

Declaration of War on Maoists IV

1 – Introduction

Maoism and "Anti-Maoism"

a dual ideology of anti-communism

The writing of the chapter IV of the Declaration of War on Maoists has been a project for us since more than one year ago. The importance of not letting our anti-Maoist struggle stand still was always evident to us after the first three chapters of the DWM. But unfortunately, various kinds of tasks for the Comintern (Stalinist-Hoxhaist - SH) have prevented us from accomplishing this purpose until now. Finally, it is time to continue developing that feature of our Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist (MLSH) ideology which is so crucial to our communist goals: anti-Maoism. The anti-Maoism of the Comintern (SH) is the only genuine proletarian anti-Maoism because it is exclusively based on *Stalinism-Hoxhaism*.

Those who openly or hiddenly struggle against Stalinist-Hoxhaist anti-Maoism of the Comintern (Stalinist-Hoxhaist - SH) by replacing it through various branches of bourgeois “anti-Maoism” - are enemies of the world proletariat and lackeys of the world bourgeoisie.

With this Chapter IV of the DWM we draw our principled demarcation-line against all hues of so-called false “anti-Maoism” which violate Stalinist-Hoxhaist anti-Maoism, in particular, and thus contradict with the lessons of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism, in general.

The antagonist class-character of proletarian and bourgeois anti-Maoism is irreconcilable.

Therefore the Stalinist-Hoxhaists struggle against any reconciliation and centrism between proletarian anti-Maoism and bourgeois (fake) “anti-Maoism”.

Our goal is the victory of the socialist world revolution on the basis of the lessons of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism which we must defend against Maoism and also against so called “anti-Maoism”. The victory of the lessons of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism depends on the defeat of both Maoism and bourgeois “anti-Maoism”- namely including the defeat of all attempts of centrist reconciliation.

It is impossible to defeat Maoism without defeat of all the various forms of bourgeois “anti-Maoism”.

The world bourgeoisie tries to defeat the lessons of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism by means of the double play between Maoism and bourgeois “anti-Maoism”. Unmasking the counter-revolutionary double-cross between bourgeois Maoism and bourgeois “anti-Maoism” - this is the purpose of this chapter IV.

It is well known that Maoism is a bourgeois ideology on an international stage- used by the world bourgeoisie as an ideological weapon against the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism. However, Maoism turned out to be not strong enough against the Hoxhaist weapon of anti-Maoism. Therefore, the world bourgeoisie was forced to create her own anti-Hoxhaist branches of false “anti-Maoism” for the purpose of deceiving, splitting and liquidating the true anti-Maoist forces, thus the Stalinist-Hoxhaists without exception. The world bourgeoisie must scatter the Stalinist-Hoxhaist forces by applying this double windmill, while we Stalinist-Hoxhaists must disarm this bourgeois eyewash. And we will begin to thwart this bourgeois “anti-Maoist” sham by means of this chapter IV.

In our three previous chapter of DWM, we had tried to expose and unmask Maoist revisionism in itself. We had tried to explain its causes, origins and consequences to the world workers, so they could understand the true character of Maoism as an anti-communist and reactionary ideology whose reason of being is no other than saving world capitalism-imperialism-revisionism from the flames of armed socialist proletarian revolution.

Our DWM I consisted mainly of an anti-Maoism Manifesto, a document where the general demarcation-line between Stalinism-Hoxhaism and Maoist revisionism was drawn and where the irremediable opposition between the teachings of the 5 Classics and Mao’s anti-socialist “thoughts” was firmly denounced:

“Today it is impossible to bring about the victory of the socialist world revolution and to fulfil the tasks of world socialism, it is impossible to strengthen the internationalist unity of the world proletariat, it is impossible to fulfil its world-historical mission without the complete break with Maoism, without explaining to the masses the inevitability of drawing a principled demarcation-line towards the revisionist Mao Zedong Ideas. We defeated the Soviet revisionism and we shall defeat Chinese revisionism as well. There cannot be any unification between the ideology of the Maoists and Marxism-Leninism! There cannot be any unification between the proletarian and the bourgeois ideology! Down with all currents of reconciliation between Marxism-Leninism and Maoism! So called “*Marxism-Leninism-Maoism*” is neo-revisionism, is anti-revisionism in words and revisionism in deeds! Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism - this is definitely the genuine world-proletarian ideology of today. Anything else is bourgeois ideology and has to be defeated. With the beginning of this new decade, the Comintern (SH) makes a long-overdue and historically important step concerning the continuation of the struggle against revisionist Mao Zedong - Ideas. The Comintern (SH) is sticking to the old correct line of the world communist movement: Revisionism was, is and still remains as the main danger in the world communist movement. Essence of

revisionism is nothing but bourgeois ideology.” (Documents of the Comintern (SH), *Declaration of War on Maoists I*, 2011, version in English)

The objectives and intentions of this DWM I would serve as a guide-line to our two subsequent DWM, which were aimed at continuing and completing the first one. Our DWM II was intended to buttress and confirm the conclusions of the DWM I through an historical analysis of Maoism’s roots from the very beginning until more recent events related with it (the Nepalese situation, Indian Naxalites, Pol Pot, etc...). In this, we used many different sources coming not only from the 5 Classics, but also from bourgeois and even Maoist forces that displayed the rightness of our assertions. Generally, our DWM II noticed Maoism’s origins as a class ideology defending the interests of the Chinese “national” bourgeoisie against its compradore and foreign imperialist rivals and promoting its interests during its quest of becoming China’s indisputable ruling exploitative oppressive class and of transforming the country into an imperialist superpower – as it is already the case nowadays. Of course, we couldn’t have failed to unmask and note the anti-communist, reactionary, racist, chauvinist, opportunist bourgeois-capitalist, social-fascist, pro-colonialist, pro-imperialist, wage slavagist essence and nature of Maoist / Chinese revisionism (and all these characteristics are completely shared with all other kinds of social-democracy, opportunism, revisionism, neo-revisionism and anti-communism), particularly when opposed to confronted with the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism. Maoism always aimed at hiding and perpetuating bourgeois-capitalist elements, exploitation and class rule under “socialistic” cloaks while keeping exploited and oppressed classes away from the infallible *invictus* teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism, that is, from Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism (MLSH). But its true nature can never be changed, and a more attentive study of Mao’s writings and positions inescapably reveal Maoism as the reactionary and pro-imperialist ideology it really is:

“When analysing Maoist revisionism, we see that the bourgeoisie united all the old revisionist ideas and tried to dress them in a “revolutionary” and “leftist” cloak in order to deceive the working classes. However, behind its “revolutionary” outlook, Maoism was an anti-Marxist tendency from the very beginning. (...) We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, are the only true defenders of the communist ideology, and we are entitled to triumph over the social-imperialist and social-fascist “Maoist movement”. Maoism is nothing more than a disgusting pro-capitalist and reactionary ideological aberration. The “Mao Zedong Thought” is not a development but a deformation of Marxism-Leninism and thus it will inevitably disappear as will happen with everything which is of bourgeois nature (...).” (Documents of the Comintern (SH), *Declaration of War on Maoists II*, 2011, version in English)

Given the tremendous importance of anti-Maoist struggle by the Comintern (SH), our following DWM III consisted in exposing the revisionist and anti-socialist positions of many Maoist parties and organizations from around the world. This is undoubtedly very useful for the world proletariat, because it permitted it to take account of concrete examples of Maoist opportunism provided not by us, but by the Maoist parties and

organizations themselves. At the same time, we displayed the direct dialectical relationship between anti-Maoist struggle on national and international scale:

«(...) we conclude that despite the differences inherent to the socio-economic development of each country, the main counter-revolutionary principles of Maoism are always present in all those parties: systematic refusal of proletarian power and hegemony, staunch defence of the “new democracy” as a mean to neutralise any possibility of socialist revolution, support of the “theory of the two revolutions” in order to ensure the consolidation of the socio-economic dominion of the national bourgeoisie, etc... In truth, one of the main characteristics of virtually all Maoist parties is their firm defense of the interests of the national bourgeoisie in their respective countries. This is the true reason behind their “anti-imperialist” phraseology. (...) if the activities of the Maoists in the single countries are very important to understand the dreadful anti-communist role played by them, we can never forget the dialectical relationship that exists between the global and national tactics of the Maoists in regard of their common struggle against the socialist world revolution, against the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism: Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha. In fact, the Maoists are in first line a global enemy of the whole world proletariat in its struggle for the world revolutionary overthrow of the world bourgeoisie (this without minimizing their role as lackeys of the national bourgeoisie and enemies of the socialist revolution in the single countries, of course). Therefore, it is absolutely necessary to combat the Maoist World Movement dialectically both on an international and national scale. The final aim of all the revisionist tricks and misleading invented by the Maoists in the single countries is to prevent the outcome of the world socialist revolution. » (Documents of the Comintern (SH), *Declaration of War on Maoists III*, 2012, version in English)

So, after these three comprehensive DWM, we must ask: after them, why do we still need one more DWM? Why after them, do we need the fourth chapter of the DWM? And the answer is simple: because our struggle against Maoist revisionist poison is still not completed and its aims are still not accomplished. In order to promote its successful development, we decided to elaborate one more chapter of the DWM, this time focused on the unmasking of the anti-communist “criticisms” against Maoism. Therefore, the purpose of this article will be to denounce the bourgeois-capitalist nature of the false “criticisms” of the social-democrats, revisionists, neo-revisionists and other opportunists who call themselves “anti-Maoists” but who are nothing else than agents of the bourgeoisie within the communist world movement.

Neo-Maoists are “Anti-Maoists” in words but Maoists in deeds.

There can be no genuine combat against Maoism if we don't do it from authentically communist positions, if we launch it from the positions of the political-economic-social-ideological system that originates Maoism: capitalism-imperialism. Thus, it is our duty not to let our struggle against Maoism to stand still, but to always encourage and continue it until the final complete triumph of Stalinism-Hoxhism over Maoist revisionism. It is very important to distinguish our proletarian ideology of anti-Maoism from all the

different branches of bourgeois so-called phony “anti-Maoism”. It is very important to distinguish different positions from which Maoism is criticized. Anti-Maoism of the Comintern (SH) is dangerous for the world bourgeoisie because we unmask the bourgeois-reactionary nature of the Maoist ideology. So what is the task of the revisionists and neo-revisionists in the question of anti-Maoism? The world bourgeoisie is forced to liquidate Stalinist-Hoxhaist anti-Maoism. And the method of the world bourgeoisie is this: assimilation of the proletarian anti-Maoism into bourgeois supposed “anti-Maoism”, thus for the purpose to replace the revolutionary Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology of anti-Maoism by the counter-revolutionary ideology of phony “anti-Maoism”. Stalinism-Hoxhaism is the only correct ideology which is able to totally and definitively defeat and destroy it to its very foundations. But there are many other branches of false alleged "anti-Maoism" which intend to deceive the working class. With this article, we don't have the pretention of exposing absolutely all of them. But we will try to denounce at least the most relevant among of them, namely the ones whose spreading reached dimensions that turned them into an instrument of anti-communist deception particularly dangerous to the world proletariat and other working exploited and oppressed classes. These are the false “anti-Maoisms” practiced by Soviet revisionists, by Trotskyists, by Titoists, by open anti-communists and even by Mao's successors in China. Not to forget mentioning the so called “anti-Maoism” of the revisionist Ramiz Alia-Clique in Albania. Last not least, we will unmask the fake “anti-Maoism” of the neo-revisionist leaders of the so called “4 and ½ Heads” and their half-heartedly and hypocritical attitude against Maoism.

Let's move forward to the unmasking of Soviet revisionist “anti-Maoism”!

2 – Analysis of different types of false “anti-Maoism”

2.1 – Soviet revisionists’ false “anti-Maoism” and the double play of the pseudo “Sino-Soviet-Split” - its origins and background



Mao with Khrushchev

The first type of false “anti-Maoism” that we will analyze is that of the Soviet revisionists. The sham supposed “Sino-Soviet split” is expression of the struggle between the Soviet-revisionists and the Chinese revisionists (which, as we shall see, was in fact no split at all, it was a “split”, “dispute”, “divergence”, “struggle”, “disagreement”, etc. that never existed...) that began in the 1950’s and lasted until the late 1980’s in open and hidden forms, until Soviet social-imperialism (social-imperialism means: “socialism” in words, but imperialism in deeds) disintegrated, disappeared and was replaced by Chinese social-imperialism as a world superpower.

The totally false so-called “Sino-Soviet split” was given huge publicity in the Western bourgeois-capitalist world at the time. It is still considered by Western capitalist ideologues as “one of the most important events of the Cold War”:

“The false “Sino-Soviet Split” was one of the key events of the Cold War, equal in importance to the construction of the Berlin Wall, the Cuban Missile Crisis, the Second Vietnam War, and Sino-American rapprochement.” (Lorenz M. Lüthi, *The*

false “Sino-Soviet Split”: *Cold War in the Communist World*, Princeton UP. p. 1, 2010, edition in English)

We will note that this attitude is in sharp contrast to the one adopted by those same Western capitalist ideologues concerning the Soviet-Albanian split and the later 1978 Sino-Albanian split that were indeed based upon unsolvable ideological disagreements, while this was ever the case with the false alleged “Sino-Soviet split” which, as we shall see, was nothing more than a battle between two revisionist countries and their respective ruling social-fascist cliques in which each one of them wanted to conquer indisputable control over revisionist world, in which each one of them wanted to ensure absolute dominance as the world’s main imperialist power (social-fascism means: “socialism” in words, but fascism in deeds). Even bourgeois ideologues at the time openly commented on this, affirming that false “Sino-Soviet split”:

“(…) eventually resulted in a dirty game, in something much less dignified than Soviet-Albanian split.” (Thomas Schreiber, *Enver Hoxha – Le sultan rouge*, Editions Jean-Claude Lattès, 1994, translated from French language)

Contrary to what occurred with phony “Sino-Soviet split”, Soviet-Albanian and Sino-Albanian splits were indeed based on authentic ideological irreconcilable divergences between revisionist-capitalist Soviet Union and China - on their way to becoming imperialist superpowers - and comrade Enver’s socialist Albania, the guiding light of the world proletariat at the time and the last country of authentic proletarian dictatorship in the world. Of course, capitalist-imperialist-revisionist ideologues had not any kind of interest in allowing that these genuine disputes between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism/social-fascism became widely known, as it involved the spreading of the genuinely communist positions of the Albanian Marxists-Leninists-Stalinists, something that they didn’t want world oppressed and exploited classes to know. Therefore, only within Albanian and within the structures of the parties which were members of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha these splits were adequately reported. Even nowadays, world bourgeoisie continues to minimize their importance with the referred purposes. And this includes also the elements of the “4 ½ Heads” who keep silence on it, respectively who try to distort the anti-Maoism of comrade Enver Hoxha.

As we already noted, much different is the treatment received by the fake “Sino-Soviet split”, which is still nowadays presented by the bourgeois-capitalist media and “scholars” as a “profound ideological divergence” between “the two biggest communist countries at the time”:

“The false “Sino-Soviet Split” (1960–1989) was the worsening of political and ideological relations between the People’s Republic of China (PRC) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) during the Cold War. In the 1960s, China and the Soviet Union were the two largest Communist states in the world, (...) and (...) the doctrinal differences proved intractable (...).”(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sino-Soviet_split, *Wikipedia*, version in English)

But is this assertion by bourgeois-capitalist Wikipedia correct? Is it true that the “Sino-Soviet split” arose between “two large communist countries”? And that the main reasons behind would be “doctrinal-ideological differences”? In order to answer these important questions, it is necessary to study and qualify the political-socio-economic systems ruling both Soviet Union and China at the time. And this because the “deep ideological disagreements” between Soviet Union and China at the time of the false “Sino-Soviet Split” could have only been genuine if they were coming from two countries having irretrievably opposite political-socio-economic orders, namely capitalism and socialism. And this because, just like conscience is determined by conditions of existence, it is the structure which determines the superstructure - including its ideological part. This a basic law and an essential teaching of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism. So, the “intractable ideological opposition” that supposedly caused “Sino-Soviet split” could only exist if it was originated and backed by real opposition in the economic structure, in the nature of material conditions and productive forces and relations between Soviet Union and China at that epoch.

But as we will note right now, the false alleged divergences between Soviet Union and China during the false “Sino-Soviet Split” could only have been baseless, as both countries were revisionist countries ruled by bourgeois-capitalist cliques aspiring to become social-imperialist superpowers.

In our three parts of DWM and also in our articles, we had already proved that China was never a socialist country, but from 1949 on it was merely a bourgeois-capitalist nation whose bourgeois class also aimed at imperialist expansion. In fact, as we have already explained and concluded in other articles and in the other parts of DWM, by the time so-called “Sino-Soviet split” came out, China could not be qualified a socialist country. China could never be qualified as such for the simple reason that it had never had anything to do with socialism, neither with proletarian dictatorship, its political-socio-economic-ideological material basis, relations / forces of production, social class structures and superstructures were never socialist. Chinese so-called 1949 “revolution” was nothing more than a mere bourgeois-democratic revolution which had nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism. The 1949 Chinese revolution had in fact a reactionary and even anti-socialist character and allowed the maintenance of capitalist and bourgeois elements not only at the main branches of the economy, but also their maintenance in the main branches of the country’s government, thus turning impossible the very existence of the proletarian dictatorship and installing the dictatorship of the Chinese national “patriotic” bourgeois class that would defeat its bourgeois compradore rival and prepare its path towards China’s transformation into an imperialist superpower. As comrade Enver and other Albanian Marxists-Leninists would affirm:

“Mao Tsetung was not a Marxist-Leninist, but a progressive bourgeois revolutionary, more progressive than Liu Shao-chi, but still a centrist revolutionary, who posed as a communist and stood at the head of the Communist Party. Within China, in the party, among the people, and abroad, he had the reputation of a great Marxist-Leninist who fought for the construction of socialism. But his views were not Marxist-Leninist, he did not follow the theory of Marx and Lenin, was a

continuer of the work of Sun Yat-sen, but in more advanced positions, and dressed up his views, so to say, with some leftist revolutionary formulas, some Marxist-Leninist theses and slogans. Mao Tsetung posed as a Marxist- Leninist dialectician, but he was not so. »

« “Mao Tsetung thought” is not Marxism- Leninism and that Mao Tsetung was not a Marxist-Leninist. He did not betray himself, as you might say. We say that Mao is a renegade, is an anti-Marxist, and this is a fact. We say this because he tried to disguise himself with Marxism- Leninism, but in fact he was never a Marxist. In general, we can say that in some directions the revolution in China had certain features of a tendency to develop on the socialist road, but the measures taken stopped halfway, or were annulled, as they are being annulled at present, and the masks will be dropped one after the other. All these things must be understood by the Chinese people, and they must be understood outside China, too, because, unfortunately, the whole development of that country, the national liberation war of the Chinese people, the establishment of the progressive bourgeois people's democratic state, has gone down in history as a proletarian revolution (...).” (Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China*, Volume II, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

“Life shows that Mao Zedong was indeed in favor of the maintenance and strengthening of the Chinese bourgeoisie, so China could become an imperialist superpower. The restitution of the means of production, wealth, profits and surplus value to the business men and to the industrials which created the conditions to the perpetuation of the oppression and exploitation of the working class was not a fortuity measure; quite on the contrary, it was the expression of the opportunist stands of Mao Zedong. Indeed, as an anti-proletarian theory and practice, the “Mao Zedong thought” has also become a strong supporter of capitalism at an international scale.” (Naun Guxho, *La Pensée MaoTseToung, theorie et pratique antiproletariennes*, 1979, translated from the French language)

In what respects to Soviet Union, we also explain the process of bourgeois-capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union and its subsequent transformation into a world social-imperialist superpower in our text entitled [“Economical development of Soviet restoration of capitalism – a brief Stalinist-Hoxhaist analysis”](#). We will only note that those “comrades” who affirm that “Sino-Soviet split” began when Soviet Union was still a socialist country because the destruction of the socialist economic base and of socialist relations of production and productive forces was initiated only with the "economic reforms" of 1965-1967 have one of two problems: blindness or anti-communist bad will. They refute Stalinist theories regarding the Plans for the construction of communism and consequently, they reject the positions of comrade Stalin himself, no matter if they call themselves “Stalinists”. There are some “comrades” who still affirm that the process of restoration of capitalism in the USSR took place between 1956-1991, during a period of more than 30 years. In truth, by the time the false “Sino-Soviet Split” was in its hey day in the early 60’s, the Soviet Union was *already* an essentially bourgeois-capitalist country where socialism had ceased to exist. In fact, the process of capitalist restoration in Soviet Union was particularly rapid, it was much quicker than many think, as it is proved by the

social-imperialist actions of the Soviet revisionists externally and their social-fascist actions internally. In order to determine if when the false “Sino-Soviet Split” arose, Soviet Union was still a socialist country or if it had already been turned into a bourgeois-revisionist one where capitalism had been restored, it is important not to rely exclusively on the most known official speeches and proclamations. The Soviet revisionists did not wait for 1956 to start making their plans for their "reforms", and they also did not wait for 1965 to begin with capitalist restoration and social-imperialist ascension in Soviet Union.

Therefore, those who affirm that Soviet’s fake “anti-Maoism” came from a supposedly “authentically socialist country” and therefore “must be correct” are denying the capitalist-imperialist character of the revisionist USSR and the process of capitalist restoration and social-imperialist neo-colonialist expansion that occurred with it for more than 30 years.

Basing ourselves in our text mentioned above and also on the other Hoxhaist documents published by the Comintern (SH), we must remark that the false so-called “Sino-Soviet split” was not in any way a “polemic between two communist countries”. Indeed, by the time it arose, both Chinese revisionist bourgeoisie and Soviet revisionist bourgeoisie had plans of becoming imperialist superpowers that would exploit and oppress the world peoples even more this time under “socialist” and even “Leninist” masks and slogans (“socialists” in words, imperialists in deeds). In this manner, and as we had already referred, it is impossible that the false “Sino-Soviet Split” and the phony Soviet “anti-Maoism” that was originated by it could never have any kind of truly ideological divergences as their reason of being. They could never be so because both China and Soviet Union had bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist political-socio-economic systems engaged in imperialist expansion when the false “Sino-Soviet Split” arose in the late 50’s. As such, if their structure was non-socialist, it is crystal clear that their ideological superstructure could never be socialist.

It is important to always remember this, in order to start the next stage of our study with the irrefutable notion that the false “Sino-Soviet Split”, and namely the so-called “anti-Maoist” positions of the Soviet revisionists, could have never had anything to do with Marxism-Leninism, with socialism or with communism. They were revisionists who hold control over a country whose socio-economic base had been turned into a bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist one, and thus their ideological “disputes” and “anti-Maoist” arguments could only have exactly the same purpose of Maoism itself: to save world bourgeoisie and world capitalism-imperialism from socialist revolution, from proletarian dictatorship, from socialism and communism.

The Soviet revisionists spread many illusions about the bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist character of the countries of their neo-colonial sphere of influence, they hide their own mechanisms of capitalist restoration capitalism together with the objective causes of the weakening and of the collapse of the Soviet social-imperialism with the purpose of still nowadays presenting social-fascist Soviet Union as having been “a socialist country”, and therefore its ideological arguments and manifestations must be also “socialist” and even “Marxist-Leninist” – including their fake “anti-Maoism”, that is depicted as being the

only correct one, as being an alleged “struggle to defend Marxism-Leninism against deviations”, etc.

The true reason behind Soviet revisionists’ false “anti-Maoism” was not simply the necessity of discrediting a rival whose imperialist ambitions represented a danger to their dominance over the revisionist world. Rather over the entire world - especially over the revolutionary, socialist world – led by socialist Albania. The true reason was this: splitting and liquidating the communist world movement, isolation of socialist Albania and transforming Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism into a bourgeois ideology – namely in cooperation with the Chinese revisionists, especially by means of initiating the so-called “Sino-Soviet Split”.

- The tactics of “anti-Maoism” of the Soviet revisionists was indispensable for hiding their social-fascism inwards and social-imperialism outwards.

- And the tactics of the Chinese revisionists against the Soviet-revisionists was indispensable for hiding as well their social-fascism inwards and their social-imperialism outwards.

Both revisionist camps used the opponent camp first, as a shield to protect their own revisionism and secondly to dominate the communist world movement, inclusively the only socialist country in the world – Albania , for the common purpose to eliminate the danger of Stalinism, the danger of the regeneration of the socialist camp, the danger of the socialist world revolution and global spreading of world communism, and the danger of the anti-imperialist wars of the oppressed and exploited peoples.

Of course, both these international revisionist camps did not need to hide their revisionism behind the imperialists with which they both cooperated, however behind the revolutionary communist and workers' movement, especially behind socialist Albania. This meant that all these counter-revolutionary maneuvers were supported and in the interest of the whole world-imperialist system. The so-called false “Sino-Soviet Split” was thus totally in the service of anti-communism and is therefore unmasked and combated by the Comintern (SH).

Just like Soviet revisionism was the ideology of the new Soviet bourgeois class, also Maoism was the ideology of the Chinese “national” bourgeois class (that later would become the Chinese imperialist bourgeois class). Both these exploitative and oppressive classes had taken control over their countries and aimed at achieving the status of imperialist superpowers. And their respective ideologies were a valuable instrument to accomplish that. Contrary to what occurs with American / Western imperialism, the “red” and “socialistic” masks provided to them by their revisionist ideologies allowed them to mislead world oppressed and exploited working classes, to deceive world peoples and to put down their movements of resistance against imperialism. After all, in words, both China and Soviet Union were “socialist countries” and therefore, “incapable of imperialist or colonialist policies”. They made use of this in order to deceive the laboring classes of the world with the purpose of making those people confound socialism with the

power of the bourgeois-revisionists and social-fascist cliques at their service. And many working peoples, particularly in the countries dependent on traditional imperialist powers were misled by the “Leninist” and “communist” masks of China and of the Soviet Union, replacing the enslaving dominance of their former colonialist masters by the enslaving neo-colonialist dominance of these new ones.

“Soviet social-imperialism even conceals its expansionist aims under the slogan of «aid for the proletarian revolution».” (Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China*, volume II, Tirana, edition in English)

“The Soviet revisionists are disguised capitalists. They betrayed socialism. The Soviet revisionists provide “aid” to other countries, but they do this from imperialist positions, while a socialist country is always inspired by Marxism-Leninism and by fair internationalist reasons when helping the others.” (Enver Hoxha, *Conversation with a delegation coming from the Popular Republic of Congo (Brazzaville)*, October 1970, edition in English)

So, by the time the false “Sino-Soviet split” came out, both Maoist China and Khrushchevist Soviet Union were bourgeois-capitalist countries following a social-imperialist and neo-colonialist path – the first of them having always been one while the second had been transformed into it after a period of genuine socialism and proletarian dictatorship. Contrary to what happened with the Chinese revisionists, the Albanian Marxists-Leninists can boast of the huge merit of criticizing the Soviet revisionist betrayal never detaching their political-ideological features from their respective economic and social consequences and objectives.

With our referred very brief analysis of the bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist nature of the revisionist Soviet Union since the 1950’s and its intensification in the following decades, we, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, aim at providing our arguments about the ideological features of Soviet false “anti-Maoism” that will be presented right now with a solid basis founded on a materialist socio-economic analysis of the Soviet Union when that kind of false “anti-Maoism” came out. However, like we already noted, the Comintern (SH) has already published all the significant documents of Hoxhism concerning the scientific analysis of the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and so we don’t need to go further on this issue. Our basic, comprehensive analysis of the political economy of revisionism - based upon the documents of comrade Enver Hoxha and the PLA can be studied here: “The political economy of revisionism” - chapter of [“50 Years struggle against revisionism”](#) (in German language: *Die politische Ökonomie des modernen Revisionismus*).

Indeed, both revisionists and social-imperialists China and Soviet Union struggled against each other with the goal of conquering more resources, labor and neo-colonies to exploit in pursuit of maximum profits - in 1969, they even reached the point of clashing across their common border – something unthinkable if they were socialist countries, as between truly socialist countries the occurrence of war is impossible. Suslov’s speech of 14 February 1964 entitled “Controversy - Chinese petty-bourgeois nationalism and

Trotskyism” originated a resolution against the Communist Party of China. On September 22, 1963, a Pravda article was published on instigation of Suslov (who after having been Khrushchev’s main collaborator in the struggle against “Molotov’s group” and was one of the driving forces that overthrew Khrushchev in 1964...), in which he stated that the 1950 defense pact between Soviet Union and China had been dissolved - in 1962, more than 5000 border incidents between Soviet Union and China had been reported. The Soviet revisionists feared a two-front war with NATO in the West and China in the East. In this speech, there were also many accusations of “Trotskyism” made by the Soviet revisionists against Chinese / Maoist revisionists. The Soviet revisionists rightly criticize the Maoists that the "theory of the impossibility of building communism in one country" is Trotskyist ideology and is borrowed from the "impossibility of building socialism in one country". The Maoists, on their side, affirm rightly that capitalism was restored in the Soviet Union. But both use their “criticisms” with the sole purpose of better hiding their own revisionism. That's the point. And this theory of "Chinese Marxism", attempts to replace Leninism as the Soviet revisionists are trying to substitute Stalinism by modern revisionism! That's why we need to attack and unmask both Maoism and Soviet revisionism on the issue of transition to communism to defend Stalinism. As we will conclude later in this article, Maoism and Trotskyism are indeed ideological twins. But the same occurs with Soviet revisionism and Trotskyism! In 1964, the Syrian revisionists published in their journal “Al Akbar” an article entitled “About the attitude of Chinese leaders” in which they stressed the necessity to convene a “world conference” against China. According to them: “The influence and extent of the deviation of the current leaders of the Communist Party of China cannot be compared with the deviation of the Trotskyists in the past. The Trotskyist group consisted of a numerically limited number of people.” This is indeed nothing more than a revisionist statement attempting to trivialize the crimes committed by the Trotskyists - justified by the "numerical" smallness of Trotskyist groupings.

In their text, Syrian pro-Soviet revisionists even try to depict social-fascist Khrushchev as having been some kind of “continuator” of comrade Lenin’s anti-Trotskyist struggle. In truth, the continuer of comrade Lenin's struggle against Trotskyism is comrade STALIN! All those who conceal the most prominent names in the struggle against Trotskyism or fights against Stalin are indeed fostering Trotskyism. It is only possible to defeat Trotskyism on the basis of Leninism-Stalinism. The Syrian revisionists praise instead Khrushchev as "continuer" of Leninist struggle against Trotskyism. It was Khrushchev who denounced the supposedly "terrorist measures" taken by comrade Stalin against the Trotskyists and rehabilitated Trotsky (for example, through the publication of the Trotskyist so-called "Testament of Lenin" in order to discredit comrades Lenin and Stalin in benefit of the pro-bourgeois, pro-capitalist-imperialist, revisionists and anti-communists Trotskyists).

And Syrian revisionists added that: “The digression of Chinese leaders, however, is the deviation of a leadership that has reached power over an unusually large country and has an huge state apparatus within the country and beyond.” But and what about the Trotskyist anti-Stalinism of the Soviet revisionists? The revisionist influence of the CPSU in the world communist movement is based mainly on anti-Stalinism of the

Trotskyists. Thus, not only the Chinese had great capacity to spread Trotskyism, but the same can be affirmed relatively to Soviet revisionists - if not even more.

Furthermore, Khrushchevist attacks against Maoists accusing them of “petty-bourgeois nationalism” and of “personality cult” can easily be turned against themselves, as after comrade Stalin’s death, exactly the same anti-socialist phenomenon occurred in the “C”PSU. The Soviet and Chinese leaders accuse each other of Trotskyism, but they all are united in applying methods of Trotskyists to annihilate the Marxist-Leninist world movement. They always penetrate within Marxist-Leninist parties to promote faction and division and to liquidate them. And the supposed “anti-Trotskyism” of Soviet and Chinese revisionists is only intended to keep proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes away from the authentic anti-Trotskyist struggle waged by comrades Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha.

And so, Soviet revisionists had to face the rivalry of the Chinese Maoist revisionists who always had desired to become leaders of the revisionist world. In order to achieve that, they tried to embrace revisionism and to agree with Khrushchev that “Stalin committed mistakes” (we should also remember Mao’s famous sentence: “Khrushchev is the Lenin of our times”). However, Mao’s great error was his underestimation of the great esteem that the Soviet Union still enjoyed among world proletarians, workers and oppressed and exploited classes. In 1956, nobody could predict the dimensions that the revisionist disease would reach, and most of the revisionist parties all over the world continued to see the Soviet Union as a “socialist” country. Indeed, the Soviet Union was seen with great esteem because it was the country in which the first successful socialist revolution had happened, it was the homeland of Lenin and Stalin, two of the greatest masters of the proletarian ideology, two Classics of Marxism-Leninism. It’s true that Comrade Enver Hoxha and the PLA were very suspicious about the line which was being followed in the Soviet Union and about Khrushchev’s intentions after the death of Stalin, but we must note that the PLA was born in circumstances which armed the Albanian Marxist-Leninists against all kinds of opportunisms. The PLA had to face revisionism since its very foundations and this made the Albanian communists more able to unmask all kinds of bourgeois ideologies, even the ones which are hidden. That’s why the PLA was always in the front line of the struggle against revisionist currents, from Titoism to Maoism. Nonetheless, many of the other “communist” parties promptly embraced Khrushchevist revisionism without questioning it. And this ready acceptance was precisely due to the already referred prestige that the Soviet Union enjoyed among the world toilers.

On the contrary, the Chinese 1949 bourgeois-democratic revolution, although seen with sympathy by progressives and even by communists, did not grant the Chinese revisionists sufficient admiration to obliterate the Soviet Union’s role as the world’s main revolutionary center, even because the Soviet Union had increased its strength with the essential role it played in the victory against nazi-fascism in the Second World War. For all these reasons, Mao and the Chinese revisionists could not accomplish their intentions of becoming the new leaders of the revisionist world. In face of this, the Maoists changed their strategy. Instead of playing the role of the Khrushchev’s supporters in the supposed struggle against “Stalin’s mistakes and deviations”, they appeared as the “unwavering

Stalinists”, as the “orthodox Leninists”, as the “greatest defenders of Marxist-Leninist purity”. This tactical change occurred at a time in which many communists around the world and even within the Soviet Union began to challenge Khrushchev’s “anti-Stalin reports” as being anti-Marxist.

In previous chapters of DWM and also in other texts, we explained that the “anti-revisionist” struggle of the Maoists was nothing more than a big fraud. As comrade Enver noted:

“The Communist Party of China, too, opposed the Khrushchevites, but as the facts show, it proceeded from aims and objectives quite the opposite of those which impelled the Party of Labour of Albania to throw itself into the struggle against Khrushchevite revisionism.” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

“Many times, I have turned back to this period of the history of the Communist Party of China, trying to figure out how and why the profoundly revisionist line of 1956 subsequently seemed to change direction, and for a time, became “pure”, “anti-revisionist” and “Marxist-Leninist”. It is a fact, for example, that in 1960 the Communist Party of China seemed to be strongly opposing the revisionist theses of Nikita Khrushchev and confirmed that “it was defending Marxism-Leninism” from the distortions which were being made to it, etc. It was precisely because China came out against modern revisionism in 1960 and seemed to be adhering to Marxist-Leninist positions that brought about that our Party stood shoulder to shoulder with it in the struggle which we had begun against the Khrushchevites.

However, time confirmed, and this is reflected extensively in the documents of our Party, that in no instance, either in 1956 or in the ’60s did the Communist Party of China proceed or act from the positions of Marxism-Leninism.” (Enver Hoxha, *The Khrushchevites*, Tirana, 1980, edition in English)

Taking into account all this and now that we have analyzed and characterized the socio-economic material basis upon which Soviet false “anti-Maoism” emerged, we will now analyze the main “anti-Maoist” arguments put forward by the Soviet revisionists, we will now analyze the major alleged “ideological disagreements” between revisionist Soviet Union and Maoist China, namely relatively to the so-called “questions of comrade Stalin”, of war, of peaceful coexistence and of peaceful transition.

2.1.1 – On comrade Stalin

The first “decisively divisive question” about which we will reflect is the one related with the so-called “Stalin question” [only the anti-Stalinists put up the “question of Stalin” - especially in the Soviet Union and in China!]. During the Sino-Soviet supposed “ideological conflict”, Soviet revisionists depicted themselves as being defending “the veritable Marxist-Leninist path” through condemning comrade Stalin’s work and activity,

through denying his immortal legacy, through rehabilitating the anti-communist bandits and criminals rightly annihilated during comrade Stalin's times and through "struggle" against what they called "Stalinist tyranny and cult of personality".

On the other side, Chinese revisionists tried to present themselves as being "authentic communists" and "defenders of Marxist-Leninist purity" because of their apparent "defense of comrade Stalin". In this manner, they all made efforts to pass an image in which each side (Soviet and Chinese) posed as "the only truly Marxists-Leninists" combating the "anti-socialist deviations" of the other side.

In truth, reality was something else. Soviet revisionists and Chinese revisionists never had any kind of genuine disagreement concerning comrade Stalin, but on the contrary, both rejected his proletarian revolutionary and communist legacy in order to keep world working exploited and oppressed classes away from Stalinist ideology, the only one capable of indicating them the true path to their total and definitive liberation from capitalist-imperialist-revisionist bondage in order to keep wage slavery alive. Of course, both the Soviet and the Chinese, as the revisionists they were, had to prevent this.

On their part, after years of concealed conspirator plans, Soviet revisionists finally started to openly attack comrade Stalin on their infamous "XX Congress" in 1956. As comrade Enver Hoxha states:

"After they had consolidated their positions following the death of Stalin, Khrushchev and the group around him first of all launched their attack on the Marxist-Leninist ideology and began their struggle to dethrone Leninism by attacking Stalin and levelling against him all the slanders the filthy propaganda of the world capitalist bourgeoisie had long been fabricating. Thus, the Khrushchevites became the spokesmen and the executors of the wishes of capital against the Marxist-Leninist ideology and the revolution in the Soviet Union. They went to work systematically to liquidate the entire socialist structure of the Soviet Union, they fought to liberalize the Soviet system, to transform the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a bourgeois state, and to transform the socialist economy and culture into a capitalist economy and culture. » (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

"The Khrushchevite revisionist line assisted imperialism and reaction to take advantage of the situation in order to launch an all-round attack on communism. Of particular assistance to this new attack on the revolution and socialism were the attacks and the slanders of the Khrushchevite revisionists on Stalin and his work.

The Khrushchevite revisionists started their campaign against Stalin in order to justify the anti-Marxist course which they had begun to follow inside and outside the country. They could not negate the dictatorship of the proletariat and transform the Soviet Union into a bourgeois-capitalist state, could not strike bargains with imperialism, without negating the work of Stalin. (...)

But for all the slanders and attacks of imperialists, revisionists and other enemies of the revolution, the name and work of Stalin remain immortal. Stalin was a great revolutionary, an outstanding theoretician, who ranks with Marx, Engels and Lenin.” (Enver Hoxha, *Eurocommunism is Anti-communism*, Tirana, 1980, edition in English)

With the pretext of “fighting against Stalin’s cult of personality”, Krushchevists inside and outside Soviet Union imposed the personality cult of Khrushchev. The struggle against so-called “personality cult” was not only related with the ascension of modern revisionists, but also to the fission within world communist movement, which leader was comrade Stalin, as “de-stalinization” was followed by the emergence of Titoism, of modern revisionism and, finally, of Maoism. For example, in their text entitled “On the disagreements in the communist and workers' world movement” which appeared on the Journal "Mordom", April 5, 1964 – (revisionist Tudeh-Party), the Iranian pro-Soviet revisionists also eloquently condemned the "cult of Stalin's personality," and replaced it with the cult of personality of Khrushchev - in one breath. Both Soviet revisionists and Maoists are in words against the cult of personality, but both share in practice the defense of the cult of personality (Khrushchev / Brejnev for the first ones – Mao for the second ones). The accusation of cult of personality against Comrade Stalin is only a pretext for the annihilation of Stalinism. "De-Stalinization" means the removal of Marxism-Leninism under the pretext of eliminating the so-called "cult of personality". The cult of personality was a weapon of propaganda cooperation between revisionists and imperialists. The fight against so-called "cult of personality" was not only the mask used by modern revisionists, but also one of the main causes of the split in the world communist movement, whose leader was Stalin, in order to promote "de-Stalinization" of the world communist movement and its replacement first by Titoism, then by Soviet revisionism and finally by Maoism.

In his book “Reflections on China”, comrade Enver Hoxha remarked that in 1956, Khrushchev immediately attacked the so-called "cult of Stalin”. He wanted to kill two birds with one stone: Replace the “cult of Stalin” by his own cult within the country and play in the world Communist movement the role of first violin. He wanted no other rivals, of course, not Mao. But Mao had hoped, however, that the roles would be reversed: Khrushchev would be surpassed by Mao. But Khrushchev understood the situation and took measures in order to safeguard his dominant position.

Indeed, since comrade Stalin’s death, we can consider that comrade Enver’s socialist Albania was the only country where proletarian dictatorship under the leadership of a proletarian party of Leninist-Stalinist type in the true sense of its definition was a reality. And comrade Enver’s Albania was also the only country which never failed defending comrade Stalin from truly Marxist-Leninist positions, it was the only country always faithfully following comrade Stalin’s revolutionary path towards socialism and communism. Even in the most difficult conditions and under the most disgusting pressures, Albanian comrades always defended comrade Stalin’s glorious name and Work, many times knowing that this defense would cost immense sacrifices to themselves and their people, as it would grant them powerful revisionist and social-

imperialist enemies. Already in 1960, comrade Enver fearlessly said in front of Soviet revisionists' very own face:

“The Party of Labor of Albania thinks that it is no right, normal or Marxist, to blot out Stalin's name and great work from all this epoch, as it is actually being done. We should all defend the good and immortal work of Stalin. He who does not defend it is an opportunist and a coward. » (PLA, *The Party of Labor of Albania in Battle with Modern revisionism, Speech delivered at the Meeting of 81 Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow on Nov. 16, 1960, 1972, edition in English*)

Decades later, he would affirm with his usual firmness:

“It is a crime to attack the great work of the Comintern and the Marxist-Leninist authority of Stalin, which played a major role in the creation and in the organizational, political and ideological consolidation of the communist and workers' parties of the world. For its part, the Bolshevik Party was a powerful aid for those parties, and the Soviet Union, with Stalin at the head, was a great potential in support of the revolution in the international arena.” (Enver Hoxha, *The Khrushchevites*, Tirana, 1980, edition in English)

As true Marxists-Leninists-Stalinists, the Albanian communists simply could have never adopted another position different from the one consisting in relentless defense of comrade Stalin. Anything else would be opportunism, revisionism and anti-communism, and so the embracement of anything else would be unthinkable to the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism.

Today, we, Stalinists-Hoxhaists know that Stalinism was the vital and decisive factor which permitted the survival of the proletarian dictatorship in Soviet Union. To deny Stalinist ideology means to deny the possibility of the successful socialist revolution; and the negation of the possibility of the successful socialist revolution is synonym of considering communism as an impossible utopia, because the accomplishment of communism is dependent on the success of the socialist construction and on the revolutionary fierceness of the proletarian dictatorship.

Comrade Stalin's name will always be inherently linked with the most glorious side of socialist revolution and construction in Bolshevist Soviet Union Characterized by intense revolutionary abnegation and communist strength, comrade Stalin's fearless proletarian rule was an uninterrupted sequence of superb achievements; from the struggle against Trotskyist attempts to destroy socialism in the USSR to the heroic manner in which Comrade Stalin led the process of industrialization and of collectivization of the means of production, not to speak about the victory over Nazi-fascist and Western-American imperialisms' wars, attacks and encirclements, of which the Communist Party of Soviet Union (Bolshevist) – CPSU (B) - guided by Comrade Stalin was the main architect. Contrary to what the Soviet revisionists affirm, the Stalinist period was not an era of terror and dogmatism during which Marxism-Leninism knew stagnation. Indeed, it was the exact opposite to this. It was an era in which the Soviet working classes enjoyed the

greatest freedom, they were living in a genuine proletarian democracy and they were successfully building socialism. Indeed, by the time comrade Stalin passed away, all the necessary premises and basic conditions to the advancement from socialism to communism were ready. To have prevented the advancement from socialism to communism in the Soviet Union and to have destroyed socialism there are undoubtedly among revisionists' greatest crimes for which they will answer in the future. The criticism directed by Soviet revisionism against Chinese revisionism and vice-versa try to evade and refuse the issue of building communism under the conditions of imperialist encirclement. Both the Chinese and the Soviet revisionists have betrayed the doctrines of Stalinism on the construction of communism. Both the Maoists and the Soviet revisionists were and are opponents of Stalinism in the Soviet Union.

It is true that socialism had been fully accomplished, and that capitalism was restored in the Soviet Union under the cloak of the "transition to communism" (- see: program of the CPSU on the XXII Congress). On the contrary, capitalism had never been eliminated in China. To deny this would be one of the false arguments of the Maoists in 1964, for example. To firmly stress this is inevitable: without full development of socialism in the Soviet Union, Stalin would not have initiated the transformation to communism. Socialism in the Soviet Union WAS already fully developed and thus ripe for transition to communism – as Stalin teaches. Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism teaches that the victory of communism in "one" country cannot be guaranteed without the dictatorship of the world proletariat and world socialism. Communism can be performed in "one" country but not guaranteed as long as the imperialist encirclement exists. Communism in "one" country can only be guaranteed in the period of world socialism. Full development of world socialism is required for the transition to world communism – thus expressively in all countries of the world. This is the only way how to change "one" communist country into one communist country (without quotation marks). The transition to world communism begins with the abolition of classes on a global scale which develops during the whole world-historical period of world socialism - between world capitalism and world communism. In the Soviet Union, all the objective and subjective conditions for the transition to communism had matured. We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, therefore defend the teachings of Stalin's transition from socialism to communism in the Soviet Union. As we also remark in the "*introduction*"-part of our world-communist program, Stalinism teaches that the transition of communism in "one" country is possible even under conditions of world imperialism as demonstrated by the Soviet Union which had fully developed the stage of socialism. Therefore, we can derive the thesis that communism in "one" country is doubtlessly not only possible but unavoidable during the period of world socialism. Stalinism-Hoxhaism teaches that Communism - on a world scale - does not mean that a country will achieve its transition to communism at the same time as all the other countries. Even in world socialism the law of unequal development of socialist countries is valid. And even in world communism certain differences will remain in the development of single communist countries until the complete development of world communism – namely when all nations have merged and finally disappeared.

But it was precisely the Soviet revisionists themselves, who did everything they could to prevent the transition from socialism to communism in theory and practice. We already

analyzed this in our texts based on the Works of the Classics. With their false “anti-Maoism” on the issue of transition to communism, the Soviet revisionists camouflaged the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. The only difference between Maoism and Soviet revisionism on the issue of transition to communism is that the Maoists deny this openly while the Soviet revisionists, in words they say “yes” to the transition to communism, but had abandoned it in deeds, not only the Stalinist road of communism, but socialism through capitalist restoration.

Therefore, Stalinism represents an irreplaceable and inestimable development of the Marxist-Leninist theory, and to deny Comrade Stalin’s contribution means to deny socialist revolution in itself. Comrade Stalin is the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. And as we Marxists-Leninists know, the negation of the teachings of one of the Classics of Marxism-Leninism means the denial of the teachings of all of them as a whole, as they all form an unbreakable unity. And the negation of the teachings of the Classics of Marxism-Leninism means the denial of scientific, materialist, dialectical communist ideology in its entirety.

It is important to take all this in consideration and to make our Stalinist-Hoxhaist (SH) positions absolutely clear before we go forward to present and compare the supposed “abyssal differences” between Soviet revisionists and Chinese revisionists in this matter.

Here are the “arguments” of the Soviet revisionists in their false “anti-Maoist struggle”. This first one is taken from one of the Soviet letters of response to the notorious “Chinese proposal concerning the general line of the international communist movement” (1963):

“There are serious differences between the CPC and the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties on the question of combating the consequences of the Stalin personality cult. The CPC leaders have taken upon themselves the role of defenders of the personality cult and peddlers of Stalin's erroneous ideas. They are trying to impose upon other parties the order of things, the ideology and morals, the forms and methods of leadership that flourished in the period of the personality cult. Let it be frankly said that this is an unenviable role, and one that will bring them neither honor nor glory. No one will succeed in persuading Marxists-Leninists, or progressives in general, to take up the defense of the personality cult. The Soviet people and the world communist movement highly appreciate the courage, boldness, the truly Leninist firmness of principle displayed by our party and its Central Committee headed by N. S. Khrushchov in eliminating the consequences of the personality cult.” (<http://www.marxists.org/history/international/comintern/sino-soviet-split/cpsu/openletter.htm>, *Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU to All Party Organizations, To All Communists of the Soviet Union*, July 14, 1963, edition in English)

“The leadership of the Communist Party of China lauds the Stalin's cult, opposing our criticism of the personality cult and our measures to combat its consequences. This in itself, of course, is already a serious interference in the affairs of our Party.” (<http://www.marxists.org/history/international/comintern/sino-soviet-split/cpsu/certain->

[aspects.htm](#), *Certain Aspects of The Inner Life of the Communist Party of China*, June, 1964, edition in English)

Courage?!! Boldness?!! Leninist firmness of principle?!!! We will not unmask and denounce all the huge evil lies and slanders fabricated by the Soviet revisionists against comrade Stalin and against authentic socialism. They cause us immense indignation and we will only say that what does not bring neither honor neither glory is the transformation of Soviet Union into a social-fascist and social-imperialist country which harshly repressed its own peoples while savagely exploiting and oppressing working classes' abroad. Contrary to what the Soviet revisionists affirm, to defend Stalinism is indeed a path of honor and glory. It is their bourgeois-capitalist machinations that only brought shame and decadence in favor of the interests of world bourgeois class and against the advancement of world socialist revolution. The "unviable" shame and defeat belong to them - it is our Stalinist-Hoxhaist struggle that will be crowned with honor and glory. And by the way, the ones who implemented the real "cult" were themselves, because by restoring capitalism in the Soviet Union and by turning it into a social-imperialist neo-colonialist superpower, they imposed the merciless cult of relentless exploitation to achieve maximum profit at home and abroad through oppression and enslavement of world working classes. What world communist movement and world peoples will truly appreciate is the day when truth will be finally revealed, Soviet and all other kinds of revisionists finally pay for their crimes and world will advance towards a classless and stateless society based on the teachings of the Classics, including on the ones of our beloved and irreplaceable comrade Stalin. We know that this paragraph is not essential to this article's theme, but we could not avoid writing it. The reading of the abhorrently anti-communist and anti-Stalinist slanders invented by Soviet revisionists reveals impressively that the Soviet-revisionists had cowardly hidden their liquidation of Stalinism behind the mask of "struggle against personal-cult".

Anyway, what really matters to the subject being analyzed here is that Soviet revisionists present Chinese Maoist revisionists as being "sectarian Stalinists" who "stubbornly defend Stalin's crimes and applaud his personality cult" (this is typical from Krushchevists, who insisted that "dogmatism and sectarianism was the main danger while, on the contrary, the main danger was modern revisionism. With the "main danger" of dogmatism, the modern revisionists intended to attack that which was the main danger for them: Marxism-Leninism. "Anti-dogmatism" is the weapon of revisionists in the fight against Marxism-Leninism, behind which they hide their own revisionism).

Soviet revisionists try to attack both comrade Stalin and the opportunist Mao in the same manner, thus depicting Stalinism and Maoism as being synonyms, thus eliminating distinction between them and attempting to discredit Stalinism in front of the eyes of the world working classes by equating it with "an unbearable sectarian tyranny" and with Maoist social-fascism, which was always an opponent of Stalinism – both in words and deeds. Soviet revisionists might have been bandits, but they were not stupid. They didn't lose an opportunity to demonize the only ideology which could lead to the destruction of their own bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist power and to the restoration of proletarian dictatorship and of socialism. Even outside Soviet Union, there were many lackey parties

following the Soviet revisionists who repeated like parrots their anti-Stalinist calumnies and false “anti-Maoist struggle”. For example, the “Communist” (pro-Soviet revisionist) Party of Denmark affirmed that it would “struggle to prevent the repetition of the errors due to Stalin’s cult of personality. Therefore, it opposes the implementation of it in China.” And it also accuses the Chinese revisionists of “dividing” the world communist movement. In truth, both Soviet revisionists and Chinese revisionists are divisors of world communist movement – while one of them justifies its anti-Stalinism with the name of Lenin, the other tries to fabricate a “Stalinist” appearance by using comrade Stalin’s name to hide its own anti-Stalinism. With the mentioned division, the first of them tries to keep its supremacy over world revisionism while the second tries to conquer it. True communists could never qualify themselves as being the main force and vanguard of Lenin’s party without Stalin. The most important duty of all the genuine communists is to defend not only Lenin but also Stalin, just like comrade Enver Hoxha made. All those who “defend” unity in words under the banner of Lenin but at the same time struggles against unity under the banner of Stalin cannot be called a true communist – but it is nothing more than an enemy of the unity of the world communist movement. That’s why all revisionists without exception are invariably and inevitably enemies of unity, no matter how much they scream the contrary. In his 1969 article entitled **“False anti-imperialism, counter-revolutionary mask of Khrushchevist revisionism”**, comrade Enver Hoxha explained that **“in the revisionist kennel there cannot be true unity and stability.”** Thus, **“each new crisis will divide even more the international revisionist front”**: if the revisionists are indeed **“united in a single-revolutionary front against their hostility and their common struggle against Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary forces who defend it”**, they are nevertheless **“related to the interests of their own national bourgeoisie”** which necessarily brings **“contradictions and conflicts with the revisionist cliques of other countries.”**

In 1964, Turkish pro-Soviet revisionists affirmed in their newspaper "Eni Tschag" that “the positions of the Communist Party of China and of the Chinese leaders have caused fission.” Indeed, the first fission was caused by the Titoists, the second by the Soviet revisionists and the third one by Chinese revisionists. So, the same that Turkish pro-Soviet revisionists are affirming for Chinese revisionism can also be applied to Soviet revisionism. These revisionisms are the ones which caused fission and division because they broke Stalinist world camp and replaced it by the revisionist world camp, they prevented the achievement of communism in Soviet Union and submerged world proletarians, workers and all other exploited and oppressed classes in their anti-MLSH poison. From a Marxist-Leninist viewpoint, it is the duty of all communists to combat Soviet revisionism, Chinese revisionism and all other kinds of revisionism and neo-revisionism. It is not possible to side with a certain revisionist current in order to fight against the others.

Also in 1964, Syrian pro-Soviet revisionists accused Maoist leaders of “dividing the communist movement.” On their journal "Al Akbar" in an article entitled “3 Ultra-foolishness' – On the attitude of the Chinese leaders”, April 12, 1964, they affirmed that Chinese revisionists were “spreading calumnies about capitalist restoration in Soviet Union and its cooperation with American imperialism” and of “wanting to establish split,

cleavage and division as an universal law of communist movement". Concerning the first two accusations, in fact, as we have already proved, when China signed the Moscow Declaration in 1960, where the Soviet Union was characterized as a socialist country. However, in 1960, SU was not just a capitalist country, but also a country that exploited and oppressed not only the countries of the "socialist world" but also the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The Syrian revisionists claim that the Soviet Union is the friend of the Arab peoples. Enver Hoxha showed that SU harshly exploited and repressed the Arab peoples. In 1960, the collaboration between Soviet social-imperialists with the U.S. imperialists (including the Arab World) already existed. Indeed, the Soviet Union supported the Arab bourgeoisie. Arab communists were put in prison and killed - with Soviet weapons! Like Khrushchev cooperated with the most reactionary Arab against Arab revolutionary leaders, Mao Tsetung also did the same. Maoism was a colonialist ideology of repression and exploitation of Arab world by the Chinese.

And Syrian Khrushchevists state that: "Arab nations condemn our disgust and anger with the "theory" of Chinese leaders calling for an intermediate zone or neutral zone, for what they mean, essentially, West Germany, England, France, China, etc.. (...) So, the Chinese leaders qualify as "neutrality" the imperialist West German equipment of Israel with weapons to penetrate the Arab countries? Or the "neutrality" of the British imperialists to bomb inhabited areas in Yemen and Oman? Are the French military bases in North Africa, an expression of the "neutrality" of French imperialism?" Of course, this anger of the Syrian pro-Soviet revisionists does not extend to the "neutral" neo-colonialist and social-fascist penetration of Soviet imperialists in the Arab world. Here we have a scandalous proof of revisionist double standing...

In 1960, the global battle between the capitalist, wage slavagist, social-imperialist, revisionist, anti-socialist, anti-communist, social-fascist SU and capitalist, fascist, imperialist, wage slavagist, anti-socialist, anti-communist U.S.A for world hegemony was reality. So, contrary to what Syrian revisionists affirm, it was not a "Chinese calumny". But the Chinese revisionists exercise their "criticism" of the Russian social-imperialism only for the reason to better hide their own social-imperialism (just like the Chinese revisionists had abused their alleged "anti-revisionist restoration of capitalism" just to hide their own capitalist way).

In what respects to their third accusation, actually, the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism never considered division as "law of development of the world communist movement." The division of the world proletariat is an instrument of the world bourgeoisie to maintain its rule. Cleavage is not a fatal law of nature of the class struggle. To base ourselves on the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism is the most effective way to prevent cleavage by the bourgeoisie and to protect the unity of the world communist movement and to strengthen it. The world communist movement must be cleaned from the blisters and dividers. That's the right world Bolshevik attitude that Chinese leaders never practiced. The "theory" of Maoist division as a law of development of the world communist movement unit is the "theory" of the Maoist so-called "struggle between two lines" and of the Maoist "theory" of the "hundred schools" (these issues were already

studied in other texts, but they will also be further developed by us later in this DWM IV):

To leave the bourgeoisie and its line of middle class in the party and to impose this as a law of development of the party is a crime against the unity of the Bolshevik Party. This party itself develops by being purged of opportunist elements. This is the Bolshevik line. Maoism is an anti-Bolshevik line. Contrary to what Syrian revisionists insinuate, the Soviet revisionists don't defend the unity against Maoism. The crimes of the Soviet revisionists are that they divided the world communist movement behind the so-called "fight against Maoism". The unity of the Soviet revisionists is based on the anti-Stalinism unity. Anti-Stalinists are never defenders of the world communist movement unity, but dividers and annihilators of it. Both Soviet revisionists and Maoists are divisors of the world communist movement, the Soviet revisionists hide this behind Leninism, while the Maoists hiding this behind Stalinism.

Of course, there can be situations when division is justified because the Marxist-Leninist line will be replaced at by a revisionist line at the party, then it is indeed the duty of Marxist-Leninists to start a new Marxist-Leninist party and to fight against the old degenerate party. So it all depends on the political line. Cleavage in defense of Marxism-Leninism can not be equated with cleavage against Marxism-Leninism. When thinking about cleavage we must always resort to the class question: "What class benefits and what class suffers damages because of the cleavage?" The revisionist parties pretend to "defend Marxist-Leninist unity" (they are supposedly "based on" the teachings of Lenin's struggle against factionalism), and attack Maoism just because the Maoists are hiding their revisionism behind Marxism-Leninism. The revisionist parties split openly (they have the power), while the Maoists split covertly (they have to conquer the power yet). In essence, the two are divisors of the communist party, are enemies of Marxism-Leninism. Of course, the Maoists keep the cloak of "Marxism-Leninism" to establish a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist party. The fact that the Maoists have no interest in a Marxist-Leninist party has been seen in many countries where the Maoists have supported various "Marxist-Leninist" parties. There is only one working class, and can therefore be only one communist party. Maoists deny this and therefore are lackeys of the bourgeoisie, weakening the Marxist-Leninist movement to strengthen their positions.

But let's return to "anti-Maoist arguments" of the Soviet revisionists, who continued with their anti-Stalinist zeal:

"By permitting abuses of power within our Party and in relation to fraternal Parties and annihilating people who had opinions of their own, he forfeited people's confidence and destroyed his own prestige. During and after the war, Stalin himself apparently felt that one should not order Parties about at one's own will. This, in particular, was one of the reasons for the dissolution of the Comintern.

After Stalin's death our Party, having analyzed all these things in an honest and Marxist-Leninist way, took steps to correct the situation that had arisen. On its own initiative, the CC CPSU corrected Stalin's errors and restored the Leninist principle

of equality in its relations with fraternal Parties and countries. (...) It is not superfluous to note that the CC CPC fully approved these steps taken by our Party and set a high value on them.” (<http://www.marxists.org/subject/china/documents/polemic/sevenlet.htm#17>, *Letter of The Central Committee of the CPSU of March 7, 1964 to the Central Committee of the CPC*, edition in English)

In first place, we must denounce the lie that comrade Stalin would be responsible for the destruction of the glorious former Comintern. It was Dimitrov and his rightist opportunism - the antecessor of Krushchevists and Soviet revisionists - that must be blamed as one of the main factors leading to the liquidation of the Comintern. However, what is most interesting with this last quotation from Soviet / Khrushchevist / Brejnevist revisionists and social-imperialists is their last affirmation that “the CPC fully approved these steps taken by our Party and set a high value on them”. So, the Soviet revisionists are declaring that Chinese revisionists have approved their anti-Stalinist and anti-communist poison and that there are no relevant differences between them regarding this issue. This is one of the exceptions when Soviet revisionists failed to present the fabricated impression of the existence of “serious differences between them and the Chinese Maoists revisionists.

However, if we study the official documents of the Chinese revisionists, we will find many examples that prove that those referred and much propagandized “serious differences” between Soviet and Chinese revisionists concerning comrade Stalin never existed at all:

“(...) Stalin made some serious mistakes in regard to the domestic and foreign policies of the Soviet Union. His arbitrary method of work impaired to a certain extent the principle of democratic centralism both in the life of the Party and in the state system of the Soviet Union, and led to a disruption of socialist legality. Because in many fields of work Stalin estranged himself from the masses to a serious extent, and made personal, arbitrary decisions concerning many important policies, it was inevitable that he should have made grave mistakes. These mistakes stood out most conspicuously in the suppression of counter-revolution and in relations with certain foreign countries. In suppressing counter-revolutionaries, Stalin, on the one hand, punished many counter-revolutionaries whom it was necessary to punish and, in the main, accomplished the tasks on this front; but, on the other hand, he wronged many loyal Communists and honest citizens, and this caused serious losses. On the whole, (...) in tackling certain concrete questions, he showed a tendency towards great-nation chauvinism and himself lacked a spirit of equality, let alone educating the mass of cadres to be modest. Sometimes he even intervened mistakenly, with many grave consequences, in the internal affairs of certain brother countries and parties.” (<http://www.marxists.org/history/international/comintern/sino-soviet-split/cpc/mhedp.htm>, *More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, edition in English)

In his speech "For new victories of the world communist movement" of January 6th, 1961, Khrushchev, the then leader of Soviet revisionists and anti-communists, said about the relationship with the Chinese:

"I want to draw attention to our unchanging effort to establish the bonds of fraternal friendship with the CPC. Our party may be in its relations with the CPC always guided by the fact that the friendship of the two great nations, the merger of the two parties (!), the enlargement of the world communist movement, is of extraordinary importance, our party will always continue to do everything possible to strengthen this friendship.

On the other hand, and simultaneously, Khrushchev said in his report to the XXII Congress of the "C"PSU on October 17, 1961, on relations with Albania:

"Albanian leaders did not agree with the conclusions of the deliberations of the fraternal parties in the years 1957 and 1960, which are known by the decisions of the Twentieth Congress and the price that our party had to pay to overcome the harmful consequences of the personality cult [!]. The Albanian leaders are now turning against our XX Congress, against the decisions of our party concerning the cult of Stalin's personality. Nobody will distract us from the Leninist path."

And the final word in his report presented at the XXII Party Congress "On the Program of the CPSU" provided by Khrushchev on 18 October, 1961 on Enver Hoxha:

"All the defects which gave us the period of the personality cult, manifests itself in their worst in the Party of Labour of Albania. Albanian leaders use to utilize violence and arbitrariness of power and prosecute people relentlessly [actually only Albanians agents of the Soviet revisionists and Titoists did this!]. The Albanians communist are victims of violent crimes of Enver Hoxha and Mehmet Shehu [!]. Our party was delivered bitter attacks by them, as they are closed enemies of communism. However, it must be said that no one would have gone in such a dizzying pace rampant anti-Soviet propaganda, as did the Albanian leaders. Apparently they want some alms from the imperialists through splitting the communists [!]." This quotation demonstrates the reconciliatory attitude to the Chinese revisionists and simultaneously the deepest hostility to the Marxist-Leninists of Albania with comrade Enver Hoxha at the top.

In Soviet Union, the bourgeoisie was in fact destroyed as a class, but a new bourgeoisie formed the heart of the socialist society outside the control of the leaders of the state, the party, the mass organizations and technocrats and bureaucrats, intellectuals and labour aristocracy were newly formed – a privileged strata of the Soviet Union. Comrade Enver Hoxha correctly noted that: **"Today's Soviet state is managed as a collective capitalist means of production on behalf and in the interests of the new Soviet bourgeoisie. The socialist public ownership became a new type of state capitalism."** Only in China the bourgeoisie remained as an untouchable class, it simply was rejuvenated and strengthened by revisionist party cadres, state, transaction, etc.

Lenin taught that we have to build a new society, so that the revolutionary enthusiasm of the builders must necessarily be based on a consistent adherence to the principle of socialist material incentives. This was not only taught by Lenin, Stalin continued it in practice - an increase of socialist consciousness, according to the increased level of socialist life. But the Soviet revisionists abused the Leninist doctrine and hid the Stalinist doctrine, in order to disguise the material incentive for the restoration of capitalism. The encouragement of socialist material was replaced by the incentive of capitalist material. Revisionist material incentive is socialist material incentive in words and encouragement of capitalist material works! In China, however, there has never been an incentive socialist material, because China has never been a socialist country.

The Soviet revisionists never criticized that China has always been socialist only in words but capitalist in actions. That is exactly in what the "anti-Maoism" of Soviet revisionists fundamentally differ from the authentic anti-Maoism of comrade Enver Hoxha and the Marxist-Leninist world movement!

The Soviet revisionists went on affirming that: "Strength of the effect of the law of uneven economic and political development of capitalism wins the socialist revolution in different countries at different times, and therefore the construction of a socialist society in these countries is completed at different times. As a result, some countries start a little earlier and others a little later with the construction of communism. The development of socialist states under one world socialist system and the use of the principles and advantages of this system give them the opportunity to shorten the deadlines for the establishment of socialism, open the perspective for an - in the area of a historical period - or more less simultaneous transition to communism."

This is exactly what has been touted in the "C"PSU Program, but was prevented, in fact, by the actual restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union! This is precisely the betrayal of the Soviet revisionists of Stalinism and the transition to communism! And the "anti-Maoism" of the Soviet revisionists is characterized in that the Chinese are turning more difficult the way of the Soviet Union and its revisionist world with the alleged "way of the world socialist camp for world communism" barred by Chinese's cleavage.

The blame for delays and failures on the road to communism is always the revisionism of other countries, and never revisionism of their own country. Their own revisionism is hidden behind false attacks against revisionism in other countries.

This applies both to Soviet revisionism and Maoism, and therefore also for the "anti-Soviet revisionism" of the Chinese revisionists and to the "anti-Maoism" of the Soviet revisionists.

The cleavage of the revisionist world camp, the complete and versatile settlement of the world communist movement has further accelerated the path of the Chinese and Soviet revisionists towards world imperialism and not towards world communism.

Today, the world imperialist system creates the conditions of globalization, the objective conditions for its collapse, we are faced with the straightforward task to destroy the world imperialist system of states by the world socialist revolution and establish world socialism and then global communism over their world ruins.

The Soviet revisionists expel more rubbish: “Undoubtedly, this requires the presence of imperialist countries and the antagonistic contradictions between the socialist and the capitalist system, inevitably, the expenditure of specific and significant forces of the socialist countries to tame [!] the aggressive claims of imperialism.”

We must ask: How will you be able to build world communism successfully without world imperialism defeated and annihilated by armed violent socialist revolution? The "theory" of "domestication of imperialism" is a totally counter-revolutionary and revisionist "theory". The same applies to the Maoist "theory of imperialist paper tigers". Both "theories" entirely contradict Marxism-Leninism.

Moreover, the Soviet revisionists state: “Some socialist countries face in their programmatic documents completion of construction of socialist society. Today or tomorrow they will be wrapped by the same problems facing our country. Should they benefit from the pseudo-revolutionary doctrine of neo-Trotskyist [!] and should slow down its development up to that time, as the world revolution is victorious?”

Here, the Soviet revisionists were enemies of world revolution and hid behind their alleged "fight" against the Trotskyite view that the construction of socialism "in a" country was only possible after the world revolution triumphed. Today, we Stalinists-Hoxhaists are demonized as Trotskyists, because we defend the world socialist revolution. In the fight against us, and the world socialist revolution, liquidators today are still based on Soviet revisionism! That is why our struggle against Soviet revisionism for the defence of the socialist world revolution is only relevant as we simultaneously fight also against Maoism.

Soviet revisionists remark: “When Soviet missiles, tanks, planes that are returned are nuclear weapons and other modern weapons are turned against those who are in the hands of imperialism, then the cause of socialism and peace will lose.”

If this were true, then why Soviet Union has then refused to equip the world socialist camp with nuclear weapons, in particular with the requirements of the Chinese revisionists to meet nuclear weapons? Because the Russian social-imperialism in this matter cooperated with U.S. imperialism! At the same time, revisionist China accomplished the atomic bomb in 1964 without the help of the Russians. Their first atomic bomb was a sign of their emerging imperialist hegemony. So far, not a single nuclear bomb was ever in the hands of other revisionist countries, and certainly is not in the hands of socialism and peace. In the world, the Russian and Chinese revisionist social-imperialism remained a monopoly of nuclear weapons.

The Soviet revisionists: “The party is firmly convinced that there is today no more forces would be able to destroy the socialist camp.”

The truth was that the Revisionist Party of the Soviet Union itself was the largest and most decisive force for the destruction of the world socialist camp. And that was one reason why the imperialist world needed not to make war against the revisionist Soviet Union at that time. The Cold War was directed only against Stalinism and of the danger of its return! Before Khrushchev, the imperialists had fear only to Stalin. And Khrushchev was more afraid of a return to Stalin as of the imperialists. That's why Khrushchev became a bitter enemy of Enver Hoxha and Socialist Albania. And the more Khrushchev fought the small Albania, the more he unintentionally supported the restoration of Stalinism and the strengthened the development of the weaponry of Hoxhism.

More revisionist rubbish: “The Soviet Union bears the burden of defending the socialist world system. This is precisely one of the manifestations of proletarian internationalism in action.”

In “action” there was not a single manifestation of proletarian internationalism, but of the power of the military world of Russian imperialism, which represented the main threat to the peace of nations, together with U.S. imperialism. The two superpowers were the greatest oppressors of the liberation struggle of the peoples, the biggest extinguishers of the fire of socialist revolution of the world proletariat, the greatest enemies of the only socialist country in the world, Albania, and of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of Comrade Enver Hoxha. And in the wake of the two superpowers, Mao Zedong laid the foundations for the imperialist ascension of the Chinese superpower.

The Soviet revisionists: “The construction of communism in the Soviet Union is one of the most important components of the development of the world revolutionary movement, the struggle for the victory of socialism in the world.” – we must use our irony to answer this by affirming that it is undoubtedly why the Soviet revisionists actually murdered Stalin and turned the Soviet Union into an imperialist superpower!

And there is more from the Soviet revisionists / Khrushchevist revisionists: “The economic competition of the two systems is an objective law.” Actually, this is pure economism at a point that the class struggle and armed socialist revolution, the conquest of political power of the proletariat, the dictatorship of the proletariat, etc. are considered "unnecessary and redundant" or even "avoidable" and "adventurer" and on top of that is they are even "anti-Marxist-Leninist.”

An objective law is not the peaceful economic competition between socialism and capitalism, but the class struggle between socialism and capitalism, between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, which is crowned with the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism and the victory of world socialism - or the restoration of capitalism - as in SU.

Stalinism teaches that the international class struggle intensifies in the same proportion that the socialist world is strengthened – when its economic strength, but also political power increases.

The Soviet revisionists: “One of the worst sins of the Chinese media and those repeating it, is that they try to pull the anti-imperialist peasant masses of the East from the alliance with the world socialist system and the Soviet Union and bring these powerful forces in opposition. The history of our Party and of world communism teaches that hidden behind the petty bourgeois, pseudo-red revolutionary spirit, lies liquidationism and therein lies the objective nature of the "concepts" of Chinese leaders and their friends with similar interests. The Soviet Union must denounce in the eyes of the peoples of Asia, Africa and South America this liquidating scenario.”

Here speaks the new Russian bourgeoisie over the Chinese bourgeoisie! The liquidationism of the Russian bourgeoisie is, in essence, no different than liquidationism from the Chinese bourgeoisie - both accuse each other of liquidationism under the guise of Marxism-Leninism.

Soviet revisionists: “The new ideological opponents, in which Marxists and Leninists of all countries have found their enemy has certain particularities: it does not act out, but within the communist movement, veiled with the Flag of Defence of Marxism-Leninism *[and even of Stalinism! - remark of the editor]* when it is alien and hostile to these ideas *[this description corresponds to both the revisionist ideas of Russian social-imperialist and the revisionist ideas of Maoism! - remark of the editor]* and manipulate the revolutionary feelings of the masses to achieve goals that have nothing in common with the interests of the socialist revolution.”

Here, the Soviet revisionists are only talking about themselves!

And there is much more:

“The reason why the mistakes made by Stalin during the later years of his life became serious, nation-wide and persistent, and were not corrected in time, was precisely that in certain fields and to a certain degree, he became isolated from the masses and the collective and violated the principle of democratic centralism of the Party and the state. The reason for certain infractions of democratic centralism lay in certain social and historical conditions: the Party lacked experience in leading the state; the new system was not sufficiently consolidated to be able to resist every encroachment of the influence of the old era (the consolidation of a new system and the dying away of the old influences do not operate in a straightforward fashion but often assume the form of an undulating movement at turning points in history); there was the constricting effect which acute internal and external struggles had on certain aspects of the development of democracy, etc. Nevertheless, these objective conditions alone would not have been enough to transform the possibility of making mistakes into their actual commission. Lenin, working under conditions which were much more complicated and difficult than those encountered by Stalin, did not

make the mistakes that Stalin made. Here, the decisive factor is man's ideological condition. A series of victories and the eulogies which Stalin received in the latter part of his life turned his head. He deviated partly, but grossly, from the dialectical materialist way of thinking and fell into subjectivism. He began to put blind faith in personal wisdom and authority; he would not investigate and study complicated conditions seriously or listen carefully to the opinions of his comrades and the voice of the masses. As a result, some of the policies and measures he adopted were often at variance with objective reality. He often stubbornly persisted in carrying out these mistaken measures over long periods and was unable to correct his mistakes in time. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has already taken measures to correct Stalin's mistakes and eliminate their consequences. These measures are beginning to bear fruit. The 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union showed great determination and courage in doing away with blind faith in Stalin, in exposing the gravity of Stalin's mistakes and in eliminating their effects. Marxist-Leninists throughout the world, and all those who sympathize with the communist cause, support the efforts of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to correct mistakes, and hope that the efforts of the Soviet comrades will meet with complete success. It is obvious that since Stalin's mistakes were not of short duration, their thorough correction cannot be achieved overnight, but demands fairly protracted efforts and thoroughgoing ideological education. We believe that the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which has already overcome countless difficulties, will triumph over these difficulties and achieve its purpose.” (<http://www.marxists.org/history/international/comintern/sino-soviet-split/cpc/mhedp.htm>, *More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, edition in English)

So, where are the “irreconcilable differences”? Where are the “abyssal disagreements”? Where are the serious differences” so much proclaimed to exist between Soviet revisionists and Chinese Maoist revisionist concerning comrade Stalin? We cannot find them. It seems obvious that the affirmation of existence of such “differences” by the Soviet revisionists is part of their false “anti-Maoism” in order to replace debate between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism by a false “debate” between two types of revisionism whose aims, purposes and even their positions are basically the same! Indeed, the same criticisms that we had made towards Soviet revisionists can be directed also against Chinese Maoist revisionists, who affirm that “the courage and determination” of the Soviet revisionists in annihilating Stalinist proletarian dictatorship and restoring imperialist-capitalist exploitation, oppression and all its inherent evils must be applauded. Those whose anti-socialist ideology is based on Buddhist religion and on Confucianism affirm that comrade Stalin – the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism – suffered from “subjectivism”. In their disgusting mouth, comrade Stalin “committed serious mistakes”. But during Stalinist times, Soviet Union successfully built socialism and was advancing towards communism, while China never had nothing to do with socialism and became a social-fascist country internally and a social-imperialist superpower externally. Today, China is a paradise for the exploitative billionaires who live in their palaces while the working and living conditions of the wage slaves resemble those practiced in the Nazi-fascist slave labor camps. Furthermore, in “Imperialism and the Revolution”, comrade

Enver asserted that in China a ridiculous personality cult was set up around Mao, who used to proudly affirm that he didn't even listen to the radio neither read any newspapers. And yet, the Chinese revisionists are the ones saying that comrade Stalin "was isolated, had his head turned and was not modest". You're the ones suffering from the defects you point to others, gentlemen the Maoist revisionists!

Relatively to comrade Stalin, there are no essential differences between the positions of Soviet revisionists and those of Maoist revisionists. Both struggle against comrade Stalin – the first of them in a more explicit manner and the second in a more concealed manner. They both reject comrade Stalin's teachings and legacy, praising Khrushchev's quest to prevent that world proletarians and workers can embrace Stalinism and definitively get rid of wage enslaving bondage. The apparent "dispute" that they consciously created was solely intended by each of them to discredit an imperialist-capitalist rival as "revisionist" so it could conquer the support and put down the class resistance struggle of the toiling masses among whom communist ideology hold immense prestige by presenting itself as being "authentically communist". So, it is now obvious that the supposed "anti-Maoism" displayed by Soviet revisionists concerning "Stalin's question" is a complete fake. Indeed, after met with Mao in the 50's, comrade Enver had warned that:

"To tell the truth, our impressions from this meeting were not what we expected (...) From the talk with Mao we did not learn anything constructive, which would be of value to us, and the meeting seemed to us mostly a gesture of courtesy. We were especially disappointed over the things we heard from the mouth of Mao about (...) Stalin (...)." (Enver Hoxha, *The Krushchevists*, Tirana, 1980, edition in English)

Already then, Mao's positions concerning comrade Stalin were entirely opportunist, just like those displayed by the Soviet revisionists. At that time, comrade Enver and the other Albanian Marxists-Leninists still expected something else, they still expected Mao to adopt principled Marxist-Leninist stands, but they came up with the conclusion that the "divergences" between Soviet and Chinese concerning Stalin were a big fraud and a mere façade invented by two branches of revisionism representing two social-fascist bourgeoisies – they actually didn't exist, just like Soviet "anti-Maoism" didn't exist.

Soviet revisionists tried to present their attacks against comrade Stalin as proof of their "spirit of self-criticism" that the Chinese revisionists were not capable of practicing. But the fact that Soviet and Chinese revisionist leaders screamed denunciations against each other is ultimately benefic for us, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, as it provides us with valuable arguments to unmask both Soviet revisionism and Chinese/Maoist revisionism.

It is clear that the death of Stalin led to the split of the world communist movement. The murder of Stalin was the clearest proof of this. The world bourgeoisie understood that the world communist movement would fall under the influence of modern revisionism. To prevent success of the struggle against modern revisionism by the world communist movement, the world bourgeoisie supported not only the Soviet imperialists, but also the Maoists. Chinese revisionism had the task of liquidating the world communist movement again if it would ever liberated from the domination of modern revisionism. But finally it

became clear that the Maoist activities in this division could not be carried out openly. Maoism was therefore difficult to unmask for the world communist movement, as over 15 years it was hidden behind the struggle against modern revisionism before being unmasked in 1978 by the PLA with Comrade Enver Hoxha at the head. [The world communist movement was freed from the influence of modern revisionism during the period from 1978 (China's rupture with Albania) to the death of comrade Enver Hoxha in 1985. Since 1985, it was under the influence of neo-revisionism - up to 2000. Since the year of the founding of the Communist International (SH), the world communist movement has been freed from the influence of neo-revisionism].

2.1.2 – On Peaceful Coexistence and on War

The second “issue of divergence” between Soviet and Chinese/Maoists revisionists about which we will reflect is that concerning so-called “peaceful coexistence” with world capitalism-imperialism. This “thesis” was fabricated by the Khrushchevist revisionists to justify capitulation to world bourgeois class and also to justify wage slavagist restoration in Soviet Union together with the country's new social-imperialist policy.

But who better than the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism to unmask this ultra-opportunist “theory” from the Soviet revisionists? Very early, Enver understood the authentic purposes of this “peaceful coexistence”:

“(...) the Soviet revisionists preached Khrushchevite peaceful coexistence as the general line of the international communist movement and proclaimed "peaceful competition with US imperialism" as the road to the triumph of socialism in the Soviet Union and other countries. (...)

Gambling on the name of Lenin and the Bolshevik Party, the Khrushchevite revisionists did their utmost to impose this anti-Marxist line of theirs, this revision of the Marxist-Leninist theory in all fields, on all the communist parties of the world. They wanted the communist and workers' parties of the world to adopt this revisionist line and transform themselves into counterrevolutionary parties, into blind tools of the bourgeois dictatorship, to serve capitalism.” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

“Equally in favor of imperialism and the bourgeoisie and harmful to the revolution was the other thesis of the 20th Congress of the CPSU about "peaceful coexistence", which the Khrushchevites tried to impose on the whole communist movement, extending it even to relations between classes, and between the peoples and their imperialist oppressors. According to the Khrushchevites, who presented the problem as "either peaceful coexistence or devastating war", there was no other solution for the peoples and the world proletariat but to bend their backs, to give up the class struggle, the revolution and any other action which "might anger" imperialism and provoke the outbreak of war.

In fact the Khrushchevite views about "peaceful coexistence", which were closely linked with those about the "changed nature of imperialism", were practically identical with the preachings of Browder that American capitalism and imperialism had allegedly become a factor of progress in post-war world development. The prettifying of American imperialism and the false image created about it slackened peoples' vigilance towards the hegemonic and expansionist policy of the United States of America and sabotaged the peoples' anti-imperialist liberation struggle. Both as an ideology and a practical political line, Khrushchevite "peaceful coexistence" urged the peoples, especially in the new states of Asia, Africa and Latin America, etc., to extinguish the "hotbeds from which the flames of war might burst out", to seek rapprochement and conciliation with imperialism, to take advantage of "international co-operation" for the "peaceful development" of their economy, etc. In its expressions, terms and other formulas, this line was the same as that preached by Browder (...).

The integration of the Soviet Union and other revisionist countries linked with it into the world capitalist economy has assumed large proportions. These countries have become some of the biggest importers of Western capital. Their debts, at least those which are made public, amount to tens of billions of dollars. Sometimes because of changing circumstances, such as those caused by the events in Afghanistan at present, this process is slowed down, but it never stops. The capitalist interests of the two sides are so great that in special situations they override all their frictions, rivalries and clashes.

The Soviet revisionists used the thesis about "peaceful coexistence" not only to justify their policy of concessions to and compromises with American imperialism. This line also served and is still serving them as a mask to hide the expansionist policy of Soviet social-imperialism, in order to lower the vigilance and resistance of the peoples to the imperialist plans of the Soviet revisionist leaders for hegemony. The thesis about "peaceful coexistence" was a call of the Soviet revisionists to the American imperialists to divide up the world and rule it jointly." (Enver Hoxha, *Eurocommunism is Anti-communism*, Tirana, 1980, edition in English)

This quotation from comrade Enver synthesizes the essential objectives of the Soviet revisionists' thesis about "peaceful coexistence" as an opportunist deviation intended to stop the struggle of world working classes for their liberation in the name of "avoiding war with imperialists". So, world proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes should refrain from their class struggles against their exploiters just because "that might cause the fury of the imperialists and thus launch the world into war".

We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, are not warmongers, but we are not afraid of war either. If world socialist revolution is not able to prevent imperialist world war, then we must transform this imperialist world war into a revolutionary civil war at a global scale. Of course, revisionists and opportunists of all types reject this because they want to prevent world workers from taking up weapons against world imperialists-capitalists to defeat

them through violent means, as is indeed entirely necessary and the only manner to achieve victory. These are the correct stands about this issue on which we base ourselves. All revisionist currents, from Khrushchevism and Maoism to Titoism, defend anti-socialist stands on this matter.

Soviet revisionists tried to present their “ideas” on this question as “true Leninist” and made and once made an affirmation their official documents that we will display here:

“The facts go to show that efforts to prevent a world war in no way weaken the forces of the world communist and national-liberation movements but on the contrary rally the broadest masses to the Communists. It was precisely in conditions of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems that the socialist revolution triumphed on Cuba (...).”

(<http://www.marxists.org/history/international/comintern/sino-soviet-split/cpsu/30march1963.htm>, *The Letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China*, March, 30, 1964, edition in English)

No comment. In the words of the Krushchevists, “peaceful coexistence fosters the spreading of communism and the national-liberation struggles” and the “proof” of this would Cuba’s example of a country where “a socialist revolution triumphed”. Socialist revolution in Cuba? Are they perhaps referring to the 1959 bourgeois-capitalist “revolution” by Cuban national bourgeoisie against their pro-American compradore rivals that ultimately ended up in turning Cuba in a colony of Soviet social-imperialism? Are they referring to the social-fascist rule that haunts Castroist-Guevarist Cuba until nowadays? Is this what they call “a socialist revolution”? Well, perhaps this is not as astounding as it may sound. After all, if the Soviet revisionists could qualify their imperialist war of aggression against Afghanistan as “fulfillment of socialist duties”, they can certainly also qualify Cuba’s 1959 “revolution” as “socialist”, of course. Taking them own examples, we can affirm that far from having attracted masses to communism and to national-liberation combats, their so-called “peaceful coexistence” only promoted social-fascism and Soviet neo-colonialism.

But let’s return to Soviet “anti-Maoism”. When displaying their “anti-Maoist” struggle, the Soviet revisionists tried to present their positions about the “peaceful coexistence” as being “opposite” to the ones defended by the Chinese revisionists about the same subject:

“What is behind the loud revolutionary phrases of the Chinese comrades? Disbelief (...) in the possibility of peaceful coexistence and in the victory of the proletariat in the class struggle. The struggle to prevent war unites all peace-loving forces. They differ in class composition and class interests. But they can be united by the struggle for peace, for averting war, because the atomic bomb does not draw class distinctions -- it destroys everybody within the range of its destructive action.”

(<http://www.marxists.org/history/international/comintern/sino-soviet-split/cpsu/openletter.htm>, *Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU to All Party Organizations, To All Communists of the Soviet Union*, July 14, 1963, edition in English)

With this abhorrent pacifist statement in which irreconcilable class interests (between exploiters and exploited, between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and other workers) are supposedly automatically eliminated in favor of “anti-war struggle” (a situation which inevitably benefits the established power of the bourgeois class who sees proletarians abandoning their communist struggle to unite with that same bourgeoisie “for peace”, thus forgetting their historical role as the thug of the bourgeoisie). The pro-Soviet “C” P of Denmark even affirmed that the victory of world socialism was possible without world war. Soviet revisionists were depicting their Chinese rivals as being “belicist” and “in favor of a devastating war that could extinguish humanity” (on the question of war and peace, especially in the matter of nuclear war, the Soviet revisionists and the Chinese revisionists constantly accused each other of being at the service of American imperialism. With this, they tried to hide the fact that all modern revisionists without exception are ultimately at the service of U.S. imperialism through their reactionary pro-capitalist theory and practice to prevent the achievement of proletarian dictatorship, of socialism and communism). And the Maoists, on their part, willingly played their role in this masquerade, pretending that real disputes with Soviet revisionists existed by making adventurist statements like the very famous from Mao: “Imperialists are paper tigers”, in which Chinese revisionists insinuate that warmongering imperialists were no longer aggressive neither dangerous.

However, a closer look at the documents from the Maoists reveals that, in fact, they also favored opportunist “peaceful coexistence” and embraced this capitulationist “theory”. In his text “Some Points in Appraisal of the present International Situation”, Mao Zedong wrote at the time (April 1946) about the possibility of an agreement between the imperialist and socialist countries, especially between the USSR and the U.S., Britain and France. However, contrary to what Mao insinuates, that does not mean that the peoples of the countries of the capitalist-imperialist world have to accomplish an agreement within their countries with their respective exploiters and oppressors (indeed, Mao’s defense of this has much resemblance with his anti-socialist “three world theory” which was already criticized by us in previous chapters of DWM and in other articles). What does this mean? – External agreements, yes – internal agreements, no. This means that the working class in the revisionist countries cannot give up their international class struggle in favor of a compromise with the imperialists (peaceful coexistence). With the victory of the world socialist revolution, the revisionists would perish along with their own power. And so, through compromise with the imperialists, modern revisionists in power believed they could handle the struggle of the genuine Marxists-Leninists. Because of the betrayal of the socialist world revolution by the revisionists, the division between the working class in capitalist and revisionist countries was consummated, the class struggle in each country became isolated, the working classes of each country are left to themselves, and the world imperialists have “free reign” to oppress and exploit individual nations.

Peaceful coexistence is supposed to strengthen the inner world of the socialist camp serving (“If you leave us alone to build socialism, we are sure you also leave you alone”). But proletarian internationalism is betrayed by the fact that the peaceful coexistence of the revisionist countries of the “world socialist system” strengthens the world imperialist

system in such a manner that even the remote possibilities of a peaceful transition to socialism are destroyed. It completely contradicts Marxism-Leninism that peaceful coexistence between the socialist countries can pave the way for the peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism. The world socialist system can not be built without the violent world socialist revolution. This Marxist-Leninist truth is trampled by both Soviet and Chinese revisionists.

On the Meeting of Syrian, Lebanese, Iraqi and Jordanian pro-Soviet revisionists entitled "On the revisionist distortions and splitting subversive activities of the Chinese leadership" (April 1964), it was declared that: "In the current era, peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition between the two different social systems is crucial for the development of the national liberation movement."

In first place, since the death of Comrade Stalin, the socialist system of the Soviet Union did not exist anymore (although two different social systems – capitalism-imperialism-revisionism and socialism - still existed as long as Albania was a socialist country of proletarian dictatorship). Thus the "peaceful coexistence" of the Soviet revisionists was only a cloak for pure capitalist coexistence between the capitalist countries and the former socialist Soviet Union where capitalism was restored. And second, the victory in the struggle of national liberation is not possible without armed revolution for the overthrow of all the inner and outer enemies of the suppressed and exploited peoples – and this entirely independent of the case if the liberation struggle would be supported by a socialist country, thus independent of peaceful co-existence between two different social systems. "Peaceful co-existence" of the Russian social imperialists was nothing else but secret diplomacy of cooperation between two superpowers which commonly exploit and oppress the peoples of the world. And the counter-revolutionary view of the revisionist "liberation struggle" of Syria, Lebanon, Iraq and Jordania was nothing but the "freedom" of decision whether their peoples should be exploited and oppressed by the Soviet imperialists or by the Chinese imperialists.

The Soviet revisionists have betrayed the transition to communism, declaring the dictatorship of the proletariat as superfluous and propagating the "state of the whole people." Comrade Stalin teaches, however: while the transition to communism in one country is carried out under the conditions of imperialist encirclement, the class struggle against external and internal enemies of the country will be exacerbated. And that class struggle can only be performed by the working class and its Bolshevik vanguard party. Comrade Stalin teaches, therefore, that the dictatorship of the proletariat is indispensable in the period of transition to communism, namely in a country that is surrounded by imperialist powers. Instead, the Soviet revisionists have ceased the class struggle against imperialism. In the question of the transition to communism, the *Chinese* revisionists found it impossible to build communism in the conditions of imperialism. In contrast to Stalinism, they affirm that the transition to communism would be an obstacle for the destruction of imperialism on a world scale, claiming that the construction of communism would be opposed to internationalism. Allegedly, the transition to communism in "one" country would "discriminate" against other socialist countries which would be still not ripe for a transition to communism. These Chinese arguments

attest to the fact that their entire way of thinking was largely effected by Trotskyism, which mistook the internal conditions of building socialism with international conditions. The Maoists denied the Stalinist theory of building communism in “one” country as a powerful lever of the socialist world revolution. And moreover, the Maoist denied even the Leninist theory of the possibility of the construction of socialism in “one” country. With other words, the Chinese revisionists did neither understand nor implement the Leninist-Stalinist theory of the socialist world revolution which relies on the construction of socialism and its transition to communism in “one” country – namely as a basis and lever of the socialist world revolution.

The difference between the Maoists and the Soviet revisionists is that the Maoists distorted the Leninist-Stalinist theory of the socialist world revolution, while the Soviet revisionists propagated it for the purpose of hiding their revisionism behind it. Finally, on the XX and XXII Congress of the CPSU, the Soviet revisionists openly abdicated the inalienability of the socialist world revolution and replaced it through the “peaceful way” towards socialism (XX Congress) and even towards communism (XXII Congress). The Leninist theory of peaceful co-existence between two different social formations is part of heaviest class-struggle, is part of the preparation of the armed socialist world revolution. Peaceful coexistence is not an end in itself. This would only lead to the prolongation of the existence of world capitalism and finally to the defeat of socialism.

There is not a “peaceful way” towards socialism or communism road while imperialism prevails in the world. However, the Soviet revisionists were of the opinion that they could build communism in "peaceful competition" between the two systems in the world (whereas the socialist camp ceased to exist after the death of comrade Stalin). The Soviet revisionists unarmed not only the working class in their own country, but also disabled the Soviet Union as a lever and base of the world socialist revolution of the world proletariat. Thus, the "communist" Program of the XXII. Congress of the “C”PSU served in fact only world imperialism and not world communism. There can be no peaceful competition - neither between capitalist states, neither between capitalist and socialist countries. As long as world imperialism exists, it never "irrevocably" loses its dominance. The world today demonstrates the core of this revisionist "theory of irrevocable victory of socialism" - which was defended at the VII World Congress of the Communist International. In 1964 there was no socialist camp anymore. (With the exception of socialist Albania) there was only competition between capitalist states. In other words, Russian imperialists were trying to safeguard their domain against Chinese imperialism and so they depicted Maoists as being engaged in "separatist activities of the division." This was the division that existed between revisionist states. In the meantime, American imperialism has maintained its hegemony, while China had to break this control to gain supremacy. Of course, nothing of this has anything to do with socialism.

Also the social-fascist Gomulka in his text “For the unity of the communist world movement and the socialist camp”– Trybuna Ludu, June 16, 1964 makes similar remarks. In truth, peaceful Coexistence and disarmament talks cannot stop the imperialist war, but only violent armed world socialist proletarian revolution can accomplish this through the destruction of the world imperialist system. The struggle of the proletariat alone is armed

class struggle - with the aim of overthrowing the domination of the world bourgeoisie and the establishment of world dictatorship of the proletariat. Instead of tackling the danger of war by the Maoist imperialist plans and policies, Gomulka attacks Marxism-Leninism. In the issue of war and peace, the Chinese and Soviet revisionism are in a single row against Marxism-Leninism, they are both against world socialist revolution – the first ones openly, the second ones in a hidden manner.

And there is more. Comrade Stalin had already noted that, since very early, the Chinese revisionists had defended opportunist and anti-socialist positions regarding various essential issues including that of “peaceful coexistence”:

“When China was liberated, Stalin expressed his doubt that the Chinese leadership might follow the Titoite course. Glancing over all the main principles of Mao Tsetung's revisionist line, in regard to all those things which he raises against Stalin, we can say without reservation that Stalin was truly a great Marxist-Leninist who foresaw correctly where China was going (...). » (Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China*, Volume II, Tirana, edition in English)

“We have vigorously and unswervingly fought for the relaxation of international tension and in defense of world peace. (...) We have consistently advocated the peaceful coexistence (...), we have advocated the settlement of international disputes through negotiation, and we have opposed recourse to force.”
(<http://www.marxists.org/history/international/comintern/sino-soviet-split/cpc/oppose.htm>, *Workers of All Countries unite, Oppose our Common Enemy*, 1962, edition in English)

Here it is Chinese pacifism and opportunism at its worst. Indeed, the embracement by both Soviet and Chinese revisionists of this kind of “peace theories” (not only that of “peaceful coexistence”, but also that of “peaceful transition to socialism”, for instance) is closely related with their common rejection of proletarian dictatorship, to which armed violence and coercion is inherent. But of course, they only refuse violence and war if it is waged by the oppressed and exploited against oppressors and exploiters. If they are waged in the opposite direction, they entirely support them, indeed they are always among the main promoters of them (as we saw on Afghanistan, Angola, Ethiopia, Cambodia, and in many other Chinese and Soviet neo-colonies).

There are no essential differences between Chinese and Soviet revisionists in what concerns their positions relatively to “peaceful coexistence” (read: capitulation) with world capitalism-revisionism. The only true “divergences” that may have existed between them are those related not with genuine concerns for authentic Marxist-Leninist ideology, but merely those arising from rivalries between two aspirants to become imperialist superpowers – as indeed they managed to do, the Soviets before, the Chinese after. Both Soviet revisionists and Chinese Maoist revisionists supported everything and everybody to get rid of their respective rivalries – one just has to recall Mao’s alliance with the imperialist USA, the imperialists, fascists and reactionaries all over the world (Mobutu, Marcos, Franco, Salazar, Somoza, Suharto, Pinochet, etc.); and also Soviet

social-imperialists' and revisionists' alliance with all kinds of social-fascists and anti-communists (Mengitsu, Neto, Castro, Che Guevara, Machel, the Argentinean fascist generals, etc.).

With their adoption of the opportunist theories of "peaceful transition", Soviet revisionists and Chinese revisionists aimed at accomplishing two purposes. The first purpose was to keep world proletarians, workers and the other exploited and oppressed classes away from armed anti-imperialist struggle, because "that will anger the imperialists and can cause a world war" and because "we cannot tolerate the use of violence" (knowing very well that without violence the defeat of imperialism is impossible). This objective is crucial to Soviet and Chinese revisionists because of their plans of becoming themselves imperialist superpowers. With such "arguments", they are preparing the grounds for convincing world toilers to put down the fight for their liberation from imperialist bondage, thus eternally perpetuating it.

The second purpose they try to fulfill is to use the "necessity of peaceful coexistence" as a justification to their obvious allowance of Western imperialist penetration in their respective countries. This because both Soviet and Chinese revisionists believed they could use the willingness of their Western imperialist rivals to penetrate their countries as something that could foster their objectives of becoming imperialist superpowers. But this would at least partially destroy the "socialist" and "red" cloaks that they were still trying to maintain to deceive world laborers about their true nature and aims in order to deviate them from anti-imperialist and pro-socialist liberation struggle. So, they justified this by affirming that "socialism implies that we must have good and peaceful relations with the entire world". However, to Soviet bourgeois-revisionist class these "good and peaceful relations" costed dearly, as Western imperialist penetration eventually led to the disappearance of Soviet Union as an imperialist superpower and as a single state. In the early 70's, comrade Enver wisely predicted that:

"It (American Imperialism) will exploit the Soviet Union, will draw fabulous profits from it, which will serve to strengthen its world empire. Besides this, the introduction of American capital into the Soviet Union will cause even the smallest remnants of the victories of the Great October Socialist Revolution to be eliminated very quickly, will bring about the dismantling of the Soviet Union as a union of republics. This is the objective of American imperialism: to destroy the Soviet Union as a dangerous rival capitalist power. The «wiseacres» will say: «This will be difficult to achieve». On the contrary, this is easily achieved when you come off the rails of Marxism-Leninism." (Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China, Volume II*, Tirana, edition in English)

And it was also comrade Enver who revealed that Chinese revisionists were also doing the same. Referring to the times when "Sino-Soviet split" began, he states:

" (...) in the conditions of the "peaceful coexistence" between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, wealthy America could assist restoration and advance of the whole world. It was the same line which Tito advocated and applied

in Yugoslavia, which had opened the doors of that country to American aid, credit and capital. It was the same desire, which Mao Zedong and other Maoist leaders had to build up China with American aid, but which the different circumstances and events had hindered up to that stage.

And the Soviet Union cannot escape American aid and the aid from the other Western countries any more than the Titoites, or today the Maoists can escape them.” (Enver Hoxha, *Eurocommunism is Anti-communism*, Tirana, 1980, edition in English)

However, the Chinese revisionists were able to avoid that what happened with Soviet revisionists occurred also with them by adopting a very simple tactic: while taking advantage of Western imperialist penetration of capital, Chinese state monopolist bourgeois class always kept and continues to keep the key industries and economic sectors firmly in its hands.

Concluding, the pretense “criticisms concerning Maoist positions about peaceful coexistence” made by the Soviet revisionists are a fake to mislead world workers in benefit of their bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist and anti-socialist interests and purposes. We will further develop this last issue in the final remarks of this sub-chapter.

2.1.3 – On Peaceful Transition to Socialism

We will now analyze the supposed “divergences” between Soviet and Chinese revisionists concerning the reactionary so-called “peaceful transition to socialism”, something which is still related with the issue of “peaceful coexistence” that we studied in last sub-chapter. Once more, we will see that Soviet imperialists-revisionists’ supposed “ideological disagreements with Maoism” are a fake. Their only true “disagreement” with Maoism was their fear that Maoist branch of revisionism (representing the interests of Chinese bourgeois class in search of imperialist ascension) could surpass the influence of their own.

The refusal of revolutionary violence and of the revolutionary use of coercive force has been a common trait to all kinds of revisionist, reformist and opportunist theories which try to keep proletarians and workers under wage slavagist bondage forever. In face of this, Khrushchevist revisionists could not be an exception.

In a Soviet text on 28 and 29 April, 1964, the International Declaration of 1957 is quoted. The Soviet revisionists tried to put all the parties embracing the “peaceful path of socialist revolution.” The Declaration of 1957 says that “if the exploiting classes resort to violence against people, another possibility should be considered, i.e the non-peaceful transition to socialism”.

In this sentence, the word "if" fully contradicts Marxism-Leninism. Any exploitation is nothing but the violence of a class against another. The statement avoids the term "violent socialist revolution." This expression was used by all the classics of Marxism-Leninism and in all revolutionary programs. Instead, we have the passive capitulationist expression "if".

A revolution against the exploiting and oppressive classes is always violent. There were no exploited and oppressed classes in history who have been freed by peaceful means of their exploiters' claws. History is the history of class struggle. Thus, there is no historical transition to socialism without class struggle. And the struggle of the working class can naturally lead to the victory over the capitalist exploiters only through armed violent means. The class struggle aims at the violent destruction of the domination of one class by the forced creation of the state of another class.

Even a strong world socialist system cannot eliminate peacefully the violence of the exploiting classes. Exploitation is the nature of a crime committed by some men against other men. Who affirms that "peaceful" means can replace violent ones in the accomplishment of socialist revolution and of proletarian dictatorship can only be or an exploiter or a lackey of the exploiters - but in any case, he/she is not a communist! Even in the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin, there could be no peace of classes because capitalism still existed in the world. That is why Lenin and Stalin taught the necessity of class struggle under socialism. However, the Soviet revisionists were of the opinion that it is possible to leave the path of violent class struggle with the help of "peaceful coexistence." We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, know that we cannot renounce to revolutionary violence and that peace of classes is impossible while there are still exploitative and oppressive classes in the world. The 1957 Declaration dodged this Marxist-Leninist theory. Therefore, the 1957 Declaration is undoubtedly a purely revisionist statement on the question of revolutionary violence and therefore on the question of the transition to socialism. It was heavily influenced by the revisionist XX Congress of the "C"PSU. And every Marxist-Leninist knows that the XX "C"PSU Congress had abandoned the path of Marxism-Leninism and had embraced the path of capitalist restoration and social-imperialist policy.

The rejection of revolutionary violence as an indispensable instrument of the proletarian dictatorship to defeat bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist forces and to accomplish socialism is a crucial characteristic of Soviet revisionism (and, as we will see, also of Chinese Maoist revisionism). In fact, this is also closely related with its rejection of proletarian dictatorship, which cannot exist without the systematic use of revolutionary force and violence. To refuse revolutionary armed violence inevitably means to refuse proletarian dictatorship whose embracement as indispensable is, as comrade Lenin once affirmed, one of the main things which distinguish reformists and opportunists from authentic communists. Of course, the proletarian dictatorship is not only some kind of abstract ideological victory over the bourgeoisie. No. The proletarian dictatorship can only grant the edification of socialism and the "*superior organization of the productive work*" (Lenin) through the effective elimination of the imperialist-capitalist order. Until the day that communist stateless, classless and propertyless society is ensured and that the danger

of capitalist restoration is totally surpassed is always necessary to strengthen the proletarian dictatorship in order to smash the bourgeoisie, the other exploitative and oppressive classes and to totally destroy the foundations of the wage slavagist socio-economical system. It's crystal clear that this process cannot advance without the use of revolutionary force and violence by the workers under proletarian leadership against reactionary forces:

“The scientific concept of dictatorship means nothing more nor less than completely unrestricted power, absolutely unimpeded by laws or regulations and resting directly on the use of force.” (Lenin, cited by Stalin in *The Questions of Leninism*, 1926, edition in English)

To affirm the contrary means to defend capitulationism and anti-communism, it means to defend the Khrushchevist thesis according to which *“socialism is irreversible”*. This thesis only defends imperialist-capitalist class interests because it weakens the proletarian dictatorship and permits the penetration of bourgeois influences inside communists' ranks.

We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, know that revolutionary proletarian armed violence is an universal law of class struggle, it is absolutely and indisputably necessary. Indeed, more than necessary, it is positive because it becomes the expression of the proletarian dictatorship whose aim is to totally destroy the very foundations of the capitalist-imperialist system and of bourgeois-reactionary influences and dominance. The refusal of both revolutionary violence and of proletarian dictatorship was justified by the Soviet revisionists as being needed to prevent “repression like that which occurred under Stalin”. But of course there was repression under comrade Stalin! Indeed, the situation found by comrade Stalin and by the other Soviet Marxists-Leninists right after comrade Lenin's death is one of the best examples of how revolutionary violence and proletarian dictatorship are indeed the only manner to successfully accomplish socialist construction.

In truth, by the time when comrade Stalin became the leader of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevist) – CPSU (B), the Russian bourgeoisie was still very powerful and was far from being eliminated. Even many members of the party were heavily influenced by the old feudal-capitalist ideology. In these conditions, proletarian armed repression and coercion was desperately needed, even because only through the exercise of revolutionary armed force and violence the proletariat learns to defeat the bourgeoisie and to build a socialist and later communist society. The truth is that the proletarian dictatorship implies bloody clashes between the revolutionary and the reactionary forces; it implies implacable combats between the old exploitative and oppressive classes and the formerly exploited and oppressed classes that are now under the leadership of their communist proletarian party vanguard; it implies the depriving of the former exploiters of their material and socio-economic basis of dominion through the complete and quick expropriation and collectivization of the means of production in favor of the proletariat and the other working exploited and oppressed classes, it implies the establishment of a planned centralized economy, it presupposes an indomitable and ferocious class struggle against everything related with the old bourgeois-capitalist

repressive system and of course, the proletarian dictatorship and its inherent revolutionary violence also necessarily involve the physical elimination of all kinds of anti-communist opponents. As Comrade Lenin stated:

“(...) this period (the dictatorship of the proletariat) inevitably is a period of an unprecedentedly violent class struggle in unprecedentedly acute forms, and, consequently, during this period the state must inevitably be a state that is democratic in a new way (for the proletariat and the propertyless in general) and dictatorial in a new way (against the bourgeoisie).” (Lenin, *The State and the Revolution, Collected Works*, pages 381-492, 1918, edition in English)

Comrade Enver always understood the true objectives behind the defense of this “peaceful transition” and he clearly affirmed:

“The laboring masses, guided by the local proletariat headed by the communist party and in alliance with all the proletariat of the world, should make life impossible for imperialism, should crush its fighting 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 by the peaceful parliamentary road?”

This question has been clear and it was not necessary for Comrade Khrushchev to confuse it in the 20th Congress, and do so in such a way as to please the opportunists. Why was it necessary to resort to so many parodies of Lenin's clear theses and the October Socialist Revolution? The Party of Labor 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 assumed power without bloodshed [like the Czechoslovak revisionists did – note of the Comintern (SH)], for they forget that the glorious Soviet Army shed streams of blood for them during the Second World War. Our Party thinks that, in this matter, we should be prepared and prepared well for both eventualities, especially, for taking power by violence, for if we are well prepared for this eventuality, the other eventuality has more chance of success. The bourgeoisie may allow you to sing psalms, but then it deals you a fascist blow to the head and crushes you because you have not trained the necessary cadres to attack, nor done illegal work, you have not prepared a place where you can be protected and still work, nor the means with which to fight. We should forestall this tragic eventuality.” (PLA, *The Party of Labor of Albania in Battle with Modern revisionism, Speech delivered at the Meeting of 81 Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow on Nov. 16, 1960*, 1972, edition in English)

“The line and program which Khrushchev presented at the 20th Congress of the CPSU constituted not only the line of the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, but also the line of undermining the revolution and of the subjection of the

peoples to imperialism and the working class to the bourgeoisie. The Khrushchevites preached that at the present stage, the main road of transition to socialism was the peaceful road. They advised the communist parties to follow the policy of class conciliation and collaboration with social-democracy and other political forces of the bourgeoisie. This line assisted the attainment of those objectives for which imperialism and capital had long been fighting with every means, including arms and ideological diversion. It opened broad roads to bourgeois reformism and gave capital the possibility to manoeuvre in the difficult economic, political and military situation created for it after the Second World War. This is the explanation for all that great publicity which the bourgeoisie gave the 20th Congress of the CPSU all around the world and which called Khrushchev "a man of peace" who "understands the situation", unlike Stalin who was for "communist orthodoxy", "incompatibility with the capitalist world", etc. With their preachings of the peaceful road to socialism, the Khrushchevites sought to impede the communists and the revolutionaries of the world from preparing for and carrying out the revolution and wanted them to reduce all their work to propaganda, to debates and electoral manoeuvres, to trade-union demonstrations and day-today demands.

This was the typical social-democratic line which Lenin had fought so fiercely and the October Revolution had overthrown. The Khrushchevite views, which were borrowed from the arsenal of the chiefs of the Second International, aroused dangerous illusions and discredited the very idea of the revolution. They did not prepare the working class and the working masses to be vigilant and to oppose the bourgeois violence, but urged them to remain submissively at the mercy of the bourgeoisie. This was also proved in the events in Indonesia and Chile, etc., with the communists and peoples of those countries paying very dearly for the revisionist illusions about the peaceful road to socialism." (Enver Hoxha, *Eurocommunism is Anti-communism*, Tirana, 1980, edition in English)

In his book "Imperialism and the Revolution", comrade Enver denounced the entire reformist talking about the "peaceful road" by stating:

"They (Soviet revisionists) also declared that the proletarian revolution had allegedly entered a new stage, that it could triumph also in ways other than the seizure of state power by the proletariat through violence. According to them, state power could be taken in peaceful, parliamentary and democratic ways, through reforms.

The revolution (...) cannot triumph on the peaceful road. (...) the bourgeoisie never surrenders its power voluntarily. The history of the international workers' and communist movement, of the development of revolutions and the victories of the working class in a number of former socialist countries, and in our socialist country, shows that up till now revolutions have triumphed only through armed insurrection." (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

These principled and Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist positions from comrade Enver were of extreme importance to world exploited and oppressed classes which were being poisoned by revisionist “peaceful venom”. Indeed, Soviet revisionists used this to invent one more “ideological divergence” with Chinese revisionists, to fabricate one more false episode of their supposed “anti-Maoism”:

“In April 1960 the Chinese comrades openly revealed their disagreements with the world communist movement by publishing the collection of articles "Long Live Leninism!" This collection, made up, in the main, of distorted, truncated and incorrectly interpreted passages from well-known works of Lenin, contained propositions directed, in substance, against the fundamentals of the Declaration of the Moscow Meeting of 1957, which was signed on behalf of the CPC by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, against the (...) recognition of the peaceful (...) road of development of socialist revolution. » (<http://www.marxists.org/history/international/comintern/sino-soviet-split/cpsu/openletter.htm>, *Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU to All Party Organizations, To All Communists of the Soviet Union*, July 14, 1963, edition in English)

Soviet revisionists tried to depict Maoists as the “orthodox dogmatists” who would not allow the “peaceful road” to socialism, contrary to them, who would be very pluralist (in the bourgeois sense of the word) and would even permit “various possible roads to socialism” (at the beginning of their “career”, the Soviet revisionists even treacherously used to affirm that “we recognize both peaceful and non-peaceful path to socialism.” But their assertion is a fake, because from the moment they spread the lie that it is possible for the bourgeoisie and the other exploitative and oppressive classes to surrender power voluntarily, they are automatically not only preventing proletarians from concentrating in preparing to take power violently and to implement their class dictatorship, but also to deviate laboring classes from a very simple universal law of class struggle: genuine proletarian dictatorship and authentic socialist revolution and construction are not possible without the smashing of the bourgeois, exploitative and oppressive classes by the revolutionary armed violence of the proletariat and the other exploited and oppressed working classes. Everything else is anti-communist garbage intended to perpetuate wage slavery and capitalist-imperialist bondage).

On their part, at the time, Maoists tried to present themselves as “defenders of revolutionary force and violence” in order to appear as “true pure Marxists-Leninists”. This was a very wise tactic because Khrushchev theory of “peaceful road to socialism” was so obviously revisionist and capitulationist that even parties sympathetic with the Khrushchev line hesitated in embracing it, even because this embracement would dramatically decrease their credibility in front of the toiling masses and those would diminish their capacity to mislead them about their true anti-socialist nature. Therefore, the appearing of Chinese revisionists as “condemning Soviet defense of peaceful road to socialism” conquered many honest workers who didn’t understood that not only that this “condemnation” was false (because Maoists had always defended “peaceful paths” in their efforts to paralyze the struggle of Chinese laborers for a true socialist construction in

China and against the bourgeois-capitalist dictatorship that Maoists were implementing), but also that the referred “condemnation” was one more fabrication to make a sterile “debate” between two types of revisionisms (defending the respective interests of their bourgeois classes against rivals) look like a vivid “life and death struggle between revisionism and Marxism-Leninism”.

Indeed, just like Soviet revisionists, also Maoists hold obviously opportunistic and anti-communist views regarding the necessity of revolutionary violence. Comrade Enver remarked that:

“(…) openly taking counterrevolutionaries under his protection, Mao Tsetung stated: «We should kill none and arrest very few... They are not to be arrested by the public security bureaus, prosecuted by the procuratorial organs or tried by the law courts. Well over ninety out of every hundred of these counterrevolutionaries should be dealt with in this way». Reasoning as a sophist, Mao Tsetung says that the execution of counterrevolutionaries does no good, that such an action allegedly hinders production, the scientific level of the country, and will give us a bad name in the world, etc., that if one counterrevolutionary is liquidated, «we would have to compare his case with that of a second, of a third, and so on, and then many heads would begin to roll. .. once a head is chopped off it can't be restored, nor can it grow again as chives do, after being cut». As a result of these anti-Marxist concepts about contradictions, about classes, and their role in revolution that «Mao Tsetung thought» advocates, China never proceeded on the correct road of socialist construction.” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

Moreover, if we analyze attentively the Maoist documents and texts, we will find that they affirm:

“If we have adopted the policy of the struggle in favor of the union towards the national bourgeoisie, that’s mainly with the purpose of educating the national bourgeoisie. (...) and this permits that our bourgeois-democratic revolution can be directly transformed into a socialist and proletarian revolution through peaceful means.” (Liou Chao Chi, *Rapport politique du Comité central du Parti communiste chinois au VIIIe Congrès national du PCC*, Pékin, 1956, translated from French language)

Re-education of the bourgeoisie?!!! The bourgeoisie doesn’t exist to be educated! It exists to be exterminated by the proletariat through revolutionary armed violence and coercive force! Comrade Lenin once said that the great problems of humanity were always solved through violence and this is foremost applicable to the elimination of the bourgeoisie, to the annihilation of the capitalist system and to the period of transition to and construction of socialism and communism.

This capitulationism idea is closely related with the “theory” of the “peaceful transition to socialism » through bourgeois means; it is linked not only with the Euro-communist and

reformist idea of “humanizing” and “educating” capitalism but also with Boukharinist « theories », which can be considered as being among the ideological antecessors of Soviet / Khrushchevist revisionism. As comrade Stalin once said:

“ Boukharin’s greatest mistake is that he concedes that the koulaks and other bourgeois elements (...) can be integrated within socialism. This theory is a total absurd! The capitalists, the kulaks, the representatives of the foreign imperialists can be integrated in socialist society, according to Boukharin. We certainly don’t want this kind of “socialism”. We will not adhere to Boukharin’s conceptions. We, Marxist-Leninists, we think that there are irreconcilable differences between the capitalists and the proletariat. This is the base of the Marxist theory of the class struggle. But the Boukharinist theory about the peaceful integration of the capitalist elements within socialism contradicts the most basic Marxist principles, it contradicts the inevitable opposition between the exploiters and the exploited because the exploiters are included within socialist system. » (Stalin, *The questions of Leninism II*, 1931, translated from French language)

In fact, both Soviet revisionism and Maoist revisionism are influenced by and adopted Bourkharinist theories, and this is particularly clear in their positions relatively to « peaceful transition to socialism », in which they defend to be possible that the bourgeoisie and the other exploitative and oppressed classes can voluntarily and peacefully « integrate » into socialism, thus centered on the idea of the « civilized » and “peaceful” integration and inclusion of bourgeois-capitalist elements within socialism, it is based on the idea of the “joint government” of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in order to undermine and turn impossible the construction of socialism through capitulation to bourgeois and non-proletarian forces, influences and elements. This was one of the main purposes of the defense made by both Soviet and Chinese revisionists of the supposed « peaceful transition to socialism ». Indeed, just like we explained in the other DWM, in practice, the Maoists always applied this pro-bourgeois strategy even during the times they attempted to appear as «anti-Khrushchevist and anti-revisionist defenders of revolutionary violence».

2.1.4 – Final Remarks

Concluding, the supposed “irreconcilable ideological differences” between Soviet revisionism and Chinese revisionism upon which Soviet alleged “anti-Maoism” would be based are a mere fake. We will still provide one more example: the Soviet revisionists’ reaction to Maoist so-called “Cultural Revolution”. This « Cultural Revolution », its character and purposes were already analyzed by us in the previous DWM and in other texts. It was a mere combat between different factions of the Chinese bourgeoisie that competed among them for absolute power within the party and the state in order to better fulfill their specific exploitative and oppressive class interests. Comrade Enver once affirmed about Maoist « Great Cultural Proletarian Revolution » that:

“(...) was neither a revolution, nor great, nor cultural, and in particular, not in the least proletarian.” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

And of course, its anti-communist nature was so evident that Soviet revisionists would never lose this opportunity to play the role of «defenders of true Marxism-Leninism against Chinese deviations». Bourgeois scholars noted the reactions and attitudes of Soviet revisionists at the time and affirmed that:

«Pravda commented, “Questions arise: (...) Why is this ‘proletarian’ movement proceeding without any participation of the working class of China? (...) Where is the working class? Where in this thing are the party and government organs (...) ? (...) a revolution should be led by workers and the party. Not one country, not one communist party, can escape the growing and in the end decisive role of the working class, chosen by history to lead, organize, and bring about the liquidation of class society... Another lengthy Pravda article castigated the Chinese for seeking revolutionary leadership “either in the army, or in student youth, or in lumpen proletarian, declassé elements, or in the peasantry... but not in the working class.” (Elizabeth McGuire, *China, the Fun House Mirror: Soviet Reactions to the Chinese Cultural Revolution 1966-1969*, University of California, Berkeley, edition in English)

In first place, we must state that it is indeed true that Chinese Maoist revisionists always denied the historical role of the proletariat and of its party as the leadership of the socialist revolution. We reflected about this in the others DWM. But in spite of this, what an interesting sudden concern of the Soviet revisionists about the necessity of having the working class (the proletariat) and its vanguard party leading a genuine socialist revolution! This is indeed true and it constitutes an universal principle of Marxism-Leninism. However, contrary to what appearances may suggest, the Soviet revisionists were not in the least worried about denouncing and condemning the revisionist deviations and anti-proletarian garbage of the Maoists, even because Soviet revisionists were always – just like the Maoist revisionists - among those who denied the necessity of working class’ party leadership in the revolution in the most blatant manners, reaching the point of even replacing it with the « party of the entire people » (read: of the dictatorship of the new bourgeois class):

« In the Soviet Union too, the Communist Party of Lenin and Stalin has been liquidated. It is true that the party there did not change its name, as occurred in Yugoslavia, but it was stripped of its revolutionary essence and spirit. The role of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union altered and its work for the strengthening of the Marxist-Leninist ideology was replaced with the distortion of the Marxist-Leninist theory, under different disguises, through empty phraseology and demagogy. The political organization of the party, like the army, the police and the other organs of the dictatorship of the new bourgeoisie, was transformed into an organization to oppress the masses, not to mention the fact that it also became the bearer of the ideology and policy of their oppression and exploitation. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union degraded, was weakened and became a

"party of the entire people", that is, no longer the vanguard party of the working class, which carries forward the revolution and builds socialism, but a party of the new revisionist bourgeoisie, which causes the degeneration of socialism and carries forward the restoration of capitalism." (Enver Hoxha, *Eurocommunism is Anti-communism*, Tirana, 1980, edition in English)

"The party was stripped of its attributes as the vanguard of the working class, as the sole political leading force of the state and society, and was transformed into a party dominated by the apparatchiki and the KGB. The Soviet revisionists called their party the "party of the entire people" and reduced it to such a condition that it could no longer be the party of the working class, but the party of the new Soviet bourgeoisie." (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

And comrade Enver didn't fail to notice the similarities between Soviet and Chinese revisionists about this matter in that both deny the leading role of the working class and of its party in the revolution:

"The Soviet revisionists do not deny the leading role of the working class in words, while they have liquidated it in practice, because they have deprived this class of any possibility to lead. But even in theory they eliminate this role, in as much as they defend the ill-famed theory of "the party and state of the entire people". The Chinese revisionists, as the pragmatists they are, sometimes put the peasantry, sometimes the army, sometimes the pupils and students, etc., which ever suits the occasion, at the head of the revolution. The Party of Labour of Albania resolutely defends the Marxist-Leninist thesis that the working class constitutes the decisive force in the development of society, the leading force for the revolutionary transformation of the world, for the construction of socialist and communist society." (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

"It must be re-emphasized that Mao (...) was not in agreement with the leading, hegemonic role of the working class." (Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China, Volume II*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

It is crystal clear that both Soviet and Chinese revisionists point to the anti-socialist deviations of each other only to hide their own. And of course, the denial of the role of leadership of the working class and its party by opportunists of all kinds is not by chance. They want to prevent the accomplishment of socialism, because it is impossible to achieve a successful socialist revolution without the leadership of the working class and of its vanguard party:

"(...) the Marxist-Leninist ideology, the ideology of the proletariat, embodied in the Communist Party, today the Party of Labor, the vanguard of the working class, was the leadership of the (Albanian) revolution. That is why we triumphed not only in

the National Liberation War but also in the construction of socialism.” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

The truth is that with their phony “profound ideological divergences”, both Soviet revisionism and Chinese Maoist revisionism put in practice a game of misleading, because both of them have the same anti-communist nature and aims. The question of Chinese opportunism in the struggle against modern revisionism is nothing more than strengthening the forces of modern revisionism - is an hidden anti-Stalinist and counter-revolutionary position. Otherwise, the Soviet revisionists would not have differed between hostile attitude toward the PLA and a friendly attitude to the Chinese revisionists. In the first stage of disagreements with the “C”P of China, the “C”PSU was convinced that they could be overcome and resolved amicably (if the “C”P China would tolerate the dominance of Soviet revisionism within the world communist movement, then, in return, the Soviet revisionists would tolerate an exceptional and privileged position of the Chinese revisionists within the world communist movement – thus combining their domination with the dominance of the Chinese revisionists as associate "junior partners" of the Soviet revisionists).

When the anti-communist program of the Soviet revisionists was decided on the XXII Congress of the “C”PSU, there were heavy simultaneous attacks against comrade Enver Hoxha and PLA released on the same XXII. Congress - on one side - and reconciliation with the Chinese revisionists – on the other side. This proves that the PLA was the first and only party then communist world movement that criticized modern revisionism on the correct basis of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism, whereas the Chinese revisionists always continued with their opportunist reconciliationist positions between Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism and anti-Stalinism of the Soviet revisionists. Chinese revisionism never really struggled against Soviet revisionism on genuine basis of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism. In other words, the Chinese revisionists never supported the correct line of the PLA. The Maoists and the Soviet revisionists spread the lie that Albania had allegedly "parroted" Maoism. The truth is that the PLA never deviated from Marxism-Leninism until the death of Comrade Enver Hoxha, whereas the Maoists tried to enslave Albania to revisionist and social-imperialist China. But this attempt failed completely – just like before them the Soviet revisionists also failed to enslave Albania to revisionist and social-imperialist Russia. And also Titoite enslavement of Albania failed thanks to comrade Enver Hoxha.

The false "anti-Maoism" of the Soviet revisionists, social-imperialists and social-fascists was to hide their own betrayal of proletarian internationalism behind the “defence” of comrade Lenin. The "anti-Soviet revisionism" of the Chinese revisionists, social-imperialists and social-fascists was to hide their own betrayal of proletarian internationalism behind the “defence” of comrade Stalin. Proponents of proletarian internationalism were only the Albanian communists, against which the Soviet revisionists and Maoists acted together.

They fabricated and promoted false “disagreements”, phony “anti-revisionist slogans” and “truly Marxist-Leninist” fake pretenses in order to achieve two simultaneous purposes:

1 – To prevent the spreading of authentic proletarian communist ideology and to replace the struggle between it and revisionism by a fake “debate” between two branches of revisionism. Maoists themselves once made an affirmation that entirely suits them: "The revisionists are producing their own opposites and will eventually be buried by them. This is an inexorable law." However, it is an inexorable law that also the revisionists have produced neo-revisionists who try to save the revisionists from being buried. Consequently: the debate between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism was paralyzed by the phony “debate” between Soviet and Chinese revisionism. That is one of the crucial points of the betrayal of the Maoists.

With all this, they aimed at preventing the complete annihilation of global wage slavagist capitalist-imperialist system, thus safeguarding that system and the bourgeois class which dominates it from socialist revolution through keeping world proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes away from Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhism - the only authentically communist and proletarian ideology whose theory and practice can ensure their total and definitive liberation from wage slavery and world bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist-imperialist bondage through successful world armed socialist revolution, global violent proletarian dictatorship, world socialism and world communism - and which, for this reason, was always the main target of both Soviet and Chinese revisionists (and of all other revisionists, neo-revisionists and anti-communists, for that matter). Besides their cloaks of “irreconcilable dispute”, Maoist / Chinese revisionism allowed Soviet revisionism to revive:

“Revisionism survived with its ability to "retransform itself" by replacing its old "Marxist-Leninist" mask of the "four heads" through a new one, including the mask of "Hoxhism" (neo-revisionism). At the international level this happened unavoidably after the Soviet revisionism had lost its international leadership. A new revisionist ideology had to be installed, to maintain the international influence of revisionism, thus more suitable to paralyze the advanced development of the Communist World Movement. And the growing influence of Maoism appeared in the form of the apposition of the portrait of Mao in the rank of the Classics of Marxism-Leninism. This demonstrates the dangerous influence of Maoism in the initial phase of the development of the new Marxist-Leninist parties in many countries of the world. This molting of revisionism succeeded mainly in the form of Maoism. And the struggle for the elimination of the Mao portrait and its exchange through the portrait of comrade Enver Hoxha (as the only genuine 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism) reflects the essence of the further development of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement towards our new Stalinist-Hoxhaist World Movement.

If we look at the leading influence of Maoism and other revisionist international influences (eg, in Russia today), it is clear that the Soviet revisionism, even if it was already eliminated as a leading international center, was revived by means of

Maoism. (...) Maoism proved to be able to resurrect revisionism globally.” [General-Line of the Comintern (SH), *Historical teachings of the Comintern and of the Communist World Movement*, chapter VIII, 2011, edition in English]

Particularly concerning Soviet capitalists-revisionists, they made a big campaign about unmasking the revisionist roots of Maoism - but only for the reason to hide their own revisionism, social-fascism, social-imperialism, anti-communism and bourgeois nature behind it (characteristics they fully share with Chinese Maoist revisionists). They even insisted in equating anti-Sovietism with anti-communism, something which had been true during the times of socialist construction in Bolshevist Soviet Union of comrades Lenin and Stalin, but which ceased to be so after revisionist takeover and capitalist-imperialist restoration in Soviet Union.

The so-called criticism of the Soviet revisionists against Maoism was much more than a mere national attack, as some put it. The "anti-Maoism" of Soviet revisionists always "recognizes" a non-existent "socialist" China whose "development" was only "affected" by the Chinese leaders who were supposedly involved in a "corrupt" and "wrong" performance (defense of China before 1958, attacks against China after 1958 - China's defense as a revisionist country which faithfully followed Soviet / Khrushchevist / Brejnevist revisionism and social-imperialism; attacks against China for wanting to break with the revisionist SU in order to build its own revisionist and social-imperialist camp and sphere of influence. Soviet revisionists always considered that bourgeois-capitalist China has been "socialist" in both words and deeds. And that is exactly in what their false "anti-Maoist" fundamentally differs from the authentic anti-Maoism of comrade Enver Hoxha and of the Marxist-Leninist world movement, which correctly considered that revisionist China and so-called "Mao Zedong thought" had never anything to do with Marxism-Leninism, neither with socialism!

In fact, the true reason and target of their anti-Maoist attack was not Maoism (as we shown, it is the same bourgeois ideology as their own) but with this Marxism-Leninism was aimed - especially against comrade Enver Hoxha. In this, they counted with the help of their puppet anti-communist parties in countries like France, Italy, Finland, England, Ceylon, Poland, Austria, Czechoslovakia, India, USA, Luxembourg, Portugal, Costa Rica, Australia, Chile, Spain, Uruguay, Belgium, Turkey, Mongolia, Hungary, Argentina, Brazil, Japan, South Africa, Iran, Syria, Denmark, etc. The Soviet revisionists and their lackeys worldwide feared to lose their dominant influence (what is affirmed in this sub-chapter about Soviet revisionists' false "anti-Maoism" is also entirely applicable to their lackeys around the world). They could not openly attack Marxism-Leninism for do not losing their "communist" and even "Leninist" mask. Therefore, this attack could only be launched indirectly against Maoism. This is the whole truth!!! We had to explain this and to conclude this because it is an all-round method. It can be also implemented against our ideology of Stalinism-Hoxhaism, and so to denounce it is undoubtedly a very important ideological weapon of defending the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism.

2 – To weaken and discredit an imperialist rival of great dimensions that could endanger each one's social-imperialist expansion and search for markets, workforce and resources with the goal of profit maximization.

The main task of the Comintern (SH) in this particular chapter of DWM IV is the defense of Stalinism-Hoxhaim by means of unmasking the international double play between both the revisionist ideology of Maoism and the pseudo-"anti-Maoism" of the Soviet revisionists. After the death of comrade Stalin, the international tactics of the modern revisionists was mainly based on this sham maneuver between the Soviet revisionist and Chinese revisionist camp as the two, open and hidden, anti-Stalinist world camps. Both the Soviet and Chinese camps were revisionist camps. They did not only serve the interests of the national bourgeoisie in Russia and China, but moreover, they served the world bourgeoisie in its struggle against the communist world movement. The so called "Sino-Soviet-Split" was as a bulwark against the socialist world revolution and the international spreading of world communism, in general, and against comrade Enver Hoxha, the PLA and the single socialist Albania, in particular. However, Hoxhaim teaches that the communist world movement must smash *all* the revisionist camps without exception. We can never share our principles with revisionists, and we can not defend the one revisionist camp for the purpose to struggle against another revisionist camp. It is impossible to defeat Soviet revisionism without the defeat of Chinese revisionism, and vice versa, it is also impossible to defeat Maoism without defeat of Soviet revisionism.

The struggle against revisionism is simultaneously a differentiated and manifold task: firstly we unmask the single camps of revisionism (in particular), and secondly we unmask their interactions against the international unity of the communist world movement; or with other words: we must analyze, unmask and smash the interdependence of both, national and international actions and "theories" of the revisionists, and both the open and hidden actions and "theories" of the revisionists. The revisionists are both, lackeys of the national bourgeoisie and lackeys of the world bourgeoisie in the struggle against the proletariat in the single countries (in particular), and against the world proletariat on a global scale (in general). Hoxhaim teaches that the unity of the communist world movement can be defended not other than by smashing the *concerted action* of hidden and open revisionism. This concerted action was disguised with the so called "Sino-Soviet-Conflict", namely for the only purpose to dupe and liquidate the communist world movement with comrade Enver Hoxha at the head. Thus, the so-called "Sino-Soviet-Split" was a feigned "controversy" in the struggle against the unity of the communist world movement with comrade Stalin at the head.

The term "SINO-SOVIET SPLIT" was only a "pseudo-split", a mock battle, for deceiving the communist world movement and the world proletariat. **The so-called false "Sino-Soviet split" was the revisionist double play of splitting the communist world movement.** The split of the revisionist camp was necessary for the splitting and liquidation of the Stalinist movement. The so called "Sino-Soviet split" was a double play of the world bourgeoisie to split and liquidate the world communist world movement by forcing the true communists to support either the Soviet or Chinese revisionist world

camp. However, the Stalinist-Hoxhaists decided neither to take side of the *hidden* anti-Stalinist Maoists nor to take side of the *open* anti-Stalinist Soviet revisionists and unmasked and combated this revisionist maneuver victoriously on the basis of Stalinism-Hoxhaism.

The world bourgeoisie wanted always to “prove” that “the communist world movement will degenerate by itself and that it would be allegedly “too weak” of coming to power (see: liquidationism of Trotsky: “self-fulfillment of the law of communist self-destruction”; or Mao: “law of destruction-construction-destruction” - “split-unity-split”). These are all “theories” of so called “self-liquidationism” of communism and its movement. The communist world movement can only lose its danger for the world bourgeoisie if it is completely in the hands of the revisionist, no matter if the different revisionist branches share this leadership or not.

In truth, both Soviet and Maoist revisionisms and revisionists are liquidationist and capitulationist “theories” which aimed to replace the ideology of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism by bourgeois ideology. All these liquidationist “theories” were already created since the 7th World Congress of the Comintern – namely to dispense of our own communist organizations and ideology in favor of the unity front with the bourgeoisie. The liquidators of today categorically deny the existence of Stalinism-Hoxhaism, because it is the main hindrance for them to liquidate Marxism-Leninism. The neo-revisionists are still unable to liquidate the weapon of Stalinism-Hoxhaism, and that's why they call it helplessly “a figment of imaginations”. However! Earlier or later the neo-revisionist liquidators will try to succeed with the implementation of the old example of the Sino-Soviet double play between open anti-Stalinism and hidden anti-Stalinism. They will learn to master the double play of open anti-Hoxhaism and hidden anti-Hoxhaism (neo-revisionism hidden behind alleged “Hoxhaism”). Therefore, we must prepare our ideological struggle against possible future splittings of our Stalinist-Hoxhaist movement by learning from the historical experiences of the so called “Sino-Soviet-Split”. Never unification with the open and hidden revisionists! No matter how loud the revisionists will call us “splitters” and sectarians! We will always defend Hoxhaism as bravely as comrade Enver Hoxha had defended Stalinism – no matter what kind of double play will appear between *open* Anti-Stalinism-Hoxhaism and *hidden* Anti-Stalinism-Hoxhaism (neo-revisionism - hidden behind alleged “Stalinism-Hoxhaism”).

In truth it was a sham of the common struggle of ALL the revisionists against Marxism-Leninism, against Stalinism, against the socialist revolution of the world proletariat. The so called “Sino-Soviet Split” is expression of anti-communism and a counter-revolutionary act of liquidating the Stalinist world movement.

Alleged “Anti-Maoism” of the Soviet-revisionists was guided by the aim of Anti-Stalinism. And alleged “pro-Stalinism” of the Maoists was guided by the same aim – Anti-Stalinism. The coinciding nature of Chinese and Soviet revisionism was - anti-Stalinism. They differed only in its tactical form – thus *open* anti-Stalinism on the Russian side and *hidden* anti-Stalinism on the Chinese side. Both forms are complementary forms to serve the same aim – thus anti-Stalinism. The Soviet-revisionists

wanted to eliminate Stalinism as a “foreign body” which “contradicts” with Marxism-Leninism [struggle against Stalinism was masked behind the accusations of so called “personal cult”]. The Maoists wanted (at first) to eliminate Stalinism just by supporting the revisionist line of Khrushchev. However, as they noticed that Khrushchevism was already discredited by its open anti-Stalinism and profoundly criticized by the PLA, the Maoists made a tactical 180 degree turn and aimed for replacing Stalinism through Maoism [namely the ideology of “Marxism-Leninism-Maoism” (MLM) emanated from this anti-Stalinist goal. The one struggled against Marxism-Leninism behind the mask of “Leninism”. And the other struggled against Marxism-Leninism behind the mask of “Stalinism”. That is not the crucial point. The crucial point is:

The so called “SINO-SOVIET SPLIT” must be considered as a double play of the world bourgeoisie – namely serving her aim to prevent the downfall of world capitalism by the socialist world revolution, and last not least, to stop the establishment of world socialism through implementation of Stalinism.

The so called “SINO-SOVIET SPLIT” was the adequate tactics and inevitable answer to the then existing confusing situation within the communist world movement after the death of comrade Stalin. Together with the death body of comrade Stalin, the Soviet revisionist wanted simultaneously to bury Stalinism.

What was the confusing situation of the communist world movement?

The communist world movement had lost its greatest leader, comrade Stalin. This meant in fact that the communist world movement was set back for decades. Especially the weakness of the leaderless communist world movement was like a vacuum which could not be filled by a new leader of the world proletariat comparable with the great comrade Stalin. Unfortunately, there was no new Stalin. The crime of the Soviet-revisionists was thus not only the murder of Stalin but moreover the liquidation of all the other Stalinist leaders of the CPSU (B). With the elimination of the Stalinist leaders of the CPSU the Soviet-revisionists paved the way for filling the gap of leadership of the communist world movement with their own revisionist leaders. This way, the Soviet revisionists emerged as lackeys of the world bourgeoisie by weakening, splitting and liquidating the communist world movement. However, all these treacherous and counter-revolutionary acts were unmasked by the Stalinists with comrade Enver Hoxha at the head. And because of this victory of the Stalinists over Soviet revisionism, Maoism became the significance as an allegedly “anti-revisionist”, “pro-Stalinist” ideology. This sham maneuver within the communist world movement was the tactics of the so called “Sino-Soviet Split” for the purpose to deepen the split of the communist world movement, to push it away from Stalinist principles and to complete its liquidation.

At latest with the XX. Congress of the CPSU, the communist world movement was overwhelmed by increasing influence by the open anti-Stalinism of the modern revisionists. And it was the 7th Congress of the Comintern which paved the way for this revisionist deviation within the communist world movement in general and within the single communist parties in particular. Since the death of comrade Stalin it was more and

more difficult for the Stalinists within the communist world movement to criticize and unmask the revisionist position of anti-Stalinism namely to follow the PLA and comrade Enver Hoxha at the head. This task was all the more difficult to fulfill, after the Maoists had tried to take the lead of anti-Sovietism. It is known from history of class struggle that the reformists and revisionists have always tried to seize, monopolize and take over the lead of class-struggle, uprisings and revolutions, for the purpose to break away the revolutionary leadership, to redirect class-struggle in peaceful waters, thus to protect the bourgeoisie from attacks of the revolutionary workers. For the purpose to prevent the socialist world revolution, the world bourgeoisie needs to take over the lead of the communist world movement – namely from inside. And because the Soviet revisionists were unable to completely take over the lead of the Stalinist world movement, the world bourgeoisie resorted to the Maoists to take over the leadership of the anti-Soviet-revisionist front within the communist world movement.

It was therefore inevitable for the world bourgeoisie to influence particularly the defenders of the Stalinist camp. Logically, this could not be mastered by the Soviet Revisionists themselves because they were more and more discredited. Therefore the Soviet-revisionists needed a counterpart – and these were the Chinese revisionists. “Anti-Soviet-revisionism” and “Anti-Maoism” - this was the ping-pong tactics between the Soviet-Revisionists and the Maoists. The true Stalinists should be split, and grinded down through a pincer movement between the Soviet revisionist and Maoist camp. The liquidation of the communist world movement was not possible by only one force of revisionism. It was only possible by means of *two* revisionist camps – the Soviet/Russian and the Chinese camps. The purpose was clear: the members of the communist world movement were forced to take sides either with Russia or China and NOT to take sides with the Albanian comrades as the only true leaders of the Stalinist world movement.

If we want to give a correct scientific answer to the question of the true intentions of the feigned "anti-Maoism" of the Soviet revisionists, we must at first basically distinguish the development of Soviet social-imperialism from that of the Maoist social-imperialism; and secondly we must analyze both the rivalry of the Russian and Chinese bourgeoisie within the system of world imperialism and their co-operation for defending the system of world imperialism against the communist world movement and the socialist world revolution of the proletariat. The teachings of Leninism on the nature of imperialism are valid for both the Russian and Chinese social-imperialism. One of the main features of Hoxhaism is the enrichment of the Leninist-Stalinist lessons on the theory of imperialism: **Social-imperialism is scientific expression of the highest stage of restoration of capitalism.** This was typical for the social-imperialist Soviet Union.

But not typical for Chinese social-imperialism.

In contrast, Chinese social-imperialism emanated from a **former semi-colonial country** [also other former colonial and semi-colonial countries formed a new type of emerging imperialism such as India, Brazil, South-Africa etc.].

Both kinds of social-imperialism have similar historical roots: The Soviet social-imperialism is expression of the restoration of the **Tsarist Empire** while the Chinese social-imperialism is expression of the restoration of the **Chinese Empire** which is, by the way, older and with far more significance in world history. These similar historical roots are doubtlessly reflected in the restoration of hegemonic ideology of Russia and China, and thus strong enough to influence and dominate the ideological development of all the other countries in the world.

According to our scientific dialectical method of "unity and conflict of opposites" we analyze the contrast and consequently the conflict of Russian and Chinese social imperialism and its ideology. Both social-imperialist systems developed after the death of comrade Stalin and in contrast to Stalinism – however in different ways. Decisive is the fact that the Soviet social-imperialism and its development towards a superpower occurred **after** the Stalinist phase of the transformation of socialism to communism in the Soviet Union and **after** the creation of the Stalinist world camp. The Stalinist leadership of the socialist world system was misused for the development of Russian social-imperialism.

In contrast, the Chinese social-imperialism emanated from the struggle against the predomination of the Soviet social-imperialism within the revisionist world camp. According to our Stalinist-Hoxhaist scientific point of view, and in the strict sense, the Chinese imperialism did not emanate from the ground of the restoration of capitalism in a socialist country, in comparison with the revisionist and social-imperialist Soviet Union. The Chinese economy had even not reached the first stage of the Leninist NEP which was expressively **based on the dictatorship of the proletariat** and which in contrast, **never** existed in China.

China developed to an imperialist superpower without having been a socialist country, thus firstly by means of the support of the Stalinist world camp, especially by the economical aid of comrade Stalin and the Soviet Union. And after the revisionists had seized power, China received economical support by the revisionist world camp and additionally by the world imperialists, primarily by the USA which were interested in strengthening own hegemonic position through weakening the communist world movement and supporting splittism in its ranks, in general, and through taking advantage of the conflict between the Russian and Chinese social-imperialists, in particular. The world imperialist system supported both the Soviet-revisionists and the Maoists, firstly for the purpose to control and balancing the deepening of their contradictions; and secondly, financial aid of the world imperialist system was only provided under the precondition that the Maoists and Soviet revisionists would strengthen their struggle against further global spreading of communism and against the danger of the socialist world revolution.

Last not least, the revisionist "Three-World-Theory" played a decisive role for the development of Chinese imperialism, especially its strengthening through Chinese neo-colonialism- namely through exploitation and oppression of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin-America. And all this utilization and **combination of different sources** (in

addition to the utilization of the **historical sources of the old Chinese Empire** and its ideologists) of the development of Chinese social-imperialism is expression of the eclectic "amalgam", the special feature of Maoism. It was the "merit" of Mao Tsetung to transform a semi-colonial country into a colonial world power. More than that: Mao Tsetung paved the way for the restoration of a former hegemonic Empire – namely unparalleled and thus for the first time in world history. And this was spirit and purpose of Maoism. The capitalist-revisionist world answered with "anti-Maoism" – namely to "kill two birds with one stone":

Firstly, to roll back the hegemonic character of Maoism and **secondly** to roll back the communist world movement (in combination and with help of Maoism).

Neo-revisionism is that revisionism which has changed its skin relatively to modern revisionism. It is the veiled form of revisionism with which the bourgeoisie makes transition from avoiding the stage of socialism in "one" country to avoid the stage of socialism in all countries.

Under the banner of "struggle against dogmatism and sectarianism" (sectarianism, in particular, is the organizational expression of dogmatism), the Soviet revisionists struggled against Marxism-Leninism as the main danger.

We can never struggle against revisionism on the basis of the revisionist ideology.

We can only struggle against modern revisionism and all other kinds of revisionism and neo-revisionism on the basis of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism.

When the Soviet-revisionists attacked Maoism, they simultaneously called China a "socialist" country and exchanged niceties and congratulations.

The Soviet revisionists created their agencies in China and the Chinese revisionists created their agencies in the Soviet Union, and both China and the Soviet Union created their own agencies within Socialist Albania and within the Albanian Marxist-Leninist World Movement.

The false struggles "against" Maoism on the one side and "against" Soviet revisionism on the other side are both expression of mutual rivalry for domination in the world communist movement. The one revisionist camp struggled for the maintenance of its domination and the other revisionist camp struggled for its removal and ran thus for its own domination. It was a battle for supremacy in between the revisionist Soviet Union and the revisionist China.

This shows that they are both counter-revolutionary camps which hide their own revisionism behind the alleged "struggle against revisionism" in other countries: such as China. This dangerous tactic was unmasked by comrade Enver Hoxha. And our duty is, as Stalinists-Hoxhaists, to defend comrade Enver Hoxha's struggle of unmasking the demagogical tactic of the Soviet revisionists - namely their deception of their alleged struggle "against" Maoism.

There have been both Soviet agents in China and in the Maoist parties in the world [to decompose], and also spies from the Maoist parties who operated with their agents in the Soviet revisionist parties. Both agencies were simultaneously encouraging subversive acts in the Marxist-Leninist parties, not only in the PLA, but also in the fraternal parties.

The decisions of 1957 and 1960 were a compromise. They contained both Marxist-Leninist and revisionist objectives (eclecticism).

The discussions of 1957 and 1960 were a ticking time bomb between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism.

The whole later conflict, the escalation through to cleavage it was only a matter of time.

This resulted in the formation of the Maoist line, with the REQUIRED split between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism being systematically undermined.

Instead the only correct alternative to modern revisionism, ie Marxism-Leninism, a new revisionist line was set as an alternative in the world with Maoism.

Basically Maoism should bring the anti-Communist work to a successful end, accomplishing that which Titoism and Soviet revisionism had failed, namely to hold the world proletariat away of the world socialist revolution to renounce Marxism-Leninism, and to prevent the reorganization of the Communist International.

It is striking and significant, therefore, the positions of the PLA and of Enver Hoxha are almost silent throughout the debate!!! This is the crux of the whole discussion and conflict between the Chinese and Soviet revisionists.

The only correct Marxist-Leninist standpoint of Albania is virtually avoided!!! Even in the Chinese documents Albania is hardly mentioned. China has the Albanian public position hardly represented!

The whole study of the arguments used by the Soviet revisionists as capitalists against their Chinese capitalist competitors (on one hand) and their Chinese allied counterparts against Marxism-Leninism (on the other hand - together against socialist Albania and Hoxhism), serves us to continue our war against Maoism.

Our weak point was the temporary cooperation with the Chinese revisionists.

Today, the argument of many Maoists is therefore:

"Until the death of Mao, we were friends, but after Mao's death you have betrayed our friendship!"

The point is Hoxhism against Maoism in particular in the period between the XX. Congress of the CPSU and the death of Mao Tsetung.

This is the period where Hoxhaism had already criticized Maoism internally, but not yet openly attacked.

The break with the revisionist Soviet Union could only lead to Marxist-Leninist world movement to nothing but to break also with the Chinese revisionists, who not only sabotaged the Albanian struggle against Soviet revisionism, but had also gone over to sabotage the building of socialism in Albania and divide the anti-revisionist world movement.

In conclusion:

The Maoists say just as the Soviet revisionists, that we can be “Marxists-Leninists” without Stalin and Enver Hoxha, so that the anti-Stalinism-Hoxhaism is a particular expression of the "principles strength" of the false “Marxist-Leninists”, something owned by the phony so-called “Marxists-Leninists” to distinguish them from the "dogmatists" and "sectarians".

Both the Maoists and the Soviet revisionists alike tried to separate Stalinism-Hoxhaism from Marxism-Leninism, or even to put Marxism-Leninism against Stalinism-Hoxhaism. Those who "defend" this are revisionists, but never Marxist-Leninist. Today, only those who are true Stalinist-Hoxhaist can be true Marxist-Leninist.

Both the Soviet and the Maoist revisionists use their own revisionism to jeopardize and annihilate the only correct way to unity of the world communist movement.

Here, the Soviet revisionist world camp was based on the "Moscow Declarations" of 1957 and 1960 and the Maoist camp on the world forensic "Polemic for general line" of 1963.

Both revisionist world camps accused each other as splitters. Here, both camps have made cleavage in the service of the world bourgeoisie and thus seriously damaged the unity of international communism.

In times of Enver Hoxha, there could be no unity with revisionists within the world communist movement, and today no unity with the neo-revisionists within the Stalinist-Hoxhaist world movement.

The socialist world camp could only form a unit as long as it was guided by the principles of Stalinism.

The camp of the Soviet revisionists explicitly based on the ideology of anti-Stalinism, claimed the victory of “Leninism” over the supposed "cult of personality" of Stalin.

The Soviet revisionist world camp led straight into the camp of world imperialism over the three ideological decomposition stations, starting with the Khrushchevism over the Brezhnevism up to Gorbachev.

The Soviet revisionist world camp was characterized by the fact that it split the unity of the world communist movement and its Stalinist foundations in the way of the so-called struggle against the "left" opportunism, falsely "against dogmatism and sectarianism".

The world camp of Maoism aimed to break the power of the Soviet revisionist world to replace it. This Maoist camp held - in contrast to the Soviet revisionists - in words (formal false) "Stalinism" while fighting against it in deeds, to replace it with Maoism.

Maoism is characterized particularly by the fact that it split the anti-revisionist world camp.

So these two revisionist world camps were not for the unity of the world communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism, but were together with Titoism the three mutually complementary spearheads of revisionism against Marxism-Leninism.

Hoxhaism was and is the only ideology that defended the principles of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism and further developed them against the cleavage by the Titoists, by the Soviet revisionists and by the Maoists. It fought them victoriously and thus the unity of the Marxist-Leninist world movement was restored again.

It is the largest division in the history of the world communist movement.

From these lessons we will learn to prevent or overcome similar revisionist hidden methods of splitting in the future.

From these lessons to be learned, such a cleavage can be prevented or overcome in the future.

Maoism has cleavage defined as a law of development of the world communist movement and thus resorted to the methodology of Trotskyism.

After overcoming the division by the Maoists, the Marxist-Leninist world movement was consolidated by comrade Enver Hoxha.

But since the death of Enver there was a new division. This time, the Comintern (SH) acted successfully for its overcoming. This proves that anti-communist splits were always avoided or overcome at a higher level of the development of Marxism-Leninism.

Under pressure from the Marxist-Leninists, the revisionists themselves were put in a defensive which they are forced to justify. They go on to paint their revisionist positions with red color and call them "Marxism-Leninism". In countries where this pressure from the Marxist-Leninists is relatively weak, the revisionists have to do less effort to justify revolutionary phrases with their revisionist phraseology. In countries where the pressure of the Marxist-Leninists is particularly high on the revisionists, much more red color is used to fool the masses. Ultimately, one tries to save himself with the method of division.

The new revisionists are those who are trying to soften the demarcation line to the old revisionists, they are the ones who want to vary in the fight against revisionism and ultimately reach their cooperation. That was also the "anti-revisionist attitude" of the Chinese revisionists against the Soviet revisionism.

The plug end to the neck in opportunism of the Chinese leadership took with time (so as not to spoil the other revisionists) a disparaging, hostile attitude towards the Marxist-Leninist parties. They did not support the revolutionary activities of the Marxist-Leninist parties, but distanced themselves from them. They saw in the true Marxist-Leninist movement a serious obstacle to their conciliatory path with the world bourgeoisie. That's why they have never known and could have never know seriously a Marxist-Leninist course. The Chinese leadership saw in the Marxist-Leninist world movement only an object for the Chinese propaganda, for the Chinese social-imperialist interests, on the other revisionist parties to whom they wanted a free approach to pressure and deceive the Chinese people and the revolutionary world public with the "firmness of principle" of Chinese leaders reportedly applauded.

Whatever revisionists fostered Chinese bourgeois class' interests - for Mao Tsetung it was all that mattered – China would provide them with applause.

The break with the Chinese revisionism was so far a great victory for the Marxist-Leninist world movement, because it was expressed that there may be a unit with no new revisionism, even if it pretends to "stay" together with us to fight against revisionism.

It is known that the revisionists do not put in their united front tactics about the firmness of principle and standards of Marxism-Leninism for the mutual relations as a criterion to reason, but the unconditional recognition of the revisionist line.

This is a chauvinist and anti-Marxist criterion.

This amounts to an attempt to prevent the union of all true Marxist-Leninist forces in the world and to create divisions within the revolutionary workers' movement at national and international level.

The revisionists are not really interested in the unity, but only in an even more effective cleavage.

What the Khrushchevist revisionists permeated with the "mother party" and their "baton" was later copied by Mao Tsetung, namely to impose the Chinese revisionist line to all others.

They only want to have all subordinated to them and only want to eliminate the only basis for unity – the absolutely necessary indispensable guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaim.

The revisionists - and the conciliators with the revisionists - are enemies of the revolutionary unity and any entity which is not revolutionary is unacceptable for Stalinist-Hoxhaists.

The struggle against revisionism can not exist without Marxist-Leninist unity, cannot be performed without global collaboration of Stalinist-Hoxhaists.

For where the international solidarity of the anti-revisionism is missing or where this is poorly developed, the revisionists put their own "unity" lever, to cleave.

The principle, the fundamental lesson of this betrayal of the revisionists is loud and clear:

No to the united front with the revisionists, but united front against the revisionists!

In the united front of the world proletariat and the Comintern (SH), we must always be guided solely by the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism.

The basis of the revolutionary united front tactic is the recognition and implementation, the inviolability of the hegemony of the world revolutionary proletariat!

But how do we Stalinists-Hoxhaists approach the unity?

We provide first the cardinal question:

Alliance with which classes and why?

From this the correct question in mind, we disclaim any unity with such forces that deny the proletariat leadership role in the revolution, do not recognize the central role of the proletariat as the social main driving force of the present epoch, and instead fusion the proletariat with the reactionary bourgeoisie and all its allies and lackeys in a common pot.

We Stalinists-Hoxhaists disclaim any unity with those who contradict the class interests of the proletariat.

Marxism-Leninism teaches that the true Marxist-Leninist party must achieve its strategic objectives skillful and revolutionary tactics of the unity must be used to conquer the natural allies of the proletariat, to exploit the inter-imperialist contradictions and must create alliances with such forces in particular frame and that for a specific time are interested in the promotion of the proletarian revolution:

"At the same time, this party must not efface its individuality, enter every sort of front and destroy itself. On the contrary it should always preserve its independence, principles and norms. It must, without fail, ensure its hegemonic role in the revolution through struggle and its correct policy. For the revolution to be crowned with success it must be led by its Marxist-Leninist party, but no one will give you hegemony: it must be won." (Enver Hoxha, *In Struggle and Revolution the Marxist-*

Leninists Become Strong and Indomitable, Discussion with Comrade Pedro Pomar, 1967
in: *Albania Today, 1977*, edition in English)

"Without making a clear-cut line of distinction between revisionist views and Marxism-Leninism, dogmatism and sectarianism cannot be combated successfully from a correct standpoint." (Enver Hoxha, *Report to the IV. Congress of the PLA*, 1961, edition in English)

Consequently, it is clear that one can never struggle correctly against revisionist positions from positions of dogmatism and sectarianism.

That is just the reverse:

To lead the fight against dogmatism and sectarianism of revisionist positions is in truth the revisionist masking of its struggle against Stalinism-Hoxhaism.

It is also clear that one can not fight against dogmatism and sectarianism if one does not simultaneously lead an anti-revisionist struggle, as both offer each other the soil against Marxism-Leninism, the one and the other must be equally withdrawn.

Dogmatism, sectarianism and "left" opportunism are only the reverse side of the revisionist medal.

The so-called "struggle against revisionism" on the part of the sectarians, the dogmatist, of the "left" opportunists - in turn serves only revisionism.

It weakens Stalinism-Hoxhaism and makes it easier to revisionism to gain access through the back door when the "left" opportunism knocks on the front door and vice versa.

Both the right and the "left" opportunism work hand in hand against Marxism-Leninism.

One can not therefore fight the "left" opportunism without fighting the "rightist" opportunism, neither vice versa.

Stalinist-Hoxhaists must therefore fight against both, must engage in a two-front war against opportunism, including against the conciliators and centrists who soften this inevitably necessary two-front war to divide, weaken and liquidate it. They do this sometimes with open revisionist masks, sometimes with "left" opportunism, and sometimes also with false "Marxist-Leninist" masks, as demonstrated by the history of Trotskyism [see: "The Bolshevik Trotsky and the Menshevik Trotsky"].

The struggle against Stalinism-Hoxhaism, the fight against sectarianism, dogmatism, the "left" radicalism, "left" opportunism under the fake "Marxist-Leninist" flag – this is a hoax from the neo-revisionists.

“The liberation of the consciousness of the proletariat and the peoples from the inhibiting influence of revisionism, the dissemination of Marxism - Leninism which points out the only correct course for the struggle and victory, is a primary task today in order to carry forward the revolutionary process in each country and on a world scale.” (Enver Hoxha, *Report to the VIII Congress of the PLA*, 1981, edition in English)

Those who denounces the principles of strength of the Comintern (SH) and their loyalty to Stalinism-Hoxhaism in a time of theoretical incoherence, in an era of neo-revisionist unprincipled "anti-dogmatism" has either not realized that there is no world socialist revolution without world revolutionary theory, or wants to prevent the world proletariat from acquiring the ideology of its liberation.

Those who instead try to keep the world proletariat away from the ideology of Stalinism-Hoxhaism or even want to "liberate" it like a puppet of world imperialism is betraying the world proletariat that can not be free without revolutionary theory and without the leadership of the Communist International.

Those who demagogic denigrate the need for the leadership of the world proletariat as "paternalism", who demagogic represent Stalinism-Hoxhaism as something "harmful", that is, as something that is "forced" upon the will of the masses artificially, is not a defender of the interests of the masses, but a defender of the world bourgeoisie who will do anything to prevent the masses to put the teachings of their liberation into practice.

2.2 – Trotskyist false “anti-Maoism”

After having analyzed Soviet false “anti-Maoism”, we will now examine Trotskyist supposed “anti-Maoism”. This sub-chapter is very important, even because all this also mostly applies to anarchism’s and anarchists’ false “anti-Maoism”. We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, know that the political posturing of Trotsky and the Trotskyists – which still nowadays hold heavy influence over students and the youth, among others - have only benefited world bourgeois class, giving it ideological weapons to deceive workers about the proletarian character of Stalin's USSR and trying to 'prove' that the cure (socialism) was actually worse than the disease (capitalism).

Since Trotsky maneuvers to destroy socialism in the Soviet Union were unmasked and defeated by the Bolshevists with comrade Stalin at their head, Trotskyists and their supporters all around the world have launched a tremendous campaign against Stalinism in order to discredit socialist construction in Soviet Union as being “a product of bureaucracy” and of “Stalin’s personal dictatorship”. With this, they consciously benefited the class interests of the world bourgeoisie, as the demonization of Stalinism has always been a major priority to it, and remains as such until nowadays.

Indeed, most of Trotskyists lies and calumnies against comrade Stalin were used not only by world bourgeoisie but also by Khrushchevist revisionists in their efforts to justify their policies of capitalist-imperialist restoration in Soviet Union. As comrade Enver remarked, many Khrushchevist anti-Stalinist attacks were:

“ (...) borrowed from the arsenal of imperialist and Trotskyite propaganda which presented the past of the Soviet Union as a period of "mass reprisals", and the socialist system as "suppression of democracy" and a "dictatorship like that of Ivan the Terrible", etc.” (Enver Hoxha, *Eurocommunism is Anti-communism*, Tirana, 1980, edition in English)

We won't provide our readers with a materialist analysis about the character of the socio-economic basis that gives birth to the phony Trotskyist “anti-Maoism” on the same molds of that presented in the previous sub-chapter about Soviet revisionists’ “anti-Maoism”. In what respects to Trotskyism, until now, in spite of its influence, it never managed to become revisionism in power in any country, although Titoist Yugoslavia is perhaps the closest thing to a Trotskyist state that ever existed:

“The Yugoslav revisionists adopted those forms of running their country that the Trotskyites (...), encouraged by the capitalist bourgeoisie, tried to adopt in the Soviet Union in the time of Lenin, in order to sabotage the construction of socialism there. While he talked about building socialism, by adopting these forms, Tito completely distorted the Marxist-Leninist principles on building up industry, agriculture, etc.” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

In his brilliant book “Yugoslav auto-administration – capitalist theory and practice”, comrade Enver already made a materialist analysis of the socio-economic basis of Titoist Yugoslavia, thus unmasking its anti-socialist, bourgeois-capitalist and pro-imperialist nature behind any doubts. Thus, our own brief reflections about the matter here could only be redundant and of much inferior quality to those put forward by the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism.

The denouncement of Trotskyist revisionism from Stalinist-Hoxhaist positions could be in itself the subject of many other entire articles. By now, we will note the fact that relatively to Maoism, Trotskyists promptly perceived Maoism both as a rival ideology and a useful ideology against Stalinism. Indeed, contrary to Trotskyism, whose revisionist and anti-communist nature often appeared clearly in front of the eyes of world laborers, Maoism had the edge over the pseudo-Marxist-Leninist appearance, especially in the alleged struggle “against” Soviet revisionism.

In face of this, Trotskyists understood that they were in danger of ceasing to be useful to the world bourgeois class, as much more efficient branches of revisionism were emerging. If during many years before comrade Stalin's death, Trotskyism had been a valuable instrument of world exploitative and oppressive classes to prevent workers from adhering to authentic Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism, since the emergence of Titoism,

Khrushchevism and foremost Maoism, Trotskyists were facing a real danger of losing their place as “savers” of world capitalism-imperialism against socialist revolution and construction. And moreover, they knew very well that the continuation of the so-called “Trotskyist world movement” would only be ensured as long as world capitalist-imperialist system could take some advantages from it.

We can never underestimate Trotskyist revisionism! The struggle of the Soviet-revisionists against Stalinism, particularly in their period of de-Stalinization, was an enormous encouragement and strengthening for all anti-Stalinist forces all over the world. Especially, the rehabilitation of Trotskyism was one of the gravest betrayals of the Soviet revisionists because this was a great aid for the rebirth and regeneration of the Trotskyite movements all over the world which were already defeated in times of comrade Stalin.

The Trotskyites understood very well to take advantage of the revisionist degeneration of the communist world movement after the death of comrade Stalin. The Trotskyites functioned as destructive elements in the ranks of communism and aggravated the splittings, factions and weakening of the communist world movement at that time. Spreading confusion, doubts and contradictions within the ranks of the communist world movement for the purpose of its weakening and liquidation – that is the true nature of Trotskyism which was also the Trotskyist tactics towards Maoism and the Maoist world movements. And exactly this was indeed useful for the whole world imperialist system in its struggle against communism in general and Stalinism in particular.

In order to combat the growing influence of their Maoist revisionist rivals, Trotskyist organizations resorted to a very old tactic: they tried to discredit Maoism by equating it with Stalinism. Trotskyists started to use this calumny during a time when bourgeois-Khrushchevist attacks against comrade Stalin were intensifying and when many workers were being misled and convinced that Stalinism = evil. Therefore, Trotskyists opportunistically took advantage of this and of their long past experience of anti-Stalinist bandits to start qualifying as “Stalinist” all other currents of revisionism that they perceived as being competing with them for absolute power and influence over world revisionism.

We will not waste too much time with the abhorrent Trotskyist slander of equating Maoism with Stalinism. In this and in other texts and also in previous chapters of DWM, we demonstrate that Maoism social-fascism not only has nothing in common with glorious Stalinism, but it is firmly opposed to it, thus Stalinist ideology could have never had anything to do with Maoist bourgeois-capitalist ascension and rule. Trotskyists try to present the wage slavagist tyranny of Chinese revisionism as being “Stalinist” only to discredit comrade Stalin’s legacy in front of eyes of world workers in order to keep them away from it.

Trotskyists discredit Stalinism through hiding its truly proletarian and communist nature by equating it with such a dreadfully pro-capitalism, social-imperialist, anti-communist and reactionary ideology as Maoism. In this outrageous manner, all exploitative and oppressive characteristics of Maoism and of its successors and consequences (namely its

transformation of China into a social-fascist state internally and into a social-imperialist superpower externally) are automatically attributed to the glorious teachings of comrade Stalin. But Trotskyists are the ones who do their utmost to prevent world socialist revolution and world communism, they are the ones who have everything in common with Maoism revisionism and with all other kinds of revisionism, as no matter the “differences” between them, their essence and aim are always the same: perpetuating of capitalism-imperialism, delaying world socialist revolution and communism as much as they can.

In truth, Trotskyists never recovered from the tremendous defeat they suffered when they tried to destroy Stalinist leadership and to restore capitalism in Soviet Union through fabricating ridiculous theories about “permanent revolution” only to weaken Soviet proletarian dictatorship in favor of world imperialist penetration and destruction of socialist construction in Soviet Union. Trotskyists try to take advantage of every opportunity to deviate workers from Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology which is the only ideology able to enlighten their path towards world socialism and world communism, towards definitive liberation, towards total elimination of all kinds of exploitation, oppression and alienation.

Trotskyists (and all the other revisionists, neo-revisionists and anti-communists) do not want this to occur, they want proletarians, workers and all other exploited and oppressed classes to be eternally subjected to wage slavagist tyranny and to the predatory greed of world capitalism-imperialism. Therefore, they have to serve their world bourgeois bosses as best as they can through convincing world workers that Stalinism is synonym of the despotic repressive and abusive capitalist class despotism which has been tyrannizing China since 1949.

Indeed, if world proletarians and workers believe that Maoism = Stalinism, then they will surely loose any willingness to embrace Stalinist ideology because if they look attentively at revisionist China, both past and present, they will only see exploitation, wage slavery, oppression, suppression, autocracy, totalitarianism and cruelty towards workers. And from the moment they think so and refuse Stalinism, accomplishment of world socialist revolution, of world proletarian dictatorship, of world socialism and of world communism will be impossible, as none of these things can be achieved without resolute adherence and unwavering defense of the brilliant revolutionary teachings of comrade Stalin, the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. Stalinism represents an irreplaceable and inestimable development of the Marxist-Leninist theory, and to deny Comrade Stalin’s contribution means to deny socialist revolution in itself. Stalinism is an irreplaceable factor which permits the victorious implementation and survival of the proletarian dictatorship, which allows successful socialist and communist construction together with an efficient struggle against all kinds of revisionism, neo-revisionism and anti-communism. That’s why the Trotskyists and the Maoists hate Stalinism so much. We can never forget Mao’s arrogant remark about Chinese 1949 bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist “revolution”:

"The Chinese revolution won victories so because it defied the will of Stalin." [Mao, Debate of March 10, Selected Works, March 1958, quoted in: General-Line of the Comintern (SH), *Historical teachings of the Comintern and of the Communist World Movement*, Chapter VIII, 2011, edition in English]

Yes, of course. Chinese 1949 "revolution" never went beyond its bourgeois stage precisely because its Maoist promoters at the service of the then Chinese "national" bourgeoisie always prevented it through refusing and waging a staunch struggle against Stalinism. After all, if it was not by this, this Chinese "national" bourgeoisie could have never accomplished its later turning of China into a world's dominant imperialist and neo-colonialist superpower. If Stalinism had prevailed in 1949 China, the Chinese "national" bourgeoisie could say goodbye not only to its plans of imperialist ascension, but also to its own existence as a class. No wonder that its Maoist representatives did their utmost to keep Stalinism away. And this was the reason why the Trotskyites had made internally efforts to form a united front with Maoism against Stalinism and to legalize a Trotskyite faction within the "C" P of China.

To reject Stalinism is synonym of choosing the side of world capitalism-imperialism, of world reactionarism, of world anti-communism, of world bourgeoisie, is synonym of striving to condemn workers to endless subjugation to wage slavagist totalitarian, anti-socialist, oppressive and exploitative bourgeois capitalist-revisionist-imperialist order. To refuse Stalinist ideology means to deny the possibility of successful socialist revolution; and the negation of the possibility of successful socialist revolution is synonym of considering communism as an unrealizable utopia because the accomplishment of communism is dependent on the success of the socialist construction and on the revolutionary fierceness of proletarian dictatorship.

With this, Trotskyists aim at fulfilling their ideological duties as lackeys of world bourgeoisie and of world capitalist-imperialist while they also "prove" that they are still useful to their masters, and therefore they are also combating Maoism as a rival revisionism. Of course, Trotskyists do everything to make this masquerade appear "credible" to world proletarians, workers and exploited and oppressed classes. However, the anti-Stalinist character of Maoism is so evident that Trotskyists themselves have difficulties in maintaining their own lies:

"The fact that the Maoist leadership would deliberately seek to inject the poison of Stalinism into the minds of millions of youth—even if that is done with admissions about the "errors" of the despot who butchered Lenin's generation, and even if contradicted by advocacy of policies that are not Stalinist—says much about the kind of international movement that Peking is assembling together." (<http://www.marxists.org/history/etol/document/fi/1963-1985/usfi/8thWC/usfi04.htm>, *The Sino-Soviet Conflict and the Crisis of the International Communist Movement*, 1965, edition in English)

So, putting aside Trotskyists' usual anti-Stalinist rubbish and also the fact that they qualify the anti-communist criminals attempting to restore capitalist-feudal bondage in

Soviet Union as being “Lenin’s generation”, it is incredible to see Trotskyists affirming with their own disgusting mouths that Maoist leadership is allegedly “Stalinist” even if it advocates policies which are not Stalinist. Please, how can someone be Stalinist while refusing to follow Stalinist policies? Even if Maoist leadership affirmed to be “Stalinist”, Trotskyists themselves are acknowledging that it could never be so! This quotation from the Trotskyists is a good example of Trotskyists insistence in depicting Maoist leadership as “Stalinist” even if they are the ones openly admitting that the opposite is true! Trotskyists are so desperate to put aside a rival revisionist “international movement” which is competing with their own that they even contradict themselves in their lies. They want to discredit Maoism, and so they resort to the kind of calumny that they know better: anti-Stalinism – even if it is crystal clear even for them that qualifications of Stalinism do not suit Maoist leadership in any manner.

In truth, there are no substantial or essential differences between Trotskyism and Maoism. The phony “criticisms” that each one of these revisionist branches directs towards the other is merely intended not only to deviate the attention of working class from genuine anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist communist struggle and to submerge it in a pretense “fight” between two entirely anti-socialist currents, but also to destroy an ideological rival for dominance over world revisionism – just like also occurred with the “split” and “disputes” between Soviet revisionism and Chinese Maoist revisionism and with Soviet phony “anti-Maoist criticisms”.

In what concerns Trotskyism of the Chinese revisionists, it is very dangerous because they hide it behind “anti-Trotskyist” slogans. Chinese leaders are Trotskyist divisors and liquidators of the Marxist-Leninist world movement. Anyway, the remarkable similarities between Trotskyism and Maoism were noted by comrade Enver Hoxha, who noticed that Trotskyism had exercised a heavy influence over the so-called “Communist” Party of China since very early and throughout its course:

“(…) in general, the Communist Party of China did not properly carry out this role in this situation which had been created in China in a studied and systematic manner, seen from the angle of scientific socialism.

(…) there were different tendencies in that small party which called itself the Communist Party of China, tendencies which have never permitted a correct Marxist-Leninist line to be established, or Marxist-Leninist thought and action to guide it.

These initial tendencies which were displayed many times among the main leaders of the party, were frequently leftist, sometimes right-opportunist, sometimes centrist, going as far as anarchist, Trotskyite, bourgeois, and marked chauvinist and racist views.

Even later, these tendencies remained as one of the distinctive characteristics of the Communist Party of China which Mao Tsetung and his group eventually led.” (Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China*, Volume II, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

And comrade Enver also noted that Maoist “Cultural Revolution” displayed clear signs of Trotskyist configuration, which Enver perceived as an inevitable result of the pro-Trotskyist ideology of Mao Zedong and of the other Chinese revisionists:

“One must not label Mao Zedong as a "prophet" of the revolution but as a "prophet of the counter-revolution". (...) The chaos which resulted in China, originated from this anti-Marxist, traitorous line of Mao Zedong and his courtiers, a chaos full of defeats in politics, ideology and economy was fought by the "Great Steersman" through the anarchy of the Cultural Revolution. This anarchist revolution saved the Maoist absolute rule but contained the risk of undermining it, too. The "prestige" of the "Steersman" had to be saved, the anarchy was not allowed to topple the myths, therefore military measures were taken.

The character of bureaucracy with the courtier Zhou Enlai-Confucius was saved and supposedly "younger" "revolutionary" elements were integrated into the scene of agitation and propaganda, for whom the "Steersman" had intended the role of painting out the anarchy as a "revolution within the revolution" by which the alleged bourgeoisie, which had infiltrated the party, was supposed to be eliminated.

But in fact there was no party, but only the bourgeoisie, there were clans and fractions which were fighting for power. This was the Trotskyist "permanent revolution", led by Mao Zedong-Trotsky.” (Enver Hoxha, *Letter to Comrade Hysni Kapo*, 30th July of 1978, edition in English)

« Truly, the centre of the Trotskyite International will be created there. All this garbage will pour into China disguised as «leftist», «Maoist» and people «persecuted» in their own countries. They will find aid and support in China, and with a comforting support and the «seal of Mao» they will begin and continue the struggle against genuine Marxist-Leninists, to win over the revisionist parties and to draw them from the influence of the revisionist Soviet Union. » (Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China*, Volume II, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

Also Maoist reactionary policy of “many lines, schools and factions in the party and in society” – which we already explained in our previous DWM - finds its equivalent in Trotskyism, it derives from Trotskyist conceptions. Comrade Enver noted:

“Mao Tsetung said: «It is enough that ten people in the Central Committee understand what Marxism is». This saying alone is sufficient to reveal the disastrous consequences and meaning of «the blossoming of a hundred flowers and a hundred schools». In the party, said Mao, «there are three currents, hence three groups: the leftists, the centrists and the rightists». With this Mao confirms with his own mouth the existence of «a hundred schools» which have been gathered in the three groups and the three lines of the party, which the Chinese practice reduces to two lines. (...) in the Communist Party of China these are not struggles like those in the Bolshevik Party or in our Party, where on the one side there were genuine Marxist-

Leninists who fought to defend the Party and its Marxist- Leninist line, and on the other side, the Trotskyite, anarchist deviators and what not. No, in these factions of the Communist Party of China none of the sides was guided by Marxism-Leninism. There were factions in which all were guided by confused views, progressive bourgeois views rather than Marxist-Leninist; other factions were more to the right or more to the left, but in the leadership of the Communist Party of China there was never a Marxist-Leninist faction, that is, a sound Marxist-Leninist nucleus. » (Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China*, Volume II, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

“According to Mao Tse-Tung, in socialist society, side by side with the proletarian ideology (...) the existence of bourgeois ideology, idealism, the growth of poisonous weeds» along with «fragrant flowers», etc., must be permitted. Such a course is alleged to be necessary for the development of Marxism, in order to open the way to debate and freedom of thought, while in reality, through this course, he is trying to lay the theoretical basis for the policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie and coexistence with its ideology.”

“Mao Tse-Tung says, «...it is a dangerous policy to prohibit people from coming into contact with the false, the ugly and the hostile to us, with idealism and metaphysics and with the thoughts of Confucius, Lao Tze and Chiang Kai-shek. It would lead to mental deterioration, one-track minds, and unpreparedness to face the world...».

From this Mao Tse-Tung draws the conclusion that idealism, metaphysics and the bourgeois ideology will exist eternally, therefore not only must they not be prohibited, but they must be given the possibility to blossom, to come out in the open and contend. This conciliatory stand towards everything reactionary goes so far as to call disturbances in socialist society inevitable and the prohibition of enemy activity mistaken.” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

Moreover, this policy was also defined by Mao as follows:

"Let a hundred flowers bloom" is a way to develop the art, and "Let a hundred schools of thought contend" is a means to advance science. Politics: "Let a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools rival" is not only a good way to develop the science and art, but also, if we generalize its application, a good method for our work in all areas.” (Mao Zedong, *Intervention à la conférence sur le travail de propagande*, Textes choisis, translated from French language)

In truth, this policy is a mere repetition of the Trotskyist theory of giving a privileged status to intellectuals with the pretext that a specifically proletarian culture does not exist. Mao equally provides intellectuals with a special status considering them as:

"... workers who provide mental efforts." (Mao Zedong, *Intervention à la conférence sur le travail de propagande*, Textes choisis, translated from French language)

Underlying the policy of a "hundred flowers", one clearly sees the idealist conception of Mao for whom, in fact, the truth is not an objective phenomenon but an essentially subjective phenomenon:

“It is only through the confrontation of opinions that truth makes its way.” (Mao Zedong, *Intervention à la conférence sur le travail de propagande, Textes choisis*, translated from French language)

For him, truth follows the "clash of ideas". This idealist conception paved the way for all anti-communist deviations. As comrade Stalin noted:

“The base is the economic structure of society at the given stage of its development. The superstructure is the political, legal, artistic, philosophical views of society and the political, legal and other institutions corresponding to them.” (Stalin, *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, 1950, edition in English)

Thus, it is entirely correct to consider art and philosophy as the domain of the superstructure. From the moment the dictatorship of the proletariat liquidates that of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat establishes itself as the ruling class it must also specifically liquidate the superstructure inherited from the old capitalist exploitative society in all spheres, including in art and philosophy, for instance. In these issues, there is no question of allowing intellectual "freedom". The proletariat must support and allow only those artists who are placed in the perspective of socialist realism. To advocate freedom of different artistic schools amounts to liquidate the absolutely necessary exclusive prevalence of proletarian art.

And Chinese revisionists also openly admit the existence of various parties during their so-called "process of socialist construction". Comrade Enver remarked:

“Mao Tsetung launched this idea of «genius», as you might say, which was in conformity with his opportunist views because such an idea meant that all the bourgeois, capitalist, Marxist, pseudo-Marxist, revisionist, Trotskyite, and anarchist views in every field should be allowed to develop freely, and there should be discussion about them. This line stemmed from his opportunist views, because, as is apparent from his own writings, he did not guide «socialism» in China on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist theory, but on the basis of a «theory» which he developed by grafting and which they call «Mao Tsetung thought». It is not the Communist Party of China, alone, which leads this «socialism» in China, and Mao admits this from his own mouth. Other parties of the bourgeoisie, which are united in a common front with the Communist Party of China, also lead it. According to Mao Tsetung, these parties, too, must govern China, together with the Communist Party. It is clear that, according to this «theory», these parties not only have the right to have their say in the construction of a new China, but also to express their philosophical views about art, culture, the structure of the state, the army, etc., etc.” (Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China, Volume II*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

Mao himself stated that:

“The possibility that the democratic parties can exist (...) is not only determined by the desires of the Communist Party, that depends also (...) on the confidence that the people has in these parties.” (Mao Zedong, *De la juste solution des contradictions au sein du peuple*, *Textes choisis*, Pékin, 1972, translated from French language)

Mao defended the “coexistence of ideological lines” and of various parties with the aim of promoting class reconciliation with the bourgeoisie in order to perpetuate its wage slavagist rule and to prevent proletarian dictatorship from being established - because the political power belongs to the class who possesses and controls the means of production and the productive relations which form the material base of society, and Maoist revisionism always made efforts to avoid the annihilation of the bourgeoisie as an exploitative and oppressive class, it always prevented its deprivation of those controls and possessions. And Trotsky also defended the existence of various parties during alleged “socialist construction” with those same objectives. In his well-known “Program of Transition”, Trotsky significantly affirmed that:

“The democratization of the Soviets is unconceivable without the legalization of the Soviet Parties.” (Trotsky, *Programme de Transition*, Paris, 1973, translated from French language)

If there were still any doubts about the reactionary and anti-communist nature of both Maoist revisionism and Trotskyist revisionism, these quotations provide us with the final answer. To really construct communism, it is indispensable to implacably annihilate the entire bourgeois class and also other enslaving, exploitative, repressive and oppressive classes that might exist. Moreover, in the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, there can be only one party: the proletarian communist party, the vanguard party of the working class which is leading the exploited and oppressed masses towards socialism and communism. After the establishment and consolidation of the proletarian power, it's illogical and reactionary to admit and defend the existence of any other parties representing non-proletarian classes. The proletarian party must lead the exploited classes and it constitutes one of the main instruments through which the proletariat exercises the revolutionary armed violence against the bourgeois and repressive classes. That's why nearly all kinds of revisionist currents have denied the leading vanguard role of the proletarian communist party. Also regarding this important issue, the Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist conceptions of Comrade Enver Hoxha are in total contrast with those of revisionists and anti-communists Mao and Trotsky:

“The revolution overturns a whole world, let alone a single tradition. Since the class struggle goes on during the whole period of the construction of socialist society and the transition to communism, and since political parties express the interests of specific classes, the presence of other non-Marxist-Leninist parties in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat would be absurd and opportunist, especially after the economic base of socialism has been built. This in no way infringes democracy, but, on the contrary, strengthens genuine proletarian democracy. The democratic

nature of an order is not determined by the number of parties, but is determined by its economic base, by the class in power, the whole policy and activity of the state and whether or not it is in the interests of the broad masses of the people and serves them.”(http://ciml.250x.com/archive/hoxha/english/enver_hoxha_selected_works_volume_4_eng.pdf, *On the Role and Tasks of the Democratic Front in the struggle for the complete triumph of socialism in Albania*, 1967, in: Enver Hoxha, *Selected Works*, Volume IV, 1982, edition in English)

And there is even more that Trotskyism and Maoism have in common. During the Eighth Congress of the “C”PC, Chinese social-fascist, revisionist / Maoist leader Liu Chao-Chi said:

“While today the period of revolutionary storm has passed, new reports of production are established, the control objectives are no longer the same. Now, the proper development of the productive forces of society is protected.” (Liou Chao-Chi, *Rapport sur le projet de constitution de la République populaire de Chine*, 1954, translated from French language)

This constitutes in fact the same Trotskyist thesis affirming that once the state power is conquered, the sole objective is the economic development of society. Consequently to such analysis, it wrongly follows that the development of the means of production automatically mechanically generates new relations of production.

Furthermore, the origins of the Maoist so-called “New Democracy” – which we analyzed in the previous DWM - can be discovered in an attempt to promote bourgeois-capitalist “democracy” (which is always a form of dictatorship of that same bourgeoisie) as an end in itself. For this, taking advantage of the economic situation of the country, Mao will spread the idea that a new path is opened to allow the bourgeoisie to participate in the construction of socialism. We see that the basis of this deviation, in Mao as well as in Trotsky, is the illusion that a temporary alliance with a party or a given class may become permanent and thus pave the way for socialism:

“(…) such a revolution in a colonial and semi-colonial country is still fundamentally bourgeois-democratic in its social character during its first stage or first step, and (….) its objective mission is to clear the path for the development of capitalism, (….) with the aim of establishing a new-democratic society and a state under the joint dictatorship of all the revolutionary classes.” (Mao Zedong, *New Democracy*, 1940, edition in English)

In this excerpt from Mao, we see clearly emerge Mao's thesis, based on the confusion carefully maintained by him between tactics and strategy. Mao is affirming that if tactically we can ally with a faction of the bourgeoisie for the liquidation of the colonial and feudal order, then we should continue the alliance with this same bourgeoisie all the way until communism! For Mao, this was a way to justify its actions, as based on the possibility of tactical alliance with some classes, he deduced that “socialism” must preserve these classes. And this is one of the greatest harms that Mao did to the Leninist

theory of alliances as being only a punctual, temporary compromise, intended to strengthen the positions of the proletariat. Authentic socialist construction and revolution requires the leadership of a single class - the proletariat – which can only successfully conquer power through his vanguard party – which also must be the only party allowed to exist. Marxism-Leninism teaches that the dictatorship of the proletariat is impossible without sharing political power with the poor peasants. In the contrary, Trotsky totally denied this basic principle of Marxism-Leninism, while Mao based his ideology on the power of the peasants instead of the hegemony of the proletariat.

And Mao substituted the Leninist-Stalinist concept of alliance, a new concept which, using the pretext of tactical alliances, imposes an “eternal” compromise between the proletariat and other classes. In fact, as we had stated in previous chapters of DWM, absolutely nothing differentiates Maoist supposed “New Democracy” from bourgeois “democracy” as the bourgeois class will continue to hold its dominant class positions in its hands. Although in practice Mao’s “sharing of power” between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is simply impossible, the illusion is already spread among the proletariat in order to make it be complacent and relax its class struggle and vigilance. Neither the “New Democracy”, neither bourgeois democracy will ever allow the proletariat to become the ruling class. Thus, the essential question of every revolution, that is, the question of who holds socio-economic-political power and of what is the nature of productive relations and forces is thus avoided. That covers, in fact, a “new” concept of democracy which stresses the need for democratic stage, prior to socialism. Here we have the “theory” of “democracy as an end in itself”, defended not only by Mao but also by Trotsky, who considered that democracy is an inevitable step in the political march to “socialism”.

So, as can be noticed, the resemblances between Trotskyist revisionism and Maoist revisionism are evident. In our DWM I, we had already called attention to this:

“The Comintern (SH) (...) decided to draw a principled demarcation line against the tendency of revisionism which leads to the assimilation of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement. The most dangerous revisionist tools of this tendency of assimilation are Maoism and Trotskyism.

Maoists raised their „tactics of many lines“ (or at least „tactics of two lines“) on the level of principles. They try to prove this theoretically on the basis of the Mao Zedong-Ideas. This can be compared with Trotskyism - raising fractionism on the level of principles. Both these forms of bourgeois ideology are used to legalize anti-Marxist positions within the ranks of the communists. We call them tactics to "have a foothold" within the communist ranks - used as a tool to lever us out. Both Maoism and Trotskyism are ideologies which serve the liquidation of communism in theory and practice.

They are counter-revolutionary ideologies. In words both ideologies allege that they are „contra-dictionary“, however, in deeds they are essentially the same. Everybody knows that Mao was a master of Trotskyite tactics in his struggle against the

Marxist-Leninists.” (Documents of the Comintern (SH), *Declaration of War on Maoists I*, 2011, version in English)

In their supposed “disagreements” against Maoists, Trotskyists try to pass the false image of being “democratic revolutionaries” apparently “criticizing Mao’s Stalinist deviations”. As we had already mentioned and explained, there is absolutely nothing in common between Maoism and Stalinism except the fact that both ideologies represented a dictatorship of a certain class: of the bourgeoisie in the first case, and of the proletariat in the second case.

And in fact, if we pay attention to more documents containing Trotskyist alleged “anti-Maoism”, we will conclude that the “divergences” claimed by Trotskyists do not exist in fact. Once more resorting to their already old and tedious anti-Stalinism, Trotskyists affirm:

“(…) an elemental struggle of revolutionary proportions of the ultra-exploited Chinese workers and peasants was channeled by an organization formed in the school of Stalinism, which established a brutal, totalitarian political tyranny, one which needed no lessons from Stalin in how to stay in power through the unremitting use of murderous repression.”
(<http://internationalviewpoint.npa2009.org/spip.php?article856>, *Mao in Question*, 2005, edition in English)

So, Trotskyists are once more equating Maoism with Stalinism (this is indeed the main essence of all their “anti-Maoist criticisms”). And they are trying to present Maoist rule as having a bloody, tyrannical and authoritarian character and as having been imposed against the will of the working classes. We must admit that this is indeed truth concerning Maoist social-fascist rule and leadership. As comrade Enver noted:

“The article of «Renmin Ribao» provides new information which enables one to understand even more clearly the anti-Marxist direction and personal power of Mao Tse-Tung in the Chinese party and state. Mao Tse-Tung did not have the slightest respect for either the Central Committee or the congress of the party, let alone the party as a whole and its committees at the base. The party committees, the leading cadres and the Central Committee itself received orders from the «General Directory», this «special staff», which was responsible to Mao Tse-tung alone. The party forums, its elected organs, had no authority whatsoever.

The article of «Renmin Ribao» says, “no telegram, no letter, no document, no order could be issued by anybody without first going through Mao Tse-Tung’s hands and being approved by him». It turns out that as early as 1953, Mao Tse-tung had issued a clear-cut order: «From now on, all documents and telegrams sent out in the name of the Central Committee can be dispatched only after I have gone over them, otherwise they are invalid.

Under these conditions there can be no talk of collective leadership, democracy within the party, or Leninist norms.” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

However, the same characteristics and qualifications can be entirely applied to Trotskyist theory and practice.

Indeed, during the times they were attempting to overthrow Leninist-Stalinist proletarian dictatorship in Soviet Union in order to replace it by their own bourgeois rule that would restore capitalism and sell out the country to world imperialism again, Trotskyists specialized in separating laboring classes from the party and the revolutionary trade-unions through imposing harsh social-fascist bourgeois-authoritarian methods. In his brilliant Works, comrade Stalin accurately noted this. When reflecting about divergences between Bolsheviks and Trotskyists, the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism declared something which illustrates very well Trotskyist policies concerning trade-unions, but which can also be applied to any other sphere of activity:

“Our disagreements are about questions of the *means* by which to strengthen labor discipline in the working class, the *methods* of approach to the mass of the workers who are being drawn into the work of reviving industry, the *ways* of transforming the present weak trade unions into powerful, genuinely industrial unions, capable of reviving our industry. There are two methods: the method of *coercion* (the military method), and the method of *persuasion* (the trade-union method). The first method by no means precludes elements of persuasion, but these are subordinate to the requirements of the coercion method and are auxiliary to the latter. The second method, in turn, does not preclude elements of coercion, but these are subordinate to the requirements of the persuasion method and are auxiliary to the latter. It is just as impermissible to confuse these two methods as it is to confuse the army with the working class.

A group of Party workers headed by Trotsky, intoxicated by the successes achieved by military methods in the army, supposes that those methods can, and must, be adopted among the workers, in the trade unions, in order to achieve similar successes in strengthening the unions and in reviving industry. But this group forgets that the army and the working class are two different spheres, that a method that is suitable for the army may prove to be unsuitable, harmful, for the working class and its trade unions.”
(http://ciml.250x.com/archive/stalin/english/stalinworks_05.pdf, *Our Disagreements, Two Methods of Approach to the Masses of Workers*, 1921, in: Stalin, *Works*, Volume 5, 1947, Moscow, pp. 4-15, edition in English)

Therefore, as can be observed, Trotskyists are the ones who, just like the Maoists, attempt to impose their social-fascist dominance over workers and trade-unions resorting to bourgeois-authoritarian, repressive and military measures. Again, the Chinese revisionists meet with Trotsky. Trotsky said in 1920 that "... the mass of workers must be moved and

commanded as soldiers." Trotsky described it the claim that forced labor is unproductive, as an "old bourgeois axiom that became a prejudice."

This characteristic of Trotskyist strategy and tactic had a very well defined purpose: to prevent the triumph of Bolshevik forces during Russian Civil War, thus avoiding socialist construction in Soviet Union. Comrade Stalin explained this:

“(...) democracy in the trade unions is mere declamation, a fashion, called forth by certain phenomena in internal Party life, that, in time, people will get tired of “chatter” about democracy and everything will go on in the “old way.” Others believe that democracy in the trade unions is, essentially, a concession, a forced concession, to the workers’ demands, that it is diplomacy rather than real, serious business. Needless to say, both groups of comrades are profoundly mistaken. Democracy in the trade unions, i.e., what is usually called “normal methods of proletarian democracy in the unions,” is the conscious democracy characteristic of mass working-class organisations, which presupposes *consciousness* of the necessity and utility of systematically employing methods of persuasion among the millions of workers organised in the trade unions. If that consciousness is absent, democracy becomes an empty sound.

While war was raging and danger stood at the gates, the appeals to “aid the front” that were issued by our organisations met with a ready response from the workers, for the mortal danger we were in was only too palpable, for that danger had assumed a very concrete form evident to everyone in the shape of the armies of Kolchak, Yudenich, Denikin, Pilsudski and Wrangel, which were advancing and restoring the power of the landlords and capitalists. It was not difficult to rouse the masses at that time. But today, when the war danger has been overcome and the new, economic danger (economic ruin) is far from being so palpable to the masses, the broad masses cannot be roused merely by appeals. Of course, everybody feels the shortage of bread and textiles; but firstly, people do contrive to obtain both bread and textiles in one way or another and, consequently, the danger of a food and goods famine does not spur the masses to the same extent as the war danger did; secondly, nobody will assert that the masses are as conscious of the reality of the economic danger (shortage of locomotives and of machines for agriculture, for textile mills and iron and steel plants, shortage of equipment for electric power stations, and so forth) as they were of the war danger in the recent past. To rouse the millions of the working class for the struggle against economic ruin it is necessary to heighten their initiative, consciousness and independent activity; it is necessary by means of concrete facts to *convince* them that economic ruin is just as real and mortal a danger as the war danger was yesterday; it is necessary to draw millions of workers into the work of reviving industry through the medium of trade unions built on democratic lines. Only in this way is it possible to make the entire working class vitally interested in the struggle which the economic organisations are waging against economic ruin. If this is not done, victory on the economic front cannot be achieved.

In short, conscious democracy, the method of proletarian democracy in the unions, is the only correct method for the industrial unions. Forced “democracy” has nothing in common with this democracy. Reading Trotsky’s pamphlet *The Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions*, one might think that he, in essence, is “also” in favour of the “democratic” method. This has caused some comrades to think that we do not disagree about the methods of work in the trade unions. But that is absolutely wrong, for Trotsky’s “democracy” is forced, half-hearted and unprincipled, and, as such, merely supplements the military-bureaucratic method, which is unsuitable for the trade unions.” (http://ciml.250x.com/archive/stalin/english/stalinworks_05.pdf, *Our Disagreements, Two Methods of Approach to the Masses of Workers*, 1921, in: *Stalin, Works*, Volume 5, 1947, Moscow, pp. 4-15, edition in English)

Indeed, now focusing in the subject of trade-unions, the Maoists of the “C” PC always defended positions very similar to those advocated by Trotskyists, and can be read in the Article 7 of the Party Statutes in 1973:

“State organs, the People's Liberation Army and the People's Militia, the labor unions, associations of poor and middle-poor farmers, women's federations, the Youth League, the Communist Red Guards, the Little Red Guards and other revolutionary organizations mass must submit, without exception, to the unified leadership of the Party.” (*Statuts du Parti communiste chinois*, in XIe Congrès du Parti communiste chinois, 1973, translated from French language)

One may wonder what it means to separate the army from state organs, because any Stalinist-Hoxhaist knows that the army is among the main government organs. But besides this, we see that the party leadership over mass organizations is legally fixed in the same way that the direction of the Party organizations over the state. This is nothing more than the resumption of the platform of Trotsky and Boukharin demanding:

“(…) that trade-unions must be transformed into units of the workers state.” (*Plate-forme Trotsky, Boukharine, etc.*, in KOLLONTAI (A.), *L'opposition ouvrière*, Paris, 1974, translated from French language)

Comrades Lenin and Stalin in particular, opposed the rapid nationalization of trade-unions, because, while acknowledging that the party must lead the trade-unions, they considered that it is no question of imposing the party leadership to the masses through administrative measures:

“Central and local organizations of the Communist Party should firmly direct the ideological aspect of the trade-union work. Communist fractions within trade-unions obeyed faithfully to the Party’s organizations under the special decisions of the Tenth Congress of the Party. It is obvious that the choice of the executive staff of the labor movement must take place under the control of the Party. But Party organs should pay special attention to the normal methods of proletarian democracy in trade-unions, where choice of leadership must be done by the organized masses

themselves.” (Lenin and Stalin cited in: *Plate-forme des Dix*, in KOLLONTAI (A.), *L'opposition ouvrière*, Paris, 1974, translated from French language)

Thus, accordingly with the 3rd and 4th Classics of Marxism-Leninism, Party leadership should not be formally in the texts, but it would instead result of the work developed by the communists among the working masses. Trotsky, on the contrary, demanded that trade-unions should be quickly converted into state agencies, imposing its management over the masses. We see that this bureaucratic concept was taken by the Chinese revisionists/Maoists, and this is no coincidence, because deviations from proletarian democracy result inevitably in bureaucratic consequences. Those who – like the Maoists and Trotskyists – are constantly talking about “democracy” and about “struggle against bureaucracy” often prove to be the worst anti-socialist, pro-capitalist and pro-bourgeois bureaucrats.

It is now obvious that, just like Maoists, also Trotskyists always tried to impose repressive social-fascist measures against the proletariat, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes with the aim of controlling them in benefit of their pro-bourgeois-capitalist aims. Like all other revisionists, both Trotskyists and Maoists are definitively against proletarian dictatorship and of armed revolutionary violence, but entirely in favor of their own bourgeois-capitalist social-fascist tyrannical domination.

Maoism is the revisionist and anti-communist ideology of Chinese national bourgeoisie in search for state power and imperialist ascension. At the same time, Maoism provided Chinese national bourgeoisie with the ideological weapon which allowed it to avoid socialist revolution and the establishment of proletarian dictatorship while keeping Chinese toiling classes away from Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism.

And Trotskyism was the revisionist and anti-communist ideology of petty-bourgeois and bourgeois pro-capitalist elements inside Soviet Union and of world imperialist class interests outside Soviet Union – united in the same goal of undermining Bolshevik revolution, of preventing socialist construction and proletarian dictatorship. Trotskyism and Maoism are ideologies intended not only to perpetuate capitalism-imperialism wherever it exists but also to restore capitalism-imperialism wherever it has been destroyed by socialist revolution. And last not least, Trotskyism and Maoism are ideologies against the revolutionary restoration of socialism on a national and global scale.

In our previous chapters of DWM and also in other texts, we described and analyzed the process and manners through which Maoist/Chinese revisionism led China on the capitalist-imperialist path, keeping it away from socialism.

However, Trotskyists try to depict themselves as « authentic defenders of socialism » in supposed contrast with Maoist « Stalinists » which would have ensured capitalist perpetuation in China. While insisting in the lie that there was once socialism in China (with the aim of disgusting workers from socialism through depicting it as synonym of Maoist bourgeois-reactionary tyranny and repression), Trotskyists remark that:

« The first ‘Red State’ in Jiangxi (1931-34, capital Ruijin), where (...) the basic institutions and security apparatus had been put in place by Chou En-lai, was a state based on the extraction of the maximum surplus from the local population, to support the Communist apparatus and military machine.” (<http://internationalviewpoint.npa2009.org/spip.php?article856>, *Mao in Question*, 2005, edition in English)

And relatively to more recent times, they state:

“The CCP’s crack down crushed all opposition to capitalist reform (...).” (<http://internationalviewpoint.npa2009.org/spip.php?article1701>, *End of a Model...or Birth of a New One?*, 2009, edition in English)

This apparent concern of the Trotskyists with “capitalist reform and integration” does not hold any water. In truth, Trotskyism is as pro-capitalist, pro-bourgeois and pro-imperialist as Maoism. Comrade Stalin never failed to clearly affirm:

“What is the essence of Trotskyism?”

The essence of Trotskyism is, above all, the denial of the possibility of building socialism in the USSR by the forces of the working class and the peasantry of our country. What does this mean? It means that if, in the near future, the victorious world revolution does not happen, we will have to surrender to the bourgeoisie (...).

Thus, what we have here is bourgeois denial of the possibility of building socialism in our country (...). Can we, with such ideas, convince the masses of the working class in order to inculcate them with enthusiasm at work, with socialist emulation, and with an wide offensive deployed against the capitalist elements? Of course not. It would be absurd to believe that our working class, who made three revolutions, would develop enthusiasm for work with the sole purpose of preparing the ground for capitalism.” (Stalin, *Rapport du Comité central au XVIe congrès du Parti communiste de l’U.R.S.S.*, 1930, translated from French language)

“In fact, Trotskyism is a vanguard detachment of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, which is leading the fight against communism, against Soviet power, against the building of socialism in the USSR. Who provided the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie with a spiritual weapon against Bolshevism, with a thesis on the impossibility of building socialism in our country, the inevitable regular degeneration of the Bolsheviks, etc? This weapon was provided by Trotskyism.” (Stalin, *Sur quelques questions de l’histoire du bolchévisme*, in: *La Révolution prolétarienne*, n° 6 (113), 1931, translated from French language)

As can be concluded, and like also occurs with Soviet revisionists’ “anti-Maoism”, Trotskyist “criticisms” against Maoism are only intended to hide their own social-fascist and anti-communist nature in order to, once more, put world proletarians and working

classes in a false “dilemma” of choice between two branches of revisionism whose character and goals are the same.

And of course, we can never forget that even when Maoist revisionists and Trotskyist revisionists seem to defend different positions, this is merely apparent, because in what respects to the division of communist movement they always agree and complement each other (just like also occurs between Maoist revisionism / Chinese revisionism and all the other kinds of false “anti-Maoism” – as they are all, without exception, essentially equal and share the very same pro-bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist, pro-wage slavery, reactionary, social-fascist, revisionist, neo-revisionist and anti-communist objectives). This is proved by the fact that, besides their false “anti-Maoist” shibboleths, Trotskyists themselves affirm that they are ready to unite and ally even with their “Maoist enemies” if the necessities of anti-Stalinist strategy and tactics demand it. In 1961, on occasion of the VI Congress of the “Fourth International” (Trotskyist), they affirmed that “The positions of the Communist Party of China (...) display many possibilities of allowing the opening of common work with us, like it was never possible in the past.” In face of this and of everything we have been noting, no more additional comments are needed.

2.3 – Maoism and Titoism: false enemies



Tito with the Chinese revisionists

Another revisionist current that also has been presented as “opposed” to Maoism is Titoism. In 1948, Titoist revisionism can be considered as the first revisionism in power, several years before Khrushchevist takeover in Soviet Union and also before Maoist seizure of power in China.

Titoists always attempted at depicting themselves as “anti-Stalinist fighters for true self-administrative workers’ socialism” which would supposedly represent “the genuine essence of Marxism-Leninism”. There are still many Titoists around the world who reach the point of affirming that “Yugoslav socialism was the best political regime that ever existed, because it combined the best parts of both socialism and liberalism.” This alone should suffice to show Titoists’ real nature as dangerous anti-socialists.

Liberalism is always anti-socialism, and it is not possible to reconcile it with socialism, neither to “take advantage of both” because wherever there is liberalism, there can never be socialism, just like wherever there is bourgeois dictatorship, there can never be proletarian dictatorship. And that was just the case with Titoist social-fascist Yugoslavia: it was always and remained a dictatorship of the bourgeois class of compradore type which promoted capitalist wage slavery, oppression and exploitation while selling the country to American/Western imperialism. Albanian Marxists-Leninists with comrade Enver at their head understood since very early what kind of “Marxist-Leninist” Tito was and what kind of “socialism” the Titoists were implementing in Yugoslavia. In the already mentioned book “Yugoslav Self-Administration: capitalist theory and practice” and also in “The Titoistes”, in “Imperialism and the Revolution”, in “Euro-communism is anti-communism”, etc. comrade Enver irrefutably proved the entirely bourgeois-capitalist, social-fascist, neo-colonial, pro-imperialist and anti-communist nature of Titoist revisionist Yugoslavia through an outstanding profound analysis of the country’s social class structures and superstructures, of its relations of production and material socio-economic basis and political-ideological order. Therefore, there is no need for us to make another analysis of this issue. We will only present here some excerpts from comrade Enver that we find to be very informative about this issue:

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

The Communist Party of Yugoslavia, which came to power, had inherited many mistakes of a deviationist nature. After the Second World War, it displayed

pronounced national-chauvinist features, which had shown up as early as the time of the war. These features were apparent in its departure from the Marxist-Leninist ideology, in its attitude towards the Soviet Union and Stalin, in its chauvinist stands and actions towards Albania, etc.

(...) The Titoites were not for the construction of socialism, or for the Communist Party of Yugoslavia to be guided by the Marxist-Leninist theory, and they did not accept the dictatorship of the proletariat. This was the source of the conflict that broke out between the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties and the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. This was an ideological conflict between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism, and not a conflict between persons over domination, as the revisionists try to make out. Stalin defended the purity of the Marxist-Leninist theory, Tito defended the deviationist, revisionist, anti-Marxist trend of modern revisionism, following in the footsteps of Browder and the other opportunists, who emerged on the eve of and during the Second World War. (...)

In fact, the Titoites were not, and could not be, for the socialist social order or the form of organization of the Soviet state, because Tito was for the capitalist system and for an essentially bourgeois-democratic state, in which his clique would hold power. This state was to serve to create the idea that socialism was being built in Yugoslavia, a "specific" socialism of a "more humane type", that is, precisely the kind of "socialism" which would serve as a fifth column in the other socialist countries. Everything was well calculated and co-ordinated by the Anglo-American imperialists and the group around Tito. (...)

Within a relatively short time Yugoslavia became the "socialist" mouthpiece of US imperialism, a diversionist agency to assist world capital. From 1948 to this day, Titoism has been characterized by feverish activity against Marxism - Leninism to organize a propaganda campaign everywhere in the world to present the Yugoslav system as the form of a "genuine socialist" order, a "new society", a "non-aligned socialism", which is no longer like the socialism Lenin and Stalin built in the Soviet Union, but a socialist order "with a human face" which is being tried for the first time in the world and which is yielding "brilliant results". The aim of this propaganda has always been to lead the peoples and progressive forces fighting for freedom and independence everywhere in the world up a blind alley. (...)

Titoism has always been a weapon of the imperialist bourgeoisie, a fire-extinguisher to quell the flames of the revolution. It is of the same line and has the same aims as modern revisionism, in general, and its different variants, with which it is in ideological unity. The ways, forms and tactics they use in the struggle against Marxism-Leninism, the revolution and socialism may be different, but their counterrevolutionary aims are identical." (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

“Such a situation was also encouraged by the capitalist states which had taken the Titoite regime under their wing in order to give Yugoslavia a capitalist orientation.

Profiting from this state of affairs, the various imperialists were competing with each other in their efforts to get a tighter grip on this corrupt state so that, together with the credits they provided, they could also impose their political, ideological and organisational views. (...) If the Yugoslav economy has made some steps forward in its development this is in no way due to the system of “self-administration”, as the Titoite revisionists try to claim for themselves. Large amounts of capital from the capitalist world in the form of investments, credits and “aid” have been poured into Yugoslavia and this constitutes a considerable part of the material base of the Yugoslav capitalist-revisionist system. The debts alone amount over 11 billion dollars. Alone from the United States of America, Yugoslavia has received over 7 billion dollars in credits.” (Enver Hoxha, *Yugoslav "Self-Administration" - Capitalist Theory and Practice*, edition in English)

“The Yugoslav system has been reduced to bad shape, the development of events has torn down all masks and dispelled all illusions. The external pompous appearances, the misleading advertisements of a well-being such as can be found in no other place»(!), of a «Yugoslavia of freedom and abundance» (!) have left the place to all-round crisis, poverty and growing unemployment, galloping inflation, and increasing shortages of even the most essential goods and articles of broad consumption, etc. Just as they did with Tito in his last breath, the imperialists and social-imperialists are doing their utmost to give the Yugoslav system a new lease of life, to keep it alive, although this system is wholly gangrened. No blood transfusion, either from Washington, Moscow or whatever international bank or fund, can save it. This is the logical end of all revisionist theory and practice. The imperialist and social-imperialist creditors take the money from their safes, not because they want to help the peoples of Yugoslavia out of their misery, but because they want to protect their political and economic interest in Yugoslavia, to expand or consolidate the domains Tito has long ago sold them in return for the credits he has received from them. But if for a period of time it seemed as if Yugoslavia was to gain in this dangerous game, now .the time has come for Yugoslavia to put itself up for auction to the imperialists and social-imperialists. A first-class borrower, shaken to its very foundations in all respects, with no clear perspective, without the necessary means and forces to find the road of salvation - such is the present-day Titoiste self-administrative Yugoslavia. (...) Quite the, opposite is the case with our country, with our course, of the construction of socialism. Consistently applying the Marxist-Leninist principles in the construction and leadership of the entire life of the country, socialist Albania has marched with sure steps ahead, without holding its hand out to anyone.” (Enver Hoxha, *The Titoistes*, Tirana, 1982, edition in English)

Since before comrade Stalin’s murder, Albanian communists always waged a fierce struggle against Titoist revisionism. They had experimented Titoists’ true colours even during the Liberation War against Nazi-fascist invaders, when Titoite imperialism which tried to transform Albania in the seventh Yugoslav republic. From the very beginning, the Titoites always tried to hinder Albania’s independence. They tried through all means to control the Albanian partisans and to subjugate them to the orders and discipline of the Yugoslav Communist Party. The Titoites were always interfering in the internal affairs of

the PLA and trying to impose their anti-Marxist line. They hired agents and spies and infiltrated them within the PLA in order to sabotage its Leninist-Stalinist line and to turn Albania into a Yugoslav neo-colonial satellite.

Indeed, one of the reasons why the PLA of comrade Enver was always so successful in the struggle against all kinds of revisionisms and neo-revisionisms was related with the conditions of its struggle during the first times of its existence. Contrary to what occurred with other parties, the PLA had to face Titoist intrigue and reactionary anti-socialist manipulations and attacks. The PLA's formation and configuration as an existing Leninist-Stalinist Party inherently includes an uninterrupted combat against the first branch of modern revisionism – Titoism - which was on the verge of conquering power and which exercised its evil influence over Albania. It can be considered that anti-revisionist struggle could have never failed to be in PLA's very own DNA. And thanks to their faithful following of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism, thanks to their correct application of it, Albanian comrades led by Enver were able to triumph over Titoist machinations and to clear the path to the establishment of proletarian dictatorship and to socialist construction in their country.

Shortly after Titoists had their bourgeois-capitalist and anti-communist nature unmasked also by comrade Stalin and by the Cominform, another perilous current of revisionism openly emerged: Maoism. The roots of Maoist revisionism can be found much before 1949 Chinese bourgeois-capitalist "revolution", but only in that year it managed to impose itself as a relevant revisionism after having seized power in China. Contrary to Titoism, which explicitly defended and promoted anti-Stalinism, in the first years after 1949, Maoists preferred to keep their "orthodox Stalinist" masks in order to better mislead workers about its veritable anti-communist character. Therefore, until some years after comrade Stalin's death, Maoists had to pretend to "condemn Titoist revisionism", because if they didn't do this, their own revisionist and opportunist face would be immediately perceivable by world labouring classes.

After comrade Stalin died, Soviet revisionists started talking about "rehabilitating Tito" and about "re-establishing relations with Yugoslavia" (with the purpose of transforming it into one more neo-colonial satellite, an objective which was failed because Yugoslavia would always be predominantly a neo-colony of Western and later also of Chinese imperialism). But Titoist Yugoslavia was so obviously anti-socialist and Titoist ideology was so obviously revisionist that world proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes as well as many honest communists who defended comrade Stalin's correct path soon demonstrated their anger and discontentment with this.

At that moment, with their usual manipulative coldness, Maoist revisionists took advantage of all this and depicted themselves as being "genuine Marxists-Leninists struggling against Khrushchevist and Titoist revisionisms". And unfortunately, many of those disagreeing with the pro-capitalist policies of Soviet revisionists believed them and thought that by siding with Maoist China they would be really defending true socialism against revisionism. In other documents, we had already explained that this was never the

case and that Maoist China never had anything to do with socialism. Now, we will only present some excerpts of Maoist “anti-Titoist” phraseology:

“(…) there are fundamental differences of opinion between the leaders of the CPSU, on the one hand, and ourselves and all other Marxist-Leninists, on the other. All Marxist-Leninists hold that Yugoslavia is not a socialist country. The leading clique of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia has betrayed Marxism-Leninism and the Yugoslav people and consists of renegades from the international communist movement and lackeys of imperialism.”

(<http://www.marxists.org/history/international/comintern/sino-soviet-split/cpc/yugoslavia.htm>, *Is Yugoslavia a Socialist country?*, 1963, edition in English)

In the same text, Maoists also present some of the “arguments” used by the Titoists:

“Under the pretext of opposing "Stalinism", the Tito clique is peddling revisionist poison everywhere and opposing revolution by the people in all countries.”

(<http://www.marxists.org/history/international/comintern/sino-soviet-split/cpc/yugoslavia.htm>, *Is Yugoslavia a Socialist country?*, 1963, edition in English)

At the first sight, it could seem that Chinese positions regarding Titoism are correct. However, as we stated, these were not authentic Marxist-Leninist positions. At the same time, Titoists were qualifying Maoists as “Stalinists” in order to discredit them among those workers who fell on anti-Stalinist traps and believed in Titoist and Khrushchevist anti-Stalinist lies. They had a lot of interest in discrediting Maoism, as Titoists understood very well that it was one more revisionist current rivalling with their own for the preferences of world bourgeois class to be used as instrument to keep toilers away from MLSh.

But, like we already proved, just like there are not any kind of substantial differences between Soviet / Khrushchevist revisionism and Maoist revisionism, also there are not any kind of essential differences or “disagreements” between Titoist revisionism and Maoist revisionism. This can be concluded after a somewhat attentive research.

For example, during comrade Enver’s only visit to China, he took noticed of the similar positions of Maoists and Titoists. When Mao asked Comrade Enver what he thought about Stalin, Enver proudly defended Stalin’s glorious legacy. However, Mao disagreed with him and said:

“Stalin made mistakes. He made mistakes towards us, for example, in 1927. He made mistakes towards the Yugoslav comrades, too.” (Mao cited by Enver Hoxha in *The Khrushchevites*, Tirana, 1980, edition in English)

This affirmation is totally false, comrade Stalin was never mistaken towards Yugoslav “comrades”. On the contrary, he unmasked their true character and objectives, thus making proof of a great Marxist-Leninist wisdom, and he also acted correctly towards Titoite Yugoslavia. As comrade Enver remarked:

“ (Stalin) long ago realized what the views of Mao Tsetung were, and saw that (...) they were Titoite revisionist views, both on international policy and on internal policy, on the class struggle, on the dictatorship of the proletariat, on peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems, etc.” (Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China, Volume II*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

So, as can be observed, comrade Stalin had noticed the striking similarities between Titoism and Maoism since very early. If comrade Stalin had not died by that time, it is crystal clear that Mao and the Chinese revisionists would have surely received the same treatment of Tito and the Yugoslav revisionists. And comrade Enver is not the only affirming this. Mao Zedong himself admits that:

“Since the beginning of the war, Stalin was very skeptical towards us. When we won the war, Stalin perceived our victory as being of the same kind of that of Tito, and in 1949 he exercised a very strong pressure upon us.” (Mao Zedong, *Oeuvres choisies, Tome V*, translated from French language)

"To the Chinese it was Stalin, who was wrong, and not Tito." (Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China, Volume II*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

These are the original words of Mao Zedong:

“Tito was not wrong, but Stalin was wrong.” (Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China, Volume II*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

The Titoites must be combated and repudiated by all genuine communists because they totally betrayed the aspirations of the Yugoslav peoples, who fought and sacrificed their lives in the struggle against Nazi-fascism with the objective of edification of a socialist Yugoslavia where proletarian dictatorship would be a reality. Unfortunately, Tito and his clique sold the country to Anglo-American / Western imperialism and followed a bourgeois-revisionist-capitalist line.

Another characteristic common to both Maoism and Titoism is their pathological love for the dictatorship of American imperialist bourgeoisie inside and outside USA, as well as for its enslaving credits, capitals and “aids”. Relatively to Maoist revisionists, comrade Enver accurately noticed:

“These "new theses and conclusions", this "Chinese form" of Marxism had nothing at all to do with any creative application of Marxism Leninism in the concrete conditions of China but were a denial of its universal fundamental laws. Mao Zedong and his comrades had a bourgeois democratic concept of the development of the revolution in China. They were not for raising it to a socialist revolution. For them the model was the "American democracy" and they reckoned on the support of American capital for the construction of new China. (...) Browder wrote: "What is called the 'Communist' camp in China, because it is led by outstanding members

of the Chinese Communist Party, is much closer to American concepts of democracy than is the so-called Kuomintang camp; it is closer in every way, including the wider scope given to 'free enterprise' in the economic life (E. Browder, *Teheran, Our Path in War and Peace*, New York 1944, p.26) (...)

Mao Zedong considered American democracy the finest example of state and social organization for China. Mao Zedong admitted to Service: "After all, we Chinese consider you Americans the ideal of democracy." Along with their acceptance of American democracy, the Chinese leaders sought the establishment of close and direct links with American capital, sought American economic aid. Service writes that Mao Zedong told him, "China must industrialize. This can be done in China only by free enterprise and with the aid of foreign capital. Chinese and American interests are correlated and similar..." "The United States would find us more cooperative than the Kuomintang. We will not be afraid of democratic American influence, we will welcome it... "America does not need to fear that we will not be co-operative. We must co-operate and we must have American help (J. Service, *Lost Chance in China*, New York 1974, p.307)." (Enver Hoxha, *Eurocommunism is Anti-communism*, Tirana, 1980, edition in English)

And this is what comrade Enver remarked about Titoist revisionists:

"(...) the views of the Titoites (are) also in their stand towards "American democracy" which the Titoites took as a model for the construction of the political system in Yugoslavia. Kardelj himself has admitted that this system is "... similar to the organization of the executive power in the United States of America". (E. Kardelj, *Directions of the Development of the Political System of Socialist Self-administration*, Rilindja, Prishtina 1978, p.235)

Following the liquidation of the party and the break with the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy, Yugoslavia has been writhing in a chaos of economic-organizational operations. The Titoites proclaimed the state property "social" property, and camouflaged the capitalist relations of production under the anarcho-syndicalist slogan of "factories to the workers", and set the detachments of the working class one against the other. The collectivization of small producers was called the "Russian way" and was opposed with the "American way" of the creation of capitalist farms and the encouragement of private peasant economies." (Enver Hoxha, *Eurocommunism is Anti-communism*, Tirana, 1980, edition in English)

So, open eulogize for so-called "American democracy" is something that Maoism and Titoism have in common. We will not make an analysis of the political-socio-economic nature of American bourgeois-imperialist dictatorship, because this is not in the scope of this article. We will only remark that its defense is inevitably synonym of anti-communist character and automatically excludes genuine MLSH.

And of course, behind their "love USA" slogans, Maoists and Titoists have very well defined aims. The first ones relied on American imperialist capitals to launch China's

own imperialist ascension while the main economic sectors and means of production were kept in the hands of Chinese bourgeoisie to prevent that American imperialists could also turn China into their neo-colony and thwart the social-imperialist plans of Chinese revisionist bourgeoisie. The second ones were hands and feet tied to American / Western (British, French, German, etc.) imperialists. If Titoists displeased them, the neo-colonialist control that American imperialist bourgeoisie held over Titoist Yugoslavia was so intense that Titoist clique would be easily overthrown by them and Tito's new Yugoslav bourgeoisie would lose all class privileges and profits in had won through refusing Marxism-Leninism and preventing proletarian dictatorship and socialist construction.

And this was not the only occasion when the likenesses between Titoism and Maoism can be noted. Also between Maoist revisionist and social-imperialist so-called "three world theory" and Titoist revisionist "non-aligned theory" the similarities are striking. Both the «third world theory» and the «non-aligned theory» aim at keeping proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes away from MLSh in order to perpetuate capitalist-imperialist bondage and wage slavery. These "theories" were fabricated by the revisionists and they replace classes by abstract notions of "non-aligned nations" and "third world nations". During the first stage of "socialism in a single country", they spread misunderstanding and tried to erase the distinction that must exist between a bourgeois "anti-imperialist" and "anti-colonial" revolution and a genuine socialist revolution (and whose assimilation and confusion we, Marxists-Leninists, firmly refuse) by depicting all them as being exactly the same with the goal of having the struggle of exploited and oppressed peoples stopped half-way before advancing to the fulfillment of socialist stages, before it starts truly menacing bourgeois-capitalist political-socio-economic basis, structure and superstructure.

They depicted every "undeveloped" and neo-colonial country as being "socialist", no matter if they were ruled by the most bloodthirsty reactionaries at the service of world capitalism-imperialism. And the same can be said relatively to the "non-aligned world movement" – to which even Suharto's Indonesia belonged, a country which was a veritable American neo-colony where workers were being slaughtered by the millions. In other articles, we have already explained all this with many details and accompanied by confirmative quotations from the Classics. We will only recall the words from the Albanian communists, who noted that the "non-aligned theory", just like the "third world theory":

"(...) aims at deviating peoples from the genuine struggle against American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism and at presenting as being "progressive" and "democratic" those reactionary cliques and leaders who are open lackeys of imperialism and of neo-colonialism." (PLA, *VIIIe Congrès de l'Union des Femmes d'Albanie*, Tirana, 1978, translated from French language)

This is how the authentic Marxist-Leninist characterized the objective role played by bourgeois-capitalist anti-socialist "third world" and "non-aligned" theories.

And comrade Enver Hoxha also recognized the similarities between expansionist policies of Titoist Yugoslavia and Maoist China towards other countries and peoples by qualifying them:

“(...) as a reactionary act from great power positions, an act which is a repetition, in content and form, of the savage and chauvinistic methods of Tito, Khrushchev and Brezhnev which China, also, once condemned.”
(<http://ciml.250x.com/archive/hoxha/english/pla/letter78.html>, *Letter of the PLA and of the Government of Albania to the CC of the Communist Party of China and to the State Council of the People's Republic of China*, 1978, edition in English)

Moreover, with his usual implacable Leninist-Stalinist wisdom, comrade Enver reminds us that:

“The present Chinese leaders want to march together with the Yugoslav revisionists and co-ordinate their actions with them in the struggle against Marxism-Leninism and all the Marxist-Leninist parties, against the revolution, socialism and communism. Mao Tsetung and the Communist Party of China have maintained a pragmatic stand towards Yugoslav revisionism and have made a great evolution in their views about Tito and Titoism. At first, Mao Tsetung said that Tito was not wrong, but it was Stalin who had been wrong about Tito. Then the same Mao Tsetung ranks Tito with Hitler and Chiang Kai-shek and says that "such people... as Tito, Hitler, Chiang Kaishek and the Czar cannot be corrected, they should be killed". However, he changed his stand again and expressed his great desire to meet Tito. Tito himself declared recently: "I was invited to China when Mao Tsetung was alive. During the visit of the Chairman of the Federal Executive Veche, Djemal Myedich, to China, at that time, Mao Tsetung expressed to him his desire that I should visit China.

Chairman Hua Kuofeng also told me that, five years ago, Mao Tsetung said that he should have invited me for a visit, stressing that in 1948, too, Yugoslavia was in the right, a thing which he (Mao Tsetung) had declared even then, to a narrow circle. But, taking into consideration the relations between China and the Soviet Union at that time, this was not said publicly" (From Tito's speech at the meeting of activists of the SR of Slovenia, September 8, 1978). The revisionist leadership of China is loyally carrying out this "will" of Mao Tsetung. Hua Kuo-feng seized the opportunity of Tito's visit to China, and especially of his own visit to Yugoslavia, to eulogize Tito, to present him as a "distinguished Marxist-Leninist", a "great leader" not only of Yugoslavia but also of the international communist movement.

In this way the Chinese leadership also openly endorsed all the attacks of the Titoites on Stalin and the Bolshevik Party, on the Party of Labour of Albania, the international communist movement and Marxism-Leninism.” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

In fact, after having played the game of “irreconcilable opposites”, Titoists and Maoists decided that perhaps their aims could be better accomplished by trying to penetrate each other’s “area of influence”. The friendly relationship of Maoist China with Yugoslavia and the betrayal at the correct anti-Titoist struggle of comrade Enver’s Albania after that prove this. On one side, as comrade Enver’s mentioned quotations and books clearly declare, Titoist Yugoslavia was a mere neo-colony of world imperialists, it was totally dependent on its enslaving credits to survive. When Chinese Maoist bourgeoisie started to pave the way of its social-imperialist ascension, Titoists understood very well that it was time to put aside the masquerade of the “ideological divergences” and start to please and praise Chinese social-imperialists in order to get some needed credits from them. On the other side, Chinese social-imperialist monopolist bourgeois class also found interest in ceasing the “ideological polemics” (which in truth never existed...) with Titoists, even because Chinese bourgeoisie was engaged in constructing and expanding their own world camp in benefit of their social-imperialist and anti-communist aims and policies of maximum profits through exploitation of workforce and resources. Chinese revisionists concluded that a good manner to conquer Titoist Yugoslavia to their camp was through appearing as its “friends” and through invading it with their neo-colonialist “credits” in order to attach the country with their social-imperialist “aids” and to entirely control the country’s political-socio-economic sectors. In this manner, through attempting at dominating and controlling Titoist Yugoslavia, Chinese revisionist and social-imperialist bourgeois class not only was able to combat there the rivalry of American /Western imperialism (with which it always had inevitable contradictions, in spite of their anti-Soviet “alliance”) also tried to dominate and control the so-called “non-aligned world” of which Tito’s Yugoslavia appeared as “the main representative” and to include it in their own Maoist “third world” camp, thus putting an end to the competition of a rival revisionist camp (in previous chapters of DWM and in other articles, we have also already exposed and unmasked the aims and character of the “non-aligned” and “three world” anti-socialist theories). These were the reasons behind the “great honours” with which the reactionary Tito was always received by the Chinese revisionists:

“The first news from Peking says that Tito arrived there by special aircraft. At the airport he was welcomed by Hua Kuofeng, Ten Hsiao-ping, Li Hsien-nien and many other «outstanding» Chinese leaders, as well as by thousands and thousands of citizens of Peking, singing and beating gongs. Along the whole 30 kilometres from the airport to the city the road was packed with people who cheered for the «hero» Tito, while in Tien An Men Square, a hundred thousand dancers, dressed in national costumes and carrying all sorts of flowers, placards and what have you, had been assembled.

Those who are turning on such a resounding welcome for this renegade from Marxism-Leninism are such pseudo-Marxists that they have made themselves door-mats for him. The bourgeois leaders never demean themselves the way these revisionists do. They are making themselves a laughing stock by displaying such lack of dignity.” (Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China, Volume II*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

And Tito was also perceived by the Chinese as a valuable tool in encouraging the American imperialists not only to side with revisionist China against social-imperialist Soviet Union but also to keep “investing” their “credits” and capitals there, so that Chinese bourgeoisie could take advantage of them to its own social-imperialist path. Comrade Enver noted that:

“Tito is continuing his triumphal tour of China. In Hangchow and especially in Shanghai, he received a majestic welcome from hundreds of thousands of people, including the acrobats who gave performances in the streets at the time he was passing. As always, this time, too, Tito, an agent of American imperialism, is continuing the work of Nixon and Kissinger and tightening the bolts of the bridge between China and the United States of America. (...)

At the same time as Tito landed in Belgrade, the minister of agriculture of China, who was going to Belgrade to gain experience from the development of capitalist agriculture in Yugoslavia, landed from another aircraft. They will do the same thing in regard to «self-administration», too. The Chinese will send tens, or even hundreds of delegations to gain experience in everything, with the intention of applying this revisionist anarcho-syndicalist Titoite experience in China to the best of their ability, while maintaining the disguise that they are allegedly building socialism, just as Tito is doing, but a Chinese «specific socialism» like Yugoslav «specific socialism». The Chinese will do this because they are partners with Tito, and they will act in complete unity together with this renegade in the internal arena and in the international arena.” (Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China, Volume II*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

In the end, both Maoist revisionists and Titoist revisionists were always united in their anti-socialist crusade, no matter if they once pretended to have “divergences” and, respectively, false “anti-Titoism” and false “anti-Maoism”. They were and are always false enemies. Mao was nothing more than a new Tito. Indeed, Maoist “opposition” to Western imperialist powers and Soviet social-imperialism was only cyclical and influenced by their opposition to the emergence of a new rival: Tito could be the friend of the imperialist powers that had nothing to fear from his nationalist leanings (it mattered little to the imperialists that Tito brutally repressed the non-Serb peoples of Yugoslavia), but it was very different with Maoist China, whose geographic and demographic weight represented a danger if it could develop its economy in an imperialist direction.

Both Maoism and Titoism try to mislead the oppressed masses and to lead them away from the socialist and proletarian revolution, both propagate class reconciliation and incentive the supposed “positive aspects of capitalism” and the “mixed economy” (indeed, both open the path to social-imperialism, but Tito’s imperialism was limited to a local scale, while Maoist imperialism, due to China’s immense demographic and economic potential, reached a global scale).

2.4 – The false “anti-Maoism” of Mao’s successors in China



Mao with Deng Xiaoping

We will now analyze the phony “anti-Maoism” supposedly practiced by Mao Zedong’s successors in China.

In first place, and in order to better position ourselves when reflecting about this issue, we must note that since Mao’s death in 1976 and his subsequent replacement by Deng Xiaoping, the strategy relatively to this adopted by Maoist parties and organizations throughout the world can be mainly divided in two: the ones which still continue to present nowadays China as being «a socialist country» and the ones which argue that Deng Xiaoping and his successors are “traitors” to Mao’s “socialist line”. Within the so-called Maoist «movement», the second current is by far the majority.

The first kind of Maoist organizations is becoming rare and it is easy to understand why: nowadays, the openly neo-colonialist nature and policies of Chinese imperialist bourgeoisie are completely explicit and obvious. The “leftist” and “progressive” appearance that Chinese social-fascism had during Mao’s epoch (when the power of the Chinese national bourgeoisie was still not fully consolidated, and consequently it needed “communistic” slogans in order to deceive Chinese laboring classes to keep them away from authentic socialist ideology and preventing genuine socialist revolution and proletarian dictatorship) begun to disappear when Deng Xiaoping came to power. Today’s China is an openly fascist dictatorship which bloodily represses proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes inside and outside China in benefit of the profits of the Chinese imperialist bourgeoisie. In spite of their decreasing numbers, this kind of Maoist organizations still exist, in our DWM III we provided some examples of Maoist parties that can be included in this type.

However, the second kind of Maoist organizations undoubtedly includes most of them, with the majority of the Maoist parties attempting to draw a demarcation line between Mao’s China (which was allegedly « socialist », « revolutionary » and even “Marxist-Leninist”) and post-Mao China (which is fascist, reactionary and capitalist). This current is as revisionist and anti-socialist as the first one, but tries to cover its character through claiming the “purity of Maoism as the third development of Marxism-Leninism” and through the fake “denouncement” of what they call “the capitalist betrayal in China”. Accordingly with this last current, Mao was “betrayed” by what these Maoists call “the rightist section of the CPC” or « the reactionaries ». Nearly all Maoist parties try to make this differentiation in order to deceive the laboring classes, making them believe that Mao was a true communist which was supposedly “betrayed” by its « reactionary successors » after his death. Therefore, they pretend to defend “Mao’s socialist legacy” against capitalist development in China after Mao’s death. Behind the “criticism of Deng Xiaoping”, these Maoists today hide their own revisionism. They try to defend the “Marxist-Leninist” Mao Zedong against Mao’s own revisionism. This second kind of Maoist organizations do its utmost to maintain a « orthodox » mask, some of them even affirming to be « defenders of comrade Stalin ». But taking into consideration the fact that it is not possible to defend comrade Stalin without defending comrade Enver, this « Stalinist » cloak falls apart because what they cannot avoid is their sick anti-Hoxhaism. They even reach the point of accusing comrade Enver of siding with Deng Xiaoping group allegedly due to the fact that “Enver Hoxha had not the clairvoyance to distinguish between Mao and his pro-capitalist and pro-imperialist successors who betrayed him”. They also condemn comrade Enver for « not having supported the efforts of the Four to reestablish socialism » in China. We will not even waste time refuting these absurd affirmations, as the reactionary and anti-communist nature of Mao Zedong and of the Gang of the Four was already unmasked by us in this and in other texts.

So, while the other current openly defends Maoist China’s imperialist, capitalist and anti-communist nature, recognizing that there were no substantial differences between Mao and his successors; the second current is much more hypocritical and treacherous, because it has a much more “revolutionary” and “hard-line Marxist” outlook that can make some honest workers believe that this is indeed a truly communist line. Indeed, it is

not by chance that this trend is the dominant inside Maoist movement. World bourgeois class, which always promoted Maoist revisionism, also encourages this current precisely because it is the one which better deceives the world proletariat and which better convinces proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes to support a counter-revolutionary, social-fascist and anti-socialist ideology like Maoism.

This more frequent type of Maoist organizations therefore advocates that there was indeed some kind of substantial ideological difference between the «authentic socialist» Mao Zedong and his «capitalist-imperialist» successors. And these last ones also played their role in this «game» by «confirming» these false «divergences with Mao», namely that Mao Zedong would have committed «leftist sectarian deviationist mistakes» that later Deng Xiaoping and the subsequent leaders would have «corrected». In their official site, when referring to policies followed during Mao Zedong's lifetime, Mao's successors at the leadership of the social-fascist «C» PC state that:

«(...) this policy was not well implemented, leading to a series of subsequent mistakes and setbacks in the Party's guidance. (...) he wanted to correct the mistakes that had been found, but he erred (...) Mao Zedong made gross mistakes.» (<http://english.cpc.people.com.cn/66095/4468893.html>, *Mao's Life*, 2006, edition in English)

By displaying this pretended «anti-Maoism», Mao's successors in China continued their antecessor's mission of keeping toiling classes away from MLSh. And this because with their «anti-Maoism», they are deliberately fostering Mao's image as a «hard-line communist», which will be then presented by Maoist parties of the second type as a «proof» of Mao's supposed «authentically socialist character», because «if his capitalist and imperialist successors criticize him, that's because he was a true revolutionary and a true socialist» and «if they accuse Mao of being «leftist», that's because he was a true Marxist-Leninist while they were revisionists and social-fascists». It is indeed true that sometimes accusations of «leftist sectarianism» are directed by revisionists of all types against authentic Marxists-Leninists. This has already occurred many times. But this does not mean that it is always the case. And if we take a look at more documents and historic facts, we will inevitably conclude that, in this situation, in spite of the claimed «divergences», there were none between Mao and his successors. Far from having «betrayed» Mao (as for example, the reactionaries of the so-called «Marxist-Leninist-Maoist movement» claim – Mao's successors in China limited themselves to continue Mao's trajectory towards the transformation of bourgeois-capitalist China into a world imperialist neo-colonialist superpower.

We, Stalinist-Hoxhaists, know very well that there is no difference between Mao and his successors. Deng Xiaoping's fascist-imperialist clique was the logical, necessary and inevitable continuation of Mao's own bourgeois-capitalist and anti-socialist line:

“Mao Tsetung was neither willing nor able to take to heart the principles and standards of a Bolshevik party. This concerns again the handling of his successors. It was Mao Tsetung himself who decided first Liu Schao – tshi, then Deng Hsiao –

ping, Lin Piao and then Hua Kuo – feng as chairmen of the party after his death – and this after all their revisionist crimes and betrayals! (...) In our opinion there is no essential demarcation line between the Chinese revisionism before and after the death of Mao Tsetung. The development of the Chinese social-imperialism and social-fascism of today is the logical consequence of the revisionist “Mao Tsetung Ideas”.” (Documents of the Comintern (Stalinists-Hoxhaists), *Neorevisionism or Leninism?*, 2004, edition in English)

And writing in December of 1977, thus already after Mao’s death and during the epoch of his successors, comrade Enver referred to the course of the « C » PC since its beginning until that moment and remarked that:

« The Communist Party of China adopted only certain Marxist slogans and formulations, but in essence it was not a genuine party of the proletariat, a party of the revolution, which could secure the leadership in the democratic revolution and ensure its transformation into a proletarian revolution. In fact, within its ranks a series of anarchist and other theories and deviations developed. The whole development of China, from the formation of the party, from the foundation of the bourgeois-democratic republic of Sun Yatsen to this day shows this (...). » (Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China, Volume II*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

In the 40’s Mao Zedong, the « hard-line leftist » and « genuine socialist », affirmed that:

“The first step or stage in our revolution is definitely (...) the establishment of a new democratic society under the joint dictatorship of all the revolutionary classes of China headed by the Chinese proletariat.” (...) It belongs to the new type of revolution (...) with the aim, in the first stage, of establishing a new-democratic society and a state under the joint dictatorship of all the revolutionary classes.” (Mao Zedong, *New Democracy*, 1940, edition in English)

This quotation alone is proof of the bourgeois-capitalist and anti-communist character of its author. Mao Zedong refuses proletarian dictatorship and substitutes it by so-called “joint dictatorship of all revolutionary classes”. Actually, all those who are not in favor of the proletarian dictatorship and in favor of socialism and communism are necessarily in favor of the bourgeois dictatorship and of the capitalist-imperialist wage slavagist system. The bourgeoisie and the proletariat are two classes whose interests are irreconcilable. By its own nature and origins, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat have historical missions and roles which are radically opposed. There is no possibility for these two classes to rule under a “joint dictatorship” as Mao argues, because that “share of power” and “joint dictatorship” will invariably be in favor of the bourgeoisie, because no matter how “progressive” and “patriotic”, the bourgeois class has always an exploitative, oppressive and reactionary nature. Until the victorious socialist revolution and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship, the bourgeoisie is the class which controls the political-economic system and which dominates the production relations and forces which determine every aspect of the human society, obviously including the state power. So, by refusing the proletarian dictatorship, Mao is indeed defending what can only be a

political-economical system in which wage slavery will continue, in which the national and “progressive” bourgeoisie will continue exploiting proletarians, workers and other laboring classes. We also already noted that one of the main instruments used by Mao in order to mislead the Chinese proletariat over the true nature of the Chinese “revolution” was precisely his theory of a “joint dictatorship” of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, of a “share of power” between these two opposite classes with irreconcilable interests and historical roles.

Here and now, we will note the striking and undeniable similarities between these positions from Mao’s own mouth and those of his successors. The Constitution of the Communist Party of China in 2012 states that:

“Under the guidance of Mao Zedong Thought, the Communist Party of China led the people (...) founding the People's Republic of China, a people's democratic dictatorship.” (http://www.china.org.cn/china/18th_cpc_congress/2012-11/16/content_27138030.htm, *Constitution of the Communist Party of China*, Revised and adopted at the Eighteenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China on November 14, 2012, edition in English)

Therefore, we note that Mao’s successors affirm that the “C”PC transformed China into a “people’s democratic dictatorship”. This is not surprising, but only confirms the refusal of proletarian dictatorship by Chinese revisionists, before and after Mao’s death. And we can spend the rest of our lives searching in the “Constitution of the CPC” but we will never find a single mention to the proletarian dictatorship. Instead, we have this “people’s democratic dictatorship», which clearly resembles Mao’s “joint dictatorship of all revolutionary classes”. In the mouths of the Chinese revisionists, and taking into account their ideological origins, aims, course and policies, “people’s dictatorship” can only mean one thing: bourgeois dictatorship. And this because, in Maoists’ view, the so-called “national patriotic bourgeoisie” is also included in what they call “people”. And since the moment that bourgeois class is promptly included by the Maoists / Chinese revisionists in the abstract term “people” and is not only allowed to survive as a class, but also to keep the material socio-economic-political-ideological basis, means of production, production / productive forces and relations, social class structures and superstructures firmly in its hands together with control over the apparatus of state and political power (including the maintenance of its private property, ownership and sector, no matter if explicit or if hidden behind “public” cloaks), we must firmly denounce that, in such conditions, impossible pretensions to “socialism” or to “proletarian dictatorship” can only be a deceitful one. Socialism and proletarian dictatorship never existed in China before and after Mao’s death.

Therefore, we observe that the “Constitution of the CPC” which was amended in 2007 follows exactly the same ideological line that we had already found in Mao’s book “New Democracy” which was written in 1940! This a clear proof that the fabricated “divisions”, “differences” and “profound divergences” which some Maoists draw between the “C”PC before Mao’s death (qualified as “socialist”, “ideologically pure”, “revolutionary”, “Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist”, etc...) and the “C”PC of Deng Xiaoping

and his successors is non-existent. They are all the same. The ideological line followed by the “C”PC’s was always totally coherent with the interests of the class to which the “C”PC was born to serve. The “C”PC’s invariably adopted a strategy and a line in total accordance with the best interests of the Chinese national bourgeoisie, later turned into a veritable imperialist neo-colonialist bourgeoisie aimed at transforming its country into the next world’s indisputable superpower.

Indeed, we must make totally clear that it was Mao’s anti-socialist ideology which fundamentally contributed to the development and the consolidation of the political-socio-economic power of the Chinese national bourgeoisie and its later transformation into a state monopolist imperialist and neo-colonialist bourgeoisie. Thus, the Mao Zedong though was an objective and direct cause of the emergence of Chinese social-imperialism; in the same way that the emergence of the Chinese social-imperialism was an objective and direct consequence of the Mao Zedong Thought. One thing is intrinsically linked with the other and both are inseparable. Comrade Enver once accurately remarked:

“The Communist Party of China and especially Mao Zedong, who was an idealist dreamer and utopian without general education (apart from the one about ancient China), followed the development of human history as xenophobic dilettantes. Their ideological, political and organizational principles, especially since the foundation of the Communist Party, are demonstratively pragmatical and solely focused on China’s interests with the obvious aim of transforming "eternal" China into a superpower which controls the world, dictates the law, imposes its own culture and its own will upon others.” (Enver Hoxha, *Letter to Comrade Hysni Kapo*, 1978, edition in English)

Another supposed “opposition” between Mao and his successors would be that relatively to “capitalist development”. In fact, Deng Xiaoping and the others who came after him always tried to provide an image presenting Mao as “an orthodox communist unable to see the advantages of capitalist development within socialism”. This was clearly displayed in Deng Xiaoping very famous statement that “(...) practice of a market economy is not equivalent to capitalism because there are also markets under socialism.” And China’s own present bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist Constitution also states that:

“Article 11 - The non-public sectors of the economy such as the individual and private sectors of the economy, (...) constitute an important component of the socialist market economy.”
(http://www.npc.gov.cn/englishnpc/Constitution/node_2825.htm, *Constitution of the People’s Republic of China*, 2004, edition in English)

Relatively to these positions hold by the Chinese revisionists, we will only affirm that it is indeed possible that during the first stages of socialist construction during the period of socialism “in a single country”, minor markets can still endure. But this must necessarily be a temporary situation, because the markets which persist during some time after socialist revolution and the establishment of proletarian dictatorship will disappear

gradually but firmly with the development and the further construction of a socialist and later communist society. And even in those first stages of socialist construction those minor markets should never be allowed to constitute a form of exploitation and of bourgeois capitalist restoration; they should be subjected to total control by the proletarian state power lead by which must always strive for the efficient elimination of those minor markets. This was what happened in Soviet Union of comrades Lenin and Stalin and in socialist Albania of comrade Enver. Indeed, in the late 40's and early 50's, comrade Enver noted that Albania was the country in which the proletarian nationalizations were accomplished more rapidly and in which the internal market was more reduced. Comrade Enver Hoxha frequently remarked that one of the causes of the success of socialist implementation in Albania was the fact that in that country the internal markets were reduced to a minimum and the PLA was struggling for their total eradication simultaneously with the intensification of socialist edification.

Of course, in Maoist, wage slavagist, revisionist, social-fascist, anti-communist, bourgeois-capitalist, neo-colonialist and social-imperialist China, the diametrically opposite occurred. It is true that to hide the structure of capitalism behind the "building of communism in China," was an expression of Maoist revisionism and social-fascism. And after the death of Mao Zedong, Deng Xiaoping openly propagated the structure of capitalism as "indispensable means for the construction of communism." But it is also true that since the beginning, Mao Zedong always encouraged the development of capitalism much before Deng Xiaoping and the other successors in order to allow the national bourgeoisie to consolidate its class power and to exploit and oppress the Chinese proletarians and laboring classes:

“In the new-democratic republic (...) the republic will neither confiscate capitalist private property in general nor forbid the development of such capitalist production (...).” (Mao Zedong, *New Democracy*, 1940, edition in English)

“The revolution of the New Democracy only wants to eliminate feudalism and not capitalism (...).” (Mao Zedong, *La situation actuelle et nos tâches, Oeuvres choisies*, 1967, t. IV, translated from French language)

So, where are the « serious divergences », the « unsolvable differences », and the “profound oppositions” between Mao and his successors? True, during the first phase of its ascension, during Mao's times, the Chinese national bourgeoisie prevented foreign rivals from penetrating their capital in China, while in the later phases of its development, when its class power and imperialist ascension was already consolidated, it promoted that in order to take advantages of it, as we have already explained in this and in other articles (this later phase corresponds to Deng's and his successors times and lasts until the present moment). Indeed, when the Chinese bourgeois class encouraged the entrance of American and Western imperialist credits and capitals in China, the leaders of Anglo-American imperialism praised Deng as “a great reformer” thinking that they would colonize China and prevent it from becoming a rival imperialism. Unfortunately for them, they were mistaken. Chinese bourgeois class, both before and after Mao's death, never for a moment abandoned its plans of imperialist ascension and was never willing to

surrender its aims to the interests of American and Western rivals. While firmly keeping the control over the major means of production and over the heavy industry, Chinese bourgeoisie avoided neo-colonization by American / Western (British, French, German, etc.) imperialism. That's why the same leaders that were eulogizing Deng's "reforms" started instead to demonize them, when it became obvious that Chinese bourgeoisie would not let its country be turned into a Western colony.

But this does not mean that the ideological substance of Mao and of his successors were fundamentally different. They were not. During Mao's times, the interests of Chinese bourgeois class demanded that a certain strategy had to be followed. Later, after Mao's death, and in order to continue its imperialist ascension, its interests demanded the adoption of another strategy. But both strategies aimed at fostering those same class interests. Mao and his successors were all defenders and promoters of a bourgeois-wage slavagist system which was "dressed in red" and falsely presented as "socialism" only to detach proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes from genuinely socialist MLSh ideology, from socialist revolution and proletarian dictatorship in order to keep alive capitalist-imperialist bondage in China and all over the world. While laboring classes believed that what was being constructed in China was really "socialism", they would not search for it somewhere else and Chinese bourgeois class would be safe. Mao's successors' false "anti-Maoism" is only intended to hide their own revisionism, defense of capitalist development in China and their position as lackeys of the Chinese imperialist bourgeoisie which is spreading its exploitative, oppressive and neo-colonialist spider all over the globe, preying for resources and workforce and enslaving world proletarians and workers for profit maximization. However, Chinese toilers are today awakening to the reality of the fascist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie which the Maoists implemented in their country since 1949, but this is a subject that does not belong to the scope of this article. Last but not least, we will only mention here the false "anti-Maoism" of Wang Ming which is based on Soviet-revisionism instead of on the principles of Stalinism-Hoxhism:

"This Chinese revisionist "Polemics" served to subjugate the communist movement of the auspices of Maoism. So far, the world communist movement was in the claws of the Soviet revisionists, and the Chinese revisionists were determined to get it in the own claws. This was not possible without the guise of fighting "against Soviet revisionism". The Chinese revisionists availed themselves preferably of the Marxist-Leninist criticism of Comrade Enver Hoxha and the PLA. The "Polemics" is thus not - as it claims - a general line of the international communist movement, but a general line of Maoism to misuse the world communist movement for the interests of the social-imperialist world domination of the Chinese bourgeoisie.

This "Polemics" was especially an attack against the Comintern of Lenin and Stalin. Dimitrov was not the only one who had trampled the old decisions of the Comintern under foot. Thus, Mao also defied the general-line of the Comintern and refused to implement the correct policies of the Comintern in his own country. Mao sabotaged the Comintern. Mao never followed the path of proletarian internationalism, but served the imperialist aspirations of the Chinese bourgeoisie. In 1931 Wang Ming

was sent to China to lead the struggle against Mao's rightist opportunism. It was Wang Ming, who represented the Leninist-Stalinist line of the Comintern. He was the deputy secretary general of the Comintern. Wang Ming was the first Stalinist Chinese comrade, who debunked Mao Tse Tung's theory of the "encircling the cities by the village". Before 1935, Wang Ming was some years leader of the Communist Party of China, a courageous opponent of Maoism. Mao put Wang Ming away by means of accusations of "dogmatism" and the Comintern-line was replaced by the bourgeois line of Mao Zedong. Mao fought against the Leninist-Stalinist course Wang Ming as "foreign dogmatism" and treated him as a "puppet of Moscow in China." (Wang Ming came later under revisionist influence, so we have to criticize this.) [General-Line of the Comintern (SH), *Historical teachings of the Comintern and of the Communist World Movement*, chapter VIII, 2011, edition in English]

2.5 – The false “anti-Maoism” of the Albanian neo-revisionists

We will now reflect about another kind of phony «anti-Maoism»: that of Albanian neo-revisionists (falsely “anti-revisionists” in words, but revisionists in deeds), behind which they hid their own opportunism and anti-communism.

After comrade Enver’s death and before openly surrendering Albania to world bourgeois class, the Albanian neo-revisionist agents headed by Ramiz Alia tried during a certain period of time to maintain an “anti-revisionist” and “Hoxhaist” appearance in order to deceive Albanian and world workers about their true aims of destroying socialism in the last existing country of proletarian dictatorship. In this manner, they could accomplish these evil goals in a more calm and efficient manner without attempts from Albanian and world proletarians to stop them.

Included in such masks, fake “anti-Maoism” could never lack. On the contrary, during such period of time, it was a valuable instrument used by Ramiz Alia’s neo-revisionist clique to keep misleading “anti-revisionist” cloaks pretending that they were “continuing Enver’s struggle against Maoism” while actually they were only preparing the ground to Albania’s surrender to global imperialism in general, and to Chinese social-imperialism (which is a direct consequence of Maoist / Chinese revisionism), in particular. However, in their official documents and texts, Albanian neo-revisionists and their supporters worldwide tried to give the impression of being staunch fighters against:

“(…) the kind of revisionism that (…) in China has converted into social-imperialism.” [PLA, *Études Politiques et Sociales (1984-1989)*, October 1985, translated from French language]

Actually, as we already referred, Albanian neo-revisionists did their utmost to destroy socialism in Albania and to deliver it into the exploitative and oppressive claws of world revisionism-capitalism-imperialism. And this also included Chinese social-imperialism, of course. Some time after comrade Enver’s death, Albanian neo-revisionists headed by

Ramiz Alia, Adil Çarçani, Fatos Nano and others promptly started to openly abandon the principle of the prevalence of the internal factor over the external factor and of reliance on one's own forces. Like the Albanian Marxists-Leninists-Stalinists always highlighted, the external circumstances can be favorable or unfavorable, they can increase or decrease the quickness of socialist development and construction, but they can never stop it. And this precisely because it is the internal factor that is determinant, even in the case of a small country with a backward economy. These principles rejected by Albanian neo-revisionists were among most important laws of socialist construction during the first stage of socialism "in a single country", being basic to MLSH theory and practice and essential to socialist construction in comrade Enver's Albania:

"Let us take, for example, the question of the economic construction of the country, the development of the socialist economy relying on one's own forces. This principle is correct. Every independent, sovereign socialist state must mobilize the entire people, and define its economic policy correctly, must take all measures for the proper and most rational exploitation of all the wealth of the country, and administer this wealth thriftily, must increase it in the interest of its own people and must not allow it to be plundered by others. This is a main, basic orientation for every socialist country."(Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

"The complete construction of socialist society is closely connected with the understanding and implementation of the principle of self-reliance in every step and every field of life. This great Marxist-Leninist principle of profound revolutionary content is not only a law for the construction of socialism, but also, in the present conditions, an urgent necessity for our country to cope successfully with enemy blockades and encirclement. (...) The freedom won, all the successes achieved so far, our socialist and independent life, are practical verification of the Leninist conclusion that self-reliance, the internal factor, is the decisive factor, both in the struggle for the triumph of the revolution and the seizure of power, and in the struggle for the construction of socialism and the defense of the Homeland. Our Party has always defended the principle that self-reliance is not a temporary policy imposed by circumstances, but an objective necessity for every country, big or small, developed or underdeveloped, a principle applying both in liberation wars and the proletarian revolution, and in the construction of socialism and the defense of the Homeland." (Enver Hoxha, *Report to the 7th Congress of the PLA*, Tirana, 1976, edition in English)

But Albanian neo-revisionists did just the opposite. During comrade Enver's times, socialist Albania was exempt from commercial deficit and from any other kinds of debts towards non-socialist countries, what ensured the country's independence towards capitalist-imperialist-revisionist world and its capacity to resist to its encirclement. But this would change with the coming to power of the neo-revisionists. Their pro-imperialist policies caused serious dysfunctions and problems to the Albanian economy, as they zealously fostered reliance on goods, commodities and importations from imperialist,

capitalist and revisionist countries (including China). One of the most known Albanian neo-revisionists, Adil Çarçani, explicitly noted that:

“(...) many products have been lacking (...) the organizations of our external commerce must have a better knowledge of the external markets and of the evolution of the economies of those countries with which we trade.” (Adil Çarçani, *Raport Sur Les Directives du IX Congrès du Parti Relatives au 8 Plan Quinquennal*, 1986-1990, translated from French language)

As we can observe, instead of blaming their own anti-socialist measures and policies for the severe handicaps affecting Albanian economy in the late 80's, Alia's neo-revisionists mentioned instead that the “solution” to the “lack of products” is supposedly “a better knowledge of the market economies” of the capitalist-imperialist-revisionist countries with the purpose of using imported commodities from those countries to put an end to the mentioned lacks.

So, while making deceitful statements about their alleged “struggle against Chinese social-imperialism”, Albanian neo-revisionists were in fact following the pro-imperialist line of Maoist / Chinese revisionists and social-imperialists. They were opening the path to the complete refusal of the principle of reliance on one's own socio-economic productive forces and to Albania's invasion by products coming from non-socialist countries (including from social-imperialist China), what resulted in the country's first commercial deficit in many decades. In the late 80's, for the first time since 1946, Albania had commercial debts towards non-socialist countries. And we know very well that a truly socialist country can never have debts. Comrade Enver always stressed that a socialist country can never owe anything to bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist-revisionist world. During the 1971-1975 five-year plan, total trade between Albania and the countries of Eastern Europe totaled \$ 335 million of imports and \$ 365 million in exports, a trade surplus. In 1975, the trade balance was positive in Albania, even relatively to the Western imperialist countries, as imports totaled \$ 44 million and exports \$ 61 million. During the period 1970-1979, the Albanian trade balance presented a trade surplus of 2% of the value of imports. The budget of a socialist state must necessarily be balanced and must always present a certain surplus: the balance of foreign trade can never be structurally deficient: indeed, debt reflects dependence towards both domestic and international creditors that eventually become *de facto* owners of the means of production, thus eventually constituting a new repressive and exploitative bourgeois class exercising a wage slavagist tyranny over proletarians, workers and other oppressed classes. It is through the priority development of the heavy industry of means of production that the Albanian communists were able to accomplish success in socialist construction in their country against world bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist-revisionist encirclement.

If a determined nation has any kind of debts (commercial or any other...) towards capitalist-imperialist-revisionist countries, companies or institutions, then this automatically means that the nation in question is not socialist. And if a country which has been constructing socialism accepts to be in any manner indebted towards the bourgeois world, then this means that this country has ceased from being socialist.

Bolshevist Soviet Union of comrades Lenin and Stalin and Socialist Albania of comrade Enver never had any kind of debt towards capitalist-imperialist-revisionist nations.

And we must never forget that in the only true socialist countries that ever existed (in Bolshevist Soviet Union of comrades Lenin and Stalin and in comrade Enver's socialist Albania) the key principle of "relying on one's own forces" was never reduced to exportations being superior to importations. Capitals invested in economy always came entirely from the country's own accumulation funds. Comrade Enver made it very clear when he remarked that a correct policy of socialist construction based on one's own forces also means the increase of the country's wealth in benefit of the working people now ruling it under proletarian dictatorship.

But as we had already mentioned, under the anti-socialist dominance of the Albanian neo-revisionists, by the late 1980s serious dysfunctions had appeared in the Albanian economy. The 1986 reform of wholesale prices promoted by the Albanian neo-revisionists was exactly like the measures taken by Khrushchev just even after the revisionist coup d'état in Soviet Union, measures which caused deep negative "formidable impact to the whole social mechanism". Once, when revisionists and anti-socialists of many kinds (the so-called "Opposition" - which was in truth a group of Trotskyist and anti-communist criminals) were trying to topple Leninist-Stalinist leadership, to destroy proletarian dictatorship, to annihilate socialist construction and to restore bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist wage slavagist system in Bolshevist Soviet Union, they had also tried to promote the application of similar counter-revolutionary policies in order to jeopardize the country's socialist economy and material productive basis. These anti-socialist aims were promptly exposed. Relatively to this, Henri Barbusse noted that:

“In the third place, a great number of the proposals of the Opposition are quite obviously dangerous, clumsy and likely to produce disastrous results. (...) the proposal that wholesale prices should be increased (the Fifteenth Congress pointed out the formidable repercussions that would eventually result from such a measure, which the Opposition adopted without considering the mechanism of Socialism as a whole...)” (Henri Barbusse, *Stalin: A New World Seen Through One Man*, 1935, edition in English)

Moreover, during the period 1987 to 1990 in Albania, spending had increased from 59 to 64% of the country's GDP while the share of capital formation declined correspondingly. Thus, the social accumulation rate declined. There were many problems due to neo-revisionist plunder and sabotage of the social wealth. During the times of Enver Hoxha, many significant reserves to be used in case of conflict were created, but they were not used. Due to their pro-imperialist policy of encouraging the importations of commodities coming from non-socialist countries, the fall in 1989 of the social-imperialist, revisionist and social-fascist countries of Eastern Europe, with which neo-revisionist Albania was promoting trade relations had a profound impact and deeply worsened this situation, leading to a decrease of Albanian toilers' living and working conditions. Thus, the economic blockade was strengthened, which facilitated the penetration of the disposition to surrender and provided an enlarged basis for proliferation of neo-revisionist, opportunist and anti-socialist elements and forces. And we cannot forget the fact that,

after the open break with Beijing, Albanian communists repeatedly noted that the materials and equipments provided by the Chinese revisionists was outdated and of very poor quality. This has also certainly exercised a negative influence over the course of socialist Albania's economy, contributing to weaken it and turning it more vulnerable to external and internal pressures, attacks and encirclements. Comrade Enver once noted that:

“The experience of Albania shows that even a small country, with a backward material-technical base, can achieve a very rapid and all-round economic and cultural development, can ensure its independence and withstand the attacks of world capitalism and imperialism when it is led by a truly Marxist-Leninist party, when it is determined to fight to the end for its ideals, and has faith in its ability to achieve them.” (Enver Hoxha, *Report to the 8th Congress of the PLA*, Tirana, 1981, edition in English)

And of course, the opposite is also true. If a country like socialist Albania ceases from being an authentic proletarian dictatorship led by a genuine communist vanguard party of Leninist-Stalinist type, then all the announced accomplishments will inevitably know and will eventually disappear, as world bourgeois-imperialist-capitalist-revisionist system takes control of the country and neo-colonizes it. Therefore, we can conclude that the Albanian neo-revisionists were the ones who, like the lackeys, agents and servers of world capitalist-imperialist bourgeois class they really were and are, destroyed centralized planned economy by refusing and abandoning the application of the laws of socialist building in Albania. If they would have remained faithful to the teachings of comrade Enver Hoxha and of the other Classics of Marxism-Leninism, for instance the social accumulation rate could have never decreased, like indeed occurred.

Taking into account what we said above, the false «anti-Maoism» put forward by the Albanian neo-revisionists allegedly “criticizing Maoist preference for markets and refusal of a truly socialist economy” simply doesn't hold any water. Making use of their false “anti-Maoism”, they affirm that:

“It is evident that those are views and theories which are not Marxist-Leninist, like happens with Mao Zedong Thought, which is founded in the market, in competition and anarchy. It is incompatible with the notions and the principles of a truly socialist economy (...) organized in agreement with socialism's objective economic laws.” [PLA, *Études Politiques et Sociales (1984-1989)*, 1986, translated from French language]

While admitting that such criticisms are indeed entirely suitable to Maoist / Chinese revisionism, they are also fully applicable to the policies embraced by the Albanian neo-revisionists, who behind their misleading “Hoxhaist”, “anti-revisionist” and even also “anti-Maoist” masks managed to destroy the last socialist state of proletarian dictatorship in the world, restoring capitalism and allowing its transformation into a neo-colony of world capitalists-imperialists (Chinese, Western, etc.). The development tendency of Albanian neo-revisionism can be briefly described in the following 4 steps = firstly,

surrender to Maoism, secondly, surrender to Soviet revisionism, thirdly, surrender to Titoist revisionism and fourthly, final capitulation to European and American imperialism, to Chinese social-imperialism, etc.

Just like Maoist / Chinese revisionists, Albanian neo-revisionists pretended in a first moment to “defend Marxism-Leninism” only to be better able to attack it later. And also just like Soviet revisionists had promoted an anti-socialist personality cult around comrade Stalin only to later use it as a supposed “proof of Stalinist despotism”, also Albanian neo-revisionists made the same relatively to comrade Enver Hoxha. Their purpose was to denigrate and discredit, respectively, Stalinism and Hoxhaism in front of the eyes of proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes:

“The cult of personality is and remains a propaganda weapon of cooperation between revisionists and imperialists. The “cult of personality and alleged “combating the personality cult” are two sides of the same tactics, namely to separate the leaders and their revolutionary ideas and lessons from the world proletariat.” [Documents of the Comintern (SH), *Message of the Comintern (SH) on occasion of the 70th Death Day of Ernst Thälmann*, August 18, 2014, edition in English]

Like the lackeys of the bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist-revisionist world they were and are, the Albanian neo-revisionists didn’t lag behind Soviet, Chinese, etc. revisionists in what respects to ability to fabricate deceitful schemes to keep laborers away from genuine proletarian and communist ideology. In many of its official documents of the Comintern (SH), we already analyzed the issue of neo-revisionist betrayal in Albania, remarking that:

“Finally, after the death of Enver Hoxha the Albanian social-fascists themselves arose their rat-heads under the leadership of the traitor Ramiz Alia and they destroyed the Albanian proletarian dictatorship from inside with support and with collaboration with the imperialists and social-imperialists from outside who planned this - step by step - long time ago when Enver Hoxha was still alive. Within shortest time the imperialists were plundering Albania. It was the same person named Ramiz Alia who once appeared against Modern Revisionism and who arranged and commanded the fall of Enver Hoxha’s and Stalin’s monuments in Tirana. Ramiz Alia talked big about Enver Hoxha in public, holding his knife behind his garment. But Enver Hoxha and the PLA are immortal. (...) They took over Krushchev’s hidden and then wildly open attack against Stalin and did it with Enver Hoxha in the same way.” [Documents of the Comintern (Stalinists-Hoxhaists), *Neo-revisionism or Leninism?*, 2004, edition in English]

“The socialist Albania of comrade Enver Hoxha was the base of the world revolution. It was clear that the disreputation of socialism in Albania from inside as well as from outside harmed and damaged the confidence of the world proletariat in socialism and world revolution. The neo-revisionist dismantling of socialism in Albania led to the weakening of the Marxist-Leninist world movement of comrade Enver Hoxha. The propaganda of the revisionists, that “socialism in Albania failed”

was also propaganda to weaken the position of communism all over the world. Ramiz Alia and his supporters all over the world helped revisionism to turn back the flywheel of the international revolutionary movement. The pretended “hundred percent Enver Hoxha - defense course“ of Ramiz Alia turned out to be a hundred percent Anti-Enver Hoxha course, a course of capitulation, a liquidatory course – a) liquidation of socialism in Albania and b) liquidation of proletarian internationalism by descending Albania as the base of the world revolution c) a course of renewed neo-revisionist branches (for example the revival of Maoism: socialism in Albania failed, ergo: Enver Hoxha was „wrong“ – Mao was „right“). Alia’s distortion of Enver Hoxha was the same distortion of Leninism by Sinovjev. Stalin unmasked Sinovjev 1926 in his “Questions of Leninism” (Stalin, Volume 8).” [Documents of the Comintern (SH), *Enver Hoxha - the 5th Architect of Marxism-Leninism and the foundation of the Comintern (ML)*, 2001, edition in English]

The most important document which proves that the Albanian neo-revisionists had dropped the official Hoxhaist line of anti-Maoism, this is the report at the 9th Congress of the PLA in November 1986.

In this report – held by the traitor Ramiz Alia – there existed not a single word against Maoism. In a short paragraph, he mentioned casually “Chinese revisionism”, while comrade Enver Hoxha were struggling expressively against the Mao Zedong-Ideas as the BASIS and prevailing feature of Chinese revisionism. What was the intention of Ramiz Alia when “forgetting” this essential lesson of comrade Enver Hoxha? There can be no talk of struggle against Chinese revisionism without struggle against Maoism. **To abandon struggle against Maoism means nothing else but capitulation of struggle against Chinese revisionism – a grave betrayal at the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. As long as comrade Enver Hoxha was alive, Ramiz Alia had carefully hidden Albanian revisionism behind the mask of “anti-Maoism”. And shortly after the death of comrade Enver Hoxha this mask was dropped immediately.** Moreover, this crime is a grist to the mills of the Maoists who defend Mao as an alleged “anti-revisionist”. The fairy-tale, that “socialism” in China would be allegedly “betrayed” after the death of Mao, was de facto nourished by Ramiz Alia and his Clique – thus a big disservice to the Maoists. In his whole report, Ramiz Alia mentioned only Marx and Lenin, and simultaneously he kept totally quiet about comrade Stalin. We call this nothing else than following in the footsteps of the Maoists and of all the other anti-Stalinists.

The false “anti-Maoism” of the Albanian neo-revisionists was extremely dangerous and difficult to be denounced and unmasked because it was hidden behind the central anti-Maoist lessons of the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. **Namely, it grew up in midst of the world-center of anti-Maoism!**

However, without this sub-chapter, our DWM IV would not be complete, and we aim at preventing conceal of this Albanian ideological branch of neo-revisionism in its historical meaning, namely concerning its enormous contribution to the annihilation of socialism and of proletarian dictatorship in Albania, to the subsequent wage slavagist, bourgeois-

capitalist-imperialist restoration and neo-colonization of this country and also to the cleavage of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement that cannot be underestimated.

2.6 – The false “anti-Maoism” of the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists

We will now analyze one of the most (if not the most) dangerous kind of false “anti-Maoism”: that from the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists. In other documents of the Comintern (SH), we state:

“The term "4-and-a-Half Heads" is derived from the term "2-and-a-Half International". This was once formed as a centrist, anti-communist International for the purpose to struggle against the revolutionary internationalist line of the Bolsheviks and against the Comintern.

“The gentlemen of the Second-and-a-Half International pose as revolutionaries; but they prove to be counterrevolutionaries” (Lenin) The forces of the "4-and-a-Half Heads" limit themselves to the "Four heads", while they disrate the lessons of comrade Enver Hoxha - namely not equally ranking to the lessons of the other 4 Classics of Marxism-Leninism.

The "4 and 1/2ists" are those who don't recognize comrade Enver as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, but only as someone who made “enriching contributions” to it. This stand is synonym of complete anti-communism because to refuse one of the Classics of Marxism-Leninism means to reject all of them as a whole. It is absolutely necessary and indispensable to recognize him as the authentic 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism, as the world-proletarian leader who truly developed further the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin after the death of Stalin and in the context of world capitalist-imperialist-revisionist encirclement.

The organizations of the so called "4-1/2 Heads" pose as Marxist-Leninists, but they prove to be enemies of Marxism-Leninism. Definition of the neo-revisionist ideology of the "4-1/2 Heads":

The neo-revisionist ideology of "4-1/2 Heads" is a bourgeois ideology which struggles both openly and hiddenly against Hoxhaism. It denies the further development of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism, created by comrade Enver Hoxha. It is an ideology of disavowal of the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism - comrade Enver Hoxha.

What is Neo-revisionism? "Neo-revisionism is "anti-revisionism" in words, and revisionism in deeds." (Documents of the Comintern (SH), "4-1/2 Heads"- a neo-revisionist ideology, 2014, edition in English)

The new neo-revisionist tendency of the “4 and ½ heads” is relatively recent and it aims at denying comrade Enver Hoxha as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, affirming that instead, Enver should be considered as «having made enriching contributions to Marxist-Leninist science». The «4 and ½ heads» neo-revisionists are still not able to hide their anti-socialism behind an “anti-revisionist”, “Stalinist-Hoxhaist” mask, behind a fake «recognition» of comrade Enver as the 5th Classic of ML in words, but its refusal in deeds. No. Most of them are still unable to reach such a sophisticated degree of neo-revisionism, in spite of the fact that some of them are already adopting more misleading «Hoxhaist» masks. Of course, they are neo-revisionists because they use «anti-revisionist» cloaks and slogans while always keeping their revisionist nature and aims.

In their official documents and logotypes, the «4 and ½ heads» neo-revisionists only present the first four Classics of ML: Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. By denying comrade Enver its place as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, they are also automatically refusing the lessons and teachings of all the other 4 Classics they affirm to recognize. And this because the infallible teachings and lessons from Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver form an indivisible and unshakeable unity; and when we say Stalinists-Hoxhaists, we also say Marxist-Leninists, as the second expression is already included in the first. The lessons of a certain Classic cannot exist without the lessons of all other Classics as a whole.

Therefore, it is easy to understand that to deny one of them means to deny all of them as a whole. And if we deny all of them as a whole, we are of course denying MLSH as a whole, too. And as the embracement and application of MLSH is the only manner to successfully abolish the world capitalist-imperialist system through proletarian dictatorship and genuine armed violent socialist construction, then our conclusion is logic: to deny comrade Enver as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism means to perpetuate the global dominance of the world bourgeois class, it means to be at the side of reaction and wage slavery against the total and definitive emancipation of world proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes towards a stateless, classless and propertyless communist world society. This stand is a synonym of complete anti-communism because to refuse one of the Classics means to reject all of them as a whole. It is as simple as this.

The expression "Marxist-Leninist" is inevitably included in the expression Stalinist-Hoxhaist. As we mentioned, most of the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists are still too much “conservative” to refuse to replace their own phony designation of “Marxist-Leninists” by another equally phony but much more deceitful designation of “Stalinist-Hoxhaists”. So, we can still use this designation as a mostly safe line of demarcation relatively to all revisionist, neo-revisionist, reformist, opportunist, social-fascist, social-imperialist and anti-communists. Stalinism-Hoxhaism is the best way to describe our revolutionary and proletarian socialist ideology and leaves no doubts relatively to our authentically communist nature. Even if there are already some groups which are clever enough to use false “Stalinist-Hoxhaist” masks and to use and manipulate the name of comrade Enver Hoxha and of socialist Albania for the benefit of their anti-communist objectives, the irreconcilable contrast between our genuinely SH nature and contents and

their neo-revisionist rubbish can never be eliminated. And this situation demands moreover that we should use the strongest line of demarcation possible relatively to all anti-socialist tendencies.

We can never limit ourselves to consider comrade Enver Hoxha as somebody who has made "enriching contributions" to the communist movement. He must be acknowledged as the true 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism, as the proletarian leader who continued the development of the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin after their deaths and in the conditions of world / global imperialist-capitalist-revisionist encirclement, with comrade Enver's socialist Albania being the last authentically socialist state of proletarian dictatorship in the world (our ideological positions and basis about this issue can be found at the "Programmatic Platform of the Comintern (SH)" http://ciml.250x.com/platform_comintern_sh.html and in the text "Enver Hoxha – the 5th Architect of Marxism-Leninism": <http://ciml.250x.com/enverclass.html>).

But let's focus on the false "anti-Maoism" practiced by the "4 and ½ heads" neo-revisionists. First of all, we must remark that nowadays the anti-communist CIPOML and its "brother-parties" are among the best examples of neo-revisionists of the "4 and ½ heads" type. That's why we searched for official documents published by such parties in order to find concrete examples of their neo-revisionist positions.

Just like happens with nearly all other kinds of false "anti-Maoisms", also that practiced by the "4 and ½ heads" neo-revisionists is intended to hide its authors' own revisionism and anti-communism, is intended to hide the absolute identity of nature and goals between them and Maoist / Chinese revisionism to deviate workers' attention from MLSH and to keep them submerged in a false "debate" between two anti-socialist defenders of global capitalism-imperialism.

In their articles, those "4 and ½ heads" neo-revisionists affirm that:

"(...) we denounced "Mao Zedong thought" as dogmatic and anti-Marxist." (<http://www.pcml.org/partido.php>, *El Partido Comunista Marxista Leninista del Ecuador*, translated from Spanish language)

"Our movement consists of (...) rich experiences (...) from the struggle against the (...) Maoist betrayal." (<http://www.revolusjon.no/english/articles/886-a-central-international-organism>, *A central international organism*, 2001, edition in English)

In first place, already in an occasion in which they try to pose as "anti-Maoists", they indirectly affirm that Maoism was once committed to the cause of genuine socialism, as if it "betrayed", that's because it had once been loyal. Of course, we Stalinists-Hoxhaists, have already remarked a thousand times that this is false, Maoism never betrayed socialism due to the very simple fact that it had never anything to do with true socialism.

It always remained a reactionary anti-communist and pro-capitalist ideology aimed at favoring the interests of Chinese national bourgeoisie and opening the path of its

imperialist ascension. The times when it may have used some “red” slogans, cloaks and masks that was entirely due to necessities of misleading laboring classes and of keeping them away from struggle for veritable socialist revolution and proletarian dictatorship - through making them believe that Maoist social-fascist and wage slavagist China was “constructing socialism”! Those who, like the “4 and ½” heads neo-revisionists deny this, are defending the exploitative and oppressive objectives of Maoism, are siding with it and have a common nature with it – they are essentially the same, no matter the supposed “anti-Maoist” masks, affirmations and slogans used by the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists.

And a further closer looks at more of their texts confirms this. For example, in their official site, the so-called “Marxist-Leninist Communist Party” of Venezuela has many books to download. They have many of comrades Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, a few from Enver Hoxha and...a book from social-fascist anti-communist Fidel Castro! Those who do not believe us can enter these links: <http://pcmlv.blogspot.pt/p/libros-y-publicaciones-marxista.html> and <https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B0WU2q-AfruONDAtRHpZcGNzUTA/edit?pli=1>.

In our article “Down with Cuban revisionism!”, we already comprehensively unmasked the true character and goals of Castroist-Guevarist revisionism and we also denounced the social-fascist and anti-communist bourgeois-capitalist nature of Castroist-Guevarist Cuba. In that article, we had exposed the various similarities between Castroism and Maoism and we remarked their common anti-socialist purposes. Therefore, if the neo-revisionists from the “4 and ½” heads love Castroism so much that they even want their readers to download Castro’s social-fascist books, that means that they are also embracing all multiple and striking similarities between Castroism and Maoism.

The neo-revisionist and social-fascist CIPOML and its “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionist parties have as purpose to prevent the world proletariat from uniting under the centralized proletarian leadership of the Comintern (SH). For that, they spread all kinds of apparently “Marxist-Leninist” slogans intended to deceive and to detach workers from world socialist revolution, from global proletarian dictatorship, from world socialism and world communism so globalized capitalism-imperialism and the maximum profits of world bourgeois class can survive. In face of this, no wonder that promote Castroism-Guevarism and – consequently – also Maoism.

Just like the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists aim at preventing world workers and other exploited and oppressed classes to organize themselves under the proletarian vanguard of their mentioned World Party with such purposes, also Castroists and Maoists do their utmost to make the same in their own countries. That’s why they all tried to convince workers that fierce leadership by an authentically communist proletarian party of Leninist-Stalinist type was not necessary and attempted to reduce its irreplaceable vanguard role to mere “orienting” and spontaneist” functions.

During the “Cultural Revolution” in China, Chinese revisionists made their famous affirmation that: "The masses are the creators of history," a voluntary and idealistic

conception. This was transformed into a slogan that was amplified during the “Cultural Revolution” particularly highlighting the absence of the party leadership:

“The revolutionary line of Chairman Mao is to trust the masses, to rely on them, respect their initiative, let them educate and liberate themselves.” (*Editorial du Hongqi*, in Pékin Information, N° 14, 1966, translated from French language)

Marx and Engels argued, at the time when they had to fight against idealistic conceptions inherited from feudalism and amplified by the bourgeoisie, that men are the ones making their own history. But when Marx and Engels said that men are the ones who make history, it was to propagate the theory of historical materialism in opposition to the reactionaries trying to reduce history to the activity of a few “great men”. Men make history as members of certain determined classes in the fight against each other, and that’s only when they really become a conscious class, “a class for itself” provided with its own party that we can talk about revolutionary action of the working class (the proletariat) in the course of history. That is why the Marxist conception of history, while considering that the masses make history, doesn’t underestimate the work of men from those masses, capable of guiding the classes in a specific historical period. We must, on the other hand, consider that the Cultural Revolution has particularly highlight certain aspects that Maoism and Castroism have in common, particularly in what respects to the refusal of the leadership role of the proletarian communist party of Leninist-Stalinist type – indispensable to lead working classes towards successful socialist revolution, proletarian dictatorship and socialist construction. Revisionists like Castroists and Maoists and neo-revisionists like those of the “4 and ½” heads can very well accommodate to the idea of organization, or even to the idea of a party. What is typical of their line is the anti-socialist and counter-revolutionary “role” they assign to the party.

Thus, Fidel Castro affirms:

“What is the function of the party? It orientates. It orientates at all levels.” (Fidel Castro, *Révolution Cubaine*, translated from French language)

We can find in this conception of the party role those ultra-opportunist theses developed by the Yugoslav revisionists which Enver Hoxha so clearly unmasked:

“The negation of the role of the communist party in the construction of socialism and the reduction of this role to an «ideological» and «orientating» factor is in open opposition to Marxism-Leninism. The enemies of scientific socialism substantiate this thesis by «arguing» that leadership by the party is allegedly incompatible with the decisive role which should be played by the masses of producers, who, they claim, should exercise their political influence directly, and not through the communist party, because this would bring about «bureaucratic despotism»! Contrary to the anti-scientific theses of these enemies of communism, historical experience has shown that the undivided leading role of the revolutionary party of the working class in the struggle for socialism and communism is absolutely essential. (...) «Bureaucratic despotism» is a characteristic of the capitalist State, and it can never be attributed to the leading role of the party under the system of

the dictatorship of the proletariat, which from its nature and class character, is sternly anti-bureaucratic.” (Enver Hoxha, *Yugoslav self-administration, capitalist theory and practice*, Tirana, 1978, edition in English)

The reactionary denial of the leading role of the communist party is an essential part of both Castroist and Maoist revisionisms and also of the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists. This because by uncritically promoting Castroism, the neo-revisionists of the “4 and ½ heads” are also automatically supporting all the anti-socialist reactionary “theories” inherent to it. And taking into account that Castroism shares these “theories” with Maoism, it is time for the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists to admit that their “anti-Maoist” mask falls apart.

However, these positions by them are perfectly understandable. A party consisting of several classes is not able to lead a revolutionary movement. Indeed, in a revolutionary period, when classes are in motion, this is precisely where it will remain paralyzed as an organization which combines the staffs of several classes, each struggling to accomplish their own class interests. And the Maoists, Castroists and also the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists certainly don’t have as objective to foster the formation of an authentically communist party led by a single class (the proletariat) and able to lead the other exploited and oppressed classes towards socialism and communism. No. Their objective is precisely the opposite. They don’t want to abolish the inevitability of class society, but to eternally perpetuate it. In face of this, it is easy to understand the reason why they and all other anti-communists deny of the necessary and irreplaceable leading role of the Leninist-Stalinist party.

And we must also refer that to publish books from Fidel Castro together with books from the Classics represents a miserable attempt at reconciling two opposites that can never be reconciliated: social-fascism and MLSh.

“WE UNDERSTAND BY NEO-REVISIONISM ALL VARIETIES OF BOURGEOIS IDEOLOGY, THAT ARE HIDDEN BEHIND MODERN REVISIONISM, THAT STRUGGLE AGAINST MODERN REVISIONISM ONLY BY MARXIST-LENINIST WORDS, THAT TRY TO ACHIEVE RECONCILIATION WITH MODERN REVISIONISM, AND THAT CAST THEIR SKIN RESPECTIVELY WILL CAST THEIR SKIN IN FUTURE.”
(Documents of the Comintern (SH), *Enver Hoxha, the 5th Architect of Marxism-Leninism*, 2001, edition in English)

But there is more. Another characteristic that the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists have in common with Maoist revisionism is the refusal of the historic merits and present necessity of a Communist International (Comintern). Just like the Chinese revisionists always did their utmost to prevent the existence of a Communist International, whose necessity was always absolute, no matter if all kinds of revisionists, neo-revisionists and anti-communists affirmed the contrary. The Norwegian “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists affirm that:

“(...) the experiences from the Comintern, (...) have proven that at "world party" or a "mother party" is laid with great dangers and hampers the independent thinking and development within each party.” (<http://www.revolusjon.no/english/articles/886-a-central-international-organism>, *A central international organism*, 2001, edition in English)

At this point, we just have to recall the famous statement of the Maoist / Chinese revisionists affirming that: “A centralized leadership such as the leadership of the Comintern neither exists nor is desirable. Democratic centralism cannot be applied to fraternal parties.” Here is the proof of the total anti-Comintern attitude of the Maoists. In our General-Line, we noticed that:

“In the "Polemics" (1963), the Chinese revisionists had not withdrawn their hostile attitude to the Comintern of Lenin and Stalin. On the contrary. In the "Polemics" (1963) the appraisal of the significance of the Comintern is completely missing, and no single thought was wasted about the necessity of a re-foundation of the Comintern. We condemn Mao not only because he was active at the time of the Comintern as a splitter of the communist world movement, but also as splitter of the Marxist-Leninist world movement at the time of Comrade Enver Hoxha, namely as a splitter in the struggle against modern revisionism. Mao continued his anti-Marxist-Leninist way steadily. He did not only inflict damage on the matter of the world revolution, but also the Chinese revolution, which he pretended to "protect" against alleged "sectarianism" and against the "dogmatism" - thus Stalinism.” [General-Line of the Comintern (SH), *Historical teachings of the Comintern and of the Communist World Movement*, Chapter VIII, 2011, edition in English]

And this open hostility towards the existence of the Comintern and / or the necessity of its re-building is also explicit in more quotations from Mao. This one, in particular, strikingly resembles the above from the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists concerning the supposed “hampering of independent thinking” and of “freedom” by the glorious Comintern of comrades Lenin and Stalin. Referring to Wang Ming and resorting to his usual anti-Stalinism and eulogizes for ultra-opportunist Dimitrov, Mao stated:

"The line of Wang Ming was in fact the line of Stalin. The Comintern made countless mistakes in the past. The early and late phase of the Comintern was quite ok, but the mean phase was not as good [of course, Mao had the Stalinist phase in mind - remark of the Comintern (SH)].When Lenin was still alive, and the Comintern was fine when Georgi Dimitrov was responsible. The first Wang Ming line dominated our party for four years and the Chinese Revolution suffered the greatest losses. Only after the dissolution of the Comintern we enjoyed more freedom. There are two types of Chinese: one is a dogmatist, who fully accepts the line of Stalin, and the other is against dogmatism and therefore the one who refuses to follow Stalin's instructions. The Comintern has never practiced self-criticism because of this error."[Mao Zedong, *From the protocols of his conversation with a Yugoslav delegation in Beijing*, September 1956, quoted in: General-Line of the

Comintern (SH), *Historical teachings of the Comintern and of the Communist World Movement*, Chapter VIII, 2011, edition in English]

It is not only the case that the “C”PC struggled against subordination under the “C”PSU. It is the case the “C”PC wants the total subordination to Maoism as the better instrument of the struggle against the indispensable and inevitable re-creation and the re-building of the new Comintern.

Moreover, in the 50’s, Mao Zedong also had displayed his refusal relatively to the Cominform. When referring to the ”Yugoslav question” (that we have analysed in other texts, and therefore we will not further develop this issue here), Mao remarked:

“On this question,” said Mao, «you Albanians have not made mistakes towards the Yugoslavs, and neither have the Yugoslav comrades made mistakes towards you. The Information Bureau has made great mistakes here.” (Enver Hoxha, *The Krushchevists*, Tirana, 1980, edition in English)

True, the Cominform (the Information Bureau) was not the Communist International, it was instead a very modest and limited ”continuation” of it. But if Mao Zedong affirmed his disgust relatively to it, it is easy to understand that his attitude towards a true Communist International would be even more negative, as a genuinely red Comintern would mean tight control, criticism and punishment of bourgeois-capitalist, social-fascist and anti-socialist deviation like Maoist / Chinese revisionism.

Maoist revisionists, ”4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists and all other kinds of anti-communists still tremble when they remember the times of the glorious former International of comrades Lenin and Stalin, when Marxist-Leninism-Stalinism was faithfully embraced and applied towards the armed violent socialist revolution and maintenance of proletarian dictatorship, of socialism and communism not only in Soviet Union but in the entire world. Unfortunately, the former Comintern was eventually liquidated by the revisionists, but the souvenirs of its brilliant Marxist-Leninist achievements remain until nowadays and still haunt the minds of all types of reformists and social-fascists. And the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists together with the Maoists are no exception. That’s why they insist in allegedly and supposedly “informing” us about the supposed “great dangers” caused by former Comintern. Surely, the glorious former Comintern of comrades Lenin and Stalin did indeed great harms; it did enormous harms to all types of revisionists, opportunists, social-fascists, reformists and anti-communists around the world.

Through its correct Marxist-Leninist proletarian line, the former Comintern gave a decisive contribution to the advancement of world proletarian and socialist revolution. If it was not for revisionist treason since 1935, the glorious Comintern of comrades Lenin and Stalin would have been a veritable decisive force behind its accomplishment. Before 1935, during the time when Stalinist line and directives were fully applied, the Comintern was an implacable and invincible enemy of world imperialism, which recognized in it a formidable incorruptible foe and attacked with revisionist disease and bourgeois penetration. If Maoists and the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists had existed during the

epoch of Leninist-Stalinist Comintern, they would have undoubtedly been unmasked and annihilated as what they really are: the best servers of the interests of capitalist-imperialist system. That's why nowadays they still feel terrified only to hear the name of the glorious Leninist-Stalinist Comintern and they demonize and denigrate it in order to do their utmost not to have it back.

And their claims that the Comintern was born from an authoritative claim of a certain party from a country to be the "mother party" and to "hamper the independent development within each party" are totally false. The Comintern was formed by multiple sections, each one corresponding to the genuinely communist and workers' parties of Leninist-Stalinist type of each country. No section ever claimed to be its "centre" or tried to interfere, to pressure or to impose its despotic will on the internal affairs of the other sections, not even the CPSU (B) which, by the way, was – together with the PLA – one of the most principled and successful parties of Leninist-Stalinist type that ever existed and who gave the most and best help for the matter of the world proletariat. All sections exercised revolutionary communist vigilance over each the other in order to avoid penetration of bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist elements and influences and the sections worked together for the great cause of world socialism and world communism in accord with the teachings of the Classics under the leadership of the directive organs of the Comintern, which also exercised functions of revolutionary communist vigilance and whose general directives were applicable to all sections – at least, this was what occurred before 1935. The Maoist revisionists and the "4 and ½ heads" neo-revisionists are the ones who gravely hamper world workers through spreading lies and calumnies about one of the main weapons of the world proletarians and workers in the struggle against world capitalism-imperialism: the former glorious Comintern of Lenin and Stalin.

And it is astounding to see how the "4 and ½ heads" – who are among the most disgusting, manipulative and deceitful neo-revisionists – even dare to affirm that the former glorious Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist Comintern which unwaveringly embraced and followed the teachings of those who were then the 4 existing Classics of Marxism-Leninism at the epoch was allegedly "dangerous and prevented independent thinking"! They are the ones who want to condemn world workers to a totalitarian and endless exploitative repressive rule whose inevitable and endless quest for profit maximization seriously threatens the survival of our planet and who struggle for the survival of the world bourgeois class. Unfortunately for them, the Comintern (SH), the only true successor and the only authentic continuation of the former Comintern in the conditions of nowadays' globalization, will lead world proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes towards armed violent socialist revolution and maintenance of world proletarian dictatorship, of world socialism and communism always in accord with the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism. And when world proletarian and socialist revolution comes, Maoist revisionists, "4 and ½ heads" neo-revisionists and the murderous exploitative and oppressive wage slavagist system which they defend will be implacably, totally and definitively torn into pieces.

Another similarity between the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists and Maoist revisionists is that relatively to the issue of “anti-monopolist capitalism”. For example, the Danish “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists affirm that:

“(…) the struggle of the working class and the great majority must have the following main directions: Stop the Monopolies, the Bureaucrats (…).» (<http://www.apk2000.dk/>, *All Together against Capital*, 2000, edition in English)

This statement has obvious resemblances with the famous “anti-monopolist” claims from the Maoists:

“The revolution of the New Democracy only wants to eliminate (...) the monopolist capitalism, (...) and the bureaucratic bourgeoisie and not capitalism in general (...).” (Mao Zedong, *La situation actuelle et nos tâches*, Oeuvres choisies, Pékin, 1967, t. IV, translated from French language)

We observe how the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists and the Maoist revisionists try to convince workers that there are two kinds of capitalism and two kinds of bourgeoisie: a not monopolist “good one” and a monopolist “bad one”; a not bureaucratic “good one” and a bureaucratic “bad one”. Proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes must struggle against the “bad ones” while leaving the “good ones” alone. This theory is entirely reactionary and anti-socialist.

So, the Chinese revisionists and the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists think that not all capitalism and not all bourgeoisie have inherent tendency to monopoly and bureaucracy but only a part of it, and they even explicitly affirm that the struggle of workers must be mostly directed against monopolist-bureaucrat-capitalism. Therefore, we conclude that, accordingly with them, laboring classes must struggle against a supposed “monopolist-bureaucratic” kind of bourgeois-capitalism, and not against all kinds of it. Of course, relatively to the Maoists, having the CPC’s historical course in mind, we must conclude that when the Chinese revisionists are referring to the struggle against monopolist-bureaucrat-capitalism, they are referring to the struggle against the former bourgeoisie of the comprador type whose interests were in opposition with those of the Chinese national bourgeoisie which Mao and the “C”PC defended, promoted and represented.

In fact, this common position of the Maoists and the « 4 and ½ heads » neo-revisionists against what they call « monopolist-bureaucratic bourgeois-capitalist order » is completely fallacious because bourgeois-capitalist system has an inherent and inevitable tendency to monopoly and bureaucracy. This because the Classics of Marxism-Leninism teach us that so-called “petty-bourgeois-capitalism” where supposedly « free and equal competition » still exists inevitably originates monopolist capitalism and also imperialism (if the country’s geographical and demographical dimensions allow it like happens with China – otherwise, it becomes a neo-colonial comprador country). This is indeed the case with revisionist and social-imperialist Maoist China, where after having defeated its rival bourgeoisie of the comprador type, the Chinese national bourgeoisie managed to transform itself into a social-fascist monopolist bourgeoisie (with an unmistakably

bureaucratic nature, of course) exercising absolute control over the country's capitalist political-socio-economic system and turning China into a social-imperialist superpower.

We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, know that bourgeois-capitalism has always a bureaucratic and monopolist nature, it is never dynamic nor progressive nor "human", contrary to what its propagandists claim. Therefore, if we fight against bourgeois-capitalist system, we must also fight against the monopolist-bureaucratic nature which is inevitably inherent to it. Consequently, it does not make any sense to affirm that we will fight against "monopolist-bureaucratic-capitalism", because all capitalism has an inherent inescapable tendency to monopoly and bureaucracy. Once more, to affirm the contrary is to be a complete opportunist and a counter-revolutionary which tries to distinguish between an alleged "bad" capitalism (bureaucratic-capitalism) and an alleged "good" capitalism (non monopolist-bureaucratic capitalism), when every communist knows that such "distinction does not exist".

And also the "4 and ½ heads" neo-revisionists use these « anti-monopolist » and « anti-bureaucrat » theories in order to keep the oppressed and exploited classes away from authentic MLSH, from socialist revolution, from proletarian dictatorship through making the « bourgeois-democratic » and anti-monopolist revolution as an end in itself. They try to commonly depict the « struggle against monopolist capitalism » as the « infallible cure » to all evils inherent to wage slavagist system. They are not the only ones spreading this anti-socialist idea. Also the reformist anti-socialist Boukharin, one of the ideological inspirations of Mao, would defend the same « ideas », namely that to liberate exploited and oppressed toiling classes is not necessary to make a violent armed socialist revolution with subsequent implementation of proletarian dictatorship. No. For that, it would supposedly suffice to « eliminate monopolist capitalism ». What the Boukharinists, Maoists, the « 4 and ½ heads » neo-revisionists want is a return to « primitive capitalism », to its « free competition » which would represent a « positive » kind of capitalism, without exploitation or oppression, where the working class and the bourgeois class would « freely concur among them as equals » – in opposition to what occurs in monopolist capitalism. This opportunist and idealist theory must be unmasked.

In first place, it is entirely false that monopolist capitalism simply annihilates concurrence. This can never be completely eliminated by capitalism even during its last monopolist-imperialist development. We know that comrade Lenin always insisted that monopoly capitalism did not suppress competition, but it had indeed complicated this phenomenon. The monopoly born of competitive capitalism only complicates its laws while expanding on its same basis. The experience of the development of capitalism also confirms this notion because, on the one hand, we are witnessing the centralization and fusion of large monopolist trusts and the struggle between them, and on the other hand, we are witnessing the survival of concurrence in new forms between small capitalists. Not understanding this dialectical phenomenon of concurrence in the era of monopoly capitalism would be synonym of advocating the "peaceful means" of Kautsky on the basis of so-called "ultra-imperialism" where competition would have allegedly disappeared.

Moreover, the Maoists and the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists also do their utmost to spread their “anti-monopolist” theories with the purpose of preventing the proletariat and the other exploited and oppressed laboring classes from acquiring their own MLSh class conscience. In fact, through presenting the “monopolist-bureaucratic capitalism” as the main enemy, they are promoting their reactionary “union” with certain sections of the bourgeoisie in order to get them submerged in bourgeois and anti-socialist influences, ideologies and forces.

And this because thanks to the so-called “monopolist capitalism” – presented as source of all evils - they found a common enemy to the proletariat, to the other toiling classes but also to the middle and petty-bourgeoisie: the monopolies. Thus, by presenting monopolies as the only target, the Maoists and the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists resume the Bukharinist idea of peaceful integration of the non-monopoly bourgeoisie into socialism. They resume Bukharin's theses on the possibility of curbing crises in the capitalist system. This position cannot surprise us since it results from the same anti-communist and pro-capitalist ideological roots. For the Maoists, the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists like for Bukharin, the “elimination” of monopolies would allow that capitalist system could have a planned stable economy, with all its contradictions solved without armed socialist revolution neither violent proletarian dictatorship. And of course, without annihilation of the capitalist-imperialist system and of its dominant bourgeois class, that would, obviously, continue to exist and to exercise its wage slavagist yoke over proletarians, workers and other classes exploited and oppressed by it. In the end, they are defending the “integration” of capitalism into socialism, whose impossibility and counter-revolutionary nature we have unmasked in this and in other articles. They will resume exactly Bukharin's theses of 1919, when he opposed that the CPSU (B) would took monopolist capitalism as the basis of socialization, and who advocated instead an “alliance” with the petty and middle bourgeoisie to oppose “the big bourgeoisie”. We know that comrade Lenin's conception was quite different: for the 3rd Classic of Marxism-Leninism, it was necessary to support the development of the monopolist bourgeois class, and it was necessary to encourage this development to create the material basis for a successful advancement towards socialism. Accordingly with comrade Lenin:

“(…) Socialism is nothing more than the state capitalist monopoly made to benefit the whole people and that, for that reason, has ceased from being a capitalist monopoly.” (Lenin, *La catastrophe imminente et les moyens de la conjurer*, *Oeuvres*, op. cit., t. 25, translated from French language)

Recalling our last quotation from Mao, we note that he associated himself with the idea of the struggle against “monopoly-bureaucratic capitalism”. But what Mao is apparently denying here is the need to achieve the economic development of monopoly capitalism as the only real economic basis for socialism (we write “apparently” because only in words in defended this to keep working classes away from genuinely socialist ideology. In practice, Mao was a staunch promoter of the development of capitalism – with all its inevitably inherent monopolist and bureaucratic tendencies - in China, of the interests of the Chinese national bourgeoisie that would become a monopolist-bureaucratic capitalist-

imperialist bourgeoisie). Thus, Maoist “New Democracy” and also the “anti-monopolist” screams of the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists can be defined as the idealization of the bourgeois system of “free competition”. On the basis of such a system we could actually imagine that the bourgeoisie would agree to integrate peacefully this “socialism”.

This constitutes something that Maoists, Boukharinists and also the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists will commonly develop, and this is not a coincidence, because having the anti-socialist nature, it is natural that they develop similar reactionary theories.

The “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists and social-fascists also foster the worldwide interests of world capitalism-imperialism in general and of Chinese social-imperialism in particular through falsely depicting as “anti-imperialist” the social-fascist countries which are presently among its most faithful neo-colonies:

“Solidarity with Cuba, North Korea and other countries being threatened by imperialism!” (<http://www.apk2000.dk/>, *All Together against Capital*, 2000, edition in English)

As we have already proved in our articles about Cuban and Korean revisionisms and also in other texts, the anti-communist regimes like those of social-fascists, revisionists and pro-imperialists Castroist Cuba and Kim Il Sungist North Korea are not anti-imperialist. On the contrary, far from being “threatened by imperialism”, they are currently fully integrated and are complete neo-colonial satellites of world capitalist-imperialist bourgeois class in general and of Chinese social-imperialist bourgeois class in particular. To act like the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists - who encourage workers to abandon struggle for the destruction of social-fascist states and to support them instead with the excuse that “they are anti-imperialist” - means in fact to promote not only the maintenance in power of those countries’ ruling bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist cliques but also the interests of Chinese social-imperialists, who take enormous profitable advantages of the neo-colonial submission of these cliques to themselves.

We must take all this into consideration when the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists make statements like this:

"There are, in any case, a number of self-styled 'hoxhaist' and 'maoist' 'parties' who so thoroughly and dogmatically take from comrades Mao Tse-tung and (!!!) Enver Hoxha the unique qualities of the processes undergone in China and (!!!) Albania, and attempt to give them a universal quality, that they have alienated themselves from these self-same comrades they claim to follow. Like it or not, they are often closer to Trotskyism (!!!) in their supposedly 'class' positions; and are, at bottom, pro-imperialist. (!!!)" (<https://www.facebook.com/groups/250106718507259/>, Eduardo Artés Brichetti, *Chilean Communist Party, Proletarian Action – CIPOML*, 2014, edition in English)

Relatively to our supposed “pro-imperialism”, we will not waste more time with it. Right above, we provided proof of who is really pro-imperialist. In what respects to the

allegations of supposedly “unique qualities of the processes undergone in Albania”, we will say that, in its official theoretical documents, the Comintern (SH) already displayed behind any reasonable doubts that the experiences from socialist construction in comrade Enver’s Albania and the invincible teachings of Hoxhaism have undeniable universal character, thus they are universally applicable and can be considered as general socio-economic laws – just also happens with those from Marxism, Leninism and Stalinism. This insistence of the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists in denying Hoxhaism’s universal nature is closely related with their defense of so-called “specific socialisms” – which is, by the way, another characteristic they share with Maoist / Chinese revisionism, as Maoism also propagates its own “Chinese socialism”, alongside with the Titoites’ “Yugoslav Socialism”, with Thorez social-chauvinist “French road to socialism”, and with many others. Of course, there can be certain national particularities which will dictate some specificities of socialist construction. However, the Classics of Marxism-Leninism always noticed that those specificities are always limited to minor and secondary aspects of the socialist edification and can never be extended to its essential characteristics, because armed violent socialist revolution, proletarian dictatorship, the construction of socialism and communism must follow a certain and invariable line in accordance with the teachings of the Classics, regardless of the place. Of course, this is even more accurate nowadays when we are already in the second stage of globalized socialism. To defend and affirm the contrary - like the “4 and ½ heads” do - means to try to prevent working classes from embracing MLSH, convincing them to rely instead on “specific socialisms” intended at covering the continuation of exploitation, oppression and wage slavery with “red” deceitful slogans. In our General-Line, referring to Maoist / Chinese revisionism, we noted something relative to this issue that is also suitable to all other types of “national socialisms” and “national Marxism”:

“The so-called "national Marxism" is anti-Marxism, is bourgeois "Marxism", which is in antagonistic contradiction to the internationalist, proletarian Marxism. A global mixture of all revisionist ideas can therefore never replace the monolithic world-proletarian ideology. There is the only unity among all varieties of national "Marxisms", namely, the unity in the fight against the internationalist Marxism. But this "unit" is doomed to failure, because the internationalist Marxism is invincible! This has proven the history over and over again. Of course, nothing can be found in China's "general line" about the necessity and inevitability of the socialist world revolution and even less under the leadership of the Communist International.

With the XX. Congress of the CPSU, thus with Khrushchev's "*possibility of different paths to socialism*", the Chinese revisionists were essentially in accordance with the Khrushchevites and consequently also against the Comintern and its reconstruction. They agreed in all, to betray the line of Stalin, the path to communism. They were only in disagreement on the distribution of their power. To topple the Soviet revisionists from their pedestal, the Chinese disguised their own revisionism behind the anti-revisionism in general and behind the struggle against Soviet revisionism in particular. Anti-revisionism in words and revisionism in deeds - that is the physiognomy of Maoism.” [General-Line of the Comintern (SH), *Historical teachings*

of the Comintern and of the Communist World Movement, Chapter VIII, 2011, edition in English]

A touch-stone for the defence of comrade Enver Hoxha is the defence of his anti-Maoist teachings. With this touch-stone we have to measure the ideology of the “4 ½ Heads”. This ideology denies acknowledging the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. Logically it denies to acknowledge and to apply Enver Hoxha's anti-Maoist teachings. Reducing a Classic of Marxism-Leninism to only a half, this means logically reducing his ideology to only a half. And, indeed, the “4 ½ Heads” reduce Enver Hoxha’s anti-Maoism to a half. However what is half a struggle against Maoism worth? Nothing! In the contrary – a “half Enver Hoxha” disqualifies the 5th Classic. The smallest deviation from the teachings of comrade Enver Hoxha means nothing but a concession to the bourgeois ideology, means betrayal at the revolutionary matter of the world proletariat.

Maoism can only be defeated through complete application of the lessons of comrade Enver Hoxha. A half-assed “struggle against Maoism”, this opens all doors to opportunists, centrists, reconciliators etc. The ideology of the “½ Heads” is a hostile ideology against the Stalinist-Hoxhaist World Movement and the Comintern (SH) and paralyses, undermines and demoralizes the Stalinist-Hoxhaist struggle against Maoism.

In last consequence, this ideology of the “4 ½ Heads” serves not the communists but the Maoists in particular, and the revisionists, in general. And this expresses the whole physiognomy of neo-revisionism as the prolonged arm of the revisionists within the anti-Maoist movement.

We must also denounce the attitude of the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists in equating us Hoxhaists with Maoists and Trotskyists, in trying to discredit us in front of the world proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes through associating with us all the reactionary and anti-communist “theories” and crimes fabricated and committed by Maoist revisionists and Trotskyist revisionists. Relatively to Maoism, we have already explained countless times its true nature and aims and we have already shown who are the ones having everything in common with it (which includes the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists, of course). Relatively to Trotskyist revisionism, in this and in previous sub-chapters of this DWM IV we presented the similarities that it has in common with Maoist revisionism and, consequently and necessarily, also with the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists. One of the main “arguments” that the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists direct against us in order to “justify” our qualification as Trotskyists is our defense of socialist revolution on a global scale. With this, far from having invented anything new, the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists are “imitating” the Soviet revisionists, who were irreconcilable enemies of world socialist revolution and hid this behind their alleged “fight” against the counter-revolutionary Trotskyist view that the construction of socialism “in a single country” was only possible after the world armed violent proletarian socialist revolution triumphed. Today, we Stalinist-Hoxhaists, are deceitfully qualified as Trotskyists because we spread the world socialist revolution. In the fight against us and against the socialist world revolution, liquidators and neo-revisionists like those of the “4 and ½ heads” are still based on Soviet revisionism! So, as

we can observe, all revisionist and neo-revisionist currents are closely linked among them, they share the same anti-communist characteristics and objectives.

That is why we must struggle against all kinds of revisionism, neo-revisionism and anti-communism, regardless of their respective misleading tricks and of their apparent “red and revolutionary colors”! A good contribution to this would undoubtedly be a future article only dedicated to firmly denounce, unmask, expose and condemn the neo-revisionist, social-fascist and anti-socialist CIPOML from our authentic Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist positions, from the positions of the Comintern (SH). We shall accomplish this task in its due time.

2.7 – The false “anti-Maoism” of standard anti-communists



Mao with Nixon

The last sub-chapter of this DWM IV dealing with a determined type of false “anti-Maoism” will be dedicated to that practiced by the “classic” anti-communists.

Contrary to what has occurred with the other sub-chapters, in this we will not deal with a false “anti-Maoism” coming from a revisionist or neo-revisionist current. And this because all kinds of revisionism and neo-revisionism have, to a more or less extent, resorted to any kinds of “socialistic” slogans and masks aimed precisely at better misleading proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes to convince them that a certain revisionist tendency was indeed able to emancipate them from wage slavery, thus encouraging them to embrace such revisionist current while refusing MLSh and allowing the perpetuation of capitalist-imperialist system. On the contrary, the positions of “standard” anti-communists that we will analyze right now do not utilize any tactics like those. They display and propagate their explicitly anti-communist positions in an entirely open manner, without “red” cloaks or subterfuges.

This kind of anti-communism was the first one to emerge, but the consciousness of the world proletariat will develop to such a high degree that open anti-communism is becoming increasingly rare, and for obvious reasons. One day, its, its capacity to deceive laboring classes will be far behind that displayed by large numbers of revisionist and neo-revisionist currents, which dress themselves with “communist” and even “Marxist-Leninist” cloaks. As we can learn from the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin, open anti-communism was forbidden under the dictatorship of the proletariat and as good as eliminated. The anti-communists were therefore forced to disguise their anti-communism behind communist “phraseology” in general and personal cult of Stalin in particular. This phenomenon is known as "speaking with two tongues". And for the purpose to regain power in the Soviet Union, the anti-communists had no other alternative than to become members of the CPSU (B) and to conquer its leadership from inside. And this hidden anti-communist tactics was victorious after the death of comrade Stalin – as history has proved.

In the present time of the global domination of darkest reactionary, anti-communist ideology of the world bourgeoisie, we can never underestimate open anti-communism! True, open anti-communism began with primitive forms in history. But meanwhile even open anti-communism appears in “modern” forms. Anti-communism of today is represented in forms of historical “science” - namely in all the media all over the world – daily, hourly.... the influence of open anti-communism upon great parts of the workers of today is far bigger than that of the already discredited modern revisionists and its complete integration and assimilation into the capitalist world system. And even the influence of the neo-revisionists upon the whole world proletariat is much smaller than that of open anti-communism, and we should also not forget that our own Stalinist-Hoxhaist influence on the whole world proletariat is still extremely minimal. Open anti-communism is thus still the main weapon of propaganda against communism (remember: to pave the way for the physical liquidation of the communists in the coming revolutionary situations)!! Remember that the first sentence of the Communist Manifesto is still valid in this dark, anti-communist world:

“A spectre is haunting Europe — the spectre of communism. All the powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre”.

Revisionism is in the service of open anti-communism!!! - What would revisionism and neo-revisionism be worth of, if it would not be linked to open anti-communism?

We must unmask the double play of open and hidden bourgeois anti-Maoism!

Both log-roll our Stalinist-Hoxhaist struggle against Maoism. Neo-Revisionist “anti-Maoism” paves the way to revisionist “anti-Maoism” and revisionism paves the way towards open reactionary “anti-Maoism” (= open anti-communism).

This corresponds with the relationship between social-fascism and fascism. Fascism and social-fascism are the most brutal form of hidden and open anti-communism. They are all twins, or two sides of the same coin. The significance of open anti-communism in combination with the counter-revolutionary ideology hidden behind “anti-Maoism” - is indispensable for the counter-revolution.

With “standard” anti-communists, the “theories”, actions and objectives of the bourgeoisie and of other exploitative and oppressive classes in maintaining their class profits, positions and privileges through preventing the annihilation of global bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist exploitative and oppressive wage slavagist system through world socialist revolution and global proletarian dictatorship towards world socialism and world communism are clearly recognizable and are easily disclosed with the subsequent loss of misleading efficacy. On the contrary, the strategies and masks used by revisionists and neo-revisionists, in spite of having exactly the same origins and purposes, are more difficult to unmask, and thus more efficient to mislead toiling classes. We just have to recall the situation of the neo-revisionists (this expression means “anti-revisionists” in words, but revisionists in deeds), who struggle to avoid socialism and to prevent the acquisition of a truly MLSH conscience and the subsequent delaying of world socialism and communism by using “anti-revisionist” and even alleged “Stalinist-Hoxhaist” slogans and cloaks.

But once more, we can never minimize the actual effect of open anti-communism upon vast parts of workers all over the world, especially in the “Western World”. As Marx and Engels teaches: the economically ruling class rules also over the ideological means of influence on oppressed and exploited classes. The ruling class of today is the world bourgeoisie – to a great deal the monopoly bourgeoisie of the USA who influences - with greatest efforts since decades - ideologically over vast parts of the oppressed and exploited classes all over the world. There is no country of the world where is no open anti-communism. Open Anti-Communism is everywhere present all over the world. Of course, there are differences in its extent - depending in every individual country. Open anti-Maoism is bigger outside China than inside China etc. etc.

For example, in Portugal, the influence of the revisionists is larger than in Germany, and in the Eastern countries influence of revisionism (especially the elder generation in contrast to the younger generation) is larger than in the Western countries etc. etc. But there is a global tendency of bourgeois ideological influence which dominates successively that of the influence of the national bourgeoisie in single countries which

cannot be ignored. And indeed, the Comintern (SH) has expected this development and this is rooted in our Platform (2009) – the creation of world-socialist consciousness within the whole world proletariat in general and in the global industrial proletariat, in particular. The victory of the socialist world revolution depends on the victory of the world proletariat over the world bourgeoisie which includes the victory of the world-socialist consciousness over the dominating world-bourgeois consciousness. The victory of the world-socialist consciousness is impossible without the defeat of all anti-communism all over the world – consisting of both hidden AND open anti-communism.

Comrade Stalin wrote in his “letters of Kutais” that the dominating consciousness of the workers is bourgeois consciousness as a consequence of the class-domination of the bourgeoisie. Stalin taught us how we must struggle for replacing bourgeois consciousness through socialist consciousness. Between that time of Kutais and today the socialist consciousness of the workers was already dominating and also frustrated by revisionist consciousness. Therefore, the conditions have changed extraordinarily. Today, our task of implementing world-socialist consciousness is much more complicated and difficult to fulfill because this struggle between communism and anti-communism takes place on a higher level of globalized class-struggle in general, and especially in the revisionist world in which capitalism was already restored. We must restore socialist consciousness by replacing restored bourgeois consciousness in the countries of restored capitalism [Soviet Union and Albania]. [and the bourgeoisie needs unavoidably the same steps of changing socialist consciousness of the workers – thus from hidden anti-communism to open anti-communism.

If the revolution is marching forward than the bourgeoisie needs more hidden anti-communism. If the revolution is marching backwards than the counter-revolution answers with more open anti-communism, but always in connection of hidden and open anti-communism. It is the same appearance with increasing “left” opportunism in revolutionary upswing on the one side, and increasing rightist opportunism in revolutionary downswing on the other side. Related to Maoism: in the so called “cultural revolution” dominated “leftist” Maoism and after that dominated “rightist” Maoism. And related to the so called “Sino-Soviet Split” dominated “leftist” Maoism as long as the Soviet revisionists dominated the world movement. After the restoration of capitalism in the SU, “rightist” Maoism dominated in China. These deviations to the “left” and to the right is expression of the special form of Maoism's centrism for strengthening the Chinese bourgeoisie through all crises and setbacks. (Of course “opportunist ping-pong” is not equal to the Two-Front-Struggle of the Bolsheviks).

This is different from creating socialist class-consciousness in the revisionist, social-fascist, anti-communist countries both past and present which have never been socialist and had never anything to do with authentic proletarian dictatorship (China, Cuba, North Korea, East Germany, Vietnam, etc.), and again different from creating socialist consciousness in the non-revisionist countries in the “rest” of the capitalist world. But what is always and everywhere on the world necessary is this – creating all over the world the world-socialist consciousness which is based on the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism. In the Platform of the Comintern (SH) we have pointed to the necessary new

world-socialist consciousness of the global industrial proletariat which must replace global ideological influence of the globally ruling bourgeoisie as a pre-condition of the victory of the socialist world revolution.

And this global bourgeois influence consists not only of hidden anti-communism but this appears always and unavoidably in connection with open anti-communism.

Concerning the restoration of bourgeois consciousness in the former revisionist countries: The main tendency of bourgeois ideological influence is the restoration of open anticommunism (especially among the younger generation; while in the elder generation remains still socialist [Leninist-Stalinist] and, unfortunately, also hidden anti-communism [Soviet revisionism; Chinese revisionism, Titoism, Castroism-Guevarism, KimIlSungism etc. depending on the individual revisionist/former revisionist country]). This different situation can only be changed by different methods and different main focus of variously handling the balance of struggle between open and hidden anti-communism in different countries and different background of ideological influence in these different countries.

In the present start-up phase of the Comintern (SH) we focus on the workers with most advanced class-consciousness. We open their eyes about neo-revisionism as the main danger in the communist world movement. And our “*Declaration of war on Maoists*” is indispensable part of this task. In this start-up phase we are yet not able to convince the *majority* of the world proletariat about world communism. In this start-up phase, we are organizationally too weak to help the entire world proletariat escaping from bourgeois ideological influence of anti-communism which will certainly not disappear by itself. This would require a type of world party which is already anchored in the masses. And this is still impossible in the present phase of construction of the Comintern (SH). The Bolshevik type of a leading global proletarian mass organization requires at first the creation of the organized vanguard of the world proletariat. The formation of the vanguard of the world proletariat is now our central task. Victory over open anti-communism on a global scale is only possible by a world proletariat which is ideologically already equipped with the lessons of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism. The victory of the socialist world revolution requires the victory of the world-socialist consciousness of the proletariat. With other words: we must train ideologically the most revolutionary elements of the world proletariat who will be then able to spread the world-communist ideas into the masses.

Our more particular tasks are: Changing the restoration of open anti-communist consciousness into the restoration of socialist consciousness in combination with the restoration of hidden anti-communism into restoration of socialist consciousness which does nothing mean else than developing the world-socialist consciousness [and looking into the future development: the world bourgeoisie is successively FORCED to mask herself with hidden anti-Stalinism-Hoxhaim if she will succeed in changing world-socialist consciousness into a bourgeois-revisionist consciousness. This general-line must be applied differently under different conditions in the different countries. Mainly,

this depends both on the special influence of the bourgeoisie in every country and on the increasing global ideological influence of the world bourgeoisie.

Under conditions of today, the world bourgeoisie will never renounce her means and instruments of open anti-communism. Open anti-communism is absolutely able to adapt to the constantly changing conditions of class-struggle, particularly under conditions of globalization and last not least to prevent the danger of the socialist world revolution (We assume that the bourgeois employs hundreds of specialists who observe permanently the development of class-consciousness of the world proletariat).

The tendency for redbaiting is increasingly high. Chivvy against communists will increase and class-contradictions will exacerbate. Word fascism means bestial open anti-communism as pre-condition for bestial elimination of communists.

Nowadays, open anti-communism is more spread all over the world than ever before. Therefore our struggle against open anti-communism is a great challenge for the Comintern (SH), especially open reactionary anti-Maoism which is aimed against communism and not against revisionism.

We know that this DWM IV would not be complete without at least some brief reference and explanation of the phony “anti-Maoism” fabricated by “standard” anti-communist organizations, which has been historically intimately linked with open fascist dictatorship of the bourgeois class and whose main influence is felt in Western countries. After all, independently of what can happen in the future, nowadays such “anti-Maoism” is still practiced and anti-communists of “classic” open type still exist and influence a great number of workers.

Open anti-communism makes no difference between communism and revisionism. Open anti-communism blames both the communists and the revisionists for the same crimes, which communists have never committed but revisionists have committed indeed. Open anti-communists blame both as “dictators” - Mao *AND* comrade Enver Hoxha, no matter that this blame applies only to Mao and not to comrade Enver Hoxha, applies only to revisionists and social-fascists but not to communists.

Therefore it is very comfortable for open anti-communists to foist the crimes of the revisionists and social-fascists on the communists namely for the purpose to libel and compromise communism and its international leaders like Enver Hoxha and Stalin. And we will not fail to mention the fact that world imperialists openly and hiddenly supported the anti-communist Mao, supported and still support other revisionist-social-fascist states and organizations as bulwarks against the world proletariat, the socialist revolution, against the ideology of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism, and last not least against communists and other revolutionaries and their organizations. The anti-communist crimes of the revisionists are only part of the countless anti-communist crimes of the whole world-imperialist system which is the biggest and most brutal world system of tyranny – based on the bourgeois ideology of anti-communism.

In clear opposition to the astute trickeries and demagogical phraseology used by revisionist and neo-revisionist currents, the approach adopted by these “standard” anti-communist organizations does not vary and is always roughly the same: to demonize socialist revolution and proletarian dictatorship by depicting them as “terrifying bloody tyrannies slaughtering millions” which would deny “freedom to the people”.

Another characteristic is their insistence in presenting as “communist” even the most obviously revisionist, reformist and social-fascist tendencies and states, in a inept desperate attempt to disgust workers from the struggle for the inevitable necessity of a stateless, classless society free from all kinds of exploitation and oppression. Of course, they have always failed this and they will continue failing this, but they apply this same tactic relatively to Maoist revisionist China, which they present as an “unbearable communist hell”. To provide a concrete example of our assertions, we will quote an excerpt of an article authored by an American reactionary and anti-communist organization called “Tradition, Family and Property” (TFP - the name says it all...):

“(...) one is amazed that even today there are Mao apologists living in the freedom-loving countries of the West. (Mao was) a brutal dictator.” (<http://www.tfp.org/ftp-home/ftp-recommends-books/unmasking-mao-the-unknown-story-of-a-twentieth-century-tyrant.html>, *Unmasking Mao*, 2007, edition in English)

“(...) liberal students praised mass-murderer Mao.” (<http://www.tfp.org/current-campaigns/2007/taking-a-stand-at-gettysburg-college.html>, *Taking a Stand at Gettysburg College*, 2007, edition in English)

As can be observed, Mao is presented as a “brutal dictator” and a “mass murder”. While it is indeed true that Mao and Chinese revisionists in general have committed dreadful crimes against Chinese proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes, it is also true that they fully supported and fostered all kinds of reactionary, bourgeois-capitalist, anti-socialist ideologies, forces and elements, allowing them free reign to detach Chinese laborers from acquiring a genuinely socialist conscience. Maoist, revisionist, social-imperialist China was and until nowadays is a social-fascist state where toiling classes are harshly repressed and exploited while bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist class and everything linked with it hold exclusive dominance. A proof of this is that the gentlemen from “Tradition, Family and Property” are the ones admitting with their own mouths that “even liberal students praise Mao”. This is hardly in agreement with the false image of Mao as the “Stalinist butcher” they try to spread. Indeed, logically, there are not any “liberals” (read: bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist lackeys and ideologues just like the so-called conservative “anti-liberal” ones from “TFP”). It is really amazing to note the false “divisions” and “oppositions” that bourgeois class has fabricated among its ideologues only to deceive workers and to deviate them from MLSh...) defending the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, but there are plenty of them defending Mao. This alone tells us a lot about Mao’s inherently anti-socialist nature.

Already in Mao’s times, comrade Enver quoted Mao noting that:

“In the Communist Party of China Mao has cultivated his own cult and has not applied the great teachings of Marxism-Leninism, the class struggle, iron proletarian discipline, or the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Communist Party of China has been built up and imbued with liberal, reformist norms and two or more lines. Hence for Mao and the Communist Party of China the basic theses of Marxism-Leninism are fictitious. People like Mao Tsetung accuse Stalin of having allegedly made mistakes in connection with the class struggle, while they themselves claim that in socialism the class struggle becomes gradually weaker. Indeed Mao Tsetung says quite openly that we should not wage the class struggle, should not execute the criminals, should not shoot the dangerous enemies, or put anyone in prison. However, this was never Stalin's way. In practice, he carried the struggle against the enemies of the people through to the end, sternly and with determination. Mao Tsetung provides five or six excuses to exonerate the counter-revolution, to defend it and in this way tries to «prove» that his course is allegedly correct and Marxist-Leninist. Mao claims he wants to eliminate violence, capital punishment, the law courts and the procuratorial organs, to avoid punishing counterrevolutionaries. He advocates only education and propaganda. Where is the class struggle on Mao's part in all this? Where does the dictatorship of the proletariat exist in his views and practice? (...)

“At first we killed some counterrevolutionaries,» he (Mao) admits, «but we should not kill any more, should not imprison them, should not put them on trial (...)» etc., etc. «We can keep the law on capital punishment in force,» says Mao, «but should not apply it in practice!» What is this? This is not class struggle. Such a stand does not wipe out the counterrevolution, does not eliminate the exploiting classes. (...) He keeps the capitalist reactionaries in the management of factories which have been their property, gives them income from these factories which have been nationalized, but which are considered partly theirs, and forgets that these factories have been built and extended by exploiting the blood and sweat of workers. Can this be called class struggle? No, this is not class struggle at all. According to Mao Tsetung, these former owners must be integrated into society, become part of society, be educated in society. (That means they must be integrated into socialism. Many bourgeois revisionist «theoreticians» as well as the Titoites and the «Eurocommunists», etc., are now talking a lot about the integration of capitalism into socialism, etc.) «This will be a very good thing,» claims Mao, «for many reasons, one of which is that we (the Chinese) will provide a good example for other countries in the world in this way.» (A «fine» example of how the enemies of the peoples are not combated!)

Lenin thought completely differently. He says: «*And the fight against this element cannot be waged solely with the aid of propaganda and agitation, solely by organizing competition and by selecting the organizers. This struggle must also be waged by means of coercion.*» (Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China, Volume II*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

So, if during Mao's and his successors' times, the gentlemen from “Tradition, Family and Property” and other counter-revolutionaries like them want to spread and exercise their

backward anti-communism poison and activities in China, they would be entirely free from doing so as they pleased! Their only limitation would be prevention from promoting the interests of American imperialism, not because it represents “freedom and democracy” but simply because, far from that, it is rivaling with Chinese imperialism for neo-colonialist global dominion and wage slavagist profit maximization.

Besides this, only against authentic communists and proletarians aimed at awakening the conscience of Chinese laborers to the bourgeois-capitalist reality of their country and to the anti-socialist nature of Chinese revisionism do Maoists indeed commit mass-murders and act as bloody tyrants. On the contrary, they would certainly receive the gentlemen from “Tradition, Family and Property” with open arms, as the purposes of their bourgeois-capitalist, wage slavagist and anti-communist ideology entirely coincide with those of Maoist revisionism. They are all ideological twins, except for the fact that Maoist anti-communism is by far more sophisticated, efficient, deceitful and hard to unmask than that of “Tradition, Family and Property”. Their “differences” and “inescapable oppositions” are solely intended to submerge workers in a fake “dilemma” between two essentially equal kinds of anti-communism.

Indeed, we must also note the amazing “worries” of “Tradition, Family and Property” with “tyranny” and “totalitarianism”, especially when this organization openly claims to represent the “most traditional values” of “freedom-loving countries of the West” such as the bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist anti-socialist USA which was built upon the dead bones of tens of millions of African slaves and of Amerindians, in which proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes suffer harsh wage slavagist bondage, whose bourgeois class always used clear violent and armed fascist and racist measures against all kinds of progressive movements at home and abroad, which always did its utmost to destroy socialist countries and Marxist-Leninist movements, which never hesitated in resorting to imperialist wars, fascist coups and all types of repression and slaughtering in its search for workforce, resources and maximum profits.

Of course, the notions of “freedom” of “Tradition, Family and Property” are in full agreement with that of Maoists and of the Chinese bourgeois class: the “freedom” and “democracy” to savagely exploit and oppress world toiling peoples and working classes in order to accumulate endless riches through imperialist and neo-colonialist expansion. We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, know that it makes no sense to talk about “freedom” while stateless, classless, propertyless communist society entirely free from exploitation and oppression of all types is not ensured on a global scale.

In one of its published articles, another bulwark of “classic” anti-communism, the “Konrad Adenauer Foundation” (whose profoundly anti-socialist ideology has so much in common with Maoism that Chinese imperialist bourgeoisie even happily allows it to have an open office in Beijing... in face of this, it is incredible that there are still those capable of shamelessly affirming and / or believing that “China is a Stalinist country”...), also makes similar remarks to those of “Tradition, Family and Property”:

“The rejection of democracy by the Communist Party (of China) (...) predominantly describe the events.” (http://www.kas.de/wf/doc/kas_34092-544-2-30.pdf?130828104155, *Presence and Future of the Past*, 2013, edition in English)

Our above affirmations are totally suitable also to this statement and to the mentioned article. We will only notice that it is truly interesting to note such concerns for “democracy” coming from an organization bearing the name of someone who once affirmed that “Mussolini’s name will be written in golden letters in the book of history”, who defended Nazi-fascism, who deliberately rehabilitated Nazi war criminals, who transformed his country in an American neo-colony while turning it into an imperialist power within Europe, who was not even capable of entirely conforming with the appearances of bourgeois “democracy”, thus resorting to explicitly fascist measures, who did his utmost to actively support Iberian fascisms and who did his utmost to persecute, terrorize, imprison and kill authentic Marxists-Leninists not only in Germany but also in other countries. It is crystal clear that “democracy” for these “classic” anti-communists is not in anyway different from Mao’s “New Democracy”: it has always and inevitably class content, it is “democracy” only for bourgeois class which freely oppresses and exploits proletarians and other laboring classes to the bone.

The same can also be remarked relatively to the famous visit of Nixon to China in the early 70’s (about which we reflected on our DWM II). At the time of Nixon’s visit to China, comrade Enver noted that:

“To receive President Nixon and talk with him (...) is not correct and will not be accepted by the peoples, the revolutionaries and the genuine communists. We are among those who do not accept this decision and will not support it. The desires of this fascist president to go to China can be understood, they are the desires of an aggressor, a murderer of peoples, an enemy of communism, of socialism (...).” (Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China*, Volume I, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

Indeed, after many years complaining about the “lack of democracy in China”, American imperialist bourgeois class didn’t hesitate in changing their “speech” sending their representative Nixon – a “standard” anti-communist – to meet with Mao and with the other Chinese revisionists in order to perceive if it was possible to turn China into their neo-colony. As we have already explained in this and in other texts, this aim could not be accomplished, and so American imperialists eventually returned to their old false “anti-Maoism” which can be included in the type to which this sub-chapter is dedicated to. Of course, their phony “anti-Maoism” was entirely based on inter-imperialist rivalries and on their frustration for not being able neither to have China as their neo-colony, neither to prevent its transformation into a powerful rival imperialist superpower which is nowadays surpassing them and on the verge of world domination.

“Standard” anti-communism gets very expensive to global bourgeoisie. This because anti-communism in such an open and “sincere” form is a profoundly repulsive ideology, and those “ideologues” who “embrace” it do so in return for considerable payments and for some degree of access to bourgeois class’ privileges, profits and positions. Let’s just

compare this with the much more capable tactics and strategies of hidden anti-communism from revisionists and neo-revisionists, which are even able to attract many workers sincerely believing that by adhering to them, they are really “struggling for communism” and do so with honest intentions and *pro bono*. The concealed anti-communism of revisionists and neo-revisionists is not less proficient and profitable than open anti-communism of “classic” kind. As world socialist revolution is inevitably approaching, as the objective and subjective factors get more and more mature for it, world bourgeois class understands that it can no longer use its old methods of domination, but must replace them by new ones substantially equal and with exactly the same anti-communist and anti-MLSH objectives but more deceitful and thus more capable of delaying the inevitable necessary destruction of bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist system. But this would not mean that the world bourgeoisie would renounce open anti-communism. Thus, the correlation between fascism (the openly fascist type of bourgeois class’ dictatorship) and colonialism, on one side, and bourgeois “democracy” (“democratic” dictatorship of the bourgeois class) and neo-colonialism, on the other side, is the same that exists between open “standard” anti-communism, on one side, and hidden revisionist and neo-revisionist “anti-communism”, on the other side.

Of course, the phony “anti-Maoism” of those “classic” anti-communists is also closely linked with the fact that they correctly perceive Maoist / Chinese revisionism as a dangerous rival in their competition for the class favors of world bourgeoisie, in their competition not to lose the advantaged positions that world bourgeois class always awards to its best and most talented lackeys. Being competent and useful to accomplish its goals, world bourgeoisie will continue to combine Maoist anti-communism with the basic and rude open bourgeois anti-Maoism for the purpose to influence both the backward and progressive parts of the working class. Maoism and other revisionist and neo-revisionist currents have made infinitely more in benefit of the interests of world bourgeois class in combination with “standard” anti-communists.

The revisionist Soviet Union does not exist anymore, however the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung still exists - in the Ukraine, in Beijing and elsewhere in the world for spreading its poison of open anti-communism. It is the duty of us Stalinist-Hoxhaists to destroy anti-communism wherever it appears. Therefore it is also our duty to destroy the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung which will never dissolve itself voluntarily. It can only be smashed in a heaviest class-struggle and socialist revolution of the working class – led by the Comintern (SH) !! If the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung would have already lost its influence – it would have long be superfluous and disappeared. However its existence proves the fact that it is still indispensable for the bourgeoisie in the struggle against communism. Therefore it is also necessary and unavoidable to struggle against it [just as our German Section did it very well concerning intervention of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung in the Ukraine – by supporting the Western lackey Klitschko – or also against social-fascist “Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung” of the German Social democratic Party which spreads its open anti-communism in the countries of North-Africa]. Under-estimating open anti-communism leads to the danger of capitulationism and would be finally nothing but a crime against the working class.

History of anti-communism teaches that its hidden forms are much more dangerous to deceive the working class. That's why we define revisionism and especially neo-revisionism as the main danger in the communist world movement. However it would be also an inexcusable and fatal error to reduce the efforts in our struggle against open anti-communism. Especially, in acute revolutionary situations, and in a situation when increasing amounts of workers will reach a Stalinist-Hoxhaist consciousness, then the world bourgeoisie will increasingly resort to hidden forms of anti-communism with the purpose of delaying world socialist revolution and to jeopardize Communist World Movement through their misleading theories which are “communistic” and even “anti-revisionist” in words but bourgeois-capitalist and pro-imperialist in deeds.

3 – Conclusions: Stalinist-Hoxhaist anti-Maoism - the only authentic one

Finally, after having analyzed some kinds of specific false “anti-Maoism”, it is time to briefly present our own anti-Maoism which is, of course, the only genuine one. And this is not surprising, because taking into account that the Comintern (SH) is the only truly communist organization in the world, the only which really struggles for socialism and communism as the vanguard, as the World Party of the global proletariat. Consequently, it had also to be the only to wage a fierce relentless combat against all kinds of revisionism, neo-revisionism and anti-communism – including against its Maoist current, of course.

It is not at all necessary to note here the absolute agreement that exists between Stalinism-Hoxhaism and today's globalized reality. And this not only due to the fact that such has already been done in other documents of the Comintern (SH), but also because it is something so evident that it is self-imposing in a manner that does not admit doubts neither hesitation.

We, Stalinist-Hoxhaists, define as the main areas of the world violent armed socialist proletarian revolution those where the industrial proletariat is the most numerous and has a more profound degree of socialist consciousness. Under conditions of globalization, a new industrial proletariat was also created in low-wage countries – i.e., in the former colonies. Under the conditions of the first stage of socialism, this solution was still Trotskyist - as the petty bourgeoisie in Asia, Africa and Latin America prevailed and there was virtually no proletariat. But today this former Trotskyist slogan has to be modified accordingly with the conditions of globalization. There is now global capitalism in all countries of the world. Everywhere, the fundamental contradiction of labor and capital is the main contradiction in all countries of the world, therefore the world socialist revolution throughout the world is ripe. Everywhere not only wage labor and capital, but

now a world proletariat and an equally gigantic world giant army of poor farmers is growing and prevailing. This makes the victory of the world socialist revolution inevitable, in spite of the efforts of all revisionists, neo-revisionists and anti-communists.

Historically, the Comintern (SH) has its roots not only in the world communist movement led by the CPSU (B), not only in the former glorious III International of comrades Lenin and Stalin, but also in the World Marxist-Leninist movement of comrade Enver Hoxha. And without neglecting the influences of the formers, it is in this last one that we can find the most direct contributions to the present anti-Maoist struggle of the Comintern (SH).

More precisely in 1978, when Maoist / Chinese revisionism was officially and openly denounced first by the PLA headed by comrade Enver, the first steps towards the drawing of a correct demarcation-line relatively to Maoist revisionism were taken. Since then, many things happened. After 1978, comrade Enver and the Marxists-Leninists in Albania and in other countries made more useful contributions to the further unmasking and condemnation of Maoist anti-socialism.

However, after the death of the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism in 1985, socialist Albania went through a process of neo-revisionist degeneration that ended up with the destruction of proletarian dictatorship, with capitalist restoration in Albania which from being the main world revolutionary center was transformed in a typical neo-colony of world capitalist-imperialist bourgeoisie. With this, also the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha fell apart. It is true that even during its lifetime, the mentioned movement was affected by some problems. For example, there were so-called "comrades" from Sri Lanka that were agents of Chinese revisionists, like also happened with M. Hill from the "C" P of Australia; others, like those from the Italian brother-party, were agents of the Brejnevists within the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha. But in spite of everything, this is a proof of how the line followed by the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha was generally correct and how it was perceived as the world bourgeoisie as a menace to its class rule, profits and privileges, as the Soviet revisionists, the Chinese revisionists and many other anti-communists relentlessly tried to split this movement from inside as part of the 5th column of the bourgeois class!

Since then and until the founding of the Comintern (SH) in the early 2000's, the struggle not only against Maoism in itself but also against the kinds of false "anti-Maoism" was almost entirely stopped and practically without relevant developments. Only when the Comintern (SH) started to build its own theoretical bases it was possible to make new contributions to our demarcation-line not only against Maoism, but also against the types of false "anti-Maoism" against which this DWM IV is directed. It is very important to distinguish different positions from which Maoism is criticized. Stalinism-Hoxhaism is the only correct ideology which is able to defeat it. Drawing the demarcation line to all the so called "Anti-Maoist" branches was the issue and subject of this Fourth Chapter of DWM. Just like had occurred with the previous DWM, the DWM IV aims at providing valuable help to correctly draw our Stalinist-Hoxhaist demarcation-line against Maoist / Chinese revisionism. Its reading must be completed by that of the other texts, articles and

documents of the Comintern (SH) which - all together - constitute a single whole and mutually complement each other.

Unmasking revisionism and neo-revisionism was very hard in the beginning, but now, when we have already revealed the basic knowledge about it, everybody can learn from it and make one's decision. This was also true concerning comrade Enver Hoxha – specially, how long did he hope for the better changing in China before he draw his demarcation-line.

We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, are authentic proletarian internationalists. But we notice that many “comrades” from various countries of the world declare that they got rid of Maoism, but if we analyze their political work than we find a lot of reconciliationist garbage - hidden garbage is the most dangerous garbage. To teach patiently Stalinism-Hoxhaism to all comrades all over the world is the only manner through which they can get totally and definitively rid of Maoism, but we cannot do this instead of them. They must do this by themselves.

We must continue our war against Maoism until it is destroyed in the brains of comrades - as comrade Enver Hoxha taught us.

In the first period of the Marxist-Leninist world movement, modern revisionism seemed to be unmasked and defeated. But Mao saved it by means of the “Mao Zedong-Thought”. As long as capitalism-imperialism exists and world bourgeois class dominates, also Maoist / Chinese revisionism and social-imperialism will be backed by it. Our anti-Maoist struggle is therefore part of our struggle for the socialist world revolution against which Maoism is fabricated and directed by the bourgeoisie.

Our anti-Maoism is the only authentic one because it is the only based on the correct application of the proletarian class teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism. And to faithfully apply these invincible teachings in all spheres of life is the only manner to abolish the inevitability of the system that inevitably gives birth to Maoism and to all other kinds of revisionism, neo-revisionism, opportunism and anti-communism: capitalism-imperialism. In previous chapters of DWM and in other articles, we already proved that Maoism is a direct product of this system. And in this DWM IV, we demonstrated that also all false non-Stalinist-Hoxhaist “anti-Maoisms” are also born from the same bourgeois-wage slavagist system and their aim is to perpetuate it, not to destroy it. Therefore, their anti-communist essence is equal to that of Maoism / Chinese revisionism.

Only by faithfully following Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism is possible to make world armed violent socialist proletarian revolution triumph. And nowadays, the faithful following of MLSH necessarily involves the creation of a Section of the Comintern (SH) in each country of the world always under the global centralized proletarian leadership of that same Comintern (SH). Only in this manner it will be possible to successfully accomplish global proletarian dictatorship, world socialism and world communism. Only in this manner it will be possible to achieve the total and definitive liberation of world proletariat, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes through the complete annihilation of the globalized exploitative and oppressive capitalist-imperialist system and of the world bourgeois class who dominates it and enormously profits from it.

World proletarians, workers, soldiers, peasants and other exploited and oppressed classes – unite under the steel centralized proletarian leadership of the Comintern (SH)!

Don't be deceived neither by the Maoists neither by their false "enemies"!

There are only two possible positions: that of Stalinism-Hoxhaism and that of all kinds of social-democracy, opportunism, revisionism, neo-revisionism and anti-socialism!

Everything else is a phony "dilemma" between different kinds of anti-communism!

Maoists and their false "anti-Maoist" ideological twins are all lackeys of the exploitative and oppressive world bourgeois class!

Only Stalinist-Hoxhaist anti-Maoism is authentic!

Maoist revisionism only wants to perpetuate capitalist-imperialist slavery!

Maoism gave birth to Chinese social-imperialism, which exercises excruciating repression over world workers!

The only manner to definitively eliminate Maoism is through combating it from Stalinist-Hoxhaist positions!

Everything else is social-fascist, anti-socialist pro-Maoist garbage!

Struggle against Maoist revisionism and its false "anti-Maoist" ideological twins with all your might!

Down with all kinds of revisionism, neo-revisionism and anti-communism!

Down with predatory wars - forward with revolutionary wars!

Down with all kinds of war, fascism, capitalism, imperialism, exploitation and oppression!

Long live the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhism: Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha!

Death to the world bourgeois class!

Death to the world exploitative, oppressive, repressive, slavagist dominant classes!

Death to globalized enslaving capitalist-imperialist system!

Take your weapons from the imperialists!

Long live the world proletarian red army and its detachments from each country!

Long live world proletarians, workers and all other exploited and oppressed classes!

Long live violent world socialist proletarian revolution – the locomotive of the future stateless and classless global society!

Long live armed proletarian dictatorship all over the world!

Long live world socialism and world communism!

Long live proletarian internationalism!

Let's form a Section of the Comintern (SH) in each country!

Long live the Comintern (SH), the only truly communist organization in the world, the only global vanguard party of the world proletariat!

Only in this manner we shall overcome!

4 – Index

1 – Introduction (page 1)

2 – Analysis of different types of false “anti-Maoism” (page 6)

2.1 – Soviet revisionists’ false “anti-Maoism”: its origins and background (page 6)

2.1.1 – On comrade Stalin (page 15)

2.1.2 – On Peaceful Coexistence and on War (page 33)

2.1.3 – On Peaceful Transition to Socialism (page 41)

2.1.4 – Final Remarks (page 48)

2.2 – Trotskyist false “anti-Maoism” (page 66)

2.3 – Maoism and Titoism: false enemies (page 84)

2.4 – The false “anti-Maoism” of Mao’s successors in China (page 96)

2.5 – The false “anti-Maoism” of the Albanian neo-revisionists (page 104)

2.6 – The false “anti-Maoism” of the “4 and ½ heads” neo-revisionists (page 111)

2.7 – The false “anti-Maoism” of standard anti-communists (page 126)

3 – Conclusions: Stalinist-Hoxhaist anti-Maoism - the only authentic one (page 137)

