



**On the Foundations
and
Concerning Questions
of**

STALINISM

On the Foundations and Concerning Questions of Stalinism

Written by Wolfgang Eggers

December 2008 – July 2009

Published by the Executive Committee of the Comintern/ML
(renamed Comintern/SH in 2009)
translated by the Section USA of the Comintern (SH) in 2020

Introduction and Chapter 1

"Marxism is the science of the laws governing the development of nature and society, the science of the revolution of the oppressed and exploited masses, the science of the victory of socialism in all countries, the science of building communist society." (Stalin)

"Leninism is Marxism of the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution. To be more exact, Leninism is the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution in general, the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular." (Stalin)

Stalinism is Marxism-Leninism for the transition from the First Period of "socialism in one country" to the Second Period of socialism on a world scale, in general.

Stalinism is Marxism-Leninism for the transition from socialism "in one country" to "communism in one country", in particular. (Comintern/ML)

Hoxhaism is the doctrine of popular revolution against fascism and its transition to socialist revolution, the teachings of the theory and tactics of the anti-revisionist and anti-social-imperialist struggle in the period of revisionism in power in general and is especially the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat under the conditions of capitalist-revisionist encirclement. (Comintern/ML)

Preface

This article was written in connection with our original article about

[the events in Georgia in August 2008.](#)

To better understand these events, we wrote a short biographical article about

[Stalin's first creative period in the Caucasus.](#)

This historical image is now rounded off with this **third, final (and once again far too long, unfortunately!) part**, as the traces of his struggle before his death take us back to the Caucasus.

The text should actually end with the chapter about the **Mingrelian Conspiracy**, but ...

...with this last chapter the traces for finding the truth about Stalin inevitably led back to Moscow, tempting the author not to conclude the voyage of discovery with the subject of **Georgia**, but to continue it with the subject of so-called "**de-Stalinization**". Something quite different has now emerged from this:

"On the Foundations and Concerning Questions of Stalinism".

The reader may decide for himself whether he wants to end his study of the Georgia text with the chapter on the **Mingrelian Conspiracy** thematically (Chapter III) or whether he is curious enough and wants to continue to bite his way through the whole text and deepen his study of the foundations and concerning questions of Stalinism.

The central link between the two themes is Berianism. Beria played a criminal role against Stalin not only in Georgia. His crimes even go far beyond the borders of the USSR, which is why we have critically exposed the defenders of Beria, the Berianists, the spread of their Berianism. This reactionary current within the Marxist-Leninist World Movement has caused ideological confusion and has caused not little damage to our movement. And therefore we must expose Berianism and destroy its influence in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement. The following article is dedicated to this task, which should therefore be understood as a self-contained, independent text. In the process, **some** world political foundations and questions of Stalinism with a current outlook have "quite incidentally" come to light.

But enough of the preface!

Why should communism fail? Because of the betrayal within the own communist ranks!

How do we achieve communism? By fighting against its traitors!

Why did Stalin's work fail? Because of the betrayal of Stalin!

How do we complete the work of Stalin? In the fight against his traitors!

We communists will always be victims of fraud and self-deception as long as we do not learn to look for the interests of the exploiting and oppressing classes behind Stalinist phrases!

There is much talk of Stalinism, but what is Stalinism, what are the foundations of Stalinism?

"...if we have full knowledge of Stalin's activity after the Second World War then we will see his titanic Marxist-Leninist greatness more clearly." (Enver Hoxha, 'Reading an Article about the Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China' in: 'Reflections of China', Volume I; Tirana; 1979; p.327; English Edition).

This particular sentence of Enver Hoxha's, the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, is, so to say, our *starting point*.

We believe that it is absolutely necessary to continue working on this "full overview", and that is why we wanted to make a small contribution to this.

How are the foundations of Stalinism being worked out?

Always by exposing and demarcating opportunists who have defended Stalinism in words but betrayed it in deeds.

Whoever wants to defend Stalinism against opportunism today must also defend it against the opportunists who wanted to sell us the anti-Stalinists Beria and Malenkov as "Marxist-Leninists".

The Khrushchevites are burnt out, but the Berianists are still digging! Therefore, we decided to develop the foundations of Stalinism in the struggle against the anti-Stalinism of Berianism.

Chapter I

On the Ideological Foundations of Stalinism

We Stalinists will emerge victorious against anti-Stalinism!

Down with Berianism!

The fact that **we Stalinists**, between the 55th anniversary of Stalin's death and the 130th birthday (!), have only now begun the struggle against **Berianism**, even though we have been fighting for Stalinism **for 40 years**, proves the precariousness of the Berianists who operate in secret. We have been giving these people a bad example this whole time and we are honestly ashamed of it. We had suspected them from the beginning, but we did not know how to explain this suspicion. We lacked sound information and quite simply the revolutionary consciousness to substantiate and prove our suspicions. We thought more about not risking our good reputation as Stalinists. We were afraid that by accusing Beria, we would be moving away from Marxism-Leninism. **We were not thinking of the fight for the truth about Stalin.**

Before, we were not 100% sure, we kept silent. In retrospect, with the destructive evidence we uncovered, one might not want to believe that we had been so **blind and silent** about all the betrayal, but it is still true and this fact remains a shameful but all the more instructive fact for us. What does it show us? It shows us that we can only correct our own subjectivism by examining the facts only on the basis of reality, that we never have a "ready-made Marxism-Leninism" and that we must not fill our gaps in knowledge with idealism, that we always have to struggle with doubts, that things are often not as we explain and imagine them, that we are constantly dealing with our ignorance, have to struggle with our shortcomings, that we approach the truth only relatively close to the truth in a permanent, self-critical process of self-conquest, that we Communists must always first free ourselves a little bit from errors in our own past, from our mistakes, before we are able and entitled to illuminate another, small piece of the way to the liberation of the working class. We have realized that we must correct, expand and consolidate our views of Marxism-Leninism not only on the basis of the misconceptions of others, but above all on the basis of the misconceptions in our own thinking and acting, that we can only strive so tirelessly to become, to be, and to remain, honest, self-critical disciples of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Hoxha.

What has changed in our attitude towards Comrade Bill Bland? Not a little, as it turns out.

Our apology should be that we had a principled ideological struggle against, for example, the **ISML ("Alliance" Marxist-Leninist, Hari Kumar)** and their "friends" around the world, and we are continuing this struggle. Hari Kumar visited us in Hamburg in 1998, and at first we had a positive, promising impression of him regarding the improvement of the situation on the theoretical front within the Marxist-Leninist World Movement. Through Hari Kumar we also came into contact with

Bill Bland. Later, the differences between us and Hari Kumar became so great that he even wanted to ban us from speaking and finally excluded us from his Yahoo group and thus from contact with other Marxist-Leninists who had logged on there. We had documented this outrageous process on our Comintern/ML homepage. Hari Kumar was afraid that his anti-Marxist-Leninist internet forum would turn into a Marxist-Leninist forum through our comrades so he pulled the emergency brake and threw us out.

It was also Bill Bland's writings that contributed to the spread of Berianism, so that we finally had to subject them to a long overdue criticism. We realized that unfortunately not only we alone, but other Marxist-Leninist organizations throughout the world had also been infected by the virus of Berianism. The positive attitude of the Albanians towards Bill Bland was an orienting basis for our trust in him. The friendship that the Albanians had with Bill Bland gave us a positive attitude towards him. And indeed, we got to know Comrade Bill Bland as an upright comrade and this attitude did not change after his death. We are very glad that in London, in his own house, the important **communiqué between the Communist League and the KPD/ML came into being in 1999**, the contents of which we published on the homepage of the Comintern/ML and which is still published on the homepage of the "**Communist League**", probably not without the explicit will of Comrade Bill Bland. Apparently Hari Kumar did not succeed in convincing the "Communist League" to delete this communiqué from their homepage. **It is significant that neither Hari Kumar, nor the ISML nor any other Marxist-Leninist organization mentions this document with a single word**, although Hari Kumar claims to defend Bill Bland!! **What is one to think of such a "defense", if he does not mention our common communiqué with a single syllable?** There must have been differences of opinion between Hari Kumar and Bill Bland, which Hari Kumar vehemently denied, in order to allude to differences of opinion between us and Bill Bland, which we, at least at that time, did not see any more than Bill Bland did. From Bill Bland's side, nothing was known about this either. **The communiqué of 1999 is the bond with which we are connected to Bill Bland until today and will remain connected forever. It is and remains a valuable document with which the foundation of the Comintern/ML began. That's why Bill Bland's significance, which he had for us at that time, cannot be erased.**

It was fundamentally correct that we defended Comrade Bill Bland against the ISML and its Trotskyite haze around the world, stretching as far as India, against its neo-revisionist, neo-Trotskyite course. Even during our visit to London we were uncomfortably struck by the condescension of intellectual there with Comrade Bill Bland. When we shared our impressions with Bill Bland, he agreed with us, and he lowered his head depressingly. We had been struggling with such people in Germany for years, but at that time they had since been long gone. What is certain is that these arrogant intellectuals had exerted a corrosive influence in London that we would not have tolerated in Germany. Admirably, however, Bill Bland quickly showed his humorous side and made us understand that we had to get through this situation and patiently continue working with this garbage. Okay. That was his business, not ours. And indeed, he had survived a whole series of attacks by his opponents in his life, including his exclusion from the "Stalin Society", which in our eyes was an opportunistic society. What fascinated us about Bill Bland was that he was not to be fooled by anybody, but used his own head and decided for himself what was right and wrong. This fundamentally critical attitude contributed greatly to his criticism of modern revisionism. In our hearts we feel deeply connected with the character of Bill Bland. However, we have seriously studied his writings and have come to the conclusion that he made a number of serious mistakes, which are more from his sources themselves than from studying them. Bill Bland, after all, had taken the standpoint of objectively examining contradictory points of view without prejudice, whether they were right or wrong.

It is sometimes much harder to convince a revolutionary heart of an error than a revolutionary mind. This also applies to our attitude towards Comrade Bill Bland. We had come to know Comrade Bill

Bland in person as a lovable, warm, modest and upright internationalist comrade, who to our astonishment had met our aims and wishes to the greatest extent possible. And this attitude has not changed and will not change until today. Bill Bland seemed to us to be able to literally "read our Marxist-Leninist attitude from our faces", which we were very happy about at the time and, frankly, it amazed us. We told him at that time that we would sincerely regret that we had made friends so late. **In the jointly written [communiqué of 1999](#), this document of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, as it could be called at that time a groundbreaking ray of hope, there is neither something Trotskyite nor revisionist to be found, for it stands on the firm ground of Marxism-Leninism. It is a principled document of historical importance for the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, which we defend and which continues to serve as the basis and guidance for our revolutionary action.**

At that time, there were only comradely expressed differences of opinion about the assessment of the KLA in Kosova, which consisted in the fact that Comrade Bill Bland unreservedly supported it, while the KPD/ML took a sympathetic, but rather critically distanced position towards certain nationalist and Maoist circles within the KLA. That was the only position where a compromise was sought and found. There was complete agreement on all other points which were of fundamental importance to us - such as **our wish to push ahead with the building of the Comintern/ML** and to express this unconditionally in the communiqué. Bill Bland was in favor of building the Comintern/ML. We measured the good relationship with Bill Bland not least by the fact that this communiqué came into being, but at that time we did not know his writings in detail. He gave us some to read and some others were published on the homepage of the Communist League and the ISML, in English of course. It was only with the Bill Bland texts translated into German by G. v. Scheven, which we published, that we became suspicious without seriously and critically dealing with them and seeing them in contradiction to the joint communiqué of 1999. We thus interpreted the attacks on us by Hari Kumar and the ISML as attacks against Comrade Bill Bland and defended him. Only later did we realize the contradiction that we could not defend Bill Bland without criticizing some of his theoretical theses and conclusions as errors. **Basically, we were not allowed to defend Bill Bland's mistakes against the correct views of Bill Bland.** We had to kneel ourselves into the matter, into the material that Bill Bland was dealing with. It was not that easy and it took a lot of time and effort. But we think it was worth it for all of us, because the deeper we penetrated into the matter, the more clearly Bill Bland's weaknesses became apparent, the more we began to distance ourselves from his wrong positions, the more necessary it seemed to us to work out our own independent position against them. So we had to torment ourselves to distance ourselves from Bill Band's positions.

Whether Marx and Engels, Lenin, Stalin or Enver Hoxha, they all had a justified critical relationship to the Anglo-American physiognomy of Marxism. Its strength was the purely objective approach, a sober and effective working style. But it's had theoretical weaknesses. There was a lack of a clear line, a consistent demarcation from bourgeois influences. Anglo-American Marxism was never consistent, never penetrated enough into the depths. It was not able to recognize the dialectical connection of things. Above all, the Bolshevik character of partiality was weak. It was unsuitable to be a guide to action for the entire Marxist World Movement, and unfortunately nothing has changed in this respect until today, if one takes a closer look at the Anglo-American "Marxist-Leninists".

Stalin emphasized American efficiency as a special feature of Lenin's working style:

"American efficiency, on the other hand, is an anti-dote to 'revolutionary' Manilovism and fantastic scheme concocting. American efficiency is that indomitable force which neither knows nor recognises obstacles; which with its business-like perseverance brushes aside all obstacles; which continues at a task once started until it is finished, even if it is a minor task;

and without which serious constructive work is inconceivable.

"But American efficiency has every chance of degenerating into narrow and unprincipled practicalism if it is not combined with Russian revolutionary sweep

"(...) The combination of Russian revolutionary sweep with American efficiency is the essence of Leninism in Party and state work." (Stalin: 'The Foundations of Leninism' in: 'Works', Volume 6; Moscow; 1953; p.195-196; English Edition).

It was Stalin who, after Lenin, masterfully applied Lenin's working style. There is no doubt that Stalin's working style is one of the foundations of Stalinism, we will learn from his working style, we will strive to acquire it, to master it. Today, we revolutionaries find global conditions to acquire a globalized, Stalinist style of work, a new World Bolshevik style of work, the world revolutionary style of work, which puts into practice the internationalist worldview of the proletariat, where not only Russian and American, but the most useful working styles of all countries of the whole world are united into a globalized style of work.

Drawing consistent demarcation lines and remaining elastic enough despite a principled attitude towards opportunism has always been a problem for the Anglo-American Marxist movement. There is a broad spectrum of right opportunism on the one hand and plenty of sectarianism on the other hand, **but this broad opportunistic spectrum was always opposed by a far too weak independent position of Marxism-Leninism.** The Anglo-American comrades have never really succeeded in completely freeing themselves from bourgeois influence and in Bolshevizing themselves. In England and America, Marxism-Leninism, with laudable exceptions, has never really been emancipated. This can be documented historically - above all on the basis of the teachings of the classics of Marxism-Leninism. It should turn out that we too had our problems with the Anglo-American literature on Marxism-Leninism and now only after nearly 10 years are trying to create clarity by dealing with the writings of Bill Bland more closely and unfortunately, not with all of them yet. The initial euphoria and hope was followed by disillusionment and distance. While studying his writings, we went through a period when we began to doubt Bill Bland, but we finally convinced ourselves that we could not let Bill Bland fall into the trap, that he could not be criticized without defending his positive aspects. Although we think he had made mistakes, we do not want to deny him his merits. But despite his merits, there were finally such serious mistakes that are not at all compatible with Marxism-Leninism and therefore had to be rejected by us absolutely. In our opinion it was a mistake of Bill Bland to get involved with people like Hari Kumar at all. Hari Kumar is a skillful neo-Trotskyite who has been able to subordinate disguised Trotskyism, that is, Trotskyism wrapped up in "Marxism-Leninism" to some Marxist-Leninists. He undoubtedly made use of Bill Bland's mistake. When we talk about Berianism here, it has been fostered in no small part by Bill Bland's misconception of the role of Beria, Malenkov, etc., but exploiting this misconception in the interest of the class enemy is something that others have done. In any case, we cannot find any underhanded intention behind Bill Bland's misjudgment of Beria, as serious as it is for keeping the foundations of Stalinism clean and defending them, and we do not want to accuse him of a deliberate deception or the fulfillment of an intelligence mission. But mistakes are to be criticized as mistakes, whether they were made intentionally or unintentionally. With the defense of the Berianists, the picture with which Bill Bland tried to draw the defense of Stalin has a devastating effect on us. We cannot and do not want to make friends with the picture that Bill Bland drew of Stalin. **Let us summarize our position on Bill Bland as follows.**

Bill Bland's criticism of revisionism is, in our view, altogether flawed and therefore must to be critically judged.

What are we as Stalinists to think of a "critique of revisionism" that starts from the

outrageous thesis that *"revisionist rule already existed in 1934"*? In our eyes this is not a criticism of revisionism, but a retreat from revisionism, a simple capitulatory attitude towards revisionism!

On the other hand, there is general agreement among us Stalinists that the dictatorship of the Soviet proletariat existed at least until the murder of Stalin, that is, until 1953, and not the "dictatorship of the bourgeoisie", because what else can such a "rule of the revisionists" be than "Stalinism" under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie? We only recognize Stalinism under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Whoever questions the axioms of Bolshevism, whoever slanders Stalinism, whoever falsifies the history of the Soviet Union over a period of two decades dismantles the real merits of Comrade Stalin in the struggle against revisionism and above all, underestimates the power of Stalinism against revisionism. However, revisionism cannot be seriously defeated with such a self-disarmament. In general: confusing the dictatorship of the proletariat with the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie has, in our opinion, nothing to do with scientific analysis. Such a mistake is more than just a small trifle, it is not a trifling matter. And that is why it is our duty as Stalinists to contradict these "scientific" analyses of Bill Bland clearly, since they are a staple for the Trotskyites to smuggle their old garbage under a new mask into the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, which we have labelled "Berianism".

Any attempt to transform the crimes of Beria into "Marxist-Leninist" deeds by quoting Stalin is grist for the mills of the Berianists, leads into the swamp of Berianism and inevitably meets with the resistance of us Stalinists.

But we would be making a mistake to condemn the writings of Bill Bland in bulk. Bill Bland's writings certainly contain certain merits, useful source material, collections of quotations, useful hints, etc., which have helped us in our own criticism of revisionism. Bill Bland's writings were and are instructive because not only did they help us to better distance ourselves from his false conclusions, but they also allowed us to consolidate our own point of view and develop new ideas. In this respect, and only in this respect, we recommend the study of his writings available to us, they are an enrichment for the further development of the anti-revisionist struggle of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement.

We point out that one must not limit oneself, as Bill Bland did, to the gathering of source material, not even to factual material, but that a Marxist-Leninist must take care to analyze the gathered material theoretically and generalize it scientifically in order to prove the objective regularities of social development in the period of Stalinism and to draw conclusions from it in the service of the current world revolutionary liberation struggle of the proletariat. This is precisely the weak point of Bill Bland.

This is the conclusion reached by the Comintern/ML with its investigations, which we have presented in detail, although not yet exhaustively, in the following. We must continue to study the writings of Bill Bland, we cannot draw a definitive conclusion here, his material is far too extensive for that. **Our assessment is also incorrect due to our own inadequate information.** But remaining silent only for that reason cannot bring the Marxist-Leninist World Movement forward. We must finally speak our mind, even if we are aware of our weaknesses.

It is only now, not least on the basis of the writings of Bill Bland, that we ourselves are able to uncover the ideology of Berianism. So far we had only noticed tendencies like **neo-Trotskyism** and **neo-revisionism**, which is the truth. As far as we know, we are the first and so far the only ones in the world to have named the ideology and with it the concept of "Berianism" as such. We

therefore not only deal with what we think is wrong with Berianism, but also point out its class origin and social function in order to make it understand what Berianism really means in practice.

After all, we founded our **Comintern/ML** in the year **2000** in **demarcation** from the Canadian "Alliance ML" and the **ISML**. **We raised Comrade Enver Hoxha to the rank of a 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism** in order to better defend Marxism-Leninism, to better defend Stalinism.

And in the past years we have tried to contribute to the defense of Marxism-Leninism, to its further development towards **world revolution**. Despite our tiny existence, we were endeavored to make our modest ideological contribution to strengthen the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, to show it the way out of the crisis as best as we could. We have distinguished ourselves from ISML more and more sharply in the struggle, have seen our own way more and more clearly in front of our eyes, have worked out an **independent world revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist position**, although we had no idea about the existence of Berianism until now. Our theory has now become strong enough to attack and expose the ISML and its ideological haze as an **anti-Marxist-Leninist current in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement**. We'll settle up with these people here now. We may have missed the mark at one time or another in the exposure of Berianism, but we certainly hit this hostile ideology hard. One cannot refute Marxism-Leninism, not even on the "ground of Marxism-Leninism". We have already extracted this tooth for the modern revisionists. What is decisive here now is the **detection of Berianism**. The focus on the **character** of Beria unfortunately makes an overestimation of his historical role inevitable, for which we ask for understanding, because only with increased attention to his criminal deeds we will be able to recognize and smash the ideological danger of Berianism, we will overcome such mistakes of the first period of socialism and draw correct conclusions from the experiences of that time.

We say it openly and we will never take it back: **Beria did not act from his own conviction, but was directed against Stalin by a foreign hand, by bourgeois ideology and its paid adepts. Beria has been "convicted" of all sorts of bourgeois positions, whether from the positions of Khrushchev or other bourgeois positions (including, not least, the bourgeois position of today's Berianists themselves, namely that Beria was allegedly a "Marxist-Leninist"). There are also revisionist voices that criticize Beria as much as Khrushchev, in order to put themselves in an anti-revisionist light** (see the "red channel" English-language article: "The Careerist-Revisionist Beria"). **All of this has led us on the wrong track. There is only one Marxist-Leninist standpoint to lift the veil which the Berianists try to hide behind after Beria's death - this is the Marxist-Leninist standpoint of the 5 classics Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha. Only now have we begun to realize what a dangerous opponent Stalin must have faced in his immediate vicinity. With our criticism of Beria we have recognized Stalin's titanic Marxist-Leninist greatness even better.**

Accusing Beria of his crimes is not difficult. Others before us have done the same. That is not what we are concerned with alone, we are concerned with Berianism, with its *ideological* roots. If Berianism is not destroyed, then the misbelief about this alleged "Marxist-Leninist" will continue to haunt unhindered. Indeed, by constantly fueling this misbelief, only more comrades will be "moved" to instinctively protect him from his Khrushchevite accusations. The fact that we are protecting Stalin from the Khrushchevites, that Khrushchev had Beria shot and that we would therefore involuntarily also protect Beria (namely *without* putting Beria under the magnifying glass!), is exactly what the Berianists are speculating on, namely that they know about us very well: The Stalinists are defending Stalin against the dirty slingshots of bourgeois propaganda. And so the Berianists then set themselves the task of making the "Marxist-Leninist" Beria a cuckoo's egg in the nest of us Stalinists. The Berianists are pursuing the goal that the enemy, hidden in a Marxist-Leninist eggshell, will throw us out of our own nest as soon as we have fed and strengthened him enough. Berianism is therefore a

parasitic ideology, which one has tried to implant in Stalinism in order to destroy its further development from within. To overcome Berianism as an ideology is therefore much more difficult, much more complicated, but all the more necessary and effective than to content oneself with criticism of the character of Beria. If we fail to plough the ground of the Berianist ideology deeply and thoroughly, new Berianists will always grow out of the earth, who will be nurtured and cared for by us Marxist-Leninists "in good faith", but as a result, the growth of Marxism-Leninism, which is close to our hearts, will no longer get a chance. We still have only ourselves to blame if we suddenly find ourselves in the hands of the class enemy. We didn't do that favor for Mao either with his slogan, "Let a thousand flowers bloom!" We are tearing the roots out of Berianism, which has surrounded itself with its "aura of closeness to Stalin", to throw it onto the dustbin of history.

Concealing the truth and distracting from it by covering up traces, by setting up false tracks was the method of the secret service chief Beria, which the Berianists copied from him. But you cannot outwit Marxism-Leninism, you cannot manipulate it arbitrarily or even treat it as a secret. Stalin also got to the bottom of Beria, but by then it was already too late. Marxism-Leninism is not there to cover the traces of our opponents, but to uncover them! One can try to brainwash the Marxist-Leninists, but one cannot brainwash Marxism-Leninism itself. And with that the whole "glory" of Berianism ends, which makes the Berianists all the more angry. One cannot put Marxism-Leninism behind social-fascist bars and draw confessions from it, nor can one undertake a purge against Marxism-Leninism. The truth cannot be forbidden, cannot be purged away, it is indestructible, immortal. Marxism-Leninism is always directed against those who have to abuse it in order to fight against world communism and for the liberation of the world proletariat. We of the Comintern/ML have the courage to openly appear as accusers and to take full responsibility for such an accusation against Beria and Berianism in front of the whole Marxist-Leninist World Movement, in front of the whole world proletariat! This is in every respect a serious step for us, but the only principled, revolutionary way. But lies about Beria are cheap; loss of principles cost nothing. Let the Berianists with their unprincipled attitude go quietly under. But we do not allow anyone to hide behind Stalin's back with his lies and to attack us from there with the mask of "Stalin"!

We try to learn from our mistakes with criticism and self-criticism. It is never too late to learn from your mistakes. However, the criticism is completely justified why it took us so long to do so, especially since we see ourselves as loyal Stalinists. We hope to overcome our criminally neglected Marxist-Leninist vigilance with this long overdue step. We sincerely hope that all other comrades may learn from our mistakes, becoming fully aware of the **deadly difference between true loyalty and hypocritical "loyalty" to Stalin, to expose this difference and to condemn the masterminds behind the cover-up of this difference.** And, dear comrades, this applies not only to Stalin but to all our beloved leaders of the communist world movement, this applies to the entire worldview of the world proletariat and this also applies to Comrade Enver Hoxha. There are countless examples of Berianism. **Hypocritical "loyalty" is one thing, open betrayal and open treason is another thing.** Both go hand in hand, but one is much more difficult to see through than the other. We owe it to Stalin to clarify this, and we are honestly glad and relieved that we were finally able to free ourselves from the clutches of these ideologues, that we were able to free Stalin a little bit from the betrayal of Berianism and thus drew a little closer to him. With the fight against Berianism, after 40 years of fighting for Stalinism, we have honestly earned our proud name as Stalinists.

Without Beria the Khrushchevites would probably have "not so easily" come to power. Beria has opened the way for them. Until his death, Beria was the greatest and most brutal anti-Stalinist of the USSR. The Berianism of today has followed in his anti-Stalinist footsteps. Defending Stalin, therefore, means for us: not to stop with the fight against the

Khrushchevites, but to continue our fight against Berianism. The fight against modern revisionism does not exclude the fight against the pioneering role of Berianism, but presupposes it. How else can one really fight revisionism if one turns one's attention only to the one hand which Beria was shot by the Khrushchevites with and does not notice what the other hand of the Khrushchevites was doing, which in fact was protectively covering Berianism which had been left alive. The Khrushchevites could not convince the sly fox Beria to share his plunder. They flayed him alive, for they could camouflage themselves much better with it than with their own lousy skin. The principle behind it was revealed by Lenin at the time. Or rather, Lenin had slapped counter-revolutionary spies on the fingers. They pointed out from their sewing box that it was tactically unwise to completely smash the Marxist organization because it would have to be re-invented in order to rebuild it. It is more advantageous to maintain a Marxist organization, because this way you can continue to control and direct it from within without anyone's suspicion. This is how the Berianists worked in our ranks.

Why does Berianism try to keep its hypocritical "loyalty" to Stalin alive beyond his death as "honest" loyalty? In order to make them sublime to the faithful Marxist-Leninists, in order to repeat to us the vile example set for Stalin. Whoever, like the Berianists, makes the murderer of Stalin a "Marxist-Leninist loyal to Stalin" makes himself an enemy of Stalin, makes himself an anti-Stalinist accomplice of revisionism, is a pathetic lackey of world imperialism. Whoever defends Beria, stands against Stalin. Whoever defends Beria stands against Stalinism. Whoever stands against Stalinism has no place in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement and belongs on the other side of the barricade, stands in the enemy camp which we are destroying.

The Berianists have quite cleverly taken advantage of our Marxist-Leninist hatred of Khrushchevites, they have sailed under our flag, not so that we would clean the halo of their Beria, but so that we would help them to replace Marxism-Leninism with Berianism, naturally in the name of "Marxism-Leninism". We did not do the Berianism this favor, we put them in the pillory of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, the only place where they belong.

Comrade Enver Hoxha rehabilitated the Marxist-Leninist World Movement in the struggle against the Titoites, against the Khrushchevites, against the Maoists, against the Euro"communists", against modern revisionism and has lifted it to a higher level.

The Comintern/ML will rehabilitate the Marxist-Leninist World Movement in the struggle against the Berianists, against the neo-Trotskyites, against neo-revisionism and will raise it to a higher level in the spirit of Enver Hoxha!

The struggle to rehabilitate the Marxist-Leninist World Movement will continue permanently!

The Marxist-Leninist World Movement is stronger than all its enemies combined!

"We regard the ideological struggle against modern revisionism as an inseparable component part of the struggle for the construction and defence of socialism in Albania, for the triumph of the freedom of the peoples and the revolution everywhere in the world." (Hoxha: 'Report to the 6th Congress of the PLA' in: 'Selected Works'; Tirana; 1982; p.746; English Edition).

With the shooting of Beria, the Khrushchevites could conveniently bury all of their own crimes against the proletariat in his grave. But eliminating of Beria does not mean that his ideology, the spirit of Berianism is eliminated! Berianism, however, has remained for the

modern revisionists as a sure signpost for the restoration of capitalism, as a reserve invisibility cloak in the struggle against Marxism-Leninism. With the help of the Khrushchevites, Berianism was able to live on to disorientate us Stalinists, even 17 years after the final withdrawal from the Soviet Union! This is a really dangerous sham maneuver of the Soviet revisionists and everything else but a "diminution" of the crimes of the Khrushchevites against Stalin and the communist world movement. The "arguments" of Khrushchev against Stalin are without doubt of the same nature as the "arguments" of the Berianists against us Marxist-Leninists, only that some keep their "arguments" hidden behind the fig leaf of "Leninism" and others their "arguments" behind the fig leaf of "Stalinism" ! Khrushchev was able to cut Beria's head off, but Berianism cannot be defeated by the modern revisionists themselves, but only by us Marxist-Leninists! Revisionism can never be defeated by revisionists, no matter how much they claim their "anti-revisionism" and try to defame us as "sectarians" and "dogmatists"! The real sectarians and dogmatists are the Berianists themselves! Their only mistake is that they conclude from themselves to others.

Khrushchev was only one of the heads of the "Hydra" of Beria! If one rejects his revisionist ideology, new heads will grow back for the Hydra. In this respect, the head of Beria cut off by Khrushchev did not really mean the death of the Hydra, but on the contrary, the Hydra created for itself the best camouflage that could exist to continue its revisionist evil unrecognized and unharmed until today! "Let the Marxist-Leninists calmly believe that the Hydra is finished, let them cut off the head of Khrushchevism, modern revisionism will survive thanks to Berianism". The Berianists certainly believed that, until we met them!

Do you remember, comrades? Stalin's "Short Course" ended with a metaphor from Greek mythology, that the Bolsheviks are invincible if they remain connected to the masses, like Antaeus to Mother Earth. What did Beria do? He ambushed Stalin. And in a weak moment he murdered him. With this he made the Soviet country, the Party, the state, the army, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the world proletariat leaderless and opened the way for the subjugation of socialism to capitalism. Beria reached for the key of invincibility of the Bolshevik leadership and the Hydra shouted: *"I did him in! I have saved all of you!"* (Beria, May 1st, 1953).

We are referring to Stalin's daughter Svetlana, whom aptly called Beria the **Hydra**, and with this metaphor we want to follow Stalin's journey into Greek mythology with how Hercules killed the Hydra:

Hercules shot burning arrows into their cave to lure her out. Angrily hissing, she shot at him, but he grabbed her and clasped her with an iron grip below her nine-fold throat. She wrapped her huge body around him, but Hercules did not give in. He then took the sickle he had in his belt and cut off her head one by one, but two heads always grew back for every head. With a torch, Heracles [his Greek name] burned out stump after stump before another head could shoot out. With one fist he held the beast. In the end, only the ninth head remained, the middle one, which he also cut off, but it lived on and jumped at him again and again. But he grabbed it and buried it in a deep hole in the ground, which he rolled a heavy rock over. Underneath it now rumbled the head, but the stone was too heavy. He cut the body of the snake into pieces and dipped his arrows into her poisonous blood. The puncture wounds were incurable. What does that tell us Stalinists?

The world proletariat must, like Hercules, shoot the burning arrows of anti-Berianism into the caves of the Berianists to draw out the snake of treason. In doing so, it must not be afraid to shoot through all the **masks** of "Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha" behind which they hide all their heads for our deterrence and for their protection. The world proletariat must neither hesitate nor tremble like a hare in front of the snake! The world proletariat must take all traitors in the whole world by the throat and must not let any of them go. The sickle symbolizes the poor peasants with

whose help the workers must cut off the ideological head of the traitors. The torch symbolizes Marxism-Leninism. Thus, the ideology of betrayal must be burned out with stump and torch before it can grow back. The laboring masses, the peoples of the world, the world proletariat is merging into one huge rock which the ninth head, the centrist head of the Hydra is buried under. But the world proletariat uses the poisonous blood of the traitors to incurably poison the counter-revolution itself.

Within the destruction of the global betrayal of communism lies the key of the invincibility of World Bolshevism. The traitors to communism are the paid agents of world imperialism! And among its ideological scribblers and lackeys are the Berianists!

"De-Stalinization" begins with the prevention of disclosure, with the concealment of the complete documents and writings of Stalin. We ask you, comrades: Who had access to them? Who was responsible for the Soviet archives? Who supervised them? Who could manipulate or destroy them? Who could falsify or make Stalin's documents disappear? Who could make the crimes against Stalin, against the Russian people, against the people of the Soviet Union disappear? Who could cover his own tracks? Who supervised the amnesties and rehabilitations after Stalin's death? Only a minister who was in charge of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and all the secret services could do that, only Beria could do that! And not only could he do it, but he did it and exactly on the same day when Stalin was dying! And the "Beria File" itself? Even up to Gorbachev the "Beria File" remained allegedly "*untraceable*" (!). The secret of the Berianists is still carefully guarded by the former KGB. By whom? By still active Berianists! The mysterious spirit of Beria is still omnipresent in today's Russian state. Even bourgeois historians complain about the incomplete and sparse publication of documents from the archives. Who decides what may be published and what may not? Explosive historical facts are still kept strictly under lock and key. Historical documents were exposed to the sea of flames in Moscow! Who are the arsonists? What have they got to hide?

Why is the speech of Stalin's secretary Poskrebyshev at the XIX Party Conference nowhere to be found?! It is said to have spoken about vigilance and the role of the USA in the fight against Bolshevism. It was probably written by Stalin, or at least under his guidance. Was it suppressed by the revisionists?

It is time, comrades, that the world learns the entire truth about Beria's worldwide counter-revolutionary network! The truth about Beria is one of the many keys to the truth about Stalin! The world proletariat wants to know the truth, nothing but the full, the pure, the whole truth! Has there ever been a Berianist who would have fought for the dissemination of the works of Stalin, for the disclosure of the documents of Stalin? No, there is not and there will never be. They are content to "reprocess" Stalin on the basis of the material disclosed (not by them, but by bourgeois historians), in order to fish in the mud! We Stalinists, through painstaking labor, distributed the works of Stalin after the betrayal of the modern revisionists and they do have their good reasons to hate us!

Comrades, millions of "documents" from the archives of the Soviet Union have now supposedly been "revealed". Millions of bourgeois judgements and comments have been written about them. A mess of disinformation. The world proletariat and we communists have only one tiny question: If so much has been revealed, why are there no documents from Stalin? Why are the missing writings of Stalin, still under lock and key or "lost", 55 years (!!!) after his death? Why is it necessary to fight an unyielding, tough battle for every single document of Stalin's? Who is interested in not finally releasing the works of Stalin completely to the whole world? If that is not censorship, then what is? Is the public not allowed to form its own opinion about Stalin's writings? Does the public need the "help" of historical "experts" to understand what Stalin said, wrote and meant? Or are we afraid that

all the myths of anti-Stalinism would collapse like a house of cards if we let Stalin speak for himself? These are all legitimate questions, right? Is there a greater scandal in bourgeois historical "science", a scandal of the world domination of capital, than the secrecy of the complete writings of Stalin? This secrecy alone is damaging to our communist cause in the eyes of the proletariat. Without the complete publication of all the works of Stalin, we cannot fully defend Stalin, he cannot fully defend himself!

The first demand that we Stalinists must make and fulfill is the complete release of all documents not only "about" Stalin, but first and foremost the release of every utterance **that come from his own mouth and from his own hand. By his own statements, by his own writings, one should be able to measure and judge Stalin. As long as this demand is not completely fulfilled, a huge stigma will remain on bourgeois "science", which they themselves have stuck the label of unbelief and insincerity on all their "scientific" works about Stalin with. They carry out the lackey services of their clients and they remain in the background. And the "scientific" lackeys of capital will never be able to wash away this shame, this scandal.**

The other thing is that here before and after Stalin's death we can only, and incorrectly, write an important reason why Stalin is censored in gaps. In any case, the lack of Stalin's documents means that a lot of further corrections and revisions of our own views are inevitable. All the more disconcerting is the fact that within the camp of Marxist-Leninists there are only a few in the world, apart from us from the Comintern/ML and the KPD/ML of Comrade Ernst Aust, who have made this fundamental demand of releasing the documents at all. For 40 years our comrades have made a sincere effort to publish the works of Stalin (we have already published volumes 1-17 in German!!) and today we are doing everything possible to collect and publish missing documents.

Let us take the legendary **Plenum of the CC of the CPSU after the 19th Party Congress in October 1952**, where Stalin spent many hours passionately announcing an important political statement (probably his most important ever!!). It dealt with the fateful questions of the future of the USSR and communism. He expressed his opinion about the future of communism after his death in it. Stalin did not mince his words in his **indiscriminate criticism of all members of the Presidium**. His criticism in front of the ears of the audience was so devastating for them that they froze and fell silent. They could not prevent Stalin's criticism of the restoration of capitalism at the 19th Party Congress, because he had surprised them with it only the day before so they prevented the announcement of his campaign against the restoration of capitalism in the USSR in order to hush up its world-historical significance for communism. What insolence! Let us remember how the entire anti-Bolshevik world pointed its dirty finger at Stalin with **Lenin's** alleged "**Testament**"! What a cowardly gang of criminals, who **sank Stalin's farewell political speech into his grave!** Betrayal all along the line, betrayal to the inauguration of the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, and betrayal of him on the day of the announcement of his resignation! Betrayal, betrayal, betrayal! **Give Stalin back his political farewell speech!! Give it back!!! It doesn't belong to you traitors to communism! It belongs to all people in the world, whose liberation Stalin fought for and whose liberation we continue to fight for!!! Fight until Stalin's works are finally and completely published!!!!**

It is easy to understand the fact that during this historical period, before and after Stalin's death, relatively little **genuinely Marxist-Leninist literature** has come into the public domain that can be based on authentic documents of Stalin, especially against the background of **today's events in the Caucasus** in our case... and there has been torrential flood of anti-communist, "scientific", "well-founded" "document research" after 1991. It is also a fact that this Marxist-Leninist literature has not even come to uniform and consistent conclusions, that rather the most diverse, even contradictory standpoints and opinions have come out, enriched with newly documented

"revelations" and some half-truths, and then vigorously mixed with old as well as new anti-Stalinist ideas in order to confuse the Marxist-Leninists with them, just as the Berianists do. The great Sisyphean task remains for us to **separate the wheat from the chaff**. All in all, the world bourgeoisie is stirring up its seething cauldron full of eclectic, tough, masses of revisionist lava, which is pouring over the Marxist-Leninist World Movement in order to concrete in the real communist, our own (!) documents about our history after the cooling process, to make them forever inaccessible for the world proletariat.

The text we present here is proof enough that we are aware that the world proletariat is still far from having completely freed itself from the influence of modern revisionism, Trotskyism and other anti-Stalin influences, as in the case of Berianism, that the struggle against modern revisionism is still an international class struggle to the death, that must be fought and won laboriously and resolutely, and that even then it must continue for decades. **But the dialectics of anti-communist counter-revolution was built on the dormant volcanoes of world revolution, which are erupting all the more violently the more one tries to prevent their eruption.** After decades, the volcano of the October Revolution had just been brought under control by the global counter-revolutionary fire brigade with the help of the revisionist extinguishing agent, at least that is what the counter-revolution hoped for. But with the most sophisticated control of the laws of the counter-revolution, the laws of the revolution cannot be overruled. On the contrary: under a global counter-revolution, the October Revolution must turn into a global world revolution so revolutionary volcanoes will erupt all over the world and the counter-revolution will be buried under its hot lava. **This is the dialectics of world communism!** The counter-revolution has also tried to cover the truth about Stalin with lies, with this result: **the volcano of Stalinism is now erupting globally and it will bury anti-Stalinism under its enormous lava mass!**

Whoever refuses to speak of Stalinism, of Stalinists, should do so. Here you are. It's up to you. But we comrades from the Comintern/ML despise this attitude as capitulatory to the anti-Stalinism of the bourgeoisie. If you don't want to call yourself Stalinist, why do you call yourself Marxist? That is inconsistent. The bourgeoisie "defames" us too, don't they? If you defend Marx, you are a Marxist, and if you defend Stalin, you are not a Stalinist? How can one make such a meaningless "difference" plausible to anyone? It's ridiculous.

Without Marx there would be no anti-Marxism and without Stalin there would be no anti-Stalinism. How can one profess Marxism, but conceal or even deny the commitment to Stalinism? Where might the comrades get their stomach aches from, if they do not dare to publicly confess themselves to be Stalinists? They may calmly and self-critically think about it! We communists call ourselves Stalinists just as we call ourselves Marxists, Leninists or Hoxhaists, because we despise hiding our connection with all the classics of Marxism-Leninism (also see Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels).

The concept of "Stalinism" was discredited by the bourgeoisie and served the hateful anti-communist and revisionist propaganda, but it did not catch on historically and could not do so either with "Marxism" or "Leninism". Even in Stalin's time, comrades considered themselves Stalinists not only in the Soviet Union but all over the world, the name Stalinist was a name of honor, and it will remain so, also and especially under the pressure of anti-Stalinist agitation.

Especially with the struggle against modern revisionism, a new Marxist-Leninist World Movement emerged, which was mainly based on the teachings of Stalin and understood them as independent teachings of the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. The teachings of the "4 Heads" were finally the teachings from which the Marxist-Leninists ideologically distinguished themselves from all other bourgeois currents within the communist movement. With the 4 Heads, the Marxist-Leninist World Movement led by Comrade Enver Hoxha led the struggle against

modern revisionism. With the defense of Stalin we defended Marxism-Leninism against modern revisionism. Stalin is and remains a touchstone, a demarcation line. One must defend Stalin as the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, otherwise one cannot defend Stalin. Just as we do not have to be ashamed but can be proud to call ourselves Marxist-Leninists, we do not have to be ashamed as Stalinists and we can be rightly proud to bear this name. **But only those who fight for Stalinism in words and deeds may rightfully call themselves Stalinists, only those who fight for Hoxhaim in words and deeds may rightfully call themselves Hoxhaists, and only those who fight for Marxism-Leninism in words and deeds may rightfully call themselves Marxist-Leninists.** All of this is actually self-evident. The concepts of Leninism, Stalinism and Hoxhaim are essentially **identical with the concept of the further development of the teachings of Marxism. One cannot speak of Marxism-Leninism and avoid Stalinism!** These are all concepts which have shaped and will continue to shape the development and further development of the communist worldview, the communist world movement, in the historical course of the class struggle against capitalism (for more information on the topic of "Classics of Marxism-Leninism" see our German-language article: "**Enver Hoxha, the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism**").

In irreconcilable demarcation to this, all other concepts like Maoism, Trotskyism, etc., are merely bourgeois ideologies which served and will continue to serve to **adapt** the communist worldview to the bourgeois worldview, the communist world movement to the bourgeois world movement, to **assimilate** it and once it has come into the hands of the class opponent, to direct it **against** the communist worldview, **against** the world proletariat and its revolution.

The head of Mao Zedong was banned from the series of classics of Marxism-Leninism by Enver Hoxha. For this alone, Enver Hoxha would have belonged to the banner of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement as the Fifth Head at that time. Since his death another 15 years had to pass until the Comintern/ML replaced the 4-headed banner of the Hoxhaist World Movement by the 5-headed banner in 2000 and the struggle for the 5 Heads has still not been finally decided upon within the Marxist-Leninist World Movement ten years later, it must be victoriously finished. And as long as "Hoxhaists" walk around with the "4 Heads" banner, this struggle can never be finished. Without the 5-headed banner, the Marxist-Leninist World Movement was quite "headless" after the death of Comrade Enver Hoxha, but under the 4-headed banner, many revisionists were able to save themselves, who, with the collapse of the revisionist Soviet Union, were looking for a "new home" where they could go into hiding. Since the foundation of the Comintern/ML in 2000, "Hoxhaists" who have reconciled with neo-revisionists have no place in the Marxist-Leninist Movement (**anti-revisionism in words only is revisionism in deeds**).

Just as Beria cut off the 4th Head in 1953, the Berianists today refuse to recognize the 5th head, putting themselves on the same level with the opportunists in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement who do not want to part with their 4-headed banner. Today all opportunists in the Hoxhaist World Movement and the opportunists who continue to do their mischief with the 3-headed banner are united in not recognizing Enver Hoxha as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. The Hoxhaist World Movement will be united only from the moment it recognizes Enver Hoxha as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism in word and deed, when it defends and carries the 5-headed banner of the Comintern/ML and gives a proper rebuff to the sham organizations which are sprouting everywhere like mushrooms and which try to take the 5-headed banner of the Comintern/ML and to fight against the Comintern/ML. The 5-headed banner was raised by the Comintern/ML in 2000 and nobody will be able to snatch it from its hands, to doubt or to undo this historical act! We were the first to raise the 5-headed banner in the year 2000 and nobody else.

Comrades, we did not leave the concept of "Marxism" to anti-communism, why should we change the concept of "Stalinism"? Why should we do that? Just as we are not afraid to show the flag in

front of the workers as communists, we do it as Stalinists. How are we to explain the teachings of Stalin to the workers if, on the one hand, we allow the concept of "Marxism" but, on the other hand, we distance ourselves from the concept of "Stalinism"? The worker would have this justified suspicion: "The communists think that everything is alright with Marxism, but with Stalinism they seem to have certain doubts and reservations so Stalinism cannot be right, Stalinism is not to be trusted, one must be careful with it.

Just as a true Marxist cannot distance himself from Leninism, he cannot possibly distance himself from Stalinism or Hoxhaism. **The teachings of the classics build on each other, form a dialectical unity and must not be divided, set against each other or equated. Only together their teachings guarantee the victory of the world proletariat over capitalism, one can speak of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism at all.**

Defending Marxism-Leninism cannot mean copying it from its original stage of development at the time of Marx and Lenin to the present conditions. Marxism would have died long ago if it had not been further developed by Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha. So what does it mean to **defend its further development with Marxism-Leninism**? It means defending Stalinism. Whoever refuses to defend Stalinism, denies the further development of Leninism. Whoever refuses to defend the further development of Leninism, refuses to defend the further development of Marxism and thus denies Leninism. Whoever denies the further development of Marxism through the teachings of Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha, denies Marxism at all. We Stalinists consider Stalinism to be a **further development** of Leninism, not just Leninism and its application by Stalin. The only point is that we can only develop it ourselves, and we have neglected this for the benefit of the bourgeoisie.

Anti-Stalinism inevitably follows its inner logic and does so in a lawful way:

The weaker Stalinism develops, the weaker the position of Stalinism and the stronger the position of anti-Stalinism. The further back the Stalin Era is, the more comfortably the bourgeoisie can let it "historically rot", in its own words, to calm it down. But in the measure that it gets new nourishment with its further development, it is revived, and thus becomes a tangible, current, subjective factor for the revolution of the world proletariat, anti-Stalinism reaches the point where the further development of Stalinism becomes **more dangerous** for it than even Stalinism in its original state of development. At this point, anti-Stalinism shifts its **main task** to the **struggle against the development of Stalinism**, tries to **confront** it with the original Stalinism in order to separate and divide its unity and to brand the development as "illegitimate". Above all, the bourgeoisie then tries to pick up the old banner of Stalinism in order to kill its further development. The bourgeoisie wants to erect a victor's monument to itself as a "champion for the liberation of Stalinism" from the weeds of the "theories of legitimacy" that overgrown it. The better the bourgeoisie is able to "defend" everything about Stalinism that hurts it the least, the greater the chance of misleading and deceiving its class opponent. **This task is currently being taken over by the "anti-revisionist" revisionists.**

And just as this anti-communist law is applied to Stalin, it has been applied to Marxism, to Leninism before and will be applied to Hoxhaism. We must be clear about what it means that Stalin had already **finished** working on the foundations and questions of Leninism shortly after Lenin's death, while today, 56 years after Stalin's death, we are still **in the beginning** with the foundations and questions of Stalinism. What we are trying to say is that the anti-Stalinist struggle - and we are only talking about the **theoretical-ideological** struggle here, is far from over, let alone won, which we can never repeat often enough.

We Stalinists, for example, are directed against those who turn Stalinism from an international proletarian doctrine into a product of specifically Russian conditions.

As Leninism defined Bolshevism as "a model of tactics for ALL", Stalinism built on that tactic. But it did not stop at the level of development of Bolshevism "in one country". At the first level, that is, the Leninist level of development, Bolshevism was based on a single Bolshevik party in power, the Party of Lenin and Stalin, while all other Communist parties of the Third International not in power were based on the same tactic. Stalinism transformed Bolshevism into a higher quality by equipping it with a base of a world socialist camp as a tactic, thus creating a much greater international development of Bolshevism as "a model of tactics for all". This new base of the Bolshevik World Camp enabled a number of communist parties to use this tactic like the Bolshevism in power. This is, of course, an enormous advance over the Comintern Era and thus a decisive step towards world Bolshevism in power. Between the tactics of Bolshevism in general and the tactics of Bolshevism in power in particular, there is a dialectical relationship which Stalin was able to apply masterfully, and it is in this relationship that the whole essence of Stalinism is reflected. World Bolshevism in power is the form of Bolshevism in which "tactics for all" reaches its highest quality. It is only at this stage of development that Bolshevism has achieved its greatest effectiveness as a *world proletarian* tactic, which Stalin fought for and which he had striven for all his life.

Stalinism is the generalization of the experiences of the revolutionary movement of all countries under the conditions of the first world socialist camp.

You can twist and turn as you like. There is no way around the recognition of Stalinism as a further development of the *international proletarian doctrine* of Leninism.

And what did Comrade Bill Bland do? Of all things, he wrote an article about the negative concept of "Stalinism", but not to wrest the concept of Stalinism from the bourgeoisie, but to leave it to the bourgeoisie. Which side did he take in this? We did not come here to write an article about the negative concept of "Marxism" in order to leave this concept to the bourgeoisie. Where, please, is there a difference? The concept of "Marxism", just like the concept of "Stalinism", belongs to the world proletariat. There can be no doubt about this among us Stalinists. And whoever wants to spread the world proletariat's worldview, cannot even defend the concept of "Marxism", if he rejects the concept of "Stalinism" and at the same time, if he rejects "Stalinism" as a concept for one of the further developments of Marx's doctrine!

Since when is Marxism essentially a completed worldview ? Marx did not create Marxism to take it to his grave? They'd like that, wouldn't they?! If Marxism was not developable in its essence, it would have died long ago, and this is also true for Stalinism. If Stalinism is not developed further, it dies and all that would remain of it would be the anti-Stalinist aftertaste of the bourgeois smear campaigns. And you would like that too, you anti-Stalinists! We cannot and do not want to set Bill Bland at this yardstick of the further development of Stalin's teachings, but by rejecting the term "Stalinism" he has certainly not covered himself with glory as a co-founder of the English Stalin Society. Marxism "*as such*" is not that strong, but in its *further development* is its real strength, because only this further development of Marxism can change the situation of the world proletariat fundamentally and therefore revolutionary. Stalinism is not that strong, but its further development is what constitutes its real strength. Every comrade has understood this and our class enemies know this very well. The world proletariat needs the further developed Stalinism NOW and TODAY to liberate itself. But it cannot dress him in his old, tight uniform for the present liberation struggle. The uniform of Stalinism has to be adapted to the size of the developed world proletariat and not vice versa with the size of the world proletariat to Stalinism (as it had still fitted perfectly in the Stalin Era).

We understand if comrades at some point express their resentment at having to constantly deal with the picking apart of Marxism-Leninism, that they are fed up with the quotation battles and prefer to take refuge in practical work. They form a certain image of Stalinism, which they have acquired over the years, and now think that this is a sufficient basis "which must not be shaken any more". This is a sort of defiant behavior that is often observed among children, a sort of resistance not wanting to have at least the final shirt removed. Stalinism as the "final shirt" of the Stalinists? Well, let's keep in mind that sooner or later something like that must be faced: An involuntary retreat into dogmatic and sectarian fragments of Stalinism has dire consequences. Stalinism, as we know, is misused by the bourgeoisie as a retreat strategy to maintain its power, as we know it from the restoration of capitalism, from the revisionists. But Stalinism is the worldview of a class that ultimately wants to abolish class society and build communism and for that you cannot treat it like your "final shirt". With such a defeatist attitude, how can one be able to develop Stalinism in the struggle against the revisionists? How did Stalin develop Leninism? Would he have been able to develop Leninism a single millimeter further without his fierce struggle against the Right and Trotskyite Bloc, *without* fighting quotation battles? Study the works of Stalin to convince yourself of the exact opposite. **Quotation battles and "quotation battles" are thus far from being the same thing.** It essentially depends on whether they are fought by Stalinists or by their opponents, what political intention is pursued, which class they serve and which class they harm, etc. Admittedly, most of all the quotation battles fought were certainly avoidable, each serious "detail work" is a hundred times more valuable, but it is, firstly, undoubtedly inevitable to get along without quotation battles at all and secondly, extremely stupid or anarchistic without wanting to get by and thirdly, it is incredibly dangerous to justify their absolute renunciation with "Marxist" phrases. This too, by the way, is a **tenet of Stalinism in its struggle to defend Leninism.**

Let us see how Bill Bland behaves in this regard. It is noticeable that in his writings one quotation after the other (whereby the predominance of *bourgeois and revisionist quotations* alone should give the unbiased reader something to think about) **and his own conclusions and comments, on the other hand, are amazingly thin, and sometimes even exhaust themselves in a single sentence. That is not the point, however. The point is that the position expressed in this final sentence causes our substantive displeasure, our ideological rejection indeed. Bill Bland avoids imposing his own opinion and lets the reader decide. At first glance, this looks engaging and sympathetic. The reader has the impression of being informed by the presentation of different points of view and is grateful to the author for informative thought-provoking impulses to help him or her form his or her own opinion. But to be able to form one's own opinion more easily or to sweeten a wrong opinion with "objectivity", to have the author do the thinking for you, in order to easily take over this uncritically and unconsciously is a serious difference for us. In fact, a reader without Marxist-Leninist background knowledge is all too inclined to take this trustworthy "factual-scientific" presentation at face value and to buy it all too lightly, not to question it critically or not critically enough. But once the reader has struggled to critically work through what is presented and to think his way deeper and deeper into the uninterrupted series of quotations, especially to look at the authors of the sources under the magnifying glass, more and more questions remain open, it is very difficult to find out for oneself what is actually right and what is wrong. It is all too easy to interpret things "one way or the other". Making something interpretable one way or another is the tool of the opportunists, not the Stalinists. Stalin, as a Classic of Marxism-Leninism, is characterized by unsurpassed clarity and logic with which he disarmed all "so and so" opportunists.**

There seems to be a "line" with Bill Bland, like a tunnel that you walk through by focusing on the light at the end of the tunnel, which only seems to get brighter and brighter. But you have to overcome this tunnel vision for things that come out of the dark when you're not blinded.

This means that one must examine all the previously hidden, newly revealed information within the prism of Marxism-Leninism, one must set to work to correctly evaluate and judge the "news". This can and must be expected from a serious Marxist-Leninist, because only after critical examination can one say with certainty what illuminates the truth and what darkens it in the "new, glaring light". Some readers may be satisfied with Bill Bland's collection of quotes, but are these really reliable sources he used? From whom does his information come? What does the author want to prove or disprove with this information? Studying the vast number of sources listed by Bill Bland and to critically question the people from whom these sources originate is indispensable for a Marxist-Leninist, but not for a lazy reader who is used to having everything chewed over. He is satisfied as it is. He is either too comfortable to use his own head or he has simply not learned otherwise. Comrades, this undoubtedly cannot be an attentive Marxist-Leninist reader. In the newspaper "Komsomolskaya Pravda" No. 12 of January 15th, 1939, Yaroslavsky writes why Stalin "directly treats with contempt those comrades who are too lazy to deal with theory, who are afraid to think theoretically boldly and to raise new questions that show cowardice in thinking. If you dedicate your life to the struggle of the workers for their liberation, you must struggle all your life for the domination of Marxism-Leninism, you must make it accessible to the working class, as Stalin did, but not parrot everything uncritically."

And indeed, the whole movement seems to be infected by the disease of reluctance to deal with something that has been "chewed through a hundred times". This has led to a vulgarization of Marxism-Leninism. And let us calmly remain with the reproach of "chewed through" Marxism-Leninism: The vulgarization of Marxism-Leninism starts where one stops chewing. And where one stops chewing, one only begins to swallow down until one can only choke down single, bite-sized pieces and finally goes over to letting oneself be presented with pre-chewed porridge, because only porridge can be swallowed without chewing. This pre-chewed porridge is exactly the disease of today's Marxist-Leninist World Movement, one can even speak of a chronic suffering. Let us listen to the great words which Karl Marx described the **timeless struggle for scientificity** with:

"There is no royal road to learning, and the only people with any chance of scaling its sunlit peaks are those who have no fear of weariness when ascending the precipitous paths that lead up to them." (Marx: 'Capital' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 35; London; 1996; p.23; English Edition).

Instead, the movement today prefers to let itself be dragged along by the events of the day rather than to seriously tackle the theoretical work, **without which there can be no world revolutionary movement**. Is it any wonder that the movement suffers from its spontaneism, that it detaches the "communism debate" or the "socialism" questions as "special" questions from the entire activity of the communists, makes them independent, alienates them and dismisses them as annoying **"fundamental debates - burdens"** and puts them far away from the class struggle into a drawer, which one opens and closes at one or the other opportunity (when it is once again too late!)

The essence of **(living)** Marxism-Leninism (and dead Marxism-Leninism is dogmatism) is never to regard it as a dogma for eternal times, to regard it as a finished and completed doctrine, to take it as a pre-chewed mush. The revolutionary spirit of Marxism-Leninism precisely consists in the fact that it is capable of development to meet the changed conditions, the present conditions of globalization. The classics can no longer provide the right answers to this, we Marxist-Leninists must do this ourselves today. We must literally "bite through" ourselves. Hoxhaism is the highest stage in the development of Marxism so far, but it is far from being its final stage. This is what our opponents would like. It is a characteristic feature of Marxism that a final stage, a closure and finality of its development is foreign to it. Under the conditions of globalization, Hoxhaism alone will not get us very far either. We Marxist-Leninists are called upon to develop Marxism-Leninism independently

on the basis of the teachings of the 5 Classics and to defend our own development against our opponents. Let us recall Enver Hoxha's thesis, which he put forward at the 7th Congress of the PLA, that **"the question of the revolution and people's liberation is not just an aspiration but a problem presented for solution!"** We believe that it is completely in line with Hoxhaism to deal with the foundations of Stalinism, as it is an indispensable compass for the practical solution of world socialism. But with the fundamentals of Stalinism, alone and on its own, we will not be able to completely solve the problems of globalized socialism, we must develop Marxism-Leninism **itself** for this new task. This was no different with Marxism than Lenin and Stalin had to solve the problem of socialism "in one country". Without the further development of Marxism, without Leninism, without Stalinism, this problem, which at that time had to be solved, would never have been mastered.

When Trotsky began to use the insult word "Stalinism," he was only slapping himself in the face with it, he was only differentiating himself from Marxism-Leninism. We are not Trotskyites and therefore have no reason to separate ourselves from Stalinism. Conversely, we distinguish ourselves from the opponents of Marxism-Leninism by separating them from Stalinism. **One cannot fight against Marxism with anything, but only with Marxism. You can fight anti-Leninism only with Leninism. You can't fight anti-Stalinism with Marx, Engels and Lenin alone. You must fight it with the teachings of Stalin. This all sounds like a play on words, but in reality this is a very principled and fundamental question which we Stalinists have to answer carefully here and which every comrade must make absolutely and absolutely clear. Not to reduce or even reject our proletarian cause just because our opponent has heaped dirt buckets on it, but to remove the dirt buckets and clean and develop our proletarian cause. That is the only correct, revolutionary attitude. Everything else is retreating from the class enemy, is a capitulatory attitude towards Stalinism, towards Marxism-Leninism, is the way into the opportunist swamp.**

We have nothing against some comrades clashing with the concept of Stalinism, but defending the teachings of Stalin. In contrast, we have something against such "comrades" who get upset about the concept of Stalinism only because they do not want to admit that they basically distance themselves from the content of Stalinism or question its independent existence as an inseparable part of Marxism-Leninism. The fact that Stalin was the best Leninist of all times is one thing, but reducing the meaning of Stalin to that, reducing the meaning of Stalinism, is another thing, is revisionist. Yes, it is not even enough to be satisfied with the mere abstract statement that Stalin (somehow) "developed" Leninism further. Much more important is this question: What does this further development actually consist of, what do we have to imagine concretely, what are the foundations of Stalinism? If one asks the comrades about the foundations of Stalinism, many of them embarrass themselves, because they always find out that they never get beyond the teachings of Leninism in all their answers. Everything they attribute to Stalin has in fact already been developed by Lenin (for example: socialism "in one country"). So, with Leninism alone you really cannot scientifically explain Stalinism. A little more already belongs to this.

So what is a Marxist-Leninist, even a Stalinist worth, if they swear loudly to the teachings of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, but are not able to defend the teachings of Stalin against those who have *reduced* the teachings of Stalin to the teachings of Lenin in a revisionist way? Who reduces Stalinism to revisionism is on no other way than fighting Stalinism with Leninism à la Khrushchev. It is impossible to fight either the Berianists or the Khrushchevites, against modern revisionism without the foundations of Stalinism. This is a yardstick by which Enver Hoxha measured the seriousness of anti-revisionists, below which the Maoists promptly fell. If Enver Hoxha had not based himself on the foundations of Stalinism, there would not have been a Socialist Albania, there would not have been a

Hoxhaist World Movement. Only on the foundations of Stalinism the Hoxhaist World Movement could develop and will develop further. In essence, Hoxhaism is as Stalinist as Stalinism is Leninist and as Leninism is Marxist. But to only put between Leninism and Stalinism a line of equality, to recognize the identity of both, but to deny both characteristics, how they differ from each other at all, is just as inadmissible as it is to reduce Leninism to Marxism. We also dissociate ourselves from all comrades who want to reduce Hoxhaism to the Marxist-Leninist teachings of the four preceding classics (we mean all 4-headed "Marxist-Leninists"!). Like Stalinism, Hoxhaism = (same) Marxism-Leninism, but their characteristics are the successive *development* of Marxism-Leninism. Just as Leninism is the further development of Marxism and Stalinism is the further development of Leninism, Hoxhaism is the further development of Stalinism. Whoever does not understand this, has no idea of the meaning of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism and cannot lead the world proletariat to the victorious socialist revolution.

Just as Stalin worked out the foundations of *Leninism*, we have to complete the work of Enver Hoxha and work out the foundations of Stalinism. You cannot defend Comrade Stalin if you do not defend his teachings, if you do not defend Stalinism. But to do so, one must first know what Stalinism is. The decisive thing is to understand, recognize and put into practice the essence of what constitutes this Leninist development towards Stalinism. One must be able to scientifically justify the further development of Leninism, must not only prove that the path of Stalin was Leninist, but must also prove what actually distinguishes Stalinism as a further development of Leninism. Stalin was not content to describe Leninism as Marxist, but first of all he emphasized the special features of Leninism in comparison to Marxism and secondly he threw the outdated formulas of Marxism overboard. This is also the fate of Stalinism. As it happened to Marxism and Leninism, it happens to Stalinism and Hoxhaism. Principles of these teachings that are still valid are applied and other, outdated principles are thrown overboard or modified or recycled.

In the words of Stalin when he gave his lecture at Sverdlovsk University on the foundations of Leninism:

Expounding the foundations of Stalinism still does not mean expounding the basis of Stalin's worldview. Stalin's worldview and the foundations of Stalinism are not identical in scope. Stalin was a Leninist, and Leninism is, of course, the basis of his worldview. But from this it does not at all follow that an exposition of Stalinism ought to begin with an exposition of the foundations of Leninism. To expound Leninism means to expound the distinctive and new in the works of Stalin that Stalin contributed to the general treasury of Marxism-Leninism and that is naturally connected with his name. Only in this sense will the Comintern/ML speak in my lectures of the foundations of Stalinism. (Incidentally, what is said here must apply in the same way to Hoxhaism as soon as we publish our next text "[On the Foundations of Hoxhaism](#)").

We Stalinists must never allow our opponents to declare with impunity that the answers to the questions of Stalinism are superfluous in order to present Stalinism as an unscientific doctrine with the flimsy reason: "Stalinism does not really exist, it is only a symbol of the inflammatory propaganda of anti-communism." Their anti-Stalinism is the result of the struggle against our teachings of Stalinism, not the other way round!

The concept of Stalinism is therefore for us Marxist-Leninists, and we make no apology for constantly repeating ourselves, an important, indispensable scientific concept for the further development of Leninism of the time when Stalin lived and worked. This is anything but a question of taste or interpretation, it is not a subjective question (which only the *character* of Stalin is tied to), but Stalinism is the scientific expression of a certain stage of social

development of the ruling proletariat in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. If the teaching of Stalinism is missing, Marxism is incomplete, it is truncated, it cannot fulfill its task, it is worthless for the revolutionary liberation of the world proletariat. Whoever is not a Stalinist, cannot be a Marxist, is an anti-Marxist. Leninism is the instrument of Marxism which Stalin drew the demarcation line against the revisionist restorers of capitalism in the transition to socialism with. Therefore, the ruthless fight against the danger of the restoration of capitalism under the conditions of *constructed* socialism and the *transition to "communism in one country"*, under the conditions of the enormously growing socialist world camp, under the conditions of the *capitalist world camp* threatened with extinction, had to be one of the most important tasks of Stalinism.

Marx did not call himself a "Marxist", but his closest friend and comrade-in-arms Friedrich Engels did, the followers of Marx and Engels did, the Marxist movement in the capitalist countries did, who were guided in the class struggle by the teachings of Marx and Engels and joined and united around them. Marx and Engels were not only those who created the worldview of the proletariat, but also the leaders in the proletarian class struggle in the pre-imperialist phase of the development of capitalism. Many of the tenets of Marxism are still valid today, even beyond the lifetime of Marx and Engels. Other doctrines were only valid in their time and lost their meaning with the capitalist development towards imperialism. Some doctrines had to be dropped, others modified, adapted to the changing conditions of the class struggle.

Lenin himself did not call himself a "Leninist", but the comrades who gathered around him, his followers understood themselves as Leninists, above all was Lenin's student Stalin:

"Marx and Engels pursued their activities in the pre-revolutionary period (we have the proletarian revolution in mind), when developed imperialism did not yet exist, in the period of the proletarians' preparation for revolution, in the period when the proletarian revolution was not yet an immediate practical inevitability. But Lenin, the disciple of Marx and Engels, pursued his activities in the period of developed imperialism, in the period of the unfolding proletarian revolution, when the proletarian revolution had already triumphed in one country, had smashed bourgeois democracy and had ushered in the era of proletarian democracy, the era of the Soviets.

"That is why Leninism is the further development of Marxism." (Stalin: 'The Foundations of Leninism' in: 'Works', Volume 6; Moscow; 1953; p.73; English Edition).

In the struggle against the Mensheviks, in the struggle against the opportunist betrayal of Marxism by the Second International, in the struggle against the bourgeois revision of Marxism, the independent Leninist movement emerged.

"Leninism grew up and took shape under the conditions of imperialism, when the contradictions of capitalism had reached an extreme point, when the proletarian revolution had become an immediate practical question, when the old period of preparation of the working class for revolution had come up and passed over to a new period, that of direct assault on capitalism." (ibid. p.74).

Stalin did not call himself a "Stalinist," but the Bolsheviks who followed him in his struggle against the Trotskyites, Bukharinites, and later against the anti-Party bureaucratic elements and leaders of the apparatchiks called themselves Stalinists. The Stalinist world movement was born at a time when the strengthening of socialism grew to an existential threat to world capitalism, when the question "Who will win, the capitalist or the socialist **world camp**?" was a task that needed a practical solution.

Enver Hoxha did not give himself the name "Hoxhaist". But the Marxist-Leninists, who regarded him as the leader of the struggle against modern revisionism in power, who followed him in the struggle against the revisionist world movement, called themselves Hoxhaists, especially since the struggle against Chinese revisionism, against Maoism, which is led by Enver Hoxha. The Hoxhaists are Marxists who built socialism in spite of the conditions of revisionism in power, who formed a Marxist world front against the imperialist-revisionist encirclement, who fought against the two superpowers, against the cooperation of the imperialists and social-imperialists, against world imperialism which is regaining strength, who understood the question of world revolution as a task to be solved practically, who raised the Stalinist world movement to the height of its time and made the support of the proletarian revolution in the revisionist countries the daily task of living proletarian internationalism in order to reconquer the dictatorship of the proletariat in the former socialist countries. Hoxhaists today are the Marxists who fight for the restoration of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the world dictatorship of the proletariat, for socialism on a world scale.

As Marxist-Leninists call themselves comrades, who fight for the world proletarian revolution to end the epoch of world imperialism forever and to lead the world proletariat on the way to the transition to world socialism. Only the Marxist-Leninists can be called communists, because they are the only ones who can rely on the science of communism and develop it further.

Stalin was the most advanced to put this world-historical task of the Marxist-Leninists into practice. Therefore, world proletariat today must continue its work and must finish its work.

As Stalinists, we must take a self-critical look at ourselves against this world-historical background to see how far we have lived up to our responsibility to liberate Stalin's life and work honorably from the anti-Stalinist deluge of our global class enemy. Without the spread of Stalinism in the proletarian world movement, without the study of Stalin's teachings, without a large-scale propagandistic counter-offensive, without the unification and globalization of all our forces, without the formation of new Stalinist cadres, without the creation of a worldwide network of new Stalinist organizations, without a world Stalinist party, without the support of the most progressive proletarians, there is no way to imagine a victory in the biggest propaganda battle in the history of the class struggle against anti-Stalinism.

We must never unite with opportunists who openly try to introduce anti-Stalinism into our ranks and smuggle it in secret. We must never give away one millimeter to this danger of disguised, "Stalinist" opportunism, which continues to grow under the pressure of anti-Stalinism! We counter the pressure of anti-Stalinism on us Stalinists by not letting the opportunists into our fortresses (which we have so far built up completely insufficiently!). As an example, we'll mention the Maoist Ludo Martens (WP of Belgium), who pretends to "defend" Stalin, only to actually, in a Maoist manner, attribute to him "acts and sins of omission" that he never committed. There are defenders and so-called "defenders" of Stalin who are hostile to each other. We from the Comintern/ML had compiled a critical article about Mao and his so-called "Stalin question" in 2003. Here is the hyperlink (in German):

[How Comrade Enver Hoxha Defended Comrade Stalin against Mao Zedong and Chinese Revisionism](#)

What Ludo Martens wrote about Stalin is written from the perspective of an anti-Stalinist who pretends to be "on the ground of Stalinism". We strongly condemn this neo-revisionist work. Ludo Martens and his international "friends" and "followers" are arch-revisionists who have no place in the camp of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement.

And if there are opportunists who have nevertheless managed to penetrate, then we strengthen the unity of our Stalinist ranks by mercilessly purging the opportunists out of our organizations and thus deepening our understanding of Stalinism. We were always weakened and threatened in our existence only when we had distanced ourselves from the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, from Stalin, either by neglecting our vigilance and determination or had overstepped the mark by "throwing the baby out with the bathwater" and thus had not understood and not understood the interaction between right-wing and "left-wing" opportunism, reconciliation and centrism. The confidence of the world proletariat can only be regained if we do not abandon it in the principled defense of Stalin, if it can rely on our loyalty to principles combined with elasticity and maneuverability, that is, on our World Bolshevik line. Our task for the struggle is therefore clearly defined: **Stalin was one of the greatest revolutionary leaders of the world proletariat. With his teachings, the wavering rule of the world bourgeoisie must be attacked, Stalinism must be transformed into a global victory. Stalinism means the victory of communism. Anti-Stalinism means the victory of capitalism. This is the way things are.**

Without Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism, however, the struggle for Stalin cannot be won. But with Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism we are able to correct our faulty attempts to assess Stalin's work before and after his death from the point of view of Marxism-Leninism all the better. **Only we Marxist-Leninists are able to bring the truth about Stalin to the public and expose the bourgeois lies about Stalin. No one else in the world.** If we have defeated the hardest chunk, the anti-Stalinism, we will also defeat the anti-communism entirely. **The struggle against anti-Stalinism is the main chain link of our revolutionary struggle against anti-communism.** Therefore, the Comintern/ML has the principle: **The cleaner the anti-revisionist conclusion of the history of the First Period of socialism, the cleaner we can tackle the following chapter, the anti-revisionist history of world socialism. This can mean nothing other than to understand the entire period of Lenin and Stalin's activity as a great and significant historical period of the heroic anti-revisionist struggle, as the only secure basis for the transition from capitalism to communism. The anti-revisionist struggle of the world proletariat is the most important basis for the world revolutionary transition of world capitalism to global socialism, which only leads to victory on the ruins of the bourgeois-revisionist world, on the ruins of the restoration of capitalism, on the shattered new revisionist currents.**

The deeper we look into the revisionist abyss, the more new revelations are revealed about the anti-Hoxhaist, anti-Stalinist, anti-Leninist and anti-Marxist crimes of the modern revisionists, **who are never detached from the entire anti-communist policy of world capitalism**, but must be regarded as a component of it, the easier it will be for us to get to the roots of modern revisionism in order to tackle and uproot the anti-Stalinism that has been sprouted in the herb, and to use it as fertilizer for the better growth of the future world socialism.

The more complete and profound our revelations about the crimes of the modern revisionists are, the more clearly the truth about Stalin comes to light. But with the truth about the **crimes of the modern revisionists** taken alone, no one is automatically convinced of Stalin's merits as the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, of the real, historical, lasting significance of the first socialist state for world communism. Only we World Bolsheviks can rework this on a Marxist-Leninist basis. **Nobody but us can and will raise and advance the Stalinist banner of the world socialist revolution.** It has been shown that the whole edifice of lies about Stalin did not automatically crumble to dust with the collapse of the power of the modern Soviet revisionists. On the contrary, the world bourgeoisie has ensured that the construct of lies, which the modern revisionists had once built up in cooperation with world imperialism in order to come to power, has nevertheless continued to exist and it knows best why. But the construct of lies about Stalin was not only painted

even blacker, but (!) its back doors were painted with even brighter red camouflage colors, in order to lure Stalinists themselves into it more easily so that they could get lost in it, die in it or better still: come out again as camouflaged, turned "Stalinists", as agents of counter-revolution against the Stalinists. **No anti-Stalinist is more valuable to the bourgeoisie in the struggle against Stalinism than a traitor within our Stalinist ranks "turned upside down" by the bourgeoisie.** Only with the help of such insidious tricks of sending agents into our own ranks does **anti-Stalinism have the possibility to penetrate into the Stalinist camp in order to turn it into a bourgeois camp from within, and otherwise to liquidate it.** All this is being done because Stalinism had once inflicted its most sensitive defeat on capitalism, and this despite thousands of counter-revolutionary conspiracies, murders, diversions and acts of espionage, despite military mass destruction, political, economic and ideological attempts to destroy Stalinist society, communism. Capitalism has tried for decades in vain to defeat communism by all means. And, when it finally succeeded with the help of the modern revisionists, it needed another **entire historical period** to transform socialism back into capitalism. So capitalism knows from its own painful experience: **there is no more serious danger for it than the successor generations of the Stalinists.** The world bourgeoisie is still very much afraid of us Stalinists and that is why it cannot afford to ever let up in the class struggle against Stalin. We Stalinists are the only ones who can take away the fear of Stalin from the world bourgeoisie, by helping the world proletariat to liberate itself from anti-Stalinism, from the rule of the world bourgeoisie and to establish the rule of the world proletariat which is crowned with the banner of Stalin.

After 1991, when history had sealed its judgement on the criminal truth of modern revisionism (socialism in words - capitalism in deeds), only a tiny minority in the public recognized Stalin and us Stalinists, the Marxist-Leninist World Movement and above all the world proletariat and last but not least the Soviet peoples as real victims of the revisionists' fairy tales. In other words, the year 1991 did not automatically lead to the rehabilitation of Stalin, to the rebirth of socialism on Soviet soil. On the contrary. The poison of anti-Stalinism is being administered further into the world proletariat in order to keep it from the path of its historical mission, to weaken its revolutionary forces. But just as counter-revolution cannot liquidate the world proletariat, it cannot eliminate Stalinism. **Without Stalin's teachings it is impossible to rebuild socialism today.**

Modern revisionism has consequently paved the way for this anti-Stalinist brainwashing, thus alienating all the more people of the former USSR from their true historical identity, but at a higher dialectical level the Soviet peoples will return to Stalin and identify with him again. The bourgeoisie and its lackeys must fear that, with the collapse of world capitalism, all their constructs of lies will inevitably collapse, including the construct of anti-Stalinism, and that they will eventually drown miserably in the anti-Stalinist maelstrom they themselves have created. **The more gigantic anti-Stalinism is built up, the deeper it falls into the abyss and the more thoroughly the world proletariat will be healed from it in the end, even if painfully.**

Those who had for decades placed themselves in the anti-Stalinist service of bourgeois ideology, in the service of modern revisionists, are now retraining themselves to continue their anti-Stalinism in the guise of "Stalinism" and thus to follow the tactic of "defeating" Stalinism with its own weapons. The anti-Stalinist revisionists, whom we have thrashed for more than 50 years, give themselves up in vain to the hope that they could be safe from our blows if they put themselves under our Stalin banner. Nothing there! Whoever dares to stand under our Stalin banner in the mad hope of driving us away from the Stalin banner will be struck down with our Stalin banner. Neither have we, nor will we let the Stalin banner be taken from our hands - never and by nobody! Just as we have learned from the deceptive maneuvers of the modern revisionists to distinguish Marxist-Leninists from "Marxist-Leninists", we also know how the revisionist "Stalinists" differ from us Stalinists, we will not fall into their trap but into ours, they will die miserably in it.

We will train the world proletariat what the so-called "Stalin question" is about, why and against whom the capitalists are so eager to clean up Stalin's "specter". In the class struggle itself, the world proletariat will gather its own experiences in order to better understand its enemies, who only try to pass themselves off as its "friends" because they want to keep the proletarians from their revolutionary liberation struggle against capitalism. In order to prevent the proletarians from appropriating the Stalinist doctrine of liberation from capitalism, the proletarians are supposed to appropriate the pseudo-"teachings" of Stalin which have been falsified, distorted and mutilated by the capitalists, doctored by them and distributed among the proletarians by their agents, which **sound "communist" and "genuinely Stalinist"** but which are supposed to prove **ineffective and harmless** in the struggle against the capitalists. Something is being sold to the workers as "Stalinism", which in reality is the exact opposite of Stalinism. The capitalists are paying a whole army of agents who are only concerned with how the capitalists can use the teachings of Stalin in a way that deceives and misleads the proletarians. **Those agents are especially well paid by the capitalists who manage to brand the Stalinists as dangerous "agents of capitalism" in the eyes of the proletarians and who can make themselves fondly known to the proletarians as "Stalinists"**. And the highest wages are paid by the capitalists to those agents who succeed in the trick of inciting the proletarians to stand up against the Stalinists "in the name of Stalin". But even if this trick cannot always be performed, the capitalists are already satisfied when they are represented within the Stalinist ranks with their agents, provide information about it, here and there secretly throw a spanner in the works, and secretly cause all kinds of pest work among the Stalinists and confusion in the interpretation of Stalin's teachings. **In a situation as precarious for world capitalism as in 1953, the capitalists were even able to get the entire presidency of the CPSU into their hands with the murder of Stalin in order to switch all socialist levers of power to capitalism, first in disguise, then openly.**

No matter what mask the revisionists try to disguise themselves with, we rip it off their faces. They have no choice but to gather regressive elements under their own "Stalinist" roofs in order to lead them as the 5th Column against us in the counter-revolutionary struggle. We will expose their true intentions and strike them on the head as soon as they dare to stick their "Stalinist" head out of their rat holes. Modern revisionism is far from being dead, it is waiting for its salvation, waiting for us to separate its head from its trunk. In the meantime, it is a real danger for us because it has the ability to shed itself, at least as long as capitalism gives it the strength to do so. Modern revisionism has not changed its nature, but the form in which it presents itself recently is just in contrast to earlier ones = "Stalinist" without giving up its old forms like "Leninist but anti-Stalinist" or "Marxist but not Leninist", "socialist but not Marxist"; "Stalinist but not Hoxhaist"; "5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism in words - anti-Marxism-Leninism in deeds"; etc.

The work and character of Stalin has outlasted 50 years of modern revisionism and will also outlast the next 50 years, will shine forever. The "cult of personality" accusation was not intended to alienate Stalin himself, but the revolutionary consciousness of the peoples, to shake and poison Stalinism. But more about this later.

Stalin placed his whole life unconditionally and consistently in the service of the cause of the proletariat. Never has the powerful red banner of the victorious socialist working class been carried so far across the globe as under Stalin. Never had the proletariat possessed greater power than under Stalin. Never has the proletariat led its class struggle against world capitalism more sharply and relentlessly than under Stalin. Never has world imperialism looked more miserable than under the blows of Stalin. Never has socialism reached such a high bloom, never has humanity been closer to communism than under Stalin. No wonder that it shook the capitalist world to the core and made Stalin the greatest and most terrible "enemy" in the history of mankind. Through Stalin, it was no longer the specter of communism that haunted Europe, but the actual reality of communism on one-sixth of the

world. Thanks to Stalin, the whole world was at the feet of the proletariat for the first time, there was really not much left and capitalism would have been wiped off the face of the earth.

This world historical reality created by Stalin left the bourgeoisie with the most severe trauma in its class history. To this day, therefore, with its chronic illness of anti-communism, it allergically reacts to everything that reminds it even remotely of communism, of Stalin. And although modern revisionism did not allow the bourgeoisie to maintain its power, to prolong the epoch of capitalism, to win the victory over communism without great sacrifices, the bourgeoisie still finds it difficult to continue to trust modern revisionism, especially since it now only has the possibility to hide behind the mask of "Stalinism". The bourgeoisie does not voluntarily agree to accept "Stalin" as a mask, because it risks contributing to the rebirth of Stalinism itself, but the bourgeoisie has no other choice. Beggars can't be choosers! The bourgeoisie will therefore have to beware, in the interest of self-preservation, of abandoning its tactics of beating communism with its own weapons. It has grown old and weak and needs its garment of "communism" all the more today because if it cannot ward off the return of communism this time, its fate is sealed forever. **In the face of a socialist country, the world bourgeoisie had one more chance to survive, it knows that world communism means its final downfall.** The struggle for Stalin will therefore have to be brought to an end today in the Second Period of socialism. The defeat must be turned into a victory. Modern revisionism has proved to be a lie and deceit in the eyes of the workers who trusted it. The bourgeoisie is therefore forced to replace its old double tactic against Stalinism with a new one. And it is precisely this **renewed, even more mendacious** bourgeois counter-revolutionary double tactic of anti-Stalinism must be crushed in the revolutionary struggle for Stalin by a **World Bolshevik tactic of the world proletariat.**

Let's take the alleged "crimes" that Stalin is said to have committed, which have been reissued again and again. If crimes have been committed, and bad crimes (against the **communists!!**) have been committed, they are not on the account of Stalin and communism, but on the account of the bourgeoisie and capitalism, who try to blame their own crimes on Stalin. If there were crimes "in the name of socialism", then they were the insidious crimes of the enemies against socialism. These are the crimes of the capitalists and their lackeys: "Stalinist crimes against socialism in words, but capitalist crimes against Stalinist socialism in deeds!" **This is the definition of the nature of the crimes of the modern revisionists, the lackeys of world imperialism against Stalin.**

The world rulers possess the material power and therefore possess the spiritual weapons against the world proletariat, they possess the global power of anti-communism, the global power of anti-Stalinism, the global power of what is and what is not a "Stalinist" crime, or what is or is not to be considered a "Stalinist crime". **Only in the eyes of exploiters and oppressors is the liberation from exploitation and oppression, is communism a "crime". And vice versa: in the eyes of the exploited and oppressed, the capitalist and his exploiting system is criminal. In this respect, it is not Stalin who is a criminal, but his political opponents are.** The "crime" is not a class concept in itself, only the different classes give it their correspondingly opposite meaning. **Before one can even speak of "crime", one must clarify its class-specific meaning, because in a class society there are no crimes that are committed "above" the classes, not even in the socialist class society, not even in the Stalin Era.** They are not "personal crimes" of Stalin, but crimes against capitalism, which are justified as long as they have been committed in the interest of the proletariat liberating itself from capitalism. Communist morality does not consider crimes against the bourgeoisie to be immoral and unethical, but for liberation from capitalism, for liberation from all class rule, as inevitable and therefore necessary, as morally justified. Crimes are always defined on the basis of the morality and legality of the respective class society, which are inevitable in the antagonistic class struggle, which are imposed on the classes in order to enforce and defend their interests. The very essence of antagonistic class struggle is that it is irreconcilable, that is, the death of one class means the death of the other class. **It is clear why the bourgeoisie *must* criminalize**

the class struggle of the proletariat, because the proletariat is the gravedigger of the bourgeoisie. But this does not quite get to the heart of the matter. Bourgeois crimes differ from the proletarian "crimes" in one crucial point: **The world proletariat is not only the only class that eliminates the crimes of the exploiting and oppressing classes, but the entire class society itself and therefore every crime that is committed by people against people.** However, if the revolutionary struggle against the crimes of counter-revolution is condemned as a "crime", then we Stalinists will be accused of these "crimes" until the world proletariat has ended the crimes of ruling world capitalism with the victorious world socialist revolution. It is exactly this way that the world proletariat creates the basis for the realization of its final goal: to eradicate from the face of the earth forever the crimes of class to class, the crimes by people against people.

Where Marxism-Leninism reigns, revisionism is powerless, the crimes against the working class, against the laboring masses will be eliminated!

The Berianists and the Khrushchevites had to admit that "they were powerless" as long as Stalin was alive and this is a historical fact which we Marxist-Leninists all start from. When the enemy admits his powerlessness in the face of the power of Stalinism, it becomes clear why so much effort is needed to protect itself from Stalinism and especially from its revival, from newly emerging Stalinists, from the renaissance of the Stalin Era. The biggest obstacle on the way to revisionist power was the character and role of Stalin under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Only after they had assassinated Stalin did they succeed in their coup and the revisionist Soviet leaders were able to occupy and expand position by position. The further they dared to distance themselves from Marxism-Leninism, the more obvious their betrayal became and also their crime, whose unmasking we owe above all to the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, Comrade Enver Hoxha. His revelations were finally confirmed with the end of revisionist rule and the dissolution of the Soviet Union. The more openly the revisionists progressed on their capitalist path, the less it could be concealed that the truth about their crimes leaked to the light of day through documents and contemporary witnesses. Some admitted their crimes themselves, some took them to their graves, and others admitted the crimes of their predecessors, especially the crimes of the key revisionist Khrushchev. He played the leading role in the struggle of modern revisionism against Marxism-Leninism. We have already written in our German-language article ["50 Years of Struggle against Modern Revisionism"](#) in great detail and on a large scale about what the text published here follows without any gaps:

In short, Khrushchev's modern revisionism and the revisionism of today's neo-revisionists differ in that the former was forced to beat Stalinism with "Leninism", while the latter now had to slip into various garments of "Stalinism" (garments from "left" [Trotskyites, Berianists etc.] to right [National Bolsheviks]), because we tore the "Leninist" mask off his face and he can no longer hide behind it. This article is therefore primarily directed against the skinned modern revisionism, against neo-revisionism, against globalized revisionism, against revisionism with a Stalinist mask, and also against Berianism.

Modern revisionism in the Soviet Union served the new Soviet bourgeoisie as the ideological basis of the transition period from socialism back to capitalism. But the lessons of our defeat in the struggle against modern revisionism will serve the transition to world socialism (negation of the negation of anti-revisionism). Capitalism is a reality in Russia today and all revisionist talk of socialism has burst like a soap bubble because of this historical fact. We Stalinists were right when we tore the mask off the modern revisionists. Revisionism leads to capitalism. With the opening of the party archives our Marxist-Leninist predictions can be proved and confirmed entirely.

For us Stalinists, the documentation of the struggle against the revisionists' putschist seizure of

power had been blocked for decades by their **cover-up and falsification tactics**, but this had not prevented our faith in Stalin, but only strengthened it even more. **The more and the more cleverly the cover-up is carried out, the more and the more cleverly it is cleared up. Do the revisionists want to doubt that?** This strengthened our efforts to lift the revisionist veil of Stalin's final period, to give ourselves an ever more objective and concrete picture of the events of that time and to draw the right conclusions: It turned out that the parasitic, revisionist worm had eaten its way much deeper into socialist society than we could have imagined, and that, in retrospect, we have to assess Stalin's final purging, although it ended in defeat, all the more highly and significantly politically. But we do not go as far as Bill Bland, who put forward the "thesis that the revisionists were in power since 1934". We have learned a lot from Stalin, but we can learn most from his struggle just before his death. Here he proved his greatest strength, his greatest experience, his greatest mastery. **Neo-revisionism here means concretely nothing else but to acknowledge in words the anti-revisionist struggle of Stalin in its final stage, in order to hide behind it the real continuation of revisionism. Neo-revisionism is the continuation of revisionism with new means, with the means of a feigned "anti-revisionist" struggle.**

Modern revisionism was the gravedigger of the First Period of socialism. Capitalism knows that it will not have enough coffin nails to prevent the resurrection of Stalin in the Second Period of socialism. Therefore, the lackeys of world capitalism are intensively engaged in creating a new bourgeois "image" of Stalinism in order to continue the camouflaged struggle against the resurgence of Stalinism, **to fight Stalin and the Stalinists with the weapons of "Stalin" and the "Stalinists". It was precisely for this purpose that Berianism was forced to make use of Beria's invisibility cloak, which had proved to be useful, because the "Leninist" cloak of invisibility of the Khrushchevites had been torn down by us. In this respect one can also speak of a Berianist skinning of Khrushchevite revisionism.**

But it was not Beria, but Stalin who was the **greatest master of the illegal Bolshevik struggle. He himself was the greatest master of covering up traces against the class enemy, naturally in the interest of the revolution (in Beria's case, it was in the interest of counter-revolution)**, and Stalin thereby rendered an invaluable service to the cause of the world proletariat, to communism. Stalin's method was as follows: **"Revelation" is best method to cover up secrets" and Beria copied this from him and used it against Stalin. And that's how it was.** To this day the world bourgeoisie had no other choice than to fish in the mud and suck any horror stories about Stalin out of their fingers. And the more the world bourgeoisie gets entangled in its own lies, the more unbelievable it becomes in the eyes of the world proletariat, the sooner it will go under with its agitation against Stalin, the more the truth will come to light. It is the enlightened, revolutionary masses who help the truth in history, the truth about Stalin, to break through and create historical facts.

What we can now contribute to historical illumination remains relatively limited. We still lack the last word. But we have come a little bit closer to the truth again, and this is a small victory that can no longer be taken away from us. Ultimately, it will only be possible to uncover everything completely when the working class in Russia is back in power and has sole possession of the historical documents, at least of all those documents that have not yet been destroyed. And it is precisely in order to prevent this from happening that the truth about Stalin, the truth about the crimes of the revisionists, will of course be further obscured, distorted and falsified by the Russian bourgeoisie now in power, though only in a different way, to prevent the inevitable period of re-Stalinization that is about to begin. But it is this, in turn, that helps us to fight even more intensively for a clearer and deeper understanding of the teachings of Stalin, the teachings of Marxism-Leninism (parallel to the politics of the StaSi archive).

In essence, nothing has changed of anti-Stalinism in Russia to this day, only the methods have been

adapted to the changing circumstances to successfully avert the danger of a new October Revolution, a new Soviet Union in the spirit of Lenin and Stalin, which has **learned from its mistakes**. Nevertheless, we Marxist-Leninists can, to a limited extent and with limited means, look over the shoulders of the bourgeoisie when they have reopened the files closed by the modern revisionists. Above all, however, we must examine ourselves on the basis of the documents that have been disclosed, we must check whether these documents are genuine or forged, whether our previous assessment was correct, whether and what we can learn from it, whether we need to rework and revise our previous views, etc., all exclusively from the perspective of Marxism-Leninism, of course. We must not judge according to our subjective wishes and ideas, we must not gloss over anything or cover up anything. **A new body of evidence is always a touchstone for every true historian, who must also be prepared to admit to earlier misinterpretations if hitherto inaccessible files prove to be irrefutable contemporary documents.** However, it is not as simple as all that, we are not fooling ourselves: To date, there will be enough documents that have already been forged again, and there are certainly plenty of documents that remain under lock and key, which could be dangerous to the Russian bourgeoisie of today. Many documents remain "missing" or are incomplete. Above all, we must address the following circumstances, the conditions dictated by the class struggle at that time: **During the Stalin Era, there was no small number of undocumented orders which were under the highest level of secrecy, "exclusively oral" orders.** And in some secret actions no traces whatsoever were allowed to be left behind to protect against the access of the class enemy. Under the conditions of the intensified class struggle in his own country, it was inevitable for Stalin to work with sham documents in order to cover up traces before the enemy even in his own ranks. **Our deliberate disinformation in documents is a means of unsettling and misleading the enemy, so that they do things for us which they are supposed to believe are in their "own" interest, that is, directed against us. With the disinformation we launch, the counter-revolution does what we want it to do, we make it our tool.** It was precisely the war successes against Hitlerite fascism that Churchill admired in Stalin. It was particularly clever to mix disinformation with coherent facts in order to increase the credibility of disinformation. **Disinformation is not only an effective attack, but also an extremely effective defensive weapon of the proletariat. Stalin masterfully used this weapon, especially in the Great Patriotic War.**

The question of the form and content of documents that appear today must be examined by the Party, in the interests of the working class. The class question must not be left out. The secret services themselves were under secret surveillance. Even the surveillance of the surveillance had to be monitored in order to be able to take the struggle against the restoration of capitalism to the deepest depths. Most comrades still have to learn to use these Stalinist methods against the class enemy.

We must continue to expect that today's revisionists have of course "helped" the bourgeoisie in sifting, selecting and evaluating documents and will continue to do so, especially on the question of Berianism, which we have put on the agenda. After August 1991 a real "**run**" on the documents began, the looting of the archives was a "booming" business.

Whoever has material power, even over historical documents, will use, falsify, manipulate or make them disappear in the interest of maintaining material power. In the class struggle, which is carried out with and through "historical" documents, one uses perfected methods of cover-up and manipulation, **globalized methods of disinformation class struggle as they are used today in the world imperialist war of plunder.** The results in, and how could it be otherwise, all kinds of things, but not to a rehabilitation of Stalin but on the contrary, the image of "Stalin's reign of terror" was painted as being even more "documentary", "more realistic", more "convincing". To come across newly discovered "historical" documents today means **entering a minefield where every misstep, every misinterpretation, can mean the most serious injuries and even political death.**

We therefore commit ourselves not to make hasty statements and draw false conclusions under any circumstances. We remain true to the principle of criticism and self-criticism in the evaluation and assessment of newly emerging document, for they could be a trap. We must not fall for the bourgeois sensationalist media with their secretly controlled "revelation mania", we must not let ourselves be led up the garden path, we must rely on our own Marxist-Leninist power of judgement, we must delve further into the study of Stalin's teachings and life, we must better analyze the actual conditions in socialist society before and after Stalin's death. That is why this text is intended to help stimulate discussion. But caution does not mean retreating into the snail's shell, for fear of getting caught in the nettles of one's enemies with misinterpretations or embarrassing oneself in front of friends. When we have learned to deal, we must also learn to take! We have to stand up for our mistakes ourselves. We cannot cheat others out of them, as Beria's political life was.

If new insights emerge from history, we are obliged to evaluate them, even at the risk of making mistakes and following the wrong tracks. Only those who revolutionize historiography can develop it further and thus make it useful for the world revolution. The defense of Stalin is still an indispensable and responsible task of all Marxist-Leninists. This requires great prudence and care, but also partiality and firmness of principle (not to be confused with sectarianism, dogmatism and personality cult, for these are **bourgeois** notions of partiality and firmness of principle). Most of the work is still ahead of us. At the moment we are not able to deal with the revisionist takeover of power and anti-Stalinism (**including any form of anti-Stalinism, which tries to mask itself with alleged "Stalinism"!!!**) of the modern revisionists by studying the newly published documents to the necessary extent. This task can be accomplished only with highly qualified, well-organized Marxist-Leninist forces. And they must be trained. There is one thing we must always pay attention to:

Any assessment of the documents on the events just before and after Stalin's death, which is not done from the point of view of class struggle, is false, anti-Marxist, seriously damages the cause of socialism, benefits the enemies of socialism and is directed against the interests of the working class and socialism. That is what Comrade Enver Hoxha taught us.

The history of modern revisionism in the Soviet Union is the history of covering up the crimes of the revisionist leaders, who are nothing else but criminals against the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin. The history of revisionist cover-up of the truth about Stalin is the history of one of the greatest crimes against communism. We therefore call upon all true Stalinists from all over the world to participate in the educational work independently and on their own responsibility and to inform us about the results of their work so that we can collect, publish and discuss them. We must help each other to uncover the truth about Stalin more and more, in order to build a dam against the disinformation flood of the rulers of this world. Comrades, do you realize that anti-Stalinism is still the biggest obstacle for us communists to win the world proletariat for communism? The complete and truthful exposure of the historical cover-ups and falsifications of the revisionists is a struggle for our Comrade Stalin! We would be bad Stalinists if we do not finish our struggle against anti-Stalinism with all our energy, for we owe it to Comrade Stalin and the cause he served in an exemplary way!

We must put an end to opportunism against Stalinism. Let us not be infected by the disease called fearing the truth about Stalin. There is only one line, the world revolutionary line of the Bolsheviks, the line of Stalin. All other lines are in fact anti-Communist lines.

Our struggle for the truth about Stalin is a struggle for the winning, organizing and mobilization of the world revolutionary proletariat, is a struggle for its ideological armament with Marxism-Leninism, in whose further development Stalin had a great share. Stalin

belongs to the world proletariat. Without having completely re-conquered Stalin, without tearing out the deeply ingrained anti-Stalinism of world reaction from the heads of the workers, the world proletariat will not be able to liberate itself from world capitalism, there will be no victorious world proletarian revolution for the world proletariat, there will be no new world proletarian Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin, which has learned from the crimes of modern revisionism and has completely overcome it.

Stalinism can neither be "de-Stalinized", "Stalinized", nor "re-Stalinized"!

We have extensively dealt with Stalin's **first creative period** in the Caucasus and now we want to move on to his last period of struggle immediately before his death, without losing sight of the **current subject of Georgia**.

This Georgian period, which runs from 1912 to 1913, was chosen, it should be noted, only because we are concerned here with Stalin's homeland, with his first historical place of activity in connection with current events in the Transcaucasus, in Georgia. And this is also where the trail of Berianism [Beria was Mingrelian] begins, which must be followed until 1953 and beyond. However, this division of time must not be misinterpreted politically. **If we say that in this period one must learn from Stalin's fight against opportunism in order to win, then the wrong conclusion must not be drawn from this that one could "confidently do without" Stalin's experiences and lessons in the fight against his opportunistic enemies after the years 1912-1913. With the character of Beria we can follow the whole Stalinist struggle against opportunism. The years in the Caucasus were Stalin's apprenticeship years of the fight against opportunism. Stalin became a master in the fight against opportunism only afterwards, in Russia. Beria's apprenticeship years also began in the Caucasus. He only became a master in the fight against Stalin in Russia. And the fight against Stalin also brought him back to the Caucasus. These two lines of development of Stalin and Beria do not overlap purely by chance, but have remained linked to Georgia to the death.**

If one wants to master the fight against opportunism, one cannot avoid studying not only the years of Stalin's apprenticeship, but above all his mastery years. The Stalinists must always learn from the entire period of Stalin's creative work, must study the historical blows that Stalin dealt to the opportunists in context, in their history of development. This is especially true of his very last blow, which he dealt to the revisionist party enemies, especially Beria. The literature on this period on the part of the Marxist-Leninists has, as already mentioned in the preface, remained quite thin, which is not least due to the sustainability of the revisionist influence in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement. It makes sense to compare and relate Stalin's first blows with his last battle, in order to better understand both the significance of Stalin's first battles in Georgia and his final battles against his enemies, which also lead back to the Caucasus (Beria's Mingrelian Affair). Stalin's purge period against the Berianist enemies of the Party in Georgia in 1950/51 must not be ignored at all if one wants to understand how the bourgeoisie came to power in the Soviet Union. In the struggle against its own revisionist degeneration, the CPSU (B) under Stalin's leadership in 1950-1952 drew important lessons, especially from his Caucasus period, in the struggle against the subversive activities of the Mensheviks. Few comrades are likely to know that Stalin had fought intensively against the Mensheviks until his death, especially against the Mensheviks who, as Georgian emigrants,

organized their nationalist subversive work in the CP of Georgia in order to take action from Georgia against Lenin's and Stalin's Soviet Union, and against Stalin himself. **There were covert anti-Soviet activities by Georgian emigrants financed by Western governments and business enterprises, and under Beria's leadership of the Moscow conspirators of 1953. In Georgia, shortly before his death, Stalin defended the internationalism of the Bolsheviks against anti-Soviet nationalism, against the Menshevik spirit of the Second International, which the Anglo-American imperialists had harnessed to their carts. For Stalin, this struggle formed a dialectical unity against Western cosmopolitanism and Soviet great power chauvinism, both of which inevitably caused the rise of nationalism in the border regions. If anti-Soviet nationalism in the Caucasus was dismantled, the instruments of cosmopolitanism and Russian great power chauvinism against the USSR and especially against its revolutionary center in Moscow were also destroyed.** For Stalin, these were two sides of the same coin, to turn the Cold War that had begun, which was waged from within and without against the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin, and which was directed against the socialist revolution and communism throughout the world, into a victory for communism.

The images of Stalin before and after the seizure of power by the Bolsheviks and Stalin before the seizure of power by the modern revisionists are the images of Stalin that is to be presented here in this article in connection with the events in Georgia, in the early 1950s and today. The criticism of Beria plays a central role in this. **The story of Stalin is the glorious story of his lifelong struggle against his internal enemies, against the opportunists who first tried to thwart the conquest of the Bolsheviks' power and then, when they were defeated, began to overthrow the Bolsheviks' power with the support of the external enemies, and who finally achieved their goal of transforming the Soviet Union into a bourgeois state, despite the bitter resistance that Stalin had put up against them. In particular, he called upon his "Old Bolshevik Guard", whom Enver Hoxha aptly called "corpses of Bolshevism", Molotov, Kaganovich, Voroshilov, etc., to go to work just like old times and to fight against skinned Menshevism, modern revisionism, without compromise and with the feared hardness and iron discipline of the Old Bolsheviks, and to face this struggle to the death. But they capitulated under the pressure of the enemies from within and without, adopting a conciliatory and centrist stance and moving further and further away from Bolshevism. His so-called "comrades-in-arms" had now used the "cult of personality" tactic against him with a retinue of their apparatchiks in the ministries and in the Party. The loudest "Stalin" shouted and above all those who most insidiously flattered Stalin were his worst and most dangerous enemies, his conspirators and murderers. With the death of the Fourth Classic of Marxism-Leninism, the revisionist conspirators and rulers also brought about the death of the Soviet Union, the first socialist country in the world.**

Many lessons of this struggle of the CPSU against opportunism were already written down by Stalin in 1938 in the "History of the CPSU (B) - Short Course". And even this "Short Course" was Stalin's product of a sharp struggle against the Trotskyite distortions and falsifications of the role of Lenin and the Bolshevik Party (Stalin's criticism of Slutsky, Yaroslavsky, etc.). **At all party congresses, especially the most recent 19th Party Congress, calls were made for the struggle against the danger of the restoration of capitalism in the USSR, binding party resolutions were passed on this, which had to be implemented in a disciplined manner. But all this was ignored, especially after Stalin's death, and was thrown overboard, twisted and distorted, as the anti-party groups within the CPSU needed it to take over revisionist power and transform proletarian into bourgeois socialism in the name of "Leninism".**

The **direct frontal assault** on Stalin and his teachings was not dared by the Khrushchevite revisionists until three years after his death, until the 20th Congress in 1956. After 70 years it was still the **standard work** for the Comintern (ML), **but it still has to be completed until Stalin's death**, because the history of the CPSU [B] as a Marxist-Leninist party does not end in 1938, but

only with the year 1953). In the Party history of the revisionists, Stalin did not appear by name until the October Revolution. His role in the Civil War and his appointment as secretary general in 1922 as well as the speech at Lenin's grave were ignored. All of Stalin's writings, which had been exuberantly praised by the revisionists at the previous 19th Party Congress, including the "Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R." (which Stalin had directed **against them!**), could no longer be mentioned from then on and fell victim to censorship. Stalin's writings were banned not only in the Soviet Union but also in the revisionist countries of the Eastern Bloc. The reissue and distribution of his Collected Works by the KPD/ML was at that time a slap in the face of the revisionists!

The former Bloc of the Right and Trotskyites in the fight against Stalin and its revival and continuation by the common front of neo-Trotskyites and neo-revisionists in the fight against Marxist-Leninists.

We want to prevent misunderstandings and point out the danger that a division of Stalin's life and work entails. Thus the method of historical division is a popular hobbyhorse of Trotskyism and modern revisionism to play one period off against another and use it as a justification for Stalin's condemnation. Our brief description of the period of Stalin's struggle, which we had re-drawn, the time at Lenin's side is played down by the anti-Stalinists more or less as a barely "acceptable prehistory of the dictator". The time shortly before and shortly after Lenin's death, however, is "self-critically" interpreted by the anti-Stalinists as the "underestimation of the danger of Stalin's abuse of power that was recognized too late", after Lenin is supposed to have warned of Stalin's "sole rule" in an alleged "letter". **All** anti-Stalinists, including Khrushchev, later referred to this. This point in time is dated as the "turning point". The fight against Trotskyism, the "leftist" opportunism of the 1920s is already considered a "personal transgression of power" and from 1929, "autocratic power". But at the latest with the purges in the mid 1930s, "where Stalin had decidedly gone too far", the actual "period of Stalin's reign of terror" begins for the anti-Stalinists. It should therefore come as no surprise that the opponents of Stalin within the ranks of the party were not particularly interested in publishing Stalin's works after 1934. With Volume 13, the flagpole was reached for them. In reality, however, they thought they had an easier time with this clumsy trick, only to pour buckets of manure over Stalin after his death. But Stalin proved Bolshevik irreconcilability towards the enemies of socialism until his death. He smashed the Bukharinite-Trotskyite gang of spies, parasites and murderers who were in the service of the spy organs of capitalist states and thwarted their plans to transform the Soviet Union into a colony of world imperialism and restore capitalist slavery. It is clear that the opponents of Stalin were foaming with rage and made him the target of their slander.

It was easiest for the people who wanted to bury the "historical fossil" without comment: "Whoever Stalin may have been, he was in any case a personality of his time and only useful as a deterrent example for today. It is therefore not worthwhile to deal with his views. He had abused Marxism far too much and Stalinism is therefore not worth dealing with it at all. The Stalinists of today are incorrigible, poor lunatics who are so blind that they no longer recognize the signs of the times, that they are incorrigibly pigheaded in their ideology and cannot admit to themselves that they have long since lost their game and are now drowning in loneliness. Stalinism is useless today, least of all Marxism."

Well, not all anti-Stalinists are so crude. More dangerous are those who cleverly hide their anti-Stalinism behind "sympathies towards Stalin" but don't want to know anything about Stalinism. **They try to separate the figure of Stalin from Stalinism in order to graft his figure onto their own political ideas.** They fill the figure of Stalin with characteristics attributed to him, supposedly to prove that he was everything **but a Marxist-Leninist**. Conversely, there are those who supposedly defend him as a Marxist-Leninist, but who attribute to him qualities that are incompatible with Marxism-Leninism, that is, in reality, directed against Marxism-Leninism. **All**

these different trends of people are cooking their own anti-Stalinist soup with the name "Stalin". There is a huge spectrum of disguised anti-Stalinists, which we cannot present here in all details. **They all share the illusory common goal - the de--Stalinization of Stalin**. Let us select an anti-Stalinist group that deserves our greatest "praise" for disguising itself with Stalin in order to remain unrecognized:

There are those who accuse Stalin in his last phase of struggle of not having recognized the danger of modern revisionism "clearly enough", of having not fought it "sufficiently", of "not" having the consistent break with the modern revisionists made and not chasing them out "in time", of having proved to be "too weak" and of having "not consistently let himself be guided by Marxism-Leninism" etc., capitulated in the struggle against the restoration of capitalism, retreated into isolation and was a prisoner of his own country, etc. The fact is that the modern revisionists conquered power by murdering him. But drawing the conclusion that Stalin of all people helped them from this is crazy speculation, which of course nobody can prove with facts. The "critics" of Stalin do not even dare to express this "criticism" openly, for this is what they hide behind their "Stalinist" phrases. They have learned from the modern revisionists that Stalin can only be beaten with the weapons of Stalin and they must be extremely careful to not be exposed!

They dare to indirectly deny or disparage Stalin's merits in the struggle against modern revisionism, only to put themselves on the pedestal of the most "determined" fighters "against" modern revisionism. They want to overtake Stalin and "teach" us Marxist-Leninists about the struggle against revisionism, want to keep us from the allegedly too weak anti-revisionist General Line of Stalin, in reality they want a **type of "anti-revisionism" which heals the wounds of revisionism**. Don't they know or don't they want to know that quite a number of modern revisionists had already been **liquidated** by Stalin, that **further death sentences** of Stalin had already been listed (among them members of the Presidium of the CPSU!), that he had already started to execute the death sentences and that the modern revisionists in the Presidium knew about their death sentence, so they knew what was going to happen to them? **That Stalin was the Bolshevik world leader in the fight against modern revisionism until the end** can be proved by these very deeds (not only against Tito but also within his own ranks!) and not only by Stalin's last writings, which by far not all have been published, whereby these "friends" of Stalin can of course continue to fish in the mud!! **We Stalinists will not buy goods from the anti-Stalinist smugglers! We will not allow them to falsify the life work of Stalin against the restoration of capitalism, the history of Stalin, the history of the Bolshevik Party in the "interest" of Stalin, in the "interest" of the history of the Bolshevik Party! Whoever directs water to the mills of the falsifiers of Stalin's history will not be given any room in our ranks for such "discussions"**.

Stalin **began** the fight against **Menshevism** in the **Caucasus** and continued it there permanently. It would therefore be wrong to assume that the fight against Beria had brought him back to the Caucasus only shortly before his death. In the course of the years Stalin came across a changed Menshevism, a **skinned Menshevism**. **This was a much more complicated struggle against the already defeated Menshevism, as it was still ruling Georgia in its early days, because now it was secretly "in the midst of us"**. It had become a Menshevism that sucked its parasitic power out of flourishing socialist Georgia to grow into a menacing danger for the whole Soviet Union. The Mensheviks were no longer allowed to be seen in public in Georgia during the Stalin Era and had therefore had to put on a "Stalinist" coat, which they now burst out from. They had now become powerful and influential "Stalinist" Mensheviks, and Mensheviks like Beria used them to regain the power lost to the Bolsheviks and finally drive Bolshevism out of Georgia. Menshevism in Georgia was the "socialist tribute" to its social-democratic forebears in the West. Beria wanted to sell the socialist prosperity of the Georgian people, built up in the struggle against Menshevism, off to the West. Beria was the main enemy of the socialist Georgian people, and was in the service of the world imperialist enslavement of Georgia, as

we will see in the chapter on the Mingrelian Conspiracy.

Other people created the legend of the first "good" (the revolutionary Stalin) and then "evil" Stalin (the dictator Stalin). This is a typical pattern of division which the bourgeoisie imposes on all communist leaders. Revolutionaries who were persecuted by the ruling bourgeoisie are admired as resistance fighters. The same revolutionaries, however, once they had conquered power and now in turn persecuted the bourgeoisie, are painted on the wall of the reign of terror.

Even Gorbachev admitted that without the proletarian Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin there would not have been such a later bourgeois-socialist Soviet Union, that the newly emerging bourgeoisie could never have begun its triumphal march without the proletariat and its dictatorship, without the defense of the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War, without Stalin. But Stalin is not the forefather of a Soviet imperialist superpower as Beria needed him, he is not the founder of the bourgeois dictatorship in the Soviet Union, the father of the social-imperialist superpower. Stalin belongs to the world proletariat and not to the new Russian bourgeoisie! And Lenin-Stalinist Bolshevism is not the original source which the radicalized petty-bourgeois national Bolsheviks draw from, but capitalism. **Lenin and Stalin based their teachings on Marxism, on the internationalism of the world proletariat and nothing else!** We do not allow any discussion on whether Lenin's Bolshevism was Marxist or not. Nor do we allow any discussion on whether Stalinist Bolshevism was Leninist or not. We do not discuss at the expense of the very interests of World Bolshevism, which are rooted in Leninist Bolshevism, which are rooted in Marxism-Leninism.

Today, Russia and Albania are the only two capitalist states in the world which have emerged from a socialist state and of course all the other capitalist states in the world have not forgotten this and they will not forget it, especially not the USA which is still the anti-communist center of world reaction.

However, since the military incorporation of the Soviet Union in the Second World War failed at that time and instead a further spread, consolidation and development of socialism followed, every bucket of dung that was poured over Stalin meant a further consolidation of the connection of the party of Lenin and Stalin with the people of Soviet society, a consolidation of the connection between the world proletariat and the oppressed peoples with the newly emerging socialist camp. **Anti-Stalinism polarizes the forces of Stalinism.** The enemies of Stalin, who were identical with the enemies of the Soviet Union and communism, had no other choice but to **try to beat Stalin "in the name of Stalin"**, among other things with the help of the "cult of personality" which was spread especially by the group of Khrushchev, Beria, etc. The path of the restoration of capitalism therefore had to be forced into the guise of the character and teachings of Stalin, which Stalin saw through. And as long as Stalin was alive, the attempt of the saboteurs also failed. Just think of the Stalin's work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.". This was a targeted blow against the restoration of capitalism! At the 19th Party Congress, from October 5th to 14th 1952, he made his last speech in front of his revisionist enemies who were in the Presidency. Shortly after the Party Congress, he settled accounts with the restorers of capitalism and put them in their place, including Khrushchev. Khrushchev was reprimanded at the 19th Party Congress, for his propagation of "agrocities" as an example. Already in the spring of 1951 he was reprimanded for this in the "Pravda". If one takes a look at Malenkov's report on the accounts, the amendments to the statute of the CPSU (B) by Khrushchev, the contribution to the discussion by Bulganin, the report by Saburov on the Five-Year Plan, etc., at the 19th Party Congress, it makes you vomit, because their demonstrative "loyalty to and unity with Stalin" at the 19th Party Congress was a single lie, a single hypocrisy, as they themselves publicly admitted after his death and finally proved it in criminal acts. You have to look closely to see that the modern revisionists were **already heading for their treacherous course in the presence of Stalin!** But it was **not even a week after Stalin's death** when they began to

crawl out of their hypocritical and double-tongued holes, where, as leaders of modern revisionism, they openly embarked on the path of restoration, with the consequences known today. They separated economy from politics, strengthened the economy while compromising the political goals of socialism, etc. We will have to go into this in more detail. In short:

The revisionists hid behind the cardboard façade of the "personality cult" they had erected themselves at the 19th Congress, which they officially dropped at the following 20th Congress to hide behind their new "Leninist" cardboard sign. A "de-Stalinization" by means of an open, abrupt and immediate break with Marxism-Leninism was at that time almost impossible, so that the revisionists finally had to use Lenin to "punish" their "scapegoat" Stalin. The revisionists of the USSR made Khrushchev their leader in the so-called "de-Stalinization".

Khrushchevism, that is the bourgeois revisionism of Stalinism using the counter-revolutionary slogan: "With Lenin against Stalin". The Soviet revisionists in power thus took a decisive step towards the bourgeois revision of Marxism-Leninism with "de-Stalinization". Soviet revisionism means bourgeois misappropriation of Marxism-Leninism for the exploitation and oppression of the restored exploited classes of workers and peasants in capitalism, means wage slavery and capitalist bondage under the banner of "Marxism-Leninism". (National Bolshevism in turn uses the banner of "Lenin and Stalin" in its counter-revolutionary struggle against Marxism, against world socialism, against the proletarian internationalism of Lenin and Stalin's USSR).

These were already more highly developed forms of class struggle, which had to be developed from lower forms, which at some point were no longer applicable, and eventually replaced them. It was not only important that the class struggle in socialism had to be waged against people who openly or covertly tried to abolish it or against people who wanted to abuse or misuse it, but that its forms and contents were further developed at a higher level, that is, against the "socialists" who either consciously and covertly inhibited the development of socialism or deliberately anticipated it, both are harmful forms which the class struggle had to be waged against at a higher level. And it is easier to fight against capitalism and its remnants with an open visor than against lagging or advancing "comrades" who were not willing or able to adapt their ideas and actions to the laws of the development of socialism and Marxism-Leninism and who, with their "Stalinist" invisibility cloak, caused much more damage to the further development of socialist society than capitalism could ever have done.

There were comrades who were once outstanding class fighters under capitalism, were Stalin's best and most loyal comrades-in-arms, but in the class struggle of socialist society they failed the moment the capitalist remnants were *already eliminated* under socialism. They failed in the class struggle of socialist society at the moment when Stalin had to fight against the bureaucratization of the socialist classes, against the formation of a new privileged layer, against the emergence of a new "socialist" bourgeoisie, against the degeneration of socialism from within, no longer only against the danger, but against the actually advancing restoration of capitalism itself.

There were also comrades who carried out a heroic anti-fascist struggle at Stalin's side and defeated the most savage and murderous hordes of fascist great powers in the Great Patriotic War, but they failed in the following *Cold War*, where it was about the continuation of the world revolutionary struggle with all means against the entire "civilized", "liberated from fascism", "democratic" world imperialism, with the USA at the head. They failed in the struggle for the victory of the socialist world camp over the capitalist world camp.

And there were comrades again, who were the greatest heroes and pioneers in the construction phase of socialism, builders of a strong Soviet Union, but when the Soviet Union was again strengthened after the war, these comrades did not understand that the conditions for the achievement of communism had matured now and that one had to advance to new shores of communism much further and make new sacrifices. These comrades had either become tired or self-sufficient, or they wanted to be satisfied with what they had achieved, with their "career", their luxuries, etc., and not to advance to the next sacrificial stage of communism. The most difficult task for Comrade Stalin was to give these comrades, whose internationalist élan was in danger of fading, whose revolutionary spirit was gradually exhausted, whose consciousness as the vanguard of the more developed working class left more and more to be desired, to talk into the conscience of these comrades, to demote them if necessary and to make a new cadre selection for the energetic implementation of his General Line. He was directly occupied with mastering even this most difficult task even at the age of 73 when his "closest comrades in arms" conspired against him and secretly murdered him. Such extremely intensified forms of class struggle only emerge with the higher forms of development of socialism and even today, the mysterious circumstances of the murder of Stalin and many communist leaders in the Soviet Union and in the people's democracies, even the murder of Enver Hoxha in socialist Albania, have not been cleared up, the criminal murder gangs of the modern revisionists have succeeded in letting their bloody trail disappear behind a wall of fog until today. Well, medical reports have appeared which at least support our suspicion that Stalin could not have died a natural death, that his injuries only caused a violent death. We are firmly convinced that the names of the murderers came from the closest, "most familiar" leadership circle around Stalin, the names of the leading members of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU, and who else had easier access to Stalin, knew Stalin's habits better, than Beria! But more about that later.

With the elimination of the exploiting classes, the class struggle was far from over; on the contrary, it was being fought as fiercely as never before. Marx and Engels were not yet aware of the dimension their words would take on when they said:

"Just abolish the class struggle, and the bourgeoisie and 'all independent persons' will 'not hesitate to go hand in hand with the proletarians'! In which case the ones to be hoodwinked would be those self-same proletarians." (Marx, Engels: 'Circular Letter to August Bebel, Wilhelm Liebknecht, Wilhelm Bracke, and Others' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 24; London; 1989; p.265; English Edition).

And it is also a bourgeois, or rather, retrograde attitude to "abolish" the class struggle in the transition to communism and leave everything to its own devices. The two-front struggle that we fought for the liberation from capitalism must continue if we want to overcome the first stage of socialism. In order to advance towards communism, we must strip off old socialist shells which are becoming an obstacle, which were still right and necessary against the remnants of the capitalist class, but which are no longer needed in the transition to communism, and turn into an obstacle. **The transition from the phase of socialism to communism is not without fierce class struggle.** Between the socialist and the communist phase there is no "peaceful coexistence" with elements hostile to the Party - the old shells do not fall on their own nor do they fall automatically. That is spontaneism, an anarchist path to communism that destroys everything again. Socialist society must now free itself from **its own** old shells. To understand the class struggle in this sense requires a high socialist consciousness, because the enemy exists in **our own** backwardness, which we can only overcome **in relation to ourselves**. A consistent struggle must be waged between the opposites of retrograde and progressive ideas, habits, working methods, etc. Socialist society must not be unfaithful to itself and refuse to move towards communism. And if it is no longer prepared to push the revolution forward, if it no longer considers it necessary to revolutionize itself permanently with

the help of Stalin's teachings, then it has already become unfaithful to itself. Trotsky had despised the role of revolutionary theory in the creation and development of the Party. **Trotsky was dead, but Trotskyism lived on under the mask of "Stalinism".**

Stalinism is the ideology of the Bolshevik Party against its revisionist degeneration into a bourgeois party of the restoration of capitalism and thus the key to the successful transition from socialism to communism.

If Stalinism is a further development of Leninism, and this is our starting point, then any "defense" of Leninism against Stalinism leads to the defense of *revisionism*. **"De-Stalinization" is "de-Leninization"**. Stalinism developed at a time when Leninism was already in power. It began with the struggle over the interpretation of Leninism, its distortion and vulgarization. One can speak of Stalinism just as one can speak of Leninism, because both are basically the same in essence (further developments of Marxism). But what one must not do is to speak of Stalinism and (plus) Leninism. Stalinism is not the "teachings of Stalin minus Leninism".

Stalinism is nothing other than Stalin's internationalist doctrine of the Soviet social order as it had actually, objectively, truly developed after Lenin's death.

The *special nature* of Stalinism can be explained for two reasons:

First of all, it emerged not only from socialism "in a" country whose stamp it necessarily had to bear, but also made the transition to communism in the struggle against the restoration of capitalism at home;

Secondly, it strengthened itself beyond its borders in the struggle against the encirclement of imperialism to the outside. It led the newly emerging world camp of communism to storm the fortress of the world camp of capitalism and bring about the victory of world socialism.

The Comintern/ML formulates Stalinism in two sentences:

Stalinism is Marxism-Leninism for the transition from the first period of "socialism in one country" to the Second Period of socialism on a global scale, *in general*.

Stalinism is Marxism-Leninism for the transition from "socialism in one country" to "communism in one country", *in particular*.

What characterized the attitude of Stalin immediately before his death?

Never wavering in the face of the Cold War, not being afraid of the imperialists, not retreating from them, boldly advancing towards communism and not letting the imperialists out of the stranglehold again, but gripping them even tighter, fulfilling his internationalist duty to the end, purging the Party from the revisionists and thwarting their coup!!! Fight against capitulation!!! Fight against the disparagement of the Bolshevik Party! Fight for Lenin's party! Fight for Bolshevism! Fight to save the Soviet Union from its external and internal enemies!

Conversely, "de-Stalinization" can be explained for two reasons: Firstly, to transform communism and finally "socialism in one country" into a capitalist country and secondly, to save world imperialism from the global threat of being destroyed by communism. But this does not destroy Stalinism. It will be difficult to rebuild it and it will not be possible to rebuild

it as it was once, but one thing is clear: the "de-Stalinization" will never go so far as to make Stalinism disappear completely. This or that part, this or that remnant of Stalinism cannot be eliminated. The difficulties will only help Stalinism regain power.

What drove the revisionists to "de-Stalinization"? Capitulation and capitulation again!!! To save their skin, to retreat, to doubt the necessity and correctness of the militant struggle against world imperialism, to shake the confidence in Stalinism, to reduce the Bolshevik Party, to put itself on the defensive, to detach from the world revolution, to give up the class struggle, to retreat, to betray Marxism-Leninism, to defect to the enemy!!!!

The center of the struggle against Stalinism had meanwhile been moved from Germany to America and England. For the counter-revolution within the USSR this meant moving the center of its support from Germany to America and England. Accordingly, Stalin also moved his fight against the new enemy center including his agency within the USSR. The central goal of the enemy was directed at the liquidation of the Soviet center of power, was aimed at Stalin. The elimination of Stalin was thus carried out by the externally supported agency of the imperialists in the USSR, by the conspirators of the Presidium of the CC of the CPSU. Stalin therefore concentrated on the elimination of his conspirators before his assassination. The history of the CPSU ended with the struggle against its conspirators, ended with the victory of the conspirators over the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin. While the conspiracy of the "Right and Trotskyite" Bloc, who were above all an agency of the fascists in Germany and Japan, had been crushed by Stalin, the conspirators of 1953, as agents of Anglo-American imperialism, achieved victory that time.

Bourgeois historians are not entirely wrong when they describe the history of the USSR as a history of Stalinization. And we Marxist-Leninists are not wrong either when we call the history of anti-Stalinism a history of futile attempts at "de--Stalinization", which are of course ultimately and all doomed to failure. **Just as the world bourgeoisie a hundred years ago, with its agitation against Bolshevism, ignited the hearts of the workers of the whole world for Bolshevism because of its hatred of capitalism, the anti-Stalinist propaganda of the world bourgeoisie will one day bounce off the workers who have had enough of capitalism. The workers will rediscover Stalinism for themselves as the doctrine with which they liberate themselves from the bondage of world imperialism.**

Now the bourgeoisie is making the bold claim that the real "de-Stalinization" of 1989 did not really happen. Well, well. we can guess what is meant by this. But here, too, we must agree with the bourgeoisie in some respects, because no one in the world will ever succeed in "de-Stalinizing" the world, because the roots of Stalinism cannot be eradicated, and especially not in Russia.

Stalinism cannot be "de-Stalinized"!

The bourgeoisie "defines" Stalinism as a "theory and practice of the terrorist, Soviet system of rule". Let's assume for a moment that this is true: But what should we define world imperialism as? As the theory and practice of the anti-terrorist, civilized, democratic worldview, as the liberator of humanity from the Soviet system of rule? In other words, something like the way world imperialism likes to present itself?

Die "Linke" (German social-fascist party – Translator's note) defines Stalinism as an "inhuman stake in the flesh of communism". And how do we Stalinists define the revisionist Die "Linke"? Die "Linke" is the inhuman flesh of rotten capitalism, but Stalinism is the world revolutionary stake in the heart of capitalism.

Gorbachev said: "Stalinism is a term invented by the opponents of communism and widely used to slander the Soviet Union and socialism as a whole." For once, our dear Mr. Gorbachev is speaking the truth here regarding the slander of the Soviet Union and socialism. But unfortunately it is only *half* the truth, because Stalinism is a term which we Marxist-Leninists had used and will continue to use not only extensively to defend the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin and socialism as a whole against anti-Stalinism, but to carry his victory across the globe. The term "Marxism", the term "Leninism-Stalinism", the term "Stalinism" is as little an invention of the bourgeoisie as the term "Marxism-Leninism" or "Hoxhaism". By this we communists refer to the teachings of the classics, which together founded and developed the worldview of the proletariat. We have already mentioned this repeatedly. For us communists, these are quite legitimate terms, while for the bourgeoisie they are only terms for "legitimizing" their anti-communism, with the words of the anti-Marxist intellectual Mr. Oskar Negt.

It was precisely this Oskar Negt, this "left-wing light" of bourgeois ideology, who raved about the so-called "science of legitimacy", about Stalinism as an alleged "sham" of Marxism. Oskar Negt wanted to talk the progressive elements of the '68 movement out of "the aberration of Stalinism". With his "criticism of legitimacy", Negt meant that Soviet society "could not withstand" the criticism of bourgeois society, that Soviet society did not fulfill what it had written on its revolutionary banner, that it had not alienated itself from Marxism or turned away from it, but that its "totalitarian system of rule" had from the beginning been covered with red paint and had misused Marx only as an alibi. Stalin had nothing in common with either Marx nor with Lenin. On the contrary, Stalin had misused the revolutionary theory of Marx and Lenin only as a "tool of legitimization" and transformed it into a pseudo-science, had put on the Marxist mask of socialism only to hide his "despotism" behind it. **"My arguments are directed against Stalinism, not against Lenin"** (Oskar Negt, 'Reply to Josef Schleifstein', A Contribution to a Discussion in 1970 on the Occasion of Lenin's 100th Birthday, Frankfurt;1970; p.127-132). In doing so, he effectively took the side of the modern revisionists. But he rejected this far from himself. After the revisionists had already been in power for 15 years, the "Marxists" of the new, Western Left talked about the so-called "legitimization of de-Stalinization". By this they understood it (translated into simple English) as: **"De-Stalinization in words, continuation of Stalinism in deeds."** It was basically as if the "leftist" intelligentsia, on the 100th anniversary of Lenin's death, made itself the mouthpiece of American imperialism, which of course they also "condemned" in words! Condemning the Vietnam War of the Americans as well as Stalinism, that was the position of the "New Left". As petty-bourgeois, they found it modern and "leftist" to "rebel" against both the rule of the bourgeoisie and the rule of the proletariat. The oh-so-progressive intellectualist "critics of the science of legitimacy" turned out to be legitimizers of the Cold War, legitimizers of bourgeois science which they submitted to with every step they took to try to deter the intellectuals opposed to capitalism from the Soviet ideology of Lenin and Stalin! Such people are **rightfully called stooges and lackeys of capital!**

They wanted to make the progressive forces believe that bourgeois Khrushchev, Ulbricht and other arch-revisionists would vainly claim that they had renounced Stalinism, but that this "deception" had been seen through: "In reality", they had secretly never discarded their "Stalinism", but continued it; in short: **"Re-Stalinization behind the mask of "de-Stalinization". Revisionism had "emerged from Stalinism"**, was a continuation of the legitimization of "Stalinist despotism, only WITHOUT Stalin. The restoration of capitalism is thus an "immanent law" of Stalinism (Stalinism = bourgeois revision of Marxism-Leninism).

The modern revisionists fight Stalin with their disguised "Leninism". The bourgeoisie of the West fights against Stalinism by falsifying the disguised "Leninism" of the modern

revisionists as disguised "Stalinism". Until today, anti-Stalinism in its entirety is based on the collaboration of this same disguised "Leninism" of the modern revisionists and its falsification as disguised "Stalinism" by the Western bourgeoisie. And so anti-Stalinism must be exposed and defeated in a two-front struggle against this collaboration by us Stalinists all over the world.

These are basically old Trotskyite parrot slogans, taken from the Titoites' bag of tricks, which were also used by the Apologists of the '68 Movement! **The fact that they unintentionally brought new forces to Stalinism with their anti-Stalinist agitation is the positive phenomenon of the '68 Movement. That was the time when the author of this book spread the writings of Stalin on his book table, where almost 40 years ago, without his efforts, the publication and spreading of the new Works of Stalin would not have been possible.**

Keeping the worker away from Stalinism by frightening him with the grimace of the social-fascists is typically petty-bourgeois and anti-Stalinism builds on this to a large extent. This is precisely the old trick of the bourgeoisie to simply make the terms revisionism and Stalinism interchangeable, to put the deterrent stamp of "Stalinism" on revisionism and let Stalinism rot as dogmatism in the backyard of the history of philosophy. To present Stalinism as deterrent to the worker as possible, in such a way that the worker should come to only one conclusion: **"Stalinism? No thanks, I'd rather live under capitalism with all its boils!"** That's what these scribblers of the bourgeoisie are paid for, and not badly, as you can see with Oskar Negt. When these petty-bourgeois write about "institutionalized Marxism," they mean Marxism in power, they mean the workers in power. The petty-bourgeoisie are happy to warm their hearts to the struggle of the workers against their exploitation and oppression while they are not yet in power. But workers in power are as much a horror for the petty-bourgeoisie as the bourgeoisie in power. Yes, they prefer the bourgeoisie in power to the workers in power, because they have already come to terms with the bourgeoisie at their side for over a hundred years. At the time of Stalinism in power, these petty-bourgeoisie had the need, from their class nature, to "de-institutionalize" Marxism, which means nothing other than "liberating" the "working class from the rule of Marxism". It was in this sense that the petty-bourgeoisie pursued its "de-Stalinization" efforts after Stalin's death. Since then, the petty-bourgeoisie's "revolutionary" task has been to "save" the working class from "re-Stalinization."

Oskar Negt and Co. were more concerned with dissociating themselves from the "Frankfurt School", following in the footsteps of Trotsky, Tito, Deborin and Bukharin, etc., in order to expose the '68 Movement as a petty-bourgeois movement which, in its broad leftist spectrum, had "descended to Stalinism", had tried to "legitimize" itself only by doing so. For this realization that the petty-bourgeois movement adorns itself with the labor movement in order to make itself bigger than it is, one did not need Oskar Negt, the Marxists already criticized this 100 years ago. Not even Oskar Negt could save the '68 Movement from its contact with Stalinism. As a result, he could not prevent, indeed, he involuntarily contributed to the emergence of such intellectuals in the Movement of '68 who seriously took up Stalin's revolutionary standpoint, who seriously joined the revolutionary workers' movement and gradually overcame their own petty-bourgeois standpoint, and who did not fall for Oskar Negts but fought them head-on as anti-communists. He, however, preached "true" Marxism", the criticism of the idealization of "pure" Marxist science. He in particular, like the entire intellectualist "Left" opposition as a whole, always regarded himself as a "revolutionary vanguard" for the "de-Stalinization" of science.

The anti-Stalinist Oskar Negt, who can at best "make friends" with Marxism when it is not in power, as was the case with Soviet Marxism under Lenin and Stalin, is a true "champion" for the liberation of science from its class corset. We Stalinists ultimately agree with Oskar Negt and the whole intellectualist "armada of the 'left' opposition" to liberate science from its class rule, from its class-ideological paternalism (and so he is and they are, of course, "much, much

more rrrrevolutionary" than we Stalinists). **There is only one "small" difference between us and them: for them this goal is already achievable in bourgeois society, whereas we will only have achieved this goal with classless society. For them, Stalinism is an unjustified, illegitimate "obstacle" to classless science, but for us it is an indispensable prerequisite for it. Wanting to already "liberate" Stalinism from its class character under capitalism can only lead to one result, to its adaptation to and subordination to bourgeois ideology, to the liquidation of the proletarian character of Stalinism and to the consolidation of capitalist class society. And this is also the definition of the term "de-Stalinization", whether we look at de-Stalinization in the East or in the West, in the bourgeois essence, both types of de-Stalinization agree and have always worked together against communism and have complemented each other. The strength of Stalinism is still evident today in the fact that the bourgeoisie, after all its futile efforts, is forced to capitulate to the teachings of Stalin. Even if the bourgeoisie never admits it, it has been forced to believe that Stalinism cannot be "de-Stalinized" at all, that simply "no weed has grown" against this ideology, that every bourgeois weed withers as soon as it comes into contact with Stalinism, that capitalism has had to suffer defeat wherever it dared to engage in a confrontation with Stalinism.**

Now we come to the two-front struggle:

Stalinism teaches us to see the class struggle, the *two-front struggle*, the struggle between the privileged classes of all kinds who did not want to develop further and the masses of the laborers, the socialist workers who are at the head of all laborers in order to revolutionize the social development continuously, under the surface of ingrained old habits, political intrigues, cleverly thought-out theories and political currents in socialism. Stalin threw all outdated forms of socialism overboard, helped all outdated Bolsheviks who could not separate themselves from these forms in solidarity and demoted those who refused to give up the outdated forms of their thinking and acting. In the same way, he stood in the way of the newly developed ideas that deviated from Marxism-Leninism in order to eventually replace it. On the one hand, he helped those inexperienced young Bolsheviks who were not yet properly guided by Marxism-Leninism, and on the other hand, he demoted those who refused to part with their deviating "renewing" views, which were nothing more than throwing Marxism-Leninism overboard as something "outdated".

"The training of Party leaders is a very difficult matter, it takes years, 5 to 10 years, more than 10. (...) Leaders cannot be trained by means of books. Books help to make progress, but they do not create leaders. Leading workers mature only in the course of the work itself." (Stalin: 'The Twelfth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.)' in: 'Works', Volume 5; Moscow; 1953; p.223; English Edition).

And if one wants to advance towards communism, they not only need new ideas, a rejuvenating communist theory that illuminates this new stage of struggle, but also a communist cadre, which one must equip with this theory, but, as Stalin taught, only the cadre of sacrificial work, the cadre that actually **grows** into a **communist** cadre during the years of struggle for the further construction of socialism towards communism.

"Have not the youth and the old guard always marched in a united front against internal and external enemies? Is not the unity between the 'old ones' and the 'young ones' the basic strength of our revolution? What was the object of this attempt to discredit the old guard and demagogically to flatter the youth if not to cause and widen a fissure between these principal detachments of our Party? Who needs all this, if one has the interests of the Party in view, its unity and solidarity, and not an attempt to shake this unity for the benefit of the opposition?"

(Stalin: 'The Discussion' in: 'Works', Volume 5; Moscow; 1953; p.396-397; English Edition).

Stalin fought not only against the swamp of revisionists but also against those who turned to the swamp.

This is not simply a matter of interpreting Stalinism. Stalinism accepts nothing in good faith. Stalinism does not exclude critical application and development, but presupposes them. Stalinism must not be obscured by formalism and dogmatism. Thus there were people who, under the guise of Stalinism, took leave of his revolutionary spirit and sent him to exile, not to Siberia, but worse still, to the study. If the disciples of Stalin were guilty of this, one cannot hold Stalin accountable or even justify "de-Stalinization". **Stalinists do not reject criticism of themselves, but only criticism from opponents of Stalinism.** The Stalinists wanted to remain consistent Marxist-Leninists by developing the basic theses of Marxism-Leninism in accordance with the changing conditions of socialism and with the given characteristics of the post-war period and by expanding the theory of dialectical materialism and the economic doctrine of Marxism-Leninism. The opponents used Stalinism to smuggle in their anti-Marxist-Leninist ideas in all areas of social life. The revisionists used eclecticism for their "de-Stalinization". This eclecticism was then celebrated by the revisionists as a "great contribution to the further development of Stalinism". **History has proven that after the emergence of Stalinism, every other ideological current that appeared with socialist slogans had to degenerate into a *reactionary* current, into anti-Stalinism, in the course of the class struggle. One could not build communism without relying on Stalinism, without consolidating and developing Stalinism in the struggle against its enemies.**

Lenin said that: "Every opportunist is distinguished for his adaptability..." (Lenin as quoted by Stalin: 'The Discussion' in: 'Works', Volume 5; Moscow; 1953; p.395; English Edition). **Isn't that what we Stalinists do? Undoubtedly we Stalinists do it too, the question is only the adaptability to what? The difference between the adaptability of the opportunists and that of the Stalinists is quite simply that the opportunists are characterized by the ability to adapt communism to capitalism, while for the communists the ability of adaptation is to adapt the teachings of communism to the changing conditions of the proletarian class struggle in the best possible way.**

And the opportunists of the Stalin Era? They distinguished themselves by adapting Stalinism to the needs of the restoration of capitalism.

The opportunism in the face of the two-front struggle was that the opportunists began to adapt to the two-front struggle of the Bolsheviks, and not only to master this adaptation to perfection in high Stalinism, but to bring themselves into possession of this instrument to beat the Stalinists with their own weapon. It was Khrushchev who was able to make perfect use of this instrument to conquer the power of revisionism.

When we examine the class struggle in the late Stalinist Era in concrete terms, we must logically examine how the Bolshevik method of conducting the class struggle was used at that time and how that struggle was conducted. The Bolshevik method of class struggle consists, as we all know, above all in leading the *ideological two-front struggle*, and this two-front struggle cannot be limited to the ideological class struggle alone, but that it was fought on all the battlefields of class struggle without exception.

"Now we cannot *first of all* defeat the Right danger with the help of the 'Lefts,' as was the case in the history of our Party, and *then* the 'Left' danger with the help of the Rights. Now we have to wage a fight on both fronts *simultaneously*, striving to defeat both dangers..." (Stalin: 'Fourth Conference' in: 'Works', Volume 5; Moscow; 1953; p.324; English Edition).

"Among Communists we are neither Lefts nor Rights, we are simply Leninists. Lenin knew what he was doing when he fought on two fronts, against both the Left and the Right deviations in the communist movement." (Stalin: 'Questions and Answers' in: 'Works', Volume 7; Moscow; 1954; p.192; English Edition).

"...when Lenin fought the Russian 'ultra-Lefts' and utterly routed them, in our midst, too, there were people who accused Lenin of Rightism, of having swung to the Right. But all the world now knows that Lenin's position at that time was correct, that his standpoint was the only revolutionary one, and that the Russian 'ultra-Lefts,' who were then making a show of 'revolutionary' phrases [and clothe him in revolutionary 'Stalinist' phrases – Author's note], were in reality opportunists." (Stalin: 'The Fight against Right and 'Ultra-Left' Deviations' in: 'Works', Volume 8; Moscow; 1954; p.8-9; English Edition).

We Stalinists have become aware that this two-front struggle in the late Stalinist Era was fiercer than ever before in the entire history of the Bolshevik Party, and that today, after more than 50 years, there are still "hidden" enemies who have so far gotten away scot-free with the slogan. "Stop thief!"

If Stalin had still been able to do it, his "Short Course" of 1938-53 would have been supplemented and completed. Stalin left us Stalinists the legacy of making up for this, and we have not yet managed to complete this work successfully. Yes, until 1953, with this date, with Stalin died and so did the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin, **and with 1953 the glorious history of the CPSU (B) ended.** As long as we have not completed the "Short Course" **of 1938-1953**, this means that we have not yet turned our defeat against modern revisionism on this battlefield into a victory. But there are a number of outstanding comrades who have already made good contributions to this, and we are sure that we will soon have put the tedious puzzle together to complete **Stalin's history of the CPSU (B) by 1953 after all.** This work is still ahead of us in Albania, where the **history of the PLA also ended with the death of Comrade Enver Hoxha.** However, it was written under the leadership of Enver Hoxha only until 1980. Since Enver Hoxha died in 1985, there are still 5 years of party history missing, which has to be written by us Hoxhaists. It will also take great efforts to unravel the course of the two-front struggle until the restoration of capitalism. The fact that we have not yet mastered all this says a lot about the true state of the present Marxist-Leninist World Movement, says a lot about the actual influence of modern revisionism, says a lot about how bitter this struggle still has to be fought.

Let us stick with the two-front struggle. When the opportunists of the USSR were still able to appear openly, it was still relatively "easy" to determine, see through and expose their positions. Conversely, in those days it was also relatively "easy" for the opportunists to see through the Bolshevik tactics of the two-front struggle, to adapt to them and to subvert them. But when they were so weakened that they could no longer afford to appear openly, when they were completely forced into illegality, the opportunists were no longer allowed to openly attack Stalin's General Line, but were condemned to use it as their shield, and this meant that they had been forced to build communism if they wanted to remain unrecognized, which considerably limited their counter-revolutionary work. With time however, the counter-revolutionaries mastered the changed claviature of the two-front struggle better and better, so that they conquered position after position, with great sacrifice of course because Stalin had to fight against the counter-revolutionary activities not only with the greatest skill but also with the greatest severity. Many actually shied away from continuing their counter-revolutionary subversion activities, but there were enough who continued them, not least under pressure from the outside, from the imperialist West.

The two-front struggle against Stalin was **conducted underground** in the late Stalinist Era. **Only**

after it appeared here and there on the surface did things come to light, it was exposed and fought against, only to go underground again and reappear elsewhere. The cat and mouse game of the counter-revolutionaries makes it so difficult for us today to historically locate and continuously follow the underground front line. **This work is made more difficult by the fact that some historically active comrades made mistakes in correctly distinguishing between "friend" and foe.** There, revisionists were identified as "Marxist-Leninists" and vice versa, Marxist-Leninists were branded as "revisionists". We ourselves do not exclude ourselves from these mistakes. Sooner or later such a thing takes revenge. Thus, our opponents do not only pursue our lack of principled standpoint in the anti-revisionist struggle with malicious joy, but they exploit our weaknesses against us. The basic rule is:

"(...) the Right deviation in communism signifies (...) a tendency of a section of the Communists to depart from the revolutionary line of Marxism.

"(...) Consequently, a victory of the Right deviation in the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries would lead to a development of the conditions necessary for the preservation of capitalism." (Stalin: 'The Right Danger in the C.P.S.U.(B.)' in: 'Works', Volume 11; Moscow; 1954; p.233-234; English Edition).

"The Rights always raise their head in a period of growing crisis. That is a general law of revolutionary crises. The Rights raise their head because they are afraid of a revolutionary crisis and are therefore ready to do everything in their power to drag the Party back and not allow the growing crisis to develop." (Stalin: 'Speech in the French Commission' in: 'Works', Volume 8; Moscow; 1954; p.108; English Edition). That also applied to the period of the growing Cold War of the Anglo-American imperialists.

"Expulsion is not the decisive weapon in the struggle against the Rights. The main thing is to give the Right groups a drubbing, ideologically and morally, in the course of a struggle based on principle and to draw the mass of the Party membership into this struggle. That is one of the chief and most important means of educating the Party in the spirit of Bolshevism. Expulsion must come, if it is really necessary, as a natural result of the ideological rout of the enemy." (Stalin: 'The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia' in: 'Works', Volume 7; Moscow; 1954; p.66; English Edition).

"The capitalist elements are fighting not only in the economic sphere; they are trying to carry the fight into the sphere of proletarian ideology, trying to infect the least stable detachments of the Party with lack of confidence in the possibility of building socialism, with scepticism concerning the socialist prospects of our work of construction, and it cannot be said that their efforts have been entirely fruitless." (Stalin: 'Questions and Answers' in: 'Works', Volume 7; Moscow; 1954; p.166-167; English Edition).

"(...) a group of 'ultra-Lefts' which keeps repeating the old slogans in a schoolboy fashion and is unable or unwilling to adapt itself to the new conditions of the struggle, which demand new methods of work. Hence we have the 'ultra-Lefts,' who by their policy are hindering the Party from adapting itself to the new conditions of the struggle and from finding its way to the broad masses of the (...) proletariat. Either the (...) Communist Party breaks the resistance of the 'ultra-Lefts,' and then it will be on the high road to winning over the majority of the working class; or it does not, and then it will make the present crisis chronic and disastrous for the Party." (Stalin: 'The Fight against Right and 'Ultra-Left' Deviations' in: 'Works', Volume 8; Moscow; 1954; p.2; English Edition).

"Can we tolerate putrid diplomacy, the slurring over of errors, in questions of the ideological struggle in the Party and the political education of the masses? No, we cannot. We should be deceiving the workers if we did. (...) There is only one solution, and that is to expose the errors of the 'ultra-Left' leaders, and in this way help honest revolutionary workers to take the right road." (ibid; p.8).

"Yes, these are practical revolutionaries, for they place the essence of the matter above the form." (Stalin: 'Thirteenth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.)' in: 'Works', Volume 6; Moscow; 1953; p.30; English Edition).

People who are actually convinced that they are **further** developing Marxism-Leninism would never tolerate the (in)freedom to let the old views exist and maintain them even further **alongside** the new ones. In this way old views can never be overcome. There were a lot of people in late Stalinism who were, **"(...) continuing to work in the old, limited, metaphysical way with methods that were obtained dialectically."** (Engels: 'Anti-Dühring' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 25; London; 1987; p.113; English Edition).

Marxist-Leninists develop Marxism-Leninism further by adapting it to the real, changing conditions of the struggle. What does it mean to adapt? Does the Marxist-Leninist adapt Marxism-Leninism evolutionarily by always quantitatively **INSERTING** new things to the old? No, Marxism-Leninism is not an eclectic teaching. Marxism-Leninism is a revolutionary doctrine which rejuvenates itself only to the extent that it overcomes its obsolescence in the struggle of opposites, in how much courage it mustered to free itself from old doctrines. **In 1958, this was criticized by the revisionists as "one-sidedness". Wanting to "prove" the "Stalinist one-sidedness" of Marxism-Leninism in this way means nothing else but to replace Marxism-Leninism by eclecticism.** The revisionists made use of the method of "peaceful coexistence" between dialectical materialism and idealism, which Shdanov had exposed in Alexandrov's "Textbook of the History of Philosophy". There, the philosophers in history were praised to the skies, with only a few critical remarks at the end, taken from Marxism-Leninism. Until 1958 the revisionists "only" denied the names Stalin and Zhdanov, but formally "recognized" their CC resolutions of 1946-1948.

The Bolshevik method of replacing the old with the new is called criticism and self-criticism. The opportunists limited themselves to interpreting the path from socialism to communism, propagating the evolutionary self-course of socialist development. Stalinism, on the other hand, illuminated this revolutionary path. The Stalinists went the illuminated path, understood it as a qualitative change (not to be confused with the "qualitative leap", which is not the only form of transformation from quantity to quality, but we will go into this later).

The further development of Marxism-Leninism, that is, to raise it to the level of the actual changes in the development of society in a revolutionary way - that is Stalinism is, or in Stalin's words: To understand the Marxist-Leninist theory, it means being able to develop it and move it forward. New understandings must **LIBERATE themselves from the old understandings through criticism and self-criticism in struggle. Here, a struggle between the old and new views takes place. Here, a **CLASSICAL STRUGGLE** against bourgeois remnants in the consciousness of advanced socialist society takes place, which the workers are not only involved in, but take the leading position. Simply excluding the working class and the masses from the philosophical discussion, from the elaboration and development of Bolshevik theory or to let them "only marginally sniff it" requires a consistent class struggle so that revolutionary theory is not separated from the revolutionary class. Here the **TWO-FRONT STRUGGLE** between regression and progress in the socialist society itself takes place! And it is precisely this struggle that Stalin led in the period of building communism after the Great**

Patriotic War until his death in March 1953. From this point of view and only from it, one can see who was really a Stalinist at that time, what was Stalinist and who merely hid behind the mask of "Stalinism" to help bring victory to the restoration of capitalism.

Marx said this about Hegel's dialectics: "It must be turned right side up again, if you would discover the rational kernel within the mystical shell." (Marx: 'Capital' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 35; London; 1996; p.19; English Edition).

And what did the modern revisionists make of it? They turned Marx upside down, trying to return to bourgeois ideology unrecognized. **They restored the dialectics of Hegel by turning back the Marxist dialectics to hide the core of their revisionist degeneration in a Marxist-Leninist shell! In the revisionist "theory", the real relationship of Marxism-Leninism is turned upside down, the mirror image is taken for its most original form and therefore needs a restorative, reactive reversal (this is a reference to Marx and Engels' "On Dialectics"). Just as modern revisionism relates to Marxism-Leninism, Hegelian dialectics relates to Marxist dialectics.**

Marxism-Leninism can never be adapted to the changed reality, communist existence can never DETERMINE communist consciousness, if this consciousness refuses to throw outdated ways of thinking, outdated formulas overboard, if it does not ruthlessly separate itself from habits that were once dear to it. In short: if the old consciousness is not completely **replaced** by the new consciousness, the Stalinist consciousness. There is no other way to bring communist being and communist consciousness into harmonious agreement. The better we succeed in achieving this goal of harmonization, the stronger communism is in the struggle against its enemies. And so, even in the two-front struggle, the struggle against the Right and "Left" is brought into harmony, without forgetting that there is a main front and a secondary front, that their dialectical reversal is recognized at the right moment and handled accordingly.

Now, the question of Stalin has been clearly answered that the harmonization of the revolutionary forces and revolutionary conditions is not a final, rigid process, but that it is a permanent dialectical process, that both the revolutionary forces and revolutionary conditions of a historical transformation of their role as an obstacle and driving force, are subject to their interaction, that in harmonization the identity and the struggle of opposites plays an important role, that harmonization is an objective process, which we approach through knowledge and adaptation to its laws, but only relatively, no more and no less.

"When one reads and rereads the works of our leaders, their writings and speeches, then this or that chapter, this or that hint or sentence, this or that thesis always gains new meaning in the light of our practice. Just as the geologist cannot exhaust all the treasures that lie in the bosom of our country, we too are constantly finding new ideas in the works of our great teachers." (Zhdanov: "Illustrative Material of the History of the C.P.S.U.(B.) - Short Course"; Berlin; 1954; p.101; Translated from German).

What did the ideological two-front struggle of Bolshevism look like under late Stalinism?

First of all, we must realize that everything we have said above about the development of Marxism-Leninism in general also applies to the ideological two-front struggle against the enemies of the Soviet Union, against the anti-Stalinists. With the progress of the socialist society, with the transition to communism, there was also a change in the two-front struggle, it adapted to this development, adopted new forms of struggle and discarded outdated forms without giving up its essential character, its aim to ideologically beat the enemies of the Soviet Union. If Beria's aim was to make this two-front struggle superfluous and to undermine it through pure elimination, through state administration, then Stalin's aim was to put the two-front struggle on a higher level in order to

avert the new dangers that had appeared in the Soviet Union since the end of the war in a Bolshevik manner. The fact that Comrade Stalin's personal intervention was necessary to combat the dying of Marxism-Leninism and the emergence of idealistic, reactionary phenomena shows what a theoretically critical state the USSR was in after the war. The sad results of the theoretical journal "Under the Banner of Marxism" are known to everyone (fight against the incorrect line of Deborin).

The dangers loomed from two ideological directions:

Firstly, it was the persistence of old formulas, clinging onto them, the fear of throwing them overboard and letting them go, which brings the dogmatists on the scene. For it is they who make a virtue of this error, of this weakness, by justifying their insistence on dogmas under the guise of "defending the principles of Stalinism".

"Marxism does not recognize invariable conclusions and formulas, obligatory for all epochs and periods. Marxism is the enemy of all dogmatism." (Stalin: 'Marxism and Problems of Linguistics'; Peking; 1972; p.53; English Edition).

The dogmatists occupied influential posts in many institutions and formed around their intellectual "leaders" an **Arakcheyev regime** (dogmatists at "house power"), which Stalin brought to light and smashed it to smithereens [Count Arakcheyev established a regime that characterized an entire era of unbridled police despotism and military arbitrariness in the first quarter of the 19th century. **And there was no one in the USSR who revived the Arakcheyev regime like the aristocratic secret service agent Beria**]:

"It has brought out, in the first place, that in linguistic bodies both in the centre and in the republics a regime has prevailed which is alien to science and men of science. The slightest criticism of the state of affairs in Soviet linguistics, even the most timid attempt to criticize the so-called 'new doctrine' in linguistics, was persecuted and suppressed by the leading linguistic circles. Valuable workers and researchers in linguistics were dismissed from their posts or demoted for being critical of N. Y. Marr's heritage or expressing the slightest disapproval of his teachings.

"It is generally recognized that no science can develop and flourish without a battle of opinions, without freedom of criticism. But this generally recognized rule was ignored and flouted in the most unceremonious fashion. There arose a close group of infallible leaders, who, having secured themselves against any possible criticism, became a law unto themselves and did whatever they pleased." (ibid; p.29-30).

These scholastic "elite schools" claimed to have leased Marxism-Leninism. They alone felt authorized to interpret and construe Marxism-Leninism correctly. Stalin castigated them as book scholars and Talmudists. **With it they consciously organized and prevented new Stalinist ideas from breaking through so that they could turn into a guidance for revolutionary action. Dogmatists, in the time of late Stalinism they were criminal, selfish and privileged saboteurs against the revolutionization of Stalinism, and were restorers of bourgeois sciences.** Their crime was preserving Stalinism. And by trying to decide what and how something is and is not allowed to be used, they tried to snatch Stalinism from the hands of the revolutionary masses and their revolutionary vanguard party, thus condemning it to die, liquidating it, **depriving the dictatorship of its intellectual power. Marr was rehabilitated by the revisionists in 1957 [sic!!]** and Stalin was firstly accused of "dogmatism" and secondly of "interfering" with the discussion and "interrupted it with his cult of personality". The separation of the philosophical work from the practical activity of the CPSU (B), the blatant withdrawal from life were completely revealed as the basis of the errors on the philosophical front during the **philosophical discussion of 1947**. Stalin

reminded the philosophers anew of the radical error in their work, which they were not able to overcome despite the instructions given to them earlier. This was particularly true of the journal "Under the Banner of Marxism", which the CPSU (B) had worked hard to produce, especially in 1931, but failed completely during the war and even died in 1944.

It is fundamentally wrong to believe that "in war there are more important things than philosophy". Of course, in a military situation, philosophy moves back into the military ranks and there were quite a few Soviet philosophers who exchanged their philosophical weapons with military weapons, but philosophy is indispensable as the intellectual weapon of military warfare and, as on all war fronts, has its task to fulfill on the "philosophical front". There is no situation of class struggle in which the philosophy of Marxism may simply disappear from the scene. That is philosophical capitulation. This is completely contrary to the Marxist worldview, and the reasons are probably well known and do not need to be named here. **Even Stalinism itself finally had to develop under the conditions of the struggle against the encirclement by bourgeois ideology, there was also a "Stalingrad on the philosophical front"**. In other words, the Great Patriotic War was of course also an ideological war, just as the subsequent Cold War was a war against Stalinism on the ideological-philosophical front. We Stalinists today are fighting against the entire philosophy of the bourgeoisie, which has a much longer tradition than the Marxist one. We are in the midst of a war against bourgeois philosophy, which cannot be destroyed with light weapons, but with heavy artillery. We need only look at the "front line" of anti-Stalinism on our philosophical battlefield to see what kind of enemy we Stalinists are dealing with. The question "Which one?" Stalinism or anti-Stalinism? is far from being decided. On this front, we still have great battles ahead of us until we defeat anti-Stalinism, not to mention the victory over all bourgeois philosophy.

Stalinism was, so to speak, the basis and the lever of the theory of world revolution, a guide to action, a guide to the liberation of the world proletariat from the bourgeois consciousness, and through its further development it still is today, of course. The defense of Stalinism was, so to speak, also a foreign ideological-philosophical war of the USSR against the imperialist aggressors, a struggle to defend the ideological interests of the world proletariat.

Every retention of outdated Marxist-Leninist formulas and schools exposes every new Marxist-Leninist initiative, every new Marxist-Leninist thinker after the Second World War to a **perishable rotting process**, a jungle where the only way to clear the way was with a machete. Many revolutionary forces were swallowed up by the jungle of dignitary schools in late Stalinism so that they could not develop their social power and had to wear a muzzle. Standing up against the established academic schools was tantamount to heresy and high treason and could mean the loss of one's own existence, could cost one their head. The bureaucratic views of Marxism-Leninism were a typical expression of this rotting process of Marxism-Leninism at that time, an expression of its increasing ossification and institutionalized independence, **its separation from the masses. The ideological disarmament of the masses was the greatest danger for the existence of the USSR after the Great Patriotic War.** This was a weakness of the Party that Stalin was the first to recognize. And it was precisely this weakness that was useful in preparing the seizure of power by the modern revisionists to carry out the restoration of capitalism **without revolting masses. Stalinism loses more and more of its importance the more it is withdrawn from the masses, the more it is moved from the streets and factories to lecture halls and study rooms.**

And it was Stalin who blew away the dust that had settled on Marxism-Leninism to form a dangerously thick layer during the period of late Stalinism. **Stalin placed himself protectively before all innovators, before all revolutionary forces in all areas of social life, who were hunted down like heretical criminals by the scholastic academies, by the professional communists and by the Inquisition in the state scientific institutes.** But this is only one front which Stalin fought on. What is the second front?

The second one, the other front, which was directed against Stalin and the CPSU (B), was the replacement of the dialectical materialist way of thinking by the metaphysical way of thinking of the bourgeoisie in the revision of Marxism-Leninism necessary for the adaptation to the realization of the construction of communism. This means in simple words that the retrograde elements of the Soviet society had to sell the adaptation to its reactionary ideology as "the further development of Marxism-Leninism". These backward revisionist ideas were praised as "the further development of Marxism-Leninism" by the backward elements of the Soviet society. These backward revisionist ideas were praised in a conformist way as a contribution of "newness", as "creative ideas" for the construction of communism. If these reactionary elements wanted to pursue the restoration of capitalism, they needed a second front to cultivate their revisionist views behind Stalin's back, to replace his communist General Line step by step with their backward, bourgeois ideology. Stalin led a struggle on the second front against **the adaptation of Leninism to revisionism, against the restoration of bourgeois ideology. In the struggle against formalism, the formalists threw the principles of Marxism-Leninism overboard.** Stalin thus rejected Marr's accusations of "formalism" against Marxist linguistics, which the revisionist Marr wanted to elevate his "new doctrine" to a "Marxist" linguistics with. In all fields Stalin led a determined fight against all the deviations that violated the principled loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and borrowed from the old revisionist chiefs. **He led the fight against all those who regarded Stalinism as something "outdated", who felt "persecuted, constricted, patronized and abandoned by Stalinism", who longed for their liberation from Stalinism through bourgeois ideology, who hated Stalinism and wanted to finally get rid of it. Stalin turned against bourgeois "modernism", which was not accidentally spread by the West.** This is where the two-front struggles against cosmopolitanism, Zionism etc., can be classified, which we will discuss later.

It would be a little too simplistic and schematic if **the older Soviet generation** were to focus more on the danger of formalism, the ossification of Marxism-Leninism, the rusting of their old revolutionary fighting spirit, their tiredness in the class struggle, their persistence in well-worn tracks, while the danger among **the younger generation** was expressed rather in the inexperience of Marxism-Leninism, its not yet sufficiently developed firmness of principles, its lack of discipline, its flirting with the West, its "peaceful coexistence" and the temptations of the restoration of capitalism. But the famous "spark of truth" in such generational influences will certainly not be denied. In any case, it has not remained unknown to us Marxist-Leninists that it was the Trotskyites who demagogically exploited the permanent artificial fomentation of the generation conflict to weaken the unity between leaders, Party and masses. We assume that this was no different in late Stalinism. In any case, it cannot be denied that the **two-front struggle** also had something to do with averting the attempted division of the **common front of the generations** (competition between the cadres of the "old guard" and the cadres of the young guard). Certainly, the generational difference was one of the many other manifestations of late Stalinism, but the argument that this was the real cause of the restoration of capitalism is not at all plausible.

"The question of generations is a secondary one." said Stalin in the argument with Trotsky. He opposed Trotsky's view as follows:

"Only those who regard our cadres as a closed entity, as a privileged caste which does not admit new members to its ranks; only those who regard our cadres as a sort of officer corps of the old regime which looks down on all other Party members as 'beneath its dignity,' only those who want to drive a wedge between the cadres and the younger Party members—only they can make the question of generations in the Party the pivotal question of democracy. The essence of democracy lies not in the question of generations, but in the question of independent activity, of members of the Party taking an active part in its leadership." (Stalin: 'Thirteenth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.)' in: 'Works', Volume 6; Moscow; 1953; p.237-238; English

Edition).

The **ideological two-front struggle** was directed against **objectivism** on the one hand and against **subjectivism** on the other. Stalinism takes the view that the objective and subjective should not be metaphysically opposed, but that both form a unity, whereby (objective) being determines (subjective) consciousness (harmonization of the objective and subjective factors in the construction of "communism in one country"). Objectivism and subjectivism are the two sides of a bourgeois coin, which falsified and distorted the teachings of Stalin, the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, especially in the late Stalinist Era: the objectivists underestimated the subjective factor and overestimated the objective factor in the teachings of Stalin. The subjectivists overestimated the subjective factor and underestimated the objective factor in the teachings of Stalin.

First, there's objectivism: Objectivism denies communist partiality. In the late Stalinist Era, the **objectivists** held the view that in the phase of building communism, in the phase of dying classes, the ideology of Marxism-Leninism was transformed into an ideology "above the classes" and dissolved. The objectivists made the mistake of ignoring the special conditions in the construction of "communism in one country", that the class struggle would continue as long as there were classes in the encircling capitalist countries that were fighting a class struggle against the Soviet Union. Only on the world scale of communism does Marxism-Leninism cease to be the ideology of the working class, when there is no longer a working class. Objectivism, this specific feature of bourgeois ideology, was present at the time of the replacement of feudalism, when bourgeois ideology presented itself as an ideology "above the classes" which reflected the entire "people's interest". To this day the bourgeoisie denies the class character of capitalist society precisely with the help of objectivism. Behind objectivism in the USSR was the "justification" that the ideology of the working class had become "worthless" and "superfluous", since in "communism in one country" there was supposedly no class struggle at all. Objectivism denies the intensified struggle between dialectical materialism and idealism, as it continues to exist until the end of the Communist era. Zhdanov condemned objectivism of the late Stalinist Era as the main danger, as a reduction in the importance of the partiality of Marxist science.

Secondly, there's subjectivism. Subjectivism denies the importance of the objective maturation of communism. Subjectivism is the opposite of Stalin's doctrine of the unity of objective possibilities and active purposeful activity of the Soviet people as a decisive factor in transforming the possibility of communism into the reality of communism. The subjectivists doubted Stalin's teaching that the activity of the Soviet people not only transforms possibility into reality, but also prepares possibility as such. The subjectivists spread what they wanted to understand or thought they understood under Stalinism, especially what they thought the masses should understand by it, namely a subjectivist teaching that was incapable of conveying objective truth to the Soviet people, if only because an objective reality supposedly did not exist. Their lack of confidence in the transition to communism was based on their lack of confidence in socialism. They arbitrarily underestimated or overestimated Stalinism in order to distort the reflection of the really existing Stalin Era. Communism corresponds to the objective truth, which we are relatively close to. Stalin turned communism "in itself" into communism "for us". Subjectivism denies the objective truth of Stalinism and that we are approaching communism. In the late Stalinist Era, Soviet society had a great interest in the scientific determination of the objective social processes and regularities of communist construction, which Stalin was able to satisfy excellently in writing and in action. The Party led the ideological struggle against subjectivism and brought it to light in order to destroy it. One cannot separate Stalinism from Stalin who developed his doctrine in the real class struggle and one cannot idealize Stalinism. Stalin was the leading subjective factor of the real

revolutionary, social changes in the USSR that he had founded. The source of Stalinism must not be sought in Stalinism itself, but in the conditions of the communist life of Soviet society, in its real existence, of which Stalinism is a reflection.

An example of the subjectivism of that time was the term "material incentive" used by revisionist economists as the "driving force" of socialist productivity. Behind this subjectivism were all kinds of capitalist forms of narrow-minded selfishness and a limited, vulgar consumer ideology. Another example: Subjectivism, the exaggeration of the subjective factor of the personality of the Bolshevik leader, is also hidden behind the personality cult. The ideas of the subjectivists were the wishful thinking of elitist groups, which did not correspond to the real situation of late Stalinism at all. However, they presented their ideas, opinions and views as "in agreement" with Stalinism, although they were far from the revolutionary masses. The subjectivists tried to impose their views on Soviet society and to falsify and deny Stalinism.

Stalin's ideological-philosophical two-front struggle was an attack against the remnants of capitalism in the consciousness of the Soviet people. He waged an offensive war against the remnants of lazy bourgeois ideology not only in the consciousness of the masses but also in the consciousness of the Party, the state and the army. He also waged this offensive struggle externally against obscurantism and reaction abroad, in all its manifestations.

Stalin accurately identified the main danger in the late Stalinist Era: The main danger that led to the threatening growth of the revisionist forces was the reduction of revolutionary theory, the reduction of the role of the party as the revolutionary vanguard in the building of communism, the reduction of the role of the revolutionary cadres who decide everything when the theoretical road to communism is illuminated, the program of building communism, the five-year plan is worked out and established. Political activity was monopolized in the hands of small leadership groups, while the Party as a whole was not called upon to carry out leading political work. Therefore, the Bolshevik character of the Party was violated. The underestimation of the development of Stalinism could only lead to the reduction of the role of the Bolshevik Party, just as, conversely, the reduction of the Bolshevik Party also led to the underestimation of the development of Stalinism. It was Stalin who opposed this threatening development.

Stalin taught that the "left" and the right opportunists worked hand in hand, that both appeared together and had to be fought together accordingly. While the "left" opportunists hid their right-wing ideas behind the teachings of Stalin, the right opportunists openly represented their bourgeois thinking. They did not dare to openly attack the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, which is why they began to develop their ideas undisturbed on the shallow "front" of the borders, where they were no more conspicuous than "provincial philosophers". But when the revisionist trial balloon was launched in a city as big as **Leningrad**, the pain threshold was crossed and the revisionist onslaught on the center had to be stopped **as well as** the attack of the revisionists **within the center** on the Stalinists. Only in this way can the so-called "Leningrad Affair" be judged ideologically correct. What took place in Leningrad on the front of political economy, on the cultural front, took place almost parallel, at least immediately afterwards, to the Mingrelian Conspiracy. There is an ideological-political connection there that cannot be overlooked.

In the **two-front struggle against great power chauvinism and local nationalism**, the main danger was great power chauvinism, so to speak, while local nationalism was only really brought about and counter-cultivated by the spreading of great power chauvinism. In the **two-front struggle against the bureaucratic centralism of the USSR and the bureaucratic decentralism of Leningrad**, the revisionist **main danger** emanated from the Moscow center **itself**, provoked and even challenged it from there. If one wants to judge the "Leningrad affair" correctly, then one must

not make the mistake of confusing the main and secondary danger, one must not **divert** from the main danger (**Beria and Malenkov were behind it, which one must not protect!**) Without the escalation of the power of bureaucratic centralism in the center of the USSR, there would also not have been a "Leningrad Affair", at least not in its historically materialized dimension.

The **dogmatization of Stalinism** is the disguised variant of "de-Stalinization", its first phase, still during the lifetime of Stalin, the "de-Stalinization" under the conditions of Stalinism in power. At the same time, the struggle against Stalinism was also connected with a disguised "criticism" of dogmatism, the struggle against dogmatism in words, in order to hide behind them in reality for its further practice.

The half-open "de-Stalinization" was something that the enemies of the Soviet Union tried to stimulate during their lifetime. With the de-ideologization under the slogan "freedom of science", they thus tried to decouple the dictatorship of the proletariat, to condemn it as repressive, as disturbing political interference in the "further development of science". This was a variant which the reactionary elements of the intelligentsia tried to restore the old privileges of the intelligentsia with, that is, to transform the non-antagonistic contradictions of workers and peasants into antagonistic class contradictions. It was an attack on the dictatorship of the proletariat under the leadership of the reactionary elements of the intelligentsia. Their aim was to restore capitalism...

In short, the ideological two-front struggle of Stalinism was directed against narrow-mindedness, ossification and entrenched tracks and against the revisionist degeneration of Stalinism through reconciliation with and flirtation with bourgeois ideology, which was pinched by these two sides and thus threatened to be strangled. What is important here is to understand that this two-front struggle was paralyzed by the different revisionist factions in their own particular way: The two-front struggle is conducted in words from the respective positions of the revisionist factions, so to say, from all positions they tried to beat the Bolshevik two-front struggle with its own weapons. This was a rather complicated process, which is difficult to understand today. The whole thing is like a puzzle. The law of the two-front struggle states that the struggle against it is not only intensifying, not only differentiating and branching out, but is also being fought with ever more hidden cards, to the same extent as the two-front struggle of Stalinism is intensifying, differentiating and branching out, and also disguising itself in order to expose the masquerade of the revisionists, in order to overrun the revisionists of their disguised crimes and strike them on the head. Stalinism teaches that the Bolshevik two-front struggle does not gradually decrease until it finally dies out completely, but that it must inevitably increase in intensity and complexity, that it must be fought under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat with ever more bitterness, determination and consistency, even by illegal means, so that it can die out at all, in accordance to the general teachings and laws of class struggle under socialism.

Let us take Stalin's vigilance campaigns, which are already mentioned in the 13th Volume of his works. These campaigns were also an expression of the two-front struggle. The Right did not have much to do with this. They were not allowed to feel addressed themselves. They only participated in the campaigns half-heartedly: In words, they were "vigilant" but in deeds, they let them fizzle out and covered up for the counter-revolutionary elements, or adopted a conciliatory, neutral attitude towards them. The "Left" shouted "treason! Betrayal" They went overboard in their alleged work of "unmasking" and terrified the Soviet people, spreading distrust among them. Behind their denunciation was not only their typical burgeoning careerism of the time, but they also cleverly distracted attention from their own crimes and delivered innocent victims to the knife. There was no trace of the unmasking of true enemies of the people. The reactionary elements of the "left" and "right" aligned themselves and used the vigilance campaigns together against the Marxist-Leninists, against the revolutionary forces of the Soviet peoples, against the laborers and the

Bolshevik Party. The Stalinist CC had to lead a principled and determined two-front struggle against the counter-revolutionary phenomena that appeared in the vigilance campaigns. This can be documented by numerous CC resolutions.

We have studied the struggle of Stalin, as it is written in the 13 Volumes, for decades, but have failed to apply this two-front struggle to the late Stalin Era, especially to the time shortly before his death. There the two-front struggle disappears in the fog of conspiracy. The fact that documents on this were kept in secret at the time or were later destroyed should not be used as an excuse for our omissions. We Marxist-Leninists have to exercise self-criticism here and make up for what we have failed to do.

This two-front struggle between the Stalinist General Line and the revisionist line, which was developing behind it in secret, raged back and forth before it finally won over Stalin, over Stalinism. The aged theoretical dignitaries formed a terrorist front against the restorers of Marxism-Leninism, whom the further advancing Soviet society had produced a huge number of excellent cadres from below. The old had "grown stuck" in their chairs and the new ones could not remove them. Here, too, is the two-front struggle: Separating the wheat from the chaff in the "old" and separating the wheat from the chaff in the "new" in order to forge a united revolutionary front of the new and the old against the counter-revolutionary front of the old and new reactionary elements. The counter-revolutionary forces, the backward elements from the layers of the intelligentsia, which weakened Marxism-Leninism in every way, were the ideological stick holders of modern revisionism, the bourgeois ideology of the new ruling bourgeoisie of the Soviet Union after Stalin's death.

Stalin was aware of the fact that after the practical reconstruction of the war damage, a nation cannot do without theoretical thinking if the Soviet Union wants to regain the level of science. Raising the level of Marxism-Leninism was a task that the Bolshevik Party itself had to work out for itself, a task that a Bolshevik Party must never, frozen in its own passivity, delegate to any state institute because the Party must not only guard revolutionary theory like the apple of its own eye, but must also develop it further with the help of democratic centralism, with the help of the Bolshevik principle of criticism and self-criticism, naturally making use of both the support from outside, from the masses, and carrying revolutionary theory into the revolutionary movement with the help of its Bolshevik agitation and propaganda, in order to draw again from the newly gained experience of the masses in applying the revolutionary innovations of theory. The Party is the leader of this dialectical process of developing revolutionary theory and this role must not be diminished. The party is the guardian of the Marxist-Leninist theory:

"The power of the Marxist-Leninist theory lies in the fact that it enables the Party to find the right orientation in any situation, to understand the inner connection of current events, to foresee their course and to perceive not only how and in what direction they are developing in the present, but how and in what direction they are bound to develop in the future.

"Only a party which has mastered the Marxist-Leninist theory can confidently advance and lead the working class forward.

"On the other hand, a party which has not mastered the Marxist-Leninist theory is compelled to grope its way, loses confidence in its actions and is unable to lead the working class forward.

"It may seem that all that is required for mastering the Marxist-Leninist theory is diligently to learn by heart isolated conclusions and propositions from the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin, learn to quote them at opportune times and rest at that, in the hope that the

conclusions and propositions thus memorized will suit each and every situation and occasion. But such an approach to the Marxist-Leninist theory is altogether wrong. The Marxist-Leninist theory must not be regarded as a collection of dogmas, as a catechism, as a symbol of faith, and the Marxists themselves as pedants and dogmatists.

"(...) Mastering the Marxist-Leninist theory means being able to enrich this theory with the new experience of the revolutionary movement, with new propositions and conclusions, it means being able to *develop it and advance it* without hesitating to replace — in accordance with the substance of the theory — such of its propositions and conclusions as have become antiquated by new ones corresponding to the new historical situation." (Stalin: 'History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union – Short Course'; Tbilisi; 2017; p.495-497; English Edition).

"It is essential to realize the incontestable truth that a Marxist must take cognizance of real life, of the concrete realities, and must not continue to cling to a theory of yesterday..." (ibid; p.501).

What would have become of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, of Leninism, if Stalin had shied away from touching the letter of Leninism, if he had lacked the theoretical courage to drop one of the old conclusions about the possibility of the victory of "*socialism in one country*" and replace it with new conclusions, corresponding to the new historical situation, about the possibility of the victory of "*communism in one country*"?

What would become of Stalinism if it had not been developed further by us, if the Comintern/ML had shied away from touching the letter of Stalinism, if it had lacked the theoretical courage to drop one of the old conclusions about the possibility of the victory of "*communism in one country*" and replace it with the new conclusion about the possibility of the victory of world communism, corresponding to the globalized revolutionary situation of the world proletariat? Can we close our eyes to the collapsing world capitalism in the face of the current world capitalist crisis? In the face of the new world revolutionary situation arising from this, can we still call ourselves Stalinists if we are afraid of realistically considering the possibility of the victory of world communism?

It was clear that Stalin's communist initiative stirred up and brought to the surface everything that had gradually been deposited on the theoretical ground of socialism in the USSR, a mud and morass that made revolutionary, scientific thinking breathless and threatened to suffocate it. The Central Committee had to take several decisions and take tough action to build a new cultural front. This cultural front opened the class struggle against the restoration of idealism. The late Stalinist Era was an era of cultural revolution, a struggle to create a communist superstructure, to which many Bolshevik leaders such as comrade Zhdanov fell victim. The assassination of Zhdanov by Beria expresses the sharpness which the counter-revolution responded to the Cultural Revolution with.

It was the beginning of a **historical period** when, **firstly**, Marxism-Leninism was already battered but strong enough not yet to be defeated and, **secondly**, modern revisionism was on the advance but still too weak to replace Marxism-Leninism. **This coexistence of two opposing ideologies, this transition from one aggregate state to the other, was anything but peaceful coexistence, it was a fight to the death, the moment of the leap to world socialism or the plunge into the darkness of the sole dominance of world reaction. It was a turning point over the decision to let Stalin's General Line of letting Marxism-Leninism win over the globe, to continue consistently or to stop halfway, to capitulate and turn back to capitalism.** The unity of Marxism-Leninism, its ability to survive, consists in its internationalism. Dividing and breaking this unity consisted in the conversion to nationalism, to great power chauvinism, to the nationalization of Marxism-Leninism

in order to prevent its progressive internationalization. **It is the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, the world proletarian force released by it, which decides the future of socialism. Its circumcision to the Soviet Union had to lead to its downfall.** When Stalin and Zhdanov directed against the ideological invasion of the imperialist West and built the bulwark of Soviet patriotism on the ideological front, the nationalists found a new source of inspiration to **restrict** Marxism-Leninism to its national importance for the Soviet Union, to adapt it to nationalism and to break its internationalist spirit. They tunneled under the Stalinist protective wall against foreign bourgeois ideology in order to enhance the domestic Russian bourgeois ideology, make it presentable and allow it to flow in, and **as a side effect to throw overboard everything progressive from abroad, much to the detriment of the Soviet Union. Here it becomes clear how the counter-revolution adapted to the Bolshevik two-front struggle, both internally and externally, in order to turn it against itself. It was a struggle of the forces of internationalization of Stalinism and the forces of nationalist, bourgeois isolation of the Soviet Union.**

The globalization of world imperialism won over the globalization of socialism. The defeat of the globalization of socialism sealed the defeat of "socialism in one country". The forces of world socialism historically proved to still be too weak to triumph over the forces of world imperialism in the first battle. The end of the Stalin Era thus became the new beginning of the era of world socialism, which is still going through a difficult and protracted birth and still has to go through painful processes. The current world crisis of capitalism is currently acting as a midwife. World socialism will see the light of day in the not too distant future and Stalinism will turn its defeat into a victory.

"De-Stalinization" took place in two stages.

However, it had gone to Beria, all in one go. He arbitrarily overrode party decisions to build a Stalin museum in Volynsko and transformed it into a children's home. What is more important now, a children's home or a museum? Beria was clever and calculating, because in reality he was not interested in a children's home or a museum, but in combining things in such a way that he could take advantage of them and erase the memory of Stalin within the Soviet peoples. He always justified the arbitrary disregard of party decisions by actions "which there was no objection against", because the revisionists basically wanted to get away from Stalin's cult of personality. Beria was never a Marxist in his nature, but he understood how to make use of Marxism. From his bureaucratic and pragmatic point of view, if he would like to clip the wings of the two-front struggle by state order, he saw it as a millstone around his neck to enforce his interests. The Khrushchevites were quite different. They could not and would not do without the two-front struggle against Stalinism. Beria waged his own "two-front struggle", the **Berianist two-front struggle**, namely to base himself on the front that had the greater power at the given moment, regardless of whether it was revolutionary or counter-revolutionary. The main thing was that it would help him advance on his career ladder. **He was an unprincipled man through and through, but he was an unprincipled man of a very special kind, someone who made unprincipledness his calculating principle. He was unprincipled, not because he was convinced of the lack of principles, but because he camouflaged himself with the respective "steadfastness of principle" of the ruling power in order to conquer it with his own principles. In English: He had the "gift" of being able to bet on the "right horse" with ice-cold calculation every time he saw the right moment to change to another horse.** The time of Menshevism in power had come, but Beria had not yet brought it about, so that with his lack of principles, with his Menshevism, he dug his own grave far too early. His anti-Stalinism was too far ahead of its time. **Therefore, Beria's Menshevism survived the Menshevik Beria.**

At first the modern revisionists were naturally aware that the colossal life's work of Comrade Stalin

could not be banished from the hearts and minds of the Soviet people overnight. This was completely illusory and objectively impossible. They had nothing at all to oppose it and had to limit themselves to disposing of the cult of personality they had practiced, step by step, behind closed doors. Only after the 20th Party Congress could they finally drop their shells and begin the formal "de-Stalinization". Shortly after Stalin's death, the new Kremlin Tsars adorned themselves with the laurels of Stalin's achievements, they credited themselves for his merits.

Molotov, in his report on "The International Situation and Foreign Policy of the Government of the U.S.S.R.", presented at the meeting of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on **February 8th, 1955** had actually managed **not to mention a single word about Stalin's foreign policy**, let alone even mention the name of Stalin from his mouth, as if he had never existed, Bulganin did mention the name of Stalin **once** in his speech as Chairman of the Council of Ministers on **February 9th, 1955**, but he fully supported Molotov and Khrushchev. On the other hand, **Khrushchev, of all people**, was the one who, in his speech at the Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU on **January 25th, 1955 (sic!)**, "New Successes in the Development of the National Economy of the USSR", continued to make use of the cult of personality, such as, for example: "Instructions of the brilliant Lenin and Stalin, the faithful continuation of his work"; "Stalin, who developed Lenin's instructions further" (and Khrushchev even **quoted** Stalin's "Instructions" in his speech!) Or let us take, for example, this passage in Khrushchev's lecture: **"The correct line, (...) which the great Lenin had mapped out, the party under Stalin's leadership unwaveringly put into practice. It continues to follow this line consistently today and will continue to do so in the future."** (From a pamphlet published by KPD; Düsseldorf; Unknown Year; p.42-43; Translated from German). The same Khrushchev **ended** the "future of this correct line" just as "unwaveringly" one year later with the 20th Party Congress, at which he officially bid farewell to Stalin in a despicable manner not only in deeds but also in words. **The revisionists of today do not continue this anti-Stalinist line so openly: Today, quite a few revisionists try to dip into the anti-Marxist cloak that the nationalists, fascists, chauvinists etc. have put on Comrade Stalin's coat in red.**

Just as these revisionist parasites had already enjoyed the paradise of the USSR during Stalin's lifetime, which the laboring Soviet people had built up in the sweat of their brow, after his death they continued to swim on the "Stalin wave" for a while and they had only carefully stripped off their personality cult, for they no longer needed it.

If we divide "de-Stalinization" into two parts, substantively and formal, it is not because we have succumbed to a mechanistic method. "De-Stalinization" is a dialectical process, just as a "re-Stalinization" on a higher level emerges from it again and becomes Stalinization on a world scale (negation of negation). And this process will also not begin with the renaming of Stalingrad and Leningrad, but with the global anchoring of Marxism-Leninism as the ruling world ideology, as the ideology of the liberated world proletariat.

First, the revolutionary spirit rots. As is well known, the fish begins to stink at the head, then the internal organs rot and then the outer shell decays or is used to fill bourgeois contents. Beria had put "de-Stalinization" into words and action, not only openly condemning Stalin, but also eliminating those who continued the path of Stalin. He did not, however, introduce himself in front of people to shout "Down with Stalin!", but he did, for example, present himself in front of a Politburo of the CP of Hungary to condemn Stalin and his politics there and to impose his "course of de-Stalinization" on the brother parties with bureaucratic violence and blackmail. Even at the 20th Party Congress, the covers had not quite fallen off yet, it was after all still a "secret speech" of Khrushchev. Both the substantive and the formal process of "de-Stalinization" could only take place in stages.

With the 20th Party Congress the modern revisionists went over to overcoming Stalin publicly, "substantively-politically, ideologically-educatively" by seeking refuge in "Leninism" for

ideological "de-Stalinization". Every second term that fell was "cult of personality". Later, when Leninism could no longer be used because the restoration of capitalism had already progressed too far for that, they gradually dropped their mask of "Leninism" in order to openly establish bourgeois ideology, while still "remembering" Lenin in solemn moments and putting the hypocritical label of the "creative development of Leninism" on their capitalism.

We call this second stage of "de-Stalinization" the **legalized, perfectly formed "de-Stalinization"**, which can be characterized by the **removal of the name of Stalin** from the public life of the USSR, from the public life of its sphere of influence in other countries. There were no more images of Stalin, no more monuments of Stalin, no more historical sights about Stalin, no more streets and places named after Stalin, no more publications in which he was mentioned, not even the works of Stalin themselves. Companies, institutions in state, party and army, in schools, in literature and art, everything was renamed. **The name of Stalin was to be systematically and with bureaucratic thoroughness banished from the memory of the Soviet people.** Of course, after the 20 Party Congress the renaming continued. **Stalinabad** was renamed in 1962; **Stalingrad** in 1961. With the Soviet Union the things named after Lenin disappeared. Leningrad was called St. Petersburg again. We Marxist-Leninists are firmly convinced that this renaming will not help the modern revisionists, because we will emerge victorious from the struggle against modern revisionism. Once we have established socialism throughout the world, the old Lenin and Stalin names will not only be restored in Russia and Albania, not only in the former Soviet republics, in the former people's democracies, but these renaming will of course be carried out by the victorious world proletariat throughout the world. The "de-Stalinization" of the modern revisionists will be replaced by our re-Stalinization on the whole globe! How else can a Marxist-Leninist understand the "dialectics of de-Stalinization" as its replacement by the global Stalinization. **Global Stalinization is the program of the Comintern/ML.**

The Hitlerite fascists had burned anti-fascist books on public pyres for propaganda purposes. Imitating this with the works of Stalin was, of course, impossible for the modern revisionists at that time, because millions of people still flocked to Stalin's coffin to mourn. The brainwashing of the modern revisionists took place as an agonizing and humiliating self-denial of the Soviet peoples. This wound in the soul of the Soviet people could not heal until today. It can only heal when the former Soviet peoples have regained their confidence in Stalinism. **Only to the extent that they understand the betrayal of the modern revisionists will they find their way back to Stalin. It is not enough that we *Marxist-Leninists* have understood this. It is our duty to help the Soviet peoples to return to the path of Stalinism, the advanced path of Stalinism on a higher ladder, in the step from their own October Revolution to their integration into the revolution of the world proletariat! No longer integrating the revolution of other countries into the October Revolution, but the other way round, integrating the overthrow of the Russian bourgeoisie into the overthrow of the world bourgeoisie! This is the Lenin-Stalinist way of the future, and to hammer it in again and again: The way ahead of us is globalized re-Stalinization.**

We must remember here that, for example, **as early as January 1951**, there were more Stalinist works among the masses than there were Leninist works. In order to get an idea of the dimension of the total number of editions, here are some impressive figures about the works of Lenin and Stalin published up to **1951**:

First Edition of Lenin's Works (1920-1926) = 2,670,000

Second and Third Editions of Lenin's Works (1925 - 1932) = 20,743,000

Fourth Edition of Lenin's Works (1941-1951) = 21,791,000

Stalin's Works (12 volumes had been published since 1946) = 10,367,000

Stalin's "Concerning Questions of Leninism" = 17,334,000

"History of the C.P.S.U.(B.) - Short Course" = 38,756,000

Stalin's "On Lenin" = 8,921,000

Total Number of Published Works of Lenin = 204,300,000 (!!!!)

Total Published Works of Stalin = 570,200,000 (!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!)

The modern revisionists could not eliminate 570 200 000 works of Stalin "overnight"! They were spread and anchored in the people! (In contrast, the Stalin works published by us Marxist-Leninists after Stalin's death seem rather small. But we promise that in the not too distant future this will soon be different again. The interest in the Stalin works is growing at the same pace as the struggle against world imperialism. The works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism will be spread a billion times under globalized socialism when Marxism-Leninism has become the ruling ideology in the world!

As long as Stalin was alive, that is, as long as power was in the hands of the Marxist-Leninists, the Trotskyites attacked Stalinism from "the left" (following the example of the Bloc of the Right and the Trotskyites). For example, Tito attached to Stalinism the predicate of "modern revisionism", "bureaucratic state capitalism", "imperialism" and "fascism", etc. We, as the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, which had developed against the 20th Congress of the CPSU, attacked the modern revisionists **as modern revisionists** only at a time when they had already come into power, while the modern revisionists attacked Stalinism already at a time when Stalin was still in power as "modern revisionists". After eliminating Stalin, after revisionism was in power, the opportunists turned 180 degrees to denounce Stalinism as "sectarianism", "leftist" opportunism and "dogmatism" etc., from right positions. In the 1960s, the Soviet revisionists regarded Stalinism as "leftist" opportunism, a current that was considered the main danger to be fought. **At this historical turning point, modern revisionism changed its fronts in the two-front struggle, the main front became the secondary front and the secondary front became the main front against Stalinism.**

Today the Berianists continue the "de-Stalinization" of Beria as follows: They try to stop the re-Stalinization by labeling us Marxist-Leninists as "dogmatists" and "sectarians" with the help of their counter-revolutionary slogan: **"Fight Stalinism and the Stalinists, with Stalin"**.

"De-Stalinization" was achieved through the interaction of the forces of collapse and the forces of deformation. Beria and Malenkov operated the wrecking ball (which was still hidden behind conspiracies, intrigues and intrigues in Stalin's time) and the deformation machinery set Khrushchev in motion. And the Berianists today? They beat us Stalinists in order to spread their bourgeois revision of Stalinism everywhere, and vice versa, they deform Stalinism in order to incite against us Stalinists. The struggle between Stalinism and Berianism will be intensified and carried out! Beria could murder Stalin, but against Stalinism the Berianists are powerless.

Consequently, the task of today's Stalinists is to ensure the cooperation of the reconstructive forces and the new formation forces of Stalinism. Everything that has proven to be good and right about Stalinism must be restored, purged from anti-Stalinism (including Berianism) and cultivated in a Marxist-Leninist manner. The application of Stalinism to our present time, this has to be ensured by

our Marxist-Leninist reformation of Stalinism. To the old, still usable building blocks only new ones have to be added, and our new, even more stable Stalinist building can be built and occupied again.

Historically, "de-Stalinization" did *not* (!) *first* begin with Khrushchev, not only with the 20th Party Congress, especially with his so-called "Secret Speech". No, only a few days after Stalin's death, the order was given to drastically reduce the mention of Stalin in the press and radio. Beria ordered a limited mourning period for 3 days. He did not allow the publication of commemorative articles as usual. There is not a single commemorative article, not by any member of the Presidium, not by anyone! The only exception to publish memorial articles of foreign party leaders was allowed to Enver Hoxha and Wilhelm Pieck.

There was even an order to wear only the portraits of Marx, Engels and Lenin at rallies, the future "3 Heads", this anti-Stalinist hallmark of all revisionist parties that followed the Soviet revisionists and still exist today. The orders for de-Stalinization came from what was supposedly Stalin's "most loyal companion", from BERIA!!! The "3 Heads" are the trademark of Beria! The "thaw period" was initiated by Beria. He was the leading head of this immediately implemented anti-Stalinist line, and not Khrushchev.

But be careful: Today's Berianists hide behind the "4 Heads" to save Beria's trademark! Beria, on the other hand, *cut off* Stalin's head to put it on himself, making a newly grafted Stalin head to camouflage the 3 Heads. That is the tactic of today's neo-revisionists, who have split into different currents but are united in their fight against Stalinism. The "thaw period" in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement after the death of Enver Hoxha was also initiated by the Berianists. Many Marxist-Leninist parties infected themselves with the newly circulated Trotskyite virus, only to end up in neo-revisionism. Less and less revolution, but more and more reformism! The majority of our Marxist-Leninist World Movement has thus gone astray and only a small remainder of upright Marxist-Leninist comrades is unfortunately left in many countries. However, it is clearly recognizable that the true Marxist-Leninists all over the world are coming together again and are working on their cooperation and unification in view of the great revolutionary tasks which face the world proletariat today.

The reform course for the restoration of capitalism of Beria was to break the restoration of capitalism in a "coup de grâce" over the knee. **Not the restoration of capitalism itself, but the way to it, made the difference between Beria and Khrushchev.** Khrushchev's "thaw" course was designed for a longer period, sometimes with detours and zigzag turns. The real impetus to turn away from Marxism-Leninism and throw Stalin's teachings, including Marxism-Leninism, into the trash can was provided by Beria with the help of Malenkov. In this respect Beria was Khrushchev's pioneer, the forerunner of modern revisionism in the Soviet Union. **Beria did not sacrifice himself for Stalin, but for modern revisionism.** Beria was even prepared to throw not only Stalinism but also Marxism-Leninism as a whole overboard, while Khrushchev chose to fight Stalinism with "Leninism".

While Beria waved unvarnished social-democratism, nationalism, social-imperialism, etc., Khrushchev initially wore the "left" garment of Marxist ideology. And so that this "left" garment could also gain credibility in the eyes of the masses, **the right-wing enemy of the Party Beria was "unmasked" by the "left"**. Without this tactical move, the so-called formal "demarcation from right opportunism", Khrushchev would not have been able to sell modern revisionism as "Marxism-Leninism" so convincingly, he would not have had a sound ideological platform from which the attack on Stalinism could have been launched, not only in the Soviet Union but also in the Communist World Movement. If Bill Bland postulated that Beria was allegedly a "Stalinist", how does it fit together that Khrushchev had not accused Beria of Stalinist "dogmatism and

sectarianism" but of right-wing opportunism? Who is wrong here, Bill Bland or Khrushchev?

Basically, this was based on Kautskyism, only that here it was not Kautsky against Bernstein, but Khrushchev against Beria, who had taken the field, in order to sell himself as a Marxist and cover up right-wing opportunism with "left-wing" phrases. **Khrushchev's two-front struggle, the "two-front struggle" against modern revisionism in the Soviet Union, was masked as "Marxist-Leninist" after Stalin's death:**

a) Berianism: right-wing, reformist, social-democratic ("revisionism");

b) Stalinism: cult of personality, dogmatic, sectarian, "left-wing opportunist";

c) Khrushchev's course: "Marxist-Leninist".

This revisionist acquisition of the Old Bolshevik two-front struggle played a key role in the development of modern revisionism as an ideological compass for "de-Stalinization", which is why we must not only memorize this scheme firmly, but also derive from it and prove the position of the revisionists before the death of Stalin! We assume that the revisionists knew and used this scheme already during Stalin's lifetime, only in a veiled and disguised form. By the way, this scheme still serves the revisionists today. Who is surprised? Here is how the Berianists present the fight against us Stalinists:

a) modern revisionists (Khrushchev, Mao, Tito, etc.);

b) dogmatists, sectarians, "leftist" opportunists (us);

c) Beria, Malenkov (Marxist-Leninists).

We must not forget, then, that both the Khrushchevites and the Berianists carried out the "de-Stalinization" under the banner of the struggle against dogmatism and sectarianism, only that one openly condemned Stalin, while the other maintained him as a cover.

Was there a two-front struggle against "de-Stalinization" ?

We are very much of this opinion, because it is a class struggle against the liquidation of Stalinism, which inevitably had to be waged against both the Right and the "Left". But where is the second front against "de-Stalinization"? Can this second front have been the front against "Stalinization"? Yes, that sounds paradoxical but dialectically, it is perfectly logical.

Let's take the example of Bolshevization for comparison. Let's remember the 7th, World Congress of the Comintern, where Dimitrov had praised his revisionist course of the popular front tactic as an expression of "Bolshevization", of all things. However, the Bolshevik course of the Comintern's popular front tactic had already been determined long ago by the resolutions of the previous World Congresses. A *change of course* brought about by the label of "Bolshevization" could therefore be nothing other than a turning away from the old Bolshevik Comintern of Lenin and Stalin. Here the term "Bolshevization" was misused to neutralize the Bolshevization as it was previously carried and anchored into the Comintern by Lenin and Stalin, to abolish it, to replace it in reality by revisionism. But one was not allowed to say such a thing openly at that time, but had to wrap it up in a phrase, had to give the new Comintern course a new name and call it "Bolshevization", in order to pass off this revisionist turnaround of the Comintern as something that was supposed to look something like a "further development of Bolshevism". "Bolshevization" of Bolshevization is therefore not to

be understood in a double sense, but as a form of abolition of Bolshevization. So what Dimitrov really wanted to achieve with this was the "de-Bolshevization" of the Comintern.

In our case, of course, this cannot be any different with "de-Stalinization". What does it mean to "Stalinize" Stalinism? Multiplying a minus with another minus gives you a PLUS. Stalinism times Stalinism = abolition of Stalinism. Ideologically, this calculation results in Stalinism multiplied by itself, which produces the opposite, revisionism. Just as one cannot "de-Stalinize" Stalinism, one cannot "Stalinize" it. But what one can and must do is the further development of Stalinism (exclusively) on the basis of Stalinism. To develop further means to raise it to such a level so that it becomes applicable again under the given global conditions and can fulfill its purpose. So we are not doing anything wrong when we strive for the globalization of Stalinism. Not "Stalinizing", but globalizing Stalinism. This, and only this, helps us further with the slogan: "To learn from Stalin is to learn to win! This slogan doesn't help at all if you learn old Stalinist doctrines by heart. As a Stalinist, you have to use your own head, but for us Stalinists, it cannot be used properly.

What had changed in the two-front struggle after Stalin's death?

If we assume that the "de-Stalinization course" of the revisionists after Stalin's death had been carried out unilaterally, without the help of a second front, then this would have been extremely risky, because Stalinism had been defeated, but was still far from being eliminated. The Stalinists offered resistance. As long as one had to reckon with Stalinism showing off and being beaten back, it was inevitable for the revisionists to keep the cardboard sign of "Stalinism" ready as a counterpart for a while. This cardboard sign was given to the so-called "Anti-Party Group" of Molotov, Kaganovich etc., in order to control the Stalinists in this "Anti-Party Group" in the function of a catch-all. This Bolshevik corpse thus formed the second front of the so-called "Stalinists". When the Khrushchevites began to weaken, the Bolshevik corpses did not set out to overthrow Stalinism, but basically they rushed to the aid of the Khrushchevites to save revisionism. Thus the first front of "de-Stalinization" and the second front of "Stalinization" complemented each other to form a common front of modern revisionism, the second front worked into the hands of the first front. We are sure that the Stalinists must have seen through this interplay and that in some way they led a Stalinist two-front struggle against both anti-Stalinist fronts. It is therefore extremely important for us today to find out who led this two-front struggle against the "de-Stalinizers" and "Stalinizers" and how it was actually waged. These are the documents which we Stalinists are interested in. But the anti-Stalinists in the West and in the East are of course in complete agreement about abstaining from them, for reasons we know. They have no interest in the truth about the real Stalinists who fought against modern revisionism after Stalin's death.

The restoration of capitalism begins with the restoration of the Party.

"De-Stalinization" did not begin only after Stalin's death, but was already prepared and carried out during his lifetime, indeed it started before Stalin even became General Secretary of the party, already during Lenin's lifetime.

The degeneration process of the Party, its attempts to restore it to a bourgeois party are things we must take a closer look at in the last phase of Stalinism. The CPSU had not degenerated until the death of Stalin, but it was already on its way there. Too many leaders took the liberty of acting with impunity and dancing on the nose of the Stalinist party. One only needs to look at Khrushchev's report on "Amendments and Additions to the Statute" at the 19th Party Congress to be

amazed that 80% of the entire report had to deal with degenerative crimes committed by party members, which would have been an impossibility in any other Bolshevik party in the world. Let us just briefly pick out two examples: In the glorious party of Lenin and Stalin, Paragraph 1 of Khrushchev's statute states that only those who "do not exploit other people's labor" can be members of the Party. This was discussed less than 40 years ago in the debate with Martov on the first paragraph. Has there ever been a Communist Party in the world that included exploiters in its party? But it is not really so far-fetched from a historical point of view, because half of its members should have been expelled from the Party at the time of Stalin, because they were already familiar with methods of exploitation and oppression, the mass dissemination of which Khrushchev himself had to admit in his report. **And indeed, already in Stalin's time there existed a parasitic stratum in Soviet society that could justifiably be called "exploiters"**. After Stalin's death, the whole system of the Soviet Union was then **transformed into a capitalist system of exploitation of foreign labor**, it was the Party itself that had completely restored capitalism and indeed disciplined itself to the decision of the 19th Party Congress, namely to dissolve itself. Another "thing of impossibility, and just as characteristic of the degenerating party, was the role attributed to Marxism-Leninism. Here Marxism-Leninism really appears only at the end of "On the Specifications of the Tasks of the Local Party Organizations" [sic!!], namely that the ideological work is underestimated and its propagation is still unsatisfactorily organized. But this is only the case with the **local** party organizations, from the local party organizations upwards, apparently not up to the top of the party hierarchy.

The highest level of the fight against dangerously increased degeneration had been reached. The decisive question at that moment was already on the agenda under item 1: Life or death of the party? Victory or defeat for Stalin. Stalin refused to capitulate until the end, he remained loyal to the Bolshevik Party, he broke all the chains of the revisionists that they tried to tie him, he tried to carry out the greatest purge in the history of the Party against the reluctance of the degenerating elements in the party leadership.

And indeed, the existence of the party was massively threatened by liquidators, the Stalinists in the period of late Stalinism still represented the dominant, the ruling faction in the CPSU, but just one faction among others, a faction which had been made more and more difficult to assert and to assert itself. **Shortly before Stalin's death, the CPSU consisted of different groupings, whose power struggles Stalin was just about able to keep under control. Basically, Stalin, in his old age, had to make a titanic effort to keep the Party clean and united. In our opinion, this was his greatest merit of his entire life. Without Stalin, the Party would have gone down the drain long ago. There was "unity", but it was a deceptive unity, a unity outwardly cemented together by Stalin, under the surface of which the struggle for decomposition among the factions was seething. For Stalin, party unity was always there for the working class, not for the Party as an end in itself. And he knew exactly that: If the unity of the Party ceases to serve the working class, it is not worth a cent for the working class, if the unity of the proletarian party turns into a unity of its degeneration, the revisionist leaders will take the unity for themselves in order to turn it against the working class.**

What is the unity in a Marxist-Leninist party worth, if it does not serve the unity of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement? What is the use of unity in a Marxist-Leninist World Movement, if it does not serve the unity of the Communist International? What is the use of the unity of the Communist World Party, if it does not serve the world proletariat, not the unity of its class? Nothing at all!

The revisionists used the unity as long as they did not believe themselves strong enough to do without it, while Stalin needed the unity in order to rein in the revisionists, to take them under his wings and to control them. Thus the unity of the Party was put to the hardest test in its

history. Each grouping wanted to use the instrument of unity to serve its own interests. The groupings did not want to "smash" it, but "only" take possession of it in order to use it as a powerful cover for the coup. If there were such a thing as a "unity" that buries a party, instead of strengthening it, under its burden, then we would be inclined not to rule this out for the last moment in the history of the CPSU (B) of Lenin and Stalin. It was as if Stalin carried this burden on his own shoulders even with his final breath:

"Do not forget that every disaccord at the top finds an echo in the country that is harmful to us, not to speak of the effect it has abroad." (Stalin: 'The Fourteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.)' in: 'Works', Volume 7; Moscow; 1954; p.402; English Edition). **(This was addressed to the opposition - author's note).**

In the end, what Stalin was unable to do was to smash those anti-party factions, this bustle of cliquism within the party, and restore the old Bolshevik unity on the ruins of factionalism. The only thing that prevented him from doing so was his violent death. The stronger Stalin's position became, the more the pressure of the anti-party cliques increased, and the more the question of power in the Party intensified. This was particularly evident at the 19th Party Congress, which demonstrated unity on the outside, but was already pitted on the inside. The Party was on the verge of either degenerating into revisionism or getting rid of the dangerously accumulated revisionist rust and freeing the party from its revisionist infestation.

Comrades, here is where the whole physiognomy of the Trotskyite unprincipled nature of its basic views of factionalism is revealed. Trotskyism rejects Stalinism's "claim to sole representation," but not a "Stalinist" faction when it moves within the Trotskyite rules of the game, the rules of ideological pluralism in the party, the rules of the groupings in the party. The Trotskyites thus represented an unprincipled unity in contrast to the Bolshevik unity, which is based exclusively on the foundations of Marxism-Leninism and is therefore a principled unity. But Stalin's conspirators of 1953 had definitively renounced the principled unity of the Bolshevik Party in order to destroy it. For them, Stalinism was only an empty shell behind which they carried on their counter-revolutionary activities. By its very nature, the Leninist-Stalinist Party is characterized by its monolithic unity, which **excludes** the existence of groups and factions within its ranks. Like Trotsky, the conspirators of Stalin opposed this monolithic unity of the party. They were factionists and liquidated the Party by turning it into a bourgeois party, but used its old shell to conceal their crime. They were worse than liquidators because they did not openly reveal their liquidationist intentions, but deceived the Party and the Soviet people behind their backs to make their exposure as impossible as possible.

Trotsky pretended to be a supporter of Lenin as if there were only differences of opinion with Stalin. The Berianists pass Beria off as Stalinist, as if there were only differences of opinion with Khrushchev. This is the same Trotskyite method of hiding the counter-revolutionary face.

Take Lenin's characterization of Trotsky in December 1911 and compare it to **Beria**:

"It is impossible to argue with Trotsky on the merits of the issue, because Trotsky holds no views whatever. We can and should argue with confirmed liquidators and otzovists; but it is no use arguing with a man whose game is to hide the errors of both these trends; in his case the thing to do is to expose him as a diplomat of the smallest calibre." (Lenin: 'Trotsky's Diplomacy and a Certain Party Platform' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 17; Moscow; 1974; p.362; English Edition). **And Beria was just a secret diplomat of the lowest calibre.**

Trotsky was for shaking up the Leninist cadre. He called for the method of coercion, where the method of persuasion (union question) was to be given priority. The 1953 Trotskyite conspirators

began the shaking (liquidation) of Stalin's cadres **from above** and then continued it **from below**.

The RSDLP's Prague Party Conference in January 1912, which Stalin also participated in, had taught that there can never again be unity between Bolsheviks and Mensheviks in one party. However, in late Stalinism, the Mensheviks built up one position after another within the Party, strengthening their factionalism in the fight against the Stalinists until they were finally able to take over the Party through a coup. They no longer needed to crush it, but it just fell into their laps with the annihilation of Stalin. Now all they needed to do was to turn or clean out the remaining Stalinists, because they already held the central power needed for this in their hands.

It was no wonder that the 19th Party Congress decided to abandon the designation "**vanguard of the proletariat**" and from now on to give itself the elitist and sectarian title: "**League of Like-Minded Communists**". The CPSU has been reduced to the level of a league (English: **Communist League**), whose meaning and purpose has nothing to do with a Bolshevik party anymore and reminds of the old times of the struggle against the founding opportunism, against the league conception of the anti-Leninists. What was hidden behind the adjective "**like-minded**" can be quickly recognized if one studies Khrushchev's report on the 19th Party Congress of the CPSU (B):

In it, Khrushchev justified the renaming of "**CPSU (B)**" to just "**CPSU**" [the criminal omission of the **(B) = Bolshevik**].

First, it had become a national party that stood above Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. This was by no means a formal act, but of political-ideological significance. By this he meant that the class struggle of the Bolsheviks against the Mensheviks must now be buried forever and that Bolshevism and Menshevism in the USSR would no longer exist for "reasons of state": "It cannot be what is not supposed to be. This was the state-imposed disarmament of the Bolshevik character of the Party, which in fact was already underway and well advanced. This was the statutory armament of Menshevism in the Party. The fact is that the fight against Menshevism, that is, the fight against the representatives of capitalism in the Party, had to be stopped, because they had conquered the majority in the Party anyway.

Secondly, with the 19th Party Congress, one was a "communist", **whether** one was a member of Bolshevism or Menshevism. Thus, the historic resolutions of the Prague Party Conference of 1912, which the Bolsheviks had formed as an **independent party** at, were tacitly repealed. Menshevism had not only become respectable, but strong enough to place itself "above the Party" and to be able to generously renounce its individuality and separation from Bolshevism by name. **It was not only Khrushchev, but in the opinion of all conspirators against Stalin, that the CPSU (B) should stop being a Bolshevik party, a party of the class struggle, forever with the 19th Party Congress. The swan song to Stalinism resounded loudly as a "hymn of praise" to Stalin. The stormy applause was no longer directed at him, the "God", but had rather become an expression of satisfaction at having "liberated" himself from Stalin, from Stalinism. And Stalin could no longer meet this provocation with the silence which he had hitherto disciplined unity with. With the 19th Party Congress, he pulled out all the stops at his disposal to oppose the liquidation of the party, so that the whole conspiratorial heap came apart and collapsed like a house of cards. Stalin had been able to strengthen his position again after the 19th Party Congress.**

If the Bolsheviks and Stalin had expelled the Menshevik pactists, the traitors to communism, from the Party, if the liquidation of the Bolshevik Party, if its transformation into a revisionist party in 1953 had not taken place at all, if the masses had asserted the dictatorship of the proletariat and continued to build communism in the USSR, world imperialism would have

been in a hopeless situation.

What should have been done after Stalin's death? We have already pointed out that after the 19th Party Congress, Stalin had prepared the Plenum of the CC, so that this question need not even be asked. Stalin had made it clear to everyone what had to be done. Well, we do not know what Stalin had instilled in the party leadership at that time.

We can only speculate. However, speculations such as "had, would, could, should," etc., etc., etc., don't get you very far.

What "would" we have done in Stalin's place?

In the years after 1953, the Stalinist forces reorganized themselves independently in order to turn the defeat by the modern revisionists into a revolutionary victory. In a party that was conquered by the revisionists, the Stalinist forces tried to exert influence. The Stalinists continue the General Line of Stalin and form a united front of resistance against the "de-Stalinization" campaign of the revisionists. Where there is "de-Stalinization", resistance must be offered, and if necessary, as an illegal organization. Stalinists call the masses to revolutionary uprising, prepare the reorganization of the socialist revolution to re-conquer the dictatorship of the proletariat. If it is no longer possible to reconquer the revisionist degenerated party, the Stalinists commit themselves to building a new Stalinist party and, if necessary, go into illegality. In any case, the Stalinists lead the class struggle against modern revisionism in their own country. They seek contact with the Marxist-Leninist World Movement abroad and cooperate with Enver Hoxha's Albania. Just as the Bolsheviks had won in the October Revolution, they completely smash the political power of the modern revisionists in a Second October Revolution and restore the power of Stalinism without Stalin.

The coup of the conspirators could have been avoided if the Party had stood united behind Stalin and given him better support in purging the conspirators, if it had not lost its Old Bolshevik party spirit. Modern revisionism is so dangerous because it conceals its liquidatory nature and does not openly oppose Stalinism, but takes it by surprise from behind.

Khrushchevite revisionism hid behind its "Marxist-Leninist critique" of Yugoslav revisionism, just like Chinese revisionism with its "Marxist-Leninist critique" of Soviet revisionism, and Berianism also hides behind its "Marxist-Leninist critique" of us Marxist-Leninists in order to split and *liquidate* the Marxist-Leninist World Movement in the name of world imperialism and replace it by a social-democratic-revisionist world movement with an "anti-revisionist face".

Khrushchev's modern revisionism was particularly dangerous because it **embodied** exactly what it pretended to "unmask" and "fight": **The mask of revisionism**, which hid behind the criticism of sectarianism, dogmatism, "left" opportunism in order to discredit Marxism-Leninism. So it says in the revisionist "History of Philosophy":

"The resurgence and spread of revisionism in the second half of the 1950s was linked to attempts by the international bourgeoisie to use the criticism of Stalin's cult of personality and the overcoming of its consequences to discredit and undermine the communist movement" ('History of Philosophy', Volume VI; Berlin; 1967; p.330; Translated from German).

It was the other way around: The "criticism of the cult of personality" was carried out in cooperation between imperialists and revisionists and "overcoming its consequences" served the common imperialist and revisionist interests to put a stop to the restoration of socialism.

the reconquest of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the return to Stalinism, the closure of modern revisionism.

The "cult of personality" and "de-Stalinization", the idolization and demonization of Stalin are two sides of the same coin. Their end justifies the means: The "elevation" to bourgeois state doctrine and its dismantling up to the opportunistic and finally, the complete abandonment of Marxism-Leninism.

End of Chapter