attention during the Anti-fascist National Liberation War to the question of the Albanian population in Yugoslavia, because it is a minority large in numbers and right on the Albanian border. In the first years of the war, our view was that the question of the future of Kosova and other Albanian regions in Yugoslavia should not be raised during the war, but the Albanians of Kosova and other Albanian regions should fight against fascism within the framework of Yugoslavia, and this problem would be resolved by the two sister parties, by the people's democratic regimes which would be established in Albania and Yugoslavia, and by the Albanian population there itself, after the war.
<<The main question was that the Albanians of Kosova and other parts of Yugoslavia had to be persuaded and convinced that by fighting fascism, shoulder to shoulder with the peoples of Yugoslavia, after the victory they would be free and the possibilities would be provided for them to decide their future for themselves, that is, that they themselves would decide whether they would be united with Albania or remain within the framework of Yugoslavia as an entity with a special status.
<<A correct and principled policy in this direction would have brought about that the Albanian population of Kosova and of other regions would have been mobilized with all their strength in the great anti-fascist war, irrespective of the savage reaction and the demagogic fascist propaganda. Right from the start of the war we told the Yugoslav leaders of our opinion that they should mobilize the Albanian population in a patriotic spirit, should allow them to fly the Albanian flag along with the Yugoslav flag, should think about the participation of a bigger number from the Albanian element in the new state power to be created in the course of the war, should support and develop among the Albanians both the feeling of great love for Albania, their Homeland, and the feeling of fraternity in the just war of the peoples of Yugoslavia, that very close collaboration should be created and strengthened between the Albanian fighting units of, Kosova and the National Liberation War of our country, while these fighting units of Kosova and other regions should be linked with and guided by the General Staff of the National Liberation Army of Yugoslavia, etc. But, as the reality showed,>> I continued presenting my ideas to Comrade Stalin, these just and
essential demands were not to the liking of the Yugoslav leadership, therefore, not only was it obscure on statements of principle, but Tito made accusations of 'nationalist deviations' against us and those Yugoslav comrades who considered these demands correct.

The nationalist and chauvinist policy on the part of the Yugoslav leadership in Kosova and the other regions inhabited by Albanians was further intensified after the war, irrespective of the demagogy and some partial measures which the Tito-Rankovich clique took at first, such as the opening of an occasional Albanian school.

Nevertheless, in the first post-war years we still considered the Communist Party of Yugoslavia a sister party and hoped that the question of Kosova and the other Albanian regions would be resolved correctly as soon as the appropriate moment arrived.

<<We thought that this moment had been reached at the time of the signing of the treaty* *( 1 The reference is to the Treaty of Friendship, Collaboration and Mutual Assistance between the People's Republic of Albania and Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, signed in July 1946.) with Yugoslavia and I raised this problem with Tito then. Tito asked me what I thought about Kosova. 'Kosova and the other regions of Yugoslavia with an Albanian population,' I replied, 'are Albanian territory which the great powers unjustly tore away from Albania; they belong to Albania and should be returned to Albania. Now that we are two socialist countries the conditions exist for this problem to be solved correctly'. Tito said to me: 'I agree, this is what we desire, but for the moment we are unable to do anything because the Serbs do not understand such a thing'. 'If they don't understand it today,' I said, 'they will have to understand it tomorrow'>>

At this moment Comrade Stalin asked me when I first met Tito and the other Yugoslav leaders. After telling him that I met them after the war, on the first visit I made to Belgrade in 1946, I continued:

<<The problem of Kosova and of the Albanian population living in other regions of Yugoslavia, and its future, remains a problem which is up to the people of Kosova and the other regions to decide for themselves. However, we for our part, without ever interfering in the internal affairs of Yugoslavia, will never cease supporting the rights of our brothers of the one blood, living in Yugoslavia and will raise our voice against the terror, the policy of extermination, which the Tito-Rankovich clique is pursuing towards them.>> Finally I told Comrade Stalin that we had written him a letter about this problem.

<<I have read your letter,>> Comrade Stalin replied. -<<I agree with you that the people of Kosova themselves should decide the question of their future.>>

<<Apart from the anti-Marxist policy Tito has pursued towards Kosova,>> Stalin continued, <<he also wanted to annex Albania itself. This became obvious when Tito tried to send his divisions into Albania. We prevented such an action. Both of us know that the units of the Yugoslav army were to be dispatched to Albania to assist Koçi Xoxe, so that, by means of these Yugoslav forces, he would liquidate free Albania and the Albanian Government.>>

<<Tito,>>. I said, <<took advantage of the fact that Greece at that period was committing provocations on our borders at every opportunity and he hatched up the intrigue that we would allegedly be subjected to 'a large-scale attack from Greece', that 'the attack was imminent' and 'constituted a threat to Albania,' etc. After this, in collaboration with the traitors Koçi Xoxe and company, with whom he had secret links, Tito suggested to us that he should send his armed forces to Albania, precisely to Korça, and later also to Gjirokastra, 'to defend us from the Greek attack'. We strongly opposed this suggestion and immediately informed you about it. We were convinced that under cover of these divisions to help us, he aimed to occupy Albania, and this was also the view expressed in the reply you sent us in connection with our report.>>

With a chuckle expressing both anger and deep irony, Stalin said:

<<And now Tito is accusing us, the Soviets, of allegedly interfering in the internal affairs of Yugoslavia, of allegedly wanting to attack Yugoslavia! No, we have never wanted to do such a
thing and it has never even crossed our minds because we are Marxist-Leninists, we are ;a socialist country, and we cannot act as Tito thinks and acts.

<<I think,>> continued Comrade Stalin, <<that as Marxist-Leninists, in the future too, we must attack the anti-Marxist views and actions of Tito and the Yugoslav leadership, but I stress that in no way should we ever interfere in their internal affairs. That would not be Marxist. The Yugoslav communists and the Yugoslav people must attend to that matter; it is up to them to solve the problems of the present and the future of their country. It is in this context, also, that I see the problem of Kosova and the Albanian population living in other parts of Yugoslavia. We must not leave any way for the Titoite enemy to accuse us later of allegedly waging our fight to break up the Yugoslav Federation. This is a delicate moment and needs very careful handling, because by saying, 'See, they want to break up Yugoslavia,' Tito not only gathers reaction around him, but also tries to win the patriotic elements over to his side.

<<As for Albania's international positio,n>> Comrade Stalin went on, <<this has been defined by the meeting of the three foreign ministers of the United States of America, Great Britain and the Soviet Union. You know of the declarations of Hull, Eden and Molotov on this question. A big noise is being made alleging that Yugoslavia, Greece, etc., are going to attack Albania but this is no light matter, either for them or for any other enemy.>> said Comrade Stalin and he asked me:

<<Are the Greeks continuing their provocations on the border?>>

<<After the lessons we have given them, especially this summer, they have ceased their armed attacks,>> I said, <<nevertheless we are always vigilant and remain on the alert.>>

<<Tsaldaris is very busy with his internal troubles,>> Comrade Stalin went on, <<he has no time now to engage in provocations, as the monarcho-fascists are quarrelling amongst themselves. I think also, that the Anglo-Americans cannot attack you from outside, but will try to attack you from within, by attempting to organize insurrections and movements, by infiltrating agents and assassins to kill the Albanian leaders, etc. The enemies will try to stir up troubles and conflicts inside Albania, but if Albania is strong internally, it need fear no danger from abroad. This is the main thing. If Albania pursues a wise and principled policy, it has no reason to fear anything.

<<As for the documents of the three foreign ministers,>> Comrade Stalin said, <<these you should keep in mind and from time to time, at opportune moments, you should mention them to remind the 'friends' of them.>>

<<However, the internal situation must be strengthened continuously in all directions; it must always be strengthened. This is the main thing,>> he said and asked me:

<<Do you have defence forces under the Ministry of Internal Affairs to attack the counterrevolutionary bands and put down the attempts of internal reaction?>>

<<Yes,>> I said. <<These forces, made up of, the sons of the, people, have done a commendable job, especially in the early years, in clearing the country of the gangs of criminals, enemies hiding in the mountains, and agents smuggled in from abroad. In close collaboration with the people, our military forces are ever better fulfilling their tasks and the Party and our state power have always seen to it that they are very well trained and equipped.>>

<<You must keep these forces in constant readiness to settle accounts with the counterrevolutionary groups, as well as with the possible bandits,>> Comrade Stalin advised me in connection with the situation in Albania and asked me:

<<Did Tito denounce the Treaty of Friendship and Mutual Collaboration with Albania?>>

<<Yes,>> I said. <<And the way Tito denounced the Treaty was typically Titoite. On November 2 this year the Yugoslav leaders sent us an official note full of slanders and base accusations, in which they called on us, in the form of an ultimatum, to abandon our road and take their road of betrayal. Then, on November 12, without waiting for a reply to their first note, they sent us their second note in which they denounced the Treaty.

<<However, we gave them our reply to both their notes, just as they deserved, and we are still living very well, even without their treaty of 'friend-ship.'>>
This meeting passed in a warm, happy and very intimate atmosphere. After the tête-d-tête talk I had with Comrade Stalin, we went into the house for dinner. At the entrance to the dining room there was a kind of an anteroom where we hung our coats and hats. In the dining room itself, which was half-panelled in timber, there was a long table, and here and there other tables for serving dishes and drinks. Also present at the dinner were two Soviet generals, the one Stalin's aide-de-camp and the other my escort during my visit. Stalin talked, asked questions, cracked jokes with us and the two generals. When we sat at the table he made jokes about the dishes. The way the dinner was served was very interesting. There was no waiter to serve us. A girl brought in all the food in dishes covered to keep them hot; she put the dishes on the table and left. Stalin got up, took the dish himself and, standing there, carved the chicken, then sat down and resumed his jokes.

<<Let us begin,>> he said addressing me. <<What are you waiting for? Do you think the waiters will come to serve us? There you have the dishes, take them, lift the lids and start eating, or you'll go supperless.>>

He laughed again heartily, that exhilarating laugh of his that went right to one's heart. From time to time he raised his glass and drank a toast. At one moment, Stalin's aide-de-camp seeing that Stalin was taking another kind of drink from the table, made an attempt to stop him and told him not to mix his drinks. He did so as it was his duty to take care of Stalin. Stalin laughed and said that it would do no harm. But when the general insisted, Stalin replied to him in a tone half angry, half in fun:

<<Leave me in peace, don't pester me like Tito!>> and looked me right in the eye, laughing. We all laughed.

By the end of the dinner he showed me a fruit and said: <<Have you ever tasted this kind of fruit?>> <<No,>> I said, <<I've never seen it. How is it eaten?>> He told me its name. It was an Indian or tropical fruit. He took it, peeled it and gave it to me. <<Try it,>>. he said, <<my hands are clean.>> And I was reminded of the fine custom of our people who, while talking, peel the apple and give it to the guest to eat.

In this unforgettable meeting with Comrade Stalin, both during the conversation in the garden and during the dinner, we talked in a profoundly comradely spirit about problems of the economic and socio-cultural development of our country, too.

As in all the other meetings, after inquiring in detail about our economic situation and the overall development of the new Albania, Stalin gave me a lot of valuable advice which has always helped us in our work.

I gave Comrade Stalin a general ;outline of the state of affairs with us, told him about the successes achieved in the realization of plans, about the great mobilization of the people, as well as about a number of difficulties and shortcomings which we were aware of and were struggling to overcome. <<Besides the shortcomings in our work,>> I told Comrade Stalin, <<the systematic sabotage of our economy by the Yugoslavs has created very great difficulties in the realization of plans in industry and other sectors. Now we are making great and all-round efforts to eliminate the consequences of this work of sabotage and we are giving particular importance to the sector of socialist industry, which, although taking its first steps, has great prospects in our country. Along with the construction of new projects, our mineral resources constitute a major field of great value in this direction. There is unexploited mineral wealth in our country. The group of scientists and geologists which the Soviet Government will send to our country this year, will provide us with further information on where these resources occur and in what quantities. On the other hand, we are exploiting deposits of oil, chromium, copper and other minerals. According to expert information there are big reserves of oil, chromium, copper and other minerals, not to mention natural bitumen, in our country. Through struggle and efforts with the mobilization of all our forces and possibilities, as well as with the credits granted by the Soviet Government, we have improved the exploitation of these valuable products. But we feel that big investments are required in order to step up the extraction of these products to the maximum. For the time being it's impossible for us to do this with the forces and means we possess. We have used the bulk of the credits accorded by the
Soviet Government and the countries of people's democracy.>> I went on, <<in order to improve the exploitation of the existing mineral resources to a certain degree. This means that, on the one hand, we are unable to exploit the already discovered underground assets such as chromium, copper and oil and those which will be discovered in the future, as we would like to, and, on the other hand, we are unable to, develop the other branches of industry at rapid rates.>>

<<Our Political Bureau has studied this question, which has great importance for the future of our people, and has arrived at the conclusion that, for the time being, we lack the internal means and possibilities to carry out this work ourselves on a full scale. Because of this we should like to know your opinion about whether you consider it proper to form joint Albanian-Soviet companies for the oil, copper and chromium industries. This might be a problem which we could put before the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance, but before doing this we want to know your opinion, Comrade Stalin.>>

In reply, after expressing his, joy about our successes in the country's economic development, Comrade Stalin told me that he did not agree on the creation of joint Albanian-Soviet companies and explained to me that though some steps had initially been taken in this direction with some of the countries of people's democracy, they had considered them wrong and given them up.

<<We shall help you today and in the future, too, >> he continued, <<therefore we are going to give you more people and more of everything else than we have diven you so far. We now have the practical possibilities to give you more because our current five-year plan is going on well.>>

I thanked Comrade Stalin for the aid they had given and would give us in the future.

<<Thank me when you receive the aid,>> he said smiling, and then asked:

<<What do your trains run on - oil or coal?>>

<<Coal, mainly,>> I told him, <<but the new types of locomotives we have received run on oil.>>

<<Do you process your oil? How is work going on with the refinery?>> he asked, continuing the talk.

<<We are building a new refinery with Soviet equipment,>> I said. <<Next year we shall instal the machinery.>>

<<Do you have coal?>>

<<We do,>> I told him, <<and geological-surveys show that our prospects in this direction are good.>>

<<You must work to discover and extract as much coal as possible,>> Comrade Stalin advised me. <<It is very necessary for the development of industry and the economy in general, therefore give it attention, because it will be difficult for you without it.>>

As at all the other meetings, Comrade Stalin displayed special interest in and concern about the situation of our peasantry, the development of agriculture and the policy of our Party in this important field. He asked me how we were getting on with cereal production and what seeds we used for bread grain.

I told Comrade Stalin that we had tried to increase the production of grain from year to year, because this was a major problem of vital importance to our country, that we had achieved a number of successes in this direction, but that we had to do still more work and make even greater efforts to ensure the bread for our people.

<<Your government must work with might and main for the development of agriculture,>> Comrade Stalin told me among other things, <<must assist the peasantry so that the peasant sees concretely that the government is taking an interest in him and in the continuous improvement of his life..>> Then he asked:

<<You have a good climate, don't you?>>

<<Yes, we do,>> I told him.

<<Yes, yes,>> he said. <<Everything can be planted and grown in your country. But the important thing is what you sow. You must select good seeds,>> he advised me, <<and for this you should seek our assistance. You must train many agronomists of your own for the future because Albania is...>>
an agricultural country and agriculture advances with good work and thorough scientific knowledge. Send an agronomist here to select seeds,>> he added. Then he asked me:

<<What about cotton? Is the peasant interested in cultivating it?>>

I told Comrade Stalin that in the past we had no tradition in the cultivation of this crop, but now we were increasing the area, planted to cotton from year to year. This was essential, because apart from anything else, the textile combine which we were building would be based on our own cotton.

<<You must encourage the peasant to produce,>> Comrade Stalin advised me, <<by paying him higher prices for cotton. When the socialist ideology is still not implanted in his consciousness, the peasant does not readily give you anything without first looking to his own interest.>>.

Further on, he asked me:

<<You still have virgin and unused lands?!>>

<<Yes, we have,>> said I, <<both in the hills and mountains and on the plain,>>. The swamps, and marshes, in particular, have been a plague both for our agriculture and the health of the people.

I added that in the years of people's power we were carrying out a great deal of work to drain marshes and swamps, and had achieved a number of successes but we had big plans for this sector and we should realize them step by step.

<<The peasantry,>> Comrade Stalin told me, must not leave an inch of land untilled. The peasants must be persuaded to increase the area of arable land.

<<In order to avoid the evils of swamps and combat malaria,>> he advised me, <<you must plant eucalypts. This is a very good tree and it grows in many regions of our country. Mosquitoes keep well clear of this tree which grows quickly and absorbs the water of marshes.>>

During dinner Comrade Stalin also asked me:

<<What do the Albanian peasants who visited the Soviet Union, say?>>

I told him that they had returned to Albania with very good and indelible impressions. In their talks with comrades and friends, at meetings and open discussions with the people, they spoke with admiration about everything they saw in the Soviet Union, about its all-round successes and especially about the development of Soviet agriculture. Among, other things. I told him how one of our peasants, who had been in the Soviet Union, described the sample of the Georgian maize. This pleased Comrade Stalin greatly and the next day I learnt that he had told it to some Soviet comrades who came to visit me. On this occasion Stalin, personally, had instructed them to bring me some bags of seed-maize from Georgia. Also on his instructions, that same day they brought us eucalypt seeds, too.

During this meeting, Comrade Stalin talked, as always, quietly and calmly, asked questions and listened very attentively, expressed his opinion, gave us advice, but always in a thoroughly comradely spirit.

<<There are no cut-and-dried prescriptions about how you should behave on this or that occasion. about how this or that problem should be solved,>> he would repeat frequently, according to the various questions, I raised. During the talk with Stalin I pointed out to him the stand of the clergy, especially the Catholic clergy in Albania, our position in relation to it. and asked how he judged our stand.

<<The Vatican is a centre of reaction,>> Comradely Stalin told me among other things, <<it is a tool in the service of capital and world reaction, which supports this international organization of subversion and espionage. It is a fact that many Catholic priests and missionaries of the Vatican are old-hands at espionage on a world scale. Imperialism has tried and is still trying to realize its aims by means of them. >> Then he told me of what had happened once in Yalta with Roosevelt, with the representative of the American Catholic Church and others.

During the talk with Roosevelt, Churchill and others on problems of the anti-Hitlerite war, they had said:<<We must no longer fight the Pope in Rome. What have you against him that you attack him?!>>

<<I have nothing against him,>> Stalin had replied.
Then, let us make the Pope our ally," they had said, "let us admit him to the coalition of the great allies."

"All right," Stalin had said, "but the anti-fascist alliance is an alliance to wipe out fascism and nazism. As you know, gentlemen, this war is waged with soldiers, artillery, machine-guns, tanks, aircraft. If the Pope or you can tell us what armies, artillery, machine-guns tanks and other weapons of war he possesses, let him become our ally. We don't need an ally for talk and incense."

After that, they had made no further mention of the question of the Pope, and the Vatican.

"Were there Catholic priests in Albania who betrayed the people?" Comrade Stalin asked me then.

"Yes," I told him. "Indeed the heads of the Catholic Church made common cause with the nazi-fascist foreign invaders right from the start, placed themselves completely in their service. and did everything within their power to disrupt our National Liberation War and perpetuate the foreign domination."

"What did you do with them?" he asked.

"After the victory," I told him, "we arrested them and put them on trial and they received the punishment they deserved."

"You have done well," he said.

"But were there others who maintained a good stand?" he asked.

"Yes," I replied, "especially clergymen of the Orthodox and Moslem religion."

"What have you done with them?" he asked me.

"We have kept them close to us. In its First Resolution our Party called on all the masses, including the clergymen, to unite for the sake of the great national cause, in the great war for freedom and independence. Many of them joined us, threw themselves into the war and made a valuable contribution to the liberation of the Homeland. After Liberation they embraced the policy of our Party and continued the work for the reconstruction of the country. We have always valued and honoured such clergymen, and some of them have now been elected deputies to the People's Assembly, or promoted to senior ranks in our army. In another case, a former clergyman linked himself so closely with the National Liberation Movement and the Party that in the course of the war he saw the futility of the religious dogma. abandoned his religion, embraced the communist ideology and thanks to his struggle, work and conviction we have admitted him to the ranks of the Party."

"Very good," Stalin said to me. "What more could I add? If you are clear about the fact that religion is opium for the people and that the Vatican is a centre of obscurantism, espionage and subversion against the cause of the peoples, then you know that you should act precisely as you have done.

"You should never put the struggle against the clergy, who carry out espionage and disruptive activities, on the religious plane," Stalin said, "but always on the political plane. The clergy must obey the laws of the state, because these laws express the will of the working class and the working people. You must make the people quite clear about these laws and the hostility of the reactionary clergymen so that even that part of the population which believes in religion will clearly see that, under the guise of religion, the clergymen carry out activities hostile to the Homeland and the people themselves. Hence the people, convinced through facts and arguments, together with the Government, should struggle against the hostile clergy. You should isolate and condemn only those clergymen who do not obey the Government and commit grave crimes against the state. But, I insist, the people must be convinced about the crimes of these clergymen, and should also be convinced about the futility of the religious ideology and the evils that result from it."

I remember that at the end of this unforgettable meeting Comrade Stalin gave us a piece of general advice: strengthen the internal situation well; strengthen the political work with the masses.

Stalin kept me a full 5 hours at this meeting. We had come at 9 o'clock in the evening and left at 2 after midnight. After we rose from the table, Stalin said to me:
<<Go and put on your coat.>>

We came out with the two generals and I was waiting to return to the room where we had our meeting in order to thank him for the warm reception and to say good-bye. We waited a little, looked into the room, but he was not there.

One of the generals told us:

<<No doubt he has gone out into the garden.>>

True enough, there we found him --- modest, smiling, with his cap on his head and his brown scarf round his neck. He accompanied us to the car. I thanked him.

<<Don't mention it.>> he replied. <<I shall phone you tomorrow. We may have another meeting. You must stay another couple of days here to visit Sukhumi.>>

Next evening, on November 25, I was waiting impatiently for the telephone to ring, but unfortunately, I did not meet Comrade Stalin again. At 1.00 a.m. of the 26th he had arrived in Sochi and sent to me his regards through the general who accompanied me. From Sukhumi, on the 25th of November 1949, I sent the comrades in Tirana this telegram:

<<Finished work yesterday. They will help us in everything. All I requested was agreed to with very great cordiality. I am well. Can hardly be there for the celebrations. My best greetings for the celebrations. I leave by the first means available.>>

On 25th of November we visited the town of Sukhumi, which had 60,000 inhabitants. The Minister of the Interior of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Georgia and another general accompanied me during the visit to Sukhumi. Sukhumi was a very beautiful, clean city, full of gardens and parks. There were many trees from tropical countries. Flowers everywhere. Among other things, I was struck by a wonderful park which had been built by the inhabitants of this city in just 50 days. The park was a little larger than the space in front of our <<Dajti>> Hotel. By night Sukhumi was ablaze with lights. Its inhabitants were handsome, smiling, looked happy and content. Not an inch of uncultivated ground to be seen. Stretching before our eyes were plantations of mandarins, lemons, grape-fruit, oranges, and grapes, boundless plains sown with wheat, maize, etc. The hills were cultivated and covered with fruittrees and forests. In the city and everywhere one saw tall eucalypt trees.

We went to see a state farm on the outskirts of the city. It was nothing but hills covered with mandarins, oranges, lemons and grape-vines. The branches of the mandarin trees were breaking under the weight of the fruit. One tree produced 1,500, 1,600, 2,000 mandarins. Sometimes we cannot manage to pick them all, the director of the state farm told us. We visited the place where the mandarins, etc. were packed. Women were working there. A big machine graded the oranges and mandarins one by one, according to size.

We also visited an old bridge built back in the 15th century and preserved as a monument of antiquity, as well as the botanical garden. It was a garden rich in trees and flowers of different varieties. We also saw a centre where they raised monkeys which get up to all sorts of amusing games. We were told that this centre had served Pavlov for his scientific experiments.

The Georgians were very kindly people. They welcomed and farewelled us in the friendliest way.

In the morning of November 26, the Soviet comrade who accompanied me came with the newspaper Krasnaya Svezda in his hand and told me the news of my promotion by the Presidium of the People's Assembly of the PRA. (1)

(1)At 8.00 hours of November 27, we left for Moscow by plane. The flight lasted 5 and a half hours. A few days later I returned to the Homeland.
Confrontation in Stalin's presence over disagreements of principle between the leadership of the Party of labour of Albania and the leaders of the Greek Communist Party. Present were: Stalin, Molotov, Malenkov; Enver Hoxha, Mehmet Shehu; Niros Zachariades, Mitsos Partsalides. On the strategy and tactics of the Greek Democratic Army. Varkiza. The tactics of passive defence is the mother of defeat. Why the defeats at Vitsi and Gramos? On the leading role of the party in the army. The place and role of the commissar. Nicos Zacharlades expresses his views. Stalin's evaluation.

During the talk I had with Comrade Stalin in Sukhumi, in November 1949, he asked me when we could meet the representatives of the Greek Communist Party to clear up the disagreements of principle between us and the leaders of that party. We were agreed on January, and after the Greek comrades agreed to this, the meeting took place in the beginning of January 1950 in Moscow, in the Kremlin. From the Soviet side the meeting was attended by Comrades Stalin, Molotov, Malenkov and a number of functionaries of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. From our Party it was me and Mehmet Shehu, while from the Greek Communist Party Nicos Zacharia des and Mitsos Partsalides. The meeting was held in Stalin's office.

Unpretentious and kindly as usual, Stalin welcomed us with a smile, rose from his desk and came to shake hands with all of us in turn. He opened the talk by asking me:
<<Comrade Hoxha, what have you to say about the comrades of the Greek Communist Party?>>
At the same time he addressed the Greek comrades by saying:
<<Let the Albanian comrades speak first, then comes your turn to put forward your opinions on what they will say.>>
Taking the floor I said:
<<Comrade Stalin, we have sent a letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union about the disagreements over matters of principle we have with the Greek Communist Party, especially with its main leaders. We have requested this meeting in your presence in order for you to judge whether we are right or wrong in our views.>>
<<I am aware of the questions you have raised,>>
said Comrade Stalin, <<but I would like you to repeat the problems you are concerned about here in the presence of the Greek comrades.>>
<<Of course I shall state here all the questions our Party has put forward in the letter we have sent you. We have discussed these questions with the Greek comrades, too, especially with Comrade Nicos Zacharia des, with Comrade Ioannides, with General Vlantas, with Bardzotas, and other comrades of the leadership of the Greek Communist Party. I would like to begin by pointing out that we have had disagreements, on a number of questions, but here I shall speak about the most important ones.>>
<<That is what we want, too,>> stressed Stalin.

Then I began my exposé:
Our first disagreement with the Greek comrades was over the strategy and tactics of the war of the Greek Democratic Army. Both for us Albanians and for the Greek people, the war against Hitlerite and Italian fascists was a liberation war, on which the fate of our peoples depended. We had to and did base this war on the heroic war of the Red Army of the Soviet Union. Right from the start, we Albanians were convinced that we would come out victorious, because our entire people had risen in a great liberation war, in which they had beside them the great Soviet Union, which would smash German nazism.

Our Party supported the Soviet-British-American alliance, because, through to the end, it considered this an anti-fascist coalition to crush the German nazis. But at the same time we never created the illusion that the Anglo-American imperialists would be the loyal friends and allies of the Albanian people. On the contrary, while supporting the alliance in general, we made a radical distinction between the Soviet Union and the Anglo-Americans from the beginning. With this I want to say that our Party, our army and the General Staff of our army not only never submitted to the dictate of the British and the Allied Mediterranean Headquarters, but even when we allowed them to give us advice, we took it with very great caution. We asked for weapons from the British but we saw they sent us very few. As you know, we waged partisan warfare, from which we went on later to big detachments up to the creation of the regular National Liberation Army.

The Greek people fought under the same conditions as we. They rose against Italian fascist aggressors, drove them back, defeated them and even entered Albania. Although our Communist Party was not founded at that time, the communists and our people helped the Greeks in their war against fascist Italy, although they were under occupation themselves. However, with the intervention of the Hitlerite army in the war against Greece, the Greek monarchist army was forced to withdraw to its own territory and was defeated. After that period, the Greek people, led by the Greek Communist Party, which created the EAM, organized the Partisan units and other bigger units later, began the resistance and the National Liberation War.

During the National Liberation War which they waged, our two peoples developed even closer fraternal relations. Friendly ties have existed between the Albanian and the Greek peoples from the past. As is known, many Albanians participated and played a very important role in the Greek revolution of the 20's of, the last century, led by Ypsilantes. However, this time the character of our war was the same and our communist parties were at the head of the peoples of our two countries. We established relations between ourselves, and even undertook military operations with combined fighting units against the German armies on Greek territory. Just as in our country, reaction in Greece, too, was strong and the occupiers were very well organized. This, too, was a phenomenon in common.

On our part, we made efforts and achieved some results in isolating the heads of reaction and in winning over elements that had made mistakes from its ranks. I cannot say with precision how they acted in Greece, but we have criticized the comrades of the leadership of the Greek Communist Party because the EAM and they themselves committed a major political mistake of principle in subordinating the National Liberation War of the Greek people to the Anglo-American strategy and placing it virtually under the direction of the British and the Mediterranean Headquarters. We addressed our criticism to Comrade Nicos Zachariades personally.

The person mainly to blame for this situation was Siantos, who in the absence of Zachariades at that time imprisoned in German concentration camps, was acting General Secretary of the Greek Communist Party. When we pointed out this matter to Comrade Zachariades later, he did not give me a clear answer, and leaned more to the view that mistakes had not been made. I persisted in the opinion of our Party, and in the end, I told Comrade Zachariades that Siantos was a provocateur, an agent of the British. Had Siantos been in our country, I told Comrade Zachariades, our Party would have put him on trial, and sentenced him to the punishment he deserved, while you did not act that way. Of course, that is your business, but this is our opinion on this matter.
<<As a conclusion, Comrade Nicos Zachariades agreed that 'Siantos should not have acted as he did,' that 'the comrades had criticized him for this, however, they did not put him on trial, but only expelled him from the party,' he said in the end.>>

<<Pursuing this matter, I would like to point out that we have had a series of political, ideological and military talks with leading comrades of the Greek Communist Party, and this is understandable, because we were two communist parties and had the one strategic aim - the liberation of our countries from the nazi-fascist occupiers and the reactionary bourgeoisie of each country.>>

<<We saw that, despite the outstanding bravery of the Greek partisans and their commanders, after Comrade Nicos Zachariades was released from the Hitlerite concentration camps, he occupied a leading position in 'liberated' Greece with the British army stationed there on the basis of the agreements signed earlier at Caserta and Cairo by representatives of the EAM, agreements which, in the end, led to the Varkiza agreement. Our Party did not agree with these actions of the Greek Communist Party, and considered them as a subordination of the Greek Democratic War, as a failure of its policy of liberation, and capitulation to Anglo-American reaction.>>

<<What is more, at a mass rally in the Athens stadium, at which the chiefs of the Greek bourgeois parties spoke in turn, Comrade Nicos Zachariades spoke, too, as leader of the Greek Communist Party, and declared among other things: 'If the other Greek democratic parties demand the autonomy of <<Vorio-Epirus>>, the Greek Communist Party will associate itself with them!' Our Party immediately protested publicly and warned that it would combat such views mercilessly. Following this event, we invited Comrade Nicos Zachariades to a meeting, at which I criticized him severely, describing his statement as an anti-Marxist and anti-Albanian stand, and I made it very clear to him that <<Vorio-Epirus>> which was Albanian territory, would never become Greek territory. I want to say on this occasion that Comrade Nicos Zachariades acknowledged his mistake, admitted to us that he had made a grave error in this direction and promised to correct the mistake he had made.>>

<<We may be wrong, but our opinion is that Marcos Vaphiades, whom they eliminated later, was a good communist and an able commander. Naturally, however, this is only an opinion of ours, which may be right or may be wrong, therefore we do not pretend to judge this, because, in the final analysis, this is a question which is not up to us, but to the Greek Communist Party, to judge.>>

<<Our opposition to the leadership of the Greek Communist Party, with Comrade Zachariades at the head, is based, in the first place, on Varkiza, where the Greek Communist Party and the EAM signed the agreement which is nothing but a capitulation, a surrender of their arms. The Party of Labour of Albania described this act as a betrayal committed against the Greek Communist Party and the fraternal Greek people. Not only should Varkiza never have come to pass, but it should be sternly condemned. I have expressed this view long ago to Comrades Nicos Zachariades and Mitsos Partsalides who was one of those who signed the agreement. We have respect for these two Greek leading comrades, Zachariades and Partsalides, but this action, inspired and carried out by them, was absolutely wrong and caused the Greek people great harm.>>

<<Nicos Zachariades has defended a thesis which is the opposite of ours on Varkiza. He has always insisted that it was not at all a capitulation, or a betrayal, but 'an act which had to be done in order to gain time and allow them to seize power'.>>

<<In connection with Varkiza, I asked Comrade Nicos Zachariades to explain the reasons for the condemnation and murder of Aris Velouchiotes, who, after the signing of the said agreement, set out to come to Albania in order to make contact with the Central Committee of our Party. Nicos Zachariades replied: 'Although Aris Velouchiotes was a courageous general, he was a rebel, an anarchist, who did not accept the decision of the Central Committee of the Greek Communist Party on Varkiza, therefore we merely expelled him from the Central Committee of the Party. But what happened to him later, who killed him, etc.,' Zachariades said, 'we do not know. We assure you that we are not the authors of his assassination,' he said.>>
I have expressed to Comrade Nicos Zachariades our opinion that, without wanting in any way to interfere in their affairs and without knowing Aris personally, only judging from the fact that he was a valiant fighter of the Greek people, he should not have been condemned. 'As for his assassination,' I said, 'we believe what you have told us, but on this score, too, we have some contradictions with you, because we are consistent on the Varkiza question.'

<<As Marxist-Leninists, we were very sorry for the Greek people, with whom we had collaborated during the Anti-fascist National Liberation War, therefore, later, at the moments when they were again faced with the question of liberation or slavery, we wanted to continue this collaboration.>>

<<I do not want to speak here about the internationalist support and backing which we gave the Greek Communist Party and the Greek National Liberation War, despite the very difficult conditions with which our country, just liberated from the occupiers, had to cope. Let the Greek comrades speak about this. Despite our great poverty, when the time came, we did everything we could to provide food and shelter to help the Greek refugees who had entered our territory. The fact that Albania was a friendly liberated country, where the people and the Party of Labour of Albania had come to power, a thing which enabled the Greek Democratic Army to feel secure and defended on its north-western flank, was of great assistance to the Greek Democratic Army.>>

<<After the capitulation at Varkiza, the Greek-National Liberation War was resumed. The Central Committee of the Greek Communist Party held its plenary meeting to which delegates from our Party were invited. On this occasion, changes were made in the leadership, however all these were internal questions of the Greek Communist Party. We simply rejoiced over and encouraged the fierce attacks launched all over Greece against the monarcho-fascists, who, seeing the danger of the situation created, went over from reliance on the British to reliance on the Americans. The United States of America sent the notorious general Van Fleet, whom they considered a consummate strategist, to command its army in Greece.>>

<<We have had contradictions with Zachariades, Bardzotas, and Ioannides over the character of the war that the Greek Democratic Army should have waged against the numerous regular forces of Greek reaction, armed with most modern means of warfare by the American imperialists. Thus, there has been a contradiction over principles between our two parties on this question, too. On the basis of our National Liberation War, we think that the Greek Democratic War should not have been transformed into a frontal war, but should have retained the character of a partisan war, fought with small and large units. In this way, Van Fleet's superior forces would not have been able to liquidate the Greek Democratic Army, but, on the contrary, this army would have harassed and attacked these forces from all quarters with the tactics of partisan warfare, inflicted losses and gradually weakened them, until it had prepared the counter-offensive. We supported the thesis that the Greek partisan war should have been based on the people, while the weapons should have been captured from the enemy.

<<Zachariades' views on strategy were in opposition to ours. The comrades of the leadership of the Greek Communist Party not only described the regrouping of the national liberation partisan forces, which they managed to carry out, as a 'regular' and 'modern' army in form, but they also claimed that they had equipped it with the strategy and tactics of the frontal war of a regular army. In our opinion, the forces which they regrouped were, in fact, just a partisan army, which they did not succeed in equipping either with the partisan tactics, or with the tactics of a regular army. On the other hand, in their military operations the Greek comrades followed the tactics of passive defence which is the. mother of defeat. This, in our opinion, was a grave mistake of the leading comrades of the Greek Communist Party, who have proceeded from the incorrect principle that partisan warfare has no final objective, that is, does not lead to the seizure of power. From the talks we have had with them, we have formed the opinion that the Greek comrades conceive partisan war as a war of isolated guerilla units of 10-15 men, which, according to them, have no prospect of growth and development into brigades, divisions, armymcorps, etc. This is not correct. As the experience of every such war has shown, and as our National Liberation War confirmed, provided it is well led, partisan warfare with small units grows gradually as the war develops, as the revolutionary drive of the
masses gathers impetus, and thus reaches the stage of the general armed uprising and the creation of a regular people's army. But the comrades of the leadership of the Greek Communist Party stubbornly defended their views and categorically excluded the necessity for the expansion and strengthening of partisan war in Greece. We have not accepted and do not accept these views of theirs. Allow me to express our opinion about how the situation presented itself at the time when the Greek Communist Party went underground and had to begin the war anew: At that time, the ELAS detachments had surrendered their arms, their bases had been destroyed, they lacked clothing, food, weapons; the morale of the ELAS fighters had declined, the movement was in retreat. From the outset, the Greek Communist Party described precisely these regrouped forces as a 'regular' and 'modern' army which, according to them could fight with the strategy and tactics of a modern army and withstand open frontal war with an enemy ten times its strength. We think that this partisan army should have fought according to the partisan tactics, as our teachers - Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, teach us. How can this regrouping of partisan forces which the Greek Communist Party carried out, be called a regular army when it did not have the necessary cadres, tanks, aircraft, artillery, means of communication, clothing, food, or even the most necessary light weapons?! We think that these views of the Greek comrades are wrong.

<<While calling this regrouping of partisan forces a regular army equipped, according to them, with 'the fighting strategy and tactics of a regular army' (strategy and tactics which were never applied in reality), the leadership of the Greek Communist Party also did not think seriously, in a Marxist manner, about how this army would be supplied. The Greek comrades said: 'There is no possibility of capturing our weapons from the enemy'. But such views, in our opinion, are contrary to the teachings of Lenin, who said that in no instance should you wait for aid from abroad, or from on high. but you must secure everything for yourselves: that in no instance should the organization or reorganization of detachments be neglected on the pretext of lack of weapons, etc. The comrades of the Greek leadership, underrating the enemy, thought that the seizure of power was an easy thing and could be done without protracted and bloody battles, and without sound, allround organization. These views of the Greek comrades brought other bitter consequences which caused their ultimate defeat, but the astonishing thing is that, even in the recent talks we have had with them, they consider their views correct.

<<However, in our opinion based on facts, the tactics and strategy for the war which Comrade Nicos upholds are wrong. In the conversation I had with Comrade Zachariades, he claimed that the units of the Greek Democratic Army could not penetrate deep into Greek territory, because the monarcho-fascists and Van Fleet had burned the villages and had deported the population, so that, according to him, all the inhabited centres were deserted. I told him that such a thing could occur, but not to the proportions Zachariades claimed. This was my opinion based on the logic of facts, because obviously, the monarcho-fascists and the American army could not possibly clear the population from all the inhabited areas of Greece.>>

<<Likewise we disagreed with the claims and views expressed in a letter of the Political Bureau of the Greek Communist Party addressed to the Political Bureau of our Party, in which the Greek leaders, wanting to avoid going deeply into their mistakes and wanting to hide them, claim that their defeats stem from their not being supplied with weapons, ammunition and clothing in the necessary quantities and that the enemy had domination in the air and on the sea and was amply supplied by the Anglo-Americans. The truth is that the enemy was much better supplied and had superior strength in men and matériel. However, in such a case, when you are conducting a war against internal reaction and foreign military intervention, the best course is that the enemy should become the greatest source of supplies. The Greek Democratic Army ought to have captured its weapons from the enemy, but these weapons could not be captured by following the tactic of defensive warfare, of passive defence. Nevertheless, we think that the basic question is not one of supplies. We think that, in rejecting the tactics of partisan warfare and its development to the general armed uprising and the seizure of power, the leadership of the Greek Communist Party has applied a defensive and passive tactic which is unacceptable either in a partisan war or in a frontal war with...>>
regular armies. By pursuing such a tactic, the Greek Democratic Army, apart from other things, deprived itself of the possibility of extending to other areas of the country where it would certainly have found an inexhaustible source of supply of manpower in the sons and daughters of the people, and likewise deprived itself of the possibility of capturing its weapons from the enemy through ceaseless, rapid, wellthought actions, carried out where the enemy least expected them. Marxism-Leninism teaches us that there must be no playing at armed insurrection, and the history of so many wars has confirmed that the defensive spells death for any armed uprising. If it remains on the defensive, the uprising is very quickly crushed by a more powerful and better equipped enemy.

<<In our opinion, the very tactic the Greek comrades employed confirms this. The biggest active forces of the Greek Democratic Army were kept permanently within the fortified sectors of Vitsi and Gramos. These forces were trained for defensive trench warfare, and a frontal war with the enemy army was imposed on them at the wish of their leadership and they accepted it. The Greek comrades thought they would take power by means of defensive and passive war. In our opinion, power could not be taken by defending yourselves at Gramos. The only manoeuvre the Greek Communist Party made (and this was imposed on it by the circumstances) was that in the battle at Gramos in 1948, where the truly heroic Greek partisans resisted for seventy days on end, inflicted losses in men on the enemy, but in the end, in order to escape encirclement and annihilation, broke out from Gramos and went over to Vitsi. However, this was still far from the seizure of power. The Greek Democratic Army should have carried out attacks to capture cities. This was not achieved. At that time, too, the Greek comrades claimed that they lacked the forces. This may be true, but why did they lack forces and where should they have found them? The Greek comrades did not analyse this problem deeply and did not solve it, either at that time, or later, in the proper Marxist-Leninist way. The tactics of the Greek comrades, as they putitinthe letter of their Political Bureau addressed to our Political Bureau, was to hold Vitsi and Gramos at any cost, as their base for the further development of the war, and they made success in war dependent exclusively on supplies, but without ever finding the correct way to secure those supplies by fighting.

<<Thus, suffering defeat after defeat, the Greek Democratic Army was forced to retreat and entrenched itself again in the zones of Vitsi and Gramos. This was a very critical phase, both for the Greek Democratic Army and for our country. During this period we followed the activities of the Greek comrades with great attention. Before the final offensive of the monarcho-fascists against the Greek Democratic Army, the comrades of the Greek leadership were of the opinion that their political and military situation was absolutely excellent, whereas that of the enemy, according to them, was utterly desperate. According to them, Vitsi is extremely well fortified and impregnable to the enemy; if the enemy attacks Vitsi, it has signed its death warrant. Vitsi will become the graveyard of the monarcho-fascists. The enemy has to launch this offensive because it has no other way out, it is on the brink of disaster. Let the monarcho-fascist army and the army of Van Fleet attack whenever they like, we shall smash them'.

<<Comrade Vlantas held that the enemy would direct the main blow against Gramos and not against Vitsi, because 'Gramos is less fortified, as it is situated on the border with Albania, and the enemy, after defeating us there, will turn back to attack us at Vitsi, because it thinks it can annihilate us there, since it borders on Yugoslavia. After fighting at Gramos and inflicting great losses on the enemy, we shall manoeuvre with our forces from Gramos in order to attack the enemy forces at Vitsi! from the rear.

<<But a little before the final attack, we informed the Greek comrades that the enemy would launch their attack on the 10th of August on Vitsi and not on Gramos. This information enabled the Greek comrades to avoid being caught by surprise, and to take measures in time. However, even after this, they still believed that the main blow would be directed against Gramos. According to them, the enemy attack on Vitsi, and not on Gramos, 'changes nothing for us. We have taken all measures both at Vitsi and at Gramos. Vitsi is impregnable,' they thought, 'it is extremely well fortified.. All the roads through which the enemy might attempt to pass have been made impassable. The enemy cannot bring his heavy weapons into the Vitsi zone, victory is ours.'
These were the views of the Greek comrades two days before the enemy attack on Vitsi. Within one day the monarcho-fascists captured the third line of defence at Vitsi and Vitsi was reduced in a matter of two or three days. There was very little fighting and resistance. This came as a great surprise to us. However, we had taken all measures for defence against an eventual attack on our territory by the monarcho-fascists. The Greek comrades, and Comrade Partsalides, who is present here, were not really convinced about the need for the defensive measures we had taken, and called them hasty on our part. The Greek comrades were not realistic.

Many refugees, among them democratic soldiers, who were routed, were forced to cross our border. What could we do?! We accepted them and accommodated them in allocated places.

The analysis which the Political Bureau of the Greek Communist Party made of the defeat at Vitsi did not satisfy us. We think that a thorough analysis was required, because grave mistakes were made there. After the retreat from Vitsi, Comrade Zachariades based the prospect of victory on Gramos. 'Gramos,' he said, 'is more favourable to us than Vitsi. The tanks, which were the decisive factor in the victory of the monarcho-fascists at Vitsi, cannot manoeuvre at Gramos,' etc.

It must be said that at that time Tito's betrayal had become known. Later Zachariades claimed, 'The only ones who gave the Greek refugees asylum were the Albanians, the Yugoslavs not only did not permit the refugees to cross into their territory, but even opened fire on them from behind.' Possibly this may have been so, we cannot say anything about it.

In a talk with Comrade Zachariades about the retreat from Vitsi, I again raised the question of their mistakes and the inability of the Greek Communist Party, and in particular, of the commander of Vitsi, general Vlantas, to form an objective picture of the situation. 'His ideas,' I said to Nicos, 'have been proved wrong. The fact that the Greek Democratic Army was unable to defend Vitsi, proved this.'

Nicos Zachariades contradicted me, saying that Vitsi fell because of the mistake of a commander, who had not placed the battalion allocated at one part of the front and failed to appear himself at his position in the fighting. Thus, according to Nicos, this commander was the cause of the defeat at Vitsi, therefore, he told me, 'We took measures and condemned him.' This was a very simplistic explanation on the part of Comrade Nicos for such a major defeat.

I told him frankly and in a comradely way that I could not believe such a thing.>>

'Believe me or not, that's how it is,' Nicos said.

'Nevertheless, I continued: 'What is to be done now?'

'Nicos answered: 'We'll fight.'

'But where will you fight?'.

'At Gramos, which is an impregnable fortress.>>

'I asked the question: 'Do you intend to place the whole Greek Democratic Army there?'

'Yes,' replied Nicos Zachariades 'we shall send it all back to Gramos.'

'I said, 'You know your own business and it is you who decide, but our opinion is that Gramos can resist no longer, therefore all those brave fighters of the Greek Democratic Army of whom you are the leader, should not be sacrificed in vain. You must handle your own affairs as seems best to you, however, as we are your comrades and friends, we would like You to summon Comrade Bardzotas, the commander of the Greek troops at Gramos, and discuss this matter with him.' Nicos opposed this idea of mine and told me that this was impossible.

'We know what happened later. Gramos became the final defeat of the Greek Democratic Army.

'The forces at Gramos were routed in four days. In our opinion, the war was not organized there. A completely passive defence was maintained. We do not exclude that fierce fighting may have occurred at some places such as Polje and Kamenik, where some soldiers of the Greek Democratic Army resisted with heroism. With the exception of the Kamenik forces the whole retreat from Gramos was disorderly, like that from Vitsi. Among the officers and men of the Greek Democratic Army there was murmuring about the wrong defensive tactics employed at Gramos. Comrade Zachariades has confirmed this to us.
We think that at the battles of Gramos and Vitsi the comrades of the Greek leadership did not keep in mind the Marxist-Leninist principles of people's war. The monarcho-fascist columns reached their predetermined positions with great speed and unmolested. They swept through the mountain crags and encircled the democratic forces, who stayed in their trenches and did not counter-attack; the enemy attacked, drove the partisans out of the trenches and occupied the fortifications. The command of the Greek Democratic Army had dispersed its forces in fortified positions and failed to use its reserves to counterattack and smash the enemy offensive by means of continual attacks and rapid manoeuvring.

We think that their erroneous views on the tactic of the war brought about their defeat. The men were capable of what was required of them, they were old partisans, tested, in battle, with high morale, who fought heroically.

On the other hand, by applying its tactics of passive defence the leadership of the Greek Communist Party allowed the monarcho-fascist army to regroup and reorganize, failed to attack in order to hinder the preparations of the enemy and bring about the failure, or at least, the weakening of its offensive, so as to allow the active forces of the Greek Democratic Army to manoeuvre on a large scale and strike incessantly at the enemy forces everywhere. These are some of the reasons which, in our opinion, caused the recent defeats at Gramos and Vitsi. In its analysis of the defeat at Vitsi, the Political Bureau of the Greek Communist Party says, 'the leadership has grave responsibility', but it says nothing about where this responsibility lies and, moreover, goes on to shed this responsibility in all directions. We think that this is not a Marxist-Leninist analysis.

To achieve success in their war, the Greek comrades should not have followed the tactic of passive defence, but should have thoroughly applied the Marxist-Leninist principles on the armed uprising. The tactic that should have been followed, we believe, had to have the aim of damaging the enemy forces incessantly and in many directions, of making the situation insecure for the enemy at all times, obliging them to disperse their forces, striking panic and terror amongst them, and, making it impossible for them to control the situation. Thus, the revolutionary war of the Greek people would have grown continuously, would have alarmed the enemy at first and then would have made it lose control of the situation, would have liberated whole regions and zones and subsequently gone over to the next objective, i.e., the general uprising and the liberation of the whole country. In this way, the partisan war in Greece had the prospect of development.

<<In the talks we have had with them, we have frequently told the Greek comrades in a comradely manner that the Greek Partisan Army must try to capture its armaments from the enemy in battle; must fight with the weapons of the enemy and secure its food and clothing from the people, together with whom and for whom it must fight.

<<We have told our Greek comrades that, first of all, the Partisan Army must be linked with the people from whom it has become separated and without whom it cannot exist. The people must be taught to fight together with the army and to assist it and love it as their own liberator. This is an essential condition. The people must be taught that they must not surrender to the enemy, and the ranks of the army should be strengthened with men and women, the sons and daughters of the people, by Greece itself.

<<Likewise, we have told the Greek comrades in a comradely manner that the leading role of the party in the Greek Partisan Army must be ensured more firmly; the political commissar of the company, battalion, brigade and division should be the true representative of the party, and as such should have the right to command, just the same as the commander. But we have noticed and have often pointed out to the Greek comrades that they have not taken a correct view of the leading role of the party in the army. On this problem I have expressed the opinion of our Party to Comrade Stalin previously and we deal with this again in the letter we have sent him. Failure to understand the leading role of the party in the army, we think, was one of the main reasons which led to the defeat of the C-reek Democratic Army in the war. We always proceed from the Marxist-Leninist teaching that the commander and the political commissar form an entity which directs the military actions and the political education of the units, that they are equally responsible for the situation of...
their detachment from every viewpoint, that both of them, the commander and the commissar, lead their unit, their detachment in the fighting.

<<Without the political commissar we would not have had the Red Army, Lenin teaches us.>>

We followed these principles in our National Liberation Army and follow them now in our People's Army. In the Greek National Liberation Army, ELAS, the joint command of the commander and the commissar existed, but this was not properly implemented in practice. The pressure of erroneous bourgeois views of career officers, who could not tolerate trusted people of the party in command alongside them, brought about that, at that time, the role of the commissar in command in the Greek Democratic Army was overshadowed and relegated to second place. This is a consequence of the views of the leaders of the Greek Communist Party on the 'regular army'. The comrades of the Greek leadership try to justify the elimination of the role of the political commissar by taking the army of some other country as an example, but we think that the Greek comrades are not realistic on this question.

<<Such mistakes were noticed even after the Greek National Liberation Army resumed the war. Since the dismissal of General Marcos this army had not had a Commander-in-chief. We think that such a situation was not correct. With us, the General Secretary of the Party has been and is simultaneously Commander-in-chief of the Army. We think this is correct. In time of peace perhaps it may not be so, possibly the Minister of Defence might fill this position, but in the conditions of the Greek Democratic Army, when it was still at war, there should have been a Commander-in-chief of the army, and we thought and still think, on the basis of our experience, that this political and military function belongs to the General Secretary of the Party. We have frequently expressed this view of ours to the Greek comrades. The reasons which the Greek comrades have given us to show why they did not act in that way, are unconvincing. The Greek comrades have told us, Comrade Zachariades is very modest', or 'we had bitter experience with Tito who was general secretary, prime minister and supreme commander of the army simultaneously.' It seems to us that this is not a question of modesty; this has no connection, either, with what they say about Tito, behind which, it seems to us that something else is insinuated.

<<We were astonished at a number of secret forms which the Greek comrades used, but we saw that the reality was quite different. We cannot explain these except with our impression that among the Greek comrades there was confusion, opportunism, false modesty and hiding of the leading role of the party. Perhaps, the General Secretary of the Party need not be Commander-in-chief of the army, but that an army at war should not have a Commander-in-chief, as was the case of the Greek Democratic Army after the dismissal of Marcos, has always seemed wrong to us.

<<The Greek comrades make no one responsible for this situation and for the subsequent defeats. They divide the responsibility, attributing it to both the guilty and the innocent. They put the blame on all the party members of the Greek Communist Party who have fought and are fighting heroically. We think that the comrades of the Greek leadership are afraid to make a thorough analysis of these mistakes, which we consider grave ones, are, afraid to put the finger on the sore spot. We also think that among some Greek comrades of the leadership there is lack of criticism and self-criticism, and that they protect one another in a comradely way' over the mistakes they have made.

<<The comrades of the Greek leadership have been opposed to our opinions, which we have expressed to them in a comradely manner as internationalist communists who are fighting for the same cause, who have great common interests, and who were profoundly sympathetic to the cause of the Greek people's war. They have not welcomed our criticisms.

<<Comrade Nicos Zachariades has raised many unpleasant things against us, which, of course, we have rejected. His declaration over ‘Vorio-Epirusp, which I mentioned in the beginning, is already known. Apart from other things, he quarrelled with us, accusing us of allegedly having requisitioned the Greek trucks which were used to transport, the Greek refugees and their belongings and demanded that we mobilized our trucks, too, for their needs. It is quite true that we used the Greek trucks to take the Greek refugees to the places allocated to them. We accepted the
Greek refugees and sent them to Northern Albania, where, regardless of our own difficulties, we had to supply food for them, that is, to share the bread from our own mouths with them. As to our means of transport, our park of trucks was very small and we needed them to send supplies to all parts of Albania.

<<The Greek comrades also criticize us for not giving priority to the unloading of the material aid, such as clothing, food, tents, blankets, etc., which came to our ports for the Greek refugees before they left Albania. This is not true.

The aid which came on ships from abroad for the Greek refugees was sometimes stowed under the cargo that came for us. In such cases obviously we had to unload the goods on top first and then those below. It could not be done otherwise; we do not know of any method of unloading a ship beginning from the bottom.

However, these were minor disagreements which could be overcome, as they were. The decisive questions were those relating to the political and military line of the Greek Communist Party during the years of the war, about which I spoke earlier.

Not only have the Greek comrades not accepted our views and criticisms, but we have the impression that they have taken them amiss, and indeed, in their letter to our Political Bureau some time ago, they make an impermissible and anti-Marxist comparison between our, principled views and stands and the views of the Titoites. In their distortion of the views expressed by our delegation about the battle of Vitsi and Gramos, in order to adapt them to their own incorrect reasoning, the Greek leading comrades, in our opinion, have the aim of hiding the mistakes made on their part. We understand the grave moments the leadership of the Greek Communist Party has gone through following the defeat at Vitsi and Gramos, and the sense of frustration and anger which exists among them, but such grave and unfounded charges are unacceptable to us, and they should have been considered and weighed up well before they were made, especially by the Political Bureau of the Greek Communist Party.

<<Following these accusations, which our Political Bureau considered dispassionately, we thought that the departure of the few Greek democratic refugees who were still in Albania had become even more necessary.

<<Whether we are right or wrong in these stands and views we have maintained, let Comrade Stalin tell us. We are ready to acknowledge any possible mistake and to make self-criticism.>>

Comrade Stalin interrupted me saying:

<<You must not reject a comrade when he is down.>>

<<You are right, Comrade Stalin.>> I replied, <<but I assure you that we have never rejected the Greek comrades. The questions which we raised for discussion had great importance both for the Greek army and for us. The Central Committee of our Party could not permit the Greek Communist Party to have the centre of its activities in Albania, nor could it permit their troops to be organized and trained in our country in order to resume the war in Greece. I have said this, in a comradely way, to Comrade Nicos Zachariades, who had previously asked that the Greek refugees should go to other countries, which in fact 1, s what has happened with the majority of the refugees. The reference was to a limited number of them who were still in our country. We have never raised the question of expelling the Greek refugees from our country. However, apart from the request made by Comrade Nicos himself, that the refugees go to other countries, logic forced us to the conclusion that, in the existing situation, even those who had remained absolutely must leave Albania.

<<These were some of the problems which I wanted to Vaise, and which we have raised both with the Greek comrades and in the letter addressed to you earlier, Comrade Stalin.>>

<<Have you finished?>> Comrade Stalin asked.

<<I have finished.>> I said.

Then he called on Comrade Zachariades to speak.

He began to defend Varkiza, stressing that the agreement signed there was not a mistake and expounded on this theme. He had expressed these same views to, me previously.
In order to explain the reason for the defeat, amongst other things, Zachariades raised the question: "If we had known in 1946 that Tito was going to betray, we would not have started the war against the Greek monarcho-fascists." Then he added some other reasons in order to explain the defeat, repeating that they lacked armaments, that though the Albanians had shared their own bread with the refugees, nevertheless they had raised obstacles, and so on. Zachariades raised some second-rate problems as questions of principle. Then he mentioned our request (which he himself had raised earlier) that those Greek democratic refugees who still remained should also leave Albania. According to him, this put an end to the Greek National Liberation War.

On this occasion, I want to express my impression that Comrade Nicos Zachariades was very intelligent and, cultured, but, in my opinion, not sufficiently a Marxist. Despite the defeat they had suffered, he began to speak in defence of the strategy and tactics followed by the Greek Democratic Army, insisting that this strategy and tactics had been correct, that they could not have acted otherwise. He dwelt at length on this question. Thus, each of us stuck to his own position. This is what Nicos Zachariades said. He spoke at least as long as I did, if not longer.

Comrade Stalin and the other Soviet leading comrades listened to him attentively, too. After Nicos, Comrade Stalin asked Mitsos Partsalides:

"Have you any opinion to express on what Comrade Enver Hoxha and Comrade Nicos Zachariades have said?"

"I have nothing apart from what Comrade Nicos put forward," said Partsalides, adding that they were awaiting the judgement of the Soviet comrades and the Bolshevik Party on these questions. Then Stalin began to speak in the familiar calm way. He spoke in simple, direct, and extremely clear terms. He said that the Greek people had waged a heroic war, during which they had displayed their courage, but that there had also been mistakes.

"As regards Varkiza, the Albanians are right," Stalin pointed out, and after analysing this problem, added: "You Greek comrades must understand that Varkiza was a major mistake. You should not have signed it and should not have laid down your arms, because it has inflicted great harm on the Greek people's war."

"As regards the assessment of the strategy and tactics you followed in the Greek Democratic War, although it was a heroic war, again I think that the Albanian comrades are right. You ought to have waged a partisan war, and then, from the phase of this war should have gone over to frontal war. I criticized Comrade Enver Hoxha, telling him that he must not reject a comrade when he is down, however, from what we heard here, it turns out that the Albanian comrades have maintained a correct stand towards your views and actions. The circumstances which had been created and the conditions of Albania were such that you could not stay in that country, because in this way the independence of the People's Republic of Albania might have been placed in jeopardy, we complied with your request that all the Greek democratic refugees go to other countries and now all of them have been removed. Everything else, including the weapons, ammunition, etc., which the Albanian comrades took from those Greek democratic soldiers, who crossed the border and entered Albania, belonged to Albania," Stalin emphasized. "Therefore, those weapons must remain in Albania," he said, "because by accepting the Greek democratic soldiers, even though it disarmed them, still that country endangered its own independence."

"As regards your opinion, according to which, 'If we had known in 1946 that Tito was going to betray, we would not have started the war against the monarcho-fascists,' this is wrong," Stalin pointed out, "because you must fight for the freedom of the people, even when you are encircled. How-ever, it must be recognized that you were hot in a situation of encirclement because on your northern flank you had- Albania and Bulgaria; all supported your just war. This is what we think," concluded Comrade Stalin and added:

"What do you Albanian comrades think?"

"We accept all your views," we replied.

"And you Greek comrades, Zachariades and Partsalides, what do you say?"
Comrade Nicos said:
<<You have helped us greatly. Now we understand that we have not acted correctly and will try to correct our mistakes.>> and so on.
<<Very good,>> Stalin said. <<Then, this matter is considered closed.>>
When we all were about to leave, Molotov intervened saying to Nicos Zachariades:
<<I have something to say to you., Comrade Nicos. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has received a letter from a comrade of yours, in which he writes that 'Nicos Zachariades is an agent of the British'. It is not up to us to solve this question, but we cannot keep it a secret without informing you about its content, especially when accusations against a leading comrade of the Greek Communist Party are made in it. Here is the letter. What can you say about this?>>
<<I can explain this matter,>> replied Nicos Zachariades, and said: <<When the Soviet troops released us from the concentration camp, I reported to the Soviet command with a request to be sent to Athens as soon as possible, because my place was there. Those were decisive moments and I had to be in Greece. At that time however, your command had no means to transport me. So I was obliged to go to the British command where I asked them to send me to my homeland. The British put me on an aircraft, and that is how I returned to Greece. This comrade considers my return home with the help of the British command as though I have become an agent of the British, which is untrue.>>
Stalin intervened and said:
<<That's clear. This question is settled, too. The meeting is over!>>
Stalin got up, shook hands with all of us in turn and we started to leave. The room was a long one and when we reached -the exit door, Stalin called to us:
<<Wait a moment, comrades! Embrace each other, Comrade Hoxha and Comrade Zachariades!>>
We embraced.
When we were outside, Mits's Partsalides remarked:
<<There is no one like Stalin, he behaved like a father to us. Now everything is clear.>>
Thus, the confrontation in the presence of Stalin was over.

FIFTH MEETING

April 1951

On the political, economic and social situation in Albania. External reaction aims to overthrow our people's state power. The verdict of the Court at the Hague. <<The enemy's attempts are uncovered and defeated through a high vigilance and a resolute stand>>.
<<Along with the construction of industrial projects you must strengthen the working class and train cadres>>. On the collectivization of agriculture. <<You need the Soviet specialists not to sit in offices, but help you in the field>>. Comrade Stalin severely criticizes a Soviet opera which paints the reality in rosy colours. At the 19th Congress of the CPSU(B) for the last time with the unforgettable Stalin.

The last meeting 1 had with Comrade Stalin took place in Moscow, in the evening of April 2, 1951, at 10.30 Moscow time. Molotov, Malenkov, Beria and Bulganin also took part in this meeting.
During the talk various problems were touched on about the internal situation in our Party and state, about the economic problems, especially in the sector of agriculture, about the economic
agreements which could be concluded with various states, the strengthening of the work in our higher institutions, the problems of the international situation, etc.

First, I gave Comrade Stalin a general outline of the political situation in our country, the great work the Party had done and was doing for the inculcation of a lofty revolutionary spirit in the masses, the sound unity which had been created and was growing stronger day by day in the Party and among our people, and the great and unshakeable confidence the people had in the Party. I told Comrade Stalin, «We shall ceaselessly consolidate these achievements while always remaining vigilant and ready to defend the independence and freedom, the territorial integrity of our country and the victories of the people against any external or internal enemy who might attempt to threaten us. In particular,» I told Comrade Stalin, «we follow with vigilance the ceaseless attempts of American imperialism, which through its lackeys, the nationalists of Belgrade, the monarcho-fascists of Athens and the neo-fascists of Rome, aims to overthrow our people’s state power and to enslave and partition Albania.»

I also informed Comrade Stalin of the verdict of the Court at the Hague. «As I have told you earlier,» I said among other things, «this court investigated the so-called Corfu Channel incident, and manipulated as it was by the Anglo-American imperialists, in the end unjustly condemned us and ordered us to pay the British tin indemnity. We did not accept this arbitrary decision, but the British seized our gold which the German nazis had plundered from the former National Bank of Albania. When the gold plundered from the occupied countries and carried away to Germany by the nazis was discovered, at its Brussels meetings in 1948, the Tripartite Commission charged with its distribution allotted Albania a part of what belonged to it. Now the British have seized a part of our gold, have frozen it and do not allow us to withdraw it according to the decision taken in Brussels.

«Close links among the external enemies of our country are now being established quite openly,» I told Comrade Stalin. «Their provocations against us from the Yugoslav border, as well as from the Greek and Italian borders, by land, sea and air, have been continuous. Apart from the openly anti-Albanian policy pursued by the present rulers of these three countries, fascist traitors, Albanian emigrants, bandits, defectors and criminals of every description are being assembled there, too, and being trained by the foreigners to be smuggled in Albania for the purpose of organizing armed movements, of sabotaging the economy, making attempts on the lives of the leaders of the Party and state, setting up espionage centres for themselves and their bosses, etc.

«We have always been vigilant towards these attempts by external reaction and have always given all their attempts the reply they deserved. Our Army and the State Security Forces have made their major contribution in this direction. They have been ceaselessly strengthened, well educated and are gradually being modernized, while mastering the Marxist-Leninist military art.»

Continuing my outline, I told Comrade Stalin about a number of military problems and the main directions from which we thought an external attack might come.

«How do you know that you might be attacked from these directions?» Comrade Stalin was quick to ask me.

I gave him a detailed answer on this problem and, having heard me out, he said:

«Regarding the military problems you raised, we have assigned Comrade Bulganin to discuss matters in detail with you.»

Then he asked a series of other questions such as: With what weapons do you defend your borders? What do you use the weapons you have captured for? How many people can you mobilize in case of war? What sort of army have you today? etc.

I answered these questions of Comrade Stalin’s in turn. Among other things, I spoke about the powerful links of our army with the people, saying to Comrade Stalin that the people wholeheartedly loved their army, and in case of an attack by foreigners, the whole of our people were ready to rise to defend the freedom and independence of the country, the people’s state power.
After listening to my answers on these problems, Comrade Stalin began to speak, expressing his joy over the strengthening of our army and its links with the people, and among other things he advised: <<I think that you have a sufficiently large standing army, therefore I would advise you not to increase it any more, because it is costly to maintain. However, you should increase the number of tanks and aircraft a little.

<<In the present situation, you should guard against any danger from Yugoslavia. The Titoites have their agents in your country, indeed they will smuggle in others. They want to attack you, but cannot, because they fear the consequences. You should not be afraid, but must set to work to strengthen the economy, to train the cadres, to strengthen the Party, and to train the army, and must always be vigilant. With a strong Party, economy and army, you need fear nobody.

<<The Greek monarcho-fascists, >> he said among other things, <<are afraid that the Bulgarians may attack them. The Yugoslavs, too, in order to secure aid from the Americans, clamour that allegedly Bulgaria will attack them. But Bulgaria has no such aims either towards the Greeks or towards the Yugoslavs.>>

In the course of the talk I told Comrade Stalin of the great work being done in our country to strengthen the unity among the people and between the people and the Party, and of the blows we had dealt at the traitor and enemy elements within the country. I told him that we had shown no vacillation or opportunism in dealing with such elements, but had taken the necessary measures to avert any consequences of their hostile activity. Those who have filled the cup with their criminal and hostile activity, I told Comrade Stalin, have been handed over to our courts where they have received the punishment they deserved.

<<You have done well, >> Stalin said. <<The enemy, >> he continued, <<will even try to worm his way into the Party, indeed into its Central Committee, but his attempts are uncovered and defeated through high vigilance and a resolute stand.>>

On this occasion, too, we had an extensive discussion with Comrade Stalin about our economic situation, about the achievements and prospects of the economic and cultural development of our country. Amongst other things I told Comrade Stalin of the successes of the policy of the Party in the socialist industrialization of the country and the development of agriculture and of some of our forecasts for the First Five-year Plan, 1951-1955.

As always, Comrade Stalin showed keen interest in our economic situation and the policy of the Party in this direction. He asked a series of questions about when the textile combine, the sugar plant, and other industrial projects that were being built in our country, would be finished.

I answered Comrade Stalin's questions and pointed out that along with the successes achieved in the construction of these and other industrial and social projects, as well as in agriculture, we also had a series of failures. We had analyzed the causes of the failures in the Central Committee of the Party in a spirit of criticism and self-criticism, and defined who was responsible for each of them. <<In particular, we are attaching importance to strengthening the leading role of the Party, the continuous bolshevization of its life, the closest possible links with the masses of the people, >> I told Comrade Stalin, and went on to a summary of the internal situation in our Party.

<<Why do you tell us of these problems which, you, Comrade Enver, know better than we do?>> Comrade Stalin broke in, and continued: We are happy to hear that you are building a series of industrial projects in your country. But I want to stress that along with the construction of industrial projects you must give great importance to the strengthening of the working class and the training of cadres. The Party should, take particular care of the working class, which will increase and grow stronger day by day, parallel with the development of industry in Albania.>>

<<The question of the development and progress of agriculture has particular importance for us, >> I told Comrade Stalin, continuing my discourse. <<You know that ours is an agricultural country which has inherited great backwardness from the past. Our aim has always been to increase the agricultural products and, bearing in mind that the greatest part of our agriculture consists of small private holdings, we have had and still have to take many steps in order to encourage and help the
peasant to work better and produce more. Results have been achieved, production has increased, but we are aware that the present level of the development of agriculture does not respond as it should to the increased needs of the country for food products for the population, raw materials for industry or for expanding export resources. We know that the only way to finally pull our agriculture out of its backwardness and put it on a sound basis for large scale production is that of collectivization. But in this direction we have been and are cautious.

<<Have you many cooperatives now in Albania?>> Comrade Stalin asked.
<<About 90.>> I replied.
<<What is their situation? How do the peasants live in these cooperatives?>> he asked next.
<<Most of these cooperatives,>> I told Comrade Stalin in reply to his question, <<are not more than one or two years old. Nevertheless, some of them are already displaying their superiority over small fragmented individual holdings. The organized joint work, the continuous state aid for these cooperatives with seeds, machinery, cadres, etc., has enabled them to put production on a sounder basis and to increase it. Nevertheless, much remains to be done to ensure that the agricultural cooperatives become an example and model for the individual peasant. Therefore, our main aim in the organization of agriculture is that, along with the strengthening of the existing cooperatives, greater aid and care for them, cautious steps should be taken also for the setting up of new cooperatives.>>
Stalin listened to me and advised:
<<You should not rush things in setting up other agricultural cooperatives. Try to strengthen the cooperatives you have, but you must see to it that the yields of crops in these cooperatives are high,>> he said. <<In this way,>> he went on, <<the members will be satisfied with the good results of the production in the cooperative, and the other peasants will see this and will want to become collectivized, too.
<<As long as the peasants are not convinced of the superiority of the collective property you have no way to increase the number of cooperatives. If the existing cooperatives prove beneficial to the peasants, then the other peasants will also follow you, too.>>

The talk with Comrade Stalin on the problems of our agriculture, on the state of our peasantry, on its traditions and mentality took up most of the time of this meeting. Comrade Stalin was eager to get as much information as possible, he was interested right down to the last detail, rejoiced over the successes but did not fail to make comradely criticism of us and give us valuable advice about how we should improve our work in the future.
<<Is maize still the main crop in Albania?>> Comrade Stalin asked.
<<Yes,>> I answered, <<maize and then wheat. However, in recent years, cotton, sunflower, vegetables, sugar-beet, etc., are being grown more and more.>>
<<Do you plant much cotton? What yield do you get?>>
<<We are continuously increasing the area planted to this industrial crop and our farmers have now gained no small experience. This year we plan to plant nearly 20,000 hectares.>> I told him, <<but as to the yield of cotton and its quality we are still backward. Up till now we have reached an average of about 5 quintals of cotton per hectare. We must improve this situation. Many times we have discussed and analyzed this problem which is of great importance to us, because it is connected with the clothing of the people. We have taken and are taking many measures, but, as yet, we have not achieved the required results. Cotton needs sunshine and water. We have the sunshine,>> I told Comrade Stalin, <<and our soil and climate are suitable for the cultivation of this crop, but we are still backward as to irrigation. We must set up a good irrigation system so that this crop, too, can go ahead.>>
<<To which do your peasants give more water, the maize. or the cotton?>> Stalin asked me.
<<The maize,>> I replied.
<<This means that your peasants still do not love cotton and underrate it,>> he said.
Continuing the talk, I told Comrade Stalin that recently we had discussed the weaknesses that had manifested themselves and the tasks arising for the further development of cotton-growing. I pointed out that from consultations in the field it turned out that, apart from other things, in some cases seed unsuitable for our conditions had been used, and I presented some requests for assistance so that work would proceed normally, both in the textile combine and in the cotton-ginning plant.

<<I think that some specialist may have made a mistake on this question,>> he said. <<But the main thing is the work of the farmer. As to your requests regarding cotton, we shall comply with all of them, if they are necessary. However, we shall see.>>

Several times in succession during this meeting Comrade Stalin inquired about our agricultural cooperatives, their present situation and their prospects for development. I remember that, among others, he asked me these questions:

<<What sort of machinery have your agricultural cooperatives? How are MTS working? Do you have instructors for the cooperatives?>> etc.

I answered all his questions, but he was not completely satisfied with the organization of our work in this direction, so he asked me:

<<This work is not going as it should. Thus, you run the risk of harming those agricultural cooperatives you have created. Along with the continuous qualification of your cadres, it would be as well for you to have some Soviet advisers for your agricultural cooperatives. You need them not to sit in offices, but to help you in the field.

<<If the main directors of your agriculture have not seen how agricultural cooperatives are run and organized elsewhere,>> continued Comrade Stalin, <<it must be difficult for them to guide this work properly, therefore let them come and see it here, in the Soviet Union, to learn from our experience and take it back to the Albanian farmers.>>

In what I said, I also told Comrade Stalin about the need to establish economic relations with other countries. After hearing me out, Comrade Stalin addressed these words to me:

<<Who has hindered you from establishing relations with others? You have concluded treaties with the people's democracies, which have accorded you credits. Please, try to establish agreements like that you have with Bulgaria, with the others, too. We are not opposed to this, on the contrary, we consider it a very good thing.>>

In the course of the talk I also raised with Comrade Stalin some problems concerning aid from the Soviet state for the development of our economy and culture. As on all other occasions, Comrade Stalin received our requests with generosity and said that I must talk with Mikoyan over the details and decisions on these requests, and I met him three times during those days.

Comrade Stalin accepted my requests for some Soviet university teachers whom we needed for our higher institutions, there and then, but he asked:

<<How will these teachers manage without knowing Albanian?>>

Then, looking me straight in the eye, Comrade Stalin said:

<<We understand your situation correctly, that is why we have helped and will help you even more. But I have a criticism of you, Albanian comrades: I have studied your requests and have noted that you have not made many requests for agriculture. You want more aid for industry, but industry cannot stand on its feet and make progress without agriculture. With this, comrades, I mean that you must devote greater attention to the development of agriculture. We have sent you advisers to help you in your economic problems,>> he added, <<but it seems to me they are no good.>>

<<They have assisted us,>> I intervened, but Stalin, unconvinced about what I said concerning the Soviet advisers, repeated his opinion. Then, with a smile he asked me:

<<What did you do with the seed of the Georgian maize I gave you? did you plant it or did you throw it out of the window?>>

I felt I was blushing because he had me in a fix, and I told him that we had distributed it to some zones, but I had not inquired about the results. This was a good lesson to me. When I returned to Tirana, I inquired and the comrades told me that it had given amazingly good results,
that famers who had sown it had taken in 70 or even 80 quintals per hectare, and everywhere there was talk of the Georgian maize which our peasants call << Stalin's gift.>>
<<What about eucalypts? Have you sown the seeds I gave you?>>
<<We have sent them to the Myzeqe zone where there are more swamps,>> I said, <<and have given our specialists all your instructions.>>
<<Good,>> said Comrade Stalin. <<They must take care that they sprout and grow. It is a tree that grows very fast and has a great effect on moisture>>
<<The seed of maize I gave you can be increased rapidly and You can spread it all over Albania,>> Comrade Stalin said and asked:
<<Have you special institutions for seed selection?>>
<<Yes,>> I said <<we have set up a sector for seeds attached to the Ministry of Agriculture and shall strengthen and extend it in the future.>>
<<You will do well!>> Comrade Stalin said. <<The people of that sector must have a thorough knowledge of what kinds of plants and seeds are most suitable for the various zones of the country and must see to getting them. From us, too, you should ask for and get seeds which produce two or three times the yield. I have told you before that we shall help you with all our possibilities, but the main thing is your own work, comrades, the great and ceaseless work for the all-round development of your country, industry, agriculture, culture and defence.>>
<<We shall certainly carry out your instructions, Comrade Stalin!>> I said and expressed my heartfelt thanks for the warm and friendly reception, and the valuable advice and instructions he gave us.

This time I stayed in the Soviet Union for the whole of the April.
Some days after this meeting, on April 6, I went to the <<Bolshoi Theatre>> to see the new opera <<From the Depths of Heart>> which, as I was told before the performance, dealt with the new life in the collective farm village. That same evening Comrade Stalin, too, had come to see this opera. He sat in the box of the first floor closest to the stage, whereas I, together with two of our comrades and two Soviet comrades who accompanied us, was in the box in the second floor, on the opposite side.
The next day I was told that Stalin had made a very severe criticism of this opera, which had already been extolled by some critics as a musical work of value.
I was told that Comrade Stalin had criticized the opera, because it did not reflect the life in the collectivized village correctly and objectively.
Comrade Stalin had said that in this work life in the collective farm had been idealized, truthfulness has suffered, the struggle of the masses against various shortcomings and difficulties was not reflected, and everything was covered with a false lustre and the dangerous idea that <<everything is going smoothly and well>>.
Later this opera was criticized in the central party organ also and I understood Stalin's deep concern over such phenomena which bore in themselves the seeds of great danger in the future.
From the unforgettable visits of these days, what I did at Stalingrad remains firmly: fixed in my mind. There, amongst other things, I went to the Mamayev Kurgan Hill. The fighters of the Red Army, with the name of Stalin on their lips, defended the hill not inch by inch but millimetre by millimetre, in the years of the anti-Hitlerite war. The soil of Mamayev Kurgan was literally ploughed, and its configuration was changed many times over by the terrible bombardment. From the hill covered with flowers and grass it was before the famous battle of Stalingrad, it turned into a place covered with iron and steel, with the remains of tanks which had crashed into one another. I stopped and respectfully took a handful of earth from this hill, which is the symbol of Stalin's soldier, and later, when I returned to Albania, I donated it to the Museum of the National Liberation War in Tirana. From Mamayev Kurgan, the city of Stalingrad, with the broad Volga River winding its way through it, was spread before my eyes. In this legendary city, an the basis of Stalin's plan for
the attack on the Hitlerite hordes, the Soviet soldiers wrote glorious pages of history. They triumphed over the nazi aggressors, and this marked the beginning of the change of direction of the entire development of World War II. This city, which bears the name of the great Stalin, was devastated, razed to the ground, turned into a heap of ruins, but did not surrender.

Quite another picture was spread before me now. The city ravaged by the war had been rebuilt from its foundations with amazing speed. The new multi-storied blocks of flats, socialcultural institutions, schools, universities, cinemas, hospitals, modern factories and plants, the beautiful new broad avenues had entirely changed the appearance of the city. The streets were lined with green-leafed trees, the parks and gardens were filled with flowers and children. I also visited the tractor plant of this city and met many workers. <<. We love the Albanian people very much and now in peace time we are working for them, too>> a worker of this plant told me. <<We shall send the Albanian peasants even more tractors, this is what Stalin wants and has ordered.>> Everywhere we were aware of the love and respect the great Stalin, the dear and unforgettable friend of the Albanian people and the Party of Labour of Albania, had inculcated in the ordinary Soviet people.

Thus ended this visit to the Soviet Union, during which I had my last direct meeting with the great Stalin, of whom, as I have said at other times, I retain indelible memories and impressions which will remain with me all my life.

In October 1952, I went to Moscow again at the head of the delegation of the Party of Labour of Albania to take part in the 19th Congress of the CPSU(B). There I saw the unforgettable Stalin for the last time, there, for the last time I heard his voice, so warm and inspiring. There, after showing that the bourgeoisie had openly spurned the banner of democratic freedoms, sovereignty and independence, from the tribune of the Congress, he addressed the communist and democratic parties which still had not taken power, in the historic words: <<I think it is you that must raise this banner, ...and carry it forward if you want to rally around yourselves the majority of the population, ...if you want to be the patriots of your country, if you want to become the leading force of the nation. There is nobody else who can raise it.>>

I shall always retain fresh and vivid in my mind and heart how he looked at that moment when from the tribune of the Congress he enthused our hearts when he called the communist parties of the socialist countries <<shock brigades of the world revolutionary movement.>> From those days we pledged that the Party of Labour of Albania would hold high the title of <<shock brigade>> and that it would guard the teachings and instructions of Stalin as the apple of its eye, as an historic behest, and would carry them all out consistently. We repeated this solemn pledge in the !days of the great grief, when the immortal Stalin was taken from us, and we are proud that our Party, as the Stalin's shock brigade, has never gone back on its word, has never been and never will be guided by anything other than the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and the disciple and consistent continuer of their work, our beloved friend, the glorious leader, Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin.
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