Albania today

It is by this name that we have called our new political informative review. It begins its existence under the conditions of the great creative drive that has included all the working people of socialist Albania to carry out in practice the historic decisions of the 6th Congress of the PLA. Our review appears at a time when the world is showing deep concern at Albania’s achievements and experience in the building of socialism as well as at our country’s stands towards the international questions in the interest of the freedom and independence of the peoples, of their social progress and socialist revolution, as well as at the struggle against U.S.-led imperialism and against Soviet-led modern revisionism.

«Albania today» will strive to meet, within its possibilities, this concern including and treating on its pages the various problems of socialist construction in Albania and of international actuality.

The review in its initial stage will appear bimonthly and will be published in three languages — English, French and Spanish. It will illustrate on its pages the qualitative changes which are noticed in the various fields of our national life as a result of the all-round socialist transformations. We shall publish materials and documents of our party, various political and ideological articles from our press, articles and commentaries on world events.

«Albania today» will acquaint foreign readers with the achievements of our country in the field of science and public education, with the creative work of our men and women in literature and arts as well as in other fields of culture.

The editorial staff will welcome the remarks and suggestions of their readers.
Dear comrades and friends,

We are gathered this evening at this fraternal dinner of Albanian communists and communists of Marxist-Leninist parties from all the continents. You came to socialist Albania to attend the congress of our Party, to become acquainted with its life and activity, to express your internationalist solidarity with us, to support us in our struggle and work. But your presence here is at the same time an expression of the steel-like unity characterising the Marxist-Leninists of all the countries, the soldiers of revolution, the ardent fighters against imperialism, revisionism and reaction.

At a time when the revisionist parties are swept over by a great disintegration and decadence, by the spirit of grouping, factionism, carriermiership and struggle for power, when they have lost every proletarian aspect and revolutionary feature, when the relations among them are characterised by dictate and subjugation, by bourgeois chauvinism and nationalism, our unity, of Marxist-Leninist forces, is rising and ever more strengthening on the sound basis of the revolutionary ideology of the working class and proletarian internationalism.

Our unity and cohesion are based on our common ideals, on the struggle we are waging against imperialism and revisionism, on the efforts for the defence of the vital interests of the working class and working masses, on the determined support we give to the peoples for their national and social liberation. Our common road is the road of revolution, socialism and communism. The banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, which the revisionists threw away, is now held by the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties, to which belongs the great historic mission of leading the working class and all the working masses in revolution.

Natural and understandable are the difficulties and obstacles with which the Marxist-Leninist movement is faced. Now the bourgeoisie with its regressive and propaganda apparatus, the various revisionists and opportunists with their demagogy and undermining work, the pseudo-revolutionaries and pseudo-socialists have thrown themselves against them. But now there is no force on earth that can stop the victorious march of Marxism-Leninism and communism. The revolutionaries have never retreated in front of difficulties and obstacles. The conviction in the justice and victory of the cause for which they are fighting, the firm confidence in the inexhaustible revolutionary forces of the working class, their loyalty to the principles give them life and make them invincible.

The whole of our party and people feel this force and determination in your participation in the congress and in the ardent greetings full of revolutionary inspiration, that you brought to our party and which were an expression of the militant internationalist unity binding us.

The revolutionaries never, and in no circumstance whatsoever, conceal their unity, but they affirm and uninterupptedly steel it.

In front of the enemy let us stand united like a granite rock, let us strengthen our ranks and thus united to a man, let us march always onward in the struggle towards the sure victory of our great common cause.

I avow myself of the opportunity to assure you that the new Central Committee elected by the 6th Party Congress, will consistently defend and implement the revolutionary line of our party. The Albanian party and people will tirelessly work to honourably accomplish their high task in the complete construction of socialism in Albania, will fight without sparing their forces so that the banner of socialism and Marxism-Leninism always flutter inviolate in our homeland. In full unity with the Communist Party of China, with all the Marxist-Leninist parties and forces, our Party, just as heretofore, will fight with determination against U.S. led imperialism and Soviet led modern revisionism. The revolutionaries and all the fighters for freedom and independence of the peoples will always find in the Albanian communists and people faithful and indissoluble friends through to the end, sincere brothers in good and bad days. We are fighting in the same barricade and, in full solidarity, will always advance shoulder to shoulder towards new victories.

Allow me, at this dinner of comrades of one and the same ideal and of the same front, where the spirit of proletarian internationalism prevails and where one heart beats, to greet once more our dear comrades and friends and thank them for the great honour they made to us and the pleasure they gave us by coming to Albania and attending the proceedings of the Congress. Allow me, likewise, on behalf of the whole party and Albanian people, to wholeheartedly wish the representatives of sister parties successes and victories in their glorious revolutionary struggle.

Let us raise this toast to the foreign comrades and friends present here and the parties and organisations they represent, to the Marxist-Leninist unity and proletarian solidarity.
"The Leadership And Class With Its Party And of The Socialist Rev

The Seventh Congress of the Albanian Trade Unions

Comrade Enver Hoxha addresses the Congress on behalf of the Central Committee of the P.L.A.

From the speech of Comrade Enver Hoxha
For me, as well as for the entire leadership of our Party and state, it is a great honour and a particular pleasure to find myself among you, comrades delegates, at this congress of your militant organization. Allow me to convey to all the delegates, to our heroic working class, the ardent revolutionary greetings of the Central Committee and the entire Party and to wish you complete success in your work.

This great assembly of the organization of the working class and the other labouring people of our country is being convened only a few months after the 6th Party Congress. At this congress, the Party took important decisions, laid down a major program of work, and assigned new tasks for the further material and cultural development of our society. Their realization will still further strengthen our country. Albania will march more rapidly on the road of its transformation into an industrial-agricultural country, the life of our people will become happier, and the complete construction of socialism will mark another big step forward.

These brilliant prospects have aroused unprecedented enthusiasm and a new upsurge of activity and efforts among all our working people in town and countryside, in factories and mines. Our working class has set about work with fresh energies. It has undertaken and is carrying out many revolutionary initiatives to implement the historic decisions of the 6th Congress of the Party and the tasks of the 5th five-year plan.

The Central Committee of the Party is confident that the proceedings of the 7th Congress of the Trade Unions and the decisions it will take will give a fresh impulse to the many-sided activity of the trade union organizations and will raise higher the impetus and mobilization of the working class at work, its revolutionary consciousness and mass actions.

Speaking of the great victories achieved by the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian people in all fields of socialist construction, Comrade Enver Hoxha said: We are proud of our socialist industry, of our factories, combines and hydro-power stations that have been built with the golden hands of the working class and are being run and exploited by it with great dexterity and ability. In the socialist transformation of the countryside and the development of agriculture we also see the important contribution the working class has made and its valuable help to the progress of our decisive importance in all the great successes that have been achieved in the development of education and culture, in the revolutionization of the entire cultural life of the country.

An important contribution to the attainment of all these important goals has been rendered by our people's intelligentsia, which together will all the working people, and under the leadership of the Party and the working class, has put all its
creative abilities at the service of the country and the cause of socialism and has worked tirelessly for the development and organization of production, the promotion of culture, education, science, etc. Everywhere, all our activity and achievement bear the seal of the creative work and the inexhaustible energy, the intelligence and self-sacrificing spirit of the working class, they bear the stamp of its revolutionary ideology.

In the complex and all-round struggle, full of difficulties and obstacles, that the working class, together with all the other working people, has conducted to overcome the backwardness inherited from the past and to build that socialist economy and culture which we possess nowadays, the working class itself has grown and been tempered. Its consciousness and organization have been raised to a higher level. The working class has grown more mature politically and ideologically, more prepared and more able to shoulder new important tasks and to better play its role and historic mission as the irreplaceable leading force of the entire life of the country, holding political power and the destiny of the country in its hands.

These results cannot be detached from the great leading and organizational work of the Party and its all-round activity to arm the working class with Marxist-Leninist theory, to raise its ideological, educational and cultural level and to promote its professional competences. In the future, too, the Party will work tirelessly to uncompro¬misingly promote the education of the working class, to raise its militant spirit and to deepen its ideological and political tempering.

The carrying out of the great tasks that have been laid be¬fore us, is the continuation of the uninterrupted and self-sacrifying struggle which our people are conducting for the construction of socialism. The working class, with its Party in the lead, stands, as always, in the forefront of this struggle.

Every time the Party has laid down new tasks and has opened new prospects for the construction of socialism, Comrade Enver Hoxha said further on, what the working class says, its thought and activity, have always been of decisive import¬ance for their realization. And this has not been accidental. It is the class, which, with its high revolutionary consciousness and spirit, with its creative and self-sacrificing work, promotes the triumph of our revolution, the construction of new socialist Albania. Therefore, the Party and the Government always feel it is indispensable to talk things over with you, comrade workers, and with the entire people; to solicit your advice on the problems raised by life and the socialist con¬struction of the country, to look into them together and joint¬ly find the most suitable solutions.

It is the right and task of the working class and its Party to ask of the party, state and economic organs, and all leading cadres, that they take all the necessary measures and organize work in such a way that the energies, efforts and abilities of the working people give the highest possible results.

For the organization and administration of our economy and the entire social life, the Party and state have made laws, have set up the necessary organs and vested them with ade¬quate power. All these are indispensable and have their signifi¬cance and importance. They should be rigorously carried out, otherwise the road will be opened to anarchy, sub¬jectivism, arbitrariness and spontaneity. But these laws and organs, however just and perfect, can never solve, by them¬selves, the great tasks set to us. Nor can these problems be tackled by inflating the apparatuses or by indulging in in¬cessant organizations and reorganizations.

The key to the improvement of work should be sought, first and foremost, in the strengthening of the consciousness of the people, so that they may correctly understand the tasks ide¬ologically and politically; it should be sought in the stren¬thening of responsibility, discipline and control at work.

The working class is directly and vitally concerned in the increase of production, in the rapid expansion of the productive forces of society. For this, it is necessary, first and foremost, that the working class itself, each worker, should set the exam¬ple of strong discipline, fight for organized work of high productivity and quality, and require the same of others, to¬gether with the greatest rigour.

The Party demands that every one, workers and cadres, em¬ployees of the state and economic administration, achieve the essential features of a revolutionary method and style of work. Discipline and rules are encroached upon both by some workers and cadres. But the infringement of discipline by em¬ployees is fraught with more serious consequences. Therefore, we should look into this problem with the greatest seriousness and demand the strengthening of order and discipline from the ordinary worker, the employee of the administration up to the leaders of the highest party, state and economic organs. Just as the workers are required to produce in quantity, qua¬lity and at cheap prices, the same class rigour should be ap¬plied to the intelligentsia and other working people who should do good, high quality and effective work. This means that they should go about their work with high productivity, and not inflate apparatuses and gather in one place cadres and employees who do more to hamper each other than create. Heavy apparatuses and excessive links cannot serve the rationalization of work, the promotion of technology and pro¬duction, and genuine scientific management.

Comrade Enver Hoxha sent on to deal with some questions relating to the sound organisation of the work for the solu¬tion of the great problems facing Albania. Further on he said: With us, in our socialist order, there are no contradic¬tions between the masses and their state power. Our state is a state of the workers and peasants. Therefore the working class and the peasantry, the labouring masses, are interested in the continuous strengthening of the proletarian state, of their state power, through a persistent struggle against bureau¬cratic distortions and against people's weaknesses and faults. When the working class and the labouring people hold to ac¬count criticism and condemn bureaucratic procrastinations, dis¬orders, irresponsibility, lack of control, and other shortcomings and bring to account the employees of the state organs and apparatuses, they rise neither against the Party nor their sta¬te power. Through such revolutionary actions they do not «deny», do not «suppress» the administrative functions of the state, which are indispensable for the direction of the econ¬omy and society, but make the people who exercise those func¬tions perform their duties better.

The Party has never permitted and will not permit in the future, any one, whoever he may be, to wether intentionally or unintentionally, to place himself above the Party and the working class, to impose his will upon the masses, to trample under foot the state laws and the rights of the working pe
Comrade Enver Hoxha addressing the working class Congress
ple or to disregard the voice of the masses. It is the duty of all the working people, especially the working class, to courageously raise their voice and strenuously condemn any manifestation of bureaucracy, to place under their control the entire activity of state, economic and Party organs, of the communists, cadres and employees, wherever they may work, whether elected or appointed. The opinion that there are people and institutions to judge their work does not represent the opinion of the Party. No unjust action can escape the eye and judgment of the working class, of the people. Bureaucracy crops up and becomes active in those places where the struggle against it is underestimated and relaxed. It is cowed when the voice of the masses is raised, when their control is exercised, when it is dealt powerful blows by the working class and its Party.

The great tasks laid down by the 6th Party Congress for the development of the economy and culture, and the many and complex problems that emerge from our impetuous development, comrade Enver Hoxha said further on, cannot be fulfilled and solved either by calling only on the conscience of the people or by taking only administrative measures. We should place the organization, management and planning of the economy on a more scientific basis so as to better harmonize the combination of social, collective and individual interests, always keeping in mind the knowledge and use of the objective laws of socialism. Our Party has always marched on this road, and it is for this reason that all these historic achievements have been attained and all these great prospects have been opened up. Now we are confronted with the task of the further improvement of our system of management of the economy, relying on the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and on the experience we have gained during all these years of socialist construction.

The interests of our economy, of our working class and people, require that we not only produce as much as possible, but also that we produce by using the least possible amount of labour, material and financial means, to turn out better and cheaper articles.

After having spoken about the great achievements made in this direction, Comrade Enver Hoxha spoke of the tasks facing us in the future to increasingly raise the efficiency of the economy, to strengthen the efficiency and the self-supporting management of the enterprises and to further improve the use of economic levers. Life, the development of the economy and culture, our socialist construction, he emphasized, are characterized by their impetuous advance and by the great transformations and successes that are the fruit of the conscious and self-sacrificing work of our heroic working class, cooperative peasantry, people’s intelligentsia, communists, and party and non-party leading cadres.

To this congress of the working class and all the working people comrade Enver Hoxha said were also invited many cooperativists, representatives of our peasantry. This is a very good thing, and demonstrates the strong and close alliance linking the working class with the peasantry. Or working class and peasantry will always march side by side, exchange experiences and help each other, because they follow the same road and have the same aims.

The peasantry are now faced with important tasks for the development of agriculture and the increase of agricultural and livestock production, which are indispensable for the advance of our economy and the raising of the people. The fulfillment of these tasks will be of decisive importance in fulfilling the whole five-year plan successfully. Conscious of all these tasks, our cooperative peasantry, working with fresh drive and enthusiasm to reach the tasks assigned to them and to make our socialist countryside more prosperous. In all their efforts our peasantry will ever as always, the direct support and unspiring all-round aid of the working class.

Our industry is faced with numerous tasks in order to help the countryside. It should supply agriculture with more fertilizers, insecticides and herbicides, more machines and tools, more construction materials and mass consumer goods. The peasantry is right to expect great aid from the working class for the improvement of the organization and management of cooperative economy and the strengthening of conscientiousness and discipline in order at work. The Party is confident that the working class will honourably fulfill all obligations towards the peasantry and play, as always, leading role in the construction of socialism in the countryside; just as the peasantry, on its part, will fulfill the tasks it has taken before the working class and the whole people of the town.

Your congress is convened at a time when great events are taking place in the world, which we cannot stand aloof from and feel unaffectedly. As always, our Party, government as the people as a whole, are analyzing with due care the development of the international situation, and are taking steps which conform with the defence of the freedom and independence of the country and the construction of socialism in Albania, and promote the cause of revolution and the liberation of the peoples throughout the world.

The international position of socialist Albania is strong and unshakable. As a result of its revolutionary activity in the struggle of its correct internationalist policy and determined anti-imperialist and anti-revisionist stand, our country, by winning the sympathy of the progressive and peace-loving people throughout the world, has made numerus and powerful friends who wish us well, and help us unspiringly.

The friendship and collaboration between the Albanian people and the Chinese people, between the two parties and governments, is strengthened with each passing day. This friendship is based and develops on the solid foundations of Marxism-Leninism, proletarian internationalism, on the basis of our common interests and aims. Being such, it continues to resist all tests; it will be increasingly tempered for the good of our two peoples and the cause of revolution and socialism the world over. Our Party and people will always strive for the unceasing promotion and strengthening of the close revolutionary Albanian-Chinese links, their fruitful collaboration and mutual respect and fraternal aid.

The brilliant successes that the Chinese working class and people have achieved under the wise leadership of the glorious Chinese Communist Party and the great Marxist-Leninist comrade Mao Tse-tung, are also our own successes. They

Comrade Enver Hoxha embracing the young pioneers who have come to greet the Congress.
our hearts with joy, and we wish our Chinese working class comrades and all the Chinese people new and greater achievements in the future in order to make great People's China an increasingly strong bulwark of revolution and socialism in the world, an impregnable base for the anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples.

The Albanian working class, just like the entire Albanian people, are boundlessly joyful to see that over these last years, the revolutionary activity of the working people, together with their class consciousness, is rising rapidly in all the capitalist and revisionist countries.

While the bourgeoisie and the Soviet-led modern revisionists are in the grip of a serious crisis which has swept over the economic, ideological and political fields, the working class, in one place earlier, in another place later, here with greater determination, there with lesser force, is coming onto the battlefield and seeking to seize power and the role history has assigned it. There is no doubt that the intensity, fierceness and the degree of political and ideological awareness of the world revolutionary movement will mount and deepen. The revolution cannot be stopped either by bourgeois suppression or revisionist treason.

An irresistible tendency of contemporary history is the powerful movement of the peoples for national liberation from the imperialist, colonialist and neo-colonialist yoke. The brilliant victories the Vietnamese people have achieved in their struggle against US imperialist aggression once more shows that people who fight heroically for their independence are unconquerable.

It is more than a month now since the heroic fighters of south Vietnam have stepped up their courageous attacks, the biggest and most powerful since the great offensive of 1968. They have succeeded in liberating many cities and regions, in laying a merciless siege round the big US military bases and in causing the enemy incalculable damage. Washington's «Vietnamization» strategy has been deeply shattered, and by now, we can say that it has completely failed. It has been proved that neither now, nor in the future, can there be such a thing as «Vietnamization». There is only one way open to Nixon: to withdraw from Vietnam as soon as possible, to leave the Vietnamese and all the Indochinese to solve their problems by themselves, in a climate of freedom and complete independence from any foreign aggression and intervention. The persistence of the US administration to continue its military violence and political manoeuvres in order to achieve what it failed to achieve on the battlefield, are destined to fail shamefully as has been the case up till now. The continuation of the aggression can never prevent the Vietnamese people from liberating their country and realizing their national aspirations. The future of the Vietnamese and other Indochinese people is assured. They are building it now through their just struggle for freedom and independence, with their blood and innumerable sacrifices.

The Albanian working class and people, confident of their inevitable victory, will continue until the end to be at one with the fraternal Vietnamese people and will give them all-out support.

The Party and State leaders among the delegates to the Congress
The Albanian people give also unreserved support and are in full solidarity with the just struggle of the fraternal Palestinian and other Arab peoples against Israeli-imperialist aggression.

The struggle of the Vietnamese people, just as that of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America against imperialism, and first and foremost, against US imperialism, confirm that no plundering power, however big and strong, can halt the national-liberation impetus of the people, nor can it prevent the toppling of the old relations of imperialist dependence, oppression and exploitation.

The peoples of the world have risen and are resisting with determination the policy of violence and hegemony followed by the US imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists, the attempts they are making at expansion and to divide the world into zones of influence and the policy of dictate and arbitrariness of the two imperialist superpowers. The working masses particularly oppose the demagogy and deceitful slogans of the old and new imperialists, who, pretending they are concerned for international peace and security, seek to foul the vigilance of the people, to prevent them from uniting into a general anti-imperialist and anti-revisionist front and to disarm all their revolutionary opponents, ideologically and politically.

But the attempts of the US imperialists, Soviet social-imperialists and all the reactionaries cannot halt the triumphant march of the people of the world, of the international working class, towards national and social emancipation, towards revolution.

Socialism is the future of mankind, therefore it cannot be stopped nor evaded.

The great historic victories that are being won by the working people of the capitalist and revisionist countries in their struggle against imperialism and the national bourgeoisie, is a further source of powerful inspiration, a further great encouragement to work with still greater enthusiasm in our country to attain the targets assigned to us and to promote still higher the cause of socialist construction in Albania.

Allow me, dear comrade delegates, to avail myself of this opportunity to welcome the representatives of the trade union of the fraternal countries and the revolutionary workers who are attending the proceedings of this congress, and through them, the working class and all the working people of all countries they have come from and to wish them success and victories in the noble struggle they are waging.

The Albanian working class, all our working people, just as they have done until now, comrade Enver Hoxha said in conclusion, will strive to unceasingly strengthen the internationalist solidarity with their class brothers in the other countries and will resolutely support the struggle of the working people throughout the world against imperialism and capitalist exploitation and for national independence, democracy and social justice; for the final triumph of the great cause of proletariat - socialism.

The Albanian workers and peasants...
Enver Hoxha

Freedom, independence, sovereignty and self-government are the most cherished aspirations for a people who must fight in hand and with any other means available in order to gain them and, after gaining them, they should be continually vigilant and fully armed to defend them at all costs against anyone who would attempt to violate and destroy them.
Albanian People Fight, Work And Live Happily In The Party Epoch

By we are celebrating with great joy the 60th anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Albania. Since 1912 the Albanian people have always called November 28 the «National day» and have connected it with the hero city of Vlora, where independence was achieved and the red flag with the double-headed eagle was raised, symbol of freedom, of the sovereignty of the homeland and of the unity of all the Albanians who had continually with arms, with the pen and through struggle for the formation of a single Albania that would exist within its borders the Albanian territories and whole Albanian people, with their customs, habits, culture and their common mother tongue. All these natural and lawful rights were denied to the Albanian people by the imperialist powers and the other capitalist states, their satellites.

Before as well as after the year 1912, when the independent Albanian State was proclaimed in Vlora, our sacred lands, drenched with the blood of our fighting people who had never bent before slavery, had continually become a market commodity of the predatory foreign powers. The map of Albania was assuming the different colours of those states which were dismembering and enslaving our homeland, in accordance with the interests of one or another.

Even after the fixing of Albania’s borders by the great imperialist powers, as a result of the uninterrupted liberation struggles of our forefathers, from the legendary time of Scanderbeg up to the Balkan wars against the Ottoman empire, during which the Albanians played one of the decisive roles in the weakening of the sick man of the Bosphorus, there was no certainty for our longsuffering people.

V. HOXHA — First Secretary of the CC of the PLA.

Delivered in the hero city of Vlora, on November 28th, on the occasion of the celebrations of the 60th anniversary of independence and the 28th anniversary of the liberation of the homeland.
Our people, guided by their Marxist-Leninist Party, by the force of arms drove the foreign invaders out of the borders of the homeland; they liquidated the traitors and treachery, they eliminated the old power of the feudals and capitalists and established their new power; they liquidated the enemy classes, they tempered the alliance of the working class and the peasantry and are building the socialist society. Today, the Albanian people are fighting, working and living happily in the epoch of the party...

The party teaches the people to be vigilant in the face of any danger whatever which may come from abroad, be it a danger of armed aggression or a danger of the loss of freedom and independence which might come through economic enslavement on the part of the imperialist metropoles, with U.S. imperialism at the head, and social-imperialist metropoles, with the Soviet revisionists at the head. In order to cope with the two danger, the Albanian people and their party must be armed and must make no concession whatsoever...
After the historic event of Vlora, the great patriot, the outstanding statesman and diplomat Ismail Qemal, traveling to London at the head of a delegation for the defense of the rights and borders of the homeland, was accompanied among others by the brave, wise and fiery Albanian patriot from Kosovo, IsaBoletini. The legend says that when IsaBoletini was going to meet the British Foreign Minister, before entering his room, he was asked to remove his pistol from his waist. After the end of the talk, when the British Minister was taking leave of him, he told Isa in a bragging way that until that time nothing had been able to disarm him, but now, the day had come when he was disarmed in London. Isa Boletini, after having firmly placed in his belt the silver pistol he had handed over to the guard, took out another pistol from the inner pocket of his gold-embroidered waistcoat and, in answer to the British Minister, told him there and then: "No, indeed, not in London either", giving to understand by this that at no time can any state whatsoever disarm the Albanians when it is a question of defending their own rights.

The historical facts showed that, even after the fixing of the borders of our country, the secret London treaties had again divided Albania among her neighbours. Again in 1917, at the time of the first great world war, the historical documents prove that the Entente powers proposed to Charles Habsburg, the emperor who replaced Franz Joseph, that they were accepting an armistice from the Austro-Hungarian empire if the latter, among other conditions, agreed to Albania being gobbled up by the Serbian state. And this emperor granted them this gift as if our country were a handkerchief which he could buy in the stores of Vienna or Budapest. This event has gone down in history as the "Slavs of Bourbon question". In these grave conditions, in struggle against the imperialist powers and the chauvinism of the neighboring states, in struggle against their innumerable and diabolic intrigues which were preventing them from achieving their sacred aims of liberation and of the creation of a free and independent Albania, our people fought for decades until they reached that day of November 28, the 60th anniversary of which we are celebrating today.

The Albanian people, as the decisive factor that has made and is making their history, themselves created the favorable conditions to reach this great historic day. At the same time there is merit in the great Albanian patriots, with Ismail Qemal at the head, who knew how to act with courage and maturity at those moments decisive for the destiny of the homeland.

The old man of Vlora and his companions, such as Luigi Gurunguri, Bajram Curri, Isa Boletini, Pandeli Cole and others, became the soul of the liberation uprisings which broke out in the years 1910-1912, of the militant meetings of the Albanians for freedom and independence, which were prevalent everywhere, in the South and North of Albania, in Peja and Gjakova, in Prirovo, and Prishtina, in Derna and Gucia, in Dibona and Shkup, in Romania, France, Turkey and in the United States of America. Precisely in these circumstances, Ismail Qemal began his triumphant march from Istanbul to Budapest, Vienna, Trieste and arrived in Durres, then, through the mud of Niksac, he arrived at last in Vlora where he was awaited by representatives"
20th of November 1912 in Vlora.

The patriot Ismail Qemal greeting the people from the balcony where he raised the flag of national independance.
from all the regions of Albania for the great historic event, to perform the lofty mission with which the people had entrusted him - the proclamation of national independence and the creation of the independent Albanian state. To these great torch-bearers of the struggle for freedom and national independence, the people and the Party of Labour of Albania erected the majestic monument in Vlora at the same place where the flag was raised 60 years ago on November 28. The immortal people, their coming generations, will come wave after wave to honour with admiration, respect and profound gratitude the titanic efforts of their predecessors and of their sons who fought for the freedom and independence of the people.

But from November 28, 1912 until November 29, 1944 the Albanian people had to fight uninterruptedly for fully 32 years against internal and external enemies, against hunger, diseases, and medieval ignorance. The Albanian people had to fight against the local feudal satraps and the countless intrigues of the imperialist powers which were tightening the noose round their necks; they had to fight against the bandit regime of the arch-hangman Ahmet Zogollu who sold out the whole of Albania to the Italian fascists, and prepared the way for her occupation.

The Albanian people had finally to wear the bloodiest and the most glorious armed struggle in their history - the national liberation struggle, led by the Albanian Communist Party, to raise again in Vlora and throughout Albania the triumphant red flag of freedom, with its two-headed eagle, which now had in the centre the bright star of the party and of the partisans. A new page was opened in the continuation of the glorious history of our people, the bright epoch of socialism and communism was opening.

What did all the events at these 32 years I have spoken of teach the people, and what conclusions did they draw from them? Freedom, independence, sovereignty and self-government are the most cherished aspirations for a people who must fight arms in hand and with any others means available in order to gain them and, after gaining them, they should be continually vigilant and fully armed to defend them at all costs against anyone who would attempt to violate and destroy them.

The various imperialist powers and capitalist states have at all times been sworn enemies of the Albanian people. They have always caused them harm, they have attacked them, murdered them, divided them, deceived, partitioned and enslaved them. Therefore, the people must have no confidence in them, they must nourish no illusion whatsoever about their pretended aid, they should always be vigilant and never fall into the trap of their demagogy, treat every problem with them as equals and in no case should they succumb to their threats and blackmail.

If anyone attempts a show of force against our people, the people, too, should show them their force. "Unity is strength", our people say. Therefore, in fair weather and in foul they must preserve their steel-like unity, to advance towards wellbeing and progress and also to withstand any storm which may come. Thirty-two years of struggles, sufferings and toil taught our people that, to be united, they must radically settle accounts with their internal enemies, with the feudalists, the wealthy peasants and chieftains, the religions and the reactionary men, with bandit politicians and highway robbers, the usurpers and deceivers - all these microbes of a wound of the medieval past and of the imperialist capitalism of the new age.

These thirty-two years of struggle, sufferings and toil taught the Albanian people to wage a merciless war against their eyes and arm them, because they had to set to the great battle for the building of a new life, full of happiness and dignity, in order to come rapidly the centuries of backwardness.

In the great test of these years the people felt colossal energies they had in themselves, they drew great states and powers in battles, having full confidence in themselves that they would break through might and would make their homeland flourish, would raise their spiritual lives, because they had already taken it to their hands and, after all these tragic tests, would never let this power escape from their hands. Finally, and one of the most important aspects, a great and brilliant lesson in history drawn by the Albanian people; the real road to liberation was shown by the Party of Labour of Albania, their glorious offspring, a party intrepid in battles, a wise, modest and honest like the people who gave birth to it in storm and tempest, a party which they themselves nourished in their mountains, sharing their food, and shedding their blood, a party of communists which holds and will always hold and will unceasingly the banner of Marxism-Leninism, the party renewed in the people the strength of spirit and body, it tempered in them the force of the sword and the rifle and ardently kindled the desire to live, to work and to learn in their free and sovereign homeland. The party sharpened in them the mental and physical capabilities to set up their people's power and build the socialist system.

Since the day of liberation, November 29, 1944 until now, November 29, 1972, twenty-eight years have passed. During this important historic period our people, guided by their Marxist-Leninist party, by the force of its programmes drove the foreign invaders out of the borders of their homeland; they liquidated the traitors and treacherous, they eliminated the old power of the feudalists and capitalists, they established their new power; they liquidated the four classes, they tempered the alliance of the working class and the peasantry and are building the socialist society.

Today, the Albanian people are fighting, working and living happily in the epoch of the party. What did this brilliant epoch, which is not a very long one, bring to our people? All good things and not one bad. Today the people are masters in their own country. Albania emerged from darkness into light, the was completely reconstructed, with cities and villages, roads and railways, factories, sugar factories, cotton and tobacco factories, steel mills, marble quarries, where the people are working. Magnificent power and hydroelectric stations were constructed. The power was brought to the whole country, the ferrous and non-ferrous industry is under construction, roads and railroads are completed. The village and the city have become the happy home of the Albanian people. Albanian sovereignty has been recognized by all the countries of the world. The Albanian people have been given the freedom and happiness that nature and history have prepared for them.
have been built agriculture, thanks to collectivization, mechanization and the implementation of modern agrotechnology, has made a great leap forward. Education has become like food for our people. There is no village anywhere no city, no factory, no workshop without schools of various kinds. Schools and light everywhere for the minds and hearts of our men and women. Cultural and sport centres, hospitals, out-patient clinics, maternity homes, etc., have been set up in all parts of Albania. The living standard of our people, compared with the pre-liberation period, has been raised and is constantly on the rise. Taking into consideration the wretched past of our people, we know how correctly and realistically evaluate this rise of the living standard, because we are aware of where we have started from, and at the same time it is clear to us where we will get to. We have raised and shall continue to raise this living standard, relying on our own forces, with our own sweat, without enslaving our homeland and the people, either economically or politically.

The party teaches the people to be vigilant in the face of any danger whatever which may come from abroad, be it a danger of armed aggression or a danger of the loss of freedom and independence which might come through economic enslavement on the part of the imperialist metropoles, with U.S. imperialism at the head, and social-imperialist metropoles, with the Soviet revisionists at the head. In order to cope with the two dangers, the Albanian people and their party must be armed and must make no concession whatsoever.

We stand for peaceful coexistence, on the known principles of great Lenin, allowing nobody at any moment whatever to violate our legitimate rights.

Someone might smile and say: ‘But would the imperialist powers be afraid of acting against socialist Albania?’ We reply to this, that neither are the Albanian people afraid of them. Imperialism and social imperialism are afraid of the peoples, of the revolution and of Marx’s ideas which inspire and guide them onward. Socialist Albania is marching in the van of this proletarian revolution and she is not alone. Her faithful friends and comrades are the peoples of the world, the world proletariat, who are oppressed and cruelly exploited by imperialism and social-imperialism in the most barbarous way.

We must arm our people well against the capitalist-revisionist propaganda and demagogy which claim that we are allegedly isolated from the world, from the progressive science, from their generous aid. What in fact is the aid they pretend they would give us through their credits? It means selling out our country to them, allowing the imperialists and the revisionists to invest their capitals in Albania, to suck the blood and sweat of our people, so that we should become satellites of the big monopolies and metropoles; that we would adopt their degenerated way of living, so that the consumer society should be established with its attendant evils, so that the

The head of the Government and General Secretary of the Albanian Communist Party, Enver Hoxha, delivering the historical speech on the day of the liberation of the homeland from the fascist invaders
Snapshot from the first marchpast of the national liberation army units in Tirana on November 29, 1944, the day of the liberation of the homeland.
Ad exploiting classes with all the evils of the present day capitalist-revisionist class should be revived and strengthened in our country. The Albanian people do not accept this, for they are aware of all these dangers, and the party and they themselves are vigilant and do not fall into errors.

Where do these modern thieves obtain the capitals with which they work with such 'generosity' to 'help' other backward peoples. From the wane exploitation of their own working class and the other peoples. The surplus value which goes in to the pocket of the capitalist from the 8-hour workday of the worker is ensured through the appropriation of the overwhelming part of this workday. What great profits he draws from the sweat of the worker? Even when the capitalists, because they want tranquillity to continue their savage exploitation, are compelled by circumstances to make a small sacrifice in favour of the workers when they burst out in bloody strikes and demonstrations, they rob the workers on the other hand through heavy taxes, the rise of prices and house rents, through high school fees and high payments for medical treatment and all the other predatory forms, including the selling of commodities on credit, and freezing of the wages of the workers for months, running - all these are characteristics of the consumer society. From these super-profits the working class becomes poorer, it is exhausted at work, whereas the capitalist creates the possibility to invest his capitals elsewhere to exploit and oppress other peoples, to colonize new countries, allegedly on behalf of progress and super-markets full of commodities which cannot be bought and which drip blood and sweat of the workers.

No! The Albanian people and their party never allow themselves to be deceived and to substitute this hell for their socialist society. Our country may perhaps lack supermarkets, and today some commodities may still be lacking in our shops, but our people are aware that the commodities have greatly increased compared with the past, and the people are firmly convinced that in the future, thanks to their tireless work, they will constantly increase them in freedom and independence.

In our country, the prices of all things, from liberation to the present day, have not kept increasing as occurs in the capitalist-revisionist countries, but, on the contrary, they have constantly kept lowering. At a time when in these countries the house rents are skyrocketing, with us they are exceptionally low; while with us education at all levels and branches is free, with them school fees and expenditures are increasing with every passing day; while with us medical service is free and treatment and medicines in hospitals are also free of charge, with them hospitalization or a simple surgical operation costs a great deal, while with us the entire taxation system has been abolished, with them the people suffer under the weight of colonial taxes, and so on. Such is their society; our society is quite the opposite.

In the capitalist and revisionist countries the number of hippies is increasing, narcotics, decadent music and stringent dance are spreading, all kinds of theories are being propagated far and wide to dehumanize the people and youth. They are seeking to introduce all these evils, which are developing in their countries, into our country, but we have shut the doors to them. We fight them and develop and promote our beautiful, pure, progressive revolutionary morality. We maintain and develop the virtues of our people, of the proletarian morality, maintain and educate a healthy, revolutionary, optimistic, serious youth, taught to carry out our revolution honourably.

The Soviet revisionists boldly claim that it is 'correctly wrong' to say that socialism can be built with own forces, as the Chinese and Albanians say. On the question the glorious Communist Party of China and Party of Labour of Albania are not wrong in the both either in theory or in practice; The main and the thing in the building of socialism is a socialist country to internal forces, the forces of that country itself. The aid a socialist country grants to another socialist country should be fraternal, internationalist, without interest and without political strings. Such is the socialist Albania receives from the People's Republic of China.

But why is the aid China grants to Albania like? It is like this because our two countries are socialist countries, because two real Marxist-Leninists are at the head and in the lead of our countries; to our two peoples, parties and states are bound in present friendship, moulded and tempered by Marxism; because we have one and the same real, same aims and the same enemies whom, in collaboration with the other peoples and the world proletariat, should defeat and smash. The Albanians and the Chinese side by side in full unity with one another. To China of Mao Tse-Tung aids the other socialist countries and peoples in the same way. The great China of Mao Tse-Tung, a powerful socialist state, is neither an imperialist nor a social-imperialist superpower.

The Soviet-led modern revisionists, by their denouncing seeking to deceive their own peoples and the peoples of the world the world when they say that their countries and their people are socialist; that is, this is a downright lie. The modern revisionists have definitely destroyed the socialist revolution in their own countries, transforming it into a capitalist system, while they have now turned the Soviet Union into a social-imperialist state. One cannot think of the existence of a true fraternal internationalist collaboration; without interest and political strings, between countries which call themselves socialist, as well as between them and us, as the Soviet revisionists and others who follow them claim: Their so-called 'aid', whether socialist, is the same as the 'aid' of US imperialism, acclaimed 'mutual socialist collaboration' of the Soviet revisionists is the same as the 'sincere collaboration' of imperialism ocularba. The two superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, which are preparing a hot war, through their alleged 'sincere collaboration' trying to convince you, to put you in their economic-and-political grip, to bring you into their spheres of influence and colonize you.

Milling meeting of the pation with his mother on the
The Soviet revisionists are enraged at China’s and Albania’s progress. China paid back all the credits they had granted to her. For years we have been paying back to the sham friends, who turned into fierce enemies, the so-called credits which consisted in some old factory machinery which had been given a coat of paint. We Albanians recognized very well what was hidden behind the so-called “internationalist aid” of the Soviet revisionists. The other peoples and states are today realizing the imperialist character of their aid. It was these Soviet revisionists who intensively sabotaged the development of our economy, industry and mining. Their aims were of a long-term nature—to enslave our socialist country and turn it into their satellite.

The same heroic Vlora saw Khrushchev, too. When this renegade to Marxism-Leninism found himself before the magnificent bay of Vlora, he was amazed, and by chance I heard his collaborator Malinovsky whispering to him: “You understand, Nikita Sargeyevich, with our missiles from Berlin and East Germany we can hit Gibraltar, while from the bay of Vlora we have the entire Mediterranean in the palm of our hand. But they had only the wind in the palm of their hands because our Party and Government destroyed their plans. Vlora will never be in the hands of foreigners.” The same Malinowsky said again to Khrushchev in Butrint: “This is a beautiful lake. If the sea coast is pierced through nearby, a magnificent submarine base could be built and then Greece, too, would be ours.”

I shivered and remembered that dark night in Tirana when together with Vasil Shanto we pasted up posters “Down with Italian fascism! Long live the fraternal Greek people fighting for freedom.” No, our Party and Government would never allow evil to come from the country of olives to the fraternal Greek people!

These shrewd communists have done these and many other evil things to a small people and country. They organised the blockade against the People’s Republic of Albania, hoping to force it to its knees, but quite the contrary happened. Socialist Albania, led by its heroic party, marched impetuously forward; it is successfully building socialism and is reaping successive victories in all the fields of life—in industry, agriculture, education and culture, in the strengthening of the defence of the homeland.

The Congress of the orthography of our beautiful language held its historic proceedings a few days ago. This is an inestimable victory among so many other magnificent victories our people have achieved with struggle, efforts and capability.

We greet wholeheartedly the educated and talented daughters and sons of our people, who at the historic convention and following in the path of the brilliant traditions of the Frashëri brothers and other patriots of our national revival, gave a greater brilliance to the language, the greatest treasure of a people.

We ardently and wholeheartedly greet especially the outstanding scholars, our Albanian brothers from Kosovo, Macedonia and Montenegro who made their valuable contribution to establishing the orthography of the common mother tongue. We wish the fraternal Albanian linguists, professors and teachers from Kosovo, Macedonia and Montenegro still greater successes in the great project they have made in the elaboration of the Albanian language which we consider as a common victory.

Dear comrades, friends and brothers.

In these great historic days, when the Albanian people, celebrating with an indescribable joy and happiness the 25th anniversary of the proclamation of independence and the 35th anniversary of the liberation of the country, let us but follow the unerring road on which our party guides us; let us be united to successfully realize all the plans we set ourselves, according to the historic decisions of the Congress of our Party of Labour and raise a toast to the glory of the people, the glory of the Party.

Monument to independence, erected in Vlora, work of the Albanian sculptors Kristoq Rama, Muntes Dhrimi and Pjetër Berisha.
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The Party must create in people and in society that world outlook, those customs, those beliefs, that revolutionary philosophy which will prevent those petty bourgeois and bourgeois world outlooks.

I think that when we report here, at the Secretariat of the Central Committee, as in every party forum, attention should be paid to raising problems which have been thoroughly studied. It is better that these reports give us a clear and full picture of the work being done in connection with the analysis, the grasping, and the further creative development of a direction given by the Political Bureau, or the Central Committee of the Party than to confine ourselves to a schematic listing of a few data.

I asked the comrades of the Ministry of Education and Culture, as well as the comrades of the apparatus of the Central Committee engaged in problems of literature and arts, how they advise the writers, poets and artists, because they should not burden them with office routine, getting involved in one way or another in the machinery of bureaucracy. I asked this question because I feel that the Writers and Artists League should not be turned into a bureaucratic organ; on the contrary, it must be a centre where there is a lively threshing out of philosophical, artistic, esthetic and other thoughts. We should not allow the writers and artists league to be turned into an organ of checking the various writings of all the writers and poets of the country, but primarily, it should work in many ways and forms to inspire them to write better and better.

It is for this reason that I advised our distinguished revolutionary poet Dritero Apoll, who is also the chairman of the Writers and Artists League, to give up the routine and bureaucratic work of the League and I asked him to tell us at this meeting about the situation of the development of our poetry. And he spoke to us with full competence about this problem.

Speech delivered at the meeting of the Secretariat of the CC of the Party on December 20, 1974, concerning the fulfillment to date of the tasks for literature and arts arising from the 4th Plenum of the CC of the Party.

Over these thirty years of a free existence in a country where socialism is being built, as it is in our country, we have achieved many successes in the field of the economy and culture. There is no doubt whatever that these successes have not been achieved without the existence of the party, the Labour, without its correct Marxist-Leninist line, without the establishment of the people's power, without the dictatorship of the proletariat and without the continuous struggle of the class struggle. All these factors have resulted in great transformations being carried out, in the socio-economic...
THE COMMUNIST
AND WOMEN

In any precisely
reformulated
feelings, those tastes, those ethics,
will permit either the revival or the spread
of old outlooks

inked with them, in the all-round education of the working
people. The economic and cultural life of our people has
changed, it has progressed. Our people work, produce, create,
and consume.

In all this development the Party has continually made all-
round analyses of key moments, which have helped the
communists and all the working people to see the good aspects
as well as the weak ones during the process of this development.

Some people have not appreciated these analyses made by
the Party, as they should. They have not seen in them the
evils of the policy and philosophy of the Party to point out
that the results of a particular period have their good aspects
but that they also have weak aspects associated with them;
there are positive and negative factors and these factors are
objective and subjective. In the opinion of these people
social life develops outside their will, because, they allege,
they will take their "predestined" course willy-nilly. Such
people differ in appearance from those who philosophize in
an idealist and mystical way, but they do not differ at all
in their world outlook. At one time, people said and believed
in this or that thing "had been written", "it was bound to
happen like this", "there is a supernatural power, the decisions
of which cannot be opposed". They called this force "God, Hea-
ven, Christ, Mohamed" and all kinds of saintly names. Even
now, there are people who think metaphysically and believe
in certain "forces" which they raise as factors that allegedly
set development in motion, such as "the bureaucracy, the
administration, selfishness, the feeling of private property, am-
bition, position, etc. For them heaven has been transformed
and taken (root) precisely in those world outlooks and sign-
posts in life which consolidated the idealist inspiration and
the life of the capitalist, merchant or money-lending bour-
geoise. Naturally, under our regime the sphere of action of
such people has been narrowed and is becoming narrower, but
their harmful mentalities are not without effect in life. In
life and in various forms, these views act. Often they appear
as entirely harmless, normal, lie hidden behind a mentality
which allegedly conforms with the laws, the customs and
even with the so-called "patriotism" of the epoch of the Party. This
is that petty bourgeois mentality, these are those bourgeois and
petty bourgeois remnants which the Marxist-Leninist Party
fights and will continue to fight until the dawn of classless
society.

It must not be thought that the people have shaken off
these remnants, we should not think that after a few moral-
ising articles these dangerous vices and world outlooks disap-
ppear without a trace, we should not think that, with the im-
provement of the living standards of the people, our men and
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women become immune to these "diseases". On the contrary, we may have a reminder of them, and this time shouting "long live the Party" which created abundance for us. But together with the abundance and wellbeing, the Party must create in people and in society precisely that world outlook, those customs, those feelings, those tastes, those ethics, that revolutionary philosophy which will not permit either the revival or the spread of petty bourgeois and bourgeois world outlooks.

Of course, this is not an easy task and this is what the bourgeoisie, capitalism, is relying on when it hopes for the "failure of socialist society", "the defeat of communism". It is precisely that philosophy, those world outlooks and those economic relations on which the development and consolidation of its state power are based, that capitalism is counting on. Its whole structure and superstructure have, of course, been defeated in a double way: both spiritually and physically. During the entire course of history the kingdom of capital, of religion, of the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie has clashed with the progressive forces, with progress, and has lost many limbs in these wars. Now it has reached the stage of its decay. Capitalism, imperialism, have lost their economic, political and ideological positions one after another. The revolution, the peoples, are eroding its foundations. Marxism-Leninism is leading the peoples towards the new life, socialism and communism, but we must not think that in face of the defeats it is suffering, world capitalism has laid down its arms. In its objectives, it relies precisely on its barbarous attacks and on predatory imperialist wars against the liberation of the peoples from its yoke, but it also counts on that world outlook and on those remnants which burden the consciousness of men and have kept them as its slaves for centuries.

In this direction the propaganda of imperialism for the degeneration of men and women and of society as a whole, to revive every form and every aspect of the former vices, feelings, sentiments, appetites, selfishness, robbery, gangsterism of those people and of those societies that supported its power, has never known such a broad extension and development as it has at the present time. All this is a reflection of the savage face of capital, a reflection of its degeneration. But with this way of life it is striving, nevertheless to prolong its existence and domination, by influencing the peoples with its propaganda in order to demoralize them, to divert them from the road of the revolution.

Capitalism and imperialism are afraid of the revolution, of the proletariat, and not of the lumpen elements or of those democrats and socialists who fight them with kidgloves nor of the modern revisionists, like those of the Soviet Union and others, who have betrayed the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. If these, dressed up in various pseudo-revolutionary ideologies, are forces and means of the counterrevolution used by capitalism and imperialism for their own aims.

In view of these things, aware of their danger at the moment, our Party teaches and educates the people, launching them into struggle for the building and consolidation of socialist society and the victories achieved, and preparing a ground for those new objectives which should be achieved. Every citizen of our country must, therefore, reflect deeply on what the Party means when it says that "we must fight with all our strength against the external and internal pressures of the bourgeoisie and revisionist ideology". This double, at the same time single, enemy is not imaginary, but real, its struggle should be waged daily, it should be active and take place in all the manifestations of life in the philosophy of all these manifestations. The struggle must be waged with all its means, through education at schools, in factories and workshops, and at home, with the family and in the street, with the wife, with the sister, with the children, with the neighbours, in all their manifestations, pointing out and condemning the bad things and fostering the good things. It is in this way, we have triumphed step by step over our enemy. We must also not allow his evil seed to germinate, nor as soon as it puts up a sprout we must nip it off at once.

Our writers and artists have an exceptionally great role in this direction. Our people and the Party need them. Through their creativity and talents they should give more help in eliminating those remnants I spoke of earlier, from the dark corners of human consciousness and should throw into shade the majesty of the socialist world and the virtues of our men and women. Under the leadership of the Party, our writers in literature and arts should do that profound ideological, political, moral, and ethical work which is needed to combat the influences and poisons of the old world and of the present-day capitalist and revisionist world, to point out the lofty communist virtues and implant them in the character of our men and women. They should struggle always to play the role of the auxiliary of the Party in moulding the new man. I want to say with regret that many communists and leaders of Party committees and state institutions do not properly understand the importance of literature and art. In their reports they repeat Lenin's golden words about the role of literature and art in educating the masses, but when it is a question of practice, they undervalue or forget them.

In the direction of the development of literature and art, the Party has helped in making a great qualitative leap for
and life in our country, is so great, so broad, so diverse, so beautiful and so open that if you immerse yourself in it, you cannot fail to be inspired to write whatever you like, songs, poems, plays, music, comedies, etc.

Conrad's writers, poets, musicians, artists, actors and directors of drama, opera and ballet theatres, cinematography, or drawing inspiration from the work and heroic feats of so many, have made very great progress in the development of literature and art in our country. This was shown at its centenary by the literary-artistic creativity realized on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the liberation of our homeland. Inspired by the decisions of the 4th Plenum of the CC of the NKP, our artists and writers came to this great jubilee with all those beautiful works. These achievements, in the series of others, bear witness, among other things, to the possibilities treated when the people are in power and are led by a revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist party, such as our Party of Labour.

From among the works of foreign authors of various countries, which you have read, there are some that I have liked, for instance, the works of classical poetry and outstanding prose and other prose writers, but there are also writings which I have not liked at all, such as many new novels which have happened to pick up and tried to read, but to tell the truth I have thrown them away, because they are worthless. Let alone the modern "poetry" which I have read, which is so awful you can't imagine. Reading such "poetry" I ask myself, who are these people who write such stuff? Meanwhile compared to this confused and worthless creativity the significance of our literature and art of socialist realism, the value of our exceptionally beautiful folk songs and dances becomes ever greater.

Among our poets and prose writers there are authors who have not literary and artistic creations of value, others who produce works of less value; then there are those who write materials without any special value. These latter, particularly the young poets and writers, who is going to help them progress? We must pay great attention to this question, we must encourage and help them, and our confirmed writers and poets, as well as those who have had more training than the young ones, have a special duty in this direction. But the first and outstanding aid we must give them to open the eyes of their consciousness to the reality of our country and people. They themselves must learn to see with their eyes and feel with their hearts the vigorous development of the life of our people and faithfully reflect it in their diverse creativity. We must understand the most profound and diverse aspects of the development which are discovered through knowledge of the material life and the feelings which arise in each period, through the clash of ideas created by internal and external influences, which are inseparable in the life of a people whatever period and in whatever corner of the continents these people may live and fight for its existence, for a better life, in freedom and economic and political independence.

If we find Dr. F. Agoll's poems good, this is because they express the pure feelings of the people, are connected with reality, with the men of work, with the soil, the products and flowers of this land, with the high chimneys of the combines, and with the troubles and joys of the men and women in their family homes. A poet who does not know reality, no matter how he developed his imagination may be, is quite unable to produce a powerful poem. But if he properly integrates his imagination with the objective reality of the country, with the life of the people, if in his writings he fights expressions full of pompous phrases, he too, can become a talented writer. For example, in my opinion, Xheva Ishali, and some other young poets have many ideas, but the way they express them is not always real, vital. It is up to them to make efforts to link themselves better with the people, but it is also up to their comrades and the Party to encourage these young talents in this direction, so that they do not see the people mainly through their imagination, but get deeply into life, in the flow and continuity of this life, in all the turns and zigzags the people make in order to achieve those aims the Party sets them and clearly understand that everything in life is not a bed of roses.

We must not be discouraged that, alongside the recognized poets and writers, we do not see new talents of a high calibre as was said here. We must bear in mind that it is not easy to create worth while literary pieces, poems, novels etc. in a short time. You need time to write valuable works; besides, you must link yourself with men and women, with the people, you must go deep into the heart of the masses, not just to find the subject for your novel or poem and then immediately leave the village or the factory, considering the birth of the idea to be sufficient. No fine hard-hitting work can come out in this way, that is why it is required of the writer to really get to know people, to know their lives, difficulties and worries, their pleasures and hopes, etc., as I said earlier.

The majority of our young writers have a cultural horizon, but it is their duty to link this culture thoroughly with the life of the country, with the directives of the Party. I am convinced that by drawing inspiration from the life of the people and the correct line of the Party, in time the young writers, too, will mature and succeed in winning recognition.

There are two ways of viewing the development of life: one is the idealist, mystical, pessimistic and conservative view, and the other is the realist view, with a revolutionary spirit, fruit of a materialist analysis of events and history, full of optimistic feelings for a change and a further positive development of History and of the development of society, of a classless society. This view becomes the property and world outlook of those men and women with pure and revolutionary virtues, who, uniting with the progressive classes, strike hard at the entire abhorred ideological and politico-moral arsenal of the reactionary forces. In order to educate and help the young writers and artists, it is essential that we teach them, make understandable to them, the ideology that guides our Party and our working class, Marxism-Leninism.

We must teach our young writers and artists how to read the open book of the socialist life of our country, how to study and grasp the content of this wonderful book. We must
Personally I feel a satisfaction when I am listening to music, whether that of great classical and progressive composers of the world, or the musical creations of our own composers. But to tell the truth, the beautiful songs and dances of the people please me most, they move me with their power and, at the same time, with their simplicity. I am not saying this just because I am an Albanian.
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make them love every letter of this book of life, make them see and feel the powerful pulse of the strength, feelings and ardent desires of our people. We must work to make them see and touch the colossal achievements of our people in all fields, see how our new man of socialist society, led by a Marxist-Leninist party, has transformed the plains, the mountains, has harnessed the flow of rivers, and built entire cities out of nothing. We must make these young people see all these beauties, all this rich colour of our people and nature, and from this wonderful book, which is the life of the people, they should make deductions and put all these great treasures of our socialist life in their books, novels, and poems, in their songs and plays, in the paintings and sculptures they create.

If our artists and writers proceed in these directions and are moulded with these teachings, if they immerse themselves completely in the revolutionary current of life with all their strength of character and the depth of their pure and ardent feelings, they will certainly give the people and their homeland wonderful works which will be a reflection of the mighty work being done in our country for the construction of socialism and formulation of the new man. As to their usefulness and magnificence, their works will be like the giant hydro-power stations, factories and combines, the beautiful wheat fields and the hills covered with fruit trees: they will be like the beauties of our cities, schools, and creches, where the happy children of our socialist country laugh and sing, where our working class, cooperativist peasantries and people’s intelligentsia, with their minds and skills, are creating and building a new, happy, and prosperous life.

I think that another special sort of help which should be given to the young, less experienced, and as yet unformed writers, painters, and musicians, or the comments, they will make about the creative work of the young people, will be the beautiful and rich creativity of our great talents, the splendid writings and compositions they bring to light, which will inspire the younger ones and those with less training from the ideological and artistic viewpoint. The works of poetry, prose, music, painting, etc., provided by our well-known writers and artists, should become major subjects for study to inspire all those engaged in literature and art in regard to their ethics, content, the treatment of problems, etc. This creativity is, and will remain, a great school and aid provided for the young by the recognised artists, from whose works not only those who have just begun to write, but also the readers, all those who are not engaged in writing, learn and gain education, because they inspire us too.

The fine works of the outstanding writers, poets and artists please us because they are permeated by valuable ideas and thoughts, which do not drop from the skies, but from knowledge of the real state of things, of our reality, of the development of the political and social life of our people. These ideas and thoughts correctly and accurately reflect our desires, joys and sorrows, the life and depth of the thinking of the people, they are connected with our prospects, therefore they not only please us, but they inspire us and invigorate our work. Hence the successful works of the outstanding authors should become the main source of assistance to our young creators rather than any schematic organization giving help on their part. When the works of the writers and artists, their paintings and musical compositions express profound thinking and great-heartedness of the people we throw into relief real characters from life, this makes those who are reflected in these creations think: With the work we carry out do we deserve this honour? And this question which they ask themselves, inspires them and multiplies the strength to work even more.

The works of our writers, be they young ones, contain inspiration, ideas, tastes, art. All these things may be always profound, they may not be perfect. It is known that a tree does not yield its fruits as soon as it appears above the soil. It is like this with the young writers and artists but in time they, too, will grow up, will mature in the thoughts and will know how to create works which are more beautiful, of greater and more lasting value.

In their creativity the young writers must draw inspiration primarily, from the line of the Party and the colossal acts of the men of labour, but, as I said, they must also learn from their older and more experienced writers, poet, and artists comrades. Among the young artists and men of letters also among the older ones, through systematic educative work we must patiently fight and eliminate conceit, ambition, arrogance, which remain with us as stains from the work with antagonistic classes. Such a thing is indispensable for the massive development and blooming of the beautiful flowers of multi-coloured flowers of a socialist garden such as ours.

But, I think, we cannot expect that all talents should not at that level of development at the same time. Therefore we must not make thoughtless comparisons between individuals engaged in creativity, saying that the productions of this one or that one stand high, while those of the others are nothing but we must not act in this way. The literature, art, music, etc., the economy, sciences and the entire culture of the classes and peoples of the world have not developed all at once.
In their colossal work our great classical teachers, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin; have dealt with the problems of literature and arts, too. The revisionists and Trotskyists are striving to minimize this major contribution of the great teachers. They do this with a view to opening a broad field for their filth of all genres which they are pouring out in all directions.

I advise the comrade writers and artists, particularly the literary and art critics, that along with the study of the Marxist-Leninist theory, they should read with especially great care these more than a few instances, in which our great teachers make criticisms of writers and artists. They are profound analyses and a model of how we should judge a literary-artistic work.

I do not want to go into detail of what a critic should be as I said above, but I would like to make a criticism of our literary critics and I hope they will excuse me for this. Sometimes criticism is neither simple nor understandable, thus it cannot always be grasped by those who read it and who want to learn. Many of these criticisms are verbose; what should be pointed out is drowned in a flood of analysis and frequently atrocity and specific phrases and terminology are used to give the impression of competence and of having thoroughly studied the work. But in acting in this way, they forget the reader, on whom this kind of criticism has no great effect. If I may give some advice, this is that our critics, should abandon any inclinations, if these appear among some of them, to imitate the bourgeois modernist critics of the present time who make their obscure, confused, and orienting criticisms, under the mask of allegedly adapting their criticisms to the works of the times.

In the field of the literary and artistic criticism of the bourgeoisie in various epochs, too, we shall see various stages and forms of it. Without aspiring to the heights of the criticisms of Voltaire, which were as slashing and profound as they were simple and understandable, but just taking the criticisms of the early decades of our century, we shall notice that they were not so double-distilled so tangled and twisted, to the degree to which the present bourgeois and revisionist art, literature and criticism have degenerated.

Our literary-artistic criticism must draw inspiration from and pursue the principled road of the great classical teachers and our Party. Our criticisms should be real, like the works they analyze; they should be simple, understandable, concise, and able to be grasped by the public. Criticism must be educative, therefore he who makes it must not consider himself to be speaking from the top of Mt. Olympus, but he should consider the author of a work as a comrade, talking to his comrade always advising him for his good.

We should also show a little tact, comrades, in the help to be given to those who create. We should bear in mind peoples psychology, their feelings. The observation made here concerning subjective criticisms is correct. Sometimes the criticisms passed on literary or musical works are exaggerated and subjective. We must require from our writers, poets, and artists, that the content, the essence of the work should be
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on a correct party road and be inspired by a sound revolutionary spirit in the service of socialism. This is the main thing which our authors must bear in mind in their creativity. As to how the one or the other will construct the theme he has chosen, the characters, this is the business of the writer, the poet, or the musician. He, better than anyone else, finds for himself the artistic figures which please him, knows which moment must be underlined to further strengthen the ideological and political axis of his work, and so on. On questions like these, each must decide for himself. It would not be advisable at all, for example, to say to a writer or someone else: "If you will remove this idea or line and add that other one, if you will shorten it a little here and extend it there, remove this artistic figure and put in another," etc. In such a case the writer would have the right to retort: "Then why don't you write your own verse the way you want it and stop messing me about?" We must not ever do things by interfering with uncalled for criticisms of literary-artistic works, for such subjective interference is not assistance, but massacre. Criticisms should not be made in this way. If we allow others to make one comment after another, endlessly, about the publication of a poem, a play, etc., the work will end up a disaster and be turned into a Russian salad. We should be particularly careful to pursue a correct policy of aid and criticism to the young writers, in the sense that we should neither be fuddled nor intimidate them by telling them baldly "Your poem is worthless," "Your writing is very poor," etc. We should also bear in mind the other aspect, that is not to praise them groundlessly, for in this way they may "take off." The aim is to help them advance, so that they, like all the others, may serve the people with devotion.

In a few words, when a work is correct in line, and does not lack artistic values, but in which there may be something amiss with regard to this or that aspect, there should not be too much hesitation to publish, exhibit, execute, or stage it. But I would like to reaffirm that it would not be right and proper, on the other hand, for the men of letters and arts to adopt a contemptuous attitude towards the fair criticisms and suggestions, of an essentially ideological and artistic character, made by the critics or the readers.

Our theatre, whether that of drama or of opera or ballet, has gained experience and has created a tradition, but we must never cease our efforts to find other, newer, ways and means with a revolutionary spirit to enrich and further improve this experience and tradition. Our theatre must reflect our revolutionary reality, the demands of our working class and cooperativist peasantry to consolidate the new society. Of course, for us the theatre is a political and ideological weapon for the education of people therefore it must be understandable and, in order to be such, it must express their feelings and desires.

It is necessary that our dramaturgy should be raised to the highest possible level of perfection, avoid banality, not only respond to the present level of culture of the masses frequenting this theatre, but it should be, as the same critics claim in the further advance of the tastes and revolutionary impulse for a more cultured life.

Naturally, we are opposed to the literature of the modern dramatic art which strives to entangle and enslave people in the consumer society, to deprive them of their pure feelings and of a revolutionary human morality in thought and actions.

Of course our revolutionary theatre does not and cannot have the individual features of one artist, but the best facets of our masses, of our socialist society. This does not mean at all, as the bourgeoisie and its "theories" about this claim, that our revolutionary theatre lowers, undervalues, entirely eliminates, the personality and creative talent of an artist. On the contrary, our revolutionary theatre opens to the artists a very wide field of feelings and thoughts which greatly enrich the spirit of the theatre and their possibilities for creation.

The inner world of our artists does not know those limitations which are imposed on the artist in bourgeois reality. Such artists in bourgeois society have only the illusion of "freedom of creation," while in fact their activity is conditioned and, of course, orientated by the bourgeoisie reality of a life full of abnormal, amoral, extravagant phenomena. It precisely these confusing phenomena and extravagance that give the bourgeois writers and artists the impression of freedom to create. The dark halls of their cinemas and theatres, dominated by the aim of creating anguish in the hearts of the spectators, so that this anguish will stay with them the whole day and the whole week and become their second self. This content, this aim, this form, and these feelings are rejected and combated by our revolutionary aesthetics, inspired by the pure feelings of our people and serving the mass people.

In this sense we should give a great impulse to our popular art through the development of the amateur art movement, too, and by this we should not think only of our folk songs and dances. We must extend and enrich these two genres which the people love.
How we have people who are masters of the pen. I am not saying that they should not write novels and poems, for there are a healthy and indispensable nourishment for the education of our men and women of the socialist society, but I notice that there is a marked inclination among the literary people to follow those who have blazed the trail in creativity with novels and poems, and a trend to underestimation or lack of interest in writing plays, film librettos and scenarios and sketches for variety theatre. I have heard people saying: 'what can we do, one cannot write without the desire,' 'there are no inclinations, no talents for these genres'. What groundless and harmful ideas! These people are making a great mistake, because they are neglecting or, what is worse, undermining these genres, which are also of incalculable importance for the education of our people. Little by little even those who have had inclinations for such genres and who have ceased distinction in this field of literary and artistic creativity have begun to neglect it. We see our theatres filled to capacity, so are our cinemas every night. But what can the spectators see? The repertoires are out of date, not in the same that they are useless, but they have no new subjects. We make few films, very few. We should not expect to have theatrical pieces in perfect form. Such a requirement would certainly lead us to closing down the theatre and would make us see day and night, as we do, the dramatization of the "Godfly". Why should we not put on more of our own works but always persist with "The Godfly" till our eyes are stuck out from watching it on television? The "Godfly", with a subject from the history of the carbonari,\(^1\) isn't so much value that it should be put on so often.

Our cinemas are screening bad foreign, capitalist and revisionist films. How do our people endure the showing of revisionist Czechoslovak, Romanian or Hungarian films, for example "How I became a policeman" and similar vile rubbish? Not only is the selection of foreign films done badly, which does great harm to the education of our men and women and youth, but hackneyed excuses are made. "What shall we do, we have no films", they say. My opinion is that the films produced by our film studio are very good, they are magnificent in comparison with those dished up to us from abroad, with bandits and cowboys.

We have wonderful artists, whom, without hesitation, I consider to be of world calibre. And here I have in mind not only veteran actors like Sandor Prosi, Pjejter Gjoka, Naim Frangi, Taha Kurini, Ndreku Lasci, Pandi Raitchi, Skender Sollaku, etc., but also younger ones like Rikard Varja, Demir Hyskja and several others, boys and girls, whose names I have not learned. With these wonderful actors and the talented directors we have, we can produce not two or three films a year, but many more, provided we prepare the scenarios for them and their working and living conditions. We have these resources, but we do not know to use them properly.

We have wonderful singers, whom we say belong to the Opera. May be so, but these and the variety show singers, as well as singers from the ranks of the people, greatly please the public with the concerts they give. Well, these great artists and others a little less great, could they not play in films? Couldn't we use them in films in which they would sing to this beautiful life blooming before our eyes, to this life which we are building with our own hands? Of course we could.

In no way must our variety theatres in districts confine themselves to a few songs, a few sketches which they put on in the cities where they have been set up. My opinion is that the professional variety shows and theatres of the districts must be turned into powerful centres and means for organisation and propaganda, to encourage a great development, both in breadth and quality, in the setting up of theatrical and variety groups in work centres, schools, and particularly, in the agricultural cooperatives.

We are filled with great enthusiasm when we see on the stages of the Opera and Ballet Theatre of the Capital, in the concerts and variety shows of the districts, hundreds upon hundreds of young girls and boys playing in such a perfect manner and singing with such, harmonious, melodious, and fine voices, that we forget that they are late operators, workers of the "Bijengji" artistic products enterprise or the "Stalin" textile combine, wool workers from Rukës, girl students from Shkodra, or school girls from Gramshi.

What a great development our art has achieved! These talented young people are capable of stage performances full of feeling and pathos, of playing important roles in films, of learning all sorts of song and dances. I am speaking of all those who have no artistic schooling. We have opened schools and we shall extend them, but we should not forget, and should not underestimate the great art which in like a precious jewel in the bosom of the people, and which is developing from day to day towards new heights. We must organize this still better.

I am aware of the instructions given, according to which our professional variety shows and theatres of the cities must give performances in the villages too. But from what I have heard, these institutions are not yet properly implementing this directive of the Party, because even today, they give few performances in villages, and the greater part of them in villages near the cities. It is the duty of our professional theatres and variety shows to extend their activity even to the most remote areas, covering our entire countryside with their artistic performances.

Today in all the agricultural cooperatives everywhere in our country, there are groups of outstanding popular singers and dancers, there are talented instrumentalists who please and educate the broad masses of the cooperativists with their performances and new ones are emerging every day. There is no doubt that alongside them, there are also talents who prefer dramatic art, people able in this field, fine humorists, with whom variety groups could be created in every agricultural cooperative to give theatrical and variety performances there. Therefore, when the professional theatres and variety shows of the cities, go to the villages, they should discover these talents in the ranks of the masses, urge them and encourage them, and organize amateur theatre troupes with them, help to organize and get them going, appoint
ARTISTIC LEADERS FROM AMONG THEIR OWN COMPANY, WHO WILL LOOK AFTER THESE AMATEUR GROUPS AND HELP THEM UNTIL THEY ARE ABLE TO STAND ON THEIR OWN FEET. THUS, IN OUR SOCIALIST COUNTRYSIDE AMATEUR DRAMATIC ART, WILL FLOURISH, TOO, NEW PEOPLE AND NEW TALENTS WILL ARISE, WHO WILL ENRICH THE STAGES AND THE REPERTOIRE OF OUR PROFESSIONAL THEATRES.

THE TEACHERS WHO WORK IN AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVES, COMMUNISTS AND NON-PARTY PEOPLE, ART-LOVING BOYS AND GIRLS, MUST HELP IN EXTENDING THE ARTISTIC ACTIVITY IN THE COUNTRYSIDE. ALL AROUND THEM ARE PEOPLE WITH RARE DRAMATIC TALENTS, CAPABLE PEOPLE, WITH A KEEN, EDUCATIVE, AND AMUSING HUMOUR. THE HOUSES OF CULTURE IN THE COOPERATIVES, SHOULD BECOME REAL CULTURAL CENTRES IN THE FULL MEANING AT THE TIME. SEE THE GREAT talent WITH WHICH OUR PEOPLE PERFORM FOLK DANCES AND SONGS! THESE COOPERATIVE FARMS ARE ABLE TO PLAY THEATRICAL PARTS, THEY KNOW LIFE WELL, AND IF WE ORGANIZE THEM PROPERLY, THEY WILL FIND GREAT SATISFACTION FOR THEMSELVES, AND THEY WILL PLEASE OTHERS AND MAKE THEM HAPPY TOO.

BUT WE MUST GO STILL FURTHER. IN EVERY PERIOD, TALENTED ARTISTS HAVE EMERGED IN THE RANKS OF THE PEOPLE, WHO, EVEN THOUGH ILLITERATE, HAVE CREATED WORK OF GREAT ARTISTIC VALUE, EVEN SOME MASTERPIECES. BUT NOW WHEN ALL THE YOUNG MEN AND YOUNG WOMEN HAVE SEVEN AND EIGHT YEAR SCHOOLING, CAN THIS NOT OCCUR? OF COURSE IT CAN. THEREFORE WE MUST WORK, LOOK FOR THEM, ENCOURAGE THEM, SUPPORT THEM WHEREVER THEY ARE, IN THE JOBS, IN PRODUCTION, IN THE VILLAGES, AND THEN WE SHALL HAVE LOTS OF COOPERATIVISTS, LATE OPERATORS, TEXTILE WORKERS AND WOMEN WORKERS LIKE THOSE OF «MIJIA» WHO WILL CREATE ARTISTIC OBJECTS SO BEAUTIFUL THAT THEY WILL ENTHUSE AND INSPIRE THE PROFESSIONAL ARTISTS TOO. WE SHOULD BREAK THROUGH THE FROZEN WALLS OF ACADEMICISM, OF RIGID FORMS, WE SHOULD THREW THE ICE WHICH KEEPS SO MANY NEW TALENTS LOCKED AWAY BECAUSE, ALLEGEDLY, YOU NEED SCHOOL FOR THIS AND SCHOOL FOR THAT. THE PARTY IS NOT OPPOSED TO SCHOOL, BUT EVEN WHEN WE DID NOT HAVE SPECIAL SCHOOLS OF POETRY, MUSIC, PAINTING, ETC., OUR PEOPLE CREATED AND CONTINUE TO CREATE, TO PRODUCE WONDERFUL TALENTS FROM THEIR RANKS.

PERSONALLY I FEEL A SATISFACTION WHEN I AM LISTENING TO MUSIC, WHETHER THAT OF THE GREAT CLASSICAL AND PROGRESSIVE COMPOSERS OF THE WORLD, OR THE MUSICAL CREATIONS OF OUR OWN COMPOSERS. BUT, TO TELL THE TRUTH, THE BEAUTIFUL SONGS AND DANCES OF THE PEOPLE PLEASE US MOST, THEY MOVE ME WITH THEIR POWER AND, AT THE SAME TIME, WITH THEIR HUMOUR. I AM NOT SAYING THIS JUST BECAUSE I AM AN ALBANIAN. NO, BUT BECAUSE OUR FOLK SONGS AND DANCES ARE REALLY BEAUTIFUL, VERY BEAUTIFUL INDEED. THE PARTY HAS PERFORMED A GREAT DEED IN RAISING TO A HIGH PEDESTAL AND PERPETUATING ALL THIS EXCER-PHANICAL WEALTH WE HAVE INHERITED FROM THE PAST. SINCE THE EARLY YEARS OF LIBERATION, WHEN OUR PEOPLE WERE STILL POOR AND LIVING IN GREAT PRIVATION, IT FORCERLY SET ABOUT WORK, INSISTING ON THE PRODUCTION OF FOLK INSTRUMENTS, SO THAT THE FOLK SONGS AND DANCES SHOULD NOT BE NEGLECTED, IF YOU REMEMBER, COMRADES, WHEN INSTRUCTIONS WERE GIVEN AT THESE MEETINGS? AND TODAY THE FOLK SONGS AND INSTRUMENTS HAVE BECOME A VERY HEALTHY SPIRITUAL FOOD FOR OUR WORKING MASSES AND OUR YOUTH.

IF THE WRITER OR POET DESIRES TO WRITE, OR THE MUSICIAN TO COMPOSE A MUSICAL PIECE WITH A GREAT INSPIRATION, ABOUT THE PAST SUFFERINGS OF THE ALBANIAN PEOPLE AND THEIR JOYS, LET US TURN TO THE SONGS AND MELODIES OF THE PEOPLE, IN WHICH WE WILL FIND A POWERFUL SOURCE OF INSPIRATION. RECALL, FOR INSTANCE, THE SONG «I REMAINED, COMRADES» WHICH EVEN DITIVRE AGUN HAS INCLUDED IN HIS POEM «OTHER ALBANIA». THIS IS A SONG OF VALUE NOT ONLY FOR THE WORDS CHOSEN WITH CARE AND MASTERY, FOR ITS GREAT SPIRITUAL POWER, BUT ALSO BECAUSE IT CONTENT IS A PROFUND SYNTHESIS AND REFLECTION OF THE PAST SUFFERING OF THE ALBANIAN PEOPLE. YOU NEVER TIRE OF HEARING THIS SONG INTERPRETED WITH SUCH CARE AND MASTERY BY THE FOLK SINGER OF THE SHKRAPARI DISTRICT, DEMIR ZYKO, MEDHI KUSHI, AND OTHERS.

OUR PEOPLE HAVE ALWAYS BEEN OPTIMISTIC. IN SORROWS AND JOYS THEY HAVE NEVER LOST THEIR FAITH IN THE FUTURE, AND THIS OPTIMISM, THIS MAJESTY HAS BEEN PERPETUATED IN THE RICH LEGACY OF ORAL LITERATURE, IN THEIR SONGS, IN THEIR DANSES, IN THEIR COSTUMES AND IN THEIR OTHER WONDERFUL TRADITIONS. THIS IS SOMETHING MAJESTIC WHICH IS PERFECTLY REALIZED IN ART BY THE GENIUS OF THE PEOPLE.

school was established, one of the important educational institutions, which, besides a whole army of patriotic teachers, also turned out musicians and composers. But, to tell the truth, without wanting to overstate them, the elaborated melodies of the folk songs festival of this district seemed to me poor and frigid in comparison with the colour, freshness, and beauty, of the songs full of inspiration of the folk art. This does not mean that our composers should give up the elaboration of folk songs or dances, cultivated music, as it is called, but these elaborations and cultivations should always be based, not just here and there, on a chord or motif in the national heritage, but they should have the soil of this land, blended into them, they should be inspired by the creativity, the work and aspirations of this people, and be dedicated to them, please them and move their spirit. If you depart from this background, you neither serve your own people, nor give other peoples, any reason to value you, because you are not bringing anything new to the common treasury of the world's progressive culture and art.

Another evening I heard on television the interpretation of some folk motifs on violincello and piano. Not only was I greatly pleased, but I said: How beautifully our cultivated music can be developed on the basis of folk motifs!

On this correct road valueable works have been created like those composed by Ček Zadeja, Tish Dafi, and many others. Songs like the one entitled 'For you, my country', composed by Plešar Geci and interpreted by the People's Artist, Mentor Khemali, will remain immortal in the treasury of our new art. It is a hymn to our socialist homeland, to our unquerable people and Party. It was born at the difficult moments of the revisionist blockade, and is permeated by a lofty revolutionary and optimistic spirit. If not every day, at least every two or three days, in moments of joy or difficulties, I like to listen to it on my tape recorder and it always moves me and inspires me to work.

This is the case with many other beautiful songs too, such as those by Avai Mula and others, which the public love and sing so much, interpreted with such great mastery, gallantry and feeling, not only by known and talented singers such as Ramiz Kovaç, Gago Çako, Vage Zela, and others, but also by new singers, professional and nonprofessional, such as Zdrila Sina, Ema Cizini, Alida Hsiku, Shygqyri Atushi, the young singer, Violeta Zefi and many others.

On no account must we neglect our folk songs; on the contrary, we should strive to have our composers base themselves firmly on these very songs. It is not right that in the Scander Miaja middle school of art the pupils should begin to learn foreign classical music first and Albanian folk music later. The remark made on this question by conductor Ramiz is quite right. However much effort may be made to teach the pupils foreign music they will not reach the heights of like, for example, who also became a renowned composer precisely because he knew how to revive the Hungarian folk repertories. The same can be said of Chopin, Bizet, etc., who are renowned with folk music as their basis.

The broad and variegated life of our country needs the multitude of people working in art, in music. We should discover them, support them, put them on the stage, and some among them who distinguish themselves there will be sent to special schools and then return in large numbers to the bosom of our art-loving people.

Our Party wants every work which comes to light be as nearly perfect as possible in all aspects, and it strives for this but perfection is not easy. It takes time, it requires experience, it requires, ability, too, things which are not innate in man, but are developed and worked up during the process of the continuous education of his innate learnings. Our people have many leanings which should be utilised and developed, for the good of our socialist society. In this direction, as in every thing, the Party must play the decisive role, not only from the material aspect, but especially from the aspect of ideas, by inspiring people with its ideology, with Marxism-Leninism. Our poets, writers, musicians, etc., all our artists, should learn Marxism-Leninism, not only from the books, but also from life, there where it is concretely applied by the people. Books have great importance for the information and education of man, therefore our people must have books and read them zealously. But to inspire people, to form their world outlook and their education, this cannot be confined to books alone. And in the case of people lacking in ideological and political development, who have extravagant inclinations, in opposition to the orientations of the Party, it is even more necessary that they should not be given books of any kind particularly, those with harmful, poisonous content, for this has a negative influence on their formation. We must provide our readers with that literature which has a revolutionary character. However, we should bear in mind that there are writers of other countries who demand that the working class rise in revolution, but they do not conceive the revolution in the way Marxists do; consequently, they are unable to handle the question of the revolution, in prose or poetry, like our writers, poets and artists. Therefore, we should always be very careful to continually mould our young artists and writers with the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, so that, under the leadership of the Party, they will mature, create for the people and think like the people. If we act in this way, what fine and healthy fruit we shall have!

In our post-liberation literature many Albanian writers and poets have distinguished themselves. In the long run a good many of them have won recognition, therefore, I think that the works of value which they have produced and which please us so much, should become subjects for study, not in a pick and choose way, but systematically. I remember how in the French school that I went through, we were given a thorough and systematic foundation knowledge of the works of the French writers and poets. But our poets and writers, who are closely linked with the people, who are inspired by and learn from them and on this healthy soil create popular works of ideological and artistic value have wonderful talent too. Therefore, with their works it is essential that they
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should not be simply skimmed just to say we've read them, read once and then put back in the shelf, but they should be read carefully and attentively, for the mighty reality of life, the heroism of our people who are building socialism, is reflected in them.

The beautiful works of our writers are welcomed not only by us, they are welcomed by foreigners, too. Here I am not speaking only of Ismail Kadare's novels or Dritero Agoli's poems and some of those others of our literary men, which have been translated into foreign languages, but of the works, of many other writers and poets too. If we can manage to train our own really able translators in foreign languages (because foreigners have always ignored our beautiful language, this is why you do not find people in other countries who have mastered the Albanian language thoroughly), we shall have great success in popularising Albanian literary-artistic works abroad. Therefore, let's get down to the job of training our own cadres who will really master other languages so that they are capable of translating the works of our writers into them.

We have been informed that the exhibition «Albanian art in centuries» which we opened in Paris, has aroused great interest among the French progressive public. We have been told that thousands upon thousands of people, including critics, literary men, philosophers, diplomats, etc., have gone eagerly to visit our exhibition which they have appraised as one of the best put on in the French capital. The visitors have been astounded at the development of our art, in the same way as foreign audiences were astonished at the second National Folklore Festival in Gjirokastra when they saw it on film, or a few years ago at our folk music and dances at the Dijon festival, where our wonderful folk art was presented. Imagine when the foreigners are able to get really good translations at the works of our poets and writers, they will discover and get to know many aspects of the material and spiritual life of our people who are building the new life of a truly socialist society.

Thus, in this direction we must work very hard indeed. It is not sufficient to publicise abroad the grandeur of the Albanian people in the field of national traditions alone, but we must also make world opinion acquainted with the great struggle and work of the Party, of this Marxist-Leninist Party, which is building socialism in its own country quite afraid of the all-round struggle waged against it by the bourgeoisie and the modern revisionists. We must make the bourgeois-revisionist world see the great force of Marxism-Leninism in Albania, not only in the economic field, but also in that of art and culture. We are building in all directions with the maximum of our possibilities, and our friends can see this in the works produced and draw inspiration from the heroism of our people.

There are many foreigners who, even though they are bourgeois, speak well of our country. In the past Albanian was a «blank space» to foreigners, about which they knew nothing. Now, when they see the development of our economy and the scientific level of our research work in this field, they are amazed and ask: Is it possible that all these treasures have lain hidden in this country? It is a good thing that you have discovered them for yourselves, - they tell us, «because had you asked others to help you they would have grabbed them».

In the outside world there are people with great artistic culture who have the Byzantine culture and art, for instance at their finger tips. The appraisal which these critics have of the mural paintings of Onufri and the works of other Albanian authors is exceptionally high. In these artistic notions they do not see the plasticity of Byzantine art. In the paintings, in the colours even in the rocks of our soil which are reflected in them they observe a special living quality «Even the saints, - they say, - have human faces and are presented like the mountain eagles».

That is all I had to say about some of the questions which were raised at this meeting. We wish all the workers of the front of literature and arts still greater successes is carrying out the tasks laid down by the 4th Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party, as well as in the other tasks while the Party, the people and the socialist construction have placed before our literature and arts.

I am sorry that I have not yet been able to see the exhibition of figurative arts which was opened on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the liberation, because, as you know, comrades I have been very busy; nevertheless, I did find the opportunity and I shall certainly go to see it. I have been told that works very good from the ideological viewpoint and well executed from the artistic viewpoint, have been exhibited there. The new talents will certainly grow. This is very important for the future. The very fact of the opening of this exhibition illustrates our great successes in this field. Let your work go well!!

1) Carabouar: was a general term given to the anti-parliamentarism and anti-feudal revolutionaries of 19th century Italy. The term reflects the important role played by the coal-miners in the bourgeois revolutionary movement.
March 7 is celebrated in Albania every year as the Teacher's Day. On this occasion children of all ages express their feelings of the most sincere love and gratitude to their teachers.
The fight of the PLA against the Khrushchevite revisionists at the 1960 Bucharest and Moscow Meetings
This issue of the «Albania Today» is dedicated to the
Volume of the Works of Comrade Enver Hoxha which was
brought throughout Albania on November 8th 1975. This
include speeches, reports, letters and radiograms of
period June-December 1960 which throw light on the de-
ined struggle waged by the Party of Labour of Albania
Comrade Enver Hoxha against Khrushchevite revisionism.

- Real Unity
  Is Achieved and Strengthened Only on the Basis
  of Marxist-Leninist Principles

- We Shall Go to Moscow not with Ten Banners, but with
  Only One, with the Banner of Marxism-Leninism

- Whether Albania is a Socialist Country or not,
  This Does not Depend on Khrushchev,
  But It Has Been Decided by the Albanian People through
  the Wars They Have fought and the Blood
  They Have Shed

- We Shall Ardently Defend Marxism-Leninism
  and the Interests of the People

- We Have Fought Empty-bellied and Bare-footed,
  But Have Never Kowtowed to Anybody

- Other Reports, Speeches, Letters, and Radiograms
On November 8, 1975, the 34th anniversary of the founding of the Party, the 19th volume of the Works by comrade Enver Hoxha, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the PLA, leader of the Party and of the Albanian people, was distributed throughout Albania.

In the series of the Works by comrade Enver Hoxha the materials of this volume are of great political and ideological importance. They belong to the period June-December 1960, a very complicated period when deep ideological and political disagreements had arisen in the relations between a number of parties. In this period the PLA had to take decisions of special responsibility and openly rise before the entire international communist movement, to defend Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism from the new and dangerous revisionist trend, which had been crystallized in its ranks by Khrushchevite revisionism.

In this volume a clear picture is given of the consistent struggle carried out by the Party of Labour of Albania at the Bucharest Meeting and the Moscow Meeting. At Bucharest the PLA did not accept that the alleged mistakes of the Communist Party of China should be judged and the latter condemned on the basis of a document full of slanderous accusations fabricated by the Soviet leadership, without giving the Communist Party of China time and the possibility to read the material and present its own view. At the Moscow Meeting the PLA had its say with revolutionary courage and, before international communism, openly criticised the wrong line of the Soviet leadership concerning a series of major questions of principle. The Party of Labour of Albania never made concessions over principles and refused to follow the revisionist course of the Khrushchev group.

The editors of the review “Albania Today” are publishing some materials from this volume in this issue, hoping that in this way they will fulfill the desire of the readers.
LETTER ADDRESSED TO ALL THE BASIC ORGANIZATIONS
OF THE PARTY ABOUT THE HOLDING OF THE BUCHAREST MEETING
AND ABOUT THE DISAGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE COMMUNIST PARTY
OF THE SOVIET UNION AND THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA

August 9, 1960

Some important ideological and political disagreements
have arisen between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union
and the Communist Party of China. Word about these dis-
agreements is beginning to appear both in the Chinese and
Soviet press as well as in the speeches of the leaders of these
countries, of course, without mentioning one-another by
name, but making allusions, which anybody can easily under-
stand. These questions also have been spoken about and dis-
cussed openly at the meeting in Bucharest of the repre-
sentatives of the communist and workers’ parties who were
delegates of their parties to the 3rd Congress of the Rup-
manian Workers’ Party.

The Central Committee of the Party considers it necessary
to inform all the Party organizations of our stand towards
his problem by means of this letter.

On June 2, 1960, the Central Committee of the Communist
Party of the Soviet Union sent a letter to the Central Com-
mittee of our Party, in which it proposed the holding, at
the end of June, of a meeting of the representatives of the
communist and workers’ parties of the countries of the so-
cialist camp to exchange opinions about the problems of the
present international situation and to determine our fur-
ther common line. The Central Committee of our Party
immediately replied to this letter, stressing that it was in
full agreement with holding the proposed meeting at the
end of June, and that the delegation of our Party for this
purpose would be headed by comrade Enver Hoxha. How-
ever, on June 7 our Central Committee received another letter
from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the
Soviet Union. In this letter the Central Committee of the
Communist Party of the Soviet Union informed us that, all
the parties had agreed in principle to the holding of the
Meeting of the representatives of the communist and work-
ers’ parties of the socialist camp, but some of them had
proposed that the meeting should be postponed to a later
date. Concerning this, the June 7 letter of the Central
Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union said:

‘We could have a preliminary discussion with the repre-
sentatives of your Party about the time for convening the
meeting at the time of the 3rd Congress of the Rumanian
Workers’ Party, on June 20, after which, in agreement with
the central committees of the sister parties, we shall fix
the definite date of the meetings. The Central Committee
of our Party replied to the Central Committee of the Commu-
nist Party of the Soviet Union, that it agreed that the meet-
ing should be postponed, and that agreement should be
reached in Bucharest about the fixing of the date when it
should be held. For this purpose, the Political Bureau of the
Central Committee authorized comrade Hysni Kapo, who
headed the delegation of our Party to the 3rd Congress of
the Rumanian Workers’ Party, to exchange opinions with the
representatives of the sister parties who were at the Congress,
about the fixing of the date of the meeting which was
proposed in the letters of the Central Committee of the Com-
munist Party of the Soviet Union.

But in fact, our delegation, which went to participate
in the Congress of the Rumanian Workers’ Party and discuss the
fixing of the date of the meeting of the representatives of the
communist and workers’ parties of the socialist camp found
itself in Bucharest faced with an international meeting already
prepared. This meeting was contrary to what had been
decided, it was contrary to the content of the letters of
the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet
Union, of which we spoke above. The agenda, too, was quite
different: instead of exchanging opinions about fixing the
date of the meeting of the representatives of the communist
and workers’ parties, as stated in the letter of the Central
Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, accu-
station were made there against the Communist Party of
China. To this end only 10 hours before the meeting a
45-page document prepared by the Soviet comrades was dis-
tributed to all the foreign delegates (the majority of whom
were only members of the central committees), in which
the views of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union were
expressed concerning the disagreements they have with the
Chinese comrades. And on this very important and delicate
question it was demanded that the representatives of more
than 50 communist and workers’ parties of various coun-
tries...
tires, who had come to Bucharest for another purpose, should adopt a stand, after 10 hours, and accuse the Communist Party of China.

It is quite clear that this meeting had been organized in haste and in opposition to the most elementary Leninist organizational rules. As you know very well, dear comrades, even when the question of a rank and file member is to be put forward for discussion in the Party branch, the Party teaches us to be careful, cautious, just, and never hasty. Implementing this Leninist principle of the Party, the branch may hold one, two and frequently even three meetings, the members are informed at least three days before of the agenda and its content, commissions are appointed to prepare the necessary materials, etc. And this, and this alone, is the right way of the Party, the organizational way Marxism-Leninism teaches us. But if we act in this way over one party member, is it in order that a whole party, which has several million party members in its ranks, which leads a people of almost 700 million, should be accused in such a hasty way and in violation of every organizational rule?

In these circumstances, considering the way in which the Bucharest Meeting was prepared and held, the Political Bureau of our Party adopted a correct stand, the only correct, principled and Marxist-Leninist stand that could be adopted. What is this stand?

It can be summed up in a few words: first, the said disagreements are disagreements between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China; second, the Bucharest meeting was premature and held in contravention of the Leninist organizational rules; third, our Party will have its say about these disagreements at the coming meeting, which must be prepared according to the rules and the practice existing among the communist and workers’ parties.

Our Party of Labour thinks that the meeting organized in Bucharest was out of order. It was contrary to the agreement reached through the correspondence between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other sister parties, according to which, only the date of the coming meeting would be set at Bucharest, it was premature and in contravention of the organizational rules which the communist and workers’ parties implement. Thus, on the one hand, taking the above facts into account, and on the other hand, since only 10 hours before the meeting we received a document in which only the view of the Soviet comrades was expressed, our Party could make no pronouncement in Bucharest about the disagreements existing between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China. Our Party will have its say, will express its view about the said disagreements at the coming meeting of the representatives of the communist and workers’ parties, which will take place later, after having studied the materials of both sides carefully, cautiously and with the Marxist-Leninist justice. Our Party, which has always fought, and has loyally defended the principles of Marxism-Leninism, is of the opinion that only at a meeting organized according to the Leninist organizational rules, after having heard the arguments of the two sides, with patience and without heat, in a comradesly spirit, can the conclusion as to who is right and who is wrong, how we should work jointly in the future for the good of socialism and communism, for the good of the unity of our socialist camp be reached.

This wise, principled, and Leninist stand was maintained by comrade Hyani Kapo at the Bucharest Meeting on the instructions of the Political Bureau. As you know from the communiqué published in the press, this stand was fully and unanimously approved by the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party which was held on July 11-12, 1960. The Central Committee is convinced that this correct and principled stand will be unanimously approved by every member of our heroic Party. Only those who do not want to respect the Leninist norms can fail to approve our correct stand.

The disagreements existing between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China concern the two biggest countries and parties of the socialist camp. Our Party cannot remain indifferent towards them... In the future our Party will work, as before, to strengthen our great love and friendship with the Soviet Union, with the Soviet peoples, with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, for there is no stronger and more sincere love than that which is based on the triumphant precepts of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. But at the same time it is undeniable and indisputable that great China, its people and party are dear to us, too, just as to all the countries of the socialist camp.

Therefore, our Party, just as all the other parties, is concerned that this important question should be solved correctly, on the basis of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. Our Party is confident that this question will be resolved at the coming meeting, which will be held in 2-3 months time and the preparation of which has been charged to a commission of representatives of many sister parties, including our Party. We have this firm confidence, for we have confidence in Marxism-Leninism, which has withstood many storms and has always emerged victorious.

Our Party of Labour has always worked and fought for the triumph of Marxism-Leninism, for its application in life, for the preservation of the purity of its principles. For this reason, during its entire glorious history, our Party has always had an entirely correct line, a line which responds to the teachings of Lenin, which responds to the interests of the Albanian people, the interests of socialism and communism. Our Party will pursue its line, based on these principles, without any wavering whatever, in the future, too. We shall fight and work for the triumph of Marxism-Leninism, for the implementation of the principles of the Moscow Declaration of 1957, and of the Bucharest Communiqué, which, as announced in the press, was unanimously approved by the Central Committee of our Party.

Our Party will enhance and strengthen its revolutionary vigilance, which must always be at the proper level, as befits our heroic Party, because the enemies of the Party and the people, the weak, opportunist, and cowardly elements will strive, as always, in various ways to attack the Party and its correct line, to arouse doubts about, and slander, our friendship with the great Soviet Union and the People’s Republic of China, to spread various slogans and views with a view to causing ideological confusion in our ranks. Being vigilant, all the members of our glorious Party must fight with contr-
The question we are going to discuss today has to do with the Bucharest Meeting. As decided, we sent to Romania a party delegation, headed by comrade Hyesi Kapo, to participate in the proceedings of the 3rd Congress of the Rumanian Workers' Party. We had foreseen that on this occasion the first secretaries, or some of them, would go at the head of the delegations of the parties, but for many reasons, which we know, we judged that I should not go. Our delegation was also authorized, in addition to its participation in the proceedings of the 3rd Congress of the Rumanian Workers' Party, to participate in the Meeting of the representatives of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist camp, according to the agreement reached, in order to fix the place, time and date of a meeting of all the parties, at which they will discuss, among other things, the disagreements existing between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China.

There is no doubt that these disagreements must be solved as quickly as possible and in the Marxist-Leninist way, in the last place between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, and, in case they are not solved between them, then the theses should be provided for a discussion among the parties where the representatives of the communist and workers' parties will have their say, and the disagreements be solved in a correct way.

However, the Soviet leaders in Bucharest are making efforts to talk about these disagreements right now. In the telegram he sent us, comrade Hyesi says that, as the Meeting of the representatives of the communist and workers' parties has been postponed, they propose to hold a meeting with the representatives of all the parties who are there, at which to raise the disagreements the Soviet Union has with China, of course in the direction the Soviet Union thinks. According to Khrushchev, at this meeting decisions could be taken, too, and all the parties should express their views, express their solidarity with the Soviet Union and with the Declaration of the Moscow Meeting of 1957, of which Khrushchev says, the Chinese comrades are not upholding. All this is being done by talking with and working on the delegations one after another, with the end in view that the delegation of the Communist Party of China will be told whether it will remain in the socialist camp or not. They say that this meeting is not to isolate China, but is being held in order to inform ourselves, to adopt a common stand.

I think that the decisions we have taken is correct. We must listen not only to what the Soviet comrades say, but also to what the Chinese say, and then have our say in the discussion. Therefore the question arises: What stand will our delegation maintain at this meeting jacked up by the Soviet representatives headed by Khrushchev?

We have been subject to a number of provocations there, against which Hyesi has stood firm, but he needs further assistance and instruction, for he finds himself faced with a series of difficulties, and the most diverse pressures and provocations.

As always, we must pursue a correct line, for we have a great responsibility to our people. We are a Marxist-Leninist party, and it is up to us to maintain a Marxist-Leninist stand, whatever may occur. Life has shown that we have never wavered, therefore not even a cannon can shift us now from the correct line our Party is pursuing. Life has shown that we were not mistaken in our opinions and attitudes towards the Yugoslav revisionists, they have been correct. If Khrushchev and company have adopted a different stand, not fighting the Yugoslav revisionists, that is their affair. That is the way they see it, but we, too, have the right to tell them our opinion. We have supported the Declaration of the Moscow Meeting of 1957, not only on the Yugoslav question, but also on other questions, such as: the unity of the socialist camp, peaceful coexistence, etc. But, on the other hand, concerning many questions included in it, we have had our reservations which we have expressed to the Soviet comrades, or we have adopted a stand in the press and propaganda of the Party. We are for peaceful coexistence, but in the way Lenin conceived it, not to extend it to the field of ideology, for this is extremely dangerous. As far as disarmament is con-
cerned, life has confirmed that imperialism is not disarming. On the contrary, it is arming more and more. Then how can we disarm? On the contrary, we must be vigilant. And so we are, and we have done well. On the basis of the line our Party has pursued, the people and all the communists are ready to rise against any danger of aggression. There are some things which we can tell the Soviet comrades that are not in order. We can tell them, for example, that we do not agree with them when they do not expose the Yugoslav revisionists through to the end. Likewise, if we have any criticism of the others, we shall tell them openly and in a comradesly spirit, in a Marxist way. Therefore, we must prepare ourselves for these things and go to the Meeting of the representatives of the communist and workers’ parties to have our say. In these matters everybody should take a clear and firm Marxist-Leninist stand and provocations by anyone must not be permitted.

Now, if you like, we may read the radiogram by comrade Hysni.

After reading the radiogram sent by comrade Hysni Kapo, conrade Enver Hoxha again took the floor.

As soon as comrade Gogo [Nushi] arrived in Moscow, he was summoned by Brezhnev. After asking him, “How are you?” and “How are you getting on?”, he told him about their theses concerning the Chinese. Likewise when comrade Mehmet [Shehu] went to Moscow, Kosygin saw him and spoke to him for an hour and a half about these questions. Comrade Mehmet replied: “If these things are so, why have they been let get worse, since it has been possible to solve them in a Marxist-Leninist way between the two parties first of all, and then, if necessary, they could have been raised with the other parties”. Mehmet told him, “Our Party will maintain a correct, principled, Marxist-Leninist stand, and will not fall into sentimental and opportunist positions”.

In his letter comrade Hysni tells us that Teodor Zhivkov tried a provocation. He said to him, “What is Albania up to? Only Albania does not agree”. Comrade Hysni retorted: “What do you imply by this?” Then Zhivkov said: “I was joking”. Hysni pointed out to him that he must have something in his head to say that, “Only Albania does not agree”. He again answered, “I was joking”.

The Bulgarians have published in an illustrated brochure a map of the Balkans in which Albania is presented as a part of Yugoslavia. Concerning this question I told Behar to summon the Bulgarian ambassador and ask him what was that they were doing, and demand that this brochure be immediately withdrawn from circulation.

With regard to the questions we discussed here I think we should guide comrade Hysni. I have prepared the letter, which I am going to read slowly because it is important.

After the reading and approval of the letter, comrade Enver Hoxha continued:

I want to stress that our strength consists in the unity of thought and deed of our leadership and the entire Party, which is of exceptional importance. Our unity is based on the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, therefore we must make it ever stronger. We have advanced consistently on this road, striving for the strict implementation to the letter of the decisions we adopt jointly, in the Political Bureau, and when the need arises we consult one another again. But on those occasions when one of us finds himself in difficulty and alone and having no possibility to consult anyone, he ought to act, as we did in the time of war, when, without comrades, one had to decide for oneself whether or not all the forces should be thrown into the attack, or to defend and implement himself the line of the Party.

1. Concerning the participation in the Meeting of the parties of the socialist camp in Bucharest to fix the place and date for a future broader meeting of the communist and workers’ parties.
2. At that time Member of the Political Bureau of the CC of the PLA and President of the Trade Unions of Albania, stopped at Moscow on his way back home from Peking where he had gone to participate in the meeting of the Council of the World Trade Union Federation.
3. Member of the Political Bureau of the CC of the PLA and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the PRA.
4. Behar Shbylla, at that time Minister of Foreign Affairs of the PRA.
5. See the letter addressed to comrade Hysni Kapo in Bucharest on June 22, 1960.

LETTER ADDRESSED TO COMRADE HYSNI KAPO IN BUCHAREST

June 22, 1960

Dear comrade Hysni,

We received your telegram and letter and studied them in the Political Bureau. We are unanimously of the opinion that the situation is very grave and is not developing in a proper party way. The development of events, the fanning and extension of the conflict between the Soviet Union and China, in the way it is being done, our Political Bureau considers very wrong, very harmful and very dangerous, therefore it can by no means reconcile itself to the methods and forms which are being used to resolve this conflict which is casting our socialist camp and international communism dear. Our Political Bureau stands firm, as always, on the Marxist-Leninist line that the disagreements between the Soviet Union and China should never have been left to get worse, that the conflict must not be allowed to deepen, but must be solved in a Marxist-Leninist way and with Marxist-Leninist methods.

The Political Bureau thinks that the disagreements which exist between the Soviet Union and China have been made known to the communist and workers’ parties not according to the Leninist rules, but in a fortuitous way, through open and indirect polemics in the press and by word of mouth. This is not the right method of solving such a conflict if it is
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leard, as Marxism-Leninism requires, that the other parties, too, should intervene and assist with their experience and weight. This assistance has not been sought until recently. However, according to the telegrams you sent us, even now the Soviet side is aiming to avoid this correct manner of solution. We come to the conclusion that all efforts to clear up these questions between the two biggest parties of the socialist camp in a proper and objective manner, in the Marxist-Leninist way, have not been made. And it seems to us that the solution of the question by a meeting, in which the other communist and workers' parties of our camp should participate, is not being taken as seriously as it should be, since the two parties that have disagreements have not presented their theses and views on these disagreements officially to the other sister parties.

The Political Bureau considers that our Party has just as great a responsibility as all the other parties, both for the strengthening of the unity of the socialist camp in the Marxist-Leninist way, and for the preservation of the purity of the Party and Marxism-Leninism. The Soviet Union is dear to our Party, but China, too, is dear to us. Therefore, we must make no mistakes, we must not get the Party into an impasse and into ideological and political confusion. We have not done this, and we shall never do it. When it is a question of defending our principles, we take no account of whether this or that one may like it. Our Party has always been guided by the correct Marxist-Leninist stand, and it will always be characterized by principled Marxist-Leninist courage.

Now what standard should be maintained towards the events taking place there? You are clear about the line of the Party and there is no need to dwell on it. But since passions have burst out not in proper Party forms, you must be very careful. Your response must be cautious and carefully weighed up. Always think of the interests of the Party and Marxism-Leninism. But this does not mean that you should not give the due reply there and then to whomever it may be. For example, is it not ridiculous and impermissible that a certain Magyarsoli should come to convince us, Albanians, of the correctness of the line of the Soviet Union and the "faults" of China? Let Magyarsoli go elsewhere to peddle his wares, and not to us. We do not need Magyarsoli to come and "enlighten" us about those principles and truths for which our Party has fought and is ready to fight always. Or, for example, make sure that Andropov thoroughly understands that we do not accept that the Soviet representatives should approach our comrades, members of the delegation to the Congress of the Romanian Workers' Party, and say to them in tones of amazement: "What, has your leadership not informed you of these things?" Remind Andropov that Mikoyan wanted to talk about these questions only to comrade Enver, and it was he (Enver), who on his own initiative, took along comrade Mehmet. Mikoyan begged comrade Enver to keep all he told him absolutely secret, and when this is the case, our leadership keeps its word, for it is not in the habit of gossiping about such things. But tell Andropov that we see two dangerous tendencies in the Soviet comrades who talked with the comrades of our delegation: First, they underestimate the danger of revisionism, a thing with which we can never agree, and, second, the tendency to present the leadership of our Party as guilty in the eyes of our comrades, for allegedly not informing them. Tell Andropov that they must stop these anti-Marxist tactics immediately, and that they should know that the unity of our leadership is like steel, just as the unity of our leadership with the entire Party of Labour is also like steel, and whoever tries, in one way or another, to make such attempts, may be sure that he will receive blows from us. Tell Andropov also that it is neither proper nor necessary for the Soviet comrades to inform our comrades, because our leadership, which knows how to defend Marxism-Leninism, also knows when and about what it should inform its members.

Say these things to Andropov without heat, but you well understand why they must be said. They are acting in an irregular way and not in a party way, and it is the occasion to bar the way to these actions. Also say to Andropov, "I am very sorry that you brought Magyarsoli with you, not as the host, but to convince me of the correctness of the line of the Soviet Union and the wrong way of China. Only good manners, since I was his guest, prevented me from being as blunt with him as he deserved."

Or, when the opportunity presents itself, as when Andropov said to you that, "... thinking that you are firmly against the Yugoslavs, the Communist Party of China wanted to win you over, but it was wrong..., etc., say that, "The times are gone when our Party of Labour and its leadership could be misled by anyone and become a partisan of wrong lines. Our Party has been tempered in struggle and does not step on rotten planks. It has stood and will always stand on the road of the Marxist-Leninist principles."

Before we come to the essence of the problem, there are also some other questions you should bear in mind, because they might help you. There are some crooked developments taking place, as you wrote in your letter to us. Provocations and behind-the-scenes manoeuvres are being hatched up there. Therefore, stand firm, and show them that there is unity, determination and courage in our leadership.

On the basis of the decisions of the Political Bureau you will act as follows:

1. Call Andropov and tell him, on behalf of the leadership of the Party (always on behalf of the Party, on behalf of the leadership): "I communicated to my leadership what you told me. Our leadership has had knowledge in a general way about these disagreements and has considered them very grave, very harmful to our common cause, and again expressed its opinion that they must be resolved, and resolved in a correct way, according to the Marxist-Leninist organizational rules. Our leadership has expressed its opinion that these ideological and political disagreements between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China should be solved in a Marxist-Leninist way through joint discussions between the two parties. If they cannot be solved in this way, then the representatives of the communist and workers' parties of the camp of socialism should be called on to discuss the issues and express their views. The stands maintained at this meeting could be put before a broader meeting of the communist and workers' parties like that of Moscow in 1957."

Now it has been decided to hold this meeting. The leadership of our Party considers this a correct decision. It is in agreement, preparing to express its opinion on the issues,
and is awaiting the fixing of the date. Tell them that, if [Hysni] am authorized to discuss the setting of the date. Our leadership has appointed and communicated, also, that our delegation to the coming meeting will be headed by comrade Enver Hoxha.

The meeting which is proposed to be held now in Bucharest with all the representatives of the sister communist and workers’ parties, who have come to the Congress of the Romanian Workers’ Party, over the disagreements between the CP of the SU and the CP of China, is considered by our leadership as premature and very harmful. Our Party also considers very harmful a camouflaged or open campaign in the press, about those very delicate questions. Let the coming meeting judge who is right or who is wrong. Our Party will exert all its strength and that modest experience it has, to resolve those grave disagreements in the principled Marxist-Leninist way. Our Party assumes all its responsibilities; it will fight honestly and courageously, as always, to defend its correct Marxist-Leninist line, to defend Marxism-Leninism, to defend the camp of socialism and its unity. The Soviet Union and the Bolshevik Party have been, and are, and will remain very dear to our Party. But it is undeniable and indisputable that, both to you, and also to us and to our whole camp, great China is very dear, too. Therefore, our leadership thinks and reaffirms that the mistakes, wherever they may be, should be considered in a realistic way at a meeting, and that every effort, everything possible, must be done through Marxist-Leninist ways and methods, to correct them for the good of socialism and communism. This was the official opinion of our leadership when they sent me to Bucharest, and it remains so now after I have informed them of what you communicated to me.

Also tell Andropov: “I [Hysni] am authorized only to represent the Party of Labour of Albania at the Congress of the Romanian Workers’ Party and talk with the representatives of the other parties of the camp of socialism about the fixing of the date for the forthcoming meeting. In case the meeting proposed by you and the Romanian Workers’ Party is to be held now immediately in Bucharest, as I pointed out previously, our leadership considers it premature, nevertheless I am authorized to take part in it.

I have been officially authorized to communicate these things to you so that you will transmit them to your leadership. Our Party says everything it has to say openly and without hesitation, in a Leninist way.

II. At the meeting that may be held keep cool. Measure your words. About the disagreements which exist between the Soviet Union and China make no pronouncement. Your statement should be brief and concise.

In essence you will declare on behalf of our Party:
1. Our Party of Labour has approved and implemented the decisions of the Moscow Conference [1957].
2. Emphasize the correct, consistent, and principled policy of our Party, its boundless loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, the great love of our Party and people for the parties and peoples of the countries of the socialist camp, for all the other sister communist and workers’ parties of the world, for the unity of our camp which must in no way be endangered, but must be strengthened and tempered in the Marxist-Leninist way.
3. Express the regret of our Party over these disagreements that have arisen between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, and express the conviction that these will be solved in the Marxist-Leninist way at the coming meeting of the communist and workers’ parties which will be held later.
4. Express the determination of our Party that it will fight shoulder to shoulder with the parties of the socialist countries, always being vigilant and mercilessly exposing imperialism and its agents, the revisionists, through to the end. These things should be the essence of your statement.

We believe that everything will go well. We are on the right road, therefore follow the situations with the coolness and revolutionary courage which characterize you.

Keep us informed about everything.

Splendid news: Yesterday good rain fell everywhere. All the comrades send you their best regards.

I embrace you,

ENVER

P.S.
To any attempt or suggestion on the part of the Soviet comrades about my coming to Bucharest you must answer, “He is not coming.”

1. A. Magyavosi, at that time Member of the Political Bureau of the CC of the Romanian Workers’ Party.
2. At that time Head of Department of the CC of the CP of the Soviet Union.
3. At the beginning of February 1960, comrade Enver Hoxha, who was in Moscow at the head of the delegation of the PLA to take part in the Meeting of the representatives of the communist and workers’ parties of the socialist countries of Europe on the questions of the development of agriculture, met A. Mikoyan on the latter’s request. Mikoyan spoke at this meeting for nearly 5 hours about the ideological and political disagreements which existed between the CP of the SU and the CP of China.

LETTER ADDRESSED TO COMRADE HYSNI KAPO IN BUCHAREST

June 25, 1960

Dear Hysni,

We received the radiograms of the evening and I am writing this piece of letter to you now in the morning! to say only that you have given a good reply to the “fellow”s. Don’t trouble yourself at all when someone may provoke you, but answer, and indeed strongly, however with coolness. Base things are being done, but right always wins. If they continue to make provocations, leave nothing on our back, but leave it on their back.

I embrace you,

ENVER

1. Sent by the plane which would bring comrade Hysni back home.
THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE IS THE LEADERSHIP OF THE PARTY
WHICH ALWAYS JUDGES FAIRLY, WISELY, CALMLY AND, WHEN NECESSARY, SEVERELY, TOO

from the conversation with Koço Tashkhoj

August 3, 1960

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: I received your letter in which you asked to meet me. I authorized comrade Hysni Kapo to talk with you, but you were not satisfied, because you wanted to speak with me or with nobody. Of course, anybody may ask to talk with the First Secretary of the Central Committee, but it may happen that the First Secretary is very busy or absent from Tirana. In such cases I authorize somebody else, as I did in your case. In the evening, as soon as I received your letter, I sent it immediately to Hysni through an officer. The officer was instructed to inform you to come and meet Hysni at the Central Committee. This was not to your liking, and you used bad language towards one of our officers. When a secretary of the Central Committee asks you to come to meet him, you should go there at once, at the fixed time, and not when it pleases you. Otherwise how can a man call himself a communist, if he does not show himself to be correct and disciplined when invited by a comrade whom the Party has elected to the leadership? Besides, you know that our officers are our comrades, they are communists, they are not «policemen», as you call them. You are wrong to speak like this, because you are a party member. The Party has charged our officers with important tasks.

We have invited you today to talk over the problems which you raised in your letter, and what you discussed with Hysni. Therefore, you must speak openly, clearly, in detail, like a party member. We have time at our disposal, and the patience to hear you out. Tell us about your problems one by one. In what are you opposed to the Central Committee and where does it stem from? Tell us about the talks you have had with the functionaries of the Soviet Embassy, what they said to you and what you said to them.

Koço Tashkoj began speaking in an irresponsible and insolent manner. Patently, comrade Enver Hoxha tried to help him, from time to time breaking in to ask a question.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: You are trying to jump from one thing to another, by telling us what was said at the Plenum of the Central Committee of our Party, as if I were not present at the meeting. Why don’t you tell us about the other matters we want to know? You told us nothing about what you said to Hysni. I say you should judge things better. Many things you raise here are the offspring of your imagination.

You are not in order when you say that the criticisms we levelled at Khrushchev were not fair. In your opinion, over what problems has Khrushchev been wrong? Or is he not wrong at all? As you said yourself, your opinion is that «Khrushchev was unjustly attacked by those who spoke at the Plenum, and no measures were taken against them».

This is astonishing. Instead of condemning the attitude of Khrushchev, you seek to condemn the comrades of the Plenum who quite rightly spoke against him.

A little while ago, you said: «Perhaps by travelling so much in the capitalist countries, Khrushchev might bring back other ideas. I want to say that there is the possibility that some circumstances might influence him. But if Khrushchev is making mistakes, Stalin made mistakes, too». No, Koço, don’t mix Khrushchev with Stalin. Do not speak in general, but tell us concretely, has Khrushchev made mistakes or not?

KOÇO TASHKOJ: I say that he has not made mistakes.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: But you say that Khrushchev might make mistakes just as Stalin?

KOÇO TASHKOJ: Even if he is wrong, I believe that he will be corrected.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: You said that you were not in agreement when I did not go to the Bucharest Meeting, that allegedly I did not reply to the invitation of the Soviet comrades. It is not as you say. I had no such invitation. You fabricate non-existent things.
The norms of the Marxist-Leninist parties are known by all. If you do not know these norms, then, I shall tell you. It has not happened and does not happen that the Central Committee of our Party may say to the First Secretary, «don’t go», when he is invited to a meeting of the communist and workers’ parties of the socialist camp or of the world. Just at the last Plenum it was decided that at the coming meeting to be held in November in Moscow, the First Secretary of the Central Committee would go at the head of the delegation of our Party. We were invited to Bucharest by the Rumanian Workers’ Party only to take part in its Congress, and we sent our delegation there. As regards the meeting of the representatives of the communist and workers’ parties which was held in Bucharest, according to the agreement reached beforehand, it was aimed only at fixing the time and place of the coming meeting of the communist and workers’ parties of the world, therefore our Central Committee did not consider it necessary to send me to Bucharest, but authorized comrade Hysni Kapo to take part in that meeting. Now, as for whence you deduce these things you are saying, other than what they are in reality, and what your starting point is, we do not understand, therefore explain this to us yourself.

You are a party member, how can it be explained that you think that all the things that were said at the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party were not put forward correctly and are without foundation? What is well-founded then? These things that you tell us?
KOÇO TASHKO: You should have more confidence in Khrushchev!

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: When, according to the Marxist-Leninist organizational norms and the rules of the proletarian internationalism, one party criticizes another party, or when a leader criticizes a leader of another party, because he has committed mistakes, this is a correct stand.

You are of the opinion that the Moscow Meeting should not be held in November, but as soon as possible. But this is a proposal made by you. The essence of the matter is that we shall go to the Moscow Meeting, and there we shall express our viewpoint. What have you to say on this?

KOÇO TASHKO: I do not agree that you should go into details.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: What do you agree? Tell us.

KOÇO TASHKO: I told you. I have nothing to add, I am a sick man.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: No, KOÇO TASHKO, you are not as physically sick as you pretend. You are sick in the head. But the Party is healthy. The Party can cure those who are sick in the head if they so desire. It is the Party's duty to help people have their say, to correct themselves, to march on the right road, but, in order to receive this aid, their hearts must be open before the Party. Do you know these principles?

KOÇO TASHKO: I know them, that is why I asked to talk with you because I could not speak at the Plenum as I can here. Who would let you to speak like this there? They would have me by the throat.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: What is this you are saying? Explain yourself a little. Who does not allow you to speak at the Plenum of the Central Committee? According to you, when you cannot speak at the Plenum, this means that the situation there is unhealthy. You said that you have great faith in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, then why don't you have the same faith in our Party as well, of which you yourself are a member?

KOÇO TASHKO: I said this because, if they interrupted me when I spoke, I ran nervous and..., one interjection, one remark against me, throws me off balance.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: As to what you feel, I do not know. I only know the Leninist norms of our Party. The Central Committee is the leadership of the Party which always judges things correctly, wisely, calmly, but, when necessary, severely, too. Then, how can you speak like this about the Central Committee, about the leadership of the Party? The members of the Central Committee are not children, who, as you say, would not judge you well but would hurl themselves at your throat! What do you mean by saying that you are nervous?

KOÇO TASHKO: That I cannot speak there. It is a question of temperament.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: But can such a stand before the Central Committee of our Party be called Marxist? Last night you said to Hysni that if you had spoken at the Plenum, you would have caused a split, while here you are telling me that, if you had spoken, «they would have had you by the throat».

Which statement do you stand by? If you explain this with «health reasons», you do not convince us. It is your duty to give the explanations that the Central Committee demands from you, because you are a party member. Therefore, tell us why you think that the members of the Plenum would not judge you fairly.

The communist speaks openly at the meetings of the Party. When he considers that he is expressing a correct view, this is in the interests of the Party, therefore he defends his opinion to the end, even if all the others are opposed to his view. That is what Lenin teaches us. The interests of the Party should be put above everything else, and not personal interests. The communist might even die, he might collapse unconscious at the meeting, but the Party must know his viewpoint now or after 50 years, therefore he should express this viewpoint, just as it is. That is how the party members think, but not you, who are afraid to speak at the Plenum, and you tell us here: «My heart might stop beating if I speak». I ask you again, tell us, what is this idea you expressed to Hysni that your speech would cause a split?

KOÇO TASHKO: I said that the comrades of the Central Committee must not think that I was criticizing you.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: This is what you think, and act the comrades of the Plenum, who understand criticism correctly. And why shouldn't you criticize me? Tell us, what is the Central Committee and what am I? I am a party member, a soldier of the Party. Above me is the Political Bureau, above the Political Bureau is the Central Committee, above which is the Congress of the Party. Then, why do you prefer to have a tête-à-tête talk alone with me and not with the Central Committee, which is the leading forum of the Party, while I am a member of the Central Committee? Tomorrow you will come to the Central Committee again and give explanations for these viewpoints.

KOÇO TASHKO: But there are some things which one should discuss rather more in confidence.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: It seems to me you do not have a correct understanding of the Central Committee. What is there in all this to be discussed in confidence? Why should you discuss these things more in confidence, for what reasons? How can it be explained that you want to avoid saying these things in the Central Committee? Why are you worried that by speaking at the Plenum of the Central Committee you would cause a split among its rank? You did not explain this.

You admitted here that if you had spoken at the Plenum it might have been thought that, «KOÇO waited and said these things at a meeting where there were a whole of people». How can you speak in such a way about the Central Committee? Are you in your senses or not? What is the Central Committee, a «mob», a random gathering? Better to have raised these matters at the Plenum, as there would have been no split at all, only the authority the Party has given you would have declined. Think it over, speak out as you should speak in the Party, you poor man! What are these things? You have been nursing these thoughts for 20 days without saying a word to us.

You have said that you agree only on the question of our going to Moscow and that, «if we do have any opinions about Khrushchev we should say them to him». But you know very well, because you were at the Central Committee and heard it there, that we have continually told Khrushchev what we think. Therefore the things we have to say to Khrushchev are not new to him, we have told him to his face, and have not
kept them to ourselves. Did you hear this at the Plenum, or not?

As the facts show, you do not agree with the decisions of the Plenum, except on one thing, that we must go on.

These are not family problems, neither are they friendly ones. You come out with views contrary to the Central Committee. Then why raise such worrying problems about which the Central Committee has decided what stand should be adopted, today, and not at the proper time? On such party problems why wait and think «to meet comrade Enver when he goes on holiday?» For all these problems that you have and which are in opposition to the Party, you should have come to us the very next day. Why did you leave this problem for 20 days? This is not a party stand. How will you explain this stand to your branch?

KOÇO TASHKO: I did not come because I thought you are busy with Thorez’s.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: I stayed only two hours with Thorez. You should have asked for a meeting, it was your duty to tell the Party everything, and not to think that, «now comrade Enver is with Thorez», «I shall go to meet him when he goes to Korça on holiday», etc. If I had not gone to Korça, what would you have done? I suppose you would have kept these things to yourself still, especially as you didn’t want to tell them to any other secretary of the Central Committee.

KOÇO TASHKO: As I said to the Soviet comrades, I hoped that you would talk with Thorez about these problems, and that through his mediation, a way to solve them would be found.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: So this is what you think! And it seems to me that this is what kept you from meeting me at once. Why do you have hopes in Thorez and yourself, and not in Enver, who is your First Secretary? However, in your opinion, is it correct, that now Thorez has come, things will be put right? Tell us what things will be put right, have you thought about it or not?

You thought that now that Thorez had come attempts would be made to improve relations with Khrushchev. What are these attempts? What mediation should we have sought from Thorez, in your opinion? Explain yourself!

KOÇO TASHKO: This is very simple. Thorez is General Secretary of a glorious party, and I thought that comrade Enver would tell him that the Moscow Meeting should be held earlier than November.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: It is still stuck in your mind that the November Meeting should be held earlier. I told you that this does not depend on us. We have been and still are of the opinion that this meeting should be held, and we have declared this before the representatives of more than 50 parties. It was decided at Bucharest that this meeting would be held in Moscow, on the occasion of the celebrations of the Great October Socialist Revolution. It has also been decided that before the meeting the proceedings of the commission comprised of the representatives of the 12 parties of the socialist countries and the representatives of the 14 other parties of the capitalist states should take place. These problems will be discussed first at the commission and then the materials will be sent to every party, hence to our Party, too.

When they come, we shall study these materials very carefully and act as was decided at the Plenum of the Central Committee, which you know. Therefore you had no need to demand from our Party that the meeting should be held as early as possible. If the meeting is held earlier, we are ready to go.

You want the meeting to be held very soon, but you do not come, according to the party rules, and tell the First Secretary your great anxiety. Then what are the reasons that you think that «now that Thorez has come the problems will be set on the right path and put in order»? What problems are you talking about?

KOÇO TASHKO: Good grief—about the known problems! All those things that were said at the Plenum and what we are talking about here!

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: That is to say that we should tell Thorez everything, and he should put them forward in the place you have in mind! But how was it decided at the Central Committee? At the Plenum we decided to put forward these problems at the Moscow Meeting. If we were to solve these problems through Thorez, this would mean we would be acting outside the decision of the Central Committee. How does it come about that you think in such a way?

KOÇO TASHKO: I think it is correct to make use of Thorez for any disagreement you have with Brezhnev, Koslov, and others.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: What is this Brezhnev, why do you try to frighten us with these names? We have nothing to do with the president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union. Don’t try to provoke us here. I have told Koslov to his face what’s wrong with him, and I shall do so again.

Now tell us about the meetings you have had with the Soviet representatives. We are interested to know what you talked about. Tell us the important things.

KOÇO TASHKO: On the 29th of July Bespalov phoned me and asked me to come and talk to him. I met him at the Soviet Club. We saw a film and afterwards went to Dajti Hotel. Bespalov told me that the relations between us had become cool.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: Didn’t they say why they had become cool?

KOÇO TASHKO: He did not say, nor did I ask. We talked about many things. I told him that the Plenum of the Central Committee of our Party had charged Comrade Enver with the solution of the problems. I said that perhaps something might be done through the talks that would be held with Thorez.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: But what was your opinion?

KOÇO TASHKO: My opinion was that these problems should be solved at the November Meeting or at any other meeting that might be held. I do not exclude some other meeting, apart from that of November.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: Thus, you do not exclude another meeting. Go on.

KOÇO TASHKO: I told Bespalov that with the coming of Thorez to our country, there would be something positive, because that day I had read in the newspaper «Zëri i Popullit» the speech Thorez made in Korça, and I was impressed by the fact that he spoke very well of our Party, the Central Committee, and comrade Enver.
COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: That is to say that you came to the conclusion that we had talked, that we had discussed these problems, too, and were of one mind with Thorez. Thus, you judge from outside, formulate in your imagination ideas that Thorez has not come here for a vacation but to talk. And you say this even to Bespalov. You think that the comrades of the Bureau must have come to agreement with Thorez, and proceeding from the estimation Thorez made of our Party in the speech he delivered in Korce, you judge that even the leadership of our Party has given way. Thus, according to your thinking, all the things decided by the Plenum have been discarded and Enver has come to the same opinions as Koco. Have you met Novikov? 

KOCO TASHKO: I have met him. Bespalov asked me to dinner at Novikov's. Ivanov was to be there, too. After dinner, we had a long talk. Near the end, I don't remember how it arose, we talked about Thorez.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: Try to remember how this conversation developed.

KOCO TASHKO: We just talked about Thorez.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: It was all about Thorez?

KOCO TASHKO: Yes, that Thorez would save the day.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: But Ivanov, what did he say?

KOCO TASHKO: I don't know, he spoke in general.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: We know Ivanov very well. He is not the one to speak in general.

KOCO TASHKO: Ivanov has never talked with me about the problems we are speaking about. Neither has Zolotov, nor Bespalov - they are close friends of mine.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: I find it surprising that they have not talked with you, when you are close friends, at a time when they are approaching cadres whom they scarcely know, and saying, "Come and talk with us."

KOCO TASHKO: They have not talked with me, not only now, but even in 1927, when I was in the Soviet Union. From all they did for me at that time, I understood something. They did me all those great honours, they said, "If you like, you may stay in the villa where comrade Enver stays with the government delegation;" they even invited me to the reception that was given in the Kremlin. Hence, they have usazhnyi for me and behave well. But recently, when Ivanov shakes hands with me, he does so very briefly, in order to avoid compromising me in the eyes of somebody who does not like me.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: But why could he compromise you? Who doesn't like you? Is this true?

KOCO TASHKO: I don't know, I cannot explain.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: But later, why did Ivanov become closer to you again?

KOCO TASHKO: This is one of the questions that I have in the back of my mind, too.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: You said that, "all the talk with the Soviet representatives was about Thorez, that this was a very important question." But when you consider the question of Thorez as important, why do you talk with Novikov and Ivanov, and do not come to me? You had all these talks with them before sending me your letter.

KOCO TASHKO: I went to them by chance.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: The party comrades will laugh at you, when this question is discussed. Since you accept the thesis that comrade Enver might have talked with Thorez, why do you discuss these questions with the Soviet representatives?

KOCO TASHKO: I don't see anything wrong with that.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: We are in the offices of the Central Committee, here, therefore speak in the proper manner. I am not a prosecutor, but the first Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party, therefore discuss the problems, as they are discussed in the Party. What you are telling us doesn't add up. On the one hand, you say that you can talk only with comrade Enver, because he is the first Secretary of the Central Committee, and on the other hand, the idea you have about our Party, you do not tell him, but you go and tell it to Bespalov, whom you consider a close friend, as you yourself said. What are you saying? Bespalov has his place, and the first Secretary of the Central Committee of our Party has his. Why didn't you respect the organizational rules of the Party and talk with me? If you had disagreements with the Central Committee and wanted to speak to the first Secretary about them, you should have done it at the proper time, immediately after the Plenum. Whether you should have gone to the Soviet representatives or not, is another matter. In my opinion you had no business to go there, while you not only went and talked with them, but went without saying a word to us and had three meetings with the Soviet representatives.

KOCO TASHKO: No, I had only two.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: This is stated in writing in your letter. Even if you had not met them at all, even the idea of going to them for talks before coming to our Party is impermissible and contrary to the organizational rules of our Party.

I do not accept you wrote your letter to me before you talked with the Soviet representatives: the very content of it refutes such acceptance.

According to you, it seems that Thorez has come from Paris just to talk with us about these questions, and then go on to Moscow. When Ivanov told you that, besides Thorez, there were also some others who would go to Moscow on the 8th of August, were you not curious to ask who were these others? Then, who asked you to say to Ivanov that an invitation to this meeting should go to comrade Enver? Who authorized you to speak in the name of the first Secretary of the Central Committee? Now you come and say to me that you are of the opinion that the problems should not be left to be discussed in November, "since they will get worse." We know this, but we know the other side, too, that our Party is not making matters worse. It is your actions that are doing this, therefore do not accuse our Party.

For 4-5 years we have not uttered a word about the unjust actions of certain Soviet leaders. Some Soviet leaders attack us, but we have been patient, while now you come and say that we should not leave these things to get worse. Isn't this an accusation? I told you, and I repeat, that it does not depend on our Party to decide the time of the meeting. Why are you so insistent that this meeting should be held as soon as possible? You tell Ivanov that an invitation should go to comrade Enver, then you come here and tell me to go and talk with Ivanov myself. Have you thought about what course you are on? Why do you act like this? What wrong has our Party done you? It has brought you up, it has helped you, it is helping and will help you, but what you have done is very grave.
You say that you love the Party, why then do you not tell the Party the things that are worrying you?

KOČO TASHKO: I told you that I am a phlegmatic type, therefore you should also keep in mind the human aspect and types of people. And what is more, after I met the Soviet representatives, they put me in a difficult position.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: How did they put you in a difficult position? Explain yourself!

KOČO TASHKO: I intended to meet you, but I postponed it from day to day. As soon as I talked with Bespalov I understood that this problem could not be put off any longer.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: Explain to us a little, why did you go and talk with him, since you condemn this talk?

KOČO TASHKO: No, I do not condemn it, but I had something to say to you also.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: You tell them everything while you tell the First Secretary of your Party only «something». But who is to blame for what you have done? If you realize your mistake, then make a little self-criticism. Didn't the Soviet representatives with whom you talked ask how the Plenum went?

KOČO TASHKO (hesitates, then says): They may have asked me...

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: Tell us frankly, did you say anything about the Plenum? Didn't Ivanov ask how these problems were discussed at the Plenum? I ask you again, did Ivanov ask you how these matters were discussed at the Plenum? Did he ask you such a question?

What was that you said to Hyni, you who pose as allegedly knowing the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, when you put our leadership in the position of the Mensheviks and Trotskyites, and said that what is happening here with us «is like the time of Kronsdat» in the Soviet Union? Is this what you think about your Party? Then what are we — beloaristists? Do you know the history of our Party? It was not you who inculcated the great love of our people for the peoples of the Soviet Union, but our Party, during the war, with blood and sweat, while you now come and make such accusations against us! These things that you said have their roots elsewhere, therefore think and reflect only in the party way, otherwise you will not correct yourself. Come down to earth. The Party has respected you more than you deserved. Your imagination is sick, and this is not a recent illness — you have had this sickness for some time.

To tell the truth, from no one else in my life have I heard such a discussion and presentation of the matter, without start, without finish, without any connection between one thing and another, like this I heard from you. Many comrades have come and have opened their hearts to me when they have made some mistake, but they have emerged from the discussion feeling better. While now you speak to me about «humanism», about the phlegmatic type! I have been humane with people, with the comrades. What do you want when you tell me now «to see the human side, too»? Do you want me to fail to defend the line of the Party, its interests? Please! I put the interests of the Party and of the people above everything else, and I will defend them as long as I live. If anybody has facts with which to criticize me and the Central Committee, we shall welcome his just criticism gladly, and this is how we have always received it.

But if anybody criticizes us for the stand we maintain towards the Yugoslav revisionists, we say «stop», whoever he might be, even to Khrushchev, because we call a spade a spade. He himself has said that the Yugoslav leadership is an agency of imperialism. Then why should our Party be attacked for its just stand against the Yugoslav revisionists? For what reasons? How can we keep our mouths shut over these things? When we say that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the mother Party, this does not mean that we should keep silent about the mistakes of some one in its leadership.

After the talks we held in Moscow in 1957, out of respect for the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, for a time we did not write against Yugoslav revisionism in our press. However, it was not long and the Yugoslav revisionists held their notorious 7th Congress, with regard to which the correctness of the line of our Party was once again obvious. By taking a revolutionary stand, we are defending the Soviet Union itself and its Communist Party, while those who violate the principles of Marxism-Leninism in one way or another, we shall criticize in a Marxist-Leninist way, whoever they may be. Don't we have the right to criticize some one when the cup is full? When mistakes are made, we cannot sit in silence. We shall criticize in a Marxist-Leninist way, because this is the way to defend the freedom and the independence of our Homeland and of the Soviet Union itself, because so much blood has been shed to win these things. This is the way to defend Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, Kočo Tashko, not your way. You mix up things in your imagination. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has the right to act as it likes, but we have the right to have our say about the complaints made against our Party. Our Party fights to the end to defend the interests of the people and of Marxism-Leninism from the enemies, but your sick imagination says otherwise. Criticism is criticism, therefore, when you are faced with mistakes, it is opportunism not to criticize. However you have suffered to some degree from this disease. I have followed the life of the Party very carefully from the very beginning. There are occasions when little should be said, but there are also occasions when you should grit your teeth, and, when it is a matter of principles, they must be defended, we must not violate them.

Have you seen our writings where we criticize the Yugoslav revisionists? In them we have constantly spoken about the experience of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Then why come and point out to me one by one the articles published by the Soviet comrades? I know them, but there are also differences in our attitudes, which are not just tactical differences. We have made our criticism known to Khrushchev, too. We do not speak about them in secret. We have told him openly to his face, and he has spoken to us the same way. But these differences have not led us to a split. You know the viewpoint of our Party, that the disagreements that have emerged are between two parties, between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, and we have said at the proper time that the examination of these questions in Bucharest was premature, hasty, that they should be solved carefully and by strictly applying the Leninist organizational rules on the relations between parties. What then impels you to adopt this stand against the Central Committee? Therefore, as a comrade, I say to you to reflect upon these
questions. During these next 2 or 3 days, according to the party rules, you have the possibility to write to the Central Committee about these questions.

KOČO TASHKO: I have nothing more to say.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: That means that you will not act like a party member, to whom the Party lends a hand to think over his mistakes. Then don't come out tomorrow and say that comrade Enver did not give you the possibility to reflect more deeply over your mistakes.

KOČO TASHKO: I have nothing to say. What I had to say I said here.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: In short, this is your stand. Are you not going to re-examine your position? I advise you once again to reflect today, tomorrow, till the day after tomorrow, and hand us your views in writing, then we shall judge your case in the Central Committee, because it is a problem of import-

ance which the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party must discuss and decide.

KOČO TASHKO: I shall not write. I said what I had to say.

---

1. - At that time Chairman of the Auditing Commission of the PLA.
2. - Even for his meeting with comrade Enver Hoxha, Kočo Tashko was three hours late, for which he was severely criticized.
3. - Comrade Rita Marko, Member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the Central Committee of the PLA, was also present at this meeting.
4. - At that time General Secretary of the CP of France.
5. - At that time first secretary of the Soviet Embassy in Tirana.
6. - At that time adviser of the Soviet Embassy in Tirana.
7. - At that time ambassador of the Soviet Union in Tirana.
8. - Soviet employee in Tirana.
9. - Respect (Russ.)

---

REAL UNITY IS ACHIEVED AND STRENGTHENED ONLY ON THE BASIS OF MARXIST-LENINIST PRINCIPLES

Letter to the CC of the CPSU and the CC of the CP of China

August 27, 1960

Dear comrades,

As is known, at the Bucharest Meeting of the representatives of the communist and workers' parties, which was held in June this year, concerning the disagreements arisen between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, the delegation of the Party of Labour of Albania, in conformity with the directives of the Central Committee of our Party, maintained a different stand from that of the delegation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the delegations of the majority of the parties participating in the meeting.

The Party of Labour of Albania nurtures the most profound respect for all the communist and workers' parties of the world and expresses its great regret that, for the first time in its revolutionary history, it was obliged to take such a stand as it took at the Bucharest Meeting, which is in opposition to the stand of the majority of the delegations of the communist and workers' parties. Our Party, like any other Marxist party, has the right to express its opinion according to its conscience and to adopt the stand which it judges is correct.

At the Bucharest Meeting the delegation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union distributed to the delegations of other parties a written document in which it was stated that the Communist Party of China has violated the 1957 Moscow Declaration. At that meeting... we found ourselves faced with a truly international conference specially organized to criticize the Communist Party of China for «violation» of the Moscow Declaration, on the basis of the material presented by the delegation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which was handed to the delegation of our Party only 10 hours before the meeting.

As is known, Marxism-Leninism teaches us that not only when the mistakes of a Marxist party such as the Communist Party of China, which has millions of members in its ranks and has proved itself over a long period of consistent revolutionary activity, are being examined, even when the mistakes of a single communist are examined, we must be very careful, very cautious, must thoroughly analyse all the causes of the mistakes this communist has made, must strive to convince him of his mistakes, take his case to the basic organization or to the appropriate forum of the Party, where the case should be examined with the greatest objectivity on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles, aiming at the attainment of a single end: the improvement of this communist and putting him on the right road. If we make such great efforts in order to analyse the mistakes of one communist and save him from these mistakes, then it is self-evident what great efforts should have been made before «exchanging opinions about the mistakes of a party» at an international communist meeting, such as the Bucharest Meeting. But this, unfortunately, was not done.

The Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania proceeds from the Marxist-Leninist principle that, in order to express its opinion about the ideological and political mistakes of another Marxist party, first it must be convinced with facts about the existence of these mistakes, and this conviction must be created by analysing, in the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party, without passion and on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist method, all the relevant arguments concerning this question, that is, both the arguments presented by the side making the criticism and the arguments presented by the side which is criticized. After
Besides this, it is stressed in these letters that at the Bucharest Meeting the «complete unity of all the communist and workers' parties» in the criticism they made of the «mistakes» of the Communist Party of China was confirmed. Such an assertion implies that the Party of Labour of Albania, too, has aligned itself with the majority of the other communist and workers' parties in regard to the «mistakes» attributed to the Communist Party of China. If we are speaking of the approval of the communique of the Bucharest Meeting, we agree that there was unity of all the parties, for the communique was approved by our Party, too. But, if we are speaking of «unity of all the parties» concerning the disagreements arisen between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, this does not correspond to the truth, at least as far as our Party is concerned, because the Party of Labour of Albania did not associate itself with the majority of the other parties, and it will express its view about these disagreements at the coming meeting of the communist and workers' parties, in November this year, as it has many times declared. To affirm that there was «complete unity of all the parties» at the Bucharest Meeting in the criticism made of the «mistakes» of the Communist Party of China, means to distort the facts and the truth.

Today, the Central Committee of our Party is more convinced than it was at the Bucharest Meeting that not only has that meeting not eliminated the disagreements arisen between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, but it has made these disagreements even deeper, to reach disquieting proportions.

The solution of the disagreements arisen between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, as we said, is of vital importance to the unity of the camp of socialism and to the unity of the international communist movement. Therefore, we think that every effort must be made to solve these disagreements on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles. It is a fact that the enemies of Marxism-Leninism, imperialism and revisionism, have already begun to exploit the existence of these disagreements to attack Marxism-Leninism, to discredit and split the camp of socialism and the international communist movement.

The Central Committee of our Party thinks that there is nothing more important to the life of all the communist and workers' parties of the world today, to the preservation and strengthening of the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement, than the solution of these disagreements on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism...

Our Party will always be vigilant against the war-mongering plans and actions of imperialism and against modern revisionism, which, as defined in the Moscow Declaration, is the main danger to the international communist movement.

Fraternal greetings
For the Central Committee
of the Party of Labour of Albania

ENVER HOXHA

I. A copy of this letter was sent also to the parties of the other socialist countries.
WE SHALL GO TO MOSCOW NOT WITH TEN BANNERS, BUT WITH ONLY ONE, WITH THE BANNER OF MARXISM-LENINISM

Speech at the 16th Plenum of the CC of the PLA concerning Liri Belishova’s grave mistakes in line

September 6, 1960

Before we speak of Liri Belishova I shall inform the Plenum of some decisions taken by the Political Bureau.

In recent weeks we have had correspondence with the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. We have been informed by the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Rumania and Czechoslovakia about a letter which each of them has addressed to the Communist Party of China. In essence these letters make serious accusations against the Communist Party of China of deviation from Marxism-Leninism, of dogmatism, sectarianism, and great state chauvinism, and other charges like these. At the same time, these letters defend N.S.Khrushchev against what is said in a document which was distributed to the representatives of the communist and workers’ parties of the socialist camp by the delegation of the CP of China at the end of the Bucharest Meeting.

The material of the Chinese comrades said, among other things, that the Bucharest Meeting was not held in accord with the proper forms, that N.S.Khrushchev’s interjections and actions during the meeting were not Marxist-Leninist, and that these questions which were raised are of great importance to the further development of the international communist movement.

Later we received a letter from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in which, after stating that the ties between our two parties have been exceptionally close, they say that at the Bucharest Meeting a «spark of misunderstanding» arose between our parties, which must not be allowed to catch fire. Therefore, they proposed to us the holding of a meeting, of whatever level we would like and when we would like, to discuss these misunderstandings together, so that «the Party of Labour of Albania and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will go with completeness of views» to the coming November meeting in Moscow.

We have sent three letters to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. In the first letter we have pointed out to it, in a comradely way, the disruptive, sabotaging activity of the Soviet ambassador V.I.Ivanov, of the counsellor Novikov, and the first secretary Bespalov, against our Party and its leadership. Since the Bucharest Meeting these three senior functionaries of the Soviet Embassy in Tirana, have carried out hostile work against our Party and leadership, breaching every rule of friendship and Party behaviour.

Their aim has been to disrupt the leadership. They have made efforts to this end, using every form and method, about some of which you know. They strove to find a crack in the leadership of our Party and, first of all, to learn what was discussed at the July Plenum, what stands were adopted and, if possible, to learn what each speaker had said.

We have been exceptionally patient with regard to these actions in this situation, for we were guided by the principle of preserving our friendship with the peoples of the Soviet Union. But our Party and our people have been extremely vigilant towards these actions which have an unfriendly and un-Marxist swell. It is a fact that all our comrades whom they have provoked, have stood up to them very well and have given them the reply they deserved. There was only Koso Tashko with whom they managed to succeed, and they did him in a most despicable way, as we shall see. He alone told them about everything that was discussed at the July Plenum of the CC of the PLA...

Considering that they had gone too far, the Political Bureau sent to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union the first letter pointing out this activity and stressing that these were unfriendly, anti-Marxist actions against our Party, and we asked the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to take measures for the sake of the sincere friendship and collaboration between our two countries and parties, so that there would be no more actions like these. Following this letter Ivanov was called to Moscow. Whether he will return or not, we do not know.

We want to be sincere friends with the ambassador and with all the Soviet personnel, within the bounds of friendship and Marxist-Leninist norms. The other functionaries of the Soviet Embassy are here and we notice that they, too, are undertaking impermissible actions.

The second letter that we sent to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, was sent at the same time to the Communist Party of China, too. After the Bucharest Meeting, particularly in the letters which the leaderships of the communist parties of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Rumania addressed to the CC of the Communist Party of China, it is alleged that all the communist and workers’ parties were in complete solidarity at the Bucharest Meeting on their stand towards the CP of China, a thing which is not true. Therefore, in this letter we do not do theirs. We express our opinion about the stand we adopted in Bucharest, and we say that as to the allegations of mistakes by the CC of China, our Party did not support these at the Bucharest Meeting.

In the letter we express the view that a great revolutionary party such as the Communist Party of China, cannot be condemned hastily and in those forms and ways as was done at Bucharest. Even with regard to a rank and file communist who has committed a grave fault, things cannot proceed in this way but only on the basis of the Leninist organizational rules, and in this case, only after every effort has been made to save him, then a final decision is taken. Hence we do not consider it in order for a great revolutionary party to be unfairly accused and condemned outside the organizational rules especially by the leadership of those parties that have addressed these letters to the Communist Party of China.
In the letter the idea is expressed that these problems, which have been made the property of the international communist movement, concern all parties, just as they do ours. Therefore we shall express our opinion about these questions at the meeting which has been decided to hold in November, where we shall speak our mind in a revolutionary and Marxist-Leninist way. The contradictions that have arisen constitute a very big issue for the international communist movement, therefore before we go to the Moscow Meeting, after we have received the necessary material and studied it, we shall put it before the Plenum of the Central Committee for discussion and decision, and we shall put forward the view of the Plenum of the Central Committee of our Party at that meeting. This, we think, is the Marxist-Leninist way for the solution of a question of an international character. We think that there is no other way, and to pursue any other course would be incorrect.

Another question, which we raised in our letters addressed to the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union and China, and which is of importance, is that not only must the problems which have arisen, developed, and assumed a very serious character, be solved between the two parties, in the first place, but we think and propose that, till it is not too late, the two great parties, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China should hold a top-level meeting prior to the meeting of the commission, which will be held at the end of September, to discuss the main questions around which their disagreements have arisen. We say in the letter that this would be of great help to the work of the commission, or the plenary meeting in Moscow. We make this proposal proceeding from the interests of international communism. Now we have been informed that our idea is considered reasonable, and the meeting of the representatives of the two parties will be held about September 15-17, but at what level, we do not know.

The third letter concerns the proposal of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for a meeting with the representatives of our Party. We reply in our letter that it is proper that, when disagreements arise between two parties, the questions should be discussed and sorted out as correctly as possible, in the Marxist-Leninist way. But there are no disagreements between our two parties, because these disagreements exist between them and another party. Therefore, for us to go to Moscow and discuss the mistakes of another party without its representatives being present, too, is not at all Marxist, and we cannot do such a thing. Such a method of work does not assist the solution of the existing disagreements, on the contrary it may render the situation more difficult. In a word, we tell them that we do not talk behind anyone’s back.

As to what the Soviet leadership say that a spark of misunderstanding has arisen between our two parties, we have replied that our Party has kindled neither spark nor fire.

Thus, the Political Bureau has sent these three letters to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

For the best preparation of the Plenum in regard to the questions we shall discuss, I recommend that the Chinese articles Long Live Leninism!, the material distributed by the Soviet representatives at the Bucharest Meeting, the 1927 Moscow Declaration, the copies of the letters we have recently addressed to the CC of the CP of the S.U., of which I spoke above, as well as the materials that have been recommended and not read as yet, should be put at the disposal of the members and candidate members of the Central Committee. All these should be studied carefully so that, when we discuss them at the Plenum, the comrades will be prepared. If we have other materials from the Communist Party of China about its views, these too, will be made available for study.

Let us now get down concretely to the question of Liri Belishova.

You know that at the July Plenum, apart from other things, Liri was criticized for the major serious mistakes she made during her stay in China and the Soviet Union. But at that meeting of the Plenum these mistakes were only touched upon in passing, in the course of the discussion. However, after these questions, which several comrades mentioned, were raised, Liri did not appear before the Plenum with a self-criticism, although she knew that the Political Bureau had arrived at the conclusion that her self-criticism before the Bureau was incomplete, that there were many gaps in it. Precisely for these reasons I said at the Plenum that, after being re-examined once more in the Political Bureau, her case should be presented to the Plenum. In fact we did examine the question of Liri1.

We gave her the possibility to reflect deeply, to ponder over the grave mistakes she has made in such complicated and difficult situations, to come out with correct conclusions and reveal the causes which impelled her to make these mistakes.

At the meeting of the Political Bureau she showed some signs of irritation in connection with the comrades’ questions, which served to uncover and make clearer Liri’s wavering on the political and ideological line of our Party. Later, I too summoned her separately, to help her reflect on these questions, indeed I reminded her of the non-Marxist methods the Soviet leaders had used for the disruption of the leaderships of a number of communist and workers’ parties, therefore I advised her to think over these questions.

I want to say that the Political Bureau of the Central Committee, which is always guided by the principle that things must be explained to the comrades to save them from the wrong road and mistakes, had tried to help Liri patiently and calmly. Her mistakes are not small and trivial, but are profound mistakes, in which, if she does not understand them, there is the danger that they will become even more grave and harmful, both to the Party and to her position in the Party.

On the other hand, by criticizing the one who makes mistakes, the Party helps him to arm himself, to make efforts to understand the reasons for his mistakes, so that he no longer falls into such mistakes. This has been the road of the Central Committee, the Political Bureau, and mine, for the correction of those who make mistakes.

The Political Bureau thinks that Liri Belishova’s mistakes are very great and serious. They show that in fact she is in opposition to the line of our Party, she is not in agreement, not in unity of thought and action on a number of ideological and political questions with the Central Committee of the Party, with our entire Party. She does not understand the vital importance to our Party, as to any Marxist party, of the question of the ideological and political unity in the Party and, the more so, the question of the unity of the Central Committee and the
Political Bureau itself. This question is of vital importance particularly in the existing situation, when the imperialist enemies and the modern revisionists are striving to split the leadership of our Party at all costs, even if they can cause some small cracks, to weaken it and then attack the Party. Therefore, those who damage this steel-like unity, which the Party has forged with struggle and bloodshed through all sorts of storms, must be severely punished, as they deserve, as the great interests of the Party and the people require.

What are the mistakes of Liri Belishova?

As you know, Liri went to China. This trip had an official character, and the delegation of which she was a member did not include all sorts of people, but party people. Thus, the delegation was not comprised of apolitical people, but of known personalities of our Party and State.

Before leaving for China, she knew of the disagreements that existed between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, not to the full extent to which they developed later, but she knew many things. When is was recommended to her, as far as possible, to avoid expressing opinions on these still unresolved problems, this means that she had knowledge of the object of the disagreements between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China. However, Liri Belishova went to China and did not act as recommended.

During her stay in China, Liri Belishova showed a surprising fear and avoided any discussion with the Chinese comrades, when it was question of expressing the opinion of our Party about modern revisionism, about our friendship with the CP of China and its Government and about the correct meaning of the ties with the Soviet Union. Indeed, in various forms she asked them, as far as possible, to refrain from discussing party questions because, allegedly, she was not authorized, etc. Why she did this, we shall see later, but the fact is that the Chinese comrades wanted to discuss party questions with us. We cannot prevent them from talking, but we have our own stand, and this stand must be expressed on every occasion. It is not so simple to seek to avoid talking about party questions. Although Liri strove at all costs to avoid dealing with party problems in the talks with the Chinese comrades, they considered it reasonable to talk to us about so great and delicate a question. Of course, they did this because they had great trust in, and deep respect for, our Party. As it seems, this is not how Liri Belishova evaluated this question. Instead of maintaining the stand that should have been maintained in these talks with the Chinese comrades, without any instructions to do such a thing, she opposed their views on some questions and gave them to understand that we were leaning towards the Soviet leaders. Not only had our Party not expressed itself in favour of such a stand, but all the comrades of the Political Bureau were in disagreement with many stands of the Soviet leaders about political and ideological problems which were apparent both in their practical activity and in their press.

Therefore, our Party had never pronounced itself against China. With her attitude, Liri Belishova implied to the Chinese comrades that our Party did not agree with their views.

The other mistake of Liri Belishova's was that she went and made contact with the counsellor of the Soviet Embassy in Peking, and told him about the things the Chinese comrades had said to her. From this her aim emerges very clearly. The Soviet leaders, from Khrushchev down to Polyansky, understood how Liri was thinking, that they were her personal opinions, that she was against the Chinese views and for the Soviet position on these questions.

Liri Belishova was considered by them the 'heroine' of the situation. The Soviet leaders utilized her actions to create a difficult situation in our Party, in our leadership and among our cadres. After the Bucharest Meeting they got hold of all the comrades who were in the USSR to expound their views and to get their opinion, in one way or another, to see if they were with the Central Committee of the PLA. One of these views was that in China Liri Belishova took an 'heroic' stand, that 'she gave the Chinese comrades the proper reply and did not allow them to issue a communique on the talks they held with her'. This is what the Soviet leaders are saying.

Not only was Liri Belishova predisposed to adopt such a stand, but she made another organizational mistake, she violated the discipline of the Party. She did nothing at all to seek the opinion of the Political Bureau. She did not understand that this was a harmful action to fan the flames in this situation of disagreements which existed between these two parties. She knew that disagreements existed between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, and not between the Communist Party of China and the whole of international communism, as this matter was put forward at the Bucharest Meeting.

We have had sincere relations with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on everything. But in the way the events developed and when it is a matter of a third party being accused, we should not pour petrol on the fire. Before she left for China, I talked with Liri about what Mikoyan had told us of the Communist Party of China. I instructed her, also, not to talk about this question with anyone, as long as we had still not informed even the CC of the Party of these disagreements. Liri should have understood that, since we had not informed our Party, it was not up to us to inform the Communist Party of China of what Mikoyan had said about them. Not only was Liri instructed, but even if she had no instruction at all, as a member of the Political Bureau, she should have realized that the questions raised with her by the Chinese comrades could not be discussed with a third party without obtaining the approval of the Central Committee.

Why did Liri not seek the opinion of the leadership of the Party? Because she did not have a correct concept of the leadership of the Political Bureau. She has been concocted and overrated her own abilities and intelligence, otherwise, like any other member of the Central Committee, when difficulties are encountered about an important problem, she should consult the leadership of the Party, and not act without receiving its advice. Liri did not do this, because she liked the position she held.

At the Political Bureau she tried hard to justify herself concerning her mistakes in Peking. She clung to such arguments as that she was alone and had nobody to consult. But the fact is that she continued to make mistakes in Moscow, too, indeed up to the meeting of the Political Bureau after she returned. She does not want to understand her grave mistakes, and she does not admit them.

When Liri was in Peking I sent her a radiogram. What was its content? When the holding of the Bucharest Meeting
June was proposed to us we had received a radiogram from the embassy in Peking, by which we were briefly informed of what had happened at the meeting of the Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions, of the major differences of principle between the delegations of the Soviet Union and China. We knew that Liri would have meetings with the Chinese comrades, therefore we sent a radiogram concerning the meeting of the communist and workers' parties which it was thought could be held in June. We told her that Chinese comrades proposed the postponement of the June meeting, but, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other parties agreed with their proposal, we had no objection. If it was to be held in June, we said in the radiogram, the Chinese comrades should be informed, if they would allow us to express a modest opinion, that the participation of the great Communist Party of China in this meeting was essential.

During this time we received another letter, from the communist Party of the Soviet Union, in which we were informed of the postponement of the meeting which was to be held in June. Then we sent another radiogram to Liri, in which we said that it was not necessary to transmit to the Chinese comrades the content of the first radiogram, because of fear that the Chinese comrades would not come to the meeting they had proposed should be postponed, had disappeared. Liri read and interpreted the radiogram in the way she wanted and according to the plan she was turning over in her mind.

Likewise, we instructed her to find the opportunity to inform the Chinese comrades that we had read and liked the articles published by them on the occasion of the 90th anniversary of Lenin's birth.

Liri did not carry this instruction from the Political Bureau, because she had her own views. But irrespective of the fact that these articles were not to her liking, she should have transmitted the view of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of our Party to the Chinese comrades. When she returned she could have expressed her personal view to the Political Bureau. This shows that Liri Belishova had gone China with definite opinions which were at variance with one of the comrades of the Political Bureau, who, those days, did frequent discussions on the political and ideological stand of the CP of the SU and the CP of China.

When she reached Moscow, Liri was more completely med. You know that we sent Liri two simple, but very clear letters, fully sufficient weapons for her to avoid making mistakes. Taking into account her attitude in China, and especially shortcomings in Liri's character, such as conceit and ambition, plus the flattery of her by the Soviet leadership who had called her a 'heroine', we feared for what she might do and took this measure so that she could not fall into errors again. Thus, we sent these two letters in order to save Liri.

In the first letter, which she received as soon as she arrived at the Belorussian peasant congress, Liri pointed out to her that she had made grave mistakes in China, and for this reason she would take care not to let the flattery and high-sounding praise about her come from the Soviet leaders go to her head. In the second letter, which she received as soon as she landed in Moscow, she was informed of the holding of the Bucharest meeting, the stand adopted there by our Party, and it was stressed to her that this stand did not please the Soviet leaders, therefore she should be careful to defend the line of the Party, to stress that she fully agreed with the stand of the Central Committee of the Party, expressed in Bucharest by comrade Hysni. This stand would have been correct and would have barred the way to all efforts by anyone who might try to split our leadership.

Thus, Liri Belishova had been prepared so as to avoid any mistakes, had she agreed with the line of the Central Committee. But the fact is that this is not what happened.

We know the tactics pursued by the Soviet leaders. They invited Liri to lunch, but there she did not maintain the stand on which she had been instructed by the Political Bureau. Liri used the tactics of jokes. «We must make jokes,» she thought. «to get out of this situation», but in fact jokes did not help her, and a situation was created which was favourable to the Soviet leaders, unfavourable and in opposition to the stand of the Central Committee of our Party, and compatible, in the final analysis, with the views of Liri Belishova.

During the lunch the Soviet leaders began with praises and toasts to Liri, and with attacks on our Party, but Liri dodged the touchy issues, the blows and venom against our Party, directed particularly by Kozlov. Kozlov expressed his dissatisfaction over the stand of comrades Hysni [Kapo] in Bucharest, and she did not knock him back immediately. She pretends not to be clear about this question, but she allegedly told Kozlov that, «Enver Hoxha has no skeleton in the cupboard like Go mitka» about whom they said that he had adopted a «pravilno», «yasno» stand. She should have intervened immediately to say that at Bucharest our Party adopted a correct and clear stand, and that she agreed with that stand.

Then Kozlov said that, «We want friendship, but without zigzags.» But who is developing friendship with zigzags? Liri did not give the proper reply to this, either. In the letter we said to Liri that Khrushchev did not like the stand of our Party at the Bucharest Meeting, therefore she should have understood that when there was talk of zigzags it was our Party which was being attacked, and she should have replied that our Party does not make zigzags.

Thus such a stand of Liri Belishova's is deliberate.

During the lunch other insinuations were made such as: «Who are you Albanians with, with the 200 or the 600 millions?» But this, too, went without the proper reply from Liri. At the meeting I had with Ivanov, I told him that what Kozlov said was anti-Marxist. And what did he mean by «with the 200 or the 600 millions?» Our Party was on a Marxist road, therefore it was with all the countries of our socialist camp. However, at the Plenum Liri told us that she did not hear this question properly, or did not understand it. But it is impossible that this escaped her ears, for he said it at lunch, sitting near her, and we do not agree with such a justification. They might even have said these things in a confusing, indirect way, but at the end of the lunch she should have risen and said: «Comrades, there are no zigzags in our line. We are for the unity of all the countries of our camp, therefore let us drink this toast to the triumph of Marxism-Leninism!» But in fact this was not the way she acted, the lunch and these venom-filled remarks of the Soviet leaders were passed off with a laugh.

But why with a laugh? Because Liri Belishova did not agree with the line of our Party on these questions, she had
a different view and she thought that her view was correct and, in the final account, in her opinion, the views of the leadership of our Party were not correct, and that in this situation we were making mistakes.

Thus, even when she came back, Liri showed some signs and took some actions which confirm this. She began especially to say to the comrades: «Comrade Enver should be sidetracked. We should not draw him into this situation so that he will not compromise himself over these questions». In plain language this means, «Nobody knows how the conflict between the Communist Party of China and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will end. Therefore, we should leave comrade Enver out of it, not let him meddle in it, and when this problem is over, then we shall see who is right, you or I, that's the time for comrade Enver to come out, and give the others who were wrong stick, and in this way we are in order, according to her view.

That is, even after her return to Tirana, in spite of the advice given her at the meeting of the Political Bureau, Liri Belishova continued to maintain the same stand and to concoct intrigues to disrupt the leadership of the Party.

Linked with this is also Liri's other saying that, «We must prepare several variants for the Moscow Meeting», and, after we see which way the wind is blowing, make use of the one which seems to us the most advantageous. This is a very wrong, opportunistic view, utterly unacceptable to our Party of Labour. We must go to the Moscow Meeting not with «several variants», but with a clear-cut stand, not with ten banners, but with one, with the banner of Marxism-Leninism.

Another view of Liri was that the comrades of the Plenum or the alternate members of the Political Bureau should not be given the documents exchanged between the Political Bureau and comrade Hysni Kapo in Bukarest, who was instructed about the stand he should adopt there. What does this mean? This is connected with the fact that, «these documents bear Enver's signature, therefore we should not expose him». Why should we not inform the Central Committee of the practice followed by the Political Bureau, and let the Plenum judge its work? What is wrong with this?

But in reality there are and there should have been second thoughts in Liri Belishova's head. The explanations she has given have not convinced the Political Bureau that she has thoroughly and profoundly understood her mistakes. She should bring out the reasons why she acted as she did and who impelled her, from what bases did these thoughts arise in her, that is, she should make a profound analysis of her mistakes. That is why we analysed this question again in the Political Bureau.

The aim of this discussion in the Political Bureau was to help Liri. The contributions to the discussion were fiery, severe, for they concerned the defense of the interests of the Party, its line, its life. We must stand firm before the interests of the Party. To tell the truth, Liri was given plenty of help by the comrades, and she should have made a frank self-criticism, with the gloves off. But her self-criticism in the Political Bureau was not satisfactory. Liri said nothing, indeed, through her contributions, she indirectly expressed dissatisfaction and doubts about the stand adopted in her regard.

Liri presented her mistakes in a very simple way. She did not make a Marxist-Leninist analysis of these mistakes, of their sources, something which was expected from her. She did not proceed from the principle of telling the Party the real causes that impelled her to make mistakes, but she clung to such arguments as «she was alone and had nobody to consult». This tactic of Liri's is not healthy. She should have told the Political Bureau frankly why these mistakes were made and where they had their source.

The comrades of the Political Bureau analysed Liri Belishova's mistakes and arrived at the conclusion that such mistakes were not made easily, had she not had some distorted views about the others and overestimation of herself.

Liri Belishova should have had it clear that revisionism does not exist only in Yugoslavia, that revisionist views also exist in parties of other countries, which are deviating from the correct Marxist-Leninist road.

Many times we have discussed with Liri that many actions of the Soviet leaders are not on the right road, but on an opportunist road, which is to the advantage of the revisionists, particularly of the Yugoslav revisionists.

And this has not been a matter only of tactical stands on their part. We observe that the Soviet leaders have allowed the struggle against the Yugoslav revisionists to die down. From time to time they write theoretical articles against the Yugoslav revisionists, but even those with many gaps in them, while as to the concrete struggle against them, this they have outright out. Indeed there are parties, such as the Communist Party of Bulgaria, which have even taken decisions not to say anything against the Yugoslav revisionists.

We cannot say that these matters were a bolt from the blue to Liri Belishova, and therefore she has no right to say: «How could I imagine that in the line of the Soviet leaders there are such revisionist views?». We talk about such problems every day, but Liri Belishova's eyes have been blinded by the fatuity and great praise of the Soviet leaders, and she has reconciled herself with them. She has forgotten that on such an important question as that of the disagreements between the CP of the SU and the CP of China no Marxist party whatever can be hindered from expressing its viewpoint, just as it cannot be hindered from expressing it also on the actions of Khrushchev or Koszov, which we think are not correct at all.

When we speak of love for the USSR we must not include here those who make mistakes, whoever they may be, Soviets, Czechs, Bulgarians or Albanians. Every Marxist and leader must have it clear that we do not love the USSR for the beautiful eyes of Ivanov. He does not love the Soviet Union, or our friendship with the Soviet Union, as long as he acts in a hostile way against a people and a party who nurture a sincere love for the Soviet people, which he has seen with his own eyes during his three year stay in our country. And why should we keep Ivanov happy to avoid ruining our friendship? The same goes for Koszov, Khrushchev, and others.

We have our own views which we have expressed and will express, but Liri Belishova was not reconciled to this stand, for she has wavered in the Party line. She has been led to these positions by her conciliatory, she has become very swelled-headed, she overrates her own capacities and underrates others. For this she has been criticized several times.

In spite of the advice given her, she adopts a very arrogant attitude towards the enemies, she has offended them and continues to do so, she has attacked them so severely that even in the apparatus of the Central Committee there are
serious thing to be in disagreement with the line of the Central Committee. The Political Bureau has decided to propose to the Plenum that Liri Belishova be discharged from her function as a member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the Central Committee for propaganda, because these high forums of the Party must not include comrades who run counter to the views and ideological and political line of the Central Committee.

In the Political Bureau and Central Committee there must be complete unity of thought and action, and in the first place on the main questions, such as the current question, which is of exceptional importance to the building of socialism in our country and international communism.

1. At that time member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the CC of the PLA.
2. On September 3 the Political Bureau distributed a document to all the members of the Plenum dealing with Liri Belishova’s mistakes and with the stand she had adopted in the Political Bureau.
3. This was a false justification of Liri Belishova’s. Not only did she have the necessary instructions from the Political Bureau of the CC of the PLA concerning the stand she should adopt in the FR of China, but also through a special radiogram of June 4, 1900, comrade Enver Hoxha drew her attention and instructioned her: «We are reading your greetings in newspapers, and they astonish us. They are extremely dry and contain mistakes.»

First of all you must speak longer and exceptionally warmly of China; sternly expose the imperialists and the Yugoslav revisionists,... It is entirely impermissible to speak of a certain modern revisionism. The successes of our country and the correct policy of the Party in every field must be pointed out well and at length everywhere. The speeches must be politically and ideologically elevated, and not with banal phrases... Tear up the hackneyed greetings and speeches you have prepared, and formulate entirely new ones.»

While the other radiogram of June 6 said: «Talks with the Chinese comrades on the ideological questions under discussion may be held only by you». (Taken from the copies of the originals of the radiograms which are in the Central Archives of the Party).
4. When she returned to Albania, Liri Belishova was asked by the Political Bureau and the basic organization of which she was a member to hand these letters in. She said that she had allegedly destroyed them. In fact she ought to have handed them over to the Soviet leaders during the meetings she had with them.
5. «Correct, «clear» (Russ.).
states of the so-called 'third world'. With his great manoeuvre «Rraro Lelo» aims to deal China a blow ideologically and undermine it politically. With these actions he assists the development of capitalism, strengthens imperialism, weakens our camp and our positions in the UNO...«Rraro Lelo's» admirers and lick-spittles consider this terrible capitulation a great success. I think that with those who you think are worried about this situation but who haven't the courage to speak up about it, you should tactfully let them know our views on these manoeuvres. Why should we keep our correct views so much to ourselves? Maybe one of them will tell «Rraro Lelo» our views, but so what? «Rraro» will understand that we do not talk with him about these questions, so let him jump up and down if he likes.

3) In regard to Gomulka's speech, we have arrived at the same conclusions as you. In no way can we accept it. The status quo in favour of the imperialists can never be accepted. You stick to the stand we decided, while as to Gomulka's proposals, not only do not accept them, but tell them that we shall denounce them at the plenary meeting of the communist and workers' parties in Moscow if they are included in the resolution.

4)...

5)...

6) Last night, I was with your family. I gave Figreet your radiograms to read and she found them amusing. Your mother and children are well. Don't worry about them. Your little son's sword is broken, so when you come bring him a sword, I think you will find one there, because not all the swords will have been turned into ploughshares.

My regards to Bokar. His boy is well. Tell him to look after Tukanov3 well lest the breeze carries him away.

I embrace you
SHEPIS

---

1. Comrade Mehmet Shihu was at that time in New York at the head of the delegation of the People's Republic of Albania to the 15th Session of the UNO General Assembly.
2. Implies Khrushchev. «Rraro Lelo, a kulak from the region of Malakastera, was an enemy of the people.»
3. At that time Foreign Minister of the PR of Bulgaria.
4. One of comrade Eneri Hoxha's pseudonyms during the National Liberation War.

---

LETTER ADDRESSED TO COMRADE HYSNI KAPO in MOSCOW

October 1, 1960

Dear comrade Hysni,

I received the letter and the material you sent me, yesterday, at the time when we were holding the meeting of the Political Bureau to examine the draft-directives of the 4th Congress of the Party about the 3rd Five-Year Plan, as well as the report on the reorganization of the school. I had just received the material when your radiogram arrived, too, in which you told us that this material must be returned to you, therefore we handed it over to be printed. I am telling you all this so that you will understand that, at the moment of writing, I have not started the reading of the material you sent me, therefore I have nothing to say about it at the moment. I shall give you an opinion by radiogram or a longer letter, which I shall send you by air.

Associating myself with your view, I, too, think that the Soviet comrades are up to a dirty manoeuvre for definite aims. The material they have provided may be acceptable up to a point, likewise it is drafted and predisposed so that it could be corrected and made even stronger. They are not much concerned about this! «If you like», they may say, «we can even make it much stronger, only there must not be any polemics, everything should go quietly and smoothly. As to carrying out what we put on paper, let us not worry about that, in a word we shall carry on as before, we shall violate this Declaration, too, like that of Moscow [1957], and if you accuse us again, we shall convene a second Bucharest meeting and really fix you.»

If the Soviet leaders have made some concessions or are recognise their mistakes, but because they make these alleged concessions to us in order to stop the discussion going any further. They think that what we are wanting is declarations. But we have Marxism-Leninism. What we need and insist on is that the Soviet leaders must correct their opportunist mistakes. The Declaration must be the conclusion of these discussions. This is precisely what frightens the Soviet leaders and does not frighten us.

The Soviet leaders are afraid of the discussions not only because of the shocks that ran through other parties after Bucharest; but because these upheavals will become ever stronger after November. So, to stave this off, they hand out this declaration: «And we can make it even stronger if you like» and, thus, all their admirers shout and cheer: «Eureka! This is has been, and will remain our line. We have never made mistakes. China reflected, reconsidered its mistakes and came back on the right road! Thus, Bucharest was very «polemical», in our parties we condemned China and Albania as dogmatic, etc. With one stone we killed two birds: we exposed them, and we cured them, and we opened the way to say to the parties again tomorrow that the patients were not completely cured because they have had a relapse of the disease of dogmatism. Finally, we triumphed in both scenes and carry on in our old ways. This, I think, is more or less the reasoning of the Soviet leaders and their admirers. Nikita found the medicine for Zhivkov and company.

We must not fall for the tricky manoeuvres of the Soviet
from, or add to, it, but this material will be as a conclusion of all-sided discussions in November and will show how the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the decisions of the Moscow Meeting [1957] have been carried out, who has departed from, and who has implemented, them consistently.

A reassessment of Bucharest will be made on the basis of facts, and not only Soviet ones, but also on the basis of facts that the other parties, too, will bring up on this question.

The coming Moscow Meeting must not be a formal meeting, nor an unproductive polical meeting, but a meeting of great constructive importance on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and the Leninist norms. It will not be only a «pacificist», conciliatory meeting to gloss over grave mistakes, but a meeting to make a radical exposure of, and cure, the mistakes. There is no other way, and they should not expect any other way of solution from us. If these mistakes are not looked squarely in the eye, we are sure that the revisionists will go rapidly on with their destructive work. Therefore, there is only one road for us, struggle in defence of Marxism-Leninism, and not reconciliation with the opportunist and revisionist mistakes in ideology and politics, such as Khrushchev and his group are making. I think that the struggle should be commenced in the commission, where the other parties, except that of China, have sent fourth-rank people, because, naturally, the Soviet leaders have reached agreement with them, have adopted the one set of tactics, and are seeking to get easily over the ditch they themselves have dug by accusing China and us of a thousand things. But this does not go down with us.

There is no need to write any more, for you know the issues yourself. When I send you the remarks about the material, I may write at greater length.

Regards to Ramiz and the comrades.

I embrace you,

Ever

P.S. I am writing to you in haste because the plane is about to leave, therefore you will find it difficult to read. Yesterday we were at the Chinese comrades and in my speech I fired the first «warning shots».

1. Member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the CC of the PLA, headed the delegation of the PLA at the Meeting of the 26 parties which were to draw up the Moscow Declaration.
2. (Russ.).
3. Ironical abbreviation for T. Zhivkov.
4. Ramiz Ali, Member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the CC of the PLA, was a member of the delegation of the PLA at the Meeting of the 26 parties which were to draw up the Moscow Declaration.

---

RADIOGRAM TO COMRADE MEHMET SHEHU IN NEW YORK

October 1, 1960

Dear Mehmet,

1) The Moscow Meeting opens today. The delegations are very colourless, apart from the Chinese and ours, 50 people all told. We hear that the Bulgarian delegation will do what the Soviets tell them and avoid stirring up polemics. This is the general watchword issued by the «friend» you have there.

2) The Soviets handed out a document in the form of a 36-page declaration, which is to be discussed in regard to adding to it or removing some bits. We have just translated and typed it, since it came only yesterday, and I have just given it a first quick reading. The real working meeting will start this Tuesday, October 4th, in Moscow.

3) The first impression of the material: A dirty manoeuvre by the revisionists, not in a polemical tone, but some devious and base insinuations, a lot of big gaps, smoothing over some angles dangerous to them, some tactical retreats to throw dust in people’s eyes, some approaches to our theses, to the effect: «Look, we are making concessions to your stubbornness, and this in the face of a savage enemy, therefore take this Declaration, be content with it, worship it if you like». But it should be read again carefully, and I will make suggestions to Hynsi about its essence.

4) What is the manoeuvre of the revisionists? In my opinion, they want to draw a veil over all their mistakes; and the veil is this Declaration. They think we are desperately concerned about declarations, as if we did not have our ideology, Marxism-Leninism. Hence, according to them, they are «fulfilling our desire» with a declaration in which room is left for amendments. Indeed, they are ready to make it much stronger. I believe, they will make a few concessions and then say: «You see, this has been our line, you made some additions, we agreed to them, and now there is nothing to divide us, hurray! But who has deviated from Marxism-Leninism, who is revisionist or dogmatic, what occurred in Bucharest and how things went on later, and so on and so forth, all these matters have been decided, and decided correctly and unanimously; you slipped into dogmatism, we condemned you and we were right; we exposed you in our parties, this was useful to you; you reflected upon your mistakes and came here; we held a discussion and reached agreement, and even produced a declaration. Go home now, make self-criticism in your parties, and henceforth do not commit the mistake of criticizing us, because we shall bring you to a second Bucharest, and this time you will be «revolutionists». This is approximately «Rapeo», «Lelo» aim. This reasoning and tactic of «Rapeo's» is certainly extremely gratifying to Zhivkov and company, since, sooner or later, they will certainly have an earthquake under their feet, but with this manoeuvre they think they may avert the danger. This, of course, is their course, but not ours. Our course is that which we have decided on and which is correct.

5) I warned Hynsi to begin the fight right in the commission and let them understand clearly that we can discuss the Declaration, removing or adding something, but that the Declaration should be the conclusion of a Marxist-Leninist debate about the problems under discussion: who has applied Marx-
ism-Leninism and the Moscow Declaration [1957] correctly
and who has betrayed it; who are the revisionists and who is
not dogmatic; who organized Bucharest and for what purpose;
who created this split and why. All the problems will be laid
on the table and examined, not on the basis of the false facts
of the Soviets, but on the basis of the arguments of the Chinese,
ours, and anybody’s else. We do not accept peace for peace’s sake
in the communist movement; we do not permit faults to be
covered up. We cannot allow the Moscow Meeting to be a
meeting of revisionists and of Right-wing pacifists: we shall
fight to make it a militant, constructive, Marxist meeting. There
is no other way. In this manner any illusion of the Khrushche-
vites will vanish, all their manoeuvres will fail, and things will
be carried through to the end. I believe that the Chinese will
act as we do.

So much for now. Write to us if you have any comment
or suggestion.

Affectionately,

SHPATTI

THE MOSCOW DECLARATION SHOULD BE MADE AS STRONG
AS POSSIBLE, WITH GUNPOWDER AND NOT COTTON WOOL

Letter addressed to comrade Hynai Kopo in Moscow

October 4, 1960

Dear comrade Hynai,

I received your letter this morning and I understood your
views. I agree with these views and the proposals you make,
which, in general, conform with that I have written you.

Thus, I am stressing once more, as we discussed when you
left Tirana, you will press for the Declaration of the Moscow
Meeting to be as strong as possible, with gunpowder and not
cotton wool, and to contain questions formulated correctly, ac-
cording to our view, and not equivocal, unclear views, such as
the Soviet delegation, the ideas of which are opportunist and
revisionist, will try to put in.

There is one thing you must bear in mind, that, by means
of the Declaration, not only must we express the correct Marxist-
Leninist views of our Party about the problems, but, when
reading this document, every communist in the world should
at once understand that in the ideological conflict which the
Khrushchev group trumpeted inside and outside the camp, this
group lost and their revisionist course was condemned. In the
first place, the members of those parties where the questions
were put forward in a distorted way, slandering the Communist
Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania, which were
condemned unjustly and thrown mud at, must understand this
fact, when they read the Declaration. This is very important,
for the slanderers have no intention of going back to their
parties and making self-criticism. Therefore, much depends on
your contribution to the discussion there, much depends on
the formulation which you will propose. Pay great attention to
the formulations of the main issues. In these formulations,
bear in mind not to stay within the limits of the Soviet text
and the form they have given to the presentation of the prob-
lem. By this I want to say don’t try to adjust the question on
the phrasing put up by the Soviets or to avoid damaging the
general or partial framework of the structure of the Soviet
text. Such a manner of construction will hinder you from form-
ulating the ideas as we conceive them, because the Soviets
have built that text in conformity with their views, they have
extended themselves in some places in order to introduce a bit
of poison or they have spread the poison in a whole whole-
over which they have also sprinkled a coating of sugar. There-
fore, don’t worry about the Soviet structure, concern yourself
about the key problems. Cut out all the little-battle and non-
sense, then leave it to the Secretariat to correct the structure of
the Declaration.

In my opinion, the Declaration stinks on the main questions,
and is just what you think it is. I read it through carefully
once and made notes alongside the text. Time did not permit
me to sum up all these remarks and elaborate them. Thus, I
decided to send you the text with the notes I have made. Don’t
think that every note on this text is a jewel. There are some
unnecessary, hasty things, written in anger. Therefore have a
look at them yourself, the aim is mostly to draw your attention
to something which may not have struck your eye while it
has struck mine, and vice versa. I am sure that you have gone
over the Soviet material with a fine-tooth comb and have seen
all the delicate questions, therefore my mind is at ease on that
score. Anyway, although you will find it somehow difficult to
read my notes, for I have scribbled them, I shall be satisfied if
they are of any help to you.

If you have anything particular to consult me about, send a
radiogram. As to the speech you will have to deliver, it will be
best if you send us a copy, because, as you yourself say, we may
be able to help you with some comments either by radiogram
or by returning the text with our remarks, if we have any,
and if the time of the return of the plane permits.

...The Khrushchev group has lined up on its side a large
number of parties, which it caught on the hop, and is taking
advantage of their trust in and love for the Communist Party
of the Soviet Union. It will be difficult for these parties and
these communists to have the courage to adopt a clear-cut stand
immediately. This is true. But it becomes very dangerous to
leave this matter to drag out, because revisionism will do its
own dreadful work, will compromise people and parties, will
carry or large-scale demagogy with propaganda and with large
material funds. Within ten years the Tito clique completely dis-
integrated the party, and the genuine communists and patriots
were thrown into jails or killed. Therefore, the most correct stand is that at this meeting we should carry the matter through to the end, as Marxists. It must come out nakedly that he is on an anti-Marxist road, who is betraying Marxism-Leninism and violating the 1957 Moscow Declaration. This is the Khrouchev group. Therefore the meeting should do the Ts. The Ts must be dethroned from Bucharest, and those who have made mistakes must admit them at the meeting like Marxists and go back to their parties to correct them. The Khrouchev group does not want to admit its mistakes, it is responsible for splitting the ideological unity of the international communist movement.

We are on a correct Marxist-Leninist road. The Khrouchev group has deviated into revisionism, therefore our struggle and time will expose them. But there is one other thing, the threat of a split and the split itself will speed up the process of the bankruptcy of the Khrouchev group and its isolation from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other parties, which will be shocked and reflect on the matter better and sooner. Otherwise, these parties pretend to be outside the conflict, indeed they consider a success that it did not come to a split, and leave it to time to prove whether the Soviet line or ours is correct. The slogan «Let time verify the line», as some advocate... is to the liking of Khrouchev, and is an opportunist, revisionist and anti-Marxist slogan. It contains in itself the fear of taking things through to the end and radically curing the mistakes. This idea serves to preserve the Khrouchevite status quo with a bit of patching up which Khrouchev has not, does not and will not have any notice of at all. This slogan helps the revisionists to go further, to spread revisionism. In a word, if this slogan is adopted, we can be sure that there are great dangers.

Revisionism is the main danger, it must be attacked, however big the «heads» that have this prudence within them. To clear up the abscess the scalpel must be used. All those who say, «Let us leave it to time», understand the situation, but lack the revolutionary courage to put the finger on the sore spot and to use the effective means to clean it.

On the other hand we should realize that the Khrouchev group is terrified of the situation, terrified of a split. They see that their policy is suffering failures, that it has created a grave situation, that is far from correct, that ideologically they are quite deliberately and hopelessly on the road to disaster. Thus, in this situation, is it permissible for us to allow this revisionist group to regain its breath, to get over this great chasm which it created? It seems to me that we must not allow this. If we do not expose the Khrouchev group, we shall be making a great mistake, for they will take advantage of this to do more harm to the Soviet Union, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and international communism. Khrouchev is an exhibitionist clown. Look what he is doing at the UNO. This is why I sent you that long radiogram the evening before last.

But, anyway, dear Hysni, carry on as you are doing, you are doing fine.

Everyday I receive amusing radiograms from Mehmet. Matters continue as before. No concrete results whatever. No disarmament, no reorganization of the UNO Secretariat, no meeting, not a damned thing. The only «success» has been the creation of the third force with Tito at the head and the blessing of «București» by Khrouchev...

Best regards to Ramiz and the comrades. The comrades here send their greetings.

I embrace you,

ENVER

1. «Uncle» (Russ.)

3) Hysni writes that he will send me the opening speech to have a look at. Hysni is completely competent and well armed as to the stands which must be maintained.

At the meeting there are some who have the fear, which we do not share, of what might happen if the Khrouchev group does not come to its senses. We do not agree with them on this, but we must discuss and convince them, for we see it more correctly, more radically, and the Khrouchev group ought to fear what we think, while we have no need to fear them. We have our positions correct and strong. Theirs are revisionist and weak. Therefore we must strike the iron while it is hot, for if the acrobat gets away with this, he will be up to a thousand and one tricks, let alone within 10-15 years in which he will do terrible things. Anyway, this in the final stage; you will come back and we shall talk here, before we go to Moscow.

4) Hysni wrote that Kozlovka invited him to lunch yesterday, but Hysni thanked him and did not go. Considering what
he has done to us, this suited us fine, so that he will understand
with whom he is dealing.

5) We hear from reliable sources that the Bucharest Meeting
had been pre-arranged behind the backs of our
Party and the Communist Party of China. Khrushchev
informed, discussed, and received the approval of all his
boys about how the issues would be raised in Bucharest, what
would be discussed and what should be decided. This is
blatant — not a faction, but a plot. This was the whole aim
of the struggle of Ivanov and Koço Tashko to get me to
put on a vacation: to compromise me and drag me into the
dirt. But they missed out.

6) The Plenum on education will open on October 7. In
the Bureau we definitely decided on the questions under dis-
ussion concerning the reorganization of the school.
The only thing we did not decide, because opinions were di-
vided, was whether the school should be 11 or 12 years. We
shall examine what the Plenum has to say, too. I was inclined
towards 12 years, I believe you, too, are for 12 years. But I
thought of a variant which does not upset the reorganization
of the school and the preparation of the new curricula. We
do not have to decide right now for years ahead. We have
3-4 years to carry out the experiment with those classes in
which we have decided to include work this year, and during
this period, the teachers should study the new programs and
thus this question will be defined more correctly. The truth
is that it is not easy to turn down the variant of the 12-year
school, but the 11 year variant, too, has its own advantages and
disadvantages. Anyway, we shall decide for the best.

Pique and the children are well.

I embrace you and we are eagerly awaiting your return.

SHPATI

1. Diminutives used in an ironical sense.

RADI OGRAM TO COMRADE MEHMET SHEHU IN NEW YORK

October 6, 1960

Comrade Mehmet,

1) You gave Vinogradov a good reply on the question of
disarmament. «Raplo Lelo» wants to cover up his failure at
the United Nations Organization, to confuse the masses, and
to mobilize the press to declare that there will be new «festiv-
als» in the coming year. It is a good thing for public opinion
to exert pressure on the Americans, since it means increased
indignation and vigilance, but he wants to be the the «big man»
himself, to take the initiative himself, to go himself, to be
everything himself. Therefore, you acted correctly in not re-
fusing him in principle. But we have plenty of time to declare
courses. He will declare himself because he disregards our
opinion. And this because he is up to some mischief.

2) The commission met yesterday in Moscow, five people or
so spoke, obedient delegates, who had adopted the watchword;
«No word about the contradictions», as if nothing had happened.
They mentioned neither the Soviet Union nor China. General

LETTER TO COMRADE HYSNI KAPO IN MOSCOW

October 7, 1960, 24th h.

Dear comrade Hysni,

Today we opened the Plenum, things are going well, the
discussions about the school reform are continuing. The con-
tributions to the discussion are good. We shall discuss this
problem tomorrow, too, and then we shall examine the draft-
directives of the Five-year Plan.

Today at noon I received the parcel with the material you
sent me. You will understand that I have very little time, but I
have glanced rapidly through your letter, your speech, and the
reformulations and amendments of the draft-Declaration you
are going to make...

1) In regard to your speech, I liked it. The problems were
dealt with well and its tone was correct. If the opportunity
presents itself, either to you in the plenary meeting, or to
Ramiz in the commission, you should defend the Communist

expressions and approval of the Soviet draft-Declaration. The
Fin, the Hungarian, the West German, the Mongolian, and
the Italian spoke. The Chinese will speak today.

3)...

4) There is nothing new on the internal front. The ploughing
is under way; the sugar-beet is being lifted but it is very
poor. A small earthquake shook the Kardhig area, but nobody
was injured, only some houses were wrecked. The situation is
not alarming. The census of the population was taken properly.
Spiro (Soleka) has shut himself up and is working on the
report.

Yours

SHPATI

1. Member of the Soviet delegation to the 15th Session
   of the General Assembly of the UNO.
2. Member of the Political Bureau of the CC of the PLA.
party of China more strongly; since the main assault is against
it, the main batteries are aimed at it. They hate us just as
much as the Chinese, and there is no doubt that they will
attack us, but the main attack will be concentrated on the
Communist Party of China, since they think, and with reason,
that the greatest potential danger to them is the Communist
party of China, and they think: «If we can defeat them, the
Albanians will be no problem».

Therefore, for the time being, our positions are not being
attacked, but we will be attacked, especially when we hit
Glausheev with some hard facts; they will accuse us, too, of
being «doggmatic», because we take the side of China. We must
show the Soviet representatives and their supporters that ours
is a Marxist-Leninist line, that we defend the Communist Party
of China only because it upholds a correct Marxist-Leninist
line, that we are fighting the revisionist and Right opportunists
viewpoints as well as the slanderers and falsifiers.

From these positions we attack all those who dare to attack
us, either openly or in an underhand way.

Apart from those parties that we know have taken wrong
positions, don't attack those that hesitate, that lack the courage
to say what they think, those that say nothing about our Party
or only something of no consequence. Don't push them into
open conflict with us, manoeuvre. The attack should be
concentrated on the main enemy, on those who have caused the
opportunism deviation and who attack our correct line. Apart
from the Soviets, Bulgarians, Poles and some others, if these
parties make some half-hearted attack on the Communist Party
of China, because they cannot do otherwise, don't put the
pressure on them, leave it to the Chinese to judge the best
tactic to follow.

2)... In my opinion, the Soviet leaders want to close the matter,
to cover up their rottenness, because for the time being, it is not
in their interests to deepen the contradictions. They are
ready to make some concessions simply to get over the river
without wetting their feet; to make the amendments demanded,
in one way or another, and then tell us: «There is no reason
to hold a discussion or debate». «We agree». «Go home!»

I may be mistaken in my assessment of what the Soviets
are up to. I told you at the start that I had had only a quick
glance through. Your speech deprives the Soviets of this
possibility, because it comes out clearly that «we have accounts
to settle». Initially, our speeches may be like a «prelude» but
later they must burst out like Beethoven's symphonies; we are
not for «serenades and nocturnes».

3) I also read the formulations of the amendments to the
draft-Declaration. They seem good. Consult and collaborates with
the Chinese comrades. Why should the Soviets and others
coordinate their activities, and not we?

I want you to re-examine the formulation about the
transition to socialism once again so that the spirit of the
point of view comes out better. I reminded you once again
of the question of the «call», which should be formulated in
another way, because in November we are going to take it up in
connection with Stalín and the attitude of Krushchev. There is
a passage about «actions»; have another look at it to see whether
it has been put there as a trap. One last remark: on page
27, in the 2nd paragraph of the draft-Declaration typed in Tirana,
or on page 14 of your text, Lenin's idea should be brought out
more clearly «...as long as the bourgeoisie does not impede
the workers' movement and its vanguard in its ideological,
political, and economic struggle.» (this is a quotation from
Lenin), but the idea that the Soviets have introduced subse-
quently should be made more precise, because there they
mean Nehru and others, in order to justify the aid they give
them.

4) It is difficult to say what you should slap back in their
faces, and what you should not. It depends on the circum-
cstances. You must go by the principle, defend the Party and its
line fearlessly, without hesitating, «Should I say this or hold
back?». As you judge it. You should expose your opponent by
means of fair arguments and crush him. A single fact used at
the right time and place can be enough to make your opponent
fall flat on his face in the mud. Therefore, don't lie yourself
down and don't worry too much about making some
mistake.

The question is simply that we should keep some things
for the Moscow Meeting instead of throwing them in at the
commission, because, if the Soviets were to learn of them they
would work out their tactics for a counter-attack.

As long as they hesitate, the French should be told in
various forms: «Which way are you going? We have a feeling
that you understand where the mistakes lie and you should
help to avoid even more serious mistakes, etc.». Make an
effort in this direction.

A diplomat of a country of people's democracy told one
of our comrades in Rome that the leaders of the com-
munist and workers' parties of our camp, with the except-
ion of the Communist Party of Albania and the Communist Party
of China, knew what was to be put forward at Bucharest,
because Krushchev had consulted them previously. Hence, the
Bucharest Meeting was organized beforehand behind the scenes
as an international faction (we shall use this argument at
the Moscow Meeting).

I have nothing else to add but to wish you success. I know
that you are working hard and suffering from the «dry-
atmosphere», but we can do nothing about it, the struggle for
justice is no bed of roses. When you fight for the Party, for
the people and communism, there is neither tiredness nor bore-
dom.

The comrades went to the reception given by the Germans:
I did not, as I wanted to write you this letter and send it to
morrow by plane. I did not go to the Germans' reception
also for the reason that I wanted to make them realize that we
did not take it kindly that their delegation did not return our
official visit, although they had decided the date and the
composition of the delegation. The reasons they gave for not
coming were unconvincing, but the real ones are those we
know and over which you are fighting there.

«Flasco» is the UNO! With a capital 'F'. Mehmet leaves
New York on the 11th of October and arrives at Tirana
on the 20-21st.

On the 25th of October we are convening the People's
Assembly, and on this occasion Mehmet will speak on the
«triumph» of disarmament and «Rapao Lelo's» coexistence in
the UNO. My best regards to Ramiz.

Yours affectionately
ENVER
WHETHER ALBANIA IS A SOCIALIST COUNTRY OR NOT, 
THIS DOES NOT DEPEND ON KHRUSHCHEV, 
BUT IT HAS BEEN DECIDED BY THE ALBANIAN PEOPLE THROUGH 
THE WARS THEY HAVE Fought AND THE BLOOD THEY HAVE SHED 

From a conversation with Y. Andropov in Moscow 
November 8, 1960

COMRADE ENVEN HOXHA: I was informed today that 
Khruushchev had expressed the wish to meet me tomorrow at 11 
am. I read the Soviet document in which Albania does not figure 
as a socialist country.

Y. ANDROPOV: What document is this, I do not under-
stand you, tell me concretely what material you mean, where 
this has been said?

COMRADE ENVEN HOXHA: This is the material of the Com-
munist Party of the Soviet Union addressed to the Communist 
Party of China.

Y. ANDROPOV: But why should you be concerned about it, 
this is a letter to China, what has China to do with Albania?

COMRADE ENVEN HOXHA: And this made my meeting with 
Khruushchev definitely impossible.

Y. ANDROPOV: I do not understand you, what is said about 
you in that material?

COMRADE ENVEN HOXHA: Read it and you will see.

Y. ANDROPOV: I have read it and am very familiar with its 
content, since I myself participated in drawing it up. But your 
statement, comrade Enver, is a very serious one.

COMRADE ENVEN HOXHA: Yes, it is serious. Tell Khru-
ushchev that whether Albania is a socialist country, or not, this does 
not depend on Khruushchev, but has been decided by the Albanian 
people themselves through the wars they have fought and the 
blood they have shed. This has been decided by the Party 
of Labour of Albania, which has marched and will always 
march on the Marxist-Leninist road.

Y. ANDROPOV: I do not understand you, comrade Enver. That 
material is meant for China, what has it to do with Albania?

COMRADE ENVEN HOXHA: I speak on behalf of my home-
land, my people, my country.

Y. ANDROPOV: This is a very serious statement, and I can 
only express my regret over it.

COMRADE ENVEN HOXHA: We shall have the meeting of the 
parties, and there our Party will express its opinion. That's 
all! Goodbye!

1. — A letter of 125 pages addressed by CC of the CPSU to the 
CC of the CP of China on November 5th, 1960, in which besides 
the accusations levelled against the CP of China, the CC of the 
CPSU ignored the existence of the PR of Albania as a socialist 
country and maligned the Party of Labour of Albania.

WE SHALL ARDENTLY DEFEND MARXISM-LENINISM 
AND THE INTERESTS OF THE PEOPLE

From the conversation of the delegation of the Party of Labour of Albania with the representatives of the 
Communist Party of the Soviet Union, A. Mikoyan, F. Kozlov, M. Suslov, P. Pospyelov, Y. Andropov, in Moscow 
November 10, 1960

A. Mikoyan is the first to speak. Expressing his «regret» 
over the disagreements that have arisen between the Com-
munist Party of the Soviet Union and the Party of Labour 
of Albania, he accuses our Party of allegedly being the cause 
of these disagreements, of «not having the same trust as be-
fore...» in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, he com-
plains of our «officers» having allegedly completely changed 
their attitude towards the Soviet officers at the naval base of 
Vloris and asks: «Do you want to leave the Warsaw Treaty?...», 
etc. He claims that the Soviet leadership allegedly stands for 
the clearing up of these «misunderstandings» in the best way. 
Tell us, he went on, «where our mistakes are, we shall not 
get angry. We get angry only when you talk behind our 
backs.»

COMRADE ENVEN HOXHA: Tell us when and where we have 
said anything against you behind your backs. With us Alba-
nians, it is not the custom to talk behind someone's back.

What you said concerning the military base of Vloria is 
not true. There is a close friendship between the Albanian and 
Soviet officers and men there. This was the case until the 
Bucharest Meeting, and it will continue to be so as far as 
we are concerned. The Central Committee of the Party has in-
structed our men at the base to maintain a correct attitude 
towards the Soviet personnel. But some of your sailors have 
attacked ours. The Ministry of Defence of the PRA has issued 
instructions that these matters should be settled through 
the party branches. An incident took place between an 
officer of our navy and a Soviet rear-admiral who came from Se-
vastopol on an inspection and who was addicted to drink. Quite properly he got hold of one of our officers, a good comrade who had studied in the Soviet Union, and demanded that he tell him what was decided at the Plenum of the Central Committee, because, he said, "he would be giving lectures on this matter in Sevastopol, and would be asked about it." Our officer replied that the communique on the Plenum of the Central Committee had been published in the newspaper, so what more did he want? He took his hat and left and reported the matter to his commander. Your comrades had the rear-admiral on the mat, he begged our pardon and the incident was closed.

Concerning the delivery of the submarines: Our seamen were trained for two and a half years in Sevastopol, they had distinguished themselves in firing practice. Our Staff and our seamen had prepared themselves to receive the submarines in a solemn manner. There is a Soviet rear-admiral in our Staff. We do not know exactly what he is, but a rear-admiral he certainly is not. He said, "The submarines cannot be handed over to you, because you are not trained." The comrades of our Ministry of Defence questioned the validity of this statement. Were it necessary for our military men to study for some months longer they should have been informed about it. But the Soviet Staff itself had said that the Albanian crews had completed their training.

Then they told us that winter had come, that seas were stormy. Our comrades came here, to your admiralty, stated their case and received the reply that "the submarines would be handed over to them." But again came the order from your people not to give them to us. When we were in Tirana, our Ministry of Defence sent a letter to Gershkov, explained the matter in comradely terms, just as I put it to you. The letter said that, if several more months were needed to train our seamen, you could tell us so. But the reason does not lie here.

A. MIKOVAN: And where does it lie?

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: It is up to you to tell us this. But this is not the main problem... Let us come now to the question of our leaving the Warsaw Treaty, since you mentioned this at the start...

A. MIKOVAN: We did not, but such was the impression created.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: How can such an impression be created -- on the basis of what a certain rear-admiral says? Let us consider this question, for there are more serious things in it.

A. MIKOVAN: Really? We know nothing of them.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: How is it that you know nothing of them? If this is the case, it is not right that your Central Committee does not know about them. Do you know that we have been threatened with expulsion from the Warsaw Treaty? Grecchio has made such a threat.

A. MIKOVAN: We know nothing about it. Tell us.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: We shall tell you all right, for it is a matter of principle. Two of your marshals, Malinovsky and Grecchio, have said such a thing. You must know this.

COMRADE HYNKI KAPO: On October 22nd, I informed Polyanuky of this.

A. MIKOVAN: You may not believe me, but I do not know.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: Since you put the matter in this way, that you know nothing about it, we must remind you that four months ago we wrote you a letter concerning your ambassador. Why did you not follow the Leninist practice of your Party, and reply to us?

F. KOLLO: We shall send you another ambassador.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: You say so now, but why have you not written to us? We wrote to you four months ago but have received no answer.

A. MIKOVAN: We did well not to answer you. And this is why: for 15 years now our ambassadors have been going to the party committees to ask for information. This has been so in Albania, too. Is it interference on the part of our ambassador to ask the Chairman of the Auditing Commission about what went on at the Plenum?

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: Yes, it is interference and entirely impermissible. I can say that in our country nothing has been hidden from the Soviet personnel. For 16 years we have followed the practice of informing you about all important documents and decisions of the Central Committee of our Party and Government. Why have we done this? Because we have been sincere and frank with the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. You have no right to accuse our Party of bad behaviour towards the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. We have been very closely linked with the Soviet comrades, ranging from the ambassador to the ordinary specialist. All doors have been open to them.

A. MIKOVAN, M. SUSLOV: Precisely, that is so.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: We think that perhaps no other Party has behaved in this way towards the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Why have we done this? Because we have considered the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as the Party which, under Lenin's leadership, carried out the Great Socialist Revolution and was the first to open the way to socialism and communism.

We have had disagreements prior to the Bucharest Meeting, and we shall tell you them. For example, on the question of Yugoslav revisionism. But we have gone about it in such a way that nothing has leaked out. Why have our relations deteriorated after Bucharest? What did we say at Bucharest? We expressed our attitude, stressing that the disagreements which were presented by Khrushchev at the Bucharest Meeting were over matters concerning the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, and that the Party of Labour of Albania reserved the right to voice its opinion about them at the Moscow Meeting. Why then was our Party attacked?

We do not agree with the Bucharest Meeting, but we did nothing to make you change your attitude towards us one hundred per cent. First of all, your ambassador behaved in a despicable manner towards us. We liked him. After the Bucharest Meeting, and especially after his return from Moscow, he began to attack us and behave contemptuously towards us.

A. MIKOVAN: I have never thought he would go as far as that.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: That means you do not believe us. Do not forget that I am the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour. I have been and am a friend of the Soviet Union. You can fail to believe me, but you believe your «chinoviks». What interest has the Party of Labour of Albania in creating disagreements and saying false things about the ambassador of the Soviet Union?
A. MIKOYAN: I believe that you are not interested in this. The ambassador has spoken no ill of you. Personally, he is a good man.

M. SUSLOV: But not very bright, especially politically.

A. MIKOYAN: Tell us, what should we do to improve our relations? We shall replace the ambassador.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: Things are not as simple as that. We do not maintain only diplomatic relations but also inter-party links, and these must be on a Marxist-Leninist basis. For example, ambassador Ivanov had contact with me. Why should he meet the Chairman of the Auditing Commission?

I am the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party. Have I asked you why you expelled Zhukov? Up to now I know nothing. The Soviet ambassador has always come to ask me about the Plenums of our Party, and I have informed him about them. He came and asked me about 'the proceedings of this Plenum'. I told him what was to be told. Since the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party told him that much, he should have gone home to bed. Otherwise, if your ambassador is going to get hold of one and the other, he and his friends are not diplomats and representatives of a socialist country, but intelligence agents. The staff of the embassy, through Bespalov, got hold of the Chairman of the Auditing Commission and 'worked' on him in two sessions, then, for the third session, he was invited to dinner in the name of the ambassador, at the residence of the first secretary of the embassy. There were three of them, the ambassador, the counsellor and the secretary. And there our comrade, who 15 days before had agreed with the decision of the Plenum, with the line of our Central Committee, was opposed to the line of the Party. Now I ask you: can an ambassador be allowed to act in this manner and on his own responsibility?

We think that all these actions were aimed at creating disruption in our Party. Your ambassador went even further. At the airport, alluding to the Bucharest events, he asked our generals, 'With whom will the army side?'

A. MIKOYAN, F. KOZLOV: He is a fool.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: I respect you, but we cannot swallow such 'excuses', although we lack your experience.

The question of the invitation Khrushchev sent me is very important. First I decided to accept it. But when I read your material, the letter addressed to the Chinese comrades on November 5th, I saw that Albania was not included in the socialist camp. All the countries of people's democracy of Europe are mentioned there with the exception of Albania.

M. SUSLOV: Neither is the Soviet Union mentioned there.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: What are you trying to tell us?

Were I in your place I would admit that it is wrong. Ivanov has acted in this way, Grechko likewise, such things are written in the document, Khrushchev has told Teng Hsiao-ping disgraceful things about Albania, but you admit nothing, whereas we have always been sincere with you. Kosygin did not behave well towards me in a conversation we had, either. He behaved as if he were an overlord. He said: 'In your Party there are enemies that want to split us.'

This year, because of very unfavorable natural conditions, we were badly in need of bread grain. We had bread for only 15 days. We asked you for 50 thousand tons of wheat. We waited for 45 days but received no reply. Then we bought it in France with convertible currency. The French merchant came immediately to Albania to size up the situation. He asked, 'How is such a thing possible? Albania has never bought grain from the Western countries, the Soviet Union is selling grain everywhere!' In order to dispel his doubts we told him, 'The Soviet Union has given us grain, has given us maize, but we use it to feed pigs'. We know where you sell your grain, where the Rumanians, the Germans sell theirs; in England and elsewhere. You put conditions on us, and we were obliged to offer you gold to buy the grain we needed.

A. MIKOYAN: We have not refused to supply you with grain, I know that grain has been shipped to you every month. You proposed to our people to pay in gold, and they accepted. Why should we want your currency?

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: Comrade Pospoyev, when you were in Albania you have seen what love our people nurture for the Soviet Union. But now you seek this love from Koco Tashko and Liri Belishava, and not from us.

The tactic you are following is completely wrong. You should have talked with me before you wrote those things in the letter I mentioned. But when you accuse our Party and its leadership of being anti-Soviet, of being criminals, and as you say, of resorting to 'Stalinist methods', and after you have made all these public accusations, you want to talk with me, this I can never accept.

A. MIKOYAN: We invited you to talk earlier but you refused.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: Things are not as you say. I had taken some days off. It was only partly a vacation, because I was working on the report for the Party Congress. Comrade Hysni told me that Ivanov had informed him that, if he wished, Comrade Enver could go to rest in the Soviet Union. But he did not tell me anything about the meeting with Khrushchev.

COMRADE HYNSI KAPO: In regard to your letter in which you invited us to hold talks, it was quite clear what we were going to talk about.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: The letter said that we should meet to discuss the question of China.

A. MIKOYAN: Not the question of China. The word 'China' is not even mentioned there. You refused to meet us.

COMRADE MEHMET SHEIHU: How can such a thing be denied? How can you behave in such a way towards our country? Shame on you, comrade Kozlov that you allow yourself to present small Albania with an ultimatum: 'Either with us or with China!'

F. KOZLOV: When your delegation passed through here I said only that I was surprised at Comrade Kapo's position. Your stand was different from that of other parties. We have treated you so very well. When Comrade Enver spoke in Leningrad, he said that the Albanian people feel they are not one million but 201 million.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: I still say it, too, but not if you do not think of China. Both you and we should be for the unity of our camp, for a billion strong camp. We love the Soviet Union but we have a great love for the Chinese people and the Communist Party of China, too. Why is it, comrade Kozlov, that since Bucharest you speak of 'signs' by our Party and ask with whom we will side, 'with the 200 or the 800'.
P. Pospyelov: With his sharp replies at the Bucharest Meeting, comrade Kape was not in order, either.

Comrade Enver Hoxha: Even now we do not agree with the Bucharest Meeting, as you organized it.

A. Mikoyan: The Bucharest Meeting is another issue. Now the question is whether our relations should be improved or not. Comrade Khrushchev said today, in his speech, that we shall maintain friendship even with those parties with which we have differences. We must meet and talk things over.

Comrade Enver Hoxha: We are not against meetings. But we ask the comrades of the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to be more careful, because to distribute among 80 and more parties a document, in which Albania is excluded from the socialist countries, and then invite us to «come and talk», is completely unacceptable.

M. Suslov, A. Mikoyan: Let's meet and talk about how we can improve our relations.

Comrade Enver Hoxha: We, too, seek to improve our relations.

M. Suslov: But not in that tone.

Comrade Enver Hoxha: I want to give you a piece of advice: put out of your mind that we are hot-headed. When Marxism-Leninism and the interests of our people are at stake, we shall defend them ardently.

---

1. This meeting with the delegation of the PLA, which was in Moscow, was demanded by the Soviet leaders with a view to «persuading» our delegation not to raise at the Meeting of the 81 parties the questions about which the PLA did not agree with them, and particularly their anti-Marxist and hostile action towards our country after the Bucharest Meeting.


4. The 17th Plenum of the CC of the PLA, which was held from 11-12 of July 1960 and approved the activity of the delegation of the PLA at the Bucharest Meeting.

5. The 4th Congress of the Party, which it had been decided to hold in November 1960. Later, due to the Meeting of the 81 communist and workers' parties in Moscow, it was postponed until February 1961.

6. A downpour hit the part of A. Mikoyan. The letter of August 13th that the CC of the CPSU sent to the CC of the PLA said expressly: «The Meeting of the representatives of the communist and workers' parties held in Bucharest showed that between the Communist Party of China and the other sister parties there is a different understanding of a series of important problems of the international situation and the tactics of the communist parties...».
WE HAVE FOUGHT EMPTY-BELLIED AND BARE-FOOTED, BUT HAVE NEVER KOTOWED TO ANYBODY

Conversation of the delegation of the PLA headed by comrade Enver Hoxha, at a meeting with N. S. Khrushchev in the Kremlin, Moscow1

November 12, 1960

N. S. KRUSHCHEV: You have the floor, we are listening.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: You have invited us. The host should speak first.

N. S. KRUSHCHEV: We accept the Albanians' terms. I do not understand what has happened since my visit to Albania in 1950! Had you been dissatisfied with us even then, I must have been a blockhead and very naive not to have realized this. At that time we had nothing but nice words to say apart from some jokes such as that I made with comrade Mehmet Shehu about the poplars2.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: If this is intended to open up conversation, it is another matter. The joke about the poplars is out of place here.

N. S. KRUSHCHEV: What other reason could be there, then, why you have changed your attitude towards us?

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: It is not us who have changed our attitude, but you. We have had disagreements on previous occasions, as for example, over the stand to be taken towards the Yugoslav revisionists. But this change of attitude occurred after the Bucharest Meeting, and precisely on your part.

N. S. KRUSHCHEV: I want to get one thing clear. I thought that we had no disagreements over Yugoslavia. You have spoken more than we have about this problem. We, too, have written about it, but dispassionately. We have stressed that the more said against them, the more their value would be increased. And that is what happened.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: In our opinion, that is not so.

N. S. KRUSHCHEV: I speak for us. But I want to ask you: in what tone shall we speak? If you do not want our friendship, then tell us so.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: We want to be friends always, we want to talk in a friendly way. But this does not mean that we should see eye to eye with you over all matters.

N. S. KRUSHCHEV: Three times we have invited you to talks. Do you want to break off relations with us?

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: It is you who caused the deterioration of our relations after the Bucharest Meeting. We have pointed out many facts to your comrades, they should have told you.

N. S. KRUSHCHEV: I do not quite understand this. I had no conflict with comrade Hynsi Kapo at the Bucharest Meeting. He said that he was not authorized by the CC of the PLA to take a definite stand towards the questions under discussion.

COMRADE HYNSI KAPO: At Bucharest I expressed our Party's opinion that the Bucharest Meeting was premature and held in contravention of the Leninist organizational norms; that the disagreements discussed there were disagreements between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, and that the Party of Labour of Albania would express its opinion at a future meeting. Thereupon you said that you were amazed at the stand taken by the Party of Labour of Albania. You said this both at the meeting of the 12 parties of the socialist countries and at the broader meeting of 50 and more parties. In reality, we had told you our stand before we spoke at the meeting of the 12 parties. I had spoken with Andropov about this. After he informed you of our talk, you told him to tell the Albanians that they must think things over and change their stand.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: The Central Committee of our Party has never accepted the Bucharest Meeting. From the very beginning, I was in the current of all that was going on at Bucharest.

N. S. KRUSHCHEV: This is of no great importance. The point is that even before the Bucharest Meeting you were not in agreement with us but you said nothing about this to us. And we considered you as friends. I am to blame for having trusted you so much.

COMRADE MEHMET SHEHU: I ask comrade Khrushchev to recall our talks of 1957. We spoke to you with open hearts about all the problems, including that of the activity of the Yugoslav revisionists. You listened to us, then after a telling reply to you by comrade Enver, you rose to your feet and said, «Do you want to put us back on Stalin's road?». That means that you knew long ago that we thought about the Yugoslav revisionists differently from you. You knew this at least as early as April 1957. But you should also remember that in 1955, when you were about to go to Yugoslavia, we replied to your letter in which you suggested changing the attitude that should be maintained towards the Yugoslav revisionists. That the problem should first be analysed by the Information Bureau which should take the decision.

A. NIKOGYAN: Yes, that is what happened.

N. S. KRUSHCHEV: You say that new people with little experience have come to power in the Soviet Union. Do you want to teach us?

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: No, there is no need. This is an internal question of yours. But do you know what your ambassador has said? Other things apart, I shall tell you only one fact that has to do with the army. He has asked to whom the Albanian Army will be loyal. This question he addressed to our generals at the airport, in the presence of one of your generals. Our officers replied that our army would be loyal to Marxism-Leninism, to the Party of Labour and socialism.

N. S. KRUSHCHEV: If our ambassador has said such a thing he has been foolish.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: Yes, but this is political foolishness.

N. S. KRUSHCHEV: This is every sort of foolishness.
A. MIKOYAN: Do you think that such behaviour by our ambassador expresses our line?

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: A fool's foolishness, even of a political character, may be excused once, but, when it is repeated many times over, then this is a line.

N. S. KHRUSHCHEV: Yes, that is true.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: Your ambassador has been a friend of our Party, and ours personally. He was no fool. He committed this 'foolishness' following the Bucharest Meeting. Why did he not display such 'foolishness' prior to the Bucharest Meeting, during the three consecutive years he stayed in Albania? That is astonishing.

A. MIKOYAN: It is not astonishing, but previously he used to receive information from you regularly and had not noticed such behaviour on your part.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: It seems to me that you said that he did not know that there were disagreements between us...

A. MIKOYAN: Comrade Enver told us that previously he used to tell Ivanov everything, but later he did not. Hence the change in the behaviour of the ambassador. We have discussed these things.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: If we have discussed these things, as Mikoyan says, then why are we sitting here? If, after discussing matters, we say that we do not agree with you, you can then say to us, «We have discussed these things».

A. MIKOYAN: But we recalled our ambassador. Why do you harp on this question?

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: All right, we will leave the ambassador aside, but what you have written about Albania and the Party of Labour in your letter to the Chinese comrades is monstrous.

A. MIKOYAN: We have expressed our opinion.

COMRADE RANIZ ALIA: You publicly accuse us of anti-Sovietism.

(He reads page 46 of the letter.)

N. S. KHRUSHCHEV: This is our opinion. You must not get angry.

COMRADE MBHMET SHEHU: You attack us, and we should not get angry.

N. S. KHRUSHCHEV: We are sorry about what happened with these people. You do not agree. I have not known Koço Tashko, I may perhaps have seen him, but, even if you were to show me his photo, I would not remember him.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: If you want his photo, we may send it to you.

N. S. KHRUSHCHEV: I know Belishova less than you do. I know that she was a member of the Bureau. She told us about the talk she had in China. Kosygin told comrade Mehmet this when Mehmet was in Moscow, and when he heard it he went white with rage. She is a courageous woman, she told us openly what she felt. This is a tragedy; you expelled her, because she stood for friendship with us! That is why we wrote about this in the document.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: That is to say, you consider what has been written here, in your material, to be correct?

N. S. KHRUSHCHEV: Yes, we do.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: There are two points here. First, you say that we expelled a member of the Bureau in an undemocratic way. Who told you that this was done not according to democratic rules and Leninist norms, but according to «Stalinist methods», as you call them? Second, you say that we expelled her for pro-Sovietism, and that implies that we are anti-Soviet. Can you explain this to us?

N. S. KHRUSHCHEV: If you have come here intending to disagree with us and break off relations, say so openly and we won't waste time.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: You did not answer our question. And you have distributed this material to all the parties.

N. S. KHRUSHCHEV: To those parties to which the Chinese have distributed their material.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: And we have our point of view which does not coincide with yours. Two or three times you have raised the question of whether we are for friendship or for breaking off relations. We came here to strengthen our friendship. But you admit none of your mistakes. You have made criticism of us, and so have we of you. You have criticized on the quiet and publicly, before all. You may have other criticisms. Tell us, and we shall tell you ours, so that our central committees may know them. The Central Committee of our Party has sent us here to strengthen our friendship.

N. S. KHRUSHCHEV: One of your comrades told our army men that Khrushchev was not a Marxist.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: In connection with the question of the military men we have talked with your comrades. How could it be in our interest to have our military men quarrel at the Vlora base?! While you produce «documents» to the effect that one of our comrades has allegedly said this and that. Have a good look at your military men. I told Mikoyan that your rear-admiral at the Vlora naval base is not a rear-admiral.

N. S. KHRUSHCHEV: We can dismantle the base if you like.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: Then what Malinovsky and Grechko have said turns out to be true. Are you trying to threaten us? If the Soviet people hear that you want to dismantle the Vlora base, at a time when it is serving the defence of Albania and the other socialist countries of Europe, they will not forgive you for this...

N. S. KHRUSHCHEV: Comrade Enver, don't raise the voice!

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: If you dismantle the base you will be making a big mistake. We have fought empty-bellied and bare-footed, but have never kotowed to anybody.

N. S. KHRUSHCHEV: The submarines are ours.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: Yours and ours, we are fighting for socialism. The territory of the base is ours. About the submarines we have signed agreements which recognize the rights of the Albanian State. I defend the interests of my country.

A. MIKOYAN: Your tone is such as if Khrushchev has given you nothing. We have talked among ourselves about the base. Khrushchev was not for dismantling it. I said to him, if our officers go on quarrelling with the Albanians, why should we keep the base?

COMRADE MBHMET SHEHU: You have treated us as enemies. Even here in Moscow you have carried out intelligence activities against us. You know this very well.
COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: As the question was put here, we might just as well discuss it at the Warsaw Treaty. I want to say that while such a thing has occurred to you, it has never crossed our minds. And then, to say, «We shall dismantle it if you like!» Relations between the Albanians and the Soviet personnel at the Vlora base have always been good. Only since the Bucharest Meeting have some incidents taken place, and they were caused by your officers who were not in order. If you insist, we can call together the Warsaw Treaty. But the Vlora base is ours and will remain ours.

N. S. KHRUSHCHEV: You flare up in anger. You spat on me; no one can talk to you.

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: You always say that we are hot-headed.

N. S. KHRUSHCHEV: You distort my words. Does your interpreter know Russian?

COMRADE ENVER HOXHA: Don't carp at the interpreter, he knows Russian very well. I respect you and you should respect me.

N. S. KHRUSHCHEV: That is just how MacMillan wanted to talk to me.

COMRADE MEHMET SHEHU AND HYSNI KAPO: Comrade Enver is not MacMillan, so take that back!

N. S. KHRUSHCHEV: But where shall I put it?

COMRADE MEHMET SHEHU: Put it in your pocket.

COMRADE HYSNI KAPO (addressing the comrades of our delegation): I do not agree that the talks should be conducted like this.

Comrade Enver Hoxha and the other comrades rise and leave the room.

1. On November 12, 1960 the delegation of the PLA agreed to meet the representatives of the CPSU once more. Also present from the Soviet side at this meeting were A. Mikhaylov, F. Koslov, Y. Andropov.

2. The sole criticism N. Khrushchev found it possible to make during his stay in Albania in May 1959 was that the poplars along our roads should be replaced with lilies and plums!...

3. Liki Belishova and Koco Tashko.

4. The reference is to the listening devices installed secretly by the Soviet revisionists both at the residence of the delegation of the PLA in Zarchevo of Moscow and in the offices of the Embassy of the People’s Republic of Albania in Moscow.


December 19, 1960

In the first chapter comrade Enver Hoxha makes a scientific analysis of the fundamental disagreements that existed at that time in the ranks of the international communist and workers’ movement concerning the definition of the character of our epoch, the questions of war and peace, peaceful coexistence, the questions of the roads of transition to socialism, the questions of revisionism and dogmatism and the question of the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

* * *

These questions of such great importance, comrade Enver Hoxha says, became the subject of a major struggle over principle, first in Bucharest, where, as is known, the Soviet leaders and those of some other parties wanted to make an accomplished fact of the «condemnation» of Marxism, the condemnation of the correct views which were defended by the Communist Party of China, bylabelling it «dogmatic» and «sectarian». Our Party did not associate itself with this anti-Marxist conspiracy, because, in principle, it did not agree either with the methods adopted by the organizers of the Bucharest Meeting, or with the content of the issues they put forward. An even greater struggle was waged on the above-mentioned matters of principle at the meeting of the commission in Moscow during October, and, finally, a determined struggle was waged at the Meeting of the representatives of the communist and workers’ parties, in November, in Moscow, over the correct Marxist meaning of these questions, for the defence of Leninism in the explanation, comprehension, and interpretation of them.

In the course of this struggle, through this long process, the positions of various parties towards these questions were also defined. Thus, from the time of the November Meeting it was clear that the disagreements on these problems were not just between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, and even less, between the Communist Party of China and the whole of international communism, as the Soviet leaders claimed in Bucharest, but these disagreements included many parties, and became disagreements between Marxists and opportunists, between parties which defended the purity of Marxism-Leninism and parties which were distorting a number of its theses and interpreting them in a one-sided manner. If it was only the Communist Party of China and our Party of Labour which rose openly in defence of the Marxist principles at Bucharest, against the trend which was distorting the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the Moscow Declaration [1957], in the October commission seven out of the twenty-six parties represented took correct positions...

At the Moscow Meeting this ratio of forces underwent a change. Besides the former seven parties, another 4-5 parties adopted the correct stand regarding all the questions under
mission. But there were a considerable number of parties, each on particular questions such as the problem of the road transition to socialism, the aggressive nature of imperialism, necessity of the struggle against revisionism and especially the Yugo revisionism, and other questions, supported those. Such positions were adopted by almost all the parties of Latin America.

The change in the ratio of forces speaks of the determined struggle waged at the Meeting by the Chinese delegation, the rejection of our Party, and others, which, through convincing arguments, refuted the distorted views and made clear to all the epochal position on the issues under discussion. The considerable number of parties, completely or partially, adopted the correct positions indicates that Marxism-Leninist right is on our side, that it is being rapidly adopted by others, that right will triumph over wrong, that Marxism-Leninism will always triumph over opportunism and revisionism. Absolutely convinced of this, our Party will continue to fight with ermination, as it has done up till now, for the purity of Marxism-Leninist ideology, for the triumph of socialism and communism.

THE STAND OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA
TOWARDS THE DISAGREEMENTS WHICH AROSE
THE RANKS OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Our Party of Labour has always pursued a correct Marxist-Leninist line and has upheld the principles of the Moscow clarification [1957]. On the all the fundamental matters which we mentioned above, that is, in connection with the definition of the epoch, the question of the struggle against imperialism, the problem of war and peace, etc., our Party has defended and implemented the correct Marxist-Leninist view. Our Party has never accepted or said that Leninism has become "out-dated." On the contrary, it has fought incessantly and with determination against the Yugoslav revisionists, who, in order to cover up their betrayal, declare Marxism "out-dated." Our Party has never had any illusions about the character of US imperialism and its leaders, but has constantly educated the mass of the people to hate it and be vigilant against it; we have never thought that peace will be donated to us, that there is a need to liquidate imperialism as it is possible to create a life without weapons, without armies, and without wars. On the contrary, having a correct view of the problems of war and peace, the danger threatening mankind from imperialism and reaction, our Party has mobilized the people under the slogan, "The pick in one hand and the rifle in the other." Our Party has fought consistently to unmask imperialism and its servants, the Yugoslav revisionists, and has never approved the "defensive policy," the "big policy of the Soviet leaders or even that of the Bulgarian leaders, either towards US imperialism or towards Yugoslav revisionism. Our Party has never thought that for the sake of coexistence the class struggle in the capitalist countries should be extinguished or the political and ideological struggle against imperialism and the bourgeoisie liquidated. On the contrary, our Party has always opposed such opportunistic concept of peaceful coexistence.

Thus, the position of our Party on these matters of principle has been in complete accord with the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, and it has long been in opposition to the position of the Soviet leaders. However, our Party has been in opposition of principle to the views and actions of the present Soviet leaders also on a series of other questions of principle, about which our Central Committee has been informed.

For instance, we have not been in agreement with the Soviet leaders in connection with their stand towards Yugoslav revisionism. This dates back to May 1955, at the time when Khrushchev and Bulganin, in a unilateral manner, overriding the Information Bureau, decided to rehabilitate the Tito clique, a thing which, as is known, brought about many evils in the international communist and workers' movement later. At that time, our Party expressed its opposition to this rehabilitation, and since then it has never approved the tactics and the stand of the Soviet leadership towards Tito and his clique, a clique which was considered, as socialist, and with which they should consult about everything, etc.

Our Party did not agree with the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, especially with the criticism against Stalin and the explanation of the peaceful road of transition to socialism. On the first issue we were not and are not in agreement, first, because the criticism against the "cult of Stalin" was made without prior consultation with the other fraternal parties, although Stalin was not only the leader of the Soviet Union but also of the international proletariat, and second, because only the mistakes of Stalin were mentioned without saying a single word about the positive aspects of his activity. On the second issue, in fact the 20th Congress gave the opportunity ideological weapons to propagate only the peaceful road of taking power.

At the 20th Congress, Khrushchev presented the issue of the transition to socialism in a distorted way. He put special stress on taking power in a peaceful way and through the parliamentary road, a thing which is contrary to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the experience of history so far.

Apart from these questions, our Party did not agree with the Soviet leaders also in regard to the events in Hungary, with their assessment of them, with the hesitation they showed over the liquidation of the counter-revolution there, and over the complete exposure of the Yugoslav revisionists on this issue. The Central Committee has been informed about this matter, therefore it is not necessary to dwell on it at length.

Finally, our Party was not in agreement with the Soviet leaders and has been opposed to them also over many other issues which have to do with the correct Leninist concept of relations among fraternal parties, which are equal and independent from one another. In connection with this, the Central Committee is also informed on the improper interference of the Soviet leaders in the internal affairs of our Party, such as in the case of the enemies of our Party, Liri Gega, Tuk Jakova, Panajot Plaku, and others.

Hence, it is evident that on the fundamental questions of the foreign policy, of the tactics and strategy of the communist movement, our Party has always maintained a correct Marxist-Leninist line, a line which has run counter to that pursued by the Soviet leaders. But, while consistently pursuing the above-mentioned line, while resolutely defending the correct Marxist-Leninist principles, without making concessions on them, despite the many pressures exerted on it by the Soviet leaders,
the Central Committee of our Party did not express its opposition publicly. Why did the Central Committee do this?

First, because after the 20th Congress, all the attacks of the imperialist and revisionist enemies were concentrated on splitting the unity of our communist movement. Therefore, for the sake of this unity, we had to contain ourselves and consistently apply the Marxist-Leninist line, while avoiding open criticism addressed to the Soviet leadership.

Second, because, as is known, as a result of the criticism of Stalin, when reaction and the revisionists began to cast doubts on the entire Soviet system, and in particular, as a result of the events in Poland and in Hungary, the effects of the whole world reaction to lower the authority of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the prestige of the Soviet Union itself were very great. In these circumstances, it was an international duty to defend the Soviet Union and its Communist Party, to give reaction not a single weapon and to defend the Soviet leadership and, by means of comradely criticism, to put it on the right road. This was what our Party did. We publicly defended the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union itself, but from 1957 on, as the opportunity presented itself, we have also pointed out to the Soviet leaders a number of matters on which we had criticism, especially in connection with their stand towards Yugoslav revisionism, towards the events in Hungary, towards the interference in the internal affairs of our Party.

This stand of our Party is correct, internationalist, Marxist-Leninist. At that time to act differently meant to play into the hands of the enemy, to damage the general cause of socialism and the international working class.

But the Soviet leaders plunged more deeply into their errors. Matters went so far that they were not only coddling Tito and his clique, but they were also showering flattery on Eisenhower, thus demonstrating that they were distorting the Marxist-Leninist concept on imperialism and the class struggle. The Chinese comrades, absolutely correctly, considered reasonable to dot the i's on the fundamental questions of the international situation and the strategy and tactics of the communist movement; by means of some articles, which explained these things on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist teachings. But the Soviet leaders did not pause to reflect. On the contrary, they organized the anti-Marxist behind-the-scenes plot of Bucharest in order to settle accounts with the Communist Party of China and with any other party which had become an obstacle to their erroneous course.

We shall not dwell on the proceeding of the Bucharest Meeting, because the Plenum of the Central Committee is already informed on this, but I shall briefly mention our stand at this meeting.

As we said before, our Party did not agree with the organizers of the Bucharest Meeting, the Soviet leaders, not only on the anti-Marxist methods which were used there, but in essence it did not agree, also, with the accusation brought against the Communist Party of China. Therefore, it maintained the correct and principled stand which is known.

How did it come to pass that our Party maintained that stand? Was it accidental? The stand of our Party in Bucharest was not accidental. It was in keeping with the consistent line always pursued by our Party, with the principled positions always defended by our Party on the fundamental questions under discussion. In Bucharest we defended Marxism-Leninism, we defended the line of the Party and, while waging this principled and courageous struggle, on the one hand, we found ourselves on the same side as the Chinese comrades who defended their glorious Party, which, like our Party, was fighting in defence of the purity of Marxism-Leninism, and, on the other hand, we ran counter to the Soviet leaders and all the representatives of the other parties who organized the Bucharest Meeting, who defended a wrong cause in opposition to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. Here lies the principled importance of our stand in Bucharest, a stand which was the logical and consistent outcome of the entire Marxist-Leninist line pursued by our Party, a stand which has enhanced the authority and prestige of our Party in the eyes of the international communist movement.

Our Party condemned the Bucharest Meeting and described it correctly as a blot on the communist movement. The correctness of our stand in Bucharest and our assessment of the anti-Marxist behind-the-scenes plot hatched up there, was demonstrated at the Moscow Meeting and by the documents approved there. Not a single representative of any of the parties there had the courage to defend the Bucharest Meeting, to answer our criticisms and those of the Chinese comrades of the fictional work which went on there. Not only this, but none dared to propose that a single good word should be put in about the Bucharest Meeting in the Declaration published which comprised 52 pages. Not the slightest trace remained of the Bucharest Meeting.

On the other hand, however, the Bucharest Meeting marks the beginning of the overt aggravation of relations between our Party and the Soviet leaders, a thing which soon began to express itself in the political and economic relations between our two countries and states. The blame for the situation rests completely on the Soviet side which was not pleased with the principled stand of our Party in Bucharest. It began to express this displeasure in many wrong actions which began to cause serious harm to the friendship and fraternal ties between our two parties and countries. This is how the anti-Marxist interference in the internal affairs of our Party by some Soviet persons began. It had the aim of splitting our Party, of arousing discontentment with its leadership, of casting doubt on the correctness of the line of our Party, of attacking the leadership of our Party, with the final aim of liquidating it. The staff of the Soviet embassy to Tirana, headed by the ambassador, worked in this direction; Kozlov in Moscow worked in this direction on our comrades who passed through there; this was the aim of the words of Marshal Malinovsky at the dinner for the chiefs of staffs of the Warsaw Treaty; this was the objective of the economic pressures which began in regard to bread and the reduction of economic aid; the threats by Marshal Grechko to throw our country out of the Warsaw Treaty, and the provocations at the military base of Vlora, etc., are linked with this.

The objective of these wrong and anti-Marxist actions is clear: the Soviet leadership aimed either to make us change our stand, that is to abandon the correct Marxist-Leninist course, the principled stand maintained by our Party, or, as a result of the difficulties which would be created, in the opinion of the Soviet leaders, some division must take place in the Party, dissatisfaction must be increased in its ranks and among the
people, and, as a way-out, the leadership of the Party must be guided to bring to the head of it the «saviours», who would be loyal to the anti-Marxist line of the Soviet leadership.

But, as is known, in reckoning their accounts they had forgotten the host, and all these intentions were foiled. They did not succeed thanks to the loyalty of our Party to Marxism-Leninism, thanks to its staunch and principled stand, thanks to a steel-like Marxist-Leninist unity with the masses of the people, the unity of the Party with its Central Committee, the unity of the Central Committee with the Political Bureau. This unbreakable unity has been and is the guarantee of all the victories of our people and Party, therefore our primary duty to make this unity ever stronger and defend it like the apple of our eye.

The source of the wrong actions of the Soviet leadership towards our Party should be sought in its non-Marxist views of fundamental issues and in the disagreements over matters of principle which exist between our Party and the Soviet leaders on the questions of principle of the international communist and workers' movement. The incorrect actions of the Soviet leaders against our Party also express the anti-Marxist concept they have about the relations between fraternal parties and countries, the concept they have about criticism and the Marxist-Leninist unity of the communist movement and the socialist camp. In Bucharest we expressed our opposition to the stand of the Soviet leaders, we criticized their crooked actions in a correct and principled way.

For Marxists, fair and principled criticism is not contrary to unity. On the contrary, criticism aids the consolidation of unity, it is a motive force, a law of development. The Soviet leaders do not see the problem in this way. They are not used to listening to criticisms, but only to making criticisms. In words they accept the principle of equal rights in the relations among parties, but in fact they recognize only their right to say the truth word, while the rest must obey blindly. Therefore, according to them, if some party or other dares to criticize them, that party is in an anti-Soviet position, is factional, against the unity of the communist movement, and so on. This distorted concept impels them to incorrect actions, like those mentioned above. In these concepts and acts Marxist dialectics has been replaced with metaphysics, with idealism.

The acts we mentioned and the erroneous stand maintained by the Soviet leaders towards our Party and our country following the Bucharest Meeting, made us more than ever convinced that our Party was in a correct Marxist-Leninist position, that its position on all the fundamental issues was principled, therefore those positions had to be defended with determination, standing firm against any pressure.

The delegation of our Party in Moscow, in October, at the meeting of the commission which worked out the declaration approved later at the November meeting, maintained this correct and principled stand. At this meeting, our delegation presented the correct viewpoint of our Party openly on all matters of principle under discussion, and together with the Chinese comrades and the comrades of other parties which also took a correct stand, resolutely defended the Marxist-Leninist teachings with sound arguments. A great struggle for principle went on in the commission on every issue, over every paragraph, and every word. This work went on for nearly 25 days.

To give you an idea of the correct struggle waged by our delegation there, as well as by the other delegations which stood in sound positions, suffice it to mention these facts: in compiling the draft-declaration, the draft presented by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was taken as the basis. This draft of 36 pages contained many erroneous views, and in many parts there were hidden attacks against the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania. For instance, it accused us of «national communism», of being opponents of the policy of peaceful coexistence, compared us with Yugoslavia, accused us of being «factionalists», and so on. Apart from this, the draft did not properly stress the necessity of the struggle against imperialism and had a soft and, frequently, opportunist spirit, putting great stress on the peaceful road of transition to socialism; the national bourgeois was presented almost as a supporter of socialism, it failed to mention Yugoslav revisionism, dogmatism was presented as more dangerous than revisionism, even though it said that revisionism was the main danger, and so on. 175 pages comments on this draft were presented, of which our delegation presented 20 pages, and the Chinese delegation 40. It must be stressed that none of our comments was refuted by argument as incorrect, but those which were not included in the Declaration were rejected on the pretext of tactics or by the majority of votes. Nevertheless, the basic draft was almost completely changed. It was extended from 36 pages to 52. The hidden attacks against us were thrown out, the section on imperialism was strengthened, the paragraph on Yugoslav revisionism was added, the question of the struggle against revisionism and dogmatism was put in order, and so on. However, some questions remained, such as that of the importance of the 20th and 21st Congresses, that of factions, of the cult of the individual, etc., to which our delegation, the Chinese delegation and the delegations of some other parties did not agree, but which should be taken up again for discussion at the November meeting.

In the meeting of the commission it was very clear how correct and principled were our positions and how distorted were the positions of the Soviet leaders and the parties supporting them. The opportunist spirit which has gripped some parties, such as the Communist Party of Italy, Syria, Britain, the United States of America and others showed itself plainly, and this emerged even more clearly at the November meeting. The Soviet leaders tried hard to manoeuvre, resorting to all kinds of methods, ranging from working on individuals among the various delegations to the procedural machinations. Here is a typical fact: the commission agreed that a phrase which Maurice Thorez had used in a speech during those days should be put in the Declaration. It was: «There will be an absolute guarantee of the liquidation of all kinds of war only when socialism has triumphed in all countries or in the main capitalist countries.» This thesis was put in on the proposal of the French delegation, and was supported by our delegation and the Chinese. But before two days had passed the Soviets proposed that it should be re-examined, presumably because their Presidium had not approved it. Despite our resistance, the majority of the meeting decided to omit it, but at the November meeting they were forced to put it back again in another form.

The proceedings at the preparatory meeting and the views expressed there indicated clearly that the Moscow Meeting in
November would become an arena of the struggle between the correct Marxist-Leninist view and the tendency to deviate from the revolutionary positions of our ideology.

Our Party and the delegation appointed by the Central Committee of the Party were prepared for this struggle. The Central Committee of our Party instructed its delegation that at the Moscow Meeting it should put forward the principled view of our Party on all questions under discussion, frankly and sincerely and with Marxist-Leninist courage, that it should inform the meeting of the erroneous acts of the Soviet leaders against our Party following the Bucharest Meeting, and criticize them severely with the aim of preventing any repetition of such acts in the future. We report to the Central Committee of our Party that the delegation carried out this directive and, as was decided by the Central Committee of the Party, all the matters were put before the meeting of the representatives of the 81 communist and workers' parties which was convened in November this year in Moscow.

Did the Central Committee of the Party act correctly when it decided that all matters should be put forward openly at the November meeting? We answer: Yes, the Central Committee acted correctly, for the following reasons:

1. - Because, as a Marxist-Leninist Party, we were duty-bound to defend the principled positions of the Moscow Declaration (1957), which were being violated. If we were to remain silent in face of the distortions of Marxism-Leninism, in face of actions contrary to the fundamental principles of our ideology, irrespective of the fact that the violators and deviators were the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, we could not call ourselves communists. In order to defend the purity of Marxism-Leninism, to defend the cause of socialism and communisation, we must always be principled, never sentimental or one-sided.

2.- Because, in its violation of the Moscow Declaration (1957), and the principles of Marxism-Leninism, as well as in its concrete actions, the Soviet leadership had gone so far that to have remained silent about these grave errors and offences would have been suicide, a crime against our common cause. The Bucharest Meeting and the anti-Marxist behind-the-scenes plot which was organized there by the Soviet leaders, the pressures and damaging actions against our Party, on the one hand, and against the Communist Party of China, on the other (I mean the withdrawal of the specialists, the cancelling of orders for various machinery, etc.) were the first signs of a very dangerous action which, if not unmasked, would have had even more serious consequences for the communist movement and the socialist camp.

3. - Because our sincere and principled criticism had a good purpose: by condemning the wrong views and actions, it aimed at liquidating them, at closing the door to them so that they would never be repeated, at clearing the air of the negative manifestations, and on this basis, at helping to strengthen our communist movement, to reinforce our unity which was endangered. This aim, and this aim alone, was what impelled the Central Committee of the Party to express its view openly, and it was absolutely correct to do so.

4. - Finally, we say with absolute conviction that there is another reason why the Central Committee was right when it decided to put forward these questions at the Moscow Meeting. We saw for ourselves, both before the meeting and during its proceedings, that the Soviet leaders, on their part, were determined to continue on the course on which they had embarked against our Party, because if we had remained silent, they had prepared themselves to cast the blame on us for everything, and for this reason they brought extreme pressure to bear on our delegation in order to make us shut our mouths.

It is clear that if we had remained silent at the meeting about the wrong actions of the Soviet leaders, this would not only have meant abandoning our whole principled line, but it would also have been fatal to our Party and to the future of socialism in Albania.

III. - ON THE ATTITUDE OF THE SOVIET LEADERS TOWARDS OUR DELEGATION AND OUR TALKS WITH THEM

As is known, our delegation went to the Soviet Union as an official delegation, invited by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for the celebrations of the 43rd anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution. This being the case, from the formal angle they did us all the honours of the occasion. But their attitude towards us was cold and the talks unfriendly. Thus, we talked with Kozlov on our arrival in Moscow, with Kogrin and Polyanzky at the dinner of the 7th of November, and their position became clear: in everything they sought to cast the blame on our Party. The next day, that is on the 8th of November, everything became even more clear.

On the 8th of November we were handed a copy of the letter which the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union sent to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in reply to the September letter from the Communist Party of China. This fact in itself did not please us, because it was a bad prelude to the holding of the meeting, but we shall speak of this later. What made an impression on us were the following facts: in one paragraph of the letter speaking of the socialist countries of Europe, they were all listed by name, with the exception of Albania. This meant that the leadership of the Soviet Union had wiped Albania from the books as a socialist country. Further down, although the letter was addressed to the Communist Party of China, there was an open and tendentious attack against our Party. While claiming that following the criticism of «the cult of the individual», all problems were solved in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union allegedly according to the rules of democratic centralism, the letter said:

«Unfortunately, there are other examples. We can bring up such a fresh example as the settlement of such matters by the Albanian comrades. In September this year they expelled comrade Liri Belishova from the Central Committee and discharged her from the post of the Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, while comrade Koço Tashko was discharged from the post of the Chairman of the Central Auditing Commission of the Party of Labour of Albania and expelled from the Party. And for what? Simply because these comrades expressed their beliefs that it is impermissible to slander the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

We express our suspicions that there is a bad end in store for all those people whose only sin is that they are friends of the Soviet Union, have a correct understanding of the st
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nation, and express their sympathy for the Soviet people and for the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

From this presentation of things it emerges: First, that allegedly the Central Committee of our Party did not carry out the rules of the internal democracy of the Party when it expelled Leliševska from its ranks and Koco Tashko from the Central Auditing Commission. It seems to me unnecessary to prove here, in the Central Committee of the Party, that this is deliberate slander. Second, it emerges that in our Party the friends of the Soviet Union are being condemned and persecuted, that is, the Central Committee of our Party is allegedly in an anti-Soviet position, etc. There is no need to prove that this, too, is another slander. But in these tendentious accusations the aim of the Soviet leadership is clear: to discredit our Party, to present it as though it has gone off the rails of Leninism, as though it has taken the road of Yugoslavia (therefore, in the same document Albania is not mentioned as a socialist country).

This shows that the Soviet leaders were not interested in resolving the disagreements which had arisen between us. On the contrary, they wanted to deepen them, indeed to use them to discredit our Party. On the other hand, in order to have complete success in their actions against our Party they resorted to all means to make us shut our mouths.

The first method was that of threats. To this end, Nikita Khrushchev himself twice spoke to the Chinese comrades about Albania. First, on October 25 [1960], he told comrade Teng Hsiao-ping, «We shall treat Albania like Yugoslavia», and the second time, he told another representative of the CP of China, «The Albanians behave towards us just like Tito used to do», «We lost an Albania and you Chinese won an Albania», «The Party of Labour of Albania is our weak link.»

What was their aim?

First, the Soviet leaders intended to intimidate us, to make us review our position and to desist from raising all the questions we had in mind. It should be borne in mind that the Soviets were more or less aware of what we would raise at the Moscow Meeting. Koco Tashko had kept them informed about our views.

Second, while speaking against our Party and threatening us, in fact, they were also warning the Chinese, that is, they intended to kill two birds with one stone.

Third, by presenting the case as though we were following the road of Yugoslavia, the Soviet leaders sought to discredit our Party, to distort our stand, to divert the discussion away from the basis of principles to slanders, etc.

Together with the method of indirect threats the Soviet leaders also used the method of direct pressure, through meetings and talks with our delegation.

Before speaking of the meetings we had in Moscow, it is necessary to say a few words concerning our view on the method of talks, meetings, and consultations. This is essential, because the Soviet leaders tried many times to present the question as though we were against talks, and to illustrate this they brought up these examples: our refusal to meet the Soviet leaders on the basis that they proposed in the well-known letter of August 13 [1960]; the fact that comrade Enver did not go to spend his summer holiday in the Soviet Union, allegedly as if we wanted to avoid any meeting with them, and, finally, our refusal of Khrushchev's invitation to meet him on November 9, of which I will speak later.

The Party and its Central Committee have been and are of the opinion that the method of meetings, talks, and consultations among the leaders of fraternal parties, the exchange of views on various problems of mutual interest, the more so when differences have arisen between two parties or socialist countries, is the most correct and advisable Marxist-Leninist method. Therefore, in the past our Party and its Central Committee have not refused any meeting and will not do so in the future, especially, when the aim of these meetings is to strengthen and consolidate the Marxist-Leninist unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

But, at the same time, proceeding from these principled positions, our Party is of the opinion that in these meetings certain other principles of Marxist-Leninism must be respected, among which: First, it is impermissible and contrary to the Leninist norms that a third party should become a subject of conversation at a meeting of two other parties, that the general line of the former should be talked about in the absence of this party; and second, any discussion or meeting between two parties, whichever they be, should be held on an equal footing, on the basis of consultations and mutual respect, avoiding any manifestation of imposing the will of one side upon the other side, or of any privileged position of one side over the other side, etc. Our Party has respected and will respect these principles. This is the principled position of our Party concerning the question of meetings, talks and consultations; we have maintained such a position in the past, and we shall maintain it in the future too.

Now let us see in concrete terms, whether the Soviet leaders are right when they accuse us of being against meetings, by bringing up the above-mentioned cases. It is true we refused the meeting proposed in the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union dated August 13, 1960. But we refused to meet them, not because we were against meetings in principle or because we wanted to avoid meeting the Soviet leaders, but because such a meeting would have been contrary to the Leninist norms, because, as is known, in their letter the Soviet leaders proposed that we should hold discussions in order to put out «the spark of misunderstanding», which had flared up between us in Bucharest, «in time», so that our two parties «could go» to the meeting next November with «a complete unity of opinion.» Why did misunderstandings arise at Bucharest? What was the fundamental problem of the Bucharest Meeting? It was the criticism of the Communist Party of China. Therefore, we were supposed to discuss China, to formulate a common view on this issue, and all this was to be done behind the back of the Communist Party of China. Is this principled? Isn't this the same as factionalism? We explained this to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in our reply, back in August, stressing that a meeting between us for that purpose was not in order. Again we think we acted very correctly.

Let's take the question of our refusal to meet Nikita Khrushchev on November 9, 1960. We think that our delegation acted correctly when it refused that meeting, and we explained this to the Soviet leaders. The thing is that, on the one hand, on November 8, 1960 the Soviet leadership handed us a letter addressed to the Communist Party of China, in which, as we
said above, Albania was not ranked among the socialist countries, and our Party was accused of anti-Sovietism, of having allegedly violated the principles of democratic centralism, and so on, and this material was distributed to the representatives of 81 parties, while, on the other hand, on the very same day they were inviting us to talks to examine the misunderstandings which had arisen between us! On the one hand, they tell the Chinese comrades, «We shall treat Albania like Yugoslavia», and, on the other hand, they want to meet us! Is this talking on equal footing? Has the basis been created for the comradely spirit indispensable for fruitful talks? Is not this a clear expression of the tendecy of the Soviet leaders to have a privileged position in talks? It is clear that we could not possibly hold talks under such conditions, because this is contrary to the principles of mutual equality and respect, especially so when we had not whispered a single word to the international communist and workers' movement about the concrete disagreements between us and the Soviet leaders up till that time. This is why we refused that meeting. It is up to the Central Committee of the Party to judge whether our delegation acted correctly or not.

As for the question of «comrade Enver’s failure to go to the Soviet Union for his holiday this year», this is not worth speaking about, because there is nothing political in it, I did not go to the Soviet Union for my vacation last year, either, and no scandal was made of it. The matter is that this year the Soviet leaders «had thought» that when comrade Enver came there they would talk to him! But neither I nor the Political Bureau had been informed of this. We were supposed to find this out by divination.

In fact, it is not our Party, but the Soviet leaders who have been against talks, against the solution of disagreements through consultations. As is known, at the beginning of August we sent the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union a letter informing it of the anti-Marxist acts of some members of the staff of the Soviet embassy headed by ambassador Ivanov. Why is it that the Soviet leaders, who tell us they are determined that the problems should be solved through discussions, have still not replied to this letter to this day? In Moscow, they told us that they had not replied because they did not want to worsen relations, because their answer might be offensive to us. This clearly shows that it had never crossed their minds that the disagreements should be resolved, that it was necessary to discuss them, but they had decided their attitude: to deny everything. Then, why talk at all? Hence, who is against talks in fact? It is clearly not us, not the Party of Labour of Albania, but the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union that is against talks.

Regardless of all this, in spite of the unequal conditions for talks, which, as we said above, were created by the Soviet leaders themselves, and despite their uncomradely attitude towards our delegation, an attitude which went so far as to resort to such anti-Marxist and police methods as eavesdropping on our conversations by means of various bugging devices both in our residence and in our embassy, our delegation, seeing their insistence on meeting us and upholding our Party’s principle on the necessity for talks, consultations, and exchanges of opinion before the meeting began and during it, consented to, and held, three meetings with the Soviet leaders.

Our delegation understood the real aim of the Soviet leaders from its talks, on November 9, 1960, with Maurice Thorez, who, as the conversation showed clearly, had been charged by them to meet us, Thorez tried to «convince» us of the correctness of the line pursued by the Soviet Union in all directions, on the question of war and peace, on the policy of peaceful coexistence calling Khrushchev the «Lenin of our time», and so on. On the other hand, he spoke against China, presenting the Communist Party of China as «dogmatic, factionalist and Trotskyite», as a great danger to the communist movement, a partisan of war, which seeks to discredit the Soviet Union, and so on. Finally, he told us of the love which the Soviet Union has for Albania, of the aid it has given Albania, as well as that we ought to be grateful to it, and in the end he said that all of us must follow in the wake of the Soviet Union.

We told him of our views, stressing that we had disagreements with the Soviet leaders, which we would put forward at the meeting (we were aware that everything we said would be eavesdropped by the Soviet leaders or would be transmitted to them by Thorez). Thorez tried to «dissuade» us from raising these matters at the meeting, otherwise the whole meeting would be against us, and would call us provocateurs, that we should resolve these things by sitting down to talk with the Soviet leaders, and here he mentioned that we had been wrong not to meet Khrushchev. The meeting with Thorez lasted three hours, and in the end we parted with each side maintaining its own viewpoint. This was the first direct pressure to stop us from speaking openly at the meeting, and the first effort to learn what we would put forward there.

Following this meeting, we held two meetings with the Soviet leaders, on November 10-11 and 12.

At the first meeting the views of each side were put forward and, as you might say, the ground was prepared for the next meeting, which, in fact, was the official meeting. On the first day of this meeting, Koslov, Mikoyan, Suslov, Pospyelov and Andropov participated from the Soviet side, while on the second day only Koslov and Mikoyan. From our side, the whole delegation took part in the meeting.

Right from the beginning of the meeting, the Soviet leaders adopted the pose that nothing had occurred from their side, as though the Party of Labour of Albania was to blame for everything, moreover that we ought to state frankly why we were aggravating our relations with the Soviet Union, what had happened, and what we were demanding from the Soviet leaders. In fact, this was their stand in the later meetings, too. Of course, our delegation rebutted any such claim, and with concrete facts proved that it was not us, but the Soviet leaders who, with their erroneous attitudes and actions against our Party and country, had caused the aggravation of our relations. We mentioned the question of the ambassador and of the staff of their embassy, the question of bread, the words of Malinovsky and Grechko, the anti-party work of Koslov with our delegation on its return from China, the crooked actions of some Soviet officers at the Vlora base, and so on. All these, we stressed, were not isolated facts but closely connected. All these things have happened since the Bucharest Meeting and have a political character. Their aim has been to force our Party to change the attitude which it maintained in Bucharest, to undermine the unity of the Party, to divide it and overthrow its leadership. In order to improve the relations between our two parties and countries,
which is the desire of our Party, and in order to strengthen it, we sought from the Soviet leaders that they would condemn these acts and take measures to avoid repetition of them in the future.

The Soviet leaders did not admit anything sincerely and frankly, but sought to dodge everything. They repeated the lines that allegedly our Party was to blame for the aggravation of the situation, that allegedly it was not for talks, as we stressed above and over again. They tried to deny the actions of the Soviet diplomats in Tirana, but in the end they were forced to admit that ‘some slight mistake’ might have been made through the ‘foolishness’ of the ambassador. They said that now they would send another ambassador, and the matter would be closed. They presented the question of bread as though we were not so badly off because they had sent shiploads of grain to Albania, whereas on the question of buying grain with gold they said that this was the proposal of the Albanian side, which was accepted by the Soviet Foreign Trade people.

They sought to excuse the attitudes of Marshal Malinovsky and Marshal Gurevich in the same way, while admitting that even if something excessive had been said, this would have been unintentional and quite accidental. Thus, according to them, there was nothing political in all those actions. Our Party was trying in vain to give them that colour, they were trifling things, and so on.

It was evident that they did not want to admit anything at all, and even when they did admit something, it was only a partial admission for the sake of appearances, so that we would not raise the issue at the meeting. Later developments proved this to the hilt. In its reply to our speech, which it distributed on December 1, 1960 to the delegates at the meeting, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union did not admit anything. On the contrary, it tried to refute our speech and defended both the ambassador as well as Malinovsky, Gurevich, and others.

During the talks, they went to great lengths to accuse our men over the grave situation which allegedly had been created at the Vlora base. They used this, as well as the measures which the Plenum of the Central Committee took against Liri Beshirca and Koco Tashko, as evidence of a certain anti-Soviet split which had allegedly emerged in Albania. They had a great deal to say about the naval base in particular. Now we learn that all that fuss which was made in Moscow about the Vlora base had been carefully coordinated with acts of provocation and very dangerous behaviour by some bad elements among the Soviet personnel at the Vlora base during those days. Evidently, everything was done to a plan. Provocations here, these things there, were employed as arguments to prove that we had changed our stand, that we were aggravating the relations, etc. But neither the provocations here, nor threats and false accusations there, succeeded. Our men here, educated by the Party, knew how to avoid scandals, never falling into the trap of planned provocations, and this, in the end, forced the provocateurs to give up their plans; whereas our delegation, convinced that our commanders and officers carry out the directives of the Party in the letter, refuted any threats and false accusations, stressing to the Soviet leaders that the Central Committee of our Party had given special instructions concerning the Vlora base, and that we were convinced that nothing had happened or would happen there through the fault of our men, and we told them to have a good look at what their people were doing. And in fact this was how things stood.

As a result of the first talks, in which voices were raised from time to time, each side was acquainted with the other’s views, but stuck to its own positions. The only agreement reached was that we would hold another meeting the following day, at which the Soviet delegation would be led by Khrushchev. We stressed to the Soviet leaders that we were willing to hold this meeting also, but they, on their part, should think things over better, should see matters from the political angle, and not reduce them to trifles or accidental and technical mistakes, as they tried to explain them.

On November 12 the official meeting took place, at which the Soviet side was represented by Khrushchev, Mikoyan, Kosylov, and Andropov, while our side by the entire delegation.

This meeting, too, went the same way as the first. Khrushchev maintained the same stand, presenting the case as though they had done nothing, indeed he could not even imagine what might have aroused the indignation of the Albanian comrades, except the criticism which he had made when he was in Albania concerning the question of popularization. After we put forward the question of the ambassador, as well as the question of what had been written in the letter addressed to the Chinese comrades against our Party, Khrushchev, for the sake of appearances, admitted that it was foolish of the ambassador to have behaved in such a manner towards our armymen, but he defended and described as correct what had been written against our Party in the letter of November 5 addressed to the Chinese comrades. The main item of the talks was the problem of the Vlora naval base. Now it became clear why this question was raised so strongly, and what was the meaning of the military blackmail and provocations which were organized here during those days. Khrushchev raised the question that a grave situation had been created at the base, that our officers were quarrelling with the Soviet officers, that our men were allegedly speaking against Khrushchev, and so on. And, in the end, he raised the issue that the Soviets might dismantle their base.

This was an open threat, which, on the other hand, proved that everything which had been said earlier against our Party had not been accidental; thus, neither what Marshal Gurevich said, ‘Albania is in the Warsaw Treaty for the time being’, nor what Khrushchev told the Chinese comrades, ‘We shall treat Albania like Yugoslavia’, or what Gomulka told the Chinese, ‘As long as Albania is a member of the Warsaw Treaty we shall not allow it to do as it thinks fit, otherwise we shall convene the Warsaw Treaty and examine the question of Albania’.

In his proposal to dismantle the Vlora base, Khrushchev let out the entire plan that he, obviously, had worked out together with his associates. He wanted to threaten our Party with this, but without success. We rejected his distorted idea, and described it as a fatal mistake, which nobody among the Soviet people would accept. We told him that threats did not go down with us and that, if they wished to raise the question of the liquidation of the base, this must be done by the meeting of the Warsaw Treaty. But we declared officially that the Party of Labour of Albania would never agree to such a decision, that we were for the preservation of the base, because it responded to the interests of the defence of our country. We posed
the question to the Soviet leaders whether, by giving up the Vlora base, perhaps they wanted to leave the US 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean a free field of action and avoid being committed to war with them in case of imperialist aggression against our country?

Of course, the discussion of this vital question made the going very much rougher in the talks, but what made it impossible to continue them was Khrushchev's unfriendly and despicable comparison when he said our talks were like his talks with MacMillan. At that, our delegation broke off the talks and left the room in protest.

As a conclusion, it can be said that the Soviet leaders did not want to talk, or to reach agreement with us on anything. They had made up their minds on their plan and point of view. They had even started to talk with others about this, with the sole aim of discrediting our Party. If they asked us to talk, they did not for because they wanted to resolve the disagreements, but to threaten us, to force us to give up the idea of our speech at the meeting. After these meetings it was clear once again who was for talks and who was not. They also showed that the Soviet leaders had no intention of making self-criticism over anything they had done against our Party and against our country. On the contrary, as their threat about the Vlora base indicated, they were determined to go further.

Therefore, we can repeat once more that in those conditions the Central Committee of the Party acted very correctly. It did well when it decided to raise, and when it actually did raise, all our contradictions with the Soviet leaders at the Meeting of the representatives of the 61 communist and workers' parties of the world in Moscow.

IV. ON THE DEVELOPMENTS AT THE MOSCOW MEETING

The Moscow Meeting was organized to discuss the current problems of the international situation and the questions of the strategy and tactics of the international communist movement. The basis for the proceedings of the meeting was the draft-Declaration prepared by the commission of 26 parties, which, as we said, was convened in Moscow in October. In discussing these questions, the meeting, in fact, had to pronounce on the disagreements which had appeared in the ranks of the international communist and workers' movement, to condemn the erroneous views and to fix the correct Marxist-Leninist view, the unified view of the whole communist movement on these questions, in the Declaration which it would approve.

But from the very beginning of the meeting, even prior to it, it was evident that the Soviet leaders and those of some other communist parties of the socialist and capitalist countries of Europe thought differently. The distribution of the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union addressed to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on the eve of the proceedings of the meeting, and the working on all the delegations with this letter made the plan of the Soviet leaders even more clear. The tendency was to organize a new Bucharest, to gain approval outside the meeting for all those things that were said in Bucharest against China, to create the opinion among all the parties that the Communist Party of China is dogmatic and factionalist, that it has violated the Moscow Declaration and acts in opposition to the entire communist movement, that together with the Communist Party of China, the Party of Labour of Albania, too, is following the same course, opposition to which is expressed in the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

In order to create this opinion, the Soviet leaders organized intensive preparatory work among the various delegations in the first days before the beginning of the meeting. Working especially actively to this end were the delegation of the Communist Party of France (with the delegations of the capitalist countries of Europe), the delegation of the Communist Party of Spain and the People's Party of Cuba (with the delegations of Latin America), the delegation of Syria (with the delegations of the Arab and African countries). On top of this organized work, in which the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union dated November 3 addressed to the Communist Party of China was read and commented on, many bilateral meetings and talks were held with the Soviet delegation and the delegations of the socialist countries of Europe. Of course, such work cannot be considered normal, on the contrary it is incorrect and anti-Marxist. On the other hand, it indicates how weak are the positions of the Soviet leaders, because he who is on the correct course and who abides by the teachings of Marx and Lenin has no need to win allies through improper methods, pressure and working on people in this way.

By doing this preparatory work outside the meeting, the Soviet leaders intended to impart a demonstrative character to the very holding of the meeting, in which the speeches made would be in general terms, with eulogies for the successes achieved, without disclosing the existing contradictions, but casting veiled allusions against the correct Marxist-Leninist positions of the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania on the fundamental issues. Such a development of the meeting would have been to the advantage of the Soviet leadership and the parties supporting its view, because, on the one hand, they did their work outside the meeting, creating the opinion that the Communist Party of China had allegedly made mistakes, indeed that it was in favour of war, of adventures, against peaceful coexistence, and so on, and on the other hand, by not uncovering the contradictions at the meeting, the Soviet leaders presented themselves as allegedly staunch partisans of the defence of the unity of the communist movement and the socialist camp, hence, they displayed their magnanimity and avoided discussion of their line, of their mistakes, of their deviations from the Moscow Declaration (1927) and from the teachings of Marxism-Leninism.

The Soviet leaders saw clearly that an open discussion of the contradictions at the meeting would discredit them before the movement in many respects: First, because they have trampled on the Moscow Declaration and have adopted a conciliatory policy in the struggle against imperialism and revisionism; second, because they have breached the Leninist norms regulating the relations among socialist states and communist and workers' parties, as is the case with China and Albania; third, because in the eyes of the entire communist movement of the representatives of 81 communist and workers' parties of the world, the existing opinion of the infallibility of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its leaders would vanish.
together with the opinion that the Communist Party of the
Soviet Union and its leaders are beyond criticism, that every-
ing they say is right, is correct, is the last word in Marxism,
and, therefore, must be implemented by all», etc., etc.

In keeping with this tactic Nikita Khrushchev spoke on
half of the Soviet delegation on the first day of the Moscow
meeting. In fact, his speech was an attempt to set the tone in
which matters should be discussed at this meeting.

Khrushchev's speech was cunningly prepared and differed
heavily from the letter which the Central Committee of the
Communist Party of the Soviet Union addressed to the Central
Committee of the Communist Party of China on November 15,
1971 which was distributed to all delegations prior to the meeting.
In which the Chinese comrades were openly accused of having
violated the Moscow Declaration and the principles of Marx-
ism-Leninism. The speech delivered to the meeting was written in
such a tone as though no disagreements whatsoever existed be-
 tween the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Com-
unist Party of China, moreover, throughout that speech of 80
pages the Communist Party of China was never mentioned by
name. Khrushchev's speech gave the main «arguments» in de-
fense of the theses of the Central Committee of the Communist
Party of the Soviet Union concerning the main question about
which there are disagreements, such as the question of war and
peace, the theoretical problems of the 20th Congress, the question
of the struggle against «factionalism» in the international
communist movement, etc. The speakers who followed in support
of Khrushchev, such as Zhivkov and others, described Khrushchev's
speech as a «creative development of Marxism», and repeated
arguments in other forms.

Although efforts were made to avoid mentioning the dis-
agreements in Khrushchev's speech, to maintain a moderate
tone, nevertheless, in a hidden manner, it contained venomous
dictions, which were directed first of all against the Chinese
comrades, on a series of important problems.

Khrushchev strongly insisted on condemnation of the
so-called factional activity in the international communist
and workers' movement, hypocritically declaring that this
thesis was not directed against any party in particular, and
he put great stress on the fact that the decisive condition for
the achievement of unity in the international communist move-
ment was allegedly respect for, and the implementation of, the
decisions taken by the majority on the part of the minority.
With this he set the line for all his supporters at the meeting
on the key problem and his main aim: the condemnation and
subjugation of the Communist Party of China and the Party of
Labour of Albania.

Immediately after Khrushchev's speech the meeting began
its «tranquil» course, as the tactic and purpose of the Soviet
leaders required, according to the principle, «Roast your meat
but don't burn the spit». Thus, during the first three days
of the meeting, 18 representatives of various parties took
the floor, among them the representatives of the parties of
Bulgaria, Hungary, Canada, Greece, Argentina, Iraq, the
Union of South Africa, and others, which, while supporting
the stand of the Soviet delegation on all matters raised in
Khrushchev's speech and eulogizing him, levelled masked
criticism against the correct views of the Communist Party
of China. All of them, on Khrushchev's example insisted that
the Declaration which had been prepared should remain un-
changed on the questions about which the delegation of China,
our delegation, and those of some other parties had expressed
opposition since the meeting of the October commission.
As is known, these questions had to do with the evaluation of
the 20th and 21st Congresses of the Communist Party of the
Soviet Union, the question of the «cult of the individual», the
question of «faction», and that of «national communism».

This is how the meeting began, and this is the «tranquil»
appearance it had in the first stage of its proceedings. But if,
formally, its appearance was tranquil, in essence the atmos-
phere was tense, because they all had an uneasy feeling, all
had something in their chests from which they could not get
away unless they brought it out. They were all worried
about the question of unity, but the course the meeting had
taken was not leading towards unity. It covered up the
contradictions without eliminating them, therefore, sooner or
later, they were bound to burst out, would come to the sur-
face, and the later this happened the worse it would be for
the fate of our movement. Marxism-Leninism teaches us to
look the truth straight in the eye and not to be afraid of it,
no matter how unpleasant it may be. The contradictions existed,
they had to be discussed courageously, who was
right and who was wrong had to be found out through criticism
and self-criticism, through a frank and comradely consultation
and discussion, and then the mind of the fifth, united in genuine
Marxist-Leninist unity, we had to march ahead towards fresh
victories. This is how we and the Chinese comrades conceived
the proceedings of the Moscow Meeting of the representatives
of the communist and workers' parties.

Therefore, it was essential to change the spirit of the
proceedings and the discussions at the meeting; it was necessary
to put an end to the stage of truce of «tranquility» which was
in the interests of the Soviet leaders, but did not serve the
genuine strengthening of our unity.

The spirit of the proceedings of the meeting changed
after the speech by the Chinese delegate, comrade
Teng Hsiao-ping, and the speech I delivered on behalf of
the delegation of the Party of Labour of Albania. The meeting
entered its second phase which is characterized by the open
discussion of the disagreements existing in the international
communist and workers' movement over fundamental ques-
tions. This discussion forced the representatives of every party
to take a stand towards these major issues, and thus the real
views of every party came out more clearly.

The speech of the delegation of the Communist Party of
China was a speech of a high ideological content, a principled,
very well argued speech, which unmasked the erroneous
views and the distortions and deviations of the Soviet leaders
concerning the fundamental questions of the strategy and
tactics of the international communist movement. Right from
the start of his speech the delegate of the Communist Party
of China exposed the method and aim of the Soviet leaders
in not opening up the problems at the meeting. He described
the November 5 letter of 125 pages, which was full of savage
attacks against the Communist Party of China and its leader,
comrade Mao Tsetung, as in fact, the main speech of the
Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet
Union. The difference, he stressed, consists only in the fact
that, taking advantage of the favourable conditions created
for them, because the meeting was being held in Moscow,
the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had distributed that speech outside the meeting, while delivering another speech in the meeting.

The Chinese delegation rebutted the distortion made of the position of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China concerning the principal content of the present epoch. He said that the Communist Party of China has never characterized the present epoch as the epoch of imperialism, of war and revolution, but as the epoch of revolutions, of the overthrow of imperialism, of the triumph of socialism and communism. This slander was first uttered at the Bucharest Meeting by the head of the Soviet delegation, and was accompanied by other distortions that allegedly the Chinese overestimated the strength of imperialism while underestimating our strength. Speaking of the content of the present epoch, the Chinese delegation expressed its opposition to replacing the activity of the masses in the struggle for peace with the activity of state leaders, explained the meaning of the expressions «the East wind prevails over the West wind», and «imperialism is a paper tiger», and stressed the need to educate the masses in the spirit of determination to fight the class enemy.

Speaking of the problems of war and peace, of peaceful coexistence, the delegate of the Communist Party of China pointed out the sources of wars, refuting the charge brought against the Communist Party of China that it allegedly wants war, that allegedly it in favour of the cold war and that allegedly it seeks to establish socialism throughout the world by means of war. This, he said, amounts to saying that the threat of war comes from China and not from imperialism. Comrade Teng Hsiao-ping said that we must speak of both possibilities, that of the prevention of war and that of the outbreak of war, and that we must carefully prepare ourselves for both possibilities. «Overestimation of the strength of the people and underestimation of the strength of the enemies», he said, «is one tendency. If this tendency is not combated, it might lead to adventurist Leftist and sectarian errors. Overestimation of the strength of the enemies and underestimation of the strength of the people is another tendency. If this tendency is not combated, it might lead to revisionist and Right opportunistic errors. It is important to combat both these tendencies. We think», he said, «that in the present conditions the main danger in the ranks of the international communist movement is the second tendency, not the first.»

He demanded the inclusion of the following phrase in the draft-Declaration: «We can be sure that there will be no war only when socialism has triumphed in at least the principal countries of the world». He explained the difference between the possibility of avoiding world war and the possibility of excluding any kind of war. The oppressed peoples will inevitably rise in war against their reactionary governments, and we must support these wars. The representative of the Communist Party of China pointed out that the policy of the Soviet Union on talks has been supported by the People's Republic of China, but we must not base all our hopes or our main hopes on talks. Everything depends on the active struggle of the masses all over the world for peace.

Comrade Teng Hsiao-ping said that the main danger in the international communist movement is revisionism. It has never happened, he said, that revisionism has developed because there has been so much struggle against it, as the Soviet leaders claim. He demanded that the chapter of the draft-Declaration speaking of this question should be more complete and said that there were also dogmatic tendencies, which, under particular conditions, might become the main danger. But dogmatism was not manifested in the Communist Party of China and even less on the questions over which it was being slandered.

He devoted a special place to the relations among the fraternal communist and workers' parties. He laid special stress on the principle of equality and independence of the various parties and on proletarian internationalism. He attached particular importance to the principle of consultations among parties and the achievement of unanimity. He said that criticism among parties is a sound basis for unity among them. The Chinese delegation refuted the charge that allegedly the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China intended to reject everything the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had done. It was wrong to think that criticism impedes unity. If criticism had been in a harsh tone, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China was not to be blamed for that. The principle of the majority and minority in the relations among parties should not and could not be applied. This is a principle applied within the parties themselves, and not at international meetings, at which each party preserves its own independence. The delegate of the Communist Party of China criticized the Bucharest Meeting at which the Marxist-Leninist principles were breached, pointed out the positive and negative aspects of the 20th and 21st Congresses of the CPSU, criticized the stand of the Central Committee of the CPSU towards the Party of Labour of Albania and rejected the proposal that «factionalist activity» should be condemned in the Declaration, a move which was directed against the Communist Party of China.

Finally, he dwelt in detail on the disagreements between the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. After an outline of the history of the disagreements and showing how the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was extending them to state relations, Teng Hsiao-ping said that these disagreements had been aggravated as a result of the violation of the principle of equality among parties on the part of the Soviet leadership and that the Moscow Declaration had not been respected.

The Central Committee knows the content of the speech of our delegation, therefore it is unnecessary to dwell on it here. However, we can say that it was listened to with great attention by the participants at the meeting, and despite the attacks heaped upon us later, of which we shall have more to say below, no one, not even the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in its written declaration of December 1, could produce convincing arguments to refute a single one of our theses. On the contrary, its principled character, its correct analysis of the questions and its courageous criticism addressed to the Soviet leaders were welcomed by many delegations of fraternal parties.

As I said above, following our speeches, the meeting took another course. This stage of the meeting also can be divided into two parts: the first 2-3 days after our speeches
A dominion by the contributions of the representatives of the communist and workers' parties who defended the interests of the Soviet leaders and consequently attacked the communist Party of China and our Party of Labour. Whereas, during the last 2-3 days of the meeting there was a predominance of speeches of the delegations of the communist and workers' parties who defended the correct Marxist-Leninist positions, that is, the parties which were of the same opinion the Chinese comrades and us. Why did this happen? Because in this direction the Soviet leaders pursued an incorrect procedure: wanting to create the impression that the fire movement was against us, they gave the floor, one after another, to those delegations which they were sure would lend the view of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, while refusing it to others. Thus, for example, they postponed the right of the Indonesian delegation to take the floor for three days on end. But, in this manner, by putting off the mands of all those delegations, it came about that the speeches delivered were by the parties maintaining a correct Marxist-Leninist stand.

What is characteristic of the speeches of the second stage of the meeting? The attacks against the Communist Party of China against our Party in particular were organized (to such an extent that they were even furnished with quotations from the documents of our Party which were only at the disposal of the Central Committee of the Communist Party the Soviet Union), and another characteristic is their lack of arguments, the replacement of arguments with offensive language.

Second, at first, following the speech of the Chinese delegate, the attacks were spearheaded only against the Communist Party of China, after our speech the attacks were directed mainly against our Party, and by the end of the meeting, particularly during the second contributions, criticism was concentrated against our two parties at the same time, against the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania.

Third, their discussions were tendentious; they condemned everything Chinese or Albanian, passing over in silence, that even supporting, even the most extreme manifestations of that opportunism, which tried to take advantage of this situation in order to spread its ideas. For example, in his speech, which gave the impression of being more of a speech of a social-democrat than of a communist, the representative of the Communist Party of Sweden, Hagberg, raised these opportunist themes: 1) He said that in the framework of its collaboration with the social-democratic party, the Communist Party of Sweden had achieved successes precisely thanks to the fact at it was in favour of a broad collaboration with all the social-democrats, that they spoke of what united them and not what divided them. He declared that the leadership of the communist Party of Sweden was against the creation of a Left within the social-democratic party, because the communists should collaborate with all the detachments of the working class. 2) He defended the Yugoslav revisionists and criticized those who spoke in harsh language against them. He declared that the main thing for us was to isolate the principal enemy and not the Yugoslav League of Communists, that we should not maintain a sterner stand towards the Yugoslav leaders than towards the heads of social-democrats, because this hurted the feelings of the Yugoslav people. We should not aggravate our relations with the Yugoslav leadership, so that we could have it as fellow-traveller, be it even temporary and not very reliable, in our common struggle for peace, etc.

3) He declared that the terms «dictatorship of the proletariat», which might cause only harm, should not figure in the Declaration which the meeting would produce. The term «dictatorship of the proletariat» was an old term of the 19th century, which had become outdated and frightened the masses. Although we communists understood the content of this term, we didn't use it, because from both the logical and the philological aspects «dictatorship» meant the opposite of democracy, its negation. The Swedish workers took offence if you spoke to them about the «dictatorship of the proletariat». This term was not included in the program of the Communist Party of Sweden and when we spoke to the workers about the socialist state, we stressed that this was the most democratic state, etc.

Likewise, the representatives of the Communist Party of the United States of America and of the Communist Party of Great Britain, under various pretexts, also demanded that the formulation of the dictatorship of the proletariat should be omitted from the draft-Declaration.

The representative of the Communist Party of the United States of America also demanded the omission from the draft-Declaration of the phrase which said: «If the class of the capitalists and their allies wages war on the proletariat, the proletariat will stand up and bury capitalism». Whereas the delegate of the Communist Party of Italy declared in his speech that not a single Italian worker would consent to pay for the victory of socialism in blood, that is, they were for «peace at any price». The representative of the Communist Party of Italy proposed a new formulation of that part of the draft-Declaration which speaks about Yugoslav revisionism. This new formulation left out the latter part that the Yugoslav revisionists have betrayed Marxism-Leninism and have engaged in undermining activity against the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

However, none of the delegates to the meeting, including even the Soviet delegation, stood up to oppose these anti-Marxist and blatantly revisionist theses. Only the delegation of the Communist Party of China and our delegation, as well as those of some other parties which stand on Marxist-Leninist positions, fought against and refuted these incorrect and opportunist views in the editing commission.

On the Stand of some Delegations Towards the Speech of our Delegation

Immediately after the speech delivered by our delegation at the meeting, the representatives of a number of communist and workers' parties launched heavy attacks full of offensive epithets against the Party of Labour of Albania. Regardless of the facts, or without knowing them at all, they labelled as slanders all criticisms contained in our speech in the ad-
dress of the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The attack was opened by Dolores Ibarruri, who said among other things, "This morning I heard the most disgraceful speech I have ever heard in my many years in the communist movement; we have not heard such a speech since the time of Trotsky. It was a provocative speech. How can anyone speak such falsehoods against the Soviet Union... We protest against the slanders addressed to Khrouchtchev. We believe that the entire movement will condemn your speech... etc.

Most offensive adjectives were employed by Gomulka against our speech and our Party. He accused our speech of an irresponsible attack against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, an act of hooliganism, which no one, who has any sense of responsibility, could permit himself. Further, on Gomulka said: "If anyone does not believe that the Chinese are factionalists, let him look at their factionalism with the Albanians..."

Attacking the speech of our delegation, Longo and the representatives of some other parties declared that it sounds like an insult and vilification, not only of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, but also of the entire international communist movement.

The representative of the Communist Party of Morocco, Ali Yata, also made base attacks against the leadership of our Party.

Georgiu Dej pronounced himself in this manner against our speech: "We listened with indignation to the speech by the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania. We controlled ourselves, put our patience to the test, for it seemed as if "The Voice of America" or "Free Europe" was speaking from this tribune. No difference whatever from the Yugoslav revisionists. With their adventurist policy, the Albanians are creating a difficult situation in the Balkans... Our meeting should resolutely condemn the disruptive speech and action of the Albanian delegate."

The delegations of some parties which had not yet pronounced themselves before my speech hurried to issue written declarations to condemn the speech of the delegation of the Party of Labour of Albania and its leadership. This is what the delegations of the Communist Party of Bulgaria, the Communist Party of France, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, and others did.

The declaration distributed by the delegation of the Communist Party of Bulgaria, among other things, says: "...What the representatives of the Party of Labour of Albania did was an expression of the blackest ingratitude and cynicism. In return for fraternal help they have brought up the basest falsification and slanders against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The Belgrade revisionists have no reason to be dissatisfied with the struggle waged by the leaders of the Party of Labour of Albania against them. Through this struggle they have simply become more valuable on the US market, receive more generous aid and loans from the United States of America."

The declaration of the delegation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, in connection with the speech by the delegation of the Party of Labour of Albania, says among other things, "What are the aims of the monstrous slanders of the Albanian delegation which dared to describe the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as almost to blame for the Hungarian counter-revolution? The present words of the Albanian delegation, which makes against the Soviet Union the grave accusation of resorting to almost colonial methods and great power chauvinism, arouse even greater indignation. These insults can only be grist to the mill of the bourgeois and revisionist propaganda about the so-called Soviet "colonialism" and Soviet 'hegemonism'."

A large number of the delegations that spoke against us in connection with our speech expressed themselves only with some phrases, such as "this was not the place to open these discussions", or "the speeches by the Chinese and Albanian comrades were inappropriate and harmful, and contained slanders against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union", or "we agree with the assessment of the speech of the Albanian delegate made by the preceding speakers", etc.

Generally speaking according to their stand towards the views expressed in our speech, the various delegations may be divided into three groups:

a) The first group includes those parties that defended us openly or supported our theses, without mentioning us at all, or saying the odd word simply for the sake of appearances against our speech.

b) The second group is made up of the delegations which spoke against us, but, as said above, in very mild terms, such as "improper speech", etc. Most of the delegations from Latin America, the Scandinavian countries, some delegations from Africa and others may be included in this group.

c) The third group is made up of the delegations that rose against us with great heat and unreservedly defended the position of the Soviet leaders. But even among them there are some shades of difference:

- The most aggressive were: Gomulka, Ibarruri, Ali Yata of Morocco, Zhivkov and the Czechs (the latter two came out with written declarations), Dej, Longo of Italy, and others who used the most abusive language against us.

- The less aggressive were: the French who issued written declarations, the Tunisians and others who spoke against us, not in the above-mentioned terms, but such as "disgraceful speech", "impermissible and unacceptable speech" aimed at discrediting the Soviet Union", etc.

- Lastly, the moderates, among whom the Hungarians may be included, for they were very measured in their written declaration.

The fierce attacks against the Chinese delegation and ours came as no surprise. They were an organized outburst of unprincipled passions, an unsuccessful attempt to stifle our principled views and criticism through base attacks and
offensive language, to divert the discussion, by means of
sentimental phrases, away from the questions of principle
on the agenda, etc. But they did not achieve their aims. In
fact most delegations began to waver, and the more passions
cooled down and logic prevailed, the more objectively the
correct and principled Marxist-Leninist views upheld by the
Chinese delegation, our delegation and some other dele-
gations, were measured by a series of delegations.

This is clearly expressed in the shift of the ratio of for-
ces and in the conclusion of the proceedings of the meeting.

As we said at the start of this report, apart from the
Chinese delegation and our delegation, the representatives
of many other parties, too, took a resolute Marxist-Leninist
stand at the November meeting. All stood for the unity of
the communist movement, and frankly admitted that without
China and its Communist Party there could be no talk of unity
either in the communist movement or in the socialist camp.
This stand was in open opposition to the proposals and theses
of the Soviets and their ardent supporters who wanted to
condemn the Communist Party of China and the Party of
Labour of Albania as factionalists, etc.

At the end of the plenary session of the meeting, after
79 representatives of the various parties had made their
contributions to the discussion, N. S. Khrushchev took the
floor for the second time, and so did Teng Hsiao-ping and
23 other persons. A characteristic of the last speeches of
Khrushchev and his supporters was that they showed them-

selves more moderate, their expressions were more contro-

led, they were more engaged in defending their viewpoints
than in attacking those of others.

Nikita Khrushchev’s second speech was a reflection of
the situation created up to then at the meeting; on one
hand, the speech of the Chinese delegation and that of our
delegation had dealt heavy blows at the arguments of the
Soviet leaders concerning the accusations against the Com-
munist Party of China, and on the other hand, it was a fact
that besides the parties openly supporting the stand taken
by the Soviet delegation against the Communist Party of
China and the Party of Labour of Albania, although without
convincing arguments, there was also another group of par-
ties, and not a small one, that supported our viewpoints, and
another in the centre that were against the split.

In conformity with this, Khrushchev’s second speech
had two characteristic aspects:

a) Although in its external form it was fiercer than his first
speech and directly attacked both the Chinese com-
rades and us, in essence it was a speech from defensive po-
sitions. Defending himself against the criticisms by the Chi-
inese comrades and us, Khrushchev tried to justify the view-
points of the Soviet leadership on a series of questions: war
and peace, the stand to be taken towards imperialism, the
thesis of the 20th Congress on the roads of transition to so-
cialism, the attitude towards the national liberation move-
ments, the criticism of “Stalin’s cult of the individual”, etc.
Concerning all these questions he did not dare to enter into
an analysis of facts but said only that all “the slanders and
attacks against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union
would be answered by the Central Committee of the Com-
munist Party of the Soviet Union in a special letter. Apart
from this, in Khrushchev’s second speech the first signs of
a retreat were apparent when he declared that, facing the
enemy, the meeting must, without fail, be concluded with a
joint document and the elimination of disagreements.
b) Relying on the support of the majority, in his second
speech Khrushchev continued his pressure on the Communist
Party of China to have it condemned and force it to its knees.
In this respect he was very insistent that allegedly the dis-
agreements were between the Communist Party of China and
the Party of Labour of Albania, on the one hand, and all
the communist and workers’ parties, on the other; that the
minority should submit to the majority and respect its opi-
nion; that “factional activity” in the international communist
movement should be condemned, etc. He went on with his
attacks against the Chinese comrades, accusing them of being
unwilling to acknowledge their mistakes simply for the reason
that they put their pride above the interests of the inter-
national communist movement, etc. Without any arguments,
and on false evidence, he also attacked the leadership of the
Party of Labour of Albania.

Khrushchev’s second speech showed that the leadership
of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union with Khrushchev
at the head had not renounced its erroneous views and methods
in its relations with the fraternal parties.

After Khrushchev’s speech and in reply to it, comrade
Teng Hsiao-ping took the floor for the second time.

His speech was centered on two main questions: First,
did the leadership of the Communist Party of China defend
the Moscow Declaration of 1957, or did it violate it? Second,
was the stand taken by the Communist Party of China aimed
at defending the solidarity of the international communist
movement, or had it endangered it?

Concerning the first question, the Chinese delegate point-
ed out that the leadership of the Communist Party of China
had consistently stood on the positions of the Moscow Declar-
ation of 1957 and had defended it with determination. He
once more refuted the accusations brought by many speak-
ing speakers to the effect that the Chinese comrades, especially
in the articles included in the pamphlet “Long Live Leninism”,
had allegedly departed from the Declaration of 1957, that
they allegedly negated the importance of the world socialist
system in the international arena, negated the principle of
peaceful coexistence, were Left adventurers, dogmatists, etc.
He proved that, on the contrary, it was the Soviet leaders and
the leaders of some other fraternal parties who began to
declare that some important theses of Leninism were obsolete,
to act according to the supposition that imperialism had
allegedly charged its nature, to spread harmful illusions
about the summit meetings, etc. The articles included in
the pamphlet “Long Live Leninism” were directed against
imperialism, against revisionism and the harmful illusions
fostered by the Soviet leaders in connection with imperialism.
So, it was they who had departed from the positions of the
Moscow Declaration of 1957, and not the Chinese comrades;
as a result, they should have consulted the other parties
about their viewpoints which they changed from those of the
Moscow Declaration, and not the Chinese comrades about
the articles which had defended the theses of the Declara-
tion in question.

Concerning the second question, the delegate of the
Communist Party of China rejected the accusation brought
by many speakers to the effect that the first speech of the
debate of the Communist Party of China allegedly endan-
ergized the solidarity of the international communist movement.
On the contrary, that speech was meant as an answer to the
letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the
Soviet Union dated November 5th, in which fact had
depended the contradictions. The delegate of the Communist Par-
ty of China also resolutely rejected the accusations that many
speakers during the meeting brought against the Communist
Party of China, as well as the accusation brought by Khrush-
chev in his second speech, to the effect that the Chinese com-
rades allegedly put their pride above the interests of the
international communist movement.

He clearly showed that an unhealthy and impermissible
situation had been created in which any criticism in the ad-
dress of the leadership of the Communist Party of the So-
viet Union was labelled as "factionalist activity", whereas the
Soviet comrades were permitted to decide everything on their
own, without asking the others, and the other parties had
only to follow them. This violated the principle of equality
and consultation in the relations among the fraternal parties.
In this respect, we consider that principle of consultation
mentioned in the address of the Congress on the role of the
Soviet leadership in the international communist movement
that was being reviewed. However, for the first time, we
expressed our opposition to the inclusion of such theses as that on the so-called "factional activity"
in the international communist movement, on "national
communism", etc., which were directed against the Communist
Party of China, and he stressed that no unity could be
reached on this basis. He also expressed his opposition to the
thesis on the importance of the 20th Congress of the
Communist Party of the Soviet Union the inclusion of which
in the draft-Declaration would be considered as an imposition
of the views of one party on the other parties. He said
that the common struggle of all the communist and workers'
parties constituted a broad basis for the overcoming of all
the existing divergencies.

The speech by the delegate of the Communist Party of
China showed that the Communist Party of China stood
firm on its correct Marxist-Leninist positions, that this was
the only right road for the achievement of unity.

Our delegation decided not to contribute to the discussion
for the second time, therefore it did not ask for the floor,
but we issued a brief written declaration which was distributed
to all the delegations. In this declaration we emphasized
that we stood firm on the positions expressed in our speech
and pointed out that the insulting criticism levelled at us
was hasty and did not serve the strengthening of the unity
in our movement. In this connection we stressed:

"Typical in this respect was the speech of the delegate
of the United Workers' Party of Poland, Vladislav Gomulka,
who went so far in his unworthy attempts to distort the truth
about the Party of Labour of Albania as to use against it
epithets, descriptions and insinuations which are altogether
impermissible in the relations among the Marxist parties and
which only the imperialists and the Yugoslav revisionists
repeatedly fling at us each passing day. From the content and
tone of the Polish delegate's speech it is clear that he is not
in the least interested in the elimination of disagreements
among parties and the strengthening of the unity of the
communist and workers' movement, but on the contrary is
striving with great zeal to deepen them, which is only to the
benefit of our enemies. His intention was to lead our meeting
into a blind alley and to discredit the Party of Labour of
Albania in the eyes of the international communist and
workers' movement. However, this attempt to isolate the
Party of Labour of Albania ended in failure and disgrace,
as it was bound to do.

We reject all the slanders and provocations made at this
meeting against our delegation, against our Party and people.

The Party of Labour of Albania regrets that a number of
delegates of some other fraternal parties hastened to use
an incorrect and un-comradely language towards the Party
of Labour of Albania in their speeches or written declarations
distributed at this meeting, without going thoroughly into
the real facts and without being aware of the truth. However,
the Party of Labour of Albania hopes that those comrades
will reflect more deeply and will understand the truth about
the content of the speech made by the delegation of the Party
of Labour of Albania.

As you see, apart from Gomulka, we did not name anyone
else, and did not respond to the personal attacks so that
we would not deviate from our principled position. Our
brief written declaration was well received by the delegations,
and none of the 23 second-time speakers, even including
Gomulka, said anything against it.

In this manner the first and more important part of the
Moscow Meeting came to an end, and the commission
for the final editing of the Declaration started its work.
The commission met 5 days in succession. The Chinese
delegation, our delegation, and other delegations with the
same viewpoints as ours, waged a stern and determined
struggle there. The change in the situation was clearly
apparent in the commission. Not only the shift in the ratio
of forces, but also the result of the resolute struggle and the
courageous and unflinching stand taken, particularly, by the
Chinese delegation and ours at the plenary session, was
even more evident there. Many delegations of parties in a
centrist position behaved with respect towards the proposals
made by our delegations.

In conclusion, some amendments were made for the im-
provement of the draft-Declaration, whereas all the proposals
intended to weaken the Declaration, to give it an opportunist
character, like those of the Italians who wanted to water
down the paragraph on Yugoslav revisionism, or the proposals of the Swedes, etc., were rejected. The Commission also rejected the thesis about "national communism", but, at the end, 4 questions remained unresolved; the assessment of the 20th and 21st Congresses, the question of the cult of the individual, the question of factions, and the inclusion in the Declaration of the principle of consultation for the achievement of unity, as proposed by the Chinese delegation.

A break of one day was taken for consultation with the heads of delegations about finding a way out. However, our delegations expressed their determination not to accept the inclusion in the Declaration of the first three of the above-mentioned four questions. Indeed, through some delegations that had taken a centrist position we had let it be understood that, if the above-mentioned questions remained in the Declaration, we would not put our signature to it.

Only at midday of the last day, as a result of our struggle and clear-cut stand, was complete unanimity reached, after the delegation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was obliged to back down. In fact the questions under discussion were resolved as follows: the question of factions was removed from the text altogether; the Chinese proposal about consultations was included; the assessment of the 21st Congress was removed completely and only the characterization of the 20th Congress according to the 1957 Declaration remained, with the addition of a phrase on the contribution made by other parties to the enrichment of Marxism-Leninism; the formula about the cult of the individual remained, but no longer as a phenomenon connected with the whole international communist movement. After these amendments the Declaration was unanimously approved by all the delegations.

The fundamental questions about which there were different opinions are presented correctly and interpreted from the Marxist point of view. The characterization of the epoch, the problems of war and peace, the question of peaceful coexistence, the problems of the national liberation movement, of the communist movement in the capitalist countries, of the unity of the socialist camp and of the communist parties, find their correct reflection in the Declaration. The only fundamental question about which we disagreed, but on which, for the sake of unity, were obliged to make a concession, was the mentioning of the 20th Congress.

But one thing should be kept always in mind. There exists the possibility that each will try to give his own interpretation to the theses of the Declaration. The Moscow Declaration of 1957, too, was correct, but many disagreements arose concerning its interpretation. Distortions could be made, not by revising the theses of the Declaration and replacing them with new theses, but by stressing its theses in an one-sided manner, by mentioning only one side of the question and leaving out the other. For, example, there exists the danger that in the characterization of our epoch only our forces may be emphasized or overestimated; there is the danger that, in connection with the problem of the war, the danger of war may not be properly stressed, and imperialism not exposed; there is the danger that only the policy of the alliance with the social-democrats and the national bourgeoisie may be emphasized, and the struggle against, and criticism of, their reactionary viewpoints and actions may be left aside; there is the danger that the peaceful road of transition to socialism will be the most stressed, and the non-violent way not mentioned as it should be; there is the danger that revisionism may be acknowledged as the main danger only in words, and more stress laid on the struggle against dogmatism and sectarianism. Similar distortions can be made over the other problems taken up in the Declaration, too.

Hence the question arises: how will this Declaration be implemented? Will it be honoured by everyone?

We can answer this question with certainty only as far as our Party is concerned. Not only will our Party of Labour fight with might and main to implement the Declaration approved, but at the same time we feel ourselves duty-bound to fight against any one who may violate it, who may attempt to distort its content.

As far as the other parties are concerned, we hope that for the sake of unity, of the common struggle against imperialism and revisionism, for the sake of the camp of socialism and communism, they will implement the Declaration approved. The implementation of this Declaration to the letter will mark a decisive step towards the liquidation of all disagreements in the ranks of the communist movement, will make a valuable contribution to the tempering of the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement, which is indispensable for the victory over the enemy. The Declaration itself and its content represent a real basis on which this unity can be built.

But we cannot fail to inform the Central Committee of the Party about some reservations, that are even now becoming apparent in the attitude of the Soviet leaders towards the implementation of the Declaration.

The reservations they have expressed, which in our opinion are unjustified, are these: In a speech he delivered in October, at a banquet in honour of the participants in the editing commission of the Declaration, Nikita Khruščev himself called the Declaration a "compromise document". "As you know," he went on, "such documents are not long-lived." Later, at the farewell banquet given in honour of the participants of the Moscow Meeting on December 2nd, that is to say, after the Declaration was signed, speaking about Yugoslavia, Nikita Khruščev stressed that it is not a socialist country, but that its economy is developing along socialist lines(1), and that "we (the Russians) would not fight Yugoslav revisionism as the Albanians are doing, for we keep in mind that, in case of war, Yugoslavia could muster a number of divisions, and we do not want them lined up against us."

On what is hidden behind these declarations, what is their purpose, we shall not attempt to comment. Let us wait and see. We only observed these facts, and now we are informing the Central Committee of the Party about them. Of course, in our opinion, such statements cannot give rise to optimism. They make you think that the Soviet leadership will not fight as every party should to implement the pledges
streaming from the unanimous approval of the Declaration which was signed.

V. THE TASKS OF THE PARTY IN THE FUTURE

The activity of our delegation, its determined and principled stand, the courageous speech and all the work carried out at the Moscow Meeting, have been very good and, as we said, have given good results. We must emphasize that, as a result, the individuality of our Party has been raised, admiration and respect for its courage, its principled stand, its determination to defend Marxism-Leninism have increased immeasurably. This rejoices us, but it should not go to our heads and make us boastful. We did nothing but our duty to Marxism-Leninism, proletarian internationalism, to our Party and our people.

But, at the same time, there are a number of new problems facing us which we must solve with the wisdom characterizing our Party, with coolheadedness and intelligence.

We should be aware that our courageous and principled stand was not to the liking either of the Soviet leadership or of the representatives of some parties of the socialist and capitalist countries, and this is evident from the attacks they directed against our Party. On the other hand, as a result of the work done by the Soviet leaders with the various delegations, especially after our speech, and the slanderous lies they told the meeting against us, among many delegations there is the impression that we attacked the Soviet Union and its Communist Party.

After having spoken of the attitude towards the Soviet Union, Comrade Enver Hoxha continued:

On Relations with the Communist Party of China

In recent times our ties and relations with the Chinese comrades have become still closer. And this is explained by the fact that our two parties are following the same course, the same aim, because the principled struggle for the defence of Marxism-Leninism united the two of us and linked us closely. Some representatives of various parties in Moscow, like Zhivkov and others, tried to present the matter as if the Party of Labour of Albania acted and acts according to the instructions of the Communist Party of China. It is not necessary to stress here that our Party has its own opinion, its own view, its own individuality. It has fought for many years resolutely in defence of Marxism-Leninism and it continues to do so. In this struggle we found ourselves shoulder to shoulder with the Chinese comrades, who are fighting, too, with courage and determination in defence of our triumphant ideas. And on this basis, on the basis of the struggle for Marxism-Leninism, our two parties became united and firmly linked together.

It must be said that at the Bucharest Meeting we defended the Chinese comrades proceeding from the positions of Marxism-Leninism. Likewise, from these same positions we defended them also at the Moscow Meeting. But, for their part, the Chinese comrades, too, at the Moscow Meeting resolutely defended our Party and its principled positions. Allow me to put forward here what the delegate of the CP of China said in his two speeches with regard to our Party.

In the first speech he said, among other things, that the position adopted by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in these recent times towards the Party of Labour of Albania had caused them great concern. The Soviet Union had given aid to Albania, and nobody denied that. «But,» he stressed, «can one consider as entirely insignificant the internationalist aid which the heroic and industrious Albanian people give the Soviet Union, the whole socialist camp, the international communist movement, the cause of peace throughout the world and the revolution of the peoples of various countries? In any case, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union cannot, because it has given aid to Albania, consider it permissible to use this as a privilege to interfere in the internal affairs of Albania, and neither have the Albanian comrades have in any way lost the right to solve their internal questions independently for this reason.

In these recent times the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union have more than once made attacks on the Party of Labour of Albania before the Chinese comrades, stating that they will adopt towards the Marxist-Leninist Party of Labour of Albania and towards the People's Republic of Albania the same stand they adopted towards Yugoslavia, that they want to condemn the Party of Labour of Albania, cutting off any kind of aid to it, simply because the Albanian comrades defend their own views on a series of questions, and, especially at the Bucharest Meeting and after this Meeting, they did not follow the Soviet comrades in their actions directed against the Communist Party of China. In its letter of November 5, addressed to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union even expressed its open support for anti-Party elements in Albania, calling them friends of the Soviet Union. We hope that the Soviet comrades will quietly ponder over whether, by adopting such a stand towards the Party of Labour of Albania, they are guided by the principles of proletarian internationalism or by patriarchal principles which are impermissible in the ranks of the communists. If things reach the point that all the sister parties and all the fraternal countries interfere in one another's internal affairs and provoke disruption of one another without hesitating to use any means whatever, then the question arises: What will become of our great communist family? There is no doubt that such acts are absolutely incompatible with the interests of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement...».
consultations, and that the good fraternal relations that have been created between them in the course of many years will be maintained in the future, too. The interests of the socialist dump and the international communist movement require this.

Some comrades insulted the delegation of the Party of Labour of Albania, a thing which is contrary to the spirit of equality between sister parties. We were astonished by the fact that even Comrade Comunica allowed himself to use offensive terms, saying that the speech of the Albanian comrades was a "dirty attack by hooligans." Can it be said that Albania is not a socialist country, and the Party of Labour of Albania not an internationalist and communist Party? Are the Albanian comrades not waging a determined struggle against imperialism and Yugoslav revisionism? If we reflect calmly that Albania is a small country in our socialist camp and is surrounded by enemies, it will be difficult to believe that the Albanian comrades resent others with contempt. Offensive words addressed to the Albanian comrades are no contribution either to the solidarity of the international communist movement or to the improvement of the relations between the Soviet Union and Albania.

Some comrades allowed themselves to declare that the speech of the Albanian comrades is allegedly a result of the factional activity the Chinese comrades are carrying out, indeed they declared that this was a "distribution of roles" between the Albanian and Chinese comrades. It is very difficult for us to understand how these comrades could invent such tales. If the act that the Albanian and Chinese comrades expressed identical views on a series of questions is to be called factional activity or the result of factional activity, the question arises: How can we call the expression of identical views by the comrades of the other sister parties? Comrades, in our ranks, in the ranks of the sister parties, such an atmosphere of irresponsibility and injustice has been manifested. This cannot fail to cause serious concern...

Our Party of Labour is grateful to the sister Party of China for its internationalist and Marxist-Leninist support.

In the future our Party will strengthen its ties and friendship with the Communist Party of China and the great Chinese people, always upholding the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the correct line always pursued by the Central Committee of our Party.

On the discussion of these questions in the Party and at the Congress

So far, the Central Committee of the Party has informed the Party, through a special letter, only about the Bucharest Meeting. We think that now, with another letter, we must inform the party organizations of the Moscow Meeting and the contradictions which exist between our Party and the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. We think this letter of the Central Committee should be analysed and discussed at district party conferences (or in actives), and then in the party branches. It would be good if all this work can be completed before the Congress, so that the delegates, who come to the Congress, will be aware of these problems beforehand.

The party organizations must see to it that our people, in the first place the communists, further enhance their revolutionary political vigilance and devote more attention to the problems of production, the realization of economic plans, in industry, construction, the mines, trade, agriculture, etc. In the present conditions total mobilization is needed, indeed a ten-fold increase of the enthusiasm and the determination of the masses, to cope with the difficulties and obstacles ahead of us, so that both the Party and the people emerge successful.

As to the Party Congress, we think that it is better to postpone it; hold it towards the beginning of February, so that we shall have time to put the questions, of which we spoke, before the Party and also to prepare ourselves better for the Congress.

Comrades,

These were the questions we wanted to report to the Plenum. Our Party, as always, will march forward towards new victories under the banner of Marxism-Leninism. We shall achieve ever greater successes, for we are on a correct road, we are fighting for a noble cause, and there is and will be no obstacle, or difficulty that can stop our triumphant advance.

9) The abridgements are made by the editor on the full text of the original published in the 19th Volume of the Works of Comrade Enver Hoxha.
ENVER HOXHA

SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE MEETING OF COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES IN MOSCOW

NOVEMBER 16, 1960
Dear comrades,

This meeting of the communist and workers' parties is of historic importance to the international communist movement, for it is making a detailed analysis of the international political situation, drawing up a balance of the successes and of the mistakes that may have been verified along our course, helping us see more clearly the line we should pursue henceforth in order to score further successes to the benefit of socialism, communism, and peace.

The existence of the socialist camp, headed by the Soviet Union, is already an accomplished fact in the world. The communist movement in general has been enlarged, strengthened and tempered. The communist and workers' parties throughout the world have become a colossal force which is leading mankind forward towards socialism, towards peace.

As the draft statement which has been prepared emphasizes, our socialist camp is very much stronger than that of the imperialists. Socialism is growing stronger and attaining new heights day by day while imperialism is growing weaker and decaying. We should make use of all our means and forces to speed up this process. This will come about if we remain unwaveringly loyal to Marxism-Leninism and apply it correctly. Otherwise, we will retard this process, for we are faced with a ruthless enemy — imperialism, headed by US imperialism, which we must defeat and destroy.

We want peace, while imperialism does not want peace and is preparing for a third world war. We must fight with all our might to avert a world war and to bring about the triumph of a just and democratic peace in the world. This will be achieved when we have forced imperialism to disarm. Imperialism will not give up its chains of its own free will. To believe anything of the kind is merely to deceive oneself and others. Therefore we should confront imperialism with the colossal economic, military, moral, political, and ideological strength of the socialist camp, as well as with the combined strength of the peoples throughout the world, to sabotage, in every way, the war which the imperialists are preparing.

The Party of Labour of Albania has never hidden this situation and the threat with which imperialism is menacing peace-loving mankind, nor will it ever do so. We can assure you that the Albanian people, who detest war, have not been intimidated by this correct action of their Party; they have not become pessimistic, nor have they been marking time as far as socialist construction is concerned. They have a clear vision of their future and have set to work with full confidence, always vigilant, keeping the pick in one hand and the rifle in the other.

Our view is that imperialism, headed by American imperialism, should be mercilessly exposed, politically and ideologically, and at no time should we permit slavering, prettification, or softness towards imperialism. No concessions of principle should be made to imperialism. The tactics and compromises which are permissible on our part should help our cause not that of the enemy.

Facing a ruthless enemy, the guarantee for the triumph of our cause lies in our complete unity, which will be secured by eliminating the deep ideological differences which have been manifested, and by building this unity on the foundations of Marxism-Leninism, on equality, on brotherhood, on the spirit of comradeship and proletarian internationalism. Our Party is of the opinion that, not only should we not have any ideological split, but we should maintain a united political stand on all issues. Our tactics and strategy towards the
enemy should be worked out by all our parties, based on
Marxist-Leninist principles, on correct political criteria complying
with the concrete existing situations...

All the peoples of the world aspire to, and fight for,
freedom, independence, sovereignty, social justice, culture and
peace. These sacred aspirations of theirs have been and are
being suppressed by the capitalists, the feudal lords and
imperialists, and thus it is natural that the struggle of these
peoples should be waged with great severity against the capital-
ists, feudal lords, and imperialists. It is also natural for
the peoples of the world to seek allies in this battle for life,
which they are waging against their executioners...

Therefore, in the struggle for peace, disarmament, and
social progress in the world, the socialist camp is not alone
facing the imperialist camp, but in close alliance with all
the progressive peoples of the world, while the imperialists
remain alone facing the socialist camp.

We are living at a time when we are witnessing the total
destruction of colonialism, the elimination of this plague that
has wiped peoples from the face of the earth. New states
are springing up in Africa, and Asia. The states where cap-
ital, the scourge, and the bullet reigned supreme, are putting
an end to the yoke of bondage, and the people are taking their
destiny into their own hands. This has been and is still being
achieved thanks to the struggle of these peoples and the mo-
ral support given them by the Soviet Union, People's China,
and the other countries of the socialist camp.

Traitors to Marxism-Leninism, agents of imperialism and
intriguers, like Josip Broz Tito, are trying in a thousand ways,
by hatching up diabolical schemes, to mislead the peoples and
the newly-set up states, to detach them from their natural allies,
to link them directly with US imperialism. We should exert
all our strength to defeat the schemes of these lackeys of im-
perialism.

We are witnessing the disintegration of imperialism, its
decomposition, its final agony. We are living and fighting in
the epoch which is characterized by the irresistible transition
from capitalism to socialism. All the brilliant teachings of
Karl Marx and Vladimir Ilich Lenin, which have never be-
come outdated, as the revisionists claim, are being confirmed
in practice.

World imperialism is being dealt heavy blows which
clearly show that it is no longer in its "golden age", when it
made the law as and when it wanted. The initiative has slipped
from its hands, and this was not because of its own wish
or desire. The initiative was wrested from it, not by mere
words and discourses, but after a long process of bloody bat-
tles and revolutions which capitalism itself provoked against
the proletariat, against the strength of the peoples who were
rising to smash the world of hunger and misery, the world
of slavery. This glorious page was opened by the Great Oc-
tober Socialist Revolution, by the great Soviet Union, by great
Lenin.

Even now, when it sees its approaching doom, when it
has strong and determined opponents such as the socialist
camp and its great alliance with all the peoples of the world,
world imperialism, headed by US imperialism, is mustering,
organizing, and arming its assault forces. It is preparing for
war. He who fails to see this, is blind. He who sees it but
covers it up, is a traitor in the service of imperialism.

The Party of Labour of Albania is of the opinion that,
in spite of the major difficulties we encounter on our way
to establish peace in the world, to bring about disarmament
and settle the other international problems, there is no res-
son to be pessimistic. It is only our enemies who are suffering losses that are and should be pessimistic. We have won, we are winning and shall continue to win. That is why we are convinced that our efforts will be crowned with success.

But we think that exaggerated, unrealistic optimism is not only not good, but is even harmful. He who denies, belittles, who has no faith in our great economic, political, military, and moral strength, is a defeatist and does not deserve to be called a communist. On the other hand, he who, intoxicated by our potential, disregards the strength of the opponents, thinking that the enemy has lost all hope, has become harmless, and is entirely at our mercy, he is not a realist. He bluffs, lulls mankind to sleep in the face of all these complicated and very dangerous situations which demand very great vigilance from us all, which demand the heightening of the revolutionary drive of the masses, not its slackening, its disintegration, decomposition, and relaxation.«Waters sleep, but not the enemy»; is a wise saying of our long-suffering people.

Let us look facts straight in the eye. World imperialism, headed by its most aggressive detachment, US imperialism, is directing the course of its economy towards preparations for war. It is arming itself to the teeth. US imperialism is rearming Bonn’s Germany, Japan, and all its allies and satellites with all kinds of weapons. It has set up and perfected aggressive military organizations, has built up large bases, and is now preparing to establish military bases all around the socialist camp. It is accumulating stocks of nuclear weapons and refuses to disarm, to stop testing nuclear weapons, and is feverishly engaged in inventing new means of mass extermination. Why is it doing all this? To go to a wedding party? No, to go to war against us, to do away with socialism and communism, to enslave the peoples.

The Party of Labour of Albania is of the opinion that if we were to say and think otherwise we would be deceiving ourselves and others. We would not call ourselves communists if we were afraid of the vicissitudes of life. We communists detest war. We communists will fight to the end to smash the diabolical plans for war which the US imperialists are preparing, but if they declare war on us, we should deal them a mortal blow that will wipe imperialism from the face of the earth, once and for all.

Faced with the threats of the US led world imperialists of atomic war, we should be fully prepared economically, politically, morally, as well as militarily, to cope with any eventuality.

We should prevent a world war, it is not absolutely inevitable. But no one will ever excuse us if we live in a dream and let the enemy catch us unawares, for it has never happened that the enemy is to be trusted, otherwise he would not be called an enemy. The enemy is and remains an enemy, and a perfidious one at that. He who puts his trust in the enemy will sooner or later lose his case...

The peaceful policy of the countries of the socialist camp has exerted a major influence in exposing the aggressive aims of imperialism, in mobilizing the people against the war-mongers, in promoting their glorious struggle against the imperialist oppressors and their tools...

But, in spite of all this, many concrete problems which have been laid on the table, like the proposals for disarmament, the summit conference, etc., have not yet been resolved and are being systematically sabotaged by the US imperialists.

What conclusions should we draw from all this? The Party of Labour of Albania thinks that imperialism and, first and foremost, US imperialism, has not changed its hide, its hair or its nature. It is aggressive, and will remain aggressive as long as it has a single tooth left in its mouth. And being aggressive, it may plunge the world into a war. Therefore, as we emphasized at the meeting of the editorial committee, we insist that it should be brought home clearly to all the peoples, that there is no absolute guarantee against world war until socialism has triumphed throughout the world, or at least in the majority of countries. The US imperialists make no secret of their refusal to disarm. They are increasing their armaments, preparing for war, therefore we should be on our guard.

We should make no concessions of principle to the enemy, we should entertain no illusions about imperialism, despite our good intentions, we would make things infinitely worse. In addition to rearming and preparing war against us, the enemy is carrying on unbridled propaganda to poison the spirit and bewitch the minds of the people. They spend millions of dollars to recruit agents and spies, millions of dollars to organize acts of espionage, diversion, and murder in our countries. US imperialism has given and is giving thousands of million of dollars to its loyal agents, the treacherous Tito gang. It is doing all this to weaken our internal front, to split us, to weaken and disorganize our rear areas.

A lot is said about peaceful coexistence, some even go so far as to assert such absurdities as that People’s China and Albania are allegedly opposed to peaceful coexistence. Obviously, such harmful and erroneous views should be refuted once and for all. There can be no socialist state, there can be no communist, who is opposed to peaceful coexistence, who is a war-monger. Great Lenin was the first to put forward the principle of peaceful coexistence among states of
different social orders as an objective necessity, as long as so-
cialist and capitalist states exist side by side in the world. Stag-
ing loyal to this great principle of Lenin's, our Party of Labour has always held, and still holds, that the policy of peace-
ful coexistence responds to the fundamental interests of
all the peoples, responds to the purpose of the further
strengthening of the positions of socialism, therefore, this
principle of Lenin's is the basis of the foreign policy of our
people's state.

Peaceful coexistence between two opposing systems does
not imply, as the modern revisionists claim, that we should
give up the class struggle. On the contrary, the class strug-
gle must continue, the political and ideological struggle
against imperialism, against bourgeois and revisionist ideology,
should become ever more intense. While struggling con-
sistently to establish Leninist peaceful coexistence, while
making no concessions on principles to imperialism, we should
develop the class struggle in the capitalist countries, as well
as the national liberation movement of the peoples of colonial
and dependent countries.

In our view, the communist and workers' parties in the
capitalist countries should strive to establish peaceful coex-
istence between their countries, which are still under the ca-
pitalist system, and our socialist countries... But their task
does not end there. In these countries, it is necessary to pro-
mote, intensify and strengthen the class struggle. The working
masses, led by the proletariat of the country headed by the
communist party, and in alliance with the whole world proletarian,
should make life impossible for imperialism, should crush its
military and economic potential, should wrest from its hands its economic and political power and proceed to the
destruction of the old power and the establishment of
the new power of the people. Will they do this by violence,
or in the peaceful parliamentary way?

This question has been clear, and it was not necessary for
comrade Khurshchev to confuse it in the 20th Congress, and,
do so in such a way as to please the opportunists. Why was
it necessary to make all those parodies of Lenin's clear theses
and of the lessons of the October Socialist Revolution? The
Party of Labour of Albania is quite clear about and does not
shift from Lenin's teachings on this matter. So far, no people,
no proletariat and no communist or workers' party has assumed
power without bloodshed and without violence.

It is incorrect for some comrades to claim that they as-
sumed power without bloodshed, for they forget that the glo-
rious Soviet Army poured out rivers of blood for them during
the Second World War.

Our Party thinks that, in this matter, we should be pre-
pared for both eventualities, and we should be well pre-
pared, especially, for taking power by violence, for if we are
well prepared for this, the other possibility has more
chance of success. The bourgeoisie may allow you sing
psalms, but then it deals you a fascist blow on the head and
chokes you, because you have not trained the necessary
cadres to attack, nor done illegal work, you have not pre-
pared a place where you can protect yourself and still work,
nor the means with which to fight. We should forestall this
tragic eventuality.

The Party of Labour of Albanin is and will be for peace
and peaceful coexistence and will fight for them in the Mar-

xist-Leninist way, as Lenin taught us, and on the basis of the
Moscow Declaration. It has been, is, and will be striving ac-
tively for general disarmament. On no occasion, not for one
moment, will the Party of Labour of Albania cease waging
a political and ideological struggle against the activities of
the imperialists and capitalists and against bourgeois ideolo-
gy. It will not cease waging a stern, uninterrupted, and un-
compromising struggle against modern revisionism, and, in
particular, against Yugoslav Titoite revisionism. There may
be comrades who reproach us Albanians with being stub-
born, hot-headed, sectarian, dogmatic, and whatever you like,
but we reject all these false accusations and tell them that
we do not deviate from these positions, for they are Marxist-
Leninist positions.

They say that we are in favour of war and against co-
existence. Comrade Kozlov has even put to us, Albanians, this
alternative: either coexistence, as he conceives it, or an atomic
bomb from the imperialists, which would turn Albania to
ashes and leave no Albanian alive. Until now, no representa-
tive of US imperialism has made such atomic threat against
the Albanian people. But here it is, and from a Member of the
Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist
Party of the Soviet Union, and to whom? To a small help-
country, to a people who have fought through centuries
against countless savage enemies and who have never bent
the knee, to a small country and to a people who have fought
with unprecedented heroism against the Hitlerites and Italian
fascists, to a party which stands loyal and consistent to the
end to Marxism-Leninism. But, comrade Frof Kozlov, you have
got the wrong address. You cannot frighten us into submit-
ting to your mistaken wishes, and we never confuse the glo-
rious Party of Lenin with you, who behave so badly, with
such shamelessness, towards the Albanian people and to-
wards the Party of Labour of Albania. The Party of Labour of
Albania will strive for, and support, all the correct and peace-
ful proposals of the Soviet Union and other countries of the
socialist camp, as well as of other peace-loving countries.

The Party of Labour of Albania will exert all its strength,
use all its rights and carry out all its obligations, to strengthen
the unity of the socialist camp, a Marxist-Leninist unity. It
is absurd to think that small socialist Albania wants to break
away and live outside the socialist camp, outside our
fraternity of socialist peoples. Albania is indebted to no one for
its pressure within the ranks of the socialist camp; the Alba-
nian people themselves and the Party of Labour of Alba-
nia have placed it there with their blood and sweat, their
work, their sacrifices, with the system of government which
they have established and with the Marxist-Leninist line they
pursue. But let no one even think that, because Albania is
a small country, because the Party of Labour of Albania is a
small party, it should do what some one else says when it
is convinced that that someone is mistaken.

As I said earlier, the Party of Labour of Albania thinks
that our socialist camp, which has one common aim, which
is guided by Marxism-Leninism, should also have its own
strategy and tactics, and these should be worked out together
by our parties and states of the socialist camp. Within the
ranks of our camp we have set up certain forms of organiza-
tion of work, but the truth is that these have remained some-
what formal, or to put it better, they do not function in a
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collective way, for instance, the organs of the Warsaw Treaty and the Council for Mutual Economic Aid. Let me make it quite clear. This is not a question of whether we, too, should be consulted or not. Of course, no one denies us the right to be consulted, but we should hold meetings for consultation. We raise this problem on principle and say that these forms of organization should function at regular intervals, problems should be taken up for discussion, decisions should be adopted, and there should be a check-up on the implementation of these decisions.

The development and further strengthening of the economies of our socialist countries has been and always is the main concern of our parties and governments, and constitutes one of the decisive factors of the unconquerable strength of the socialist camp.

The construction of socialism and communism is proceeding at a rapid rate in our countries. This is due to the great efforts of our peoples and to the reciprocal aid they render one another.

So far, the People's Republic of Albania has given economic aid to no one, first, because we are poor, and second, because no one stands in need of our economic aid. But within proper norms, we have made and are making every effort to give the countries which are our friends and brothers some little help through our exports. We have been aided by our friends, first and foremost by the Soviet Union...

The Party of Labour and the Government of the People's Republic of Albania have utilized this aid of the Soviet Union and the other people's democracies as well as they could to the best advantage of our people. Our people are forever grateful to the Soviet people, and to the peoples of the people's democracies for this aid. We have considered, considered, and will consider this aid not as charity but as fraternal, internationalist aid.

Our people, who have been in dire poverty, who have fought with heroism, who have been murdered and burnt out, had a duty to seek the aid of their friends and brothers bigger and economically better off than they. And it was and still is the internationalist duty of their friends to give this aid. Therefore, it is necessary to reject any sinister and anti-Marxist view that any one may hold about the nature and purpose of this aid. Economic pressures on the Party of Labour of Albania, on the Albanian government, and on our people will never be of any avail.

I wish to propose here that the aid of the economically stronger countries for the economically weaker ones, such as ours, should be greater. The Albanian people have no intention of folding their arms and opening their mouths to be fed by others. That is not their custom. Nor do our people expect the standard of living in our country to be raised at once to the standard of living in many other countries of people's democracy, but greater aid should be given our country to further develop its productive forces. We think that the economically stronger countries of the socialist camp should accord credits also to neutral capitalist countries and to peoples recently liberated from colonialism, provided the leaders of these capitalist countries are opposed to imperialism, support the peaceful policy of the socialist camp, and do not hinder or oppose the legitimate struggle of the revolutionary forces, but first of all, the needs of the countries of the socialist camp should be looked into more carefully and be fulfilled. Of course, India stands in need of iron and steel, but socialist Albania, stands in greater and more urgent need of them. Egypt needs irrigation and electric power, but socialist Albania has greater and more urgent need for them.

On many political issues of first rate importance, our socialist camp has held and holds identical views. But, since collective consultations have not been held regularly, on many occasions it has been noted that states from our socialist camp take political initiatives (not that we are opposed in principle to taking initiatives), which very often affect other states of the socialist camp as well. Some of these initiatives are not correct, especially when they are not taken collectively by the members of the Warsaw Treaty.

An initiative of this kind is that of the Bulgarian government which, with total disregard for Albania, informed the Greek government that the Balkan countries of people's democracy agree to disarm if the Greek government is prepared to do so, too. From our point of view, this initiative was wrong, for, even if the Greek government had endorsed it, the Albanian government would not have accepted it. Albania is in agreement with the Soviet proposal made by Nikolai Khruschev in May, 1959, but not with the Bulgarian proposal, which wants the Balkan countries to disarm, while leaving Italy unaffected. Or have the Bulgarian comrades forgotten that bourgeois and fascist Italy has attacked Albania a number of times during this century? On the other hand, can it be permitted that without any consultation at all with the Albanian government, with which they are bound by a defensive treaty, the Bulgarian comrades should propose a treaty of friendship and non-aggression to the Greek government, at a time when Greece maintains a state of war with Albania and is making territorial claims against our country? It seems to us that it is dangerous to take such unilateral actions.

From this correct and legitimate opposition of ours, perhaps the Bulgarian comrades may have arrived at the con-
clusion that we Albanians do not properly understand co-
existence, that we want war, and so forth. These views are
eroneous.

Similar gestures have been made also by the Polish
comrades at the United Nations, when comrade Gomulka
stated in unilateral way at the General Assembly of the
United Nations Organization, that Poland proposes that the
status quo on the stationing of military forces in the world
should be preserved, and concretely, that no more military
to be is, but by whom and where? All the NATO
members including Italy, West Germany and Greece have
been equipped with missiles. Not to give the secret of the
atomic bomb, to whom? Britain, France, and West Germany,
have it. It is clear that a proposal of this kind will oblige
us, the countries of people’s democracy, not to install
miles, or any other country of the socialist camp, except the
Soviet Union, not to have the atomic bomb.

We pose the question, why should communist China not
have the atomic bomb? We think that China should have
it, and when it has the bomb and missiles, then we shall
see in what terms US Imperialism will speak, we shall see
whether they will continue to deny China its rights in the
international arena, we shall see whether the US imperialists
will dare brandish their weapons as they are doing at pre-
sent.

Some one may pose the question: will China win its rights
over the United States of America, by possessing and drop-
ning the bomb? No, China will never use the bomb unless we
are attacked by those who have aggression and war in their
very blood. If the Soviet Union did not possess the bomb, the
imperialists would have been talking in a different tone.
We will never attack with the bomb, we are opposed to war,
but we are ready to destroy the bomb, but we must keep it
defend ourselves. ‘It is fear that guards the vineyard’, our
people say. The imperialists should be afraid of us, and ter-
fibly afraid at that.

Based on Stalinism-Leninism and on the Moscow Declara-
tions and the Manifesto on peace, the Party of Labour of
Albania has pursued a correct Marxist-Leninist line in mat-
ers of international policy and in the important problems
of socialist construction. In international relations, the line of
our Party has been in accord with the policy of the socialist
camp...

The major problems of the time have concerned both
the Party of Labour of Albania and our small people. Our
People’s Republic has been and is surrounded geographical-
ly by capitalist states and the Yugoslav revisionists. We
have had to be highly vigilant and tie down people and
considerable funds to defend our borders, to defend the
freedom and sovereignty of our country from the innum-
erable attempts of the imperialists and their satellites and
lackeys.

We are a small country and a small people who have
suffered to an extraordinary degree, but who have also fought
very hard. We are not indebted to any one for the freedom
we enjoy today, for we have won it with our own blood.
We are continually aware day and night, of our imperialist
enemies, of their manoeuvres against the socialist camp and
our country in particular, therefore we have never had, nor
will ever entertain, illusions about their changing their nature
and their intentions towards peoples, our camp, and towards
socialist Albania in particular...

US and British imperialists have accused us Albanians of
being ‘savage and warlike’. This is understandable, for
the Albanian people have dealt telling blows at their repe-
tated attempts to put us under bondage and have smashed
the hands of their agents who have conspired against the
Party of Labour of Albania and our regime of people’s dem-
ocracy...

We do not think we need prove at this meeting that war
is alien to the socialist countries, to our Marxist-Leninist
parties, but the question remains: why do the imperialists
and their agents accuse China and Albania of being ‘warlike’,
and allegedly opposed to peaceful coexistence?

Let us take the question of Albania. Against whom would
Albania make war and why? It would be ridiculous to waste
our time in answering this question. But those who accuse
us of this are trying to cover up their aggressive intentions
...towards Albania.

Rankovich wants us to turn our borders into a road-
house with two gates through which Yugoslav, Italian, and
Greek agents and weapons could go in and out freely, with-
out visas, in order to bring us ‘culture of cut-throats’,
so that YIo may realize his dream of turning Albania into
the 7th Republic of Yugoslavia, so that the reactionary Ita-
lian bourgesie may put into action for the third time their
predatory intentions towards Albania, or so that the Greek
monarcho-fascists may realize their crazy dream of grabbing
southern Albania. Because we have not permitted and will
never permit such a thing, we are ‘war-mongers’. They
know very well that if they violate our borders they will
have to fight us and the whole socialist camp.

Their aim, therefore, has been and is to isolate us from
the camp and from our friends, to accuse us of being ‘war-
mongers and savage’ because we do not open our borders
for them to graze freely, to accuse us of being, allegedly,
opposed to peaceful coexistence. But the irony of fate is that
there are comrades who believe this game of the revisionists
and these slanders against the Party of Labour of Albania.
Of course, we are opposed to any coexistence for the sake
of which we Albanians should make territorial and political
concessions to Sophocles Venizelos. No, the time has gone
forever when the territory of Albania could be treated as a
token to be bartered. We are opposed to such a coexistence
with the Yugoslav state which implies that we should give
up our ideological and political struggle against the Yugo-
slav revisionists, these agents of international imperialism,
these traitors to Marxism-Leninism. We are opposed to such
coexistence with the British or the US imperialists for the
sake of which we should recognize, as they demand, the
old political, diplomatic and trading concessions King Zog’s
regime had granted them.

As a general conclusion, the Party of Labour of Alba-
nia is absolutely convinced that our great cause, the victory

(Supplement no. 6/75)
SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE MEETING OF 81 COMMUNIST AND WORKERS’ PARTIES IN MOSCOW

November 16, 1960

of socialism and peace, will triumph. Through determined action, the combined forces of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union, of the international communist and workers’ movement, and of all the peace-loving peoples have the possibility of compelling the imperialists to accept peaceful coexistence, of averting a world war. But, at the same time, we will intensify our revolutionary vigilance more and more so that the enemy may never take us by surprise. We are convinced that victory will be ours in this noble struggle for world peace and socialism. The Albanian people and the Party of Labour of Albania, just as heretofore, will spare nothing to assist the triumph of our common cause with all their might. As always, we shall march forward in steel-like unity with the whole socialist camp, with the Soviet Union, and with the whole international communist and workers’ movement.

Dear Comrades,

The unity of the international communist and workers’ movement is the decisive factor in realizing the noble aims of the triumph of peace, democracy, national independence and socialism. This question is especially emphasized in the 1957 Moscow Declaration and the draft-statement prepared for our meeting. In the 1957 Declaration it is stressed that,

"... the communist and workers’ parties bear an exceptionally serious historic responsibility for the fate of the world socialist system and the international communist movement. The communist and workers’ parties taking part in the meeting declare that they will spare no effort to strengthen their unity and comradely collaboration in the interests of the further unity of the family of socialist states, in the interest of the international workers’ movement, in the interests of the cause of peace and socialism."

It must be said that, especially in recent times, in the international communist movement and in the relations among certain parties, profound ideological and political disagreements have arisen, the deepening of which can bring nothing but damage to our great cause. Therefore, the Party of Labour of Albania thinks that, in order to go forward together towards fresh victories, it is necessary to condemn the mistakes and negative manifestations which have appeared so far, and to correct them.

We want to refer here to the Bucharest Meeting, at which our Party, as you know, refrained from expressing its opinion concerning the differences which have arisen between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, but reserved the right to do so at this meeting of the representatives of the communist and workers’ parties. At that time, the Party of Labour of Albania was accused by the Soviet comrades, and by some comrades of the other fraternal parties, of everything imaginable, but no one took the trouble to think for a moment why this party maintained such a stand against all this current, why this party, which has stood loyal, to the end to Marxism-Leninism and the Moscow Declaration, is unexpectedly accused of allegedly opposing Marxism-Leninism and the Moscow Declaration, why this party, so closely bound to the Soviet Union and to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, suddenly comes out in opposition to the leadership of the Soviet Union.

Now that all the comrades have in their hands both the Soviet information material as well as that of the Communist Party of China, let them reflect on it themselves. We have read and studied both the Soviet and the Chinese materials, we have discussed them carefully with the party activists, and come to this meeting with the unanimous view of our whole Party.

As we all know, on June 24 this year, on the occasion of the 3rd Congress of the Romanian Workers’ Party, the Bucharest Meeting was organized unexpectedly, and without any previous warning, at least as far as our Party was concerned, on the initiative of the comrades of the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Instead of exchanging opinions and setting the date for this meeting we are holding today, which was agreed upon by the letters of June 2 and 25, it took up another topic, namely, the ideological and political accusation directed against the Communist Party of China, on the basis of the «Soviet information» material. On the basis of this material, entirely unknown, up to a few hours before the meeting of the conference, the delegates of the fraternal communist and workers’ parties were supposed to pronounce themselves in favour of the views of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, at a time when they had come to Bucharest for another purpose and had no mandate (at least as regards the delegation of our Party), from their parties to discuss, let alone decide, such an important issue of international communism. Nor could a serious discussion be thought of about this material, which contained such gross accusations against another Marxist-Leninist party, when not only the delegates, but especially the leaderships of the communist and workers’ parties were not allowed to study it from all angles, and without allowing the necessary time to the accused party to submit its views in all the forms which the accusing party
had used. The fact is that the overriding concern of the Soviet leadership was to have its accusation against the Communist Party of China, passed over quickly, and to have the Communist Party of China condemned at all costs.

This was the concern of comrade Khrushchev and other Soviet comrades in Bucharest, and not at all the international political issues worrying our camp and the world as a whole after the failure of the summit conference in Paris.

Our Party would have been in full agreement with an international meeting of communist and workers' parties, with whatever other meeting of whatever agenda that might be set, provided that these meetings were in order, had the approval of all the parties, had a clear agenda set in advance, provided the communist and workers' parties were given the necessary materials and allowed enough time to study these materials so that they could prepare themselves and receive the approval of the political bureaus of their parties and, if necessary of the plenums of their central committees, on the decisions that might eventually be taken at these conferences. The meetings should be conducted according to the norms governing the relations among communist and workers' parties. They should be conducted in complete equality among parties, in a comradely communist and internationalist spirit, and with lofty communist morality.

The Bucharest Meeting did not comply with these norms, therefore although it took place in our Party denounced and denounced that Meeting as out of order and in violation of the Leninist norms.

We think that the Bucharest Meeting did a great disservice to the cause of the International communist movement, to the cause of the international solidarity of the workers, to the cause of strengthening the unity of the socialist camp, to the cause of setting a Marxist-Leninist example in settling ideological, political, and organizational disputes that may arise within the ranks of the communist and workers' parties and which damage Marxism-Leninism. The blame for this falls on the comrades of the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union who organized this Conference, who conceived those forms, and who applied those non-Marxist norms in this matter.

The aim was to have the Communist Party of China condemned by the international communist movement for faults and mistakes which do not exist and are baseless. The Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania is fully convinced of this on the basis of its study of the facts and the Soviet and Chinese materials which the Party of Labour of Albania now has at its disposal, based on a detailed analysis which the Party of Labour of Albania has made of the international situation and of the official stands of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China.

The entire Party of Labour of Albania holds the unanimous view that the Soviet comrades made a grave mistake in Bucharest. They unjustly condemned the Communist Party of China for having, allegedly, deviated from Marxism-Leninism, for having, allegedly, violated and abandoned the 1957 Moscow Declaration. They have accused the Communist Party of China of being «dogmatic», «sectarian», of being «in favour of war», of being «opposed to peaceful coexistence», of «wanting a privileged position in the camp and in the international communist movement», etc.

The Soviet comrades made a grave mistake also when, taking advantage of the great love and trust which the communists have for the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, they tried to impose their incorrect views towards the Communist Party of China on the other communist and workers' parties.

Right from the start, when the Soviet comrades began their feverish and impermissible work of inveigling the comrades of our delegation in Bucharest, it became clear to the Party of Labour of Albania, that the Soviet comrades, resorting to groundless arguments and pressure, wished to lead the delegation of the Party of Labour of Albania into the trap they had prepared, to bring them into line with the distorted views of the Soviet comrades.

What was of importance to comrade Khrushchev (and comrade Antropov said as much to comrade Iyani Kapo), was whether we would «line up with Soviet side or not».

Comrade Khrushchev expressed this opinion in other ways, also, in his interjections against our Party at the Bucharest Meeting. This was corroborated also by many unjust and unfriendly gestures of the comrades of the Soviet leadership and the employees of the Soviet Embassy in Tirana after the Bucharest Meeting, to which I shall refer later. What was important for the comrades of the Soviet leadership was not the views of a Marxist-Leninist party such as ours, but only that we should maintain the same attitude in Bucharest as the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

No warning was given to the Party of Labour of Albania by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which organized the Bucharest Meeting, that, on the occasion of the Congress of the Romanian Workers' Party, accusations would be brought against the Communist Party of China for alleged grave mistakes of line. This came as a complete surprise to the Party of Labour of Albania. While now we hear that, with the exception of the Party of Labour of Albania, the Communist Party of China, the Korean Workers' Party, the Vietnam Workers' Party, other parties of the camp were cognizant of the fact that a conference would be organized in Bucharest to accuse China. If this is so, then it is very clear that the question becomes very much more serious and assumes the form of a fraction of an international character.

Nevertheless, our Party was not taken unawares and it did not lack vigilance, and this happened because it always observes the Leninist norms in relations with the other parties, because it has great Marxist respect for the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist Party of China, and all the other communist and workers' parties, because it respects the feeling of equality among parties, an equality which the other parties should respect towards the Party of Labour of Albania, regardless of its being small in numbers.

Right from the beginning, our Party saw that these norms were being violated at the Bucharest Meeting, and that is why it took the stand you all know, a stand which it considered and still considers as the only correct one to maintain towards the events as they developed.
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Some leaders of fraternal parties dubbed us as «neutralists», some others reproached us with «departing from the correct Marxist-Leninist line», and these leaders went so far as to try to discredit us before their own parties. We scornfully reject all these things because they are slanders, they are dishonest, and they are incompatible with communist morality.

We pose the questions to those who undertook such despicable acts against the Party of Labour of Albania: has a party the right to express its opinions freely on matters as how it sees them? What opinion did the Party of Labour of Albania express in Bucharest? We expressed our loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, and this is corroborated by the entire life and struggle of the Party of Labour of Albania. We expressed our loyalty to the decisions of the 1957 Moscow Declaration and Manifesto on peace, and this is corroborated by the line consistently pursued by the Party of Labour of Albania. We expressed our loyalty to, and defended, the unity of the socialist camp, and this is corroborated by the whole struggle of the Party of Labour of Albania. We expressed our affection for, and loyalty to, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and to the Soviet peoples, and this is corroborated by the whole life of the Party of Labour of Albania. We did not agree to pass judgement on the «mistakes» of the Communist Party of China and, even less, to «condemn» the Communist Party of China without taking into account the views of the Communist Party of China on the charges raised against it in such a distorted, hastily, and anti-Marxist way. We counselled caution, coolheadedness and a comradely spirit in treating this matter so vital and exceptionally serious for international communism. This was the whole «crime» for which stones were thrown at us. But we think that the stones which were picked up to strike us fell back on the heads of those who threw them. The passage of time is confirming the correctness of the stand maintained by the Party of Labour of Albania.

Why were comrade Khrushchev and the other Soviet comrades in such a great hurry to accuse the Communist Party of China groundlessly and without facts? Is it permissible for communists and, especially, for the principal leaders of so great a party as the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, to perpetrate such an ugly act? Let them answer this question themselves, but the Party of Labour of Albania also has the full right to express its opinion on the matter.

The Party of Labour of Albania is of the opinion that the Bucharest Meeting was not only a great mistake but also a mistake which was deliberately aggravated. In no way should the Bucharest Meeting be left in oblivion but it should be severely condemned as a black stain in the international communist movement.

There is not the least doubt that the ideological differences have been and are grave, and that these have arisen and have been developed between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China. These should have been settled in due time and in Marxist-Leninist way between the two parties concerned.

According to the Chinese document, the Communist Party of China says that these differences of principle were raised by the Chinese comrades immediately following the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Some of these matters have been taken into consideration by the Soviet comrades, while others have been rejected.

The Party of Labour of Albania thinks that, if these differences could not be settled between the two parties concerned, a meeting should have been sought of the communist and workers' parties at which these matters could be brought up, discussed and a stand taken towards them. It is not right that these matters should have been left unsettled, and the blame for this must fall on the Soviet comrades who had knowledge of these differences but disregarded them, because they were dead certain of their line and its inviolability, and this, we think, is an idealist and metaphysical approach.

If the Soviet comrades were convinced of the correctness of their line and their tactics, why did they not organize such a meeting in due time and have these differences settled? Were the matters raised so trivial, for example, the condemnation of J.V. Stalin, the major question of the Hungarian counter-revolution, that of the ways of taking power, not to speak of many other very important problems that emerged later? No, they were not trivial at all. We all have our own views on these problems, because as communists we are all interested in them, because all our parties are responsible to their peoples, but they are responsible to international communism, as well.

In order to condemn the Communist Party of China for imaginary faults and sins, comrade Khrushchev and the other Soviet leaders were very concerned to present the case as if the differences existed between China and the whole international communist movement, but, when it came to problems like those I just mentioned, judgement on them has been passed by Khrushchev and the comrades around him alone, thinking that there was no need for them to be discussed collectively, at a meeting of the representatives of all the parties, although these were major problems of an international character.
The Hungarian counter-revolution occurred but matters were hushed up. Why this tactic of hushing things up when they are not to their advantage, while for things which are to their advantage the Soviet comrades not only call meetings like that of Bucharest, but do their utmost to force on others the view that “China is in opposition to the line of all the communist and workers’ parties of the world”? The Soviet comrades made a similar attempt towards us also. In August this year, the Soviet leadership sent a letter to our Party in which it proposed that, “with a view to preventing the spark of differences from flaring up”, the representatives of our two parties should meet so that our Party would align itself with the Soviet Union against the Communist Party of China, and that our two parties should present a united front at this present meeting. Of course, the Central Committee of our Party refused such a thing, and in its official reply described this as something quite unjust, a factional act directed against a third fraternal party, against the Communist Party of China. Of course, this correct principled stand of our Party was not to the liking of the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

There is no doubt that these matters are of first-rate importance. There is no doubt that they concern us all, but neither is there any doubt for the Party of Labour of Albania that the matters, as they were raised in Bucharest against China, were tendentious and aimed at condemning the Communist Party of China and isolating it from the whole international communist movement.

For the Party of Labour of Albania this was dreadful and unacceptable, not only because it was not convinced of the truth of these allegations, but also because it rightly suspected that a non-Marxist action was being organized against a great and glorious fraternal party like the Communist Party of China, that under the guise of an accusation of dogmatism against China, an attack was being launched against Marxism-Leninism.

At the meeting, the Communist Party of China was accused of many faults. This should have figured in the Communiqué. Why was it not done? If the accusations were well founded, why all this hesitation and why issue a communiqué which did not correspond to the purpose for which the meeting was called? Why was there no reference in it to the “great danger of dogmatism” allegedly threatening international communism?

No, comrades, the Bucharest Meeting cannot be justified. It was not based on principles. It was a biased one to achieve certain objectives, of which the main one, in the opinion of the Party of Labour of Albania, was, by accusing the Communist Party of China of dogmatism, to cover up some grave mistakes of line which the Soviet leading comrades have allowed themselves to make.

The Soviet comrades stood in need of the support of the other parties on this matter. Therefore, they bluntly tried to take them by surprise. That is how the Soviet comrades achieved half their aim and won the right to put forward the condemnation of China in these parties as the outcome of an “international conference of communism”. In the communist and workers’ parties, with the exception of the Party of Labour of Albania and certain other communist and workers’ parties, the question was raised of “the grave errors of policy committed by the Communist Party of China”, the “unanimous condemnation of China in Bucharest was reported, in an effort to create opinion in the parties and among the people in this direction. The Party of Labour of Albania was also condemned at some of these party meetings.

After the Bucharest Meeting the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania decided, and decided rightly, to discuss in the Party only the Communist, to tell the Party that there existed divergences of principle between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China which should be taken up and settled at the coming meeting which would be held in Moscow in November. And this was what was done.

But this stand of our Party did not please the leading comrades of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and we were very soon made aware of this. Immediately following the Bucharest Meeting, an unexpected, unprincipled attack was launched, and brutal intervention and all-round pressure was undertaken against our Party and its Central Committee. The attack was begun by comrades Khurschhev in Bucharest and was continued by comrade Koslov in Moscow. The comrades of our Political Bureau who happened to pass through Moscow were worked up with a view to turning them against the leadership of our Party, putting forward that the leadership of the Party of Labour of Albania had betrayed the friendship with the Soviet Union, that “the line pursued by the leadership of the Party of Labour of Albania is characterized by “signs”, that “Albania must decide to go either with the 200 millions (with the Soviet Union), or with the 450 millions (with People’s China), and finally that an isolated Albania is in danger, for it would take only one atomic bomb dropped by the Americans to wipe out Albania and all its population completely”, and other threats of the kind. It is absolutely clear that the aim was to sow discord in the leadership of our Party, to remove from the leadership of the Party of Labour of Albania those elements who, the Soviet leaders thought, stood in the way of their crooked and dishonest undertaking.

What came out of this divisive work was that Lidi Bulishova, ex-Member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, capitulated to the cajolery of the Soviet leaders, to their blackmail and intimidations, and took a stand in open opposition to the line of the Party.

The attempt of the Soviet comrades in their letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China to present this question as if the friends of the Soviet Union in Albania are being persecuted is a falsehood. Life-long friends of the Soviet peoples are the million and a half Albanians and the Party of Labour of Albania, which has forged and steel this friendship, tempered in blood, and not the various capitulators, splitters and deviationists.

But attempts to arouse doubts about the correct stand of our Party in Bucharest were not confined just to Moscow. They were made, with even more fervour, in Tirana by the employees of the Soviet Embassy headed by the Soviet Ambassador to Tirana himself.

As I said before, prior to the Bucharest Meeting, one could not imagine closer, more sincere, more fraternal relations than those between us and the Soviet comrades. We kept
nothing hidden from the Soviet comrades, neither party nor state secrets. This was the decision of our Central Committee. These relations reflected the Albanian people’s great love for, and loyalty to, the Soviet peoples, sentiments which our Party had tempered in blood.

Over these sacred sentiments of the Party of Labour of Albania and our people certain sickly elements, with the Soviet Ambassador at the head, trampled roughshod. Taking advantage of our friendly relations, taking advantage of the good faith of our cadres, they began feverishly and intensively to attack the Marxist-Leninist line of the Party of Labour of Albania, to split the Party, to create panic and confusion in its ranks, and to alienate the leadership from the Party. The Soviet Ambassador to Tirana went so far as to attempt to incite the generals of our army to raise the People’s Army against the leadership of the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian state. But the saw struck a nail, because the unity of our Party is steel-like. Our cadres, tempered in the National Liberation War, and in the bitter life and death struggle with the Yugoslav revisionists, defended their heroic Party in a Marxist way. They know very well how to draw the line between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union of Lenin and the splitters. And in fact they put these desirers in their place.

Nevertheless, the employees of the Soviet Embassy to Tirana, headed by the Ambassador, through impermissible anti-Marxist methods, managed to make the Chairman of the Control Commission of the Party of Labour of Albania, who 15 days earlier had expressed his solidarity with the line pursued by the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania in Bucharest, fall in the clutches of these intriguers and go completely off the rails of Marxism-Leninism, so that he came out in flagrant opposition to the line of the Party. It is clear that these deplorable efforts of these Soviet comrades were aimed at splitting the leadership of the Party of Labour of Albania, at alienating it from the mass of the Party. And this as a punishment for the «crime» we had committed in Bucharest, by having the courage to express our views freely, as we saw fit.

The functionaries of the Soviet Embassy to Tirana went even further. They turned to the Albanians who had studied in the Soviet Union with a view to inciting them against the Albanian leadership, thinking that they would be a contingent suitable to their crooked aims. But the Albanians, whether those who had completed their studies in the Soviet Union, or those still in the course of them, know that such base methods as those used by the employees of the Soviet Embassy to Tirana, are altogether alien to Marxism-Leninism. The Albanians are the sons and daughters of their own people, of their own Party. They are Marxist-Leninists and internationalists.

We could list many other examples, but so as not to take up too much time at this important meeting, I will mention only two other typical cases. The pressure on our Party continued even during the days when the commission was meeting, here in Moscow, to draw up the draft-statement which has been submitted to us, when the Soviet comrades told us that we should look ahead and not back. During those days in Moscow, the Member of the Central Committee and Minister of the Soviet Union, Marshal Malinovsky, launched an open attack on the Albanian people, on the Party of Labour of Albania, on the Albanian government, and on our leadership at an enlarged meeting of the Chiefs of Staff of the Warsaw Treaty countries. This unfriendly and public attack has much in common with the diversivist attack of the Soviet Ambassador to Tirana, who tried to incite our People’s Army against the leadership of our Party and our state. But, like the Soviet Ambassador, Marshal Malinovsky, too, is making a grave mistake. No one can achieve this aim, and even less that of breaking up the friendship of our people with the peoples of the Soviet Union. The just struggle of the Party of Labour of Albania against these subversive acts strengthens the sincere friendship of our people with the peoples of the Soviet Union. Nor can this friendship be broken up by the astonishing statements of Marshal Grechko, Commander-in-Chief of the Warsaw Treaty, who not only told our military delegation that it was difficult for him to meet the requirements of our army for some very essential armaments, for the supply of which contracts have been signed, but said bluntly, «You are in the Warsaw Treaty only for the time being», implying that Marshal Grechko seems to have decided to throw us out. But, fortunately, it is not up to the command Marshal to take such a decision.

In October this year, comrade Khrushchev declared solemnly to the Chinese comrades, «We shall treat Albania like Yugoslavia». We say this at this meeting of international communism so that all may see how far things have gone and what attitude is being maintained towards a small socialist country. What «crime» has the Party of Labour of Albania committed for our country to be treated like Tito’s Yugoslavia? Can it be said we have betrayed Marxism-Leninism as the Tito clique has done? Or did we break away from the socialist camp and hitch up with US imperialism as Yugoslav revisionists have done? No, and all the international communist movement, all the concrete political, ideological and economic activity of our Party and our state during the whole period of the National Liberation War, and during these 16 years since the liberation of the country, bear witness to this.
This is borne out also by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union itself, which, in its letter of August 13, 1960 to the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, stressed: "The relations between the Party of Labour of Albania and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, based on the principles of proletarian internationalism, have always been truly fraternal. The friendship between our parties and peoples has never, at any time, been obscured by any misunderstanding or deviation. The positions of the Party of Labour of Albania and that of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union upon all the most important issues of the international communist and workers' movement and of foreign policy have been identical. Of what then are we guilty? Our only 'crime' is that in Bucharest we did not agree that a fraternal communist party like the Communist Party of China should be unjustly condemned; our only 'crime' is that we had the courage to oppose openly, at an international communist meeting (and not in the market-place), the unjust action of comrade Khrushchev; our only 'crime' is that we are a small Party of a small and poor country, which, according to comrade Khrushchev, should merely applaud and approve but express no opinion of its own. But this is neither Marxist nor acceptable. Marxist-Leninism has granted us the right to have our say, and no one can take this from us either by means of political and economic pressure, or by means of threats and the names they might call us. On this occasion we would like to ask comrade Khrushchev why he did not make such a statement to us instead of to a representative of a third party. Or does comrade Khrushchev think that the Party of Labour of Albania has no views of its own, but has made common cause with the Communist Party of China in an unprincipled manner, and therefore, on matters pertaining to our Party, one can talk with the Chinese comrades? No, comrade Khrushchev, you continue to blur and hold very wrong opinions about our Party. The Party of Labour of Albania has its own views and will answer for them both to its own people as well as to the international communist and workers' movement.

We are obliged to inform this meeting that the Soviet leaders have, in fact, passed from threats of treating Albania in the same way as Titoite Yugoslavia, to concrete acts. This year our country has suffered many natural calamities. There was a big earthquake, the flood in October, and, especially the drought, which was terrible, with not a drop of rain for 120 days in succession. Nearly all the grain was lost. The people were threatened with starvation. The very limited reserves were consumed. Our government urgently sought to buy grain from the Soviet Union, explaining the very critical situation we were faced with. This happened after the Bucharest Meeting. We waited 45 days for a reply from the Soviet government while we had only 15 days bread for the people. After 45 days and after repeated official requests, instead of 50,000 tons, the Soviet government accorded us only 10,000 tons, that is, enough to last us 15 days, and this grain was to be delivered during the months of September and October. This was open pressure on our Party to submit to the wishes of the Soviet comrades.

During those critical days we got wise to many things. Did the Soviet Union, which sells grain to the whole world, not have, 50,000 tons to give the Albanian people, who are loyal brothers of the Soviet people, loyal to Marxism-Leninism and to the socialist camp, at a time when, through no fault of their own, they were threatened with starvation? Comrade Khrushchev had once said to us, 'Don't worry about grain, for all that you consume in a whole year is eaten by mice in our country'. The mice in the Soviet Union might eat, but the Albanian people could be left to die of starvation until the leadership of the Party of Labour of Albania submits to the will of the Soviet leaders. This is terrible, comrades, but it is true, if they hear about it, the Soviet people will never forgive them, for it is neither Marxist-Leninist, internationalist, nor comradely. Nor is it a friendly act not to accept our clearing for buying grain from the Soviet Union, but to oblige us to draw the limited gold reserve from our National Bank in order to buy maize for the people's bread from the Soviet Union.

These acts are linked with one another, they are not just accidental. Particularly in recent days, comrade Khrushchev's attacks on our Party of Labour have reached their climax. Comrade Khrushchev, on November 6, you declared that 'the Albanians behave towards us just like Tito'. You said to the Chinese comrades, 'We lost an Albania and you, Chinese, won an Albania'. And, finally, you declared that 'the Party of Labour of Albania is our weak link'.

What are all these monstrous accusations, this behaving like a 'dealer', towards our Party, our people, and a socialist country, which was allegedly lost and won as in a gamble? What appraisal is this of a fraternal party, which, according to you, is allegedly the weak link in the international communist movement? For us it is clear, and we understand only too well, that our correct and principled Marxist-Leninist stand, that our courage to disagree with you and condemn those acts of yours which are wrong, impel you to attack our Party, to resort to all kinds of pressure against it, to pronounce the most extreme monstrousities against our Party. But there is nothing comradely, nothing communist in this. You liken us to the Yugoslav revisionists. But everybody knows how our Party has fought and continues to fight the Yugoslav revisionists. It is not we who behave like the Yugoslavs but you, comrade Khrushchev, who are using methods alien to Marxism-Leninism against our Party. You consider Albania as a market commodity which can be gained by one or lost by another. There was a time when Albania was considered a medium of exchange, when others thought it depended on them whether Albania should or should not exist, but that time came to an end with the triumph of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism in our country. You are repeating the same thing when you arrive at the conclusion that you have 'lost' Albania, or that someone else has 'won' it, or that Albania is no longer a socialist country, as it turns out from the letter you handed to us on November 6, in which our country is not mentioned as a socialist country.

The fact that Albania is marching on the road of socialism and that it is a member of the socialist camp is not determined by you, comrade Khrushchev, it does not depend on your wishes. The Albanian people, headed by their Party of Labour, decided this through their struggle, and there is no force capable of turning them from that course.
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As regards your claim that our Party of Labour is the weakest link in the socialist camp and the international communist movement, we say that the twenty-year history of our Party, the heroic struggle of our people and our Party against the fascist invaders, and the sixteen years that have elapsed from the liberation of the country to this day, during which our Party and our people have faced up to all the storms, demonstrate the opposite. Surrounded by enemies like an island amidst the waves, the People’s Republic of Albania has courageously withstood all the assaults and provocations of the imperialists and their lackeys. Like a granite rock, it has kept and continues to keep aloft the banner of socialism behind the enemy lines. You, comrade Khrushchev, misled your hand against a small country and its Party, but we are convinced that the Soviet people, who shed their blood for the freedom of our people, too, and the great Party of Lenin will not be in agreement with this activity of yours. We have complete faith in Marxism-Leninism. We are certain that the fraternal parties which have sent their delegates to this meeting will examine and pass judgment on this issue with Marxist-Leninist justice.

Our Party has always called the Communist Party of the Soviet Union a mother Party, and has said this because it is the oldest Party, the glorious Party of the Bolsheviks, because of its universal experience, of its great maturity. But our Party has never accepted, and will never accept, that some Soviet leader may impose on it his views which it considers erroneous.

The Soviet leadership viewed this matter of principled importance utterly wrongly, in an idealistic and metaphysical way. It has become swell-headed over the colossal successes attained by the Soviet peoples and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and is violating Marxist-Leninist principles, considers itself infallible, considers every decision, every action, every word and gesture it makes, infallible and irrevocable. Others may err, others may be condemned, while it is above such reproach. “Our decisions are sacred, they are inviolable.” “We can make no concession, no compromise with, the Communist Party of China, the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union told our people. Then why did they call us together in Bucharest? Of course, to vote with our eyes closed for the views of the Soviet leader. Is this Marxist? Is this normal?

Is it permissible for one party to engage in subversive acts, to cause a split, to overthrow the leadership of another party or another state? Never! The Soviet leaders accused comrade Stalin of allegedly interfering in other parties, of imposing the views of the Bolshevik Party upon others. We can testify that at no time did comrade Stalin do such a thing towards us, towards the Albanian people and the Party of Labour of Albania. He always behaved as a great Marxist, as an outstanding internationalist, as a comrade, brother, and sincere friend of the Albanian people. In 1945, when our people were threatened with starvation, comrade Stalin diverted the ships loaded with grain destined for the Soviet people, who were also in a very bad way for food at that time, and sent the grain at once to the Albanian people. Whereas the present Soviet leaders permit themselves these ugly deeds.

Are such economic pressures permissible; is it permissible to threaten the Albanian people, as the Soviet leaders did after the Bucharest Meeting? In no way whatsoever... We know that the aid is an internationalist aid given our small people who, before the war, suffered great, all-round misery. The second World War burnt and devastated our country, though never: downing the Albanian people, who under the leadership of the glorious Party of Labour of Albania fought with great heroism and liberated themselves.

But why did the Soviet leadership change its attitude towards us after the Bucharest Meeting to the point that it let the Albanian people suffer from hunger? The Rumanian leadership did the same thing, too, when it refused to sell a single ear of wheat to the Albanian people on a clearing basis, at a time when Rumania was trading in grain with the capitalist countries, while we were obliged to buy maize from French farmers, paying in foreign currency.

Some months before the Bucharest Meeting, comrade Dej invited a delegation of our Party for the specific purpose of conducting talks on the future development of Albania. This was a laudable and Marxist concern on his part. Comrade Dej said to our Party, “We, the other countries of people’s democracy, should no longer discuss how much credit should be accorded to Albania, but we should decide to build in Albania such and such factories, to raise the means of production to a higher level, regardless of how many million rubles it will cost—that is of no importance.” Comrade Dej added, “We have talked this over with comrade Khrushchev, too, and we were in agreement.”

But then came the Bucharest Meeting and our Party maintained the stand you all know. The Rumanian comrades forgot what they had previously said and chose the course of leaving the Albanian people to suffer from hunger.

We have made these things officially known to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union before. We have not submitted them to public discussion, nor have we whispered them from ear to ear, but we are revealing them here for the first time in a party meeting, like this one here today. Why are we raising these matters?
We do so, proceeding from the desire to put an end to these negative manifestations which do not strengthen but weaken our unity. We proceed from the desire to strengthen the relations and Marxist-Leninist bonds among communist and workers' parties, among socialist states, rejecting any bad manifestation that has arisen up to date. We are optimistic, and we are fully convinced and have unshaken confidence that the Soviet and other comrades will understand our criticisms in the proper way. They are severe, but frank and sincere, and aim at strengthening our relations. Notwithstanding these unjust and harmful attitudes which are maintained towards us, but which we believe will be stopped in the future, our Party and our people will consolidate still further their unbounded love for, and loyalty to, the Soviet people, to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, to all the peoples and communist and workers' parties of the socialist camp, always on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist teachings.

To our Party friendship means justice and mutual respect on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. This is what the 1957 Moscow Declaration says, and what is stressed in the draft-statement which has been submitted to us. We declare in all earnestness that the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian people will be, as always, determined fighters for the strengthening of relations and unity in the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

The Albanian people will go through fire for their true friends. And these are not empty words of mine. I am expressing here the sentiments of our people and of our Party, and let no one ever think that we love the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for the sake of some one's beautiful eyes, or to please some individual.

Dear Comrades.

In the 1957 Moscow Declaration as well as in the draft-statement submitted to us, it is pointed out that revisionism constitutes the main danger in the international communist and workers' movement today. In the 1957 Moscow Declaration it is rightly stressed that the existence of bourgeois influence is the internal source of revisionism, while capitulation to the pressure of imperialism is its external source. Experience has fully corroborated that, disguised under pseudo-Marxist and pseudo-revolutionary slogans, modern revisionism has tried with every means to discredit our great doctrine, Marxism-Leninism, which it has dubbed as outdated and no longer responding to social development. Hiding behind the slogan of 'creative Marxism', of 'new conditions', the revisionists have striven, on the one hand, to deprive Marxism of its revolutionary spirit and to undermine the belief of the working class and the working people in socialism, and on the other hand, to use all the means in their power to prettify imperialism, describing it as moderate and peaceful. During the three years that have elapsed since the Moscow Conference, it has been fully confirmed that the modern revisionists are nothing but splitters of the communist movement and the socialist camp, loyal lackeys of imperialism, avowed enemies of socialism and of the working class.

Life itself has demonstrated that until now the standard-bearers of modern revisionism, its most aggressive and dan-
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Reformations of the Balkan Federation under the direction of the Belgrade Titoites, to hitch the Communist Parties of the Balkan countries to the chariot of the Yugoslav Communist Party, to place the partisan armies of the Balkan peoples under the Titoite Yugoslav staff. It was to this end that, in agreement with the British, they tried to set up the Balkan Staff and to place it, that is to say, to place the Balkan armies, under the direction of the Anglo-Americans. Our Party successfully resisted these diabolical schemes. And when the banner of liberation was hoisted in Tirana, the Titoite gang in Belgrade issued orders to their agents in Albania to discredit the success of the Communist Party of Albania and to organize a ‘putsch’ to overthrow the leadership of our Party, the leadership which had organized the Party, guided the National Liberation War, and led the Albanian people to victory. The first ‘putsch’ was organized by Tito through his secret agents within our Party, but the Communist Party of Albania smashed this plot of Tito’s.

The Belgrade plotters did not lay down their arms, and together with their agent in our Party, the traitor Koci Xoxe, continued the re-organization of their plot against new Albania in other forms, new forms. Their intention was to turn Albania into the 7th Republic of Yugoslavia.

At a time when our country had been devastated and laid waste and needed to be completely rebuilt, when our people were without food and shelter, but with high morale, when our people and army, weapons in hand, kept vigilant watch against the plots of reaction, organized by the Anglo-American military missions which were threatening new Albania with a new invasion, when a large part of the Albanian partisan army had crossed the border and had gone to the aid of the Yugoslav brothers, fighting shoulder to shoulder with them and together liberating Montenegro, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Kosovo and Metohia, and Macedonia, the Belgrade plotters were hatching up schemes to enslave Albania.

But our Party offered heroic resistance to these secret agents who posed as communists. When the Belgrade Trotskyites realized that they had lost their case, that our Party was smashing their plots, they tried their last card, namely, to invade Albania with their army, to overwhelm all resistance, to arrest the leaders of the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian state, and to proclaim Albania the 7th Republic of Yugoslavia. Our Party smashed this diabolical plan of theirs too. The aid and intervention of J.V. Stalin at these moments was decisive for our Party and for the freedom of the Albanian people.

Precisely at this time the Information Bureau exposed the Tito clique.

The Information Bureau brought about the defeat of the conspiracies of the Tito clique, not only in Albania, but also in the other people’s democracies. Posing as communists, the renegade and agent of imperialism, Tito, and his gang, tried to alienate the people’s democracies in the Balkans and Central Europe from the friendship and wartime alliance with the Soviet Union to destroy the communist and workers’ parties of our countries, and to turn our states into reserves of Anglo-American imperialism.

Who was there who did not know about and see in action the hostile schemes of imperialism and its loyal servant Tito? Everybody knew, everybody learned, and all unanimously approved the correct decisions of the Information Bureau. Everyone, without exception, approved the Resolutions of the Information Bureau, which, in our opinion, were and still are correct without exception.

Those who did not want to see and understand these acts of this gang had a second chance to do so in the Hungarian counter-revolution and in the unceasing plots against Albania. The wolf may change his coat but he remains a wolf. Tito and his gang may resort to trickery, may try to disguise themselves, but they are traitors, and agents of imperialism. They are the murderers of the heroic Yugoslav internationalist communists, and this is what they will be, and how they will act, until they are wiped out.

The Party of Labour of Albania considers the decisions taken against the renegade Tito group by the Information Bureau not as decisions taken by comrade Stalin personally, but as decisions taken by all the parties that took part in the Information Bureau. And not only by these parties alone, but also by the communist and workers’ parties which did not take part in it. Since this was a matter that concerned all the communist and workers’ parties, it also concerned the Party of Labour of Albania, which, having received and studied a copy of the letter comrades Stalin and Molotov had written to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, endorsed in full both the letter and the decisions of the Information Bureau.

Why, then, was the ‘change of attitude’ towards the Yugoslav revisionists, adopted by comrade Khrushchev and the Central Committee of the CPSU in 1955, not made an issue for consultation in the normal way with the other communist and workers’ parties, but was conceived and carried out in such hostile and unilateral way? This was a matter that concerned us all. The Yugoslav revisionists had either opposed Marxism-Leninism and the communist and workers’ parties of the world, or they had not; either they were wrong, or we were wrong in regard to them, and not just Stalin. This thing could not be resolved by comrade Khrushchev at his own discretion, and it is impermissible for him to try to do so, but in fact, that is what he did, and this change of attitude...
in the relations with the Yugoslav revisionists is connected
with his visit to Belgrade. This was a bomb-shell to the Party
of Labour of Albania which immediately opposed it categori-
cally. Before comrade Khrushchev set out for Belgrade in
May 1955, the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of
Albania sent a letter to the Central Committee of the Com-
munist Party of the Soviet Union in which it expressed the
opposition of our Party to his going to Belgrade, stressing
that the Yugoslav issue could not be settled in an unilateral
way, but that a meeting of the Information Bureau should
be called to which it asked that the Party of Labour of Alba-
nia also, should be invited. It is there that this matter
should have been settled after a correct and lengthy dis-
cussion.

Of course, formally we had no right to decide whether
comrade Khrushchev should or should not go to Belgrade,
and we backed down on this, but in essence we were right,
and time has confirmed that the Yugoslav issue should not be
settled in this precipitate way.

The slogan of «overriding interests» was launched, the 2nd
Resolution of the Information Bureau was speedily revoked,
the «epoch of reconciliation» with «the Yugoslav comrades»
began, the conspirators, wherever they were, were re-examined
and rehabilitated, and the «Yugoslav comrades» came off unscat-
tered, strutted like peacocks, trumpeted abroad that their «just
cause» had triumphed, that the «criminal Stalin» had triumphed
up all these things, and a situation was created in which
whenever refused to take this course was dubbed a «Stalialist»
who should be done away with.

Our Party refused to take such a conciliatory and oppor-
tunist course. It stood fast on the right Marxist-Leninist
ideological position, on the position of the ideological and
political struggle against the Yugoslav revisionists. The Party
of Labour of Albania remained unshaken in its views that the
Titoite group were traitors, renegades, Trotskyites, subver-
sionists, and agents of the US imperialists, that the Party of
Labour of Albania had not been mistaken about them.

The Party of Labour of Albania remained unshaken in its
view that comrade Stalin had made no mistake in this matter,
that, with their line of betrayal, the revisionists had attempted
to enslave Albania, to destroy the Party of Labour of Al-
bania, and through hatching up a number of international
plots with the Anglo-American imperialists, they had tried to
embroil Albania in international conflicts.

On the other hand, the Party of Labour of Albania was in
favour of establishing state relations of good neighbourliness,
trade and cultural relations with the Federal People's Repub-
lic of Yugoslavia, provided that the norms of peaceful coex-
istence between states of different regimes were observed,
because as far as the Party of Labour of Albania is concerned,
Titoite Yugoslavia has not been, is not, and never will be a
socialist country, as long as it is headed by a group of reneg-
gades and agents of imperialism.

No open or disguised attempt will make the Party of La-
bour of Albania waver from this correct stand. It was futile
for the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the So-
viet Union to try to persuade us, through comrade Stalin,
to eliminate the question of Koci Xoxe from the report sub-
mitted at our 3rd Congress in May 1956, because that would
mean negating our struggle and our principled stand.

In Albania, the Titoite saw struck a nail, or, as Tito says,
«Albania was a thorn in his foot», and, of course, the Titoite
traitor group continued their struggle against the Party of
Labour of Albania, thinking that they were exposing us by
dubbings as «Stalinists».

The Belgrade group did not confine their fight against us
to propaganda alone, but they continued their espionage,
subversion, plots, dispatching armed bands into our country,
more intensively than in 1948. These are all facts. But the
tragedy is that, while the Party of Labour of Albania, on the
one hand, was defending itself against the bitter and un-
cesing attacks by the Yugoslav revisionists, on the other
hand, its unwavering, principled, Marxist-Leninist stand was
in opposition to the conciliatory stand of the Soviet leaders
and of certain other communist and workers' parties towards
the Yugoslav revisionists.

At that time it was loudly proclaimed and written that
«Yugoslavia is a socialist country, and this is a fact», that «the
Yugoslav communists possess a great experience and great
merits», that «the Yugoslav experience is worthy of greater
interest and more attentive study», that «the period of dis-
putes and misunderstandings had not been caused by Yugosl-
avia», and that «great injustice had been done to it, and so
on and so forth. This, of course, gave heart to the Tito cli-
que, who thought they had won everything, except that there
still remained one «thorn in their foot» which they intended
to isolate and, later, liquidate. However, not only could our
Party not be isolated, much less liquidated, but on the con-
trary, time proved that the views of our Party were correct.

A great deal of pressure has been exerted on our Party
over this stand. The Albanian leaders were considered «hot-
blooded» and «stubborn», «exaggerating» matters with Yugos-
lavia, «unjustly harassing» the Yugoslavs, etc. The attack
against our Party in this direction has been led by comrade
Khrushchev.

So far, I have mentioned in brief what the Yugoslav revi-
sionists have done against our Party and our country during
and after the war, after 1946, but I shall dwell a little, also,
on the events prior to the Hungarian counter-revolution, which
is the work of Yugoslav agents. The Belgrade traitor group
began to organize a counter-revolution in Albania also. Had
our Party made the mistake of joining in the «conciliation
waltz» with the Yugoslav revisionists, as was prevented in
1955, then the people's democracy in Albania would have gone
down the drain. We, Albanians, would not have been here
in this hall, but would have been still fighting in our moun-
tains.

Firmly united by steel-like bonds, our Party and people
remained extremely vigilant and discovered and unmasked
Tito's spies in our Central Committee who worked in collu-
sion with the Yugoslav legation in Tirana. Tito sent word
to these traitors, saying that they had precipitated things,
that they should have waited for his orders. These spies and
traitors also wrote to comrade Khrushchev asking him to inter-
vene against the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of
Albania. These are documented facts. Tito's aim was that the
counter-revolution in Albania should be coordinated with that
of Hungary.

Our 3rd Congress was to be held following the 20th Con-
gress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The Yugo-
slav agents thought that the time had come to overthrow the
obstinate and Stalinist Albanian leadership, and organized a
plot which was discovered and crushed at the Party Confe-
rence of the city of Tima in April 1956. The plotters received
the stern punishment they reserved.

Tito’s other dangerous agents in Albania, Dali Ndreu and
Liri Gega, received orders from Tito to flee to Yugoslavia,
because ‘they were in danger’ and because activities against
the Party of Labour ‘had to be organized from Yugoslav
territory’. Our Party was fully aware of Tito’s activity and
secret orders. It was wide awake and caught the traitors right
on the border when they were trying to flee. The traitors
were brought to trial and were executed. All the Yugoslav
agents who were preparing the counter-revolution in Albania
were detected and wiped out. To our amazement, comrade
Khrushchev came out against us in defence of these traitors
and Yugoslav agents. He accused us of having shot the Yugo-
slav agent, the traitress Liri Gega, allegedly ‘when she was
pregnant, a thing which had not happened even at the time
of the Czar, and this had made a bad impression on world
opinion’. These were slanders trumped up by the Yugoslavs in
whom comrade Khrushchev had more faith than in us. We,
of course, denied all these insinuations made by comrade
Khrushchev.

But comrade Khrushchev’s incorrect, unprincipled, and hos-
tile stand towards our Party and its leadership did not stop
there. The other Yugoslav agent and traitor to the Party of
Labour of Albania and to the Albanian people, Panajot Plaku,
fled to Yugoslavia and placed himself in the service of the
Yugoslavs. He organized the hostile broadcasts from the so-
called ‘Socialist Albania’ radio station. This traitor wrote to
the renegade Tito and to comrade Khrushchev, asking the lat-
ter to use his authority to eliminate the leadership of Alba-
nia, headed by Enver Hoxha, under the pretext that we were
‘anti-Marxists and Stalinists’. Far from being indifferent at
this traitor’s letter, comrade Khrushchev expressed the opinion
that Panajot Plaku could return to Albania on condition that
we do nothing to him, or he could find political asylum in
the Soviet Union. We felt as if the walls of the Kremlin had
dropped on our heads, for we could never imagine that the
First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist
Party of the Soviet Union could go so far as to support Tito’s
agents and traitors to our Party against our Party and our
people.

But the culmination of our principled opposition over the
Yugoslav issue with comrade Khrushchev was reached when,
faced with our principled insistence in the exposure of the
Belgrade Titoite agency, he was so enraged that, during the
official talks between the two delegations in April 1957, he
said to us angrily, ‘We are breaking off the talks. We cannot
come to terms with you. You are seeking to lead us to the
road of Stalin’.

We were disgusted at such an unfriendly stand by com-
rade Khrushchev who wanted to break off the talks, which
would mean an aggravation of relations with the Albanian
Party and state over the question of the betrayers of Mar-
xism-Leninism, the Tito group. We could never have agreed
on this matter, but we, who had been accused of being hot-
blooded, kept calm, for we were convinced that we were in
the right, and not comrade Khrushchev, that the line we
were pursuing was the correct one, and not that of comrade
Khrushchev, that our line would be confirmed again by expe-
rience, as it has been confirmed many times over.

In our opinion, the counter-revolution in Hungary was
mainly the work of the Titoites. In Tito and the Belgrade re-
negades, the US imperialists had their best weapon to des-
troy the people’s democracy in Hungary.

After comrade Khrushchev’s visit to Belgrade in 1955, no
more was said about Tito’s subversive activity. The counter-
revolution in Hungary did not break out unexpectedly. It was
prepared, we may say, quite openly, and it would be futile
for any one to try to convince us that this counter-revolution
was prepared in great secrecy. This counter-revolution
was prepared by the agents of the Tito gang in collusion
with the traitor Imre Nagy, in collusion with the Hungarian
fascists, and all of them acted openly under the direction of
the Americans.

The scheme of the Titoites, who were the leaders, was
for Hungary to be detached from our socialist camp, to be
turned into a second Yugoslavia, to be linked with the NATO
alliance through Yugoslavia, Greece and Turkey, to receive
aid from the USA and, together with Yugoslavia and under
the direction of the imperialists, to continue the struggle
against the socialist camp.

The counterrevolutionaries worked openly in Hungary.
But is it that their activities attracted no attention? We
cannot understand how it was possible for Tito and the Hor-
thytie bands to have worked so freely in a fraternal country
of people’s democracy like Hungary where the party was in
power and the weapons of dictatorship were in its hands,
where the Soviet army was present.

We think that the stand taken by comrade Khrushchev and
the other Soviet comrades towards Hungary was not clear,
because the greatly mistaken views which they held about
the Belgrade gang did not allow them to see the situation
correctly.

The Soviet comrades trusted Imre Nagy, Tito’s man. We
do not say this for nothing or without good grounds. Before

Albania today
the counter-revolution broke out and when things were boiling up at the «Petőfi Club», I went through to Moscow and, in conversation with comrade Suslov, told him what I had seen on my way in Budapest. I told him, too, that revisionist Imre Nagy was raising his head and was organizing the counter-revolution at the «Petőfi Club». Comrade Suslov categorically opposed my view, and in order to prove to me that Imre Nagy was a good man, pulled out of his drawer Imre Nagy's fresh «self-criticism». Nevertheless, I told comrade Suslov that Imre Nagy was a traitor.

We wonder and pose the legitimate question: Why did comrade Khrushchev and the Soviet comrades go many times to Brioni to talk with the renegade Tito about the question of Hungary? If the Soviet comrades knew that the Titoites were preparing the counter-revolution in a country of our camp, is it permissible for the leaders of the Soviet Union to go and talk with an enemy who organizes plots and counter-revolutions in the socialist countries?

As a communist Party, as a state of people's democracy, as a member of the Warsaw Treaty and of the socialist camp, we must ask comrade Khrushchev and the Soviet comrades to tell us why so many meetings with Tito at Brioni in 1956, with this traitor to Marxism-Leninism, and not a single meeting with our countries, not a single meeting of the members of the Warsaw Treaty?

Whether to intervene or not to intervene with arms in Hungary, is, we think, not within the competence of one person alone; seeing that we have set up the Warsaw Treaty, we should decide jointly, because otherwise it is of no use to speak of alliance, of the collective spirit and collaboration among the parties. The Hungarian counter-revolution cost our camp blood, it cost Hungary and the Soviet Union blood.

Why was this bloodshed permitted and no steps taken to prevent it? We are of the opinion that no preliminary steps could be taken so long as comrade Khrushchev placed his trust in the organizer of the Hungarian counter-revolution, the traitor Tito, and the Soviet comrades so seriously underestimated the absolutely necessary regular meetings with their friends and allies, so long as they considered their unilateral decisions on matters that concern us all as the only correct ones, and so long as they attached no importance whatsoever to collective work and collective decisions.

The Party of Labour of Albania is not at all clear about this matter, how things developed and how decisions were taken. At a time when the Titoites are conducting talks at Brioni with the Soviet comrades, on the one hand, and feverishly organizing counter-revolutions in Hungary and Albania, on the other, the Soviet comrades make not the slightest effort to inform our leadership, at least as a matter of form since we are allies, on what is happening or on what measures they intend to take. But this is not a formal matter. The Soviet comrades know only too well what the Belgrade gang thought of Albania and what their aims were. In fact, not only is this stand of the Soviet comrades to be condemned, but it is also incomprehensible.

Hungary was a great lesson for us, in regard to what was done and in regard to the drama that was played on the stage and behind the scenes there. We believed that after the Hungarian counter-revolution the betrayal of Tito and his gang was more than clear. We know that many documents, that expose the barbarous activity of the Tito group in the Hungarian events, are kept locked away and are not brought to light. Why this should happen, we do not understand. What interests are hidden behind these documents which are not brought to light but are kept under lock and key? After the death of Stalin, the most trifling items were searched out to condemn him, while the documents that expose a vile traitor like Tito are locked away in a drawer.

But even after the Hungarian counter-revolution, the political and ideological fight against the Titoite gang, instead of becoming more intense, as Marxist-Leninism demands, was played down, leading to reconciliation, smiles, contacts, moderation, and almost to kisses. In fact, thanks to this opportunist attitude, the Titoites got out of this predicament, too.

The Party of Labour of Albania was opposed to the line followed by comrade Khrushchev and the other comrades towards the Yugoslav revisionists. Our Party's battle against the revisionists continued with even more fury. Since it was impossible to attack our correct line, many friends and comrades, particularly the Soviet and Bulgarian comrades, ridiculed us, had an ironical smile on their faces, and with their friendly contacts with the Titoites, isolated our people everywhere.

We have hoped that, after the 7th Titoite Congress, even the blind, let alone the Marxists, would see with whom they were dealing and what they should do. Unfortunately, things did not turn out that way. Not long after the 7th Titoite Congress, the exposure of revisionism was toned down. The Soviet theoretical publications spoke of every kind of revisionism, even of revisionism in Honolulu, but had very little to say about Yugoslav revisionism. This is like saying, «Don't see the wolf before your eyes but look for its tracks». Slogans were put out, «Don't speak any more of Tito and his group, for that will fan their vanity». «Don't speak any more of Tito and his group, for that would harm the Yugoslav people». «Don't speak about the Titoite renegades, for Tito makes use of what we say to mobilize the Yugoslav people against our camp», etc. Many parties adopted these slogans, but not our Party, and we think we acted correctly.

Such a situation was created that the press of friendly countries accepted articles from Albanian writers only provided they made no mention of the Yugoslav revisionists. Everywhere in the countries of people's democracy in Europe, except in Czechoslovakia, where, in general, the Czechoslovak comrades assessed our activities correctly7, our ambassadors were isolated in a roundabout way, because the diplomats of friendly countries preferred to converse with the Titoite diplomats, while they hated our diplomats and did not want even to see eyes on them.

And matters went so far that comrade Khrushchev made his coming to Albania in May, 1959, at the head of the Soviet Party and Government Delegation, conditional on the Yugoslav issue. The first thing comrade Khrushchev said, at the beginning of talks in Tirana, was to say to everyone at the meeting that he would not talk against the Yugoslav revisionists, a thing which no one could compel him to do, but such a statement was intended to show quite openly that he disagreed with the Party of Labour of Albania on this issue.
ENVER HOXHA

SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE MEETING OF 81 COMMUNIST AND WORKERS’ PARTIES IN MOSCOW November 16, 1960

We respected the wishes of our guest during the whole time he stayed in Albania, regardless of the fact that the Titoites press was highly elated and did not fail to write that Khrushchev had shut the mouths of the Albanians. This, in fact, responded to reality, but comrade Khrushchev was too far from convincing us on this matter, and the Titoites learned that quite clearly, because after our guest’s departure from our country, the Party of Labour of Albania no longer felt bound by the conditions put upon us by our guest and continued on its own Marxist-Leninist course.

In his talks with Vukanovich-Tempo, among other things, comrade Khrushchev has compared our stand, as far as its tone is concerned, with that of the Yugoslavs, and has said that he did not agree with the tone of the Albanians. We consider that comrade Khrushchev’s statement to Vukanovich-Tempo, to this enemy of Marxism-Leninism, the socialist camp, and Albania, is wrong and should be condemned. We hold that one should get what he deserves, and we, on our part, disagree with comrade Khrushchev’s conciliatory tone towards the revisionists. Our people say that facing the enemy you raise your voice, facing your loved one you speak in honeyed tones.

Some comrades have the mistaken idea that we maintain this attitude towards the Titoites because we allegedly want to be the banner-bearers of the fight against revisionism, or because we view this problem from a narrow angle, from a purely national angle, therefore, they claim, we have embarked on a “chauvinist course”, if not totally, at least on that of “narrow nationalism”. The Party of Labour of Albania has always viewed the question of Yugoslav revisionism through the prism of Marxism-Leninism, it has always viewed and fought it as the main danger to the international communist movement, as a danger to the unity of the socialist camp.

But while being internationalists, we are, at the same time, communists of a specific country, of Albania. We, Albanian communists, would not be called communists if we failed to defend the freedom of our sacred country consistently and resolutely from the plots and diversionist attacks of the revisionist Tito clique, which are aimed at the invasion of Albania, a fact which is already known to everyone. Could we Albanian communists possibly permit our country to become the prey of Tito, of the US imperialists, of the Greeks, or of the Bulgars? No, never!

Some others advise us not to speak against the Yugoslavs, saying, “Why are you afraid? You are defended by the Soviet Union”. We have told these comrades, and tell them again, that we are afraid neither of the Yugoslav Trotskyites nor of any one else. We have said, and say it again, that, as Marxist-Leninists, not for one moment should we diminish the struggle against the revisionists and imperialists until we wipe them out. Because, if the Soviet Union is to defend you, you must first defend yourself.

The Yugoslavs accuse us of allegedly “being chauvinists, of interfering in their internal affairs, and of demanding a rectification of the Albanian-Yugoslav borders”. A number of our friends think and imply that we Albanian communists swim in such waters. We tell our friends who think thus that they are grossly mistaken. We are not chauvinists, we have neither demanded nor demand rectification of borders. But what we demand, and will continually demand, from the Titoites, and we will expose them to the end for this, is that they give up perpetrating the crime of genocide against the Albanian population in Kosovo and Metohia, that they give up the white terror against the Albanians of Kosovo, that they give up driving the Albanians from their native soil and deporting them on mass to Turkey. We demand that the rights of the Albanian minority in Yugoslavia should be recognized according to the Constitution of the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia. Is this chauvinist or Marxist?

This is our attitude on these matters. But if the Titoites speak of peaceful coexistence, of peace, of good neighbourly relations, and on the other hand, organize plots, an army of mercenaries and fascists in Yugoslavia for the purpose of attacking our borders and of chopping up socialist Albania, together with the Greek monarcho-fascists, then, you must be certain that not only the Albanians in new Albania, but also the one million Albanians living under Titoite bondage will rise, arms in hand, to stay the hand of the criminals. And this is Marxist, and if anything happens, this is what will be done. The Party of Labour of Albania does not permit any one to play at politics with the rights of the Albanian people.

We do not interfere in the internal affairs of others, but when, as a result of the slackening of the fight against Yugoslav revisionism, things go so far that in a friendly country like Bulgaria a map of the Balkans is printed in which Albania is included within the boundaries of Federal Yugoslavia, we cannot remain silent. We are told that this happened due to a technical error of an employee, but why had this not happened before?

But this is not an isolated case. At a meeting in Sremska Mitrovica, the bandit Rankovich attacked Albania as usual, calling it a hell where barbed wire and the boots of the frontier guards reign supreme, and saying that the democracy of the Italian neo-fascists was more advanced than ours.
Rankovich's words would be of no significance to us, except that the Soviet and Bulgarian ambassadors to Belgrade, who attended this meeting, listened to these words with the greatest serenity, without making the slightest protest. We protested in a comradely way over this to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Bulgarian Communist Party.

In his letter of reply to the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, comrade Zhivkov dared to reject our protest and called the speech of the bandit Rankovich a positive one. We could never have imagined that the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party could describe as positive the speech of a bandit like Rankovich who so grossly insults socialist Albania, likening it to hell. We not only reject with contempt this impermissible insult by the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, but we are dead certain that the Bulgarian Communist Party and the heroic Bulgarian people would be utterly revoluted if they came to hear of this. Things will not go any too well if we allow such gross mistakes towards one another.

We can never, never, agree, with comrade Khrushchev, and we protested to him at the time, over the talks he had with Sophocles Venizelos in connection with the Greek minority in Albania. Comrade Khrushchev is well aware that the borders of Albania are inviolable and sacred, and that anyone who touches them is an aggressor. The Albanian people will fight to the last drop of their blood if any one touches their borders. Comrade Khrushchev was gravely mistaken when he told Venizelos that he had seen Greeks and Albanians working together as brothers in Korça. In Korça, there is no Greek minority whatsoever, but for centuries the Greeks have co-voted the Korça district as they do all Albania. There is a very small Greek minority in Gjirokastër. Comrade Khrushchev knows that they enjoy all the rights, use their own language, have their own schools, in addition to all the rights that the other Albanian citizens enjoy.

The claims of the Greeks, among them, those of Sophocles Venizelos, the son of Eleutherios Venizelos who murdered Albanians and put whole districts of Southern Albania to the torch, the most rabid Greek chauvinist and father of the idea of Great Greece, of the partitioning of Albania and annexing it under the slogan of autonomy, are very well known. Comrade Khrushchev is well aware of the attitude of the Party of Labour of Albania, the Albanian government and people on this question. Then, to fail to give Sophocles Venizelos the answer he deserves, to leave hopes and illusions and to say that he will transmit to the Albanian comrades the desires of a British agent, a chauvinist, this is unacceptable to us and deserves condemnation.

Comrade Khrushchev, we have given our reply to Sophocles Venizelos, and we believe you have learned of this through the press. We are not opposed to your politicizing with Sophocles Venizelos, but refrain from politicizing with our boundaries and our rights, for we have not allowed nor will we allow such a thing. And it is not as nationalists but as internationalists that we do this.

Some may consider these things I am telling you as out of place, as statements inappropriate to the level of this meeting. It would not have been hard for me to have put together a speech in an allegedly theoretical tone, to have spoken in generalizations and quotations, to have submitted a report in general terms in order to please you and pass my turn. But to the Party of Labour of Albania it seems that this is not the occasion. What I have said may appear to some as attacks, but these are criticisms which have followed their proper course, which have been made before, when and where necessary, within Leninist norms. But seeing that one error follows another, it would be a mistake to keep silent, because attitudes, deeds, and practice confirm, enrich, and create theory.

How quickly the Bucharest Meeting was organized and how quickly the Communist Party of China was condemned for "dogmatism!" But why has a conference to condemn revisionism not been organized at the same speed?

Has revisionism been totally exposed, as the Soviet comrades claim? No, in no way whatsoever! Revisionism has been and continues to be the main danger. Yugoslav revisionism has not been liquidated, and the way is being dealt with is leaving it a clear field for all forms of action.

And can it be said that there are no disturbing manifestations of modern revisionism in other parties? Anyone who says "no" is closing his eyes to this danger, and one fine day we will wake to see that unexpected things have happened to us. We are Marxists, and should analyze our work just as Lenin did and taught us to do. He was not afraid of mistakes, he looked them in the eye and corrected them. This is the way the Bolshevik Party was tempered and this is the way our parties have been tempered.

But what is happening in the ranks of our parties? What is happening in our camp since the 20th Congress? Comrade Suslov may feel optimistic, and he expressed this feeling at the October Committee meeting when he reproached the Head of the Delegation of the Party of Labour of Albania, Hyron Kapo, with pessimism in his view of events. We, Albanian communists, have not been pessimistic even at the blackest moments of the history of our party and people, and never shall be, but we shall always be realists.

Much has been said about our unity. This is essential, and we should fight to strengthen and temper it. But the fact is that on many important issues of principle we have no unity.

The Party of Labour of Albania is of the opinion that things should be re-examined in the light of a Marxist-Leninist analysis and the errors should be corrected. Let us take the question of the criticism of Stalin and his work. Our Party, as a Marxist-Leninist one, is fully aware that the cult of the individual, is an alien and dangerous manifestation for the parties and for the communist movement itself. Marxist parties should not only not permit the development of the cult of the individual, which hampers the activity of the masses, negates their role, is at variance with the development of the life of the party and with laws that govern it, but should also fight with might and main to uproot it when it begins to appear or has already appeared in a specific country. Looking at it from this angle, we fully agree that the cult of the individual of Stalin should be criticized as a dangerous manifestation in the life of the party. But in our opinion, the 20th Congress and, especially, comrade Khrushchev's secret report did not
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put the question of comrade Stalin correctly, in an objective Marxist-Leninist way.

Stalin was severely and unjustly condemned on this question by comrade Khrushchev and the 20th Congress. Comrade Stalin and his work does not belong to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union and the Soviet people alone, but to us all. Just as comrade Khrushchev said in Bucharest that the differences are not between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, but between the Communist Party of China and international communism, just as it pleases him to say that the decisions of the 20th and 21st Congresses were adopted by all the communist and workers’ parties, in the same way he should also be magnanimous and consistent in passing judgment on Stalin’s work so that the communist and workers’ parties of the world could adopt it in all conscience.

There cannot be two yardsticks, nor two measures of weight over this matter. Then, why was comrade Stalin condemned at the 20th Congress without prior consultation with the other communist and workers’ parties of the world? Why was this “anathema” pronounced upon Stalin all of a sudden to the communist and workers’ parties of the world, and why did many fraternal parties learn of it only when the militarist press published comrade Khrushchev’s secret report far and wide?

The condemnation of comrade Stalin was imposed on the communist and progressive world by comrade Khrushchev. What could our parties do under these circumstances, when unexpectedly, using the great authority of the Soviet Union, they were imposed on bloc on a matter of this kind?

The Party of Labour of Albania found itself in a great dilemma. It was not convinced, and will never be convinced, on the question of condemning comrade Stalin in that way and in those forms that comrade Khrushchev used. Our Party adopted, in general, the formulae of the 20th Congress on this matter, but nevertheless, it did not stick to the limitations set by the congress, nor did it yield to the blackmail and intimidation from outside our country.

The Party of Labour of Albania maintained a realistic stand on the question of Stalin. It was just and grateful towards this glorious Marxist against whom, while he was alive, there was no one among us “brave enough” to come out and criticize, but when he was dead a great deal of mud was thrown, thus creating an intolerable situation in which, the leading role of J.V. Stalin in a whole glorious epoch of the Soviet Union, when the first socialist state in the world was set up, when the Soviet Union waged strong successfully defeated the imperialist plots, crushed the Trotskyites, Bukharinistes, and the kulaks as a class, when the construction of heavy industry and collectivization triumphed, in a word, when the Soviet Union became a colossal power, in building socialism, when it fought the Second World War with legendary heroism and defeated fascism, a powerful socialist camp was set up and so on and so forth was negated.

The Party of Labour of Albania thinks that it is not right, normal, or Marxist, to blot out Stalin’s name and great work from all this epoch, as is being done at the present time. We should all defend the good and immortal work of Stalin. He who does not defend it is an opportunist and a coward.

As a person, and as the leader of the Bolshevik Communist Party, after Lenin’s death, comrade Stalin was, at the same time, the most prominent leader of international communism, helping in a very positive way and with great authority in consolidating and promoting the victories of communism throughout the world. All of comrade Stalin’s theoretical works are a fiery testimony of his loyalty to his teacher of genius, great Lenin, and Leninism.

Stalin fought for the rights of the working class and the working people in the whole world, he fought to the end, with great consistency, for the freedom of the peoples of our countries of people’s democracy.

Viewed from this angle alone, Stalin belongs to the entire communist world and not to the Soviet communists only, he belongs to all the workers of the world and not just to the Soviet workers.

Had comrade Khrushchev and the Soviet comrades viewed this matter in this spirit, the gross mistakes that were made would have been avoided. But they viewed the question of Stalin very simply and only from the internal aspect of the Soviet Union. However, in the opinion of the Party of Labour of Albania, even from this aspect, they viewed it in a one-sided way, seeing only his mistakes, almost completely putting aside his great activity, his major contribution to the strengthening of the Soviet Union, to the tempering of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, to the building of the economy of the Soviet Union, of its industry, its kolkhozian agriculture, to his leading the Soviet people to their great victory over German fascism.

Did Stalin make mistakes? In so long a period filled with heroism, trials, struggle, triumphs, not only Joseph Stalin personally, but also the leadership as a collective body, could not help making mistakes. Which is the party and who is the leader that can claim to have made no mistakes in their work? When the existing leadership of the Soviet Union is criticized, the comrades of the Soviet leadership advise us to look ahead and let bygones be bygones, they tell us to avoid potentialities, but when it comes to Stalin, they not only did not look ahead...
but they turned right round, completely backward, in order to track down only the weak spots in Stalin's work.

The cult of the individual of Stalin should, of course, be overcome. But can it be said, as it has been claimed, that Stalin himself was the sponsor of this cult of the individual? The cult of the individual should be overcome without fail, but was it necessary and was it right to go to such lengths as to point the finger at any one who mentioned Stalin's name, to look askance at any one who used a quotation from Stalin? With great speed and zeal certain persons smashed the statues of Stalin and changed the names of cities that had been called after him. But why go any further? At Bucharest, turning to the Chinese comrades, comrade Khrushchev said, «You are hanging on to a dead horse, come and get his bones, if you wish!» These references were to Stalin.

The Party of Labour of Albania declares solemnly that it is opposed to these acts and to these assessments of the work and person of J.V. Stalin.

Soviet comrades, why were these questions raised in this manner and in such a distorted form, while the possibilities existed for both Stalin's mistakes and those of the leadership to be treated properly, to be corrected, without creating that great shock in the hearts of the communists of the world, which only the sense of discipline and the authority of the Soviet Union prevented from bursting out?

Comrade Mikoyan has said that we dared not criticize comrade Stalin when he was alive because he would have cut off our heads. We are sure that comrade Khrushchev will not cut off our heads if we criticize him correctly.

After the 20th Congress, the events we know took place in Poland, the counter-revolution broke out in Hungary, attacks began on the Soviet system, upsets occurred in many communist and workers' parties of the world, and finally this which is going on now.

We pose the question: Why did these things occur in the international communist movement, in the ranks of our camp, after the 20th Congress? Or do these things happen because the leadership of the Party of Labour of Albania is sectarian, dogmatic, and pessimistic?

A thing of this kind should be of extraordinary concern to us, and we should look for the source of the malady and cure it. But, certainly, this sickness can not be cured by pitting the renegade Tito on the back, nor by putting in the Statement that modern revisionism has been completely defeated, as the Soviet comrades claim.

The authority of Leninism has been and is decisive. It should be established in such a way as to clean up erroneous views everywhere and in a radical way. There is no other way out for us communists. If there are things that must and should be said outright, just as they are, this should be done now, at this conference, before it is too late. Communists, we think, should sleep with a clear conscience. They should strive to consolidate their unity, but without keeping back their reservation, without nurturing feelings of favouritism and hatred. A communist says openly what he feels in his heart, and matters will be judged correctly.

There may be people who are not pleased with what our small Party is saying. Our small Party can be isolated, our country may be subjected to economic pressure in order to prove, allegedly, to our people that their leadership is no good, our Party may be and is being attacked, Mikhaïl Suslov equates the Party of Labour of Albania with the bourgeois parties and likens its leaders to Kerenskiy. But this does not intimidate us. We have learned some lessons. Ranokvich has not said worse things about the Party of Labour of Albania, Tito has called us Goebels, but again, we are Leninists, and they are Trotskyites, traitors, lackeys and agents of imperialism.

I wish to emphasize that the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian people have shown in practice how much they love, how much they respect the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and that when the Party of Labour of Albania criticizes the wrong-doings of certain Soviet leaders, that does not mean that our views and our attitude have changed. We, Albanians, as Marxists, take the courage to criticize these comrades, with our Marxist severity we tell them in a comradely way, we open our hearts, and tell them frankly what we think. Hypocrites we have never been nor will ever be.

In spite of the severity we show, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will hold us dear, regardless of errors we may make, but the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other communist and workers' parties of the world will not accuse us of lacking sincerity, of talking behind their backs, or of swearing allegiance to a hundred banners.

In conclusion, I wish to say a few words about the draft-statement submitted to us by the Editorial Commission. Our Delegation acquainted itself with this draft and scrutinized it carefully. In the new draft-statement many amendments have been made to the first variant submitted by the Soviet Delegation, which was taken as a basis for the work of the said Commission. With the amendments made to it, the new draft-statement has been considerably improved, many important ideas have been stressed, a number of theses have been formulated more correctly, and the overwhelming majority of the allusions against the Communist Party of China have been deleted.

At the meeting of this Commission, the Delegation of our Party offered many suggestions some of which were adopted. Although our Delegation was not in agreement that certain important matters of principle should remain in the drafted document, it agreed that this document should be submitted to this meeting, reserving its right to express its views once again on all the issues on which it disagreed. Above all, we think that those five issues which remain uncoordinated, should be settled so that we may draw up a document which has the unanimous approval of all.

We think that it is essential to make clear in the Statement the idea of Lenin expressed recently by comrade Maurice Thorez, as well as by comrade Suslov in his speech at the meeting of the Editorial Commission, that there can be an absolute guarantee of the prohibition of war only when socialism has triumphed throughout the world or, at least, in a number of other major imperialist countries. At the same time, that paragraph which refers to factionist or group activity in the international communist movement should be deleted, since this, as we have pointed out at the meeting of the Commission, too, does not help consolidate unity, on the contrary, it undermines it. We are also in favour of deleting the words referring to the overcoming of the dangerous conse-
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quences of the cult of the individual, or else, of adding the phrase «which occurred in a number of parties», a thing which corresponds better to the reality.

I do not want to take the time of this meeting over these questions and other opinions which we have on the draft-statement. Our Delegation will make its concrete remarks when the draft-statement itself is under discussion.

We shall do well and it will be salutary if we take the courage at this conference to look our mistakes in the face and treat the wounds, wherever they may be, but which are threatening to become aggravated and dangerous. We do not consider it an offense when comrades criticize us justly and on facts, but we never, never, never accept that, without any facts, they may call us «dogmatic», «sectarian», «narrow nationalists», simply because we fight with persistence against modern revisionism, and especially against Yugoslav revisionism. If anyone considers our struggle against revisionism as dogmatic or sectarian, we say to him, «Take off your revisionist spectacles, and you will see more clearly».

The Party of Labour of Albania thinks that this conference will remain an historic one, for it will be a conference in the tradition of the Leninist Conferences which the Bolshevik Party has organized in order to expose the distorted views and root them right out, in order to strengthen and steel the unity of our international communist and workers’ movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. Our Party of Labour will continue to strive with determination to strengthen our unity, our fraternal bonds, the joint activity of our communist and workers’ parties, for this is the guarantee of the triumph of the cause of peace and socialism...

1 The meeting of the 81 Communist and Workers’ Parties was held in Moscow from the 10th of November to the 1st of December 1960. It was held in an extremely complicated situation of the international communist movement as a result of the spread of modern revisionism and the disruptive anti-Marxist activity of the Soviet leadership with Khrushchev at the head.

The delegation of the PLA was headed by comrade Enver Hoxha. His speech at the Moscow Meeting was approved by the Plenum of the CC of the PLA on November 1st, 1960.

The activity of the delegation of the CC of the PLA at the Moscow Meeting was fully and unanimously approved by the Plenum of the CC of the PLA held from the 19th to the 20th of December 1960.

2 In December 1959, N. Khrushchev, head of the Soviet government, who was for the settlement of major international issues with the chiefs of imperialism by means of discussions only, made arrangements through diplomatic channels for the calling of a summit conference with the participation of the heads of the governments of the USSR, USA, Britain and France. This conference was to have been held in May 1960, but it could not be held because of the sabotage of the US imperialists and the vacillating adventurist stand of N. Khrushchev.

3 Through this proposal and the notes the Soviet government addressed on May 25, 1960 to the governments of Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Turkey, Greece, Italy, France, Britain and the USA, it proposed the creation of a zone free of nuclear weapons and missiles in the Balkans and the Adriatic region.

4 Several times in succession the CC of the PLA lodged protests with the CC of the CPSU over Khrushchev’s anti-Albanian acts; one of these was connected with the talks held by the Soviet Prime Minister with the reactionary Greek politician, Venizelos, whom he told that during his visit to Albania he had allegedly seen the Greek minority in Korça, thus sanctioning Greek chauvinist claims over Albanian territory.

5 In its letter on June 2, 1960, the CC of the CPSU proposed the holding of a meeting of the representatives of the communist and workers’ parties of the socialist camp towards the end of June in order to exchange views on the problems of the present international situation and define our future common line». But on June 7, 1960, in another letter, the CC of the CPSU expressed the opinion that this meeting should not be held in June but at a date to be set by a preliminary gathering of the representatives of the communist and workers’ parties of the socialist countries at the time of the 3rd Congress of Romanian Workers’ Party in Bucharest.

6 At the 2nd Plenum of the CC of the CPA held in Berat in November 1944, the delegate of the CC of the CPY hatched up a plot behind the scenes against the CPA with the participation of the anti-party elements, Seljilla Malešonka, Koçi Xoxi, and Pandi Kristo. The main objective of this conspiracy was to overthrow the leadership of the Party headed by comrade Enver Hoxha, and replace it with a leadership in the pay of the Yugoslavs.

7 This stand was maintained only in the beginning.

8 Head of the provisional counter-revolutionary government in Russia in 1917.
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REPORT DELIVERED AT MEETING OF THE PARTY OF ALBANIA

COMRADES,

THE CAUSE OF A CERTAIN DEGREE OF ORGANIZATIONAL FRAGMENTATION, AND THE FACT THAT OUR PARTY IS NOT YET CONSOLIDATED AS AN ORGANIZATION, SHOULD BE Sought IN THE GROUP SPIRIT WHICH STILL EXISTS, COMRADES, IN THE RESOLUTION OF THE MEETING OF ALL THE MAIN COMMUNIST GROUPS IN ALBANIA[7] YOU HAVE SEEN HOW THINGS STOOD IN REGARD TO COMMUNIST WORK IN OUR COUNTRY. YOU HAVE SEEN WHAT GREAT MISTAKES THESE GROUPS HAVE MADE. BECAUSE OF THESE ERRORS, ORDERLY WORK HAS STILL TO BE ESTABLISHED, AND WE HAVE NOT YET BEEN ABLE TO ADVANCE AS WE SHOULD.

Vacillation, liberalism, rivalry, an opportunist understanding of issues, etc., brought about a difficult situation for our movement. Everyone was striving for himself, each thinking that the essential thing was to form groups and to make themselves into a «party», by abusing the others, pointing out all their «mistakes», saying that the others were «to blame» for everything, while they alone were «absolutely right».

As you know, we have had many groups, such as those of Korçë[8], Shkodra[9], and the «Youth»[5] group, and we have also had two people, of the communist group of Korçë, who have set up a sort of small group. They have gathered around themselves a few people with whom they have some influence, and have kept them «for their own ends». These comrades are A. and M. There were also two Trotskyite groups: that of Fudë[6] and of Cëndro[7] and, finally, a group of liquidationist opportunist: the «Zjarri» group (we shall have more to say later about all the groups and individuals).

This was the situation in Albania before the Meeting of the main groups. Things could not go on like that. It was necessary to advance to something new, something more organized, to the Party.

We consider that we found the best and most appropriate means necessary in such a situation. We have used the system of unification from below up, under a single leadership of chosen from those people who were least infected with the old group spirit, and who have given the surest guarantees that they will carry out the line of the Party. We have set to work. But we should not forget that in the course of such a major job much of the old has managed to smuggle itself into our ranks, and many such harmful elements are still to be found today. Comrades accepted from various groups (who, in
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the time of the groups; may have been excellent «militants» and first-rate «agitators» for the cause of their own group) have shown themselves to be very weak as members of the Party. This has come about because these comrades were not known earlier, and thus there are many harmful and unstable elements to be found in our ranks. It seems that the spirit of groups is much stronger than we had thought at first. Many of these people have remained in Tirana, in particular where the situation with regard to the liquidation of the groups is least satisfactory, chiefly because it is here that all the representatives of the groups are to be found, including the most quarrelsome factionalists, those who find difficulty in reconciling themselves to the new organizational line. Their former situation is shaken, and the new situation has not entered their heads, and thus they carry on in the old spirit, outside the line of the Party, hindering its work and orderly development.

It is no secret to any communist that two trends have formed, one of which has agreed to support the Party and has vigorously set about the task, carrying out the line, while the other has reservations on all questions, criticizing (objectively it has tried to prevent the Party

work from developing systematically), putting spokes in the wheel and hindering the activity of the Party. These elements come from various groups, but mostly from the «Youth» group (particularly in Tirana), whose representatives, Anastas and Xhepi), even after promising to end their former activity and to act according to the directives of the Provisional Central Committee, still maintain their old connections.

Up to now we have been of the opinion that we should be patient with these comrades and convince them to submit to discipline and to understand the necessity that they carry out the directives to the letter. Now we should resort to another method, that of purging the Party of harmful elements, of all those who hinder the work and development: of the Party. In our opinion, we must resort to this method without fail, if we do not wish to fall into the old bog and if we want the Party to develop in a unity of discipline. An irreconcilable struggle should be waged against all deviations, whatever their origin and whatever group they come from. It is impermissible for us to slip into the position of the old social-democrats, who said: «Better an insecure peace than a good clash». A struggle must be waged also against all those who attack the work of the Party from outside (Z.)

1) The situation within the Party

A full understanding of the structure of our organization and how the Party is run has not yet been formed. This is due to many causes, and in particular to the fact that the comrades do not have a good understanding of Marxism-Leninism, that they do not appreciate the importance of linking theory with practice, or that they do not have a grasp of the most fundamental questions which must be grasped by a communist organizer, agitator, and propagandist. It is clear that things cannot go on like this. We must do a great deal of work in every field to raise the level of the comrades' understanding, so that they can make progress and become leaders. But we cannot possibly do this if we do not link theoretical work with practical work, because
«without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement»; that is to say, we have to follow the road pointed out by our immortal teacher, Lenin, towards the linking of theory with practice, linking theoretical development with practical work. It is impermissible for us to neglect the one on account of the other, to underestimate the one and give more importance to the other. In the one direction as well as in the other, our work is lagging. It is lagging painfully. Only those who refuse to look at themselves, who close their eyes to the truth, can fail to see this.

Lack of knowledge causes grave elementary errors in our work, and this is to some extent the reason why the spirit of groups still exists.

The best way to understand this question more clearly is to look back at the past, at history. We shall try to avoid going into detail, and will take up only the most important matters, which have an obvious influence on the development of problems in general. We should speak of these matters, even if only in general terms, although some of them belong to the past. In our opinion, we should continue to discuss them for a long time yet, until the spirit of groups is totally eradicated and we have fully mastered the work of the Party. But this must not be taken to mean that we should mark time forever while we dig up the past, or that we should point out only this or that mistake of a group, but we should draw from the experience of the past whatever is of value to us for the present and the future.

The lack of firm contacts and knowledge about organizational matters, the lack of unity, the lack of faith in the cause of struggle of the working class and the labouring people, the irresponsibility of comrades, distrust of, and failure to implement, the directives of the Comintern which were of historic importance, ambitions and egoism, the influence of the bourgeoisie, the tendency to lie low in order to conceal that one is a communist and many other such things have caused the old group rivalries to flame up to the point where their struggle has come out into the open.

This has led to individuals and groups working without plans, without check-up, without responsibility to anyone. Serious organizational errors have been committed, which will take a long time and a great effort to correct. The hang-overs from such organizational errors which, along with group factionalism include sectarianism and pettiness, prevent progress in the organizational work, and hinder the work of the Party from being reorganized as it should. Thus, it is necessary to begin a decisive struggle against these remnants (sectarianism, misunderstanding, and unclarity), which are totally alien to the Party and the worker movement, but which, unfortunately, still exist among us. We shall not allow harmful ambitions and irresponsible elements to destroy the party work, to destroy what we have built with such great effort. We shall not allow the old ills and the old teachings to persist. Astonishing things have occurred and are still occurring among us in matter of organization. Frequently a few people have attached themselves to certain elements, falling under their influence, serving them and trusting them blindly. These elements have become steeped in group work. Under the old mysterious cloak of complicity the time of the groups, they have made approaches to some comrades and today are still endeavouring to win over others by various cunning methods. Amongst them there are some comrades with a low level of understanding, of with little awareness of the importance of this question, who believe all they are told by the old group leaders or the quarrelsome factionalists, who place the individual above the movement, above the Party.

This is an evil which we must rigorously combat without fail. We cannot allow this state of affairs to continue any longer. The comrades must be absolutely convinced to have faith in the Party, to love it and its work. Long discussions have been needed to explain the necessity of work with the masses. These comrades have been very slow in becoming conscious of the necessity of work with the masses. They have denied the possibility of working under fascism. They alleged that «It is possible to work with this organizational system in Greece and other countries», or «perhaps this is an old method of work and we should not be exposed», «we should not go into action, because the police may discover us», «we do not want to lose men, and if anyone wants to go into such action, let him go alone», etc. In other words, they have refused to work and show themselves as communists before the masses, they have refused to undertake actions. How then do they think the revolution will be achieved? They are not clear to us. But one thing is clear in that way we will never be able to achieve the revolution, and nothing good can be expected from such work.

We have already gone ahead of this, the organizational situation is difficult and cannot be corrected immediately, cause with the passage of time this has struck root. It still crops up, the in a new form. Such concepts are barriers from the old work and are totally alien to the revolutionary worker movements. It is essential that we wage energetic struggle against them (in «Youth» and Shkodra groups).

Apart from this, the comrades have I view that we should discuss problems with all elements. They claimed that it could not fight with all elements. They indeed that we could not fight the enemy because «we are not strong enough». They led them to a great mistake, and they led into a position of conciliation, as well as this, liberalism and familial have pushed them along this road.

Enough about that.

The comrades of the Provisional Central Committee have gone to various places and have reorganized the old komsomol cells (amongst them duties and tasks have been divided). Provisional Central Committee has only done the organization, but has fact unified the organizations of various regions and established contacts between them and the Central Committee. W visiting various places and organizing it has given the comrades full assistance. In fact, it has directed the entire organizational work, giving advice and directives. It has defined its position on questions and, through its proclamations, has laid down the political line of work, and brought the organization life. Its task has been important and arduous. It has been charged with creating the Party, and you know well, comrades, that this task was not at all simple, especially in a domain where a contradiction might emerge at every step. It has fought sectarianism and has begun the struggle against deviations, it has fought petitio in the and parochialism, and in the course of this work other problems have emerged which have been resolved by the Central Committee. The Party is not built in one day. It takes time. The Central Committee will wage a struggle relying on its own
of consciousness they have as party members. They are dissatisfied because they themselves have not been made leaders. How do they know that their representatives have not been appointed? It is evident that discipline has been violated and secrecy betrayed. Old connections have been maintained. These comrades have got the idea into their heads that their group is considered worthless. This, allegedly, is the reason for their revolt. This pretext has been suggested to them by their old chief, because the Party has left no room for the slightest doubt on this subject. They have duplicated propaganda material without the permission of the regional committees. They have undoubtedly notified the old leaders of the group (Anastas Lula and Xhepi) about this and have distributed this duplicated material only amongst their former comrades. This has led to the creation of some petty theories among some persons according to which work in the countryside is impossible. When you talk with a peasant, he agrees, but once you turn your back, he sticks out his tongue and makes fun of you. Others claim that "it is necessary to move the entire organization into the countryside", or that "some comrades who should be freed from all party work should be assigned to the mission of killing fifth columnists and spies (professional assassins)", etc.; that "the comrades of the cells lack initiative"; that "the Soviet Union is playing politics like the bourgeois countries".

If these were merely their own opinions, then the problem would have been much easier to solve, but unfortunately such ideas have begun to circulate and to form themselves as a line, and worse still, a line guiding a group (the "Youth" group).

When asked why they maintained their old contacts, they replied that they were indignant at the intrigues going on in their cells, and this is why they kept those old contacts. But is this really the only reason for their discontent? In the course of our talks with them, they accepted that they had been wrong, and promised to put an end to their old connections, but time has taught us to put our trust in deeds alone. These are not the only dissatisfied comrades. Certain elements coming from the strata of "agias" and "beys" are dissatisfied too. They persist in old forms of work, which, like the class they come from, are alien to the worker movement. Some workers too have associa-
while the other, who at first expressed his desire and was interested in the election of the Central Committee, has shown dissatisfaction because he himself is not in the Central Committee, because only workers, and not intellectuals, can become members of the committee. In fact, intellectuals can become members—those who are far removed from the group spirit and have the necessary qualities. This man, who formerly had contacts with the Korca group and who now maintains friendly relations and contacts with all the groups, is dissatisfied with the selection of these committees. He raises some astonishing matters, but one thing is clear: he does not have a single correct idea of the Party and is quite unable to distinguish between communists and nationalists. He goes so far as to criticize our statements, which according to him, are not sufficiently nationalist in content. Astonishing! Under the influence of the nationalist, he has formed the opinion that our fight today is a fight just for solidarity and internationalism, and not for the good of the Albanian people! He has other such ideas in his head, but there is no need to comment on them.

He has refused to hand over the names of his contacts. He claims that they have not yet been trained, but they have been trained to have contacts with him! Among them there are both young and mature elements with whom he is unable to do communist work, first, because there are too many of them, and second, because he himself is working underground. For this and other reasons these people are often left a long time without communication or contact. The most important thing is that he does not do regular communist work among them. He maintains contacts with people in Pogradec whose names he has still not handed over. He also had connections in Ishen, but did not hand over their names until the Party itself discovered them. We advise this comrade not to continue in this way, for it is not the way to act, and cannot be tolerated.

Within a short time he should hand over all his connections, and the names of all his contacts (the Party will not deprive him of his friends). If he does not observe party discipline, then the Party will have to take the necessary steps.

We have always been of the opinion that we should correct our comrades. But we should blame ourselves for not taking the decision to denounce these wrong actions openly right at the beginning. However, we justify this fault by the desire to correct people. We have scored successes in this and we are continuing to follow this method. We bear in mind the teachings of the great Lenin: "We are marching in a compact group along a precipitous and difficult path, firmly holding each other by the hand. We are surrounded on all sides by enemies, and we have to advance under their almost constant fire. We have combined voluntarily, precisely for the purpose of fighting the enemy, and not to retreat into the adjacent marsh, the inhabitants of which, from the very outset, have reproached us with having separated ourselves into an exclusive group and with having chosen the path of struggle instead of the path of conciliation. And now several among us begin to cry out: let us go into this marsh! And when we begin to shame them, they retort: how conservative you are! Are you not ashamed to deny us the liberty to invite you to take a better read? Oh, yes, gentlemen! You are free not only to invite us, but to go yourselves wherever you will, even into the marsh. In fact, we think that the marsh is your proper place, and we are prepared to render you every assistance to get there. Only let go off our hands, don't clutch at us and don't besmirch the grand word 'freedom', for we too are 'free' to go where we please, free to fight not only against the marsh, but also against those who are turning towards the marsh!"  

Now, comrades, let us speak of a group which is very far from the Party and which is completely in the marsh—this is the Zjarri group, a self-styled 'party'. The Zjarriists claim that they are legal communists. As you can see, comrades, this group occupies a special place. It is a completely liquidationist opportunistic group and has been in the opportunistic liquidationist marsh since 1935, when it styled itself a party.  

Its chiefs have created an arsenal of petty, very harmful theories and hypotheses which every reactionary, even Mustafa Kruja himself, could subscribe to. Here are some of their theories: "We should not engage in agitational work and propaganda, because the time is not ripe", "the USSR today is making concessions such as in the realm of religion", "in the Soviet Union the communists are on the retreat, and so should we be, we should not carry out actions" (according to them they have allegedly received directives from the Comintern about this). "For this reason, we should not undertake any actions until four days before the expulsion of the Italians" (they say the Italians and not the fascist invaders), "the communists should not undertake any actions for the time being, because those who undertake them now are not communists" (then, when should actions be undertaken?). They say the communists should not act at the present time. And this mysterious thought raises a question: then, when should they go into action? They say only four days before the revolution! How ridiculous that grown—up men should say such things! They have established contacts with the government of Mustafa Kruja. They ask: "Who can guarantee that the USSR will win?" They are slipping into the position of the German fascists who claim that the war of the Albanian communists (our war) serves Russian Pan-Slavism, because allegedly the USSR is fighting for Pan-Slavism. Then, they declare again that we should not distribute leaflets, because our people can neither read nor write, and it is not the appropriate time for this, that those who hold demonstrations, write the leaflets and undertake actions, are not communists, but terrorists! They claim that it is not the time for us to fight, it is not the time for revolution, "when we have a communist government and army, the revolution will burst out", etc., etc. There are many such opinions. Here finally, is a typical example. The Zjarriists declare: "Those who undertake actions today, will be condemned by the people's tribunal. The interesting thing is that they show themselves up. If they act in this manner and fall into the position of the fifth column and spies, it is true that the people's tribunal will pass judgement on them, and they can fall into this position very easily.

Comrades, we should be careful, because there are Trotskyites in our country, as the Comintern itself has defined them, such as the infamous Fundo, and Qendo who is connected with the Greek Trotskyites. Both of them oppose the Comintern and its line, and comrade Stalin. We must not underestimate the danger they represent. They are infiltrating among us in various ways, and using every means to spread their ideas. They find various ways to propagate their ideas, and for this reason we should not underestimate them, but
should wage a fiercer struggle against them and expose them before the people. «We should brand these dregs of society and put them in the pillory of shame and scorn.» (History of the CPSU (B)).

The struggle waged against them so far has been almost non-existent, and some have acted in a liberal and conciliatory manner towards them. Yes! There has been conciliation with the Trotskylites, there have been contacts with them, and comrades have sheltered them in their homes. Communists should not have done this (these communists have themselves admitted that this was wrong).

### 2) Educational, political, and theoretical work

Very little importance has been attached to educating, uplifting, and bolshevizing the cadres. And even less importance to other problems.

In order to orientate ourselves in this current complex situation, we should be equipped and armed with the tactics and theory of the proletariat, with the knowledge Marx and Engels have bequeathed to mankind, and which Lenin and Stalin have enriched and developed.

The reason why the cadres are not at the necessary level is not that the comrades have failed to study, or have not wanted to learn, but because the comrades have not translated those works which are indispensable to the working class and the communist cadres. Various booklets and pamphlets have been translated, some of them of doubtful origin. There have also been good books among them. But the most necessary one: «The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (B), Foundations of Leninism» as well as the report delivered to the 7th Congress of the Comintern by Dimitrov, etc., have been neglected. This is the reason that the theoretical and political level of the comrades is very low. Some comrades who have done some study have considered themselves very learned, and have even started writing various articles, deviating from Marxism-Leninism and attempting to create new theories such as «the theory of the class» [9], «the theory of cadres», etc.

We shall not go into the errors of the comrades who were in leading posts in the past and who ruined a great number of cadres, because they neglected them and lacked concern for them, or because they educated them in the old group spirit. It is easy to see that they are to blame for this.

But we would be very wrong to lay all the blame on the past; we should look for a large share of this responsibility in the present weaknesses in our work. We should use our experience, benefit from it, increase our knowledge and proceed further ahead on this road. We should take this work seriously in hand. The question of the development and raising of the political level of the comrades should not be left solely to their own initiative. They should study collectively, while at the same time individual study should not be neglected. On this point, the Party should exercise careful checkup and give assistance.

It is very difficult for the worker comrades to raise their political level much by relying solely on their own initiative. When he comes home tired from his work, the worker comrade finds it difficult to read, because he is not used to doing this, and thus very precious time is wasted. For the intellectuals, on the other hand, this is possible, because of the very nature of their work. The workers should be given the possibility of collective study as well as individual study. We should make this possible by preparing suitable literature. There are objective difficulties in this field, in particular because, of the lack of literature for the workers. Thus, for quite a while our work will limp along, but we hope that the «History of the CPSU (B)», and the «Foundations of Leninism» will soon be translated. It is necessary to raise the political and theoretical knowledge of the comrades and train cadres for the leadership. There are also other difficulties, such as the difficult conditions in which the work is being carried on, inadequate equipment etc. We tell the comrades not to be content with the single copy they receive from the Central Committee, but to duplicate it by hand or with a typewriter. It sometimes happens that comrades do not study even those materials that come into their hands, such as books, leaflets, etc. There are also communists who distribute leaflets without even reading them themselves. What could they possibly say to the people? Sometimes, only the distribution of the leaflets is discussed in the cells. This should not happen any more. All party members should read and study our leaflets, for in them they will find the political line of the Party. We should study the literature, for only in this way can we arm ourselves with knowledge. All the materials of the Party should be the subjects of study in the cells. We should not behave with the party materials as we have done up till now; we should study them, not leave them for months in unsuitable places to get wet in the rain, or eaten by mice. The organs of the Party should be very careful about this, and they should organize the distribution of materials properly, because irregularities on this point, as well as other manifestations of laxity on the part of certain comrades, help the factionalists to win over young people by giving them some books which in many cases they cannot understand.

In order to become leaders we should study collectively in courses and study groups, but we should not exclude individual study. The comrades in the higher organs should supervise and check up this work. Every course or study group should be led by the most advanced comrades who were previously least infected by the group spirit, that is, by those comrades who have completely eliminated the old group spirit. The factionalists and those instilled with this spirit should not be assigned to the leadership of any study circle, or educational group, or any other sort of work among the youth. This is done solely with the aim of preventing the old group spirit from infecting others. The Central Committee has undertaken the task of supplying the organization as soon as possible with the necessary translated materials («History of the CPSU (B), Foundations of Leninism», etc).

### 3) On the question of numbers in the Party (On cadres)

It appears from comrades' reports that the number of comrades is low and that the quality of party members is not yet as high as it should be. Today the Party comprises a small number of comrades. Here we observe a narrow and sectarian attitude. Why not bring in all who fulfill the necessary conditions? We should seek the causes of this in our behaviour which is still sectarian, and not only in this, but also in our inactivity; we do not yet know how to select people. We should go further than the desire for increased numbers, and find loyal fighters. It is often said of various people that they are
"friends," "comrades," "good fellows," and many other terms which indicate that they are communists, but very little initiative and ability is shown in organizing them. These people are disciplined, devoted and active, but they are communists outside the party ranks. Some comrades claim that they are not yet "sufficiently advanced," and thus do not fulfill the requirements. But what do the comrades expect of them? This practice should be ended. The dedicated, disciplined comrades, those who would make good party members, especially worker comrades, should be admitted to the Party. This applies to the proletariat and the peasantry. But we should not go too far and admit unprepared sympathizers and similar elements into the Party. On the question of admission to the Party, the party organs should check carefully on the candidates, to see that they fulfill all the necessary requirements, because the present period is dangerous for the Party and the enemy may introduce provocateurs into our ranks. In this period the organizational question is the major one. Our primary task is to consolidate the Party organizationally. Those who are conscious, loyal, convinced, steeled, disciplined, fearless and have an unblemished record can enter our ranks. Without these qualities no one can become a party member, or win the right to take pride in the name of Lenin and Stalin.

The higher party organs should care for the comrades and maintain constant contact with the lower organizations; they should be continually in touch with the organizations and always be informed of the situation within them, because, otherwise, the former state of affairs will predominate. We shall go into battle with the existing cadres, until the Party is renewed with new cadres who will emerge in the struggle. Therefore, we should check up on and observe everything that is done in the organizations. Among the masses there are loyal fighters and communists, who will emerge in the front ranks of the struggle and lead it to victory.

a) Because we are going into battle, we should ensure our replacements. Of course, we cannot all go into battle and leave the masses to be misled by spies and the fifth column, so we must without fail leave our replacements behind. As soon as possible, and this is possible, we must train our replacements and raise their political level so that the organizations will not be weakened when those who cannot stay here go to join the partisan units. In particular, we must train replacements among women. There must not be a single forum without women. On this point, we should not err again and behave in a sectarian manner, but should have a good understanding of the importance of work with women, who will play an important role in our work.

b) Our youth have been organized according to old forms of work. Because the youth organs have imperfectly understood the line of the Party, the youth are fragmented, and in some places there is still a field for the activity of old factionists. Through their old methods of work they attract the youth (they have included many of the communist youth in their cells, etc.). The leaders of the youth have not correctly understood the struggle of the youth. Thus have not been able to wage an energetic struggle against the old group method amidst the youth and in the educational groups. Here too the factionists have exploited the situation, doing their old work of setting up sectarian educational groups and reviving the old group spirit. We cannot allow the old forms of work to go on among the youth, because this is the most important sector of the Party, from which it is regenerated. We should make every effort, exerting all our energies, to bring about the unity of the Communist Youth of Albania. We should mobilize the youth of town and countryside on a broad scale; this is one of our principal tasks. The task of the Communist Youth of Albania is to mobilize the entire popular youth of Albania. We now have a new method of work among the youth and I shall not speak at length on this, because the comrade from the youth's organization will speak to us about it.

c) The work among the workers is extremely valuable. It is essential for us to penetrate among the workers and the poor of the towns, and work among them, among the proletariat. The majority in our Party could be workers. We should henceforth put an end to our old practice. We should not deceive ourselves. No one else can lead, fight and work wholeheartedly for the cause of communism like the proletarians and workers. We should go to countryside too and mainly among the poor peasants in the villages, the semi-proletarians, of whom there are many in our country. We should carry the most disciplined and the best organizers, our best propagandists and agitators there, because today we must mobilize the country around our Party, because our Party is a fighting party, and today the will of the people want to fight. We must convince the masses and explain to them your very essence. We should know how to approach them, to discuss with them objectively, and listen carefully to the most immediate and concrete questions. We should not speak to them, for example, as Vlora comrades are doing, calling the national liberation council of the soviets. That is an error and a left deviation.

d) A few actions have been undertaken but they have not had a broad commu- nistic character. As for the sabotage actions, there have been far fewer of them than there could have been. We should understand clearly that our actions are closely linked with those of other countries, they have an international character and at the same time prepare the people for the struggle for their own liberation. Various forms of action: demonstrations, acts of sabotage, etc., popularize our Party and our struggle.

All our organizations are obliged to undertake actions, and every organization has had the possibility to undertake such but a very liberal attitude has been maintained towards them. Certain actions which have been carried out have not been given the necessary publicity. One factor which has impeded the carrying out of actions is the fact that we have not yet organized our army. This question has been the subject of much discussion in our organizations, and the absolute necessity of setting up partisan units and town guerrilla has been raised, but they are still not evidence. The comrade responsible for the military line will discuss this question in his report on the army. The comrades will report on what has been done in this sector. One thing must be stressed, that an hesitancy in this matter must be eliminated and we must get down to the reality, the formation of our army, to actions.

4) Discipline in the Party

In every organization there must be some kind of discipline. But in our Communist Party, which is the vanguard of the working class there should exist that particular discipline which arises from the high consciousness of Communist Party members, the most highly conscious part of the working class and the working poor.
ple. The difficult conditions of illegal work demand even greater discipline from us. Without steel-like discipline and without the unity of our Communist Party, which has many powerful enemies, we cannot fight the war successfully.

It is mainly alien elements, introduced into our Party with the intention of destroying it from within, who breach our communist discipline; this discipline is also violated by various people who are not yet free of their petty-bourgeois cliche that is, people who are not yet mature enough to become party members, or by various careerists. But if we have our eyes open, it is not difficult to detect these people.

We stress this because recently there have been breaches of discipline in our Party, often quite flagrant ones, and impermissible carelessness on the part of some comrades, that means to say they are not sufficiently awake; otherwise the persistent group spirit cannot be explained. And then there is a tendency to petty criticism which first of all appears accidental and later becomes a line.

But we know within what framework to criticize and how far this should go. Outside this framework it is not sound criticism, and it assumes the form of carping criticism-unhealthy criticism. It is noticeable that certain comrades underestimate others and do not reveal their own mistakes; they criticize others but not themselves. In this way they seek to elevate themselves, posing as «the strongest», or «the most developed», boasting about their knowledge of Marxism-Leninism.

Such work implies a return to the old days, to the quarrels and clashes between groups. This means a turning back of the Party. We should unceasingly criticize this backward tendency, not on the basis of the old group spirit, but through a desire to eliminate backwardness and to advance.

Then we must also speak about security in organizational matters. This is generally weak and has gone from one extreme to the other. Much has been said about security and it will also be dealt with by the comrades who report on equipment and the need for security.

Works, vol. I

1) The 1st Consultative Meeting of the Activist of the CPA began its proceedings in Tirana on April 8, 1942, and continued for three days with some interruptions. The main report was delivered by comrade Enver Hoxha. The meeting adopted a resolution setting out the tasks to be carried out to strengthen the Party, to establish and consolidate its links with the masses, and to mobilize them in the National Liberation War.

2) The Meeting of all the communist groups in Albania was held in underground conditions from the 8th to the 14th of November 1941. On the first day of its proceedings it took the historic decision of merging the groups and of founding the Communist Party of Albania (CPA). The meeting heard the reports on the activity of each group, on the successes and shortcomings of the communist movement in Albania, and the vital problems facing the Party.

In the course of the discussions of the ideological, tactical and organizational questions of the Party, pronounced divergencies emerged among the representatives of groups. Comrade Enver Hoxha and other comrades wagged a bitter principled struggle against the anti-Marxist and liquidationist theses of the chief of the «Youth» group. The social-democrat viewpoints which had hardly begun to spread in Albania by the renegades of the communist movement, the Trotskyite line and activity of the «Zarr» group which posed itself as the «Communist Party of Albania»; as well as alien views which had struck root in the ranks of the communist groups were condemned. The meeting adopted a Resolution which made a thorough analysis and a Marxist-Leninist assessment of the international situation and the communist movement in Albania, it mapped out the ideological and organizational basis on which the CPA was founded and outlined its revolutionary program and tactics.

3) The communist group of Korça was formed in June 1929. It was the first revolutionary organization of the Albanian working class, but suffered from marked ideological and organizational weaknesses. Anti-Marxist elements had found their way into the group. The communist literature studied by its members was not entirely Marxist and included also Trotskyite and anarchical materials. Due to these shortcomings it remained isolated from the worker movement and confined itself to the town of Korça only. With the arrival of the distinguished communist militant Ali Kelmeni from the Soviet Union, where a communist group of Albanians was created as early as 1928, the activity of the communist group of Korça entered a new stage. The members of the group began to combine illegal with legal work, to take active part in legal worker and trade societies and turn them into revolutionary organizations, they began to translate genuinely Marxist literature, extend their activity to other towns, especially in Tirana where a branch was set up which, directed by comrade Enver Hoxha, later became an important centre of the communist and anti-fascist movement in the capital.

4) The communist group of Shkodra was formed in 1934 and extended also to several other towns. The head of the group was an intellectual of wrong theoretical views and marked political inactivity. When arrested under Zog's regime, he knelt down before the enquiry and told on all the comrades of his group. The activity of the group was limited to student and trade circles, and some working centres. This group had not a clear-cut political line, a definite organizational form and a sound discipline and secrecy. Like other groups,
that of Shkodra, apart from Marxist literature circulated also Trotskyite and anarchical literature.

5) The Youth group was formed in 1940 as a result of the division and weakness of the communist movement. It began as a faction of the communist group of Korça and later an emerged as a separate group. Elements of marked Trotskyite and anarchical views placed themselves at its head. The group swelled its ranks with intellectual elements of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois extraction. Its leadership emerged with an anti-Marxist ideological and political platform. It held that Albania lacked proletariat, that the class struggle did not exist in Albania, and therefore there was no basis to form the Communist Party, that peasantry was conservative and reactionary, and could not become the ally of the working class, that the links with the masses and the work among them would endanger the cadres, that the fascist occupation promoted the development of capitalism and the growth of the proletariat.

6) Lefko (Zoi) Pandi, a deserter, enemy of the Albanian communist movement, of the Communist International and the Albanian people.

7) Aristid Ondoro, a deserter from the communist group of Korça, chief of a small Trotskyite group in Tirana, placed himself at the service of reaction and occupiers.

8) Anastas Lula, ex-chief of the Youth group. At the Meeting of the communist groups in November 1941, together with the former vice-chairman of the group, Sadiq Pandi (Xhepi), he endeavoured to hinder the forming of the Communist Party of Albania. Following the founding of the Party, they followed by every manner of means against the political line of the Party and its Central Committee. At the Consultative Meeting of Activists, the CPA admonished them for the last time to give up their anti-Marxist activity and carry out the directives of the Party. But they did not change their ways. They organized a dangerous faction in the bosom of the Party. In June 1942, the Extraordinary Conference of the Party liquidated this Trotskyite faction and expelled its chiefs from the Party. As they kept up their treacherous activity, the 1st National Conference of the CPA branded them as enemies of the Party and people.

9) The Trotskyite -Zjarri- group was formed in Greece in 1936. It engaged in an openly hostile activity against the communist groups and against the CPA. In the beginning of 1943 it was finally destroyed.

10) The directives of the Communist International for the communist movement in Albania were drafted on the basis of the decisions of the 7th Congress of the Comintern, which held its proceedings from July 25 to August 25, 1935. They reached Albania in 1937

11) The Meeting of the main communist groups in Albania elected a Provisional Central Committee of 7 persons. Comrade Enver Hoxha was assigned to guide it, though there was no secretary elected.

12) Titles of the Turkish feudal military regime. The title -aga- was bestowed on low and middle rung officers, and that of -bey- on high rung officers and officials. After the proclamation of Albanian independence -beys- and -aghas- were titles applied to all the rich of the town and countryside.

13) The Meeting of the main communist groups for the creation of the Party had decided that the leaders of the communist groups were to hand over to the Central Committee all their connections with the members of their groups.

14) Mustafa Merlika (Kruja), an inveterate agent of Italian fascism, prime minister of the quisling government from October 1941 to January 1943.

15) In December 1941, Zisi Andrea, head of the Zjarri group, together with Mustafa Kruja, the quisling prime minister signed an agreement in which the latter promised that -the Albanian Communist Party- (as he styled his Trotskyite Zjarri group) would not fight against fascism.

16) This refers to the erroneous assessment of the situation of the class struggle in Albania by the heads of the communist group of Shkodra and of the Youth group. According to this assessment Albania not yet entered the stage of capitalist development, the working class did not exist and the most progressive class was made up of craftsmen, and, as a result, there was room to wage the class struggle.

17) The theory of the cadres was borrowed from the archio-Marxists, members of an anti-Marxist organization in Greece who in 1930 joined Trotsky's Internation and during the Second World War acted as agents of fascism and nazism. According to their theory, the communist must not engage in any activity to organize and mobilize the masses, but sit in their secluded cells and engage them only in theoretical education, in training cadres, and only after the cadres a trained can they start their revolutionary activity.

18) Besides the main report by Comrade Enver Hoxha, the Conference heard reports on military, youth, equipment and other questions.

19) In February 1942, the CC of the CP issued the directive for the setting up everywhere of national liberation councils as organs of the National Liberation War of people's uprising, and simultaneous organs of the revolutionary people's powe.