

Economical development of restoration of capitalism in Soviet Union

– a brief Stalinist-Hoxhaist analysis

This short article deals with a very complex but important issue: that concerning the process of bourgeois-capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union and its subsequent transformation into a world social-imperialist superpower. Initially, it was included in our DWM IV. However, due to its dimension, its inclusion in it was somewhat inopportune in the context of the paragraph which mainly deals with the **ideological** unmasking of Soviet false "anti-Maoism". Nonetheless, because of the extreme relevance and usefulness of the issue dealt by it, the Comintern (SH) decided to publish it in a separate article, independent from the DWM IV.

Beginning with the murder of comrade Stalin and until the late 50's, the Soviet Union ceased from being a socialist country, it ceased from being the proletarian homeland of comrades Lenin and Stalin, the world's main revolutionary center the basis and lever of the socialist world revolution. By that time, the leadership of the « Communist » Party of the Soviet Union was submerged in Khrushchevist revisionist garbage and had rejected Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism and the construction of authentic socialism. The actual restoration of capitalism was hidden behind the guise of "building communism", which is a particular expression of modern revisionism in the Soviet Union. True, among workers it still enjoyed from the prestige inherited from comrades Lenin's and Stalin's times, from the times when it was still the center of world socialist revolution. But even this would change when it became more and more evident that Soviet Union had been transformed into a social-fascist superpower embracing a policy of belligerent socialimperialism. As comrade Enver accurately stated:

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

Union, which had turned into a revisionist country, into a social-imperialist state, built up its own strategy and tactics.

The Khrushchevites worked out such a policy as to enable them to disguise all their activity with Leninist phraseology. They elaborated their revisionist ideology in such a way as to palm it off upon the proletariat and the peoples as the «Marxism-Leninism of the new period», so they could tell the communists, inside and outside the country, that «the revolution was continuing in the Soviet Union in the new political, ideological and economic conditions of world development », and not only that this revolution was continuing there, but that this country was allegedly going over to the stage of the construction of a classless communist society, where the party and the state were withering away. (...) With their advent to power the Khrushchevites also prepared the platform of their foreign policy. Just like US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism too, based its foreign policy on expansion and

hegemonism by means of the armaments race, pressure and blackmail, and military, economic and ideological aggression. The aim of this policy was the establishment of social-imperialist domination over the whole world. In the Comecon countries, the Soviet Union is implementing a typically neo-colonialist policy. The economies of these countries have been transformed into appendages of the Soviet economy.

The Warsaw Treaty serves the Soviet Union to keep these countries under its yoke, enabling it to station there large military forces, which are no different from occupation armies. The Warsaw Treaty is an aggressive military pact which serves the policy of pressure, blackmail and armed intervention of Soviet socialimperialism. The revisionist-imperialist «theories» on «the socialist community», «the socialist division of labor», «limited sovereignty», «socialist economic integration», etc., also serve this neo-colonialist policy. But Soviet social-imperialism is not satisfied with the domination it exercises over its satellite states. Like the other imperialist states, the Soviet Union is now fighting for new markets, for spheres of influence, to invest its capital in various countries, to monopolize sources of raw materials, to extend its neo-colonialism in Africa, Asia, Latin America and

elsewhere. Soviet social-imperialism has a whole strategic plan which includes a series of economic, political, ideological and military activities for the purpose of extending its expansion and hegemonism. At the same time the Soviet revisionists are working to undermine the peoples' revolutions and the liberation wars by precisely the same means and methods as those employed by the US imperialists. Usually, the social-imperialists operate through their tools, the revisionist parties, but, according to the occasion and circumstances, they also try to corrupt and bribe the ruling cliques in the undeveloped countries, offer enslaving economic «aid» in order to get a foothold in these countries, stir up armed conflicts among the different cliques, siding with one or the other, organize plots and putsches to bring pro-Soviet regimes to power, and even resort to direct military intervention, as they did, together with the Cubans, in Angola, Ethiopia, and elsewhere. The Soviet social-imperialists carry out their intervention, their hegemonic, neo-colonialist actions under the disguise of aid to, and support for, the revolutionary forces, the revolution and the construction of socialism. In reality they help the counterrevolution. The revisionist Soviet Union tries to open the way to realizing its expansionist, neo-colonialist plans, by presenting itself as a country which is pursuing a Leninist and internationalist policy, as an ally, friend and defender of the new national states, the undeveloped countries, etc.

The Soviet revisionists preach that, by linking up with the Soviet Union and the so-called socialist community, which they proclaim as the «main motive force of world development today», these countries can advance successfully on the road of freedom and independence, even of socialism. This is why they have also concocted the theories of the «non-capitalist road of development», countries of «socialist orientation», etc. Despite what they pretend, the strategy of the Soviet socialimperialists has nothing in common with socialism and Leninism. It is the strategy of a predatory imperialist state which wants to extend its hegemony and domination to all countries on all continents.” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

And indeed, as we shall prove, revisionist Soviet Union was nothing more than a new bourgeois-capitalist country aiming at world social-imperialist

superpower status and domination, just like revisionist and later social-imperialist China.

“The socialist social formation is destroyed only when the productive forces and the relations of production are caught in a no longer detachable conflict, that is, after the productive forces have been so far destroyed that they are no longer sufficient for the maintenance of socialism against the capitalist world. And the old, lower, capitalist relations of production occur then in the place of the higher, socialist production relations, when their material conditions of existence have matured in the womb of the socialist society itself. (...)

The basic economical law of the restoration of capitalism is the dialectical law of motion of the transformation from the socialist back into the capitalist mode of production, especially the transformation of the socialist relations of production into capitalist relations of production by means of the power of the state-monopoly of the new bourgeoisie which arose hiddenly in the midst of the socialist society.

On a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of the socialist society get into conflict with the emanating state-capitalist relations of production, under which they can not further develop. The state-capitalist relations of production become fetters by which the productive forces can not further develop. The stages of transition into capitalist relations of production affect the stages of deceleration and retardation of the further development of the productive forces. With it, they lack space for expansion that leads to disaccordances between the unity and harmony of productive forces and relations of production within the socialist system of production. From this follows occurrence of crises of production, difficulties of the fulfillment of the 5-Year-plan, stunted and destroyed productive forces, supply shortfalls, unemployment, degeneration of production facilities, etc. and finally the successive collapse of the whole economical system of the socialist society. The transition or change from accordance to disaccordance of the socialist relations of production with the social character of the productive forces – this is typical for a socialist economical system which is successively restored by capitalism.” (Wolfgang Eggers, 1956-2006 – *50 years of communism in struggle against modern revisionism, The political economy of modern*

revisionism, published by the Comintern (SH) in 2006, translated from German language)

Therefore our definition of the political economy of modern revisionism is as follows:

The political economy of modern revisionism is the theoretical basis of the abolition of the socialist accordance of productive forces and relations of production – hidden behind the cloak of the political economy of Marxism-Leninism.

Anyway, the plans of the Soviet revisionists to the country's transformation from a socialist nation into a social-fascist, revisionist and social-imperialist state began more or less hiddenly even before the death of comrade Stalin in 1953. Just after the infamous XX Congress of the "Communist" Party of the Soviet Union ("C"PSU), when revisionism was officially proclaimed, large numbers of militants of base organizations within the "C"PSU demanded that the party's Central Committee made a truly Marxist-Leninist evaluation of comrade Stalin's work and activities. In face of this, the revisionist leadership was forced to resort to all kinds of social-fascist measures, including persecution against various members of the Party and forced dissolution of a series of Party organizations who acted very resolutely in defense of comrade Stalin.

This alone is proof of the bourgeois-capitalist character that the Soviet state had embraced. In a bourgeois state, the only real control is that exercised by the governing bodies at the service of exploitative and oppressive classes over the governed exploited and oppressed classes. Under capitalism, the mechanisms of popular control are annihilated by the economic domination and pressure of the bourgeoisie. In contrast, in a socialist state, popular control is not an utopia or a dream but a reality inseparable from the existence of socialism. This control is:

"(..) the test from below, when the masses, when those who are led, test the leaders, draw attention to their mistakes and indicate the way in which these mistakes may be rectified. This sort of testing is one of the most effective methods of testing people."
(http://ciml.250x.com/archive/stalin/english/stalinworks_14.pdf, *Report and Speech in Reply to Debate at the Plenum of the Central Committee of*

the CPSU, 1937, in Stalin, Works, Volume 14, 1978, pp. 282, edition in English)

Concerning this, comrades Lenin and Stalin had emphasized that one of the great problems consists in the following: administrative agencies of the state and the economy are fertile ground to bureaucrat and technocrat elements retaining remnants of the bourgeois mentality and who therefore want to occupy those places where the whole economic and political power is concentrated. This is a constant danger that affects not only those who are still attached to bourgeois ideology, but is also likely to affect workers assigned to their control.

Comrade Stalin also warned at the 15th Congress of the Communist Party of Soviet Union (Bolshevist) – [CPSU (B)] in 1937 that "while combating bureaucracy," some workers themselves were "contaminated by the bureaucracy" and that these phenomena would persist "as long as the state exists." The enlargement and the quantitative and qualitative improvement of workers' control over the administrative apparatus are the only guarantees of safeguarding and strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Stalinist purges so much demonized by capitalists and revisionists of all kinds were clearly a valuable instrument of maintenance of an authentic proletarian dictatorship, of genuine socialist construction. They were aimed precisely at fighting neo-bourgeois elements seeking to evade popular control. This is confirmed even by explicitly anticommunist historians:

"The physical evidence surrounding the 'Ejovshchina' (the 'Great Purge') must be redefined. It was not the result of a petrified bureaucracy who eliminated dissidents and destroyed the old revolutionaries. In fact, the purges were just the opposite. It is not incompatible with available materials to argue that the purges were a radical reaction, (...), against the bureaucracy. Officials were destroyed from above and from below (...)." (J. Arch Getty, *Origins of the Great Purges*, Cambridge University Press, 1985, p. 206, edition in English)

The prompt removal of this proletarian control exercised over the bureaucratic members eager to degenerate into bourgeois-capitalist

elements after Khrushchev's coup is evidence of the transformation of the Soviet Union into a revisionist and social-imperialist country.

From the moment that the referred control exercised from below disappears, the bureaucratized elements held economic and political power, turning into a new bourgeois class. After the middle 50's, and already at the time the Sino-Soviet conflict came out, economic and social facts irrefutably corroborate the bourgeois-capitalist nature of the revisionist, social-fascist and social-imperialist Soviet Union.

Indeed, in revisionist USSR, the "salary" and the material benefits of representatives of the "bureaucratic power" were considerable and disgusted the working people, who noted that the bureaucrat servants of the state were becoming the masters of that same state. That bureaucracy used the social demagoguery of the "well-being" of Soviet workers in order to destroy all forms of socialist life and of socialist consciousness. Since the late 50's, Soviet state of proletarian dictatorship had been transformed into a state serving the interests of the ruling exploitative new bourgeois class. Marxism-Leninism teaches us that in a society divided into antagonistic classes - and, as has been shown, Soviet society had become such a society - the state cannot be anything else than the instrument of dominant social class, and any statement affirming that represents the interests of "the whole people" is simple anti-socialist demagoguery.

Profit was officially proclaimed as a regulator factor of production only in 1965, a fact which in itself is sufficient to characterize the nature of the USSR at that time. However, profit had been regulating and dominating Soviet economy since much earlier, namely since the late 1950s. The transformation of the means of production into goods and commodities was formalized by the Resolution No. 1150 of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, on 22 September, 1957, in which it was determined that enterprises should now operate having profit as basis.

And by the same time, the socialist property had been annihilated in the industrial sector in 1957 in favor of state monopolist capitalist property and system which only benefited a handful of bureaucrats, technocrats and bourgeois elements that were finally freed from proletarian and working class control. A similar process occurred also with Soviet agriculture by that epoch, when at the Soviet countryside, the means of production and

commodities were already circulating freely and all major traits of economic planning were withering away.

Basing themselves on their invincible proletarian ideology, Albanian Marxists-Leninists led by comrade Enver Hoxha were always capable of foreseeing and anticipating revisionist maneuvers and steps. This was quite obvious in the case of the Soviet revisionists: in October, 1964, even before the official proclamation of the Kosygin "economic reform", in his "Open Letter to the members of the Communist Party of Soviet Union", Enver Hoxha not only fiercely and implacably denounced revisionist theories, but also never lost an opportunity of affirming that through its so-called "economic reforms", Khrushchev's group had restored capitalism: Khrushchevists had rejected "the socialist principle of remuneration according to work", and they had "undermined the centrally planned economy". Moreover, comrade Enver also noted that they were trying to encourage the principle of the capitalist pursuit of profit, of capitalist free competition and were fostering the ruin of the collective property which was parceled out, like occurred with stations machinery and with tractors.

Later, in his many brilliant Works (*With Stalin*, among many others), Enver Hoxha, the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, made a genial synthesis of the multifaceted activity of comrade Stalin and of the herculean socio-economic transformations that were accomplished during the period of his proletarian leadership.

In truth, very soon after comrade Stalin's murder by the revisionists, the breakdown of the patterns of reproduction of the social product proves this conclusively. What changed in the revisionist USSR consisted in that the development of productive forces towards socialism and communism was stopped, that methods of management of state monopoly property changed: the restoration of wage slavery and of market production would necessarily lead to the creation of serious disproportions in social production and which should also lead to contradictions between the revisionist-bourgeois supporters of a "rigid" management and those of a more "soft" management of bourgeois-capitalist revisionist property, as happens in any modern bourgeois state. In what concerns the mentioned property, it lost its socialist nature and remained a kind of capitalist property which does not stop from being so whether it is openly privatized or if its character is hidden behind state monopolist "public" cloaks, thus originating the same

evils as in any other bourgeois-capitalist society. As comrade Enver declared:

“The Soviet Union's return to capitalism could not fail to have its own special features, and the capitalist order there could not fail to assume special forms. These special features and forms are determined by the fact that capitalism in that country was re-established as a result of the overthrow of socialism, as a result of a retrogressive process, unlike the capitalism of the classical type which follows the overthrow of the feudal order, as a progressive process.” (Enver Hoxha, *Report to the VIII Congress of the PLA*, 1981, edition in English)

“As very lengthy experience has already proved, state capitalism is supported and developed by the bourgeoisie, not to create the foundations of socialist society, (...), but to strengthen the foundations of capitalist society, of its bourgeois state, in order to exploit and oppress the working people more. Those who run the «public sector» are not the representatives of the workers, but the men of big capital, those who have the reins of the whole economy and the state in their hands. The social position of the worker in the enterprises of the «public sector» is no different from that of the worker in the private sector; his relationship to the means of production, to the economic management of the enterprise, the policy of investments, pay, etc., is the same. The bourgeois state, i.e., the bourgeoisie, appropriates the profit of these enterprises.” (Enver Hoxha, *Eurocommunism is Anti-communism*, Tirana, 1980, edition in English)

For example, contrary to what Soviet revisionists might state, unemployment was a common phenomenon in revisionist Soviet Union, and a blatant proof of its bourgeoiscapitalist nature, as there can never be unemployment under socialism (as was the case in Bolshevist Soviet Union of comrades Lenin and Stalin and in socialist Albania of comrade Enver Hoxha).

From the second half of the 1970s on, it became more and more evident that the weakening of the Soviet social-imperialism showed beyond any doubts it were not the bourgeois-revisionist states who ran the economy, but the fluctuations of the global economy controlled by the multinational corporations owned by world bourgeois class that dictated their orders to

those bourgeois-revisionist states. Already in the early 60's, a bourgeois anti-communist journalist noticed openly the "new signs of bourgeois life in the USSR" of which "many examples can be noted". He even affirmed that:

"The USSR has changed. And the word "changed" has a double sense. I want to say that it has changed a lot, and as the zealous pro-Western that I am, I firmly believe that it has changed in the good sense, that it has changed positively." (Léon Zitrone, *L'URSS a bien changé. Maintenant on peut y rire...*, Editons mondiales, Paris, 1963, p. 310, translated from French language)

This alone should end with any doubts about the bourgeois-capitalist character of the USSR since late 1950's and early 1960's.

Enver Hoxha was entirely right when in his "Report to the VI Congress of the Party of Labor of Albania - PLA" he valiantly denounced "the new Soviet bourgeoisie composed of bureaucrats and technocrats" who had "taken the reins of the state and the economy" to "ensure important privileges and incomes to themselves". He was totally correct when he declared that this state monopolist bourgeoisie had "replaced the remuneration according to work by a system of income distribution that allowed its members to appropriate the fruits of toil and pain of the working masses, to ensure, by the most diverse methods, incomes dozens of times higher than those of workers and peasants." Finally, he also was absolutely right to expose the "socializing" hoaxes the Soviet revisionists liked to spread to mislead proletarians, workers and exploited and oppressed classes of the world and therefore do irreparable harm to the world communist revolutionary movement:

"The confusion is made even worse because the Khrushchevite revisionists try to peddle the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and elsewhere as socialism. This demagogy misleads many honest people, who, while they rightly criticize many negative phenomena in the life of the Soviet Union and other revisionist countries, identify the order there with socialism and attribute the consequences of the restoration of capitalism to socialism." (Enver Hoxha, *Report to the VI Congress of the PLA*, 1971, edition in English)

In 1981, in his “Report to the VIII Congress of the PLA”, Enver Hoxha made one more of his materialist analysis, this time about the contradictions within Soviet bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist-imperialist, wage slavagist, social-fascist, neo-colonialist and anticommunist society that clearly displayed a bleak outlook for Soviet revisionists and their country’s vassals. Speaking of the revisionist countries Enver Hoxha correctly declared that:

"In these countries capitalism has been re-established in various forms, and a class of new exploiters is emerging and growing strong. If the country which goes through this regressive process is big in territory, population, or economic potential, the state of this country turns social-imperialist, and if, on the contrary, the country is small, its state becomes a satellite of world capitalism, dominated by foreign capital and neo-colonialism, which exploit the wealth of this country and the toil of its people." (Enver Hoxha, *Proletarian Democracy is Genuine Democracy*, 1978, edition in English)

In this simple sentence, comrade Enver fulfilled the goal of systematizing and enunciating a general law that is valid to all revisionist and social-fascist countries without exception. And this general law put forward by comrade Enver is not in the least invalidated by the subsequent dismemberment of the Soviet social-imperialism under Western imperialism, because the balance and the equilibrium of inter-imperialist forces do not stand still and there are imperialist countries which grow faster than others. This was indeed the case with the rivalry and with inter-imperialist contradiction between imperialist USA and social-imperialist Soviet Union.

Another irrefutable proof of the non-socialist nature of the Soviet Union at the time (when the false “Sino-Soviet split” began) is the huge increasing of its external trade. In fact, one of the economic signs that can indicate if a country was socialist or not during the first stage of socialism “in a single country” is the volume of external/foreign trade – this volume is substantially smaller in socialist countries than in bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist-imperialist countries. For example, during the times of comrade Stalin, the state budget assigned to external/foreign trade of the Bolshevik Soviet Union represented less than 0,4 % (!) of the total state budget of the country of the year 1950. And in comrade Enver’s socialist

Albania similar numbers were also accomplished. These kinds of figures could only be presented by authentically socialist countries. In fact, it is impossible to conceive even in mere theoretical terms that in a capitalist-bourgeois country the volume of the foreign/external trade could represent such a tiny share of the entire social economic income. And this because the inherent tendency of capitalism to the limitless enlargement of production inevitably enters in contradiction and shocks with the exploitation of (wage) slaves, and thus originates massive amounts of excessive “surplus” commodities that must be flown away in the external market.

Indeed, the values of external/foreign trade must diminish in the same measure that socialist construction develops. This was what happened in Bolshevik Soviet Union of comrades Lenin and Stalin and in socialist Albania of comrade Enver. This is caused not by any plans of autarchy, but by a successful application of the principle of “relying on one’s own forces”. This was absolutely necessary, even because due to capitalist-imperialist encirclement, to diminish reliance on capitalist-imperialist world was of extreme importance to the survival of socialism. Indeed, the successful application of this principle is also a proof that a certain country is authentically constructing socialism. In the economic sphere, this principle meets the needs of the expanded reproduction accelerated through social wealth, but this reproduction can never be accomplished if wage slavery prevails, whether on behalf of a national indigenous bourgeoisie or of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

Wherever the bourgeoisie is in control, work is not distributed according to social utility and profitability of the whole economy whole, but in accord with the rate of maximum profit that can be made through the immediate development of a particular sector of the economy. Of course, today we are no longer on the first stage of socialism. However, concerning the events during the times in which we were indeed in the first stage of “socialism in a single country” (like occurred with the false “Sino-Soviet Split”, for instance), this indicator was still valid as one more proof of the bourgeois-capitalist nature of the Soviet Union. Thus, we present a table displaying the evolution of the volume of external/foreign trade of Soviet Union since:

**Volume of foreign trade of the USSR (in billions of dollars): 1955 – 6,4
1960 – 11,2 1965 – 16,2 1970 – 24,5 1975 – 70,2 1980 – 145,0 1985
– 170,4 1990 – 224, 8**

In first place, these figures show that during the period 1955-1990, the volume of Soviet external/foreign trade has increased by more than 350%! National income increased much less rapidly: it is sufficient to note that during the period 1965-1980, it had increased by around just 2%. If we compare this to the situation in 1954, just after comrade Stalin's death, we note that Soviet national income had increased 15 times compared to its 1913 level, despite the destructions, shortcomings and difficulties imposed by two imperialist world wars. During the times of socialist construction in Soviet Union, foreign trade was developed in parallel and less than or in proportions similar to those of national income. However, after capitalist restoration, it grew at much higher rates in the second half 1950s and even faster from 1973 on, like occurred with all its imperialist competitors. This is to what the so-called "market socialism" and "socialism with a human face" inevitably leads! To a bourgeoiscapitalist economy entirely integrated in the merciless claws of world imperialism! And the non-socialist nature that Soviet Union already had in the late 50's (when the false "Sino-Soviet split" began, for example), only intensified in subsequent decades. If until the early 1970s, the Soviet social-imperialist economy was still in an upward phase, it began in the second half of the 1970's in a period of decline relatively to its American competitor. At its peak, in the early 1970s, the volume of foreign trade of the socialimperialist USSR amounted to 33% of that of the USA. But in 1980, it did not represent more than 30% of this and in 1990 not more than 25% of this. Until the early 1970s, the Soviet revisionists still managed to strengthen their market positions in their neo-colonial satellites, but a few years later, their relative share in the trade to these countries fell by almost a third, while their trade dependency on their own imperialist competitors was growing more and more, thus leading to the intensification of the exploitation of the neocolonial countries of the Comecon by the Soviet social-imperialists, aggravating economic and social crisis. In revisionist USSR, the situation was so serious that:

"The Soviet Union is seeking to export products to pay for its imports." (Pierre George, *L'économie de l'URSS*, Presses universitaires de France, Paris, 1981, p. 115, translated from French language)

By the early 1980s, the situation had become unsustainable for Soviet social-imperialism and to the countries included in its sphere of influence: the first became dependent on its own imperialist rivals, just like also occurred with its neo-colonial satellite countries. All were heavily indebted to Western imperialist countries and were severely accountable to the IMF and to the World Bank. And for instance, in Vietnam, a pro-Soviet neo-colony, the policy of "reform or die" was implemented by the revisionist bourgeoisie who supposedly "invented" a "market economy of socialist orientation"... This process of massive indebtedness was noted by the Albanian communists who noticed that:

"The provision of such credits ensures the bourgeoisie markets for the sale of goods, the capitalists make colossal profits from the high interest rates charged, while the debtors are bound hand and foot to the creditors and the capitalist firms. (...) Apart from the extraction of capitalist profits, these credits, this «aid» and loans also have political objectives. The states which accord the credits aim to support and consolidate the political and economic power of particular cliques, which defend the economic, political and military interests of the creditor country. As the agreements on such credits are concluded between governments, they make the economic and political dependence of the debtor on the creditor even greater. The ruling cliques of the so-called socialist countries, like the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Poland, etc., and now China, too, allow foreign capital to flow into their countries, because this capital serves the ruling cliques, while it is a heavy burden on the peoples. The Comecon countries are up to their necks in debt." (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

In 1981, Albanian Marxists-Leninists also noted that the volume of the debt contracted by the revisionist countries, including by those of the Soviet social-imperialist camp, towards the Western imperialist countries amounted to more than \$80 billion (!!):

"The situation is so critical that some countries, including Poland and Romania are no longer able to pay the interests on their loans and they asked the international bourgeoisie to grant them new loans, defer payment deadlines and not to declare them "insolvent." (PLA, *La dégénérescence du Comecon en une organisation capitaliste*, Etudes politiques et sociales, translated from French language)

In the meantime, the situation in the Soviet Union went from bad to worse, as it had to sell its gold, platinum and diamonds on the world market in order to face the repeated requests by the international monopolist bourgeois class for the repayment of loans and payment of interest rates.

"By granting prohibitive loans to revisionist and social-fascist countries, the international bourgeoisie ensures economic gains and considerable political. It thus finds new markets, so popular in time crisis, sells its merchandise inventory and increases its capital. If, in 1979, the revisionist Western countries have paid to creditors about 5 billion dollars in interest, in 1980 this amount reached \$ 7 billion and now it is about 8.5 billion." (PLA, *La dégénérescence du Comecon en une organisation capitaliste*, Etudes politiques et sociales, translated from French language)

In this context, it was inevitable under the conditions of commodity production that all industries whose productivity lagged behind their competitors eventually collapse. Hence, the disintegration of the Soviet bloc and the deindustrialization of its neo-colonial satellites was decided when the revisionists allowed the free flow of foreign capital from the Western imperialists. In fact, it is true that the bourgeois anti-socialist revolution in the USSR took place in the 1950s, but the immense industrial and technical potential of such a huge country with a powerful heavy industry of production of means of production inherited from the socialist period and the transformation of these sectors into a sector under the control of the monopolist capitalist state bourgeoisie led to turning of the USSR (Soviet Union) into a bourgeois-capitalist, social-fascist, racist, chauvinist, revisionist, reactionary, wage slavagist, neo-colonialist and anti-communist imperialist superpower of international relevance, which would impose and expand its neo-colonialist so-called "areas of influence" in search of exclusively dominating world's cheap labor, workforce, markets and resources, without hesitating to resort to wars, fascist coups, etc. in

order to accomplish its ultimate purpose: profit maximization (with all this being exactly what also happens with any other kind of imperialism). Soviet social-imperialists were just that, imperialists, no matter the falsely “internationalist” phraseology which they used to justify their imperialist actions, and the utilization of "socialist" labels to qualify the comprador bourgeois cliques who were their lackeys.

Such was the case with their invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, where despite their high-sounding phrases about the "defense of socialism", social-imperialists were struggling to hide the real content of Czechoslovak events: the simple inter-imperialist rivalries through the repression of the pro-Western wing and the wing of the country's pro-Western bourgeoisie compradore. Relations within the "socialist community" under the dominance of revisionist Soviet Union had nothing in common with relations between genuinely socialist countries: the "common policy" was no longer determined by a collective body as the former glorious Comintern of Lenin and Stalin, but was instead determined by Soviet revisionist and social-imperialist clique which imposed its views during bilateral meetings. Comrade Enver confirmed all this in his works, as it is displayed by his quotations above. He even affirmed that:

«The total breakdown of the U. R.S.S. with the whole tradition of solidarity was cruelly felt in a country where the memory of the selfless support received during Stalin's times was still alive. The more the loyalty to an old friendship with the people of the U. R.S.S. is intense, moving and standing, more the condemnation of Moscow's current policy is strong and profound. » (PLA, *Conférence nationale sur l'oeuvre immortelle du camarade Enver Hoxha*, Edition numérique, p. 34, translated from French language)

Albanian communists noted that, contrary to what they proclaim, Soviet socialimperialist "helpers" do not tend to favor the independent development of the national economies of the countries, their “help” and do not guarantee their economic and political independence, but intended to submit the countries that accepts their neocolonialist slavery and make it lose its political and economic independence through preventing them from having heavy industry of means of production and through transforming them into mere dependent neo-colonial appendixes of their own imperialist economy. The heavy industry of production of means of production is the

only one which ensures independence and the socio-economic basis for socialism. Comrade Stalin affirmed that:

“If we (...) we should have to cease giving primacy to the production of means of production in favor of the production of articles of consumption. And what would be the effect of ceasing to give primacy to the production of the means of production? The effect would be to destroy the possibility of the continuous expansion of our national economy, because the national economy cannot be continuously expanded without giving primacy to the production of means of production.” (Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, 1952, edition in English)

Albanian Marxists-Leninists-Stalinists also noticed, based on their own experience, how the imperialists and revisionists, following in the footsteps the Trotskyists, loved to interpret the principle of support on its own strengths as a "shift to the positions of narrow nationalism". For Albanian Marxist-Leninists, the principle of supporting its own force is of a "universal" and "can be applied in all branches and sectors of life", it was indeed one of the most acute manifestations of the class struggle on the international level during the first stage of socialism “in a single country”, and the fundamental principle guiding the struggle to build socialism in a hostile international environment, in the context of the imperialist-revisionist-capitalist encirclement.

But when Soviet social-imperialism failed to dislodge the positions of its main imperialist competitor which relied on a massive domestic and external economic potential in the commercial sector such as in investment, Soviet social-imperialism began to experiment decline since the mid-1970's, which worsened at the same time of the intensification of the massive influx of capital in dependent countries included in the sphere of influence of U.S. imperialism (South and Central America, Southeastern Asia), whose products using cheaper labor competed successfully with those produced by the pro-Soviet neo-colonial satellites of the Comecon. It was in this catastrophic economic situation that revisionist leaders were driven to consider the full opening of the economy of the revisionist USSR and of its satellites towards the world market in the commercial field, as in that of investment, hoping to attract foreign investment. But they had “forgot” to foreseen the results of the devastating action of the law of

value's so-called "invisible hand". And so, the only thing they achieved was the quickest weakening of Soviet social-imperialist, thus turned the country into a semi-colony, a situation which caused the disintegration of Soviet social-imperialism in the late 1980's and early 90's, in a process whose further causes and developments do not belong to the scope of this article.

We will only note that:

"Currently [in 1988], we talk openly in the Soviet Union of the development of the private sector, currently, creating joint ventures with foreign capital is practiced freely in trade transactions with the exterior." (PLA, *Etudes politiques et sociales*, p. 614, translated from French language)

This could never be the situation in a country building true socialism. For example, in comrade Enver's socialist Albania, the Constitution clearly defined that:

"The granting of concessions to, and the creation of, foreign economic and financial companies and other institutions or ones formed jointly with bourgeois and revisionist capitalist monopolies and states, as well as obtaining credits from them, are prohibited in the People's Socialist Republic of Albania." (*Article 28 of the Constitution of People's Socialist Republic of Albania*, December of 1976, edition in English)

Moreover, in revisionist USSR during the period 1967-1987, annual inflation of retail prices and wholesale was greater than 5%. The cost of the life increased much faster than wages progressed, as with any country bourgeois. On 15 April, 1987, we could read in the *Literatournia Gazeta* about the levels of inflation that:

"Life is becoming more and more expensive. Everyone knows and talks constantly. Only the Central Statistics Department does not know, she is supposed to know everything. (...) The price recently increased without common measurement with wage increases." (*Literatournia Gazeta*, 15 April, 1987, translated from French language)

The excessive swelling of the military-industrial complex at the expense of development of productive industries in the era of "peaceful coexistence" was the result of the immutable economic necessity of monopoly capitalist

state and its tendency to want to accumulate through the development of unproductive industries (arms) instead of improving the condition of workers.

Finally, we hope that this brief text about such a complex issue as the economical development of Soviet restoration of capitalism can contribute to a correct drawing of our Stalinist-Hoxhaist demarcation-line relatively to all kinds of bourgeois-capitalists-revisionists, neo-revisionists, imperialists, social-imperialists, colonialists, neo-colonialists, fascists, social-fascists, opportunists and anti-communists.