

Chapter 2

Questions of Stalin's Personality

The "Cult of Personality" and its "Criticism" - Two Sides of the same anti-Stalinist Coin

You can think what you like about **Stefan Heym**, but on **December 21st, 1953**, he told the truth about Stalin's alleged "cult of personality", and he certainly hit the "**nail on the head**":

"And then there were those who couldn't do enough with nice adjectives. As if he needed that! The man was of such stature as a human being, as a party leader, as a scientist, historian, general and statesman that neither the dirt nor the artificial laurels that were thrown in his path even reached the soles of his shoes."

Very few comrades are aware that Beria had built up his own cult of personality around himself, especially in Georgia. We will come back to this when we discuss the "Mingrelian Conspiracy". Beria, Stalin's "faithful companion", was the greatest sycophant, hypocrite and loving servant within the Soviet Union, the "most subservient servant" of Stalin, the most perverse figure of the "cult of personality" around Stalin, one of the most skillful in using the cult of personality and the most brutal in putting anti-Stalinism into practice. He was the one who invested the most in it and profited the most from it and finally became a victim of his "de-Stalinization" himself. The cult of personality was Beria's most dangerous weapon to enforce the "de-Stalinization", which he immediately initiated openly and directly after the murder of Stalin. The cult of personality was the hatchet that Beria forged to slaughter Stalin and us Stalinists in order to destroy Stalinism! Beria did everything to appropriate Stalin privately, to appropriate Stalinism privately, for the purpose of world capitalist exploitation. That was the privatization of the Stalinist social order for the purpose of its exploitation and oppression. The cult of personality was the most perfidious method of "de-Stalinization". "De-Stalinization" means the elimination of Marxism-Leninism under the guise of eliminating the so-called "cult of personality".

The cult (Latin: worship of the gods) is as old as mankind itself. It was practiced even before it was divided into classes. The cult of personality (translated as: the worship of a person like a god) is thus older than the socialist society in which it was practiced around Stalin. It is even older than the class society. With cults of personality, for example, the retrograde elements of the millennia-old society have repeatedly tried to put progressive people, especially their leaders, in such a glaring light that society, in normal light, no longer sees them as their progressive people, as their progressive leaders, and even no longer recognizes itself as a progressive society. Whoever blinds the masses can blind them with it, darken their lives, disarm the masses with it, break their beliefs in the bright beam of light, and even break them. The weapons of blindness and delusion can very well be transformed into deadly weapons of class struggle. They are the same weapons of whitewashing and rose-tinted glasses, only much more sharply, as in the course of the intensifying class struggle in the Soviet Union and finally in the

whole world. What began with whitewashing and rose-colored glasses around the figure of Stalin was soon no longer enough, and increased to the instigation of an excessive, criminal cult of personality, which was spread all over the world and ended with the so-called "criticism of the so-called cult of personality" as a death sentence not only for Stalinism in particular, but also against communism in general.

What is said here about the cult of personality in particular applies of course quite generally to the cult that is practiced around peoples, masses and classes, like for example the "Proletkult" in relation to the working class. A cult is a cult. After all, it can be practiced with anything and everything, even a cult for the liberation from injustice and slavery, even a cult for the liberation from war and fascism, even a cult for the class struggle itself.

Thus class struggle is neither a demonized "specter" nor a "cult which the communists sacrifice themselves to", but the real revolutionary process of upheavals of all formations of class society. In the social formation of communism, the cult of personality, like any other cult, can forever only be read as a chapter in history lessons. The only thing communism and the cult have in common is the first letter of each term. They can no more be marked with signs of equality than the terms Proletkult and proletarian culture. Both are mutually exclusive.

One only needs to place form over substance in order to replace the old substance with a new substance unnoticed, which then gets rid of the old shell all the more demonstratively in order to take on its new form. The cult of personality around Stalin was replaced by the cult of personality around Khrushchev, after the cult of personality around Beria or Malenkov could not be enforced. The cult of personality separates and alienates the appearance of the communist world leader from his human condition, ascribing to him divine attributes which, as is well known, Marxism rejects to worship. In this way, those who have cultivated the cult of personality then provide themselves with an alibi to appear against the revolutionary leader and replace him with a fake. This is done in order to deceive socialist society, in order to lead it imperceptibly back to a capitalist society, leaving it in the belief that it is still on the "socialist path". In other words, to lead it, so to speak, "on the wrong path".

Experience teaches us enough to be very careful not to over-emphasize people, especially ourselves. Marxism-Leninism, therefore, does not turn a blind eye when the cult of personality remains "within the framework", but absolutely and strictly rejects the cult of personality. Marxism-Leninism opposes the cult of personality because it is harmful to the cause of the proletariat.

Marx and Engels already stood up against the emphasis on their own figures. Engels wrote in a letter to the Singers' Association of the Communist Workers' Education Society, Tottenham Street on November 28th, 1891:

"Both Marx and I have always been against all public demonstrations that are tied to individual figures unless a great purpose can be served by them; and most of all against those demonstrations that in our lifetime would revolve around our own figures" (Engels: 'Letter to the Singers' Association of the Communist Workers' Education Society' in: 'Marx-Engels Werke', Volume 22; p.234; Translated from German).

"(...) we (...) feel almost criminally averse to becoming popular personalities." (Engels: 'Engels to Jenny Marx' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 40; London; 1983; p.555; English Edition).

Marx and Engels vehemently opposed the cult of personality around Lassalle, the "Lassalle Cult." Marx and Engels had initiated this struggle with the result that German revolutionary social-

democracy, the German working class, separated itself from Lassallianism.

"Neither of us cares a straw for popularity. Let me cite one proof of this: such was my aversion to the personality cult that at the time of the International, when plagued by numerous moves—originating from various countries—to accord me public honour, I never allowed one of these to enter the domain of publicity, nor did I ever reply to them, save with an occasional snub. When Engels and I first joined the secret communist society, we did so only on condition that anything conducive to a superstitious belief in authority be eliminated from the Rules. (Lassalle subsequently operated in the reverse direction.)" (Marx: 'Marx to Wilhelm Blos' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 45; London; 1991; p.288; English Edition).

We do not want to conceal at this point that Engels wrote to Eduard Bernstein in 1881, two years before the death of his friend and comrade-in-arms Karl Marx:

"But there's no denying the fact and, what is more, Marx's genius, his almost excessive scientific scrupulousness and his incredible erudition place him so far above all the rest of us that anyone who ventures to criticise his discoveries is more likely to burn his fingers than anything else." (Engels: 'Engels to Bernstein' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 46; London; 1992; p.146; English Edition).

But Engels did not portray Marx as an idol to be worshiped here, but only emphasized Marx's outstanding characteristics, which is not only legitimate, but completely true. Marx is a rare type of person whom one can really give proof of genius to. **As the founder of communism, Marx is and remains the most outstanding and significant of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism, followed by Lenin, without wanting to diminish the importance of all the other Classics.**

Engels expressed his great modesty, honesty and frankness with the following words, which we all know well:

"What I contributed—at any rate with the exception of my work in a few special fields—Marx could very well have done without me. What Marx accomplished I would not have achieved. Marx stood higher, saw further, and took a wider and quicker view than all the rest of us. Marx was a genius; we others were at best talented. Without him the theory would not be by far what it is today. It therefore rightly bears his name." (Engels: 'Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 26; London; 1990; p.382; English Edition).

Engels honored Marx's merits, especially in his eulogy of March 17th, 1883:

"Although the 'Manifesto' was our joint work, I feel obliged to state that the basic concept at its core belongs to Marx". (Engels; Translated from German).

Engels later expressed the idea of having "only played second violin" alongside Marx in his letter to Johann Philipp Becker of October 15th, 1884.

And Lenin commented on this:

"Engels always-and, on the whole, justly so-placed himself behind Marx. 'With Marx,' he wrote to an old friend, 'I always played second fiddle.' His love for Marx when the latter was alive, and his reverence for Marx's memory after the latter's death, were infinite. This stern fighter and strict thinker possessed a deeply loving soul." (Lenin: Frederick Engels' in: 'On Engels'; Moscow; 1935; p.14; English Edition).

As the word "cult of personality" already says, it is a special form of **cult (reactionary, cultism)**. The cult is again a term we know from **religion**. **Fideism** is a doctrine that puts faith in the place of knowledge. The fideism of the revisionists aimed at putting the belief in Stalin in the place of the belief in Marxism-Leninism. It was the intention of the revisionists to enclose Marxism-Leninism as a relic to be admired and worshiped by the masses in a shrine which the "Holy Father" Stalin was to keep watch over. Then they tried to place Stalin himself as a relic.

With the cult of personality, the revisionists put Marxism-Leninism under religious fetters.

After the defeat of the Revolution of 1905, the **Otzovists** had already tried in vain to smuggle religion into the Party in order to mourn the decline of the revolutionary movement in their theorizing prayer rooms and to draw strength from the worship of socialism. We recall Lenin's struggle against the **image of God**, his writing: "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism":

"This is typical philosophical revisionism, for it was only the revisionists who gained a sad notoriety for themselves by their departure from the fundamental views of Marxism and by their fear, or inability, to 'settle accounts' openly, explicitly, resolutely and clearly with the views they had abandoned." (Lenin: 'Materialism and Empirio-Criticism' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 14; Moscow; 1968; p.21; English Edition). (Lunacharsky called the "Anti-Dühring" a "religious economy", which caused disgust with Lenin) The Otzovists wanted to turn the Leninist party into a religious sect.)

The **connection between sectarianism and cult of personality** was not only highlighted more than 50 years ago at the 20th Party Congress of the Soviet revisionists. Lenin had already castigated the bourgeois press, which wrote on the 25th anniversary of the death of Karl Marx that Marx had **"(...) founded an anti-scientific utopia and a real 'Church' of his sectarian disciples."** (Lenin: 'An Estimate of Marx by International Liberalism' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 13; Moscow; 1973; p.492-493; English Edition).

Marx and Engels condemned the **Bakuninist "revolutionary catechism" as the "proclamation of a communism more authoritarian than the most primitive communism"**. This replacement of **"(...) the Holy Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church of the Jesuits with its arch-anarchist and pan-destructive 'holy revolutionary cause'."** (Marx; 'Bakunin' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 23; London; 1988; p.545; English Edition).

Marx and Engels quoted the Bakuninist revolutionary catechism in its entirety and then formulated the excellent following sentence: **"To criticise this masterpiece would be to weaken its comic impact."** (ibid; p.548).

"§ 1. The revolutionary is a dedicated man. He has neither personal interests, nor affairs, nor feelings, nor attachments, nor property, nor even a name. Every part of him is absorbed by one sole interest, one sole thought, one sole passion: the revolution.

"§ 2. In the depths of his being, not only in words, but in deeds, he has severed all ties with civil order and with the entire civilised world, with laws, decencies, morality, and the conventions generally accepted in that world. He is its implacable enemy, and if he continues to live in it, it is only to destroy it more surely.

"§ 3. A revolutionary despises all doctrinairism and renounces worldly science, leaving it for future generations. He only knows one science: that of destruction. For that purpose and none other, he studies mechanics [mechanisms of mass-destruction – editor's note], physics [nuclear physics – editor's note], chemistry [toxicology – editor's note], and perhaps medicine [Doctors'

Plot – editor's note]. **With the same goal, he studies living science day and night—men, characters, positions, and all conditions of the existing social order in all possible spheres. The goal remains the same: the destruction, as quickly as possible and as certainly as possible, of this foul (poganyi) order** [socialism – editor's note].

"§ 4. **He despises public opinion** [he shies away from and manipulates public opinion – editors note].

"(...) § 5. **The revolutionary is a dedicated man. He has no mercy for the State in general or for the entire civilised class of society, and he should no more expect mercy for himself. Between him and society there is a struggle, open or concealed, but always incessant, irreconcilable, and to the death. He must accustom himself to withstand torture.**

"§ 6. **Strict with himself, he must be the same with others. All feelings of affection, all the softening feelings of kinship, friendship, love and gratitude must be stifled in him by a unique and cold passion for the revolutionary cause. For him, there is only one joy, one consolation, one reward and one satisfaction: the success of the revolution. Night and day, he must have only one thought and one goal—implacable destruction. Pursuing this goal coldly and without respite, he must himself be ready to perish and to destroy with his own hands all that which obstructs the achievement of this goal** [sic!!!].

"§ 7. **The nature of the true revolutionary excludes all romanticism, all sensitivity, all enthusiasm, and all involvement; it even excludes personal hatred and vengeance. Revolutionary passion, having become with him a habit every day and every moment, must be combined with cold calculation. Everywhere and always he must obey not his personal impulses, but whatever is prescribed to him by the general interests of the revolution.**" (ibid; p.545).

Bakunin drew up hit lists, which he divided into different categories of liquidation. What fits Beria's murder of Stalin and the other leading Bolshevik comrades is what we read in paragraph 18 on the "third category":

"§ 18. **The third category covers a large number of highly placed brutes or individuals who are remarkable neither for their minds nor for their energy, but who, by virtue of their position, have wealth, connections, influence, and power. We must exploit them in every way possible, outwit them, confuse them, and, wherever possible, by possessing ourselves of their filthy secrets, make them our slaves. In this way, their power, connections, influence and wealth will become an inexhaustible treasure and an invaluable help in various enterprises.**" (ibid; p.547).

And there is still the link between **dogmatism and religion**, between the cult of personality and proletarian cult. Karl Marx declared against the **dogmatic Willich-Schapper party**, which opposed the "**Communist League**":

"**Just as the word 'people' has been given an aura of sanctity by the democrats, so you have done the same for the word 'proletariat. Like the democrats you substitute the catchword of revolution for revolutionary development,' etc., etc.**" (Marx: 'Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 11; London; 1979; p.403; English Edition).

And indeed, religion means nothing other than the subjugation of the masses, the subjugation

of the Party to invisible powers, which can be well **hidden behind a personified mask**. Now, in the Era of Late Stalinism, this is not some imaginary "invisible power" from a transcendental heavenly kingdom, but the **counter-revolutionary power of the restoration of capitalism** in the middle of the solid earthly ground of Soviet power! **And the counter-revolutionaries did not have to search long for the idea of the cult of personality, because with the cult of personality which the Nazis had pursued around Hitler, the same people-dumbing goals could be achieved with the social-fascist Stalin Cult.** The idea of the "**omnipotence of der Führer**" is not only based on the racial "theory", on Social Darwinism, but is also based on fascist voluntarism and other reactionary ideologies. Stalin's cult of personality was intended to express his supernatural power, which would exist **beyond** the willful control of the masses. If the Soviet people had done their utmost for the Great Patriotic War, "for Stalin," in view of the millions of victims and the destroyed homeland, they were left with war-traumatic fears for the future, circumstances that were to awaken thoughts of fate and happiness, chance and providence. **Faith in Stalin was to replace the masses' faith in themselves.** "*After Stalin, all is lost!*" In response to this **mass defeatism**, the counter-revolution wanted to make its coup "socially justifiable" in order to "raise the masses up" in their own sense afterwards.

The reactionary **occasionalism** behind the cult of personality calls on the Soviet people to submit to their "fate" and become **passive spectators in the restoration of capitalism - "Ita est, ergo ita sit."** ("It exists, therefore it is so.") Everything accepted and endured as in the time of the Russian Tsar.

From then on the Soviet people should no longer fight for themselves, **but** "for Stalin". The leaders would then **no longer be there for the masses**, but vice versa, the masses would **be there for the leaders**, they would have to **serve the state and not the state for the masses**, etc. **Marxism-Leninism would then no longer be the ideology for the liberation of the masses, but an instrument of domination which the masses have to believe (to obey and submit).** The cult of personality was imposed on the whole socialist society of late Stalinism in order to prepare the transition from socialism to capitalism.

The reactionary American "philosopher" Dewey expressed this as follows:

"In contrast, the adjective 'religious' denotes nothing in the way of a specifiable entity, either institutional or as a system of beliefs." (Dewey: 'Intelligence in the Modern World'; New York; 1939; p.1010).

Dewey made religion attractive for imperialism by demanding: "Religion belongs to **all and not only** to the church (**Globalized opium for the peoples of world revisionism - globalized opium for the world proletariat!**) Thus, religious influence was to be opened up anew even in those social strata which no longer wanted to have anything to do with the church (the restoration of religion). By the way, Dewey was an admirer of Roosevelt and that as a **social-democrat**. Dewey was praised in the highest tones by all social-democrats all over the world because he had allegedly "dealt a severe blow" to the Soviet Union and the advance of communism in the world with his pragmatic "philosophy". He was considered their "savior from communism. "Truth is everything that frees us from the 'red danger', hence the 'cult of personality of Stalin' and his 'criticism' of him is also true. And the more we convince the world of the existence of the 'cult of personality of Stalin', the truer the 'criticism' of it becomes. Only that which the masses are supposed to believe is true, namely the 'cult of personality' to the masses of the USSR and the 'criticism' of it to the masses in the rest of the world. The touchstone, the yardstick or criterion of truth is the **combination of the practical application of the cult of personality and the 'criticism' of it. Everything that we find useful against communism, that unites us against it is true.**"

The cult of personality thus became one of the first effective propaganda weapons of collaboration between revisionists and imperialists.

And Beria and Khrushchev were two anti-Stalinist wire-pullers who cultivated the cooperation concerning the "cult of personality" and its "criticism" with world imperialism until 1953, and then blew the same imperialist horn of anti-Stalinism and publicly denounced Stalin.

The main argument against Stalin's doctrine was that the conspirers did not want to see in it the further development of Leninism, but a **turning away from Leninism**, because it was supposedly **reduced** to the "authority of the figure" of Stalin. For Beria and for all the other conspirers, the Stalinist system is based on a kind of "Olympus" where Zeus arbitrarily and legally proclaims for everyone what is to be considered "truth" or "untruth" throughout the country and the world.

Here is the **materialist** view of the ancient philosopher **Heraclitus**:

"The world, one and the same out of all, none of the gods has made nor man, but it was and is and will be his eternal living fire, igniting according to measure and extinguishing according to measure." (Heraclitus, as quoted by Lenin in: 'From the Philosophical Estate'; p.276; Translated from German).

The initiators of the cult of personality presented Stalin as something like a pope who decides on the interpretation of Catholicism. "Law" and "truth" were reduced to questions of faith, to a system of lies, which Stalin had sanctioned only by his "dictatorial and selfish" authority. Their accusation that Marxism-Leninism had been degraded by Stalin to a kind of "religious doctrine" **was based on their animosity towards Marxism-Leninism.**

Marxism-Leninism teaches that the key of the teaching about socialist society, the key to understanding the Stalin Era, is not to be found in the consciousness of a single person, it cannot be traced back to an individual character, but the key lies solely in the socialist mode of production of material goods, in the class struggle. Not chance, not personality and its will played the decisive role in the Stalin Era, but it was expressed in the special socialist living conditions and was determined by the situation and interests of the workers. The conditions in the Stalin Era were created earlier and Stalin had to start from them as something given and not created by him. Only because Stalin respected the conditions of socialist development and did not violate them in his actions did he reaped his great world successes. The laws which determined the development of the USSR represented an objective reality. They worked inevitably and determined the will and consciousness of Stalin. The Stalin Era is the result of the socialist activity of the Soviet peoples under the leadership of the CPSU(B) and its leader, Comrade Stalin.

"The objective side [of the proletarian movement – editor's note] comprises the processes of development which take place outside of and around the proletariat independently of its will and of the will of its party [and the will of Stalin as its leader – editor's note], processes which, in the final analysis, determine the development of the whole of society." (Stalin: 'The Political Strategy and Tactics of the Russian Communists' in: 'Works', Volume 5; Moscow; 1953; p.63; English Edition).

This has nothing to do with the standpoint of the Objectivists, who simply ignored personality as a tiny quantity (like the "legal Marxist" Struve). Indeed, they even declared that one should run history with "depersonalized events" (Bulgakov). The Objectivists denied and fought against the subjective factor of the revolution in general. Stalin, on the other hand,

attached due importance to the subjective factor and its strengthening. Already in one of his first articles, "A Reply to 'Social-Democrat'", Stalin disseminated Lenin's doctrine of the role of the subjective factor in the revolution in the Caucasus (see Volume 1 of his Works). After the defeat of the 1905 Revolution, the Marxists fought against the philosophizing representatives who, with bourgeois individualism, mysticism and the cult of personality, tried to dissuade the masses from the revolutionary path and discredit the revolutionary party of the proletariat and its philosophy (personalism, divinization, fideism). They deified the "individual spirit" as the "real subject of history". For them, the masses had no historical role at all; indeed, they behaved ignorantly, contemptuously and arrogantly towards the history of the popular masses' liberation struggle.

Even in the view of economists, the influence of personality, people, classes and parties is not given any importance to the spontaneous movement. They are said to be unable to influence the objective economic law. The economists *metaphysically* contrast the objective factor with the subjective factor, the spontaneity of consciousness, the economic forms of struggle with the political ones, instead of aligning the subjective factor with the objective factor. In Rosa Luxemburg's work, too, there are errors that are rooted in the reduction of the subjective factor (theory of spontaneity). When the revolutionary situation *exists*, when the objective factor is fully developed, the actions of the masses, the people, the revolutionary leaders are the subjective factor that *decides* on the victory and defeat of the revolution. There can be no victorious subjective factor without the revolutionary leaders, the party, etc. As world leader of the proletariat and a Classic of Marxism-Leninism, Comrade Stalin was, is and remains one of the most outstanding subjective factors for the victory of the world proletariat.

"The subjective side comprises the processes which take place within the proletariat as the reflection in the consciousness of the proletariat of the objective processes, accelerating or retarding the latter, but not determining them." (ibid). We complement: Not only as the reflection of the objective processes in the consciousness of the proletariat alone, but as a concentrated expression in the consciousness of the party of the proletariat and its proletarian leaders, that is, what was going on within Stalin and what is going on within us Stalinists.

Whoever equates the subjective factor, the role of personality in history, with Stalin's "cult of personality", and thus slows down the objective processes, in reality opposes the necessity of the unfolding of the subjective factor for the acceleration of the world revolution, that the working class was helplessly at the mercy of the restoration of capitalism, that it was impossible to eliminate its inevitability with its own subjective power and above all with the help of Stalinism. And this is precisely what the intention of the modern revisionists with their so-called "cult of personality" after Stalin's death amounted to.

"Stalin's cult of personality" was also a **form of reactionary idealism**, or in simple terms: **Opium of the socialist people**. It is a counter-revolutionary weapon to turn Marxism-Leninism into a pure creed among the masses, like the Mao's "Little Red Book" later on. Faith in Stalin thus degenerated into recognition of his alleged supernatural "genius", a kind of superhuman who "animates" the Soviet people, watches over their destiny "fatherly" and to whom the Soviet people would have to owe obedience, reverence and worship in return. Stalin had banned religion from the minds of the Soviet people, but with the revisionist cult of personality it was smuggled back in and restored. The revisionist cult of personality was an expression of the restoration of religion in the Soviet Union.

Let us return once again to Stalin's "**Short Course**", where he ended by quoting from the **myths of the ancient Greeks**. We reshape the characters a little bit, so that we understand the cult of personality, the murder hatchet of Stalin's conspirers, more clearly:

In their socialist world the Soviet people had a famous hero, Comrade Stalin. He had a special affection for the Russian people. There was no "hero" whom he, this Comrade Stalin, could not defeat. He was considered an invincible hero. What was his strength? It consisted in the fact that every time he came into trouble in a struggle with an opponent, he united firmly with the Soviet people and the Bolshevik Party, who had elected him as their leader and trusted him. From the masses, from the Bolshevik Party, Stalin drew all his strength. But still he had his weak point: that was the danger of being torn away from the Soviet masses, from the Bolshevik Party, by the cult of personality. His conspirers took this weakness into account and ambushed him. And an enemy was found who took advantage of his weakness. It was Beria. But how did he defeat him? Beria created Stalin's image in order to lift it up into the sky, so that Stalin would be torn away from the masses and the Bolshevik Party. Then he killed Stalin and also destroyed the criminal idol. And the lesson of this "story"? The counter-revolutionaries and their dangerous weapon of cult of personality are to be crushed mercilessly and completely, therein lies the key to the invincibility of the Bolshevik leader.

The struggle against the so-called "cult of personality" not only served the seizure of power by the modern revisionists, but also the division of the communist world movement, whose leader was Stalin, with the **"de-Stalinization" of the communist world movement**. This was a useful gift from Beria to the Trotskyites who had been released from prison by himself. Beria made sure that after their rehabilitation they could regenerate and spread internationally, especially in the "de-Stalinization", to actively help spread the "criticism" of the "cult of personality". It cannot be regarded as a coincidence that the **renewed appearance of Trotskyism coincided with Beria's murder of Stalin** (and the same revival of Trotskyism with the death of Enver Hoxha was not coincidental either!) During Stalin's lifetime no one should have dared to take this daring step, for he would have been a dead man. Stalin characterized, among other things, Trotskyism as follows:

"Thirdly. Trotskyism is distrust of the leaders of Bolshevism, an attempt to discredit, to defame them." (Stalin: 'Trotskyism or Leninism?' in: 'Works', Volume 6; Moscow; 1953; p.366; English Edition). (... and like Beria to murder him in the end!).

In dialectical *reversal*, Trotskyism means as much as trusting in the leaders of opportunism, it means attempting to rehabilitate them and, as intended by the Berianists, putting them in a new "Marxist-Leninist" light, releasing them from our consciousness that had banished them or bringing them back to life as "martyrs of Stalinism" and giving them a "Marxist-Leninist" halo.

Such comrades who today *do not or no longer* consider the role played by Stalin to be of decisive importance, like the Berianists, have not only made a thorough error, but they are also diverting water to the mills of the Trotskyites, who not only deny the role of Stalin as a Classic of Marxism-Leninism, but attribute to Comrade Stalin the role of the "greatest enemy" of Marxism-Leninism. In the anti-revisionist struggle of Marxist-Leninists, the neo-Trotskyites and neo-revisionists, the Berianists come to the aid of the modern revisionists today, in order to remove their battered image by means of skinning (cosmetic surgery and rejuvenation for the aging "modern" revisionism = neo-revisionism).

Trotskyism and modern revisionism are of the **same nature**, not only with regard to the cult of personality tactic against Marxism-Leninism. Both are mortal enemies of Marxism-Leninism under the guise of "Marxism-Leninism". This was first true of Leninism at that time. Now it applies to Stalinism and not less to Hoxhaim. We must not forget that Trotskyism was forced to continue its counter-revolutionary struggle within the Marxist-Leninist World Movement illegally after Stalin had smashed its open forms of struggle in the ranks of the CPSU(B). And today the modern Trotskyites, the Berianists, continue their illegal struggle against Stalin behind the mask of

"Stalinism" in our world revolutionary ranks. **To this day, Trotskyism and Berianism have not given up its double tactic of continuing its subversive work against Lenin, Stalin and Hoxha under the masks of "Leninism", "Stalinism" and "Hoxhaism"**. It is self-evident that Trotskyism and Berianism, is particularly dangerous under the mask of the "defense of Stalin" and therefore its Marxist-Leninist unmasking and combating will continue to be of particular importance in the future (**Hard to believe, but true: Since it is hard to imagine that some Trotskyite groups, that Trotskyites in general, that the Berianists, the greatest haters of Stalin, of all people, could present themselves as the "most loyal defenders of Stalin" in our ranks in such a devious way, but that is precisely why their "Stalinist" invisibility cloak is so perfect!**). And what do we learn from this? **It is not enough to rip the "Stalinist" invisibility cloak off the faces of the Trotskyites, the Berianists. Rather, we Marxist-Leninists, for our part, must put on a Trotskyite invisibility cloak if we are to penetrate the Trotskyite and Berianist organizations unrecognized, and we must do so if we are really serious about destroying Trotskyism, about destroying Berianism. To do this, however, we must have a precise knowledge of neo-Trotskyism, we must study the Trotskyites, the Berianists, of today, not only their counter-revolutionary "theories" but also their counter-revolutionary practice, especially within our own ranks!** The Marxist-Leninist struggle for Stalin against all his Trotskyite enemies is thus far from complete or even decided. The Comintern (ML) calls on all Marxist-Leninists in the world to continue the struggle in defense of Stalin undiminished and to unite firmly, both against Stalin's open enemies and against his supposed "friends". We must not let the struggle in defense of Stalin be taken out of our hands. **This struggle for the classics of Marxism-Leninism can only be waged and ended victoriously by us Marxist-Leninists ourselves. And this can only succeed on the condition that we keep our Marxist-Leninist ranks pure from Trotskyite and revisionist influences, from Berianist influences, and take to heart the teachings of Stalin.** We must be vigilant, because it is very likely that the enemies of Stalin will choose us Stalinists of the Comintern (ML) to undermine, crack and liquidate this current ideological bulwark in defense of Stalin, all "in the name of Stalin"! The Trotskyites, the Berianists, are defaming us, the Comintern (ML) in order to defame other Marxist-Leninists from there and **replace them with the renewed ("Stalinist") Trotskyism. That is their old, declared goal. The Trotskyites have historically failed to replace *Leninism* with Trotskyism and they will also historically fail to replace *Stalinism* (note: and finally also *Hoxhaism!*) with Trotskyism.** We will see to it that any revival of Trotskyism is buried under the mask of "Marxism-Leninism". If, in so doing, we act boldly and intrepidly in the spirit of Stalin, we need not fear the "r-r-r-r-evolutionary intelligentsia," **for Stalinism was and always will be a guarantor of victory over Trotskyism**, no matter in what garb it will slip into to cover its tracks, as Beria did. The Berianists have always been successful in covering their tracks, but this is exactly what will bring them down.

It is an old trick of all those who deviate from Marxism-Leninism to hide their anti-party ideology behind people who are all too conveniently sacrificed without touching the revisionist ideology these people represented, so that this ideology can continue to "run free" unhindered. Of course, this is especially true of Beria and the Berianists.

If Beria murdered Stalin, then he has by no means been able to silence Stalinism. It is not about the figure of Stalin, but about the circumstances, about the conditions of the Stalin Era. You can remove Stalin, but this does not mean that you can eradicate either the Era of Stalinism or the roots of Marxism-Leninism. The question of individuals is not the first thing that interests us, but the current role of the leaders of Stalinism in our struggle for world communism.

The revisionist danger must not be sharpened on individuals. And so we are not primarily interested in the figure of Beria, although he is as repulsive as could be. First and foremost we are interested in the victory over Berianism, the ideology Beria used to bring the powerful

colossus, the USSR, to its knees from within.

Comrades, the bourgeoisie stereotypically places the figure of Stalin at the center of its inflammatory propaganda. Why? The bourgeoisie wants to make everything that the Soviet people had achieved in the construction of communism and in the struggle against reaction and fascism, in the struggle against world imperialism, fade into the background. This trick must not be used. We as Stalinists must not be content with refuting the accusation of the cult of personality as unfounded. It cannot be our intention to **limit** ourselves to the purification of Stalin's character. We can only restore the honor of Stalin by highlighting the great communist achievements of Soviet society, which Stalin served with all his might, a force on which we rely to achieve the goal of building world socialism. It was above all the Russian people who had taken Stalin to their hearts, who made him what he has become, the greatest leader of communism. The deep affection for the people and by the people, the revolutionary unity between the Bolshevik leader Stalin and the workers of the Soviet Union, is what we Stalinists today put in the center of the analysis of the late Stalinist Era, which the relationship between world proletariat and world Bolshevik leaders is also based on.

As a **Georgian**, Stalin was a comrade who "only" came from a border region of Russia. One can see this in a more positive light, because he came from a country that connects the Eastern and Western worlds and from a world revolutionary point of view, it is therefore an ideal location for the development of a Bolshevik leader. And this positive role of Georgia was also duly emphasized in the events of August 2008. But there were enough enemies of Stalin who hated him for the sole reason that a Georgian "rules the Russians and becomes ruler of the huge Soviet Union". "How can a Georgian, of all people, become the successor of the revolutionary Russian leader Lenin?" Stalin's enemies did not forgive him for exposing and fighting Russian Great Power Chauvinism, nor the local nationalism in Georgia, as a Georgian! He did not unilaterally stand on the Western side, nor did he unilaterally stand on the Eastern side. **Throughout his life, Stalin united the peoples of the West and the peoples of the East in their common, world revolutionary liberation struggle against world imperialism. And it is important to hold on to this honorable and glorious Stalinist tradition consistently today.** To be an "Asian" was considered an insult in Russia, and so Stalin's enemies reviled him as an "crude Asian brute", whose "rudeness" Lenin is said to have "warned" of in his alleged "Testament" ... (We will come back to what this Trotskyite "testament" is about in detail at another point). Yes, one even went so far as to claim that Stalin allegedly "Georgianized" the Soviet Union - but more about this later in the chapter on the Mingrelian Conspiracy, which turned out to be Georgiantization by Beria. In English: Berianization of Stalinist Georgia or "de-Stalinization" by a Berianist Georgia.

Svetlana, Stalin's daughter wrote:

"My father loved Russia deeply all his life. I know no other Georgian who had so completely sloughed off his qualities as a Georgian and loved everything Russian the way he did."
(Alliluyeva: 'Twenty Letters to a Friend'; New York; 1967; p.119-120; English Edition).

As for the great importance of Stalin already had in the creation of the Bolshevik Party, after his death it was scaled down to silence by the Soviet revisionists. And when the Comintern (ML) comes to the public today with its brief description of his first creative period in the Caucasus, the dung buckets will not be far away, which will certainly be poured out over us "fossils of the Stalin Cult" in the near future.

The Soviet peoples, the socialist working class, the world proletariat have never accused Stalin of the cult of personality; on the contrary, he was loved and revered by the masses, was their leader, whom they trusted and who never betrayed their trust throughout his life. The accusation of the cult of personality served the traitors to shake this trust of the masses in

Stalin, to make them believe that Stalin had "abused" their trust, that the Soviet Union must "free itself" from him in order to be "saved". In reality, the accusation of the cult of personality was intended to shake and bury the masses' self-confidence in their own revolutionary, creative power, if the cult of personality was to frighten them. This was not the first time in the history of the class struggle that the bourgeoisie tried to deny the masses their destiny, to take their fate into their own hands and to build their own, a better world. Until today, the world bourgeoisie has not stopped trying to persuade the masses that they cannot change their fate as exploited and oppressed, that they are a flock of sheep whose sole purpose is to be eaten by wolves. And on behalf of the world bourgeoisie Beria took Stalin's side to get rid of him.

What was Stalin's position on the cult of personality?

For this purpose we have selected a few quotations from him, some of which are well-known, others less so, and some of which are new.

"The point is (...) a new bourgeoisie has arisen which, being unable to come into the political arena openly, is trying to breach the communist front from within and is looking for champions [!!!] among the leaders of the R.C.P.(B.). Well, this circumstance is giving rise to oppositionist sentiments within the R.C.P.(B.) and is creating the ground for an opportunist deviation," (Stalin: 'The Communist Party of Poland' in: 'Works', Volume 6; Moscow; 1953; p.280; English Edition).

"He [Stalin] believes that it is possible that 'saboteurs' are behind it in order to discredit him." (L. Feuchtwanger: 'Moscow 1937'; London; 1937; p.93; Translated from German).

This first quote from Leon Feuchtwanger probably hits the nail on the head. One of the main saboteurs was Beria.

From a conversation with Colonel Robins on **May 13th, 1933**:

"Robins: I consider it a great honour to have an opportunity of paying you a visit.

"Stalin: There is nothing particular in that. You are exaggerating.

"Robins (smiles): What is most interesting to me is that throughout Russia I have found the names Lenin-Stalin, Lenin-Stalin, Lenin-Stalin, linked together.

"Stalin: That, too, is an exaggeration. How can I be compared to Lenin?" (Stalin: 'Talk with Colonel Robins' in: 'Works', Volume 13; Moscow; 1954; p.268; English Edition).

"Stalin systematically gives credit for all the progress made to Lenin, whereas the credit has been in very large measure his own" (Barbusse: 'Stalin'; London; 1935; p.294; English Edition).

"Only later did I realise that this simplicity and modesty, this striving to remain unobserved, or, at least, not to make himself conspicuous and not to emphasise his high position, this feature was one of Lenin's strongest points as the new leader of the new masses, of the simple and ordinary masses of the "rank and file" of humanity." (Stalin: 'Lenin' in: 'Works', Volume 6; Moscow; 1953; p.56; English Edition).

And in a talk with the German writer Emil Ludwig, Stalin said:

"As for myself, I am just a pupil of Lenin's, and the aim of my life is to be a worthy pupil of his." (Stalin: 'Talk with the German Author Emil Ludwig' in: 'Works', Volume 13; Moscow; 1954; p.107; English Edition).

And indeed, Stalin remained the most worthy and greatest of all of Lenin's students until his death.

Emil Ludwig then stated:

"Marxism denies that the individual plays an outstanding role in history. Do you not see a contradiction between the materialist conception of history and the fact that, after all, you admit the outstanding role played by historical personages?" (ibid).

Stalin replied:

"No, there is no contradiction here. Marxism does not at all deny the role played by outstanding individuals or that history is made by people. In Marx's *The Poverty of Philosophy* and in other works of his you will find it stated that it is people who make history. But, of course, people do not make history according to the promptings of their imagination or as some fancy strikes them. Every new generation encounters definite conditions already existing, ready-made when that generation was born. And great people are worth anything at all only to the extent that they are able correctly to understand these conditions, to understand how to change them. If they fail to understand these conditions and want to alter them according to the promptings of their imagination, they will land themselves in the situation of Don Quixote. Thus it is precisely Marx's view that people must not be counterposed to conditions. It is people who make history, but they do so only to the extent that they correctly understand the conditions that they have found ready-made, and only to the extent that they understand how to change those conditions. That, at least, is how we Russian Bolsheviks understand Marx. And we have been studying Marx for a good many years." (ibid; p.107-108).

Emil Ludwig remained stubborn:

"Some thirty years ago, when I was at the university, many German professors who considered themselves adherents of the materialist conception of history taught us that Marxism denies the role of heroes, the role of heroic personalities in history." (ibid).

And Stalin answers just as persistently:

"They were vulgarisers of Marxism. Marxism has never denied the role of heroes. On the contrary, it admits that they play a considerable role, but with thereservations I have just made." (ibid).

But Emil Ludwig does not give up and keeps asking questions:

"Sixteen chairs are placed around the tableat which we are seated. Abroad people know, on the one hand, that the U.S.S.R. is a country in which everything must be decided collectively, but they know, on the other hand, that everything is decided by individual persons. Who really does decide?" (ibid; p.108-109).

Stalin patiently gives the answer:

"No, individual persons cannot decide. Decisions of individuals are always, or nearly always, one-sided decisions. In every collegium, in every collective body, there are people whose opinion must be reckoned with. In every collegium, in every collective body, there are people who may express wrong opinions. From the experience of three revolutions we know that out of every 100 decisions taken by individual persons without being tested and corrected collectively, approximately 90 are one-sided.

"In our leading body, the Central Committee of our Party, which directs all our Soviet and Party organisations, there are about 70 members. (...) Each has an opportunity of contributing his experience. If this were not the case, if decisions were taken by individual persons, there would be very serious mistakes in our work. But since each has an opportunity of correcting the mistakes of individual persons, and since we pay heed to such corrections, we arrive at decisions that are more or less correct." (ibid).

June 1926:

"I must say in all conscience, comrades, that I do not deserve a good half of the flattering things that have been said here about me. I am, it appears, a hero of the October Revolution, the leader of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the leader of the Communist International, a legendary warrior-knight and all the rest of it. That is absurd, comrades, and quite unnecessary exaggeration. It is the sort of thing that is usually said at the graveside of a departed revolutionary. But I have no intention of dying yet.

"(...) I really was, and still am, one of the pupils of the advanced workers of the Tiflis railway workshops." (Stalin: 'Reply to the Greetings of the Workers of the Chief Railway Workshops in Tiflis' in: 'Works', Volume 8; Moscow; 1954; p.182; English Edition).

November 12th, 1926:

"It has to be admitted, comrades, that it was Lenin, and no one else, who discovered the truth that the victory of socialism in one country is possible. Lenin must not be robbed of what belongs to him by right. One must not fear the truth, one must have the courage to tell the truth, one must have the courage to say frankly that Lenin was the *first* of the Marxists to present the question of the victory of socialism in one country in a new way, and to answer it in the affirmative." (Stalin: 'Reply to the Discussion' in: 'Works', Volume 8; Moscow; 1954; p.318; English Edition).

September 1927:

Stalin was asked: ***Could you briefly tell us what are the main disagreements between yourself and Trotsky?*** (Stalin: 'Interview with the First American Labour Delegation' in: 'Works', Volume 10; Moscow; 1954; p.124; English Edition).

Stalin replied: **"I must say first of all that the disagreements with Trotsky are not personal disagreements. If they were personal disagreements the Party would not bother with them for a single hour, for it does not like individuals to thrust themselves forward."** (ibid).

October 1927:

"And what is Stalin? Stalin is only a minor figure." (Stalin: 'The Trotskyist Opposition Before and Now' in: 'Works', Volume 10; Moscow; 1954; p.177; English Edition).

July 9th, 1929:

"We have hundreds and thousands of young and capable people who are striving with might and main to rise to the surface and contribute their mite to the common treasury of our work of construction. But their efforts are often unavailing, because they are very often kept down by the vanity of the literary 'lights,' by the bureaucracy and callousness of some of our organisations, and, lastly, by the envy (which has not yet evolved into emulation) of men and women of their own generation. One of our tasks is to break down this blank wall and to give scope to the young forces, whose name is legion. My foreword to an inconsiderable pamphlet by an author unknown in the literary world is an attempt to take a step towards-accomplishing this task. I shall in the future, too, provide forewords only to simple and unassuming pamphlets by simple and unknown authors belonging to the younger forces. It is possible that this procedure may not be to the liking of some of the snobs. But what do I care? I have no fondness for snobs any-how. . . ." (Stalin: 'To Comrade Felix Kon' in: 'Works', Volume 12; Moscow; 1954; p.120; English Edition).

"Your congratulations and greetings I place to the credit of the great Party of the working class which bore me and reared me in its own image and likeness. And just because I place them to the credit of our glorious Leninist Party, I make bold to tender you my Bolshevik thanks.

"You need have no doubt, comrades, that I am prepared in the future, too, to devote to the cause of the working class, to the cause of the proletarian revolution and world communism, all my strength, all my ability and, if need be, all my blood, drop by drop." (Stalin: 'To all Organisations and Comrades who sent Greetings on the Occasion of Comrade Stalin's Fiftieth Birthday' in: 'Works', Volume 12; Moscow; 1954; p.146; English Edition).

April 1930:

"There are some who think that the article, 'Dizzy with Success,' was the result of Stalin's personal initiative. That, of course, is non-sense. It is not in order that personal initiative in a matter like this may be taken by anyone, whoever he might be, that we have a Central Committee." (Stalin: 'Reply to Collective-Farm Comrades' in: 'Works', Volume 12; Moscow; 1954; p.218; English Edition).

Take his letter to "Comrade Shatunovsky" from August 1930:

"You speak of your 'devotion' to me. Perhaps it was just a chance phrase. Perhaps. . . . But if the phrase was not accidental I would advise you to discard the 'principle' of devotion to persons. It is not the Bolshevik way. Be devoted to the working class, its Party, its state. That is a fine and useful thing. But do not confuse it with devotion to persons, this vain and use-less bauble of weak-minded intellectuals." (Stalin: 'Letter to Comrade Shatunovsky' in: 'Works', Volume 13; Moscow; 1954; p.20; English Edition).

February 1933:

"I have received your letter ceding me your second Order as a reward for my work.

"I thank you very much for your warm words and comradely present. I know what you are depriving yourself of in my favour and appreciate your sentiments.

"Nevertheless, I cannot accept your second Order. I cannot and must not accept it, not only because it can belong only to you, as you alone have earned it, but also because I have been amply rewarded as it is by the attention and respect of the comrades and, consequently, have no right to rob you.

"Orders were instituted not for those who are well known as it is, but mainly for heroic people who are little known and who need to be made known to all.

"Besides, I must tell you that I already have two Orders. That is more than one needs, I assure you." (Stalin: 'Letter to Comrade I. N. Bazhanov' in: 'Works', Volume 13; Moscow; 1954; p.241; English Edition).

1935:

In 1935 the general plan for the reconstruction of Moscow was published. One of the designs for the Palace of the Soviets envisaged the erection of colossal statues of Lenin and Stalin. Stalin rejected this design with these words:

"We are building the Palace of the Soviets with a monument to their creator - Lenin."

Early December 1937:

In the Kremlin, Stalin found a campaign poster with his picture and an appeal: "Vote for Stalin!" He got angry:

"'That's all I need, too. If this goes on, I'll find my statue in my bed one night...' After that, all electioneering in the Kremlin was strictly forbidden. (...) Only twice in all these years did Stalin speak in the first person, including on the eve of his election on December 11th, 1937. Otherwise he always spoke of his plans and orders in the form: "We Bolsheviks, we Leninists, we supporters of the General Line. For he does not want to be in the foreground as a person, but as the embodiment of the entire Party, the entire country, the entire progressive world" (Achmed Amba, "A Person Sees Stalin"; Rowohlt; 1951; p.141, 166).

February 1938:

"I am absolutely against the publication of 'Stories of the childhood of Stalin.'

"The book abounds with a mass of inexactitudes of fact, of alterations, of exaggerations and of unmerited praise.

"(...) The important thing resides in the fact that the book has a tendency to engrave on the minds of Soviet children (and people in general) the personality cult of leaders, of infallible heroes. This is dangerous and detrimental. The theory of 'heroes' and the 'crowd' is not a Bolshevik, but a Social-Revolutionary theory. The heroes make the people, transform them from a crowd into people, thus say the Social-Revolutionaries. The people make the heroes, thus reply the Bolsheviks to the Social-Revolutionaries. The book carries water to the windmill of the Social-Revolutionaries. No matter which book it is that brings the water to the windmill of the Social-Revolutionaries, this book is going to drown in our common, Bolshevik cause.

"I suggest we burn this book." (Stalin: 'Letter on Publications for Children Directed to the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Youth' in: 'Works', Volume 14; London; 1978; p.327;

English Edition).

1938:

"Hence the practical activity of the party of the proletariat must not be based on the good wishes of 'outstanding individuals,' not on the dictates of 'reason,' 'universal morals,' etc., but on the laws of development of society and on the study of these laws." (Stalin: 'The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) - Short Course'; Tbilisi; 2017; p.159; English Edition).

"(...) not on the good wishes of 'great men', but on the real needs of development of the material life of society." (ibid; p.160).

February 1946:

"The hymns of praise to Stalin also pain the ears, it hurts to read them." Stalin: 'Answer to a letter of 30 January, from Col.-Professor Rasin' in: 'New World'; 1947; p.25; English Edition).

Here are some excerpts from Stalin's correction of the draft of the book "J.V. Stalin - Short Biography" (1947) and Mochalov's notes on Stalin's conversation with the Authors' Collective of 23 December 1946:

"There are mistakes. The tone is not good and is raised in the manner of the social-revolutionaries. All teachings up to and including every teaching about the constant factors of war come from me. It turns out that I have created a teaching about communism as if Lenin, you see, had only written and spoken about socialism and never about communism. Furthermore, it is presented as if the teaching about the industrialization of the country and the collectivization of agriculture came from me, and so on and so forth. In fact, Lenin deserves credit for having raised the problem of the industrialization of our country. This is also true of the question of the collectivization of agriculture, etc. There is much praise and exaggeration of the role of personality in this biography. What should the reader do after reading this biography? Should he fall on his knees and worship me? You do not educate people in the spirit of Marxism. We do not need idol worshipers.

"The matter is then presented in such a way that I have created the teaching on the permanent and temporary factors of war, while in every work of military history it is written about them. It may be that I have emphasized some things more strongly and definitively, but that is all." [By constant and permanent factors of war Stalin understood, for example, the strength of the hinterland, the moral spirit of the army, the number and quality of the divisions, the armament, the organizational abilities of the commanders, while among the secondary or only temporary factors was counted, for example, the moment of surprise of the fascists' attack on the Soviet Union.]

"We have the teaching of Marx and Lenin. We don't need additional teachings. People should not be educated to be slaves, but there are tendencies to do so among you. And if I no longer exist? You do not educate people to love the Party. And if I am no more, what will happen then?' Stalin asked, 'Who is this kind of expenditure intended for?' 'There are hundreds of thousands of libraries in our country. You can get nausea from such an edition.

"As for Baku, they say that there was nothing going on there with the Bolsheviks, and I just had to appear and everything changed immediately. Someone built it all up. You can believe it or not. What was it really like? It was necessary to create cadres. Such Bolshevik cadres were

formed in Baku. I have given the names of these people in appropriate places. This also applies to another period. Such Bolshevik cadres as Dzerzhinsky, Frunze and Kuybyshev also lived and worked, but they are not written about, they are missing.

"As far as the period of the Great Patriotic War is concerned, it was necessary to find capable people, appoint them to the appropriate functions and temper them for their tasks. Such people were gathered around the Supreme Command of the Red Army.

"Nowhere is it clearly stated that I am a student of Lenin. It's not understandable... only somewhere far away something about it is mentioned. I made that clear in my famous conversation with Ludwig. I am a pupil of Lenin, I went to Lenin for teaching and not the other way round. No one can say that I am not a pupil of Lenin. Lenin gave reasons and showed the way, and we have followed that given way."

Stalin's criticism of his son Vasili:

"Do you think you're Stalin? You think I'm Stalin? Stalin, that's him [pointing to a portrait]. We have a duty to stay on the ground and do the tasks our humanity dictates to us." (No citation available).

Stalin's nature, not only in his private sphere, but also in his political work, is in stark contrast to public acclaim. For Stalin himself this was an unbearable ordeal. There was not a trace of any stardom or graces to be discovered in him. Everything was simple and natural. He didn't tolerate obeisance, he loathed the cult of personality and mocked it. He never approved, encouraged or even ordered and commanded this cult of personality. This is confirmed by all those who have spoken about personal encounters with Stalin, including his enemies such as Churchill, for example.

It is clear from all these quotations that it was never his personal standpoint that he held, but always the standpoint of the Leninist Party, the standpoint of the working class, the masses, etc. The arrogance of the deserving man despised Stalin all his life. It was only with the help of the method of cult of personality that the revisionists were able to personify Stalin's standpoints according to the motto: *"You can be completely calm, this is from Stalin himself, this is what Stalin said, this is what Stalin ordered, this is what Stalin commanded, this is what Stalin banned, etc. etc."* **In this way the revisionists began to do and leave what they wanted in the name of Stalin.** With the traitorous word "Stalin" on their lips, they murdered Stalin underhand and deceived the masses' trust in Stalin in order to seize power. With the cult of personality, the axe was to fly down on Marxism-Leninism itself!

In general, one must not allow artificial contrasts between individuals and the collective, society, nor tolerate constructed contradictions between the role of the individual and the people. **The revolutionaries are not loners. They place themselves collectively at the service of the cause of the proletariat, they subordinate themselves to the needs of society, they carry out the tasks assigned to them by the Party of the working class in a disciplined manner. Revolutionaries are both students and teachers of the masses.** The working class does not tolerate any divisive antagonism between its leaders, its class and the masses fomented by the bourgeois, revisionist and Trotskyite demagogues to the detriment of the unity between the revolutionaries and the workers. Bolshevism is the revolutionary unity of socialism and the workers movement. Anti-Bolshevism is the division of this unity. Let's not forget **that both the method of formation and the corresponding method of "condemnation" of the cult of personality afterwards is a creation of the reactionary class in the struggle against the revolutionary class.** It was the vain attempts of the Soviet revisionists, who had built up this cult of personality themselves, in order to bring down Stalin with their accusation of the "cult of personality" later on all the more easily. The cult of

personality is alien to the working class, and it was no less a person than Stalin himself, to whom this cult of personality, which was organized around him with much pomp, was deeply hated and whom he himself fought incessantly from beginning to end against. In contrast to the revisionists, Stalin was capable of open self-criticism. For example, the mistakes that were made when Hitler invaded the Soviet Union:

"Our government made many mistakes."

But Khrushchev said in his criminal secret speech against Stalin:

"Everyone can err, but Stalin considered that he never erred, that he was always right. He never acknowledged to anyone that he made any mistake, large or small, despite the fact that he made more than a few in matters of theory and in his practical activity." (Khrushchev: 'Speech to 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U.'; Moscow; 1956; English Edition).

Stalin was very sensitive to hypocritical, outwardly pompous "ovations" and even reacted to them with extreme anger and rage. Thus, especially in the last part of his life, he lived in seclusion, puritanically, in a room where he worked, ate and slept, but he was always on guard to direct the destinies of the Soviet Union. He was often drawn to the South, and even when he went to Georgia in the early 1950s for convalescence, he sought the seclusion of his own figure there, but he never withdrew from his political work or even from his responsibility to the cause of the revolution, the Party, the working class. As Lenin's most loyal Bolshevik, he fulfilled this responsibility to the last breath.

"My father had unpleasant memories of his journey here because he couldn't stand the sight of a crowd applauding him and shouting 'Hurrah!' His face would twitch with annoyance each time it happened." (Alliluyeva: 'Twenty Letters to a Friend'; New York; 1967; p.201; English Edition).

Stalin abhorred personality cults, flatterers, praisers, screamers, phrasemongers, chatterboxes, blubbers and panic-makers. His logic was of irrefutable power, his mind crystal clear, his will was of steel, his devotion to the Party and the cause of the world proletariat immeasurable, his conviction of world communism unshakeable. He only wanted to be a humble, simple servant of the working class, considering himself a disciple of Lenin and that was honor enough for him.

All revisionists bred and cultivated the cult of personality in order to denigrate, discredit and destroy the prestige of the leaders of Marxism-Leninism (and thus Marxism-Leninism itself!) in the eyes of the international workers' and communist movement in the subsequent so-called "struggle against the cult of personality". This was inevitable if they wanted to transform the dictatorship of the proletariat under the guise of "Marxism-Leninism" into the dictatorship of the new bourgeoisie. The split of the communist world movement was necessary for the elimination of socialism through the restoration of capitalism and for the later transition to social-imperialism and social-fascism, was necessary to give world imperialism a "proof" of trustworthiness. They started with Stalin, then it was Enver Hoxha's and Albania's turn to be publicly discredited and condemned and thereby deepen the division in the bosom of the international communist movement. With the vulgarization of Stalinism, the followers of the cult of personality reduced Marxism-Leninism to almost nothing and thus condemned the world communist movement to passivity, to vegetating. But Comrade Enver Hoxha lifted the Stalinist banner, which the revisionists trampled with their boots. He led the struggle against the personal accusation of the revisionists. Enver Hoxha rightly said about the cult of personality:

"The cult of personality means glorifying individual personalities excessively, attributing to them supernatural qualities and attributes, making them into people who perform miracles and finally get down on their knees before them". (Hoxha; Translated from German).

"However, Khrushchev strengthened his positions and immediately attacked the so-called cult of Stalin. He intended to kill two birds with one stone: internally, to replace the «cult of Stalin» with his own cult, and likewise in the international communist movement, to ensure that he himself and no one else, was top dog, hence not Mao either. Meanwhile, Mao had hopes that after this their roles would change: Khrushchev «would be the pupil of Mao». However, Khrushchev understood the situation and took another course, shifted his rifle from one shoulder to the other." (Hoxha: 'Reflections on China', Volume II; Tirana; 1979; p.252; English Edition).

It was not the Khrushchevites but Tito who started the anti-Stalinist hate propaganda against the so-called "cult of personality".

Tito openly stated that it was not only about the cult of personality, but also about that order which "made the cult of personality possible", and by this he meant the Soviet order. And that was also one of the reasons for Beria's pacing with Tito. The accusation of the "cult of personality" had to be used to justify the slogan of "liberalization" and thus the restoration of capitalism, served as a pretext for the bourgeois revision of Marxism-Leninism, as a pretext for overcoming and liquidating the dictatorship of the proletariat, as a pretext for discrediting the Bolshevik Party. When the modern revisionists speak of Stalin's alleged "crimes", why did they not only cover and welcome them during Stalin's time, but also committed them themselves "in the name of Stalin"? Why did they cover up their crimes and blame them on Stalin? Did Khrushchev, Beria and all the other revisionist leaders ever criticize themselves, for being the main culprits in the cult of personality, for example? Their appraisal of Stalin during his lifetime was disgusting enough in itself, but the true extent of this crime becomes clear with Khrushchev's so-called "Secret Speech" at the 20th Party Congress, which he had not even held by order and decision of the Central Committee. So much for Khrushchev's understanding of the democracy of "collective leadership"? Khrushchev's Secret Speech was the appropriate cover which he could conceal his own crimes as well as those of his co-conspirers behind. The "disclosure" of "treason," "crime," and "secrets" in order to cover up treason, crime, and secrets. That was the dialectic of the double-tonguedness of the modern revisionists, that was the dialectic of the double-tonguedness of the Trotskyites and the Berianists! This is all in contrast to Stalin, who had never in his life placed himself above the Party, and who even offered the Party his resignation, his voluntary renunciation of the leadership of the party three times in his life, who did not seize power as Khrushchev had done in such a shameful way.

It was very convenient for the Khrushchevites, for the Berianists and for all the other enemies of the Soviet Union to portray Stalin as someone who decided everything on his own, "over the heads of the others", because one has to ask oneself the serious question: What were all those "heads"? When one has become aware of how many enemy heads Stalin was surrounded by, which he naturally could not trust, and when one then has to be convinced of how many Marxist-Leninist cadres he allegedly "liquidated", then one can only come to the conclusion that these "heads" carried everything on his shoulders, that these "heads" were often the reason why he had to put their condemned garbage in order. Who else could have done it? So this is not Stalin's personal fault, but first of all it was those who abandoned him and secondly those who betrayed him and stabbed him in the back.

Stalin worked day and night all his life in the service of the cause of the proletariat, as a disciple of Lenin, until his final breath.

We want to close this section of the "Cult of Personality" chapter and take shorthand from an arbitrarily selected typical sequence of a working day for Stalin, September 27th, 1935 which is a day from the time when Stalin was "only" General Secretary. During the war, of course, this looked much more concentrated, where he "incidentally" fought the Great Patriotic War:

"7:50 - Breakfast (18 minutes).

"8:10 - 'Forging Time' (planning of the course of the day with his 'pipe').

"8:17 - Walk to the office accompanied by an officer of the watch.

"8:20 - study the latest TASS news (every 8 hours); skim over the 'Pravda'.

"8:45 h Andreyev, as one of the CC Secretaries, reports on recent party events, personnel and organizational issues of the party organs

"9:25 - After Andreyev leaves, Stalin takes time to think through the complex of questions before tackling the next field of work.

"9:40 - Molotov comes to the briefing and leaves at 9:45 (on the first, third and fifth day of the week meetings of the Council of Ministers are held between 10:00 and 12:00).

"10:15 - Zhdanov arrives. Principles and ideological questions are discussed with subsequent assignments (e.g.: the visit of a cinema delegation to Chaplin).

"11:05 - Zhdanov leaves, but comes back with Andreyev and some district leaders at 11:25 to solve problems of bread deliveries

"12:07 - Stalin goes to lunch with Zhdanov (informal talks at the lunch table).

"12:47 - Stalin is in his private cabinet ("private" receptions of "various people").

"14:00 - Writing errands in his study

"16:16 - 16:48 - Molotov is there with the ministers (for finance, trade and agriculture) and is briefly interrupted in the middle by the Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs.

"17:00 - 18:05 - The Commissar of Heavy Industry "Sergo" (Ordzhonikidze), with his deputy Pyatakoy, reports about the Stakhanovite movement (at 17:30, Professor Bardin, one of the greatest authorities of the steel industry, joins the group).

"18:08 - 18:22 - Dinner with "Sergo", Stalin's best Georgian friend.

18:25 - 19:45 - Military conference with Commissar of Defense Voroshilov and three marshals (Tukhachevsky, Yegerov, Budyonny), the army's political chief Garmarnik and the NKVD Chief Yagoda, as commander of the internal troops. In the course of which an urgent call of Molotov is postponed.

"20:00 - 20:50 - Monthly meeting of the commission for the elaboration of Stalin's "Constitution" (which is solemnly adopted on December 5th, 1936) Today, the complex of jurisprudence is discussed with Prosecutor Vyshinsky.

"21:15 - 0:50 - Politburo meeting with shorter invitations from 21 ministers and party leaders. Questions of agriculture, the navy, foreign trade, health care, the copper and lime industry, and cleaning (called the "examination of party documents") are discussed, without the interruption of coffee and snacks.

"Until 1:25 - The missing Politburo members are informed by telephone: Zhdanov (already back in Leningrad), Kosior (Ukrainian District Leader), Eiche (Siberian District Leader).

"1:30 - Stalin comes home: Reading time "in the corner" (private corner).

"After 18 hours and 35 minutes the 56 year old goes to bed." (Shortened excerpts from: Amba: 'A Person sees Stalin'; Rowohlt; 1951; p.151-158; Translated from German).

The Stalinist is a special type of Bolshevik revolutionary. How did Stalin characterize the Bolshevik revolutionary, how did he evaluate the advanced type of a communist?

"Comrades, we Communists are people of a special mould. We are made of a special stuff. We are those who form the army of the great proletarian strategist, the army of Comrade Lenin. There is nothing higher than the honour of belonging to this army. There is nothing higher than the title of member of the Party whose founder and leader was Comrade Lenin. It is not given to everyone to be a member of such a party. It is not given to everyone to withstand the stresses and storms that accompany membership in such a party. It is the sons of the working class, the sons of want and struggle, the sons of incredible privation and heroic effort who before all should be members of such a party. That is why the Party of the Leninists, the Party of the Communists, is also called the Party of the working class." (Stalin: 'On the Death of Lenin' in: 'Works', Volume 6; Moscow; 1953; p.48; English Edition).

"Things have come to a sorry pass, comrades, if the only reason why we are called old Bolsheviks is that we are *old*. Old Bolsheviks are respected not because they are *old*, but because they are at the same time eternally fresh, never-aging revolutionaries. If an old Bolshevik swerves from the path of the revolution, or degenerates and fails politically, then, even if he is a hundred years old, he has no right to call himself an old Bolshevik; he has no right to demand that the Party should respect him." (Stalin: 'The Right Deviation in the C. P. S. U. (B.)' in: 'Works', Volume 12; Moscow; 1954; p.2; English Edition).

What does Stalinism teach us about the traits and outstanding characteristics of a communist?

***"We must not become infatuated with the successes achieved, and must not become conceited."* (Stalin: 'Report to the Seventeenth Party Congress' in: 'Works', Volume 13; Moscow; 1954; p.385; English Edition).**

***"We must remain true to the end to the great banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin."* (ibid; p.387).**

***"We must be true to the end to the cause of proletarian internationalism, to the cause of the fraternal alliance of the proletarians of all countries."* (ibid; p.388).**

We are imbued with the same world revolutionary spirit as Stalin. We world revolutionaries want to be as hard, as strong-willed and as disciplined as Stalin. We want to learn from Stalin's creativity and assertiveness. We world revolutionaries follow Stalin's world politics clearly and decisively. We fight just as relentlessly against the oppressors and exploiters of the

world and smash our enemies in our own camp just as resolutely as Stalin did. We guard our unity like the apple of our eye and act in solidarity and helpfulness with one another just as Stalin used to do. Let the barkers quietly yap at us from the side of the road. They will get a kick if they try to stop us. We will not deviate from Stalin's General Line and follow his compass until we reach the socialist shore of the world, even if we have to zigzag our way, which Stalin was not spared. We take the hardest tests, the fight to the death, just as Stalin did. We do not fall into timidity when the world revolution is "delayed" or when we have to accept defeat and retreat. We learn to rein in our world revolutionary impatience and do not panic when the situation above us is threateningly coming to a head. Stalin used to say, "There is no fortress that the Bolsheviks cannot take!" Even the greatest fortress, the world fortress, will be seized by us World Bolsheviks. We'll consider all our decisions carefully and thoroughly, as carefully as Stalin did. We want to be faithful to Marxism-Leninism as Stalin was faithful to Marxism-Leninism. We remain honest to the world proletariat and are its most faithful servants, as Stalin was. As proletarian internationalists, we love all peoples of the world as the great proletarian internationalist Stalin loved them.

What is the expression of the type of the world Bolshevik today? The Comintern / ML has listed 15 characteristics of the type of a contemporary Stalinist:

The world revolutionary is guided only by one worldview, the worldview of the world proletariat. That is Marxism-Leninism, the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Hoxha.

The world revolutionary fights for the victory of the proletarian world outlook over the bourgeois world outlook.

The world revolutionary defends world revolutionary theory, world revolutionary thought and ideals, the science of the world proletarian movement, which gives it the revolutionary direction and the revolutionary aim.

The world revolutionary leads the ideological class struggle in the spirit of proletarian internationalism against the nationalist spirit of the world bourgeoisie and against the ideology of cosmopolitanism.

The world revolutionary subordinates all political interests and aims to the highest political interest and the highest political aim of the world proletariat - the world socialist revolution.

The world revolutionary fights for one single party, for the party of the world proletariat, for the party of all world revolutionaries, the Communist International / ML.

The world revolutionary is a world revolutionary only if they fight against world revisionism and world opportunism in their own ranks of the world proletarian movement and fight for World Bolshevism.

The world revolutionary leads the political class struggle for the overthrow of world imperialism, world fascism and world reaction to the revolutionary liberation of the world proletariat from wage slavery, exploitation and oppression.

The world revolutionary fights only for one single rule, for the political rule of the world proletariat - the world dictatorship of the proletariat.

The world revolutionary leads the military class struggle of the world proletariat to the

destruction of the armed counter-revolution of the world bourgeoisie, to the violent conquest of the political power of the world proletariat.

The world revolutionary exercises iron, military discipline only against one army, the army of the world proletariat - the World Red Army.

The world revolutionary provides the world proletariat with the weapons of the world bourgeoisie to direct them against themselves.

The world revolutionary defends the world revolutionary movement only by defending the world proletariat which leads the world revolutionary movement.

The world revolutionary fights against the destructive, rotting and parasitic world of capitalism, the "*homeless, profit-greedy knave*" and for the world of a renewed socialism, for the new home of the world proletariat - for world socialism.

The world revolutionary is world revolutionary because he permanently advances and changes the proletarian world, the proletarian world him, through ruthless criticism and self-criticism.

The so-called "cult of personality" and the newly emerged

Marxist-Leninist World Movement of Enver Hoxha

In 1956 the modern revisionists did not yet use the term "Stalin Cult" from their lips. They were able to withdraw behind the anonymity of the term "cult of personality" and, by means of its generalizing character, tie in with the Marxist criticism of the "role of cult of personality in history". It was quotes from Marx, Engels and Lenin behind which they hid their criticism of Stalin. However, in the register of Lenin's Works, which appeared in 1972, the term "personality and its role in history" is found, but not the term "cult of personality".

Their criticism of the "cult of personality" was therefore so dangerous because they pretended to formulate it from the "ground of Marxism-Leninism". The struggle against the so-called "cult of personality" and against its alleged "criticism of it" was duly exposed, fought and defeated by the Marxist-Leninist World Movement after the death of Stalin and especially after the 20th Party Congress of the CPSU and Khrushchev's dirty speech. It provoked the protest of the Stalinists all over the world - especially the PLA with Comrade Enver Hoxha at the head. Not least as a result of this struggle against the so-called "cult of personality", the new Marxist-Leninist World Movement has emerged and strengthened.

The clarification of the so-called "Stalin Question" only came up when those who questioned Stalin were already in power. At the time of High Stalinism there was no public Stalin Question. Especially with the so-called "Secret Speech" of Khrushchev it became the

ideological demarcation line between the modern revisionists and the Marxist-Leninists all over the world. It triggered a movement of revival of Stalinism aimed at the revolutionary smashing of revisionism in power. This was one of its greatest historical merits. The movement to defend Stalin and to revive Stalinism is the historical merit of the PLA with Comrade Enver Hoxha at the head. Only anti-Stalinists raise the "Stalin Question" and question Stalinism. And so came what had to come: this demarcation line was drawn in the struggle against the Maoists in power, against Chinese revisionism, on a higher level of the international class struggle, namely against that revisionism which in words defended Stalinism against Soviet revisionism, in order to fight Stalinism in Albania as well as in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement.

The formation of a new Marxist-Leninist World Movement basically began with Enver Hoxha's world-historical speech, which he gave at the meeting of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties on November 16th, 1960. And that was in Moscow, in the center of the most dangerous revisionism of the world! It was a meeting where almost all revisionist leaders of the whole world were represented. Only the Yugoslav revisionists did not take part in it. And the Maoists took a half-hearted position on the so-called "Stalin Question" because they had to hide their own Chinese revisionism. Enver Hoxha said in his speech, and this is roughly equivalent to a definition of the Period of Stalinism:

"It was correct and grateful towards this glorious Marxist against whom, while he was alive, there was no one among us [underlined by the editor] <<brave enough>> to come out and criticize, but when he was dead a great deal of mud was thrown, creating in this way an intolerable situation in which a whole glorious epoch of the Soviet Union when the first socialist State in the world was set up, when the Soviet Union waxed strong, successfully defeated the imperialist plots, crushed the Trotskyites, Bukharinites and the kulaks as a class, when the construction of heavy industry and collectivization triumphed, in a word, when the Soviet Union became a colossal power succeeding in building socialism, when it fought the Second World War with legendary heroism and defeated fascism, liberated our peoples, when a powerful socialist camp was set up, and so on and so forth -- all this glorious epoch of the Soviet Union is left without a helmsman, without a leader.

"The Party of Labor of Albania thinks that it is no right, normal or Marxist, to blot out Stalin's name and great work from all this epoch, as it is actually being done. We should all defend the good and immortal work of Stalin. He who does not defend it is an opportunist and a coward. [underlined by the editor]

"As a person and as the leader of the Bolshevik Communist Party, after Lenin's death Comrade Stalin was, at the same time, the most prominent leader of international communism [underlined by the editor] helping in a very positive way and with great authority in consolidating and promoting the victories of communism throughout the world. All of Comrade Stalin's theoretical works are a fiery testimony of his loyalty to his teacher of genius, to great Lenin and Leninism.

"Stalin fought for the rights of the working class and the working people in the whole world, he fought to the end with great consistency for the freedom of the peoples of our countries of People's Democracy.

"Viewing things from this angle alone, Stalin belongs to the entire communist world [underlined by the editor] and not to the Soviet communists alone, he belongs to all the workers of the world [underlined by the editor] and not to the Soviet workers alone.

"(...) Did Stalin make mistakes? Of course he did. In so long a period filled with heroism, trials, struggle, triumphs, it is inevitable not only for Joseph Stalin personally but also for the leadership as a collective body to make mistakes. Which is the party and who is the leader that can claim to have made no mistakes in their work? When the existing leadership of the Soviet Union is criticized, the comrades of the Soviet leadership advise us to look ahead and let bygones be bygones, they tell us to avoid polemics, but when it comes to Stalin, they not only did not look ahead but they turned right round, completely backward, in order to track down only the weak spots in Stalin's work.

"(...) At Bucharest, turning to the Chinese comrades, Comrade Khrushchev said: <<You are catching on to a dead horse>>, <<Come and get his bones, if you wish!>> These references were to Stalin." (Hoxha: 'Speech delivered at the Meeting of 81 Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow on November 16, 1960' in: 'Selected Works', Volume III; Tirana; 1980; p.157-159; English Edition).

The Albanian comrades linked the struggle against the so-called "cult of personality" with the struggle against modern revisionism, based on the teachings of Comrade Stalin and showed the deceived working class in the revisionist countries the revolutionary way out to overthrow the revisionist dictatorship of the new bourgeoisie and to reconquer the dictatorship of the proletariat, which had been established under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin. Enver Hoxha taught that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the only form of political power that is able to oppose the revisionist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, to replace it. The restoration of socialism is today the task of the entire world proletariat, which is nothing else than the creation of world socialism under the present conditions of globalization.

The Albanian comrades have again raised the world revolutionary banner of Comrade Stalin, thus winning the sympathy and support of all loyal supporters of Stalin all over the world. New Marxist-Leninist parties have emerged, based on the Bolshevik principles of Lenin-Stalin's party building of a new type. A strong Stalinist world movement had been rebuilt and so the traitors to Stalin were exposed and attacked on a world scale with the banner of Stalin.

The Albanian comrades courageously took side with Stalin and called upon the world proletariat and the communist world movement to remain faithful to and defend the principles and teachings of Comrade Stalin, not to renounce them, not to replace them with the opportunist ideas of Bernstein, Kautsky, Trotsky, Bukharin, Tito, Khrushchev and the other renegades and to tear the mask off the face of the modern revisionists.

Subjugating, persecuting, and eliminating the enemies of the Soviet Union was not a crime and could not have been as an expression of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin and Stalin taught that there was no let-up in the class struggle against the remnants of the old bourgeoisie and that they were uncompromising in their opposition to any attempts by a new privileged layer to rise above the dictatorship of the proletariat. **The revisionists, however, as is well known, abandoned the class struggle and condemned Stalin because he defended the Leninist doctrine of the inevitability of the intensification of the class struggle under socialism.** After Stalin's death, the revisionists rehabilitated the criminals under socialism. The modern revisionists used the slogan of "struggle against the cult of personality" in order to realize their counter-revolutionary aims to rehabilitate such criminals to socialism as Tito, as "Victims of Stalin" and to eliminate the revolutionary leaders who were loyal to Marxism-Leninism and followed Stalin. If Stalin had lived, Khrushchev and all the other revisionist criminals would have been punished or eliminated. Stalin was in the process of radically purifying the leadership when his murderers beat him to it. When the purge began at the end of 1948, some revisionist leaders had already been sentenced and punished with death. The other revisionists were very afraid that their crimes would be exposed and punished

at any moment. So they had no choice but to flee and seize power when their head was already on the scaffold.

Enver Hoxha said:

"He [Mao – editor's note] says that 'Stalin shot people for the most trifling mistake'. This is a slander. Stalin did not shoot people for making mistakes. On the contrary, he struggled to correct those who made mistakes and there are documents which show this is true . Stalin directed that evil-doers should be put in prison or concentration camps, and that counter-revolutionaries, traitors, spies, and the other enemies of the people should be shot for especially dangerous crimes. If he had not done this, socialism could not have been built in the Soviet Union, and Stalin would not have been on the Leninist road. Mao Tsetung is opposed to this line. He generalizes the issue and treats both those who have committed not very dangerous crimes, who certainly should not be shot, and counter-revolutionaries, in the same way. Who says that we should shoot those who have not committed grave crimes? Nobody. On the contrary, we are for correcting such people, and this is what we have done." (Hoxha: 'Some Thoughts about the Ballist 'Decalogue' Mao Tsetung' in: 'Reflections on China', Volume II; Tirana; 1979; p.383; English Edition).

The Albanian comrades courageously stood up against the modern revisionists, who raved about a period of "reign of terror", of "serious violations of socialist legality", in order to denigrate, falsify and reject the historical experiences of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of socialist and communist construction in the Soviet Union under Stalin's leadership. The Albanian comrades called on the communist world movement to continue the way of Lenin and Stalin and not to follow the way of the modern revisionists.

The Albanian comrades revealed Khrushchev's accusation of the "cult of personality" as a bluff. They were not interested in who defends the cult of personality and who fights it, as the Khrushchevites did, but the Albanian comrades were mainly concerned with the fundamental question: Should we abandon or defend Lenin's principles on the relations between the masses, the class, the Party and the leaders?

For the Albanian comrades it was clear: in order to defend Marxism-Leninism one must defend Stalin, one must attack the modern revisionist Khrushchev and his lackeys in the communist world movement, who with his accusation of the "cult of personality" really wanted to strike Marxism-Leninism.

Because of our loyalty to Stalin, the revisionists, after their defeat, were finally forced to hide again behind the mask of Stalin which they actually thought they would never have to put on again. After the Stalin statues were toppled in Albania and Ramiz Alia revealed his true counter-revolutionary face, the banner of Enver Hoxha was kicked into the dirt, the banner of Stalin's most faithful and best disciple. This was a heavy defeat for the Stalinist world movement. It split and disintegrated into a thousand pieces and the cause was of course the penetration of revisionist influence, since the struggle against revisionism had almost ceased (For example: The neo-revisionist "Declaration of Quito" of 1992).

But basically a salutary process of purging took place, whereby the upright comrades as a minority in the Stalinist world movement regained principled ground under their feet. It was clear to the upright comrades of the Stalinist World Movement after the overthrow of the dictatorship of the proletariat of Albania that one could only raise the banner of Stalin if one raised the banner of Enver Hoxha, which had been trodden in the mud at the same time.

What did this mean for the Stalinists all over the world? The Stalinists could not defend Stalin if they would not defend Enver Hoxha. The so-called "Stalin Question" was therefore inseparably linked to the so-called "Hoxha Question", especially to the fight against the so-called "cult of personality" of Enver Hoxha. Thereupon the Stalinist World Movement was equipped with the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, with Comrade Enver Hoxha. This also meant a strengthening of Stalinism. This task was solved by the Comintern/ML in 2000. From that time on, the old demarcation line in the so-called "Stalin Question" was raised one step higher to distinguish itself from those revisionists who had put on the mask of Stalin in the meantime. This was a historically important step to protect Stalinism from the renewed attacks of revisionism (neo-revisionism). But this was not the end of the task. Now the Stalinists all over the world had to defend themselves against the penetration of hostile elements into the Hoxhaist World Movement. What had to be done? An ideological struggle had to be led against neo-revisionism: Hoxhaism in words, revisionism in deeds. Since its existence, the Comintern/ML fought against many neo-revisionist manifestations in order to clean the Marxist-Leninist World Movement from the garbage of revisionist and sectarian influence. These were groups which we did not all see through at first sight, but whose true nature we recognized step by step.

Today there are different currents and "schools" which try to separate Stalinism from the Marxist-Leninist World Movement and each in its own way influences the world proletariat. These "Stalinist Schools" such as the Alliance/Canada and the ISML, which we consider to be typical sectarian "Berianist Schools", strive to place the Marxist-Leninist World Movement under its high priesthood.

This "Berianist School" set out to have the last word on the events of the late Stalin Era and to distort the role of Stalin in the history of the communist world movement in its favor. The Stalinists could not allow this. They had to deal with it self-critically and lo and behold, this dangerous current within our ranks could not only be recognized, but in the dissociation from Berianism we learned with the renewed study of the works of Comrade Stalin also to recognize the basics of Stalinism much clearer, so that today we can make the "Foundations of Stalinism" available to the Hoxhaist World Movement and enrich it. Basically we owe this to the Berianists. We cannot put ourselves on the level of Stalin's "Foundations of Leninism", which is not our intention, but the beginning has been made and we are sure that the Stalinists all over the world will help each other to further cooperate on the "Foundations of Stalinism" and to perfect them, so that the world proletariat can be helped to a safe weapon to liberate itself from anti-Stalinism and to build its new world with the compass of the Foundations of Stalinism.

What does Stalinism mean today in the struggle against the danger of the cult of personality?

Stalinism today solves the question of cult of personality on a world scale on the basis of the experiences and teachings in the struggle against modern revisionism in the first period of "socialism in one country". The cult of personality is not a danger that is limited to a purely national level. The struggle against the so-called "cult of personality" was carried out between the Revisionist-Trotskyite World Movement and the Marxist-Leninist World Movement. And this struggle is not finished, but is in full swing, which is proved by this struggle against Berianism.

At present there is no 6th Classic of Marxism-Leninism in sight, which the neo-revisionists could accuse of having a cult of personality around. What is the consequence? It follows that the Hoxhaist World Movement is still too weak to form new leaders in the global class struggle of the world proletariat. This task of training new leaders of the Hoxhaist World Movement must be solved now and it will be solved on the one hand by the fact that the world

proletarian revolutionary struggle will develop and grow, whose center new leaders will emerge from and on the other hand by the fact that the new leaders will equip themselves with the latest state of the further developing Marxism-Leninism and arm themselves with the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Hoxha. Without world revolutionary theory, there is no world revolutionary movement, no re-emerging Hoxhaist movement. The Comintern/ML is currently far from playing a practical leading role in the Marxist-Leninist movement, although it itself like many others has emerged from the world revolutionary movement of Comrade Enver Hoxha and is trying to create its most progressive center. But it tries to serve its modest contribution with new theoretical impulses and to raise the banner of proletarian internationalism of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha with all other comrades all over the world. And here in this ideological field, the Comintern/ML has already shown certain leadership qualities in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement which are necessary to throw a last lifeline to the comrades of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement which has been seized by a strong revisionist current and is threatening to drift further and further away from the revolutionary course. Today, the Comintern/ML has already become the force that has raised the bar of Marxism-Leninism the farthest in the struggle against those who try to lower it for the purpose of letting the revisionists jump over to destroy the fortress of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of Comrade Enver Hoxha from within for good. The Comintern/ML restores the ideological base of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement by firstly, preserving this base in its old revolutionary core and protecting its Marxist-Leninist roots, secondly, by liberating it from outdated doctrines and thirdly, by enriching it with new ideas.

And this also includes correctly leading the struggle against the so-called "cult of personality" of Stalin, including the Berianists.

What does "correct" mean? Two things must be taken into account:

Firstly, when we Marxist-Leninists reject the slanders against Stalin, the so-called "criticism of the cult of personality", it is not with the aim of restoring the cult of personality, but to emphasize the outstanding importance of the figure of Stalin as the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. Reviving and rehabilitating the cult of personality of Stalin today, so to speak as an "anti-revisionist weapon against the slanderers of Stalin", is sectarian and works into the hands of the rehabilitation of the revisionists. One cannot replace an "exaggerated" cult of personality with a "normal" one, one cannot fight the cult of personality with cult of personality, but one must rely on the formulas of Marxism-Leninism to create and consolidate a healthy relationship between leader - class - mass. We are not longing for the old cult of personality, nor do we feel the need to choose a new one, for we are against the cult of personality in general and for the final elimination of its inevitability, for the elimination of class society which created it for the sole purpose of opposing the class struggle which is waged by the workers for the elimination of class society!

The cult of personality must be dismantled, but the figure of Stalin must not be dismantled at the same time. Those who separate loyalty to Stalin from loyalty to communism, those who dismiss the defense of their figure as a cult of personality and their ideas as a cult, preach the betrayal of Stalin, the betrayal of communism. We Stalinists want to treat the figure of Stalin just as Stalin had treated the figure of Lenin and just as Stalin continued Leninism, we Stalinists want to continue Stalinism as Enver Hoxha did. Is that clear enough?

So whoever points out the merits of Stalin as the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism is therefore neither an admirer of the figure of Stalin nor a slave of the cult of personality that was practiced around him. Any accusation that the defense of the Marxist-Leninist life and work

of Comrade Stalin is "sectarianism" must be rejected absolutely, because we Marxist-Leninists must never allow the merits and teachings of Stalin to be diminished, falsified or undermined by anyone and in any way. We Stalinists want to change the world and Stalin is our role model, teacher, guide.

Second. If we Marxist-Leninists fight against the so-called "criticism of the cult of personality", we must also fight against the attempts of the neo-revisionists, who use the rejection of the "criticism of the cult of personality" in order to impute to Comrade Stalin a meaning that serves the revival of revisionism, that serves world capitalism and its lackeys in the ranks of the revolutionary world camp. We Marxist-Leninists are opponents of such elements who abuse the role and importance of the figure of Stalin for their great-power chauvinist, imperialist, nationalist and reactionary purposes, for the purpose of splitting and disorganizing the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, for the purpose of strengthening revisionism. We Marxist-Leninists must not allow elements to penetrate our movement who pretend to defend Stalin in order to smuggle all their revisionist filth into our ranks. Revisionists defend Stalin in words to betray him in deeds. Not everyone who defends Stalin against the so-called "cult of personality" is a Marxist-Leninist. One can only lead the fight against the so-called "cult of personality" on the ground of Marxism-Leninism, otherwise one slides into the swamp of opportunism.

Only if one takes action *against both directions equally*, recognizes their interaction and smashes them, does one correctly fight against the accusation of the cult of personality.

The so-called "Stalin Question" is only raised by our opponents because they reject Stalin as a Classic on principle or do not even want to recognize him as a Marxist-Leninist. We therefore want to distance ourselves from the outset from the right opportunists and "left" sectarians who attack our principled position on the irrefutable teachings of Stalinism:

For the Marxist-Leninists of the world, for the future representatives and members of the Comintern/ML, there is fundamental clarity and unity about Stalin as the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. When we defend Marxism-Leninism, we defend Comrade Stalin. This does not mean that we want to defend his mistakes or suppress discussions about mistakes. Mistakes were made by all the classics, that is why they have not lost their significance as classics to this day and will never lose it.

We must make clear to the proletariat the importance of Stalin as the 4th Classic, spread his works, learn and teach them and apply them in the class struggle. We explain why and how we must reject the attacks on Stalin. We educate our members in the spirit of Stalin.

The entry of a comrade into the Marxist-Leninist Party, his activity in the daily class struggle, cannot be made dependent on his complete clarity about the so-called "Stalin Question". One cannot simply exclude him because of ambiguities, just consider that it took us ourselves several years to clarify and refute the question raised by our opponents. One cannot simply exclude a new comrade because of ambiguities in the so-called "Stalin Question", that would be sectarianism and misunderstood principled standpoint.

We must not expose the Marxist-Leninist World Movement to the danger of its division or liquidation because of a conciliatory attitude towards a struggle in the so-called "Stalin Question" led by right-wing opportunists or sectarians against us. This must not happen to us in the demarcation to Berianism either.

Let our opponents raise the so-called "Stalin Question" as much as they want. They will not

achieve their goal for us to question Stalin. The Stalinists always emerge strengthened from this struggle, the opponents are discredited every time.

They always began with the last classic and then tried to "refute" one classic after the other or at least to reduce its importance in order to "refute" and reduce all of Marxism-Leninism. They attacked Stalin and meant Lenin. They attacked Lenin and meant Marx and Engels. They attacked Marx and Engels and meant communism. This is the consistent path of revisionism, starting with sectarianism and ending with openly anti-communist bourgeois ideology, which ends up on the dustbin of history. Last but not least, Enver Hoxha had brilliantly refuted the so-called "Stalin Question". When we are called "Stalinists", we are not affected. Some Trotskyites insult us as openly as they insult Stalin. The other kind of Trotskyites are more subtle. They defend Stalin in words in order to accuse us Stalinists of "sectarianism." Both form the front of the 5th Column in the struggle against Stalinism today, in the struggle against the world socialist revolution, against the world revolutionary proletariat. Our opponents will try to turn the tables, "swear" on Stalin and make us Marxist-Leninists look like charlatans. However, nothing and nobody can deny, refute or stop the teachings of Stalin, not even with rotten tricks. We do not fear physical extermination, we do not fear fascist persecution and torture, we do not fear the social fascists and their lackeys, but also not such opponents who pretend to have suddenly "discovered" their "heart" for Stalin in order to abuse our trust and to storm the fortress from inside with a "Trojan Horse" and put a knife in our back.

We must not be blind in one eye or the other. Whoever stops in the fight against the exaggeration of Stalin's importance and does not fight the same way against the understatement of Stalin's importance, will only be able to halfway defend the figure of Stalin and his importance. If one wants to learn how an exaggeration and the criticism of it was turned into an understatement and belittlement, study Berianism. The ideology of Berianism is the ideology of belittling and disrespecting the figure and work of Stalin "on the grounds of Stalinism", is the revision of Stalinism, is the revisionism of Stalinism. Bill Bland praises Stalin as an "outstanding Marxist-Leninist, who has led a consistent struggle against revisionism throughout his life", to write in the same article that actually it was not Stalinism, but in reality *"revisionism has ruled the Soviet Union since 1934"*. An outstanding Marxist-Leninist, this Stalin, who since 1934, for almost 20 years under the revisionist rule of the USSR "led a consistent fight against revisionism" [sic !!!]. Bill Bland concludes this from the 17th Party Congress, which took place in 1934, at which the revisionists allegedly established their rule over the USSR. The period from 1934-1953 is consequently denigrated as a "revisionist" USSR. During this period, the USSR is said to have been a work of counter-revolution and not the work of Stalin! This is a destructive thesis, which in fact denies the actual development of Stalinism, which could not be based on anything else but the objectively existing socialist development of the Soviet Union from 1934 to 1953. Was there no socialist Soviet Union at all between 1934 and 1953? Without a socialist USSR of the years 1934 - 1953, Stalinism could not have developed into a bloom at all. Bill Bland makes a grave mistake here, because with this thesis he puts himself exactly in line with the thesis of the revisionists by declaring the work of Stalin with the 13 volumes, thus with January 31st, 1934 (sic!) to be "finished". After all we have criticized about Bill Bland, we cannot dismiss this agreement with the revisionists as a coincidence. There is a system behind it. It is precisely this objective existence of socialism in the USSR that is denied. Bill Bland takes the view that "objective conditions led to the fact that this struggle [Bill Bland meant the struggle that Stalin waged against revisionism - editor's note] should ultimately not be crowned with success." (Bill Bland, Conclusions - "Stalin, The Myth and Reality"; a lecture given at the Weekend School of the Communist League; 1977 [not to be confused with the 1999 lecture - translator's note]). Stalin's "defeat" against revisionism is thus based on the false premise of the allegedly "objective

conditions of the rule of revisionism from 1934 - 1953". We Stalinists firmly reject this thesis of Bill Bland as a revisionist and completely untenable thesis. Praising Stalin in words, but denying him in deeds is the bourgeois revisionism of Stalinism.

Unfortunately, what we are dealing with here is not just a particular belittling of the role of Stalin, but a general belittling of *Marxism*. What are the serious consequences for the Marxist-Leninist World Movement? If one regards Stalinism as a dam against the influence of bourgeois ideologies on the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, then the dismantling of this dam must inevitably lead to the Marxist-Leninist World Movement being flooded with bourgeois influences, so that the revolutionary theory is not only diluted and vulgarized, but also runs the risk of drowning in revisionist ideology. From this then arises the dangerous swamp of opportunism, which the future generation of revolutionary workers is lured into. Comrades, the flooding of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement with bourgeois influences is in full swing right now, at this very moment! We must not have any illusions about this. There is only one thing we can do: We have to build the dam higher, where it will be dismantled the most: At Stalinism. What is the task of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement? It is not only to be careful not to belittle Stalinism but also *not to overvalue it*. It is *precisely in this very specific place* that Stalinism must be defended and developed under the changing conditions of the world proletarian liberation struggle.

And now we find ourselves confronted with the very effect of the poison of Berianism, which inevitably had to produce the daring and intolerable thesis of Bill Bland, namely to encourage petty-bourgeois intellectuals, who doubt the existence of socialism, to belittle Stalinism much further than Bill Bland did. If Bill Bland put forward the still quite "harmless" thesis that there had "only" been no socialism in the USSR since 1934, "critics" of the split off grouping of the organization "Red October" in Germany come to the conclusion that Bill Bland cannot speak of 1934 - 1953 as a period of the "restoration of capitalism", because his thesis assumes that there must have been something that capitalism restores - socialism. Thus the "critics" of Bill Bland, who in reality are only his successors, who only openly said what Bill Bland could not have said at that time, because he would have been criticized for it in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement. So what is the "great discovery" of the new generation of "thinkers of dialectical materialism"? "There has never been socialism in the world!" "Without socialism there can be no restoration of capitalism", and so our intellectuals conclude that our slogan for the struggle against the restoration of capitalism is "not" Marxist-Leninist. That's how they want to put the noose around our necks, these resourceful fools! Our formula here against neo-revisionism hits the mark once again: "Anti-revisionism in words, revisionism in deeds! Mind you, a group that split off from the German organization "Red October" in the beginning of 2008 is trying to tell us these monstrous fairy tales, these so-called "Marxist-Leninists", who shortly before had still taken a "Stalinist point of view" (which they had, by the way, only accepted after we had pulled the soft pillow of modern revisionism out from under them!!!). These are uprooted intellectual elements, who go from one organization to another, only to finally crawl into their own snail's shell in disappointment and withdraw from the class struggle. If they would at least leave it at that, we wouldn't mind. But of course petty-bourgeois intellectuals can't sit on their hands and that's why they try to paste up their theoretical fantasies as "honest searches for truth". When we followed the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of Comrade Enver Hoxha with many other new Marxist-Leninist parties at the end of the 1960s and beginning of the 1970s, we also had to struggle with these intellectualist, sectarian debating club appearances. It had cost us no small amount of strength to deal with this intellectual hooliganism and finally to leave them alone. The fact that they are now crawling out of their holes again as a new generation of "revolutionary theorists" shows us that we are right, that the Marxist-Leninist World Movement is on the move again, that it will emerge anew and strengthened from dropping this intellectualist

ballast.

The Trotskyite seed has thus sprouted among the vacillating petty-bourgeois intellectuals and bears its "fruits". We prophesied this to them nine years ago, but they wanted to be smarter than us in their typical arrogance, and now we see that they have gone even further down the Trotskyite path. This "dialectical intelligence" inevitably had to sink into the quagmire of Hegelian idealism because, under the pressure of bourgeois influence, they had strayed too far from the solid ground of materialism, the recognition of historically existing socialism. The poison of Berianism has already had an effect on them, which they thought they had "honestly" and "self-critically" distanced themselves from. These people do not understand that Berianism puts the "criticism of Berianism" in their mouths only in order to further dissuade them from Marxism-Leninism. "Honest self-criticism", which these people write about, is a cover-up for the fact that they have in fact gone even deeper into the swamp with their "criticism of Bill Bland". This disguised "honest self-criticism" of Bill Bland is intended to throw sand in the eyes of our comrades, which of course only makes the whole thing worse. Anyone can "somehow" criticize Berianism, but only Marxist-Leninists can really push back Berianism as a Trotskyite influence within the Marxist-Leninist World Movement.

So we see where Berianism has already led, to the denial of Marxism, to the fight against Marxism, to the fight against the Marxist-Leninist World Movement. Berianism lays out the trap with bait so that our comrades fall into it, and then Berianism washes its hands in innocence in order to rub them behind the back of the comrades afterwards. You can see what it leads to if you do not criticize Bill Bland in time. You can see what it leads to if we Stalinists do not criticize ourselves in time and fail to keep up the defense of Stalin at all times. It is a fatal error to believe that the criticism of the accusation of the "cult of personality" against Stalin is all-encompassingly closed by the Marxist-Leninist World Movement through Enver Hoxha. We have made the mistake of resting on old laurels. We have been punished for this rightly. The Berianists taught us a lesson and we have to learn from it!

The history of the decline of Marxism is an evil chapter in the history of opportunism which continues to be written in ever newer forms.

Although the Berianists affirm in words that they are "correctly" fighting this struggle, it turns out that they did not do so with honest intentions, that they did not scientifically prove the role of Stalin's personality, but only pseudo-scientifically "justified" its belittlement. The Berianists came to the conclusion that the cult of personality which the revisionists had pursued could only spread thanks to a "minority position" of Stalin, from which they drew the conclusion that it could not have been far off with the role of Stalin. Basically, this is not only an outrageous criticism of Stalin, but also an insidious criticism of the Albanians with Enver Hoxha at the head, of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, of us Stalinists and of all people who do not appreciate Stalin highly enough. Then the sectarianism of the Berianists against us Stalinists, the accusation that we would practice the cult of personality "like the revisionists", comes to light. Yes, while the revisionists proceeded with the cult of personality out of ice-cold calculation, we would be even more dangerous representatives of the cult of personality, because we were honestly convinced of it. The Berianists see their task in disparaging the revolutionary people of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, in disparaging us Stalinists and in demoralizing inexperienced comrades in the so-called "Stalin Question", in giving them a distorted, disparaging image of Stalin. This is a false game that the Berianists are playing. They want to isolate us Stalinists in the same way that the revisionists tried to isolate Stalin, only that they put themselves on the sidelines.

The Berianists are making a crucial mistake. They put themselves above the love which the

world proletariat and the peoples of the world, especially the Soviet peoples and the whole communist world movement felt for Stalin. They place themselves above the millionfold trust that Stalin enjoyed, because he 100% justified it in words and deeds. The Berianists place themselves above the great achievements of the people of the first socialist state in the world, which would have been unthinkable without Stalin. Stalin was of *decisive* importance for the communist world movement, for progressive people all over the world. Even Stalin's worst enemies respected him and rightly considered his role to be *decisive*. Even Beria's murder of Stalin was done in the knowledge that Stalin's role was *decisive*.

The Berianists inflate themselves up as "scientific" "Marxist-Leninists" who "defend" Stalin in the "two-front struggle" against the alleged "sectarian cult of personality" of us Stalinists, of Enver Hoxha and his Marxist-Leninist World Movement and at the same time against the revisionist cult of personality including its "criticism" of him. The Berianists claim to be the ones who lead the Marxist-Leninist two-front struggle against the cult of personality, and they see themselves as the "true" defenders of Stalin, but of a Stalin of "not decisive importance". So, what should we call such Stalinists who do not attach a decisive importance to Stalin? They are not *decisive* Stalinists. And as non-perceiving Stalinists, they will never achieve decisive importance in the Stalinist World Movement.

They portray Stalin's struggle as the "struggle of a lonely fighter in the desert" who was helplessly at the mercy of the power of the revisionists because of the "objective conditions". The Berianists project the significance of Stalin on his "outstanding fight against the superiority of the revisionists". Although the "objective conditions" dictated the hopelessness of his anti-revisionist struggle to him, Stalin nevertheless fought bravely and attest to Stalin's non-decisive significance of being like that of Don Quixote. Stalinism is all fine and dandy, but not up to revisionism. In other words: The working class fights heroically, but the "objective conditions" of capitalism do not allow it to liberate itself. This is the direction which Berianism wants the world proletariat to go, this is the thought which communism should be infected in order to submit to the "objective conditions" of capitalism with.

We Stalinists reject such tall tales about Stalin by far: It was not revisionism, but Marxism-Leninism, Stalinism that had a decisive importance in the Soviet Union, as the great victories of socialism in its First Period OBJECTIVELY proved. One cannot want to turn this historically proven relationship upside down! Who put the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin into practice, Stalin or the "objective conditions" of the revisionists? Who showed the world the right way to communism, not only theoretically but also practically, Stalin or his opponents? Was it the work of the Soviet peoples under the leadership of Comrade Stalin or the work of the revisionists? The fact that Stalin spent his life successfully preventing the restoration of capitalism, thus giving his opponents one defeat after another until his death, that all the enemies of the world trembled before him, that he made communism stronger in the world than any other is why the Berianists do not want to acknowledge all these great achievements. They do not write anything about them, they do not consider them defensible, they do not consider them crucial.

The elimination of the inevitability of the restoration of capitalism on a world scale cannot be reduced to objective conditions. It is a fact that there was nobody in the world who, had created the conditions for the historical victory of world socialism like Stalin. Stalin made communism so strong that it was about to conquer the whole world. The objective conditions were excellent: The weakening of the imperialist world camp and the strengthening of socialism.

Stalinism is the doctrine of the spread of communism throughout the world, as an objective,

historical fact that cannot be discussed away or "scientifically disproved".

The struggle against the so-called "cult of personality" of Stalin is not only to refute the accusations of the modern revisionists, not primarily to bring to the fore his weaknesses (if there were any) and the "strengths" of the revisionists, as the Berianists do, but to bring out and emphasize the true greatness of Stalin on Marxist-Leninist soil, **completely independent of the revisionist barkers and Berianist disillusionists**, to establish his personality as the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism and of emphasizing his outstanding importance for today's Hoxhaist world movement. The Bernianists do not say a single word about this. On the contrary!! Read for yourselves what a devastating result the Berianists come to in their evaluation of the role of the personality of Comrade Stalin:

"I must make it clear right from the start that the Communist League does not consider the role played by Stalin to be of decisive importance [!!!!]" (Bland: "STALIN - The Myth and the Reality", A lecture given at the Weekend School of the Communist League; 1977).

Comrades, we honestly ask you: Can there be Stalinists whom the role of Stalin is not decisive for?

If you do not give a decisive importance to Comrade Stalin, what importance do the Berianists give to the other classics of Marxism-Leninism, including a role of non-decisive importance? Do they mean to say that only Marx, Engels and Lenin are classics of Marxism-Leninism, as the Berianists propagated immediately after he killed Stalin?

Neither the murder of Stalin, nor the "scientific proof" that Stalin's role was not decisive and it cannot change the truth that Stalin was and always will be the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism.

What conclusion must one draw from this, comrades? One can only draw one conclusion, the only correct one:

The Berianists do not attach any importance to Marxism-Leninism itself. They play with Marxism-Leninism in the Trotskyite manner in order to discredit and falsify it.

Whoever disparages any classic of Marxism-Leninism disparages all other classics.

Whoever makes such intolerable assertions about Stalin cannot possibly be a Stalinist.

Bill Bland was not a Stalinist. A Stalinist would never endorse the kind of view that Bill Bland held. The presumptuous claim of Bill Bland is bad enough in itself. However, we Stalinists cannot and must not accept this claim, but we must resolutely oppose this Trotskyite method which has crept into us, if we want to "scientifically" justify it and smuggle it into the Marxist-Leninist World Movement as a "Marxist-Leninist" standpoint. It was a mistake not to have done so until now. We are self-critical about this:

We declare war on Berianism!

The Berianists are dangerous enemies of Marxism-Leninism and they must be treated as such. Bill Bland has at least contributed (and we do not exclude ourselves from this) to the fact that Berianism found its way into the Marxist-Leninist World Movement.

The defeats have always been blamed on the communists, the workers' leaders, the classics, but never on their traitors, who were rehabilitated by our enemies (Beria)! Personal

inadequacies are equated with the revolutionary cause. The bourgeoisie especially accuses the proletarians themselves of being to blame when they succumb to the "delusion" of the classics. Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha are not religious idols to be worshipped. We love and honor our classics and all heroes and leaders of the revolutionary world proletariat, but we Marxist-Leninists are opponents of the cult of personality. We are not mindless followers who blindly follow their idols. We are neither "sectarians", "ultra-leftists", nor "Keepers of the Holy Grail", which our opponents of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement want to make believe.

It was never the revolutionary workers who practiced the cult of personality or the Proletkult, but those were always and only the agencies of the bourgeoisie within the revolutionary workers' movement. The cult of personality is part of the ideological arsenal of the bourgeoisie. The revisionists have only praised the classics and workers' leaders highly and practiced the cult of personality in order to better overthrow them. And the bourgeoisie, as it turned out, has not shied away from reducing and distorting the role of Stalin, the role of Stalinism, behind the struggle against the so-called "criticism of the cult of personality".

We Marxist-Leninists have never measured the seriousness of the professions of loyalty to our classics with mere words, but have always followed their teachings in the fire of daily class struggle.

The Conspiracy against Stalin already began with the Conspiracy against Lenin

"The leaders of the Second International, Bernstein and Kautsky, began their betrayal by rejecting Marx and Engels, the Trotskyites, Bukharinites and Zinovievites began their betrayal by rejecting Lenin, and the Khrushchevites began its betrayal by rejecting Stalin. History repeats itself, but the modern revisionists must not forget that they repeat not only the actions but also their consequences. They will suffer the same fate as all their successors. Their defeat is inevitable, it will happen sooner or later: Marxism-Leninism will triumph over all opponents and traitors" (Zëri i Popullit: 'The so-called Struggle against the 'Cult of Personality' and its Consequences'; Tirana; 1964; p.158; Translated from German).

How was Trotskyism able to save itself, recover and regain strength after its defeat in the 1930s? At first, it could only save itself by "going on a long march through the institutions", by presenting itself as a "communist" faction in order to put itself at the head of the "struggle against Trotskyism!" This was achieved by none other than Beria, who took the place of the traitors Yagoda and Yezhov. And who freed the Trotskyites from the prisons immediately after Stalin's death? Beria! Who rehabilitated them? Khrushchev!

"As a matter of fact Trotskyism was a faction of Menshevism until the Trotskyists entered our Party; it became temporarily a faction of communism after the Trotskyists entered our Party, and it became once more a faction of Menshevism after the Trotskyists were driven out of our Party. 'The dog returned to his vomit.'" (Stalin: 'Reply to Olekhnovich and Aristov' in: 'Works',

Volume 13; Moscow; 1954; p.132; English Edition).

Beria had also "returned to his vomit".

What Stalin said at the 15th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) about the conspirers of the Trotskyites and Bukharinites also applies to the conspirer Beria:

"Ruthlessness in the choice of means and lack of principles in politics." (quotation found in: "Trial Report"; Moscow; 1937; p.528; Translated from German).

Beria's understanding of domestic politics, especially of state security and intelligence, was not that of an extended arm of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as an instrument of political class struggle in the hands of the socialist working class, but a completely limited understanding of the tactics of conspiracy, administration, hypocrisy, careerism, intrigue, etc. He undoubtedly had "leadership qualities", but he belonged to the sort of "leaders" who are not used to being called *Bolshevik* leaders. He himself instigated conspiracies in order to "convict" comrades of conspiracies and liquidate them "in complete legality" and with Stalin's signature, or to subordinate them to his interests, to blackmail them. At any time he could have blamed all his crimes on Stalin, but that would have cost him his own head, and thus would have thrown his so laboriously prepared plans overboard in one fell swoop. He transformed worker socialism into a conspiratorial "socialism" which not only separated itself from the working class, but restored the tsarist autocracy, the Okhrana, in its "red" garb. Beria was a social fascist. In order to restore capitalism, the counter-revolutionary policies of the bourgeoisie first had to be restored. Its "red" terror served to deter and subdue the masses. You should not dare to stand up against it! Disguised terror was his teacher, not Stalin!

This is a deeply anti-Marxist-Leninist understanding of politics and challenges our fundamental contradiction. What is our Marxist-Leninist position on this? We Bolsheviks take the view that the class struggle is not conducted by conspirers and their apparatchiks, but by the working class and its revolutionary party, that the political power of the working class cannot be conquered or defended by conspiracy, but by the class struggle, by the struggle of the Soviet peoples, by the application of Marxism-Leninism by the broad masses of the working people themselves. Lenin did not believe in the omnipotence of conspiracies.

He did not believe "(...) **that to reduce political struggle to conspiracy means, on the one hand, immensely restricting its scope, and, on the other hand, choosing the most unsuitable methods of struggle.**" (Lenin: 'The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 2; Moscow; 1972; p.340; English Edition).

Lenin believed that politics **should not be reduced** to conspiracy, that the working class should not give up its political struggle and not leave it to a handful of conspirers. And just as one could not overthrow the tsarist government by means of conspiracy circles detached from the working class movement, one could not defend the socialist government by conspiracy, but only by mobilizing the working class, the Soviet peoples, the world proletariat. To Lenin, conspiratorial terror is **powerless terror** because it misses the class goal in its essence, while truly revolutionary terror is exercised by the whole people against its tormentors (also see Lenin's article "The Happening to the King of Portugal" found in his Collected Works, Volume 13, page 472). On the other hand, a terror of the Soviet peoples against the conspirers of the restoration of capitalism would not only have been justified but also necessary and victorious.

As a faithful disciple of Lenin, Stalin has always defended Lenin's view against conspiracy.

"I must declare that Communists never had, do not have, and cannot have, anything in common with the theory and practice of individual terrorism; that Communists never had, do not have, and cannot have, anything in common with the theory of conspiracies against individual persons. The theory and practice of the Comintern consists in organising the mass revolutionary movement against capitalism. That is true. That is the task of the Communists. Only ignoramuses and idiots can confuse plots and individual terrorism with the Comintern's policy in the mass revolutionary movement." (Stalin: 'The Fourteenth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.)' in: 'Works', Volume 7; Moscow; 1954; p.300; English Edition).

Stalin was a strict opponent of all conspiracy theories. But why was and is he still accused of being guided by "conspiracy theories"? Precisely in order to divert attention from his political class struggle, from the leadership of the world revolutionary mass movement, to cover up the fact that he was a Marxist-Leninist who was guided by the teachings of Marxism-Leninism: **"The liberation of the masses can only be the work of the masses!"** Attaching "conspiracy theories" to Stalin, which is one of the inventions of anti-Stalinism, is propagated by anti-Stalinists in order to "substantiate" the "paranoia" of a "dictator", a "despot" etc. **The task of Marxism-Leninism is to unmask the "fantastic", "mysterious", "irrational" nature of the "conspiracy ideology" and to expose its reactionary class character.** It is obscurantism when the purely theoretical pattern of conspiracy is used to separate and isolate revolutionary theory from revolutionary practice, the masses from their leaders. And in theory and practice, Stalin took consistent action against conspirers and their plans for overthrow, of which there have been many in the history of the Bolshevik Party. **The accusation that Stalin was allegedly guided by "conspiracy theories" against the people, against the masses, is only intended to distract from the fact that it was in reality the anti-Stalinists, the counter-revolutionaries, the imperialists and their terrorist organizations who had conspired not only purely theoretically but also quite practically against the revolution, against the working class and its leaders. If there were conspiracies in the USSR under Stalin, they were all plotted against the USSR, against the Soviet peoples, against the working class and its leaders, against Lenin and Stalin.**

Who can believe the fairy tale that the world imperialists, the greatest enemies of communism, are the most peaceful innocent lambs? From the very beginning, the aim of world capitalism was to demonize communism by all means, to discredit it among the masses and to eliminate the leaders in an "elegant" as well as brutal way. The imperialists are not only afraid of communism, but also have a boundless rage in their bowels because the communists dare to sweep their capitalism from the globe. This is an old known fact and to deny this and put up Stalin's alleged "conspiracy theories" instead is part of the bourgeoisie's arsenal, part of the stupefaction of the laboring masses.

"Conspiracy theories" are alien to the working class and its ideology. The bourgeoisie even defames the proletarian worldview as a "conspiracy theory of the powerlessness against capital". And we remember that not only Stalin, but also Lenin, and even the Bolsheviks in general, were accused as "Blanquists", as adherents of "Blanquism", for example by the Struvists, the "legal Marxists". The conspiracy ideology in its entirety deliberately serves to insult the complexity of the actual class struggle and its manifold forms. It leads straight into the swamp, into the labyrinth of suppositions, of fantasies, of constructed personal motives, of falsified history, in order to cover up the exposure of the actual political and social processes. They lead straight into religion, are opium for the people, give themselves a "scientific", sometimes even a Hollywood-style ravishing touch of the agent milieu in order to "explain" the hitherto unexplained, that is: to satisfy the search for truth through speculation, through creeds and spy thrillers among other things.

Today, the conspiracy ideology is once again on the rise. Social supporters are often petty-bourgeois

elements, who thereby try to explain and express their powerlessness and desperation, their capitulation to the capitalist world crisis that has come upon them. Some nationalists, who feel overwhelmed by the supremacy of globalization, are also affected by this. Even in our own communist camp, petty-bourgeois conspiracy ideology is trying to smuggle itself in to fill the gap of impatient waiting, namely that capitalism has still not disappeared and socialism has still not returned. The defeat of socialism, the end of the First Period of Socialism, is a historical fact which cannot be justified by "conspiracy theories". Revolutionary upheavals cannot be artificially fueled by conspiracies. That is anarchist.

The conspiracy ideology is reactionary because it tries to replace the theory of class struggle and denies the active role of the masses in the history of class struggle. The globalization of the bourgeois conspiracy ideology must be countered by the globalization of Marxism-Leninism.

Well, we Stalinists do not fundamentally reject the instrument of conspiracy in the class struggle. Political conspiracies belong to the history of class society like the lid to the pot. We merely believe that political conspiracies (Blanquism) must not replace our class struggle, that they are, **in themselves**, unsuitable. We always keep all forms of struggle open, never committing ourselves to a single form of struggle. We do not exclude the method of conspiracy as **one of many** methods of class struggle, just as our class enemy does not and cannot do without it. The method of conspiracy is part of the class struggle, both on the part of the bourgeoisie and on the part of the working class. In hot, revolutionary situations, this method is not excluded on both sides of the barricade, conspiracies and counter-conspiracies take place. **They are inevitable and indispensable in the antagonistic class struggle between capitalism and socialism.**

"(...) the French word 'conspiration' is the equivalent of the Russian word "zagovar" ('conspiracy') (...) It would be extremely naive indeed, therefore, to fear the charge that we Social-Democrats desire to create a conspiratorial organisation." (Lenin: 'What is to be Done?' in: 'Collected Works', Volume 5; Moscow; 1977; p.475; English Edition).

Conspirers are called conspirers because they do not reveal the truth of their political intentions, not even among themselves. Conspiracy groups have organized themselves not only against Lenin and Stalin, against the Bolshevik leaders, but also against competing and rival conspiracy groups, especially when they work together in an anti-Soviet Bloc. Just as the various anti-Soviet groups joined together to liquidate the Soviet leaders in the 1930s, so did the anti-Soviet conspiracy groups in the late 1940s and early 1950s. It would be naive to think that vain sunshine prevailed among the conspirers of 1953. After Stalin's death they all tried to slaughter each other and get out of each other's way, the conspiracy for the best place at the revisionist feeding trough really started. And it was then that the pig Khrushchev, along with the other pigs, drove out the pig that had pushed the most, Beria.

The **double-tonguing**, "**for the Party in words and against the Party in deeds**", was elevated by the Trotskyite-Zinovievite Center into an anti-Bolshevik tactic against Stalin. **Zinoviev** used this "legal" method to "crawl into the Party on his stomach", as he himself put it, and to gain the trust of the Party, and Stalin in particular. And Zinoviev did not seem to have been the only one who wanted to gain Stalin's trust in this way, only Beria had more flattery and cunning than him to penetrate Stalin's personal environment. Pretending "loyalty" and "devotion" to Stalin in order to create better opportunities for acts of terror against Stalin were the exact counter-revolutionary measures not only used by Beria but also by all other conspirers of 1953. **Stalinists in words, but Stalin's murderers in deeds!**

Stalin's conspirers of the 1950s, with Khrushchev at the head in the end, used the same unscrupulous methods as once used by the Trotskyite-Zinovievite Center and the Right and

Trotskyite Bloc. The traces of the terrorist state conspiracy were obliterated by liquidating all those who knew too much about it. **Consequently, two things always belonged to terrorism: 1. The organization of the terrorist act itself and 2. The liquidation of the perpetrators to cover up the traces.** The conspirers were intent on seizing the leadership of the OGPU/MDV on the one side or the GRU on the other after the seizure of power to cover up the traces of their crimes. They copied methods from the Nazis where participation in the conspiracy was physically destroyed at the hands of the organizers of the conspiracy, as was the case with the destruction of Röhm and his followers. The modern revisionists, like the Trotskyites and fascists, also used this method.

One of Stalin's conspirers in the 1930s was Bukharin. He most submissively pursued the tactic of nesting in the Party and gaining the personal trust of the leadership. For this reason he also allowed himself to be humiliated at the **17th Party Congress**, just to be able to stay in the Party, because nothing could be done from outside after the 1930s. Beria went further, he penetrated to the core of power and from the center he used his powerful socialist host to finally tap into it.

There were conspirers who stood before the court in the 1930s that did not tell the whole truth and those who told the whole truth. There were those who intended to continue their anti-party path, the others had broken with it completely and turned away from that path. With several groups of conspirers, contradictions could easily arise within the terrorist conspiracy front, especially when the **secrets constituted a power of mutual blackmail**. In this way, conspiracy became a commodity that was usually traded bidding in the satisfaction of its political aims. Secrets can be the best investment and life insurance if they are mastered and used properly, as Beria did. But if you are handed over to them, you will perish in them. Beria must have been aware of this, too, if he, as a conspirer, had to carry this mental pressure (not a guilty conscience, but the desire to fly away at some point) with him. Beria had traveled a decade-long path of crime before he became a murderer of Stalin. Even a conspirer like Beria, did not fall from the sky or be born a conspirer.

As a Bolshevik, one must see through the **dialectical laws of conspiracy** and use them **as a weapon against the conspirers themselves**. Stalin understood this like no other, and Beria, who always stayed close to Stalin, learned to use this weapon against Stalin himself. Trotsky never came as close to Stalin as Beria did.

Stalin as the "target" of the conspiracy could of course take advantage of the fact that he could turn different groups of conspirers against each other. It was enough if he could get certain internal information from the conspirers to lure them into his trap. Stalin had informants within the counter-revolutionary organizations, but also informants about hidden enemies in the middle of the Party. In this way, he was able to blow the entire conspiracy at the right moment, confusing the conspiratorial front and striking when the enemy least expected it. In the same way, the conspiracy front and the victim front could face each other for years without any change in the balance of power. One knows about each other, but has each other in an entanglement, controls each other's authority, and Stalin was like a panther constantly on the lookout and ready to leap. Whoever wavers in a conspiracy becomes a security risk for the conspiracy group, which is why the group must liquidate the "risk" if the "risk" does not "voluntarily" liquidate itself.

From the Soviet files most of the failed **attacks on Stalin** are probably known, as well as the names of those who carried out the attacks and above all who planned and ordered them, but certainly not all of them. One of the Trotskyite attacks that Trotsky personally ordered was the shooting of Stalin at the 7th World Congress of the Comintern, which was to trigger an "international mass movement". The plan failed, as did the one to shoot Stalin at the 13th Plenary of the ECCI, at which Stalin was not even present. With the purges further plans were uncovered and thwarted. For decades Stalin had kept the international counter-revolutionary terror of the whole world from destroying the Soviet Union, from eliminating communism. This alone speaks for his anti-

conspiracy leadership qualities. If the conspirers accused Stalin of "paranoia", then Stalin gave them good reason for them to do so!

The question of the **opposition's tactics and the resolution of differences of opinion** was still in the **foreground in the initial phase of the Party** until the 1930s. For years, the Party let itself be fooled to a certain extent by its enemies, because it was of the honest opinion that comrades had to be convinced of the right policy. Before Kirov's murder, there was no death penalty for party members. The Party only realized later that there was an anti-party tactic of liquidation behind it, which had to be stopped, when the opposition had in fact moved to overthrowing the Party and murdering its leaders.

At first, the opposition hid its struggle against Soviet power behind criticism of its shortcomings, weaknesses and difficulties, because it was speculating on the defeat of socialism, on its collapse. However, when socialism gained so much strength that this method seemed hopeless, the opposition began to give up all hope, abandoned the previous path of political-ideological argument about the General Line of the Party, to take the criminal path of conspiracy, terror, sabotage and cooperation with the world reaction against the USSR of Comrades Lenin and Stalin. Counter-revolutionary ideas became counter-revolutionary actions. What was the trigger of the wave of purging in the 1930s? Crimes of party leaders were exposed and this meant a warning against further double-talkers and traitors in the Party, who talked about their remorse and disguised themselves and masked themselves to organize a strike in the back of the Party, the country, the proletarian cause, all the easier. This was also the position taken by the conspirers of 1953. Although the leaders of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite Center were exiled or imprisoned, their center remained capable of action, to carry out the murder of Kirov for example. The center of the conspiracy was directed abroad by Trotsky. The center of the 1953 Conspiracy was within the party leadership itself. Although Stalin was in control of the 1953 conspirers, they remained capable of acting to carry out the assassination of Stalin. Whether the conspiracy was directed by foreign forces we do not know, but at least we assume that conspiracy threads were directly and indirectly directed abroad.

The enemy, once arrested, did not confess his crimes until the facts of the indictment were incontrovertibly established, once the enemy was fully exposed. If we write these lines here, the enemies of Stalin will of course read them with great attention and they will put 2 and 2 together and carefully analyze what has become known of their crimes and what has not yet been revealed. With this knowledge they can then use enough useful information to put us, who continue to follow their tracks, on the wrong track. Be sure, we know more about you than you suspect! We will get you all, if not today, then tomorrow!

The common system of Trotskyites and fascists against the Bolsheviks, especially the plans for the assassination of Stalin came into being in 1933 when the Nazis came to power. Trotsky saw the assassination of Stalin as his main task. The Gestapo let the Trotskyites run free because it was bound by the agreement with them to kill the Soviet leaders through terrorist means, especially Stalin. The fascists therefore relied not only on intervention from outside, but also on terrorist acts from within, which they undertook together with the Trotskyites, but without the support of the Fifth Column. Starting in 1932, terrorist acts were carried out in the USSR by German Nazis on behalf of Himmler, not only as head of the Gestapo, but already with Himmler as chief of staff of the SS.

Not only Trotskyites are **social-fascists**, not only the modern revisionists are **social-fascists**, all other anti-Bolsheviks who act in the guise of "Bolshevism" are social-fascists, and so are the **Berianists**. And whether they like it or not, they all together form a 5th Column of international fascism against world revolution. The hatred for Stalin, the deep animosity towards us Stalinists, is equally strong and of equal essence among the fascists and social-fascists. They only differ

outwardly in that one flag is brown, green, yellow, black etc., but the other one is "red".

In the case of a possible compromise of Trotsky, the acts of terror were to be passed on to the Gestapo and the White Guards, this was also intended with the compromise of Beria, but the murder of Stalin could be successfully covered up and Beria was eliminated just in time. Trotsky placed his hopes especially on the Trotskyites who had not yet been compromised as Trotskyites in the ranks of the CPSU(B). The Trotskyite conspiracy groups were not to be connected with each other, so that when one group went up, the entire conspiracy organization would not be exposed. The premise applied to all conspirers:

The struggle against communism is a struggle against the Communist Party, especially against its leadership. The struggle against the Communist Party is a struggle against Stalin, against the leaders of the Party. Once Stalin was dead, then one came into possession of the party and lead it on the path of capitalism. The stronger the influence of capitalism, the stronger the decline of communism, which finally ends with its decline. That was the line of counter-revolution, which has been consistently implemented since fascism came to power. But under the pressure of the Great Patriotic War, it was Hitler who finally took his own life in a cowardly manner, and not Stalin, whom he pompously tried to kill. It was only after the Second World War, under the pressure of Anglo-American imperialism, that Stalin became the victim of their Cold War, murdered by traitors within his own leadership connected with the West. Everything points to the fact that what happened in the 1930s with the fascists against Stalin also happened with the Anglo-Americans after the Second World War, especially from the end of the 1940s until the date of Stalin's death. The motto of the Americans is "Not only do we spare all those who turn away from Stalinism, but we also handsomely reward them with dollars". The first to hold out his hand was Tito, who was once so "loyal to Stalin", but Beria did not want to take second place to him and held out his hand as well. Every single one of them, from Tito to Gorbachev, was in cooperation with world imperialism and not only held out their hand, but also received their thirty pieces of silver for their betrayal.

Whether it be Trotsky, Beria or Khrushchev, they and all the others realized that there was no possibility of changing the Party's policy, of getting the Party into their hands, until Stalin was forcibly eliminated: In the struggle against Stalin neither one nor the other could stop at the extreme means so Stalin had to be physically destroyed. Only with the conquest of political power could the restoration of capitalism be completed. As for the assassination of the party leaders, Trotsky pursued the tactic "far from Moscow" of ambushing him on the borders with spectacular assassinations such as staged "car accidents", etc. **The conspirers of 1953 were quite different:** They could very "legally" use the access to Stalin's private room to assassinate Stalin without being disturbed by anyone in the process. It is by this development that one can measure how far the enemies and murderers had advanced after Trotsky's death to complete their criminal work. What is more, Trotsky could only blame the White Guards, foreign intelligence services, etc., to wash his hands of the crime. The conspirers of 1953, on the other hand, were all so dirty that they could easily blame any leader of the Party and the Soviet state. They calmly chose their victims. Even criminals could release them arbitrarily and put comrades, who had made mistakes but had overcome them, back in prison if they seemed dangerous to them. This common tactic was used by both the conspirers of 1953 and the Trotskyite conspirers in the 1930s, for both had **gained influence over the Ministry of the Interior and the state security organs and other instruments of the dictatorship of the proletariat.** Trotsky was far from Russia and had no mass influence. Beria made use of the secret service and Khrushchev used all the propaganda means in the Party and state to create his own mass base, his own cult of personality, after he no longer needed the trust of the masses as a "fighting companion" of Stalin at the 20th Party Congress. Trotsky's conspirers and the conspiracy of the modern revisionists had the same goals, the restoration of capitalism in the USSR, except that Trotsky sold himself as an agency of the Nazis, while the modern revisionists sold themselves to the Anglo-Americans: Allowing the development of private capital, dissolving

collective economies, liquidating Soviet economies, transferring Soviet enterprises to foreign hands, accepting loans, making concessions that would not exclude the transfer of territory had all played the same role from the beginning.

Stalin sent a strong signal to foreign governments that the USSR would never capitulate and had nothing to give to imperialism. Stalin consistently pursued his course of confrontation between capitalism and socialism, which meant nothing other than an intensification of the class struggle, which did not stop him from sitting on a bench with the imperialist great powers, forcing them to make tactical concessions in order to protect the USSR from them. After Stalin's death, the USSR signaled to the same foreign governments the desire to end the confrontation, the desire to gradually align socialism with capitalism. **Other than by building links with the West, the modern revisionists could not have asserted their power.** Just as Trotskyism proved to be a weapon in the hands of the fascist arsonists, the modern revisionists had been a weapon in the hands of the Anglo-American arsonists, for they murdered the man who had fought for peace like no other in human history, who had fought against the inevitability of war. And the fight against the inevitability of war meant for Stalin after World War II to turn the spearhead against the USA. **Just as Trotskyism and fascism extended their hand against communism in the days of fascism, the modern revisionists and the victorious Western powers, led by the USA and England, extended their hand against communism.** Traitors to communism have always been and will always be agents of capitalism, under whatever mask these traitors have slipped or will slip.

The tactic of criminal offenders was and still is, to confess only what can be irrefutably proven, as was the case in the 1930s, but by no means any more. With his invented fairy tales, the deceitful criminal speculates on the gullibility of the people and finally on his "heartbreaking remorse that moves you to tears". The "burned" (unmasked) Trotskyite agents in the Party were immediately publicly "branded" by the Trotskyites to protect the currently undisguised Trotskyites in the Party. Thus, Trotskyites still run around in the Communist World Movement as so-called "Marxist-Leninists" like the Berianists, for example. Such a tactic is generally called a "**placeholder tactic**". Berianists, then, are placeholders of Trotskyite subversion within the Marxist-Leninist movement, as what happened with Beria and Malenkov and other traitors who are still celebrated today as "Marxist-Leninists". These placeholders are not only "sleepers", but also activists to disintegrate the Marxist-Leninist organizations from within in the most covert ways. The mistakes of the Marxist-Leninists are praised, for example, and the correct Marxist-Leninist line is criticized as "sectarian", always with "Marxist-Leninist arguments" of course. In the Marxist-Leninist camp there were so-called secret "placeholders". Placeholders are those who move in the Marxist-Leninist camp unrecognized through double-tonguedness, as agencies of the modern revisionists and other anti-Marxist-Leninist forces, who would have no open access to the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, who, if they appeared openly, would sooner or later be thrown out and smashed. **Placeholders within the communist movement and organization create space there for the systematic adaptation of the revolutionary forces to the counter-revolutionary forces from within.** The party enemies within the Marxist-Leninist Front, which have remained undiscovered by the Marxist-Leninists, try to preserve as many (historical) criminals as possible, and this for as long as possible under the guise of "Marxist-Leninists", just to camouflage the crimes and to make room enough for covering further crimes. **Such a placeholder role is also played today by the Berianists:** *"Lead the Marxist-Leninists further astray when they try to get behind them. Only in this way can you continue to pursue your Berianists policy unhindered, the Marxist-Leninists will follow you in the belief that you are fighting modern revisionism."* Well, the Berianists can assume that we Marxist-Leninists also have our placeholders in their camp, in front of and behind the barricades of our class struggle!

Part of this tactic was also to protect accomplices from being discovered and exposed, in order to leave reserves for further crimes, or to finish the crime that had been uncovered. A second,

independently structured, conspiracy **reserve center** is often set up for this purpose. Parallel centers of the restoration of capitalist relations in the USSR were, on the one hand, the centers of the encircling imperialist powers and, on the other hand, the centers of counter-revolutionary elements inside and outside the Party and government of the USSR. For all their tactical autonomy and parallelism, these centers were strategically interlocked and coordinated, all serving the common strategic goal of liquidating the power of socialism and its leaders.

The Trotskyites acted more decisively and energetically than the Zinovievites. **Whoever got the best position before the murder would be all the more powerful after the murder.** Whoever could show the greatest crimes was naturally entitled to the largest piece of the cake. It was no different with the conspirers of 1953. Beria was the greediest. They killed Beria so that there would be enough of the cake left for them. With this competition to get the biggest piece of the cake, the activities of the conspiracy groups against Stalin took on a characteristic momentum of their own, which put the conspirers in situations that they could neither predict nor plan for, but to which they were rather at the mercy of, and which irreversibly brought everything to a head. But once you got to the levers of power, it turned out that they were not as easy to control as they had hoped. Everything now seemed to conspire against the conspirers themselves. The conspirers were under enormous pressure. And this is also expressed in their chaotic political actions immediately after the murder, although they had practiced in cold-bloodedness for decades. This was particularly evident in Beria's adventurist politics, which he carried out at breakneck speed after Stalin's death.

The modern revisionists were representatives of the vanguard of the international counter-revolution, who insidiously seized the vanguard of the proletarian world revolution in order to lead it into a dead end, into the enemy camp. They were more or less aware that they would make a retreat to capitalism, that they would have to give up their power as leaders at the moment when the process of restored capitalism was finished. The counter-revolution eats its children, even Beria. The path was marked out; if a revisionist leadership deviated from it, for whatever reason, it was deposed by another revisionist leadership. The end of this revisionist path that had been taken since the death of Stalin was finally reached with the transition from Gorbachev to Yeltsin. Once caught in the wolf pit of imperialism, the modern revisionists were seized and became its pawn. The modern revisionists had imagined in their megalomania that they would exploit the imperialist forces for themselves, but in reality it turned out that it was the imperialists who had used the modern revisionists as their tool against communism. After all, the modern revisionists had brought the degeneration of the once so proud socialism of Lenin and Stalin to such a state of decay that only a small, run-down pile of misery was left on the doorstep of world imperialism. **But has modern revisionism really collapsed with its rotten work?** To believe this would mean to have learned nothing from the history of modern revisionism. Is it really so hated by the masses that it is buried and cannot rise again? This is what the Trotskyites claimed when they begged for leniency from the Soviet court. But of course we Marxist-Leninists know that this is not true, that Trotskyism is shedding its skin and poses a threat to us as long as the threat of capitalism exists. The Trotskyites committed their murders to overthrow socialism and they were shot for that. And so it is with the modern revisionists who aim their guns at the rebirth of socialism and then try to shoot at us Stalinists "in the name of world revolution".

Rykov organized Kulak uprisings against the Soviet government in the North Caucasus. At that time he was chairman of the Council of People's Commissars and passed material to both the Second International and the Mensheviks so that they could incite the Soviet Union in their newspaper "Sotsialicheski Vestnik" and call on the Kulaks to revolt. On behalf of the fascist espionage services, the conspirers collected cadres for bandit uprisings by preparing them for armed actions in the North Caucasus and elsewhere. For this purpose, the Bloc of the Right and Trotskyites made contact with the Social-Revolutionaries, who had their roots in the Kulak strata of the village and also maintained their foreign Central Committee in Paris among emigrant circles. Bukharin was

already active here from 1926, because he saw the peasant movement in the North Caucasus as one of the most important levers for overthrowing Soviet power. In the North Caucasus, Kulak uprisings were able to break out earlier than elsewhere, and there were also remnants of the White Guard Kulak army on standby from abroad. Therefore, Bukharin concentrated on taking the lead there in time. This would have signal effect for all other uprisings in the whole country. This was Bukharin's "mass tactic" to transform the border regions back into capitalism. **And that was of course directed against Leninism, which affirmed the possibility of the direct transition of former colonial countries to socialism, without having to go through the capitalist stage of development.** Traitors within the bloc were liquidated, including in the North Caucasus. This was intended to put pressure on the bloc's own members to increase their efforts to commit terrorist acts. The conspirers before 1953 did not proceed differently. They even approached Japan and Germany, asking them to hurry up their attack on the Soviet Union so that the conditions for the uprising would not deteriorate any further. But the acts of terror led, quite contrary to their aims, to the consolidation of the masses' vigilance against the internal enemies of the Soviet Union. **The masses did not perceive the terror as an "act of liberation" from the "yoke of socialism", but as an attack on their own interests.** The masses were upset by Kirov's murder and stood even more firmly behind Stalin than ever before. But the question of the seizure of power by an armed insurrection was raised by Bukharin even before 1929, before the bloc with the Trotskyites was formed. From 1934, the defeat of Soviet power was to be prepared from within. That was the preparatory work for the destruction of Soviet power. Wood was stolen in the northern part of the country and illegally sold to the English. England wanted to invade the north of the Soviet Union. An illegal deal was going on between the imperialists and the Bukharinites. This was supposed to be a kind of advance payment so that the right could build capitalism in Russia after the destruction of the USSR, in direct cooperation with the imperialists abroad. In 1935 an agreement was reached between the Trotskyites, the Right and the military group of Tukhachevsky on armed overthrow. In comparison, Beria occupied the Kremlin with his MVD troops and thus had the entire Presidium under his control.

Elements of double-talkers that did their counter-revolutionary work in the Party existed from the beginning, that is, long before the October Revolution, they were already there at the time of the Okhrana, which recruited such elements from the revolutionary movement, organized and paid them. Among the defendants of the trials in the 1930s were many former elements of the Okhrana. When the Okhrana was crushed, many of them then served in the secret services of foreign imperialist states illegally within the Party and government apparatus of the USSR, some of them even in leading positions, including before and after Stalin's death. **This is a straight line of counter-revolution that must be followed here, from the first day of the foundation of the Bolshevik Party until its crushing after Stalin's death.** The more of them were exposed, especially the various legal representatives of the opposition in the Party, the more vigorously the remaining counter-revolutionaries made declarations "against" the counter-revolutionaries, in order to use this double-tongued tactic to dismiss any suspicion of belonging to the counter-revolution, so as not to expose their counter-revolutionary reserves. From 1930, the legality of counter-revolution was over. From then on, it only appeared illegally. The "Right and Trotskyites," who could no longer appear in public, were of course far from being crushed by this, but they continued their subversive work against the Soviet Union all the more intensively illegally, and even took the lead themselves in the "struggle against the Bloc of the Right and Trotskyites" in order to conquer new positions in the Party.

The tactic of openly expressing counter-revolutionary positions within the Party, the formation of an opposition, turned from that moment on into the tactic of concealing and falsifying the revolutionary goals, for example, concealing the main links of the class struggle or replacing the actual main links of the chain with false ones in order to weaken the thrust or to steer it in the wrong direction. This tactic was used more and more elaborately until the death of Stalin, until it was

mastered by the modern revisionists in power to make the actual implementation of the restoration of capitalism appear as a "further development and consolidation of socialism". The roots of this tactic lead back to the tactics of the Bloc of the Right and Trotskyites as it continued its counter-revolution after the purges of the 1930s. **It is therefore imperative that we follow the trail of the Right and Trotskyite Bloc until the death of Stalin in order to understand and interpret the 1953 Conspiracy historically.**

Yagoda's task as deputy chairman of the OGPU of Menzshinsky was to protect the illegal organization of the Right and Trotskyite Bloc before and during the purges of the 1930s from the grip of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Openly the Right had appeared mainly with Tomsy, Rykov and Bukharin (triple alliance), but the organization itself operated illegally. Protection of their own criminal organization was the reason why the Right and Trotskyites accepted innocent victims to divert suspicion from themselves and save their own skins. Innocent victims then later put Beria and Khrushchev on Stalin's account. Beria and Khrushchev thus entered the general tenor of Western anti-Stalinist propaganda.

The so-called "**Ryutin Platform**" from 1932 was the illegal program of counter-revolution, the program of the violent overthrow of Soviet power, designed in Tomsy's country house, where besides **Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsy** other counter-revolutionaries took part. The double tactic of this platform was already expressed in the intention of its authors to officially distance themselves from it by name, in order to address and win over as many opponents of the Soviet system as possible, including those who would not have supported the platform at all if they had known that the authors' real names were Tomsy, Rykov and Bukharin. **After all, they were leading members of the Central Committee of the CPSU(B)!** The content of the platform was the practice of all violent measures against the USSR and the organizational unification of the counter-revolutionary forces. The forces of dissatisfaction with the Party and government were to be united and concentrated on armed uprisings, for example Kulak uprisings. By uniting with this Ryutinist Platform of the Right, Trotsky showed what he was hiding under his leftist uniform, his fascist sentiments! The Right and "Left" ideologically armed each other and proved what they really were - outright scoundrels.

While the Bloc of the Right and Trotskyites opened the door for the fascists to invade the Soviet Union, the conspirers of 1953 opened the door to the Soviet Union for the Cold War of the Anglo-Americans, not to hand over the Soviet Union, but to participate in the power game of world domination, that is, the subjugation of the world to capitalism, which they hoped to gain ample advantages from. But in whose hands would the power actually end up in the end? Only in the hands of world capitalism, of course, which became a historical fact in 1991. The 1953 Conspiracy was thus a division of world imperialism with the Western powers at the top, especially the USA. The fear of being exposed brought them together to cover each other. But once brought together, the common cover turned into a collective pressure, which thus weighed on each of them individually. The strength of the common conspiracy became the ultimate test of their disintegration at the weakest link in the chain.

The Trotskyites had to build up their own illegal military forces for the "palace revolution" independently of their other illegal organizations, while Khrushchev was able to use the leadership of the Red Army to take over his power by party means quite "legally". The center of the Bloc, as well as Yagoda from the Ministry of the Interior and Tukhachevsky from the army, were connected with the military group. Khrushchev, on the other hand, quite "legally" used Beria and Zhukov/Bulganin.

In **1934**, 2/3 of the Central Committee was purged, not by the revisionists, but by Stalin and his followers. Stalin's General Line was developed in ideological two-front struggle into a majority

line, which could only be overthrown over his dead body. **The great importance of Stalin is above all that he was able to push the Marxist-Leninist line through to the end against all revisionist forces** who had allied themselves with the imperialist forces from outside against Stalin, to overthrow Stalin, to assassinate Stalin.

The Trotskyites and the Right were preparing their **overthrow for the 17th Party Congress** in January 1934 (the trials were in 1938, 4 years later, when the criminal gang was really going strong!), even planned to arrest Stalin and the other leading members of the government in the republics and districts (Tomsky). Although they had to refrain from doing so because of the hopelessness of their plan, they had at least tried to win a majority at the Party Congress, but Stalin survived the critical situation caused by the lower number of votes due to the influence that the Trotskyites and Rightists had actually exerted on the delegates. However, the majority of votes weren't against him thanks to his great successes in building socialism, thanks to the masses who stood behind him in a united front, and not least thanks to the crushing exposure of the Bloc of the Right and Trotskyites, the formation of the Leninist Front against all anti-party deviations. In this hard struggle at the 17th Party Congress, he once again remained the victor, while the "stragglers", the double-talkers, suffered defeat and finally made hypocritical praises for Stalin in order to be able to continue their illegal bloc-wooing within the Party.

For the 1953 Conspiracy against Stalin, the entire leadership of the CPSU bears the responsibility, both the comrades of the Old and the New Guard, **without exception!** The role of the leadership circle in the 1930s and 1953 was different in so far as **in 1953 nobody had fought on the side of Stalin, but everyone more or less agreed to eliminate Stalin.** This relative unity to rebel against Stalin was ultimately decisive for the conspirers to step up their attacks on Stalin and this had finally given impetus and dynamism to their criminal deeds. In the counter-revolutionary united front, they reduced their fear of Stalin and this was of great importance for what happened next. The conspiracy groups were united by their different anti-party views, which then led to the need to fight against Stalin. But as they fought against Stalin, it became increasingly clear to them that they had betrayed socialism, the USSR, that they had become accomplices of the capitalist world. They hid this all the more because they were afraid of being exposed and liquidated as traitors. This fear, this bad conscience drove them deeper and deeper into the abyss. If Stalin had lived, the program of the restoration of capitalism would have failed, it would have meant the bankruptcy of the conspirers.

Just like the Right and Trotskyites, who considered "socialism in one country" impossible, the modern revisionists feared world socialism after Stalin's great victories.

Without fascism from outside, there would be no counter-revolutionary groups in the Soviet Union that could have relied on fascism. In the First Period of Socialism, that is, in the period of "socialism in one country", although it was possible, with a great deal of effort and countless sacrifices, to sweep the Bloc of the Right and Trotskyites from the surface, to inflict on it bitter defeats and losses which gave an enormous and decisive impetus to the construction of socialism, to win the Great Patriotic War over fascism and its 5th Column in the Soviet Union, to create better conditions for the transition to the Second Period of Socialism, etc. But the counter-revolution that continued to rumble underground could not be rendered harmless forever; this required the intensification of the class struggle in the Soviet Union. **In the First Period of Socialism, the inevitability of the counter-revolutionary movement of the restoration of capitalism could not be eliminated, but can only be done on a global scale, that is, in the Second Period of Socialism.** This is due to the historical fact that the First Period of Socialism is characterized by the increasing pressure of world imperialist encirclement:

"Capitalist encirclement must not be regarded simply as a geographical concept. Capitalist

encirclement means that the U.S.S.R. is surrounded by hostile class forces, which are ready to support our class enemies within the U.S.S.R. morally, materially, by means of a financial blockade and, if the opportunity offers, by military intervention." (Stalin: 'Political Report of the Central Committee to the Sixteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.)' in: 'Works', Volume 12; Moscow; 1954; p.311; English Edition).

At the time of fascism, the counter-revolutionary groupings within the USSR could not rely on a closed global counter-revolutionary system of imperialist encirclement, but only on the individual great powers, which were fighting each other and weakening each other, especially Germany, England and Japan. Above all, the counter-revolutionary groups relied on the great power that was most likely to contribute to the overthrow of the USSR and the conquest of counter-revolutionary power - Germany. **Germany was the main enemy before the Second World War and after the war it was the USA and it has remained so until today.** This also corresponds to the essence of the First Period of Socialism. But how do the conditions of the counter-revolutionary groupings in the Soviet Union change, after on the one hand world imperialism was extremely weakened after World War II and on the other hand the Soviet Union with the emerging socialist camp, with the revolutionary development of Asia, etc., was strengthened on an international scale? **The world was faced with the decisive historical situation of the worldwide triumph of socialism and thus the worldwide decline of capitalism. In other words: the socialism of the First Period had already matured so far after the Second World War that the qualitative leap to world socialism was beginning to take place. The conspiracy would not have brought about Stalin's death, would not have brought about the failure of his already made transition to the Second Period of Socialism, if world imperialism had not been forced in this situation to support this conspiracy from outside with all available means.** Beria took the position of non-interference. For him, the Soviet Union was strong enough to deal with everyone in the world, to cooperate with both aggressors and their victims "for the good of the Soviet Union". In reality, Beria's attitude of non-interference favored the aggression of the Allied Western powers, but in reality his attitude did not favor the end of the Cold War, on the contrary, it only increased their warlike aggression.

Without a Roosevelt and a Churchill there would have been no conspirer named Beria. For the modern revisionists, the extermination of Hitlerite fascism was a precondition for the alliance with the other Western powers and not a decisive step towards the entire extermination of the world imperialism, as Stalin planned. **Without the determination and unity of the world imperialist camp to counter the imminent danger of the socialist camp with all its might and all its means, there would have been no national movements in the border areas of the Soviet Union which could have been seduced by Beria to separate themselves from the Russian center.** On the threshold of the Second Period of Socialism, the character of the conspiracy also changed. **It no longer served only to overthrow "socialism in one country", but to prevent the transition to world socialism. Thus, modern revisionism had become a world revisionist current. The conspirers of 1953 transformed the center of world revolution into a center of counter-revolution and this is exactly what saved world imperialism from its downfall.** Thanks to the resulting Marxist-Leninist World Movement, socialism was victoriously defended in Albania. In other words, although the transition to world socialism was prevented, the development of "socialism in one country" was not prevented, but the socialism of the First Period continued to develop, despite revisionism in power. **In this way we Marxist-Leninists proved to the world that we had victoriously defended Stalin's legacy, that Stalin could be assassinated, that socialism could be swept off the face of the earth for a limited period of time, but that Stalin's legacy could not be permanently destroyed. Today, world imperialism is starting to decay globally, so that even the revisionists are deprived of their support by world imperialism, that the victory of the world socialist revolution is inevitably within reach.**

At the 15th, Party Congress, Stalin spoke out against the opposition of Kamenev and Zinoviev:

"Shall we Bolsheviks, who uprooted the nobility, restore them now in our Party?" (Stalin: 'The Fifteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B.)' in: 'Works', Volume 10; Moscow; 1954; p.360; English Edition).

The majority of the Presidium, indeed the entire Presidium should have been expelled in the early 1950s. Stalin did not want any noble "Bolsheviks" in the Party, **neither those of the old nor those of the new nobility.**

Such radical situations as purging the entire leadership had not occurred for the first time with the Bolsheviks. **Like Stalin in 1953, Lenin was all alone in 1903.** From the leading group of six went Plekhanov, Zasulich, Martov, Axelrod and Potresov. As a result, however, the Party with Lenin found itself in the right, on the Bolshevik path. The situation was no different in 1907 and 1908, in the period of withdrawal of the failed 1905 Revolution. Also, as far as the period of the NEP and the subsequent period of building "socialism in one country" was concerned, it required the annihilation of the leaders of the capitalist remnants and the Trotskyite leaders of the opposition. Or take the situation created by the Great Patriotic War. Here too, it was inevitable that leading party heads had to roll, especially within the Red Army. And 1953? The same thing! As a result, the Party with Stalin, with Stalinist members of the Presidium, could have continued the Bolshevik path of Lenin and Stalin victoriously, if such "leaders" as Khrushchev, or those who made him a leader, had been purged from their posts in time. **The purging of the Party, especially the purging of the party leadership, is not an arbitrary act, but is inseparably connected with the historical turns of the class struggle, which every Bolshevik Party has to master, and which, after all, cannot go off without party sacrifices, sacrifices in the party leadership.**

It is a fact that history, including the history of Bolshevism, always makes certain decisive turns in its course. These turns have always led to the replacement of old party leaders by new ones as radical as the turn itself.

Also at the beginning of the 1950s, Bolshevism was at its historical turning-point, the turn to World Bolshevism: The smashing of all world imperialism, the breaking of its orbit with proletarian internationalism in power, the victory of socialism on a world scale, the turn from the "dictatorship of the proletariat in one country" to the world dictatorship of the proletariat, the turn of "communism in one country" to world communism. In short: the practically imminent transition from the First to the Second Period of Socialism, the turn to world socialism.

At the beginning of the 1950s, such presidium members, who got cold feet in the face of this enormous challenge, who had already made themselves all too comfortable in their stately beds furnished by the working class, were an impossibility for Stalin. For this very reason the Party's path led inevitably into degeneration, into decline. **The path of transition to world socialism, the transition of "communism in one country", was betrayed by the turn of the first socialist state in the world into a restored capitalist state, whereby the turn to the Second Period ended with the temporary death of the First Period of Socialism, the transition from "socialism in one country" to "communism in one country".**

We Marxist-Leninists have always spoken of **capitalist encirclement** under the conditions of Lenin's and Stalin's USSR, whereas we had to assume capitalist-revisionist encirclement after the seizure of power by the modern revisionists. This was, of course, completely correct. But have we correctly shed light on the dialectical development process towards capitalist-revisionist encirclement? How did this decisive qualitative change of the encirclement come about, which the Marxist-Leninist World Movement with its leading Albanian world center was now confronted

with?

Stalin tried to solve the question of capitalist encirclement dialectically. The encirclement from outside affects the inner "encirclement". The 1953 Conspiracy aimed at "revisionist encirclement" the leading center of the Bolshevik Party with Stalin at the head by means of direct and indirect support for the capitalist encirclement from outside. The capitalist-revisionist encirclement, as it affected Albania and the Marxist-Leninist World Movement after Stalin's death, had already developed during Stalin's lifetime, only that Stalin could prevent the unification and fusion of the capitalist and revisionist encirclement into a single world front until his death.

The transition to "communism in one country" depended on whether Stalin would succeed in delaying not only the Cold War from the outside, but also the Cold War from within, which could not be waged by the revisionists from outside any other way than under the conditions of the Cold War, which was inevitable, but which he delayed, either until the moment when the Socialist World Camp spreads sufficiently or finally until the moment when the imperialists among themselves *as well as the revisionists among themselves* fall apart because of the spread of the Socialist World Camp on the one hand and the transition to "communism in one country" on the other hand.

Stalin wanted to liberate the Party from those wavering, capitulating and lambing leadership elements, which had hindered the Party's progress in this **direction towards the turnaround**. But the blowing up of the inner perimeter was already no longer an internal affair of the Soviet Union, but was closely linked to the struggle against the Anglo-American imperialists' Cold War, that is, to the struggle against the newly emerging world capitalist camp.

To that, Stalin said:

"Well, if some of the old leaders who are turning into trash intend to fall out of the cart—a good riddance to them!" (Stalin: 'The Fifteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B.)' in: 'Works', Volume 10; Moscow; 1954; p.382; English Edition).

But with his murder, Stalin could not continue his internationalist work, what remained alive in the Party, that which was no longer worth staying alive, and the new, the growing, that had been killed with Stalin, must today be rebuilt from the front with great difficulty. So much for the world-historical consequences of failed purges, so much for the iron principle of a Bolshevik Party: **The Party moves forward by purging itself of rubbish. Conversely, the Party will be purged of its own retrograde elements if it fails to take this iron principle seriously and consistently put it into practice.** We should not be surprised, comrades, that the bourgeoisie is demagogically and precisely denouncing this principle of purging, our principle of purging, as an "undemocratic and uncivilized, barbaric tool of the Communist Party's dictatorship of terror over dissenters and opponents" to the masses. We should also not be surprised that the modern revisionists condemned the purges as **"the devil work of Stalin"** to lick the boots of world imperialism. It is significant that the modern revisionists branded Stalin as a "deviator" from Leninism, when Leninism taught the purge of the Party that Stalin could only implement masterfully.

Up to Stalin's death, the Conspiracy still had a generally defeatist character. The conspirers were tired of constantly having to hide their displeasure and resentment from Stalin, since they had long since broken with Stalin. They felt malicious joy when Stalin had difficulties in enforcing his General Line. They supported him only very half-heartedly and reluctantly, and many of them stabbed him in the back wherever and whenever the opportunity arose. When their dissatisfaction had increased to the point of refusal, a new "thirst for action" matured in them and **passive**

defeatism turned into active defeatism. This, of course, did not remain hidden from Stalin. This tense situation did not remain without consequences for his state of health. He was already 73 years old and this fight cost him a lot of strength. The different conspiracy groups were all sharply criticized and fought by Stalin. Conversely, Stalin was a constant threat to the realization of their criminal intentions. In order to finally get rid of him, they granted each other a mutual amnesty, concluded a "non-aggression pact" among themselves until the conquest of their revisionist power, and then, after Stalin's death, they competed with each other in the struggle for succession, for their own power, for their own heads. However, it would be un-Marxist to push personal motives for power to the fore. **In reality, the new bourgeoisie was only concerned with how to use its political power best in order to implement the restoration of capitalism safely and smoothly.**

The depravity of Khrushchev's morality is expressed in the elimination of Beria, which was already planned by him before the elimination of Stalin. Khrushchev's duplicity towards conspirers who helped him to seize power proved to be a masquerade which allowed him to direct all his fire against Beria in order to assert and consolidate power. Khrushchev accused Beria of "shaking the foundations of the USSR", of being a "Western agent" etc., and exposed this double-talking man with the intention of covering his own tracks of his involvement in the heinous crime against Stalin. Everything that Khrushchev accused Beria of in the blackest colors was partly committed by Khrushchev himself and that is the truth. Khrushchev's sentence against Beria was the sentence against himself. That was how Radek proceeded in the trial of Zinoviev and Kamenev - the same way, with the difference that Radek did not escape his just punishment, while Khrushchev was able to continue his crimes, which we Hoxhaists exposed and fought against. Khrushchev walked over the corpses of his cronies and burrowed his way out of the stinking, bloody sewer in which he had been stuck during Stalin's lifetime. But traitors never escape the judgment of the world proletariat. It will not only nail Khrushchev's crimes to the shameful stake of history, it will not only destroy Khrushchevism, but all of world revisionism.

What about Beria? Beria, who had participated with Khrushchev in the preparation of the "palace revolution" during Stalin's lifetime, cried over the murdered body of Stalin to cover his tracks as well. **Only that in covering his own tracks. And he was a master at it, for in fact nothing bad could be "proved" to him, without running the risk, in uncovering his true crimes, of diverting the traces to the other conspirers, to Khrushchev. Thus Khrushchev had no choice but to pass his death sentence on Beria, for otherwise he could not have saved his own skin if Beria had asserted his will against all the others, and not least against Khrushchev himself.** But Beria was not possessed by a "naked lust for power". That is not true. This was an attempt to deceive public opinion. In order to hide the program of the restoration of capitalism and implement it unrecognized, Khrushchev shoved it on Beria, according to the motto of all criminal offenders: "Stop thief!" **But if one takes both the criminal deeds of Khrushchev and the criminal deeds of Beria in the period between Stalin's and Beria's deaths under the Marxist-Leninist magnifying glass, one cannot deny that both were "in their own way" advocates of the program of the restoration of capitalism and that they differed only in the different amount of blood on their hands.** Those who deny this take the side of the restoration of capitalism, whether or not they claim to be "anti-revisionist, Marxist-Leninist". **A distinction between Beria and Khrushchev is not a distinction between modern revisionism and Marxist-Leninism. Beria had been overthrown not as a Stalinist but as a hasty restorer of capitalism who has rushed ahead too quickly. Beria and Khrushchev were in principle in agreement about "de-Stalinization", but there were irreconcilable differences on the road to capitalism, both in terms of the extent and limits of the restoration of capitalism to be carried out, and in terms of the pace and methods. Whoever calls Beria a so-called "Marxist-Leninist" is making a momentous mistake and must know that he is helping the bourgeoisie to save modern revisionism from its final downfall is moving to the other side of the barricade. We do not**

blame any comrade who has so far misjudged Beria. We ourselves have only now received information about Beria, so for a long time we were unable to form an accurate picture of him. However, those whom we condemn are people with dark intentions, such as those from the "red-channel", who know very well about Beria's crimes.

Since we Marxist-Leninists had seen through and denounced the renegade Khrushchev, his liquidation of Beria had to look as if a "leader of Marxism-Leninism," "a loyal follower of Stalin," had "fallen victim" to the revisionists. **But the truth is that here only a conspirer against Stalin fell victim to a rival conspirer against Stalin.** In this way, these Berianists have tried to save revisionism and to make it us Marxist-Leninists. Every revisionism, every revisionist who is not exposed and who can continue to hide, is a danger for us Marxist-Leninists that we must face. This is exactly what we understand by neo-revisionism : **"Anti-revisionism in words, revisionism in deeds!" The attitude towards Beria is a touchstone in distinguishing Marxism-Leninism from neo-revisionism!** The hostile attitude of "red-channel" towards us is no coincidence and has its reason. The "red-channel" defends the GDR against our reproach of social-fascism, logically they must also protect Beria from us. Whoever supports the social-fascist GDR of Ulbricht and Honecker is an arch-revisionist, whom we Stalinists do not touch with velvet gloves, because the StaSi did not do that with our Marxist-Leninist comrades either. Let them defend their GDR, they will end up on the dung heap of history just like the GDR.

Both Beria and Khrushchev believed that world imperialism, with the U.S. in the lead, would win and strangle everything, and that it was therefore better to come to an understanding with them in time and make some kind of compromise in terms of retreating from socialism to capitalism. **Only Beria did this behind the Party's back through his power in the Interior Ministry, while Khrushchev chose the more appropriate way through the Party and successfully gained decisive influence in the party base and thus among the masses. Beria was so filled with blind hatred of Stalin that he was careless and underestimated Stalin's influence in the Party and the masses, and refused to acknowledge this fact, which Khrushchev understood very well. For as it turned out, the cadres in the Party, state and army felt caught off guard by Beria's breathtaking reform course, they distrusted Beria's passing over the Party, they condemned Beria, which Khrushchev was able to cleverly exploit to get the reins in his own hands by "leaning" on the Party, and thus on the masses.**

If one demands **"proof" against Beria**, what kind of "proof" should be given about such conspirers? It will hardly be possible to find any document in which Beria, with his signature, confessed to being a conspirer against Stalin and to being his murderer? The very essence of his conspiracy was to hide his crimes behind Marxism-Leninism, behind Stalin, in order to make them appear "Marxist-Leninist" and "Stalinist". It is impossible to have the conspiracy certified by a public notary to prove guilt. The question of proof cannot be asked at all, especially not when the KGB still guards the **"Beria file"** like a sanctuary before the eyes of the public, if it still exists at all.

I did him in! I saved you all!

That is what the social-fascist butcher Beria said on the tribune of the Mausoleum on May 1st, 1953.

"I love all – all Humanity! I really do! I set myself before you!"

This was the call of his German student, the social-fascist butcher Mielke, at his 1989 trial.

Like master, like student!

Neither the masters nor students have ever regretted their crimes, but have celebrated themselves as "liberators". Both of them, in the name of Stalinism, not only persecuted, imprisoned, tortured, beat, poisoned and murdered communists, but also did this to all other people when they stood in the way of their anti-Stalinist goals.

Not only is there inflammatory bourgeois propaganda that portrays these two murderers as "Stalinist" butchers, thereby blaming Stalinism for capitalist crimes against humanity. No, that's not all. There are also people who place themselves in the service of this inflammatory bourgeois propaganda, who "scientifically prove" that the murderers of Stalin were in fact "Marxist-Leninists", "loyal followers" of Stalin [sic!!!].

It is clear that we Stalinists could no longer remain silent on this, that we had to expose, brand and condemn this bourgeoisie's sham maneuver, that we not only had to consistently distance ourselves from the Berianists, but also launch a Marxist-Leninist offensive against them, that we had to push back the ideological influence of the Berianists in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, that we had to drive them out of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, that the Marxist-Leninist World Movement had to free itself from the harmful influence of Berianism and to strengthen itself through purges.

We have included Mielke here because we, as the KPD/ML, had been declared "Public Enemy #1" by the GDR. This was the order given by Mielke to the StaSi. We are among the Stalinists who were hunted by a student of Beria, and this hunt for us has not ended even after Mielke's death, and the informants of Mielke are still among us unscathed. Here we take position as directly concerned Stalinists on Bill Bland's article: "THE 'DOCTOR'S CASE' AND THE DEATH OF STALIN".

As affected Stalinists, we, unlike Bill Bland, approach the question of Comrade Stalin's death politically and partially, in a biased way, if you will. This is not historically one-sided or unscientific, but quite the opposite, in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. We cannot, therefore, be comfortable with the collection of quotations from bourgeois historians which Bill Bland stuffed the chronological sequence of events with. Such anti-communist "historians" as Robert Conquest, whom Bill Bland so fondly quoted, are utterly detestable. Robert Conquest also wrote the preface to the anti-Stalinist inflammatory writing of Sudoplatov, who was loyal to Beria: "Special Tasks: The Memoirs of an Unwanted Witness—A Soviet Spymaster", which certainly, though not intended by him, contributed to the revelation of Beria's anti-Stalinism. Sudoplatov once revered Beria as the "deliverer" from Stalinism, as leader of the fight against Stalin's "terror regime", the "criminality of Stalin", the "crimes of Stalinism", etc. It is certainly true that Sudoplatov also strongly criticized Beria, because the goodwill of Western historians depended on it, which Sudoplatov could not appear in the world public without. **What we criticize about Sudoplatov is not that he did not fight for Stalinism. Sudoplatov was not the kind of class enemy that Beria was. Beria was his mentor and Sudoplatov obeyed his orders. As a former convinced Stalinist, he had once earned great merits, and of course, as Stalinists we cannot condemn them. What we must reproach Sudoplatov and many other comrades, however, is that he finally turned away (as he called it) from the "power intrigues of the leadership" in disappointment. He saw himself in the victim role, which had been dictated "from above". He should have remained faithful as a Stalinist and as such at Stalin's side, in order to hunt down the schemers against Stalin in his own ranks, for example Beria and all the other conspirers. Sudoplatov did not deny his former Stalinist actions, but later judged them to be "fatal errors", blamed Stalinism for these "errors" in an inadmissible way, in order to finally be able to celebrate himself as a hero—even at the price of earning applause from the capitalist world. Sudoplatov, like many other Stalinists, lost his bearings on the**

factional struggles going on at crucial moments in the fierce class struggle in the Soviet Union, was no longer able to distinguish friend from foe, finally refused make the distinction, and thus actually became a stooge of power, though not of Stalin's power, but of the power of Stalin's opponents, as Beria was one. He did not lose his militant attitude, but he did lose his proletarian attitude, his revolutionary, Bolshevik spirit, which he was always so proud of. Sudoplatov was one of the many proletarian revolutionaries who became capitalist soldiers through Beria. The tragic thing about him is that until his last breath he surrendered to Beria's "self-deception," that it wasn't he, Sudoplatov, but Stalin who had "lost his revolutionary spirit". Sudoplatov and thousands of other Stalinists were so influenced by the sneaky opponents of Stalin at the head of the Soviet Union that they managed to use them as a tool against Stalin. This was a great crime against the Stalinist cadres, committed not only by Beria but by the modern revisionists as a whole. This is a historical fact that cannot be ignored. To this day, the effect of Beria's poison has been to incite, break and subdue upright comrades at turn them against upright comrades, to compromise the leaders, to burn the cadres and to deceive the masses. Berianism has also benefited, and continues to benefit, informants on a global scale. From this we Stalinists must learn lessons: We must educate our cadres so well that one good day we do not lose them to the class enemy, who will use them against us to destroy us. If we make the cadres the strongest point, we must always take into account that precisely because of this they can become the weakest point, and we must take appropriate precautions against this.

And Sudoplatov's "double tragedy" (which overtook him and many others) consisted in the fact that the modern revisionists violated him until they were tired of him and left him to the lechery of the Western hustle and bustle.

In the preface, Robert Conquest writes about this autobiography of Sudoplatov:

"It is perhaps the most important single contribution to our knowledge since Khrushchev's Secret Speech." (Conquest: 'Foreword' to Sudoplatov's 'Special Tasks'; Canada; 1994; p.viii; English Edition).

"He emerges, in fact, as one of the most valuable of all possible sources for important matters over the period of High Stalinism." (ibid; p.xii).

Well, these are the very "sources" that provided the imperialists' anti-Stalinism with new ammunition that Bill Bland uncritically took over.

Incidentally, in the introduction to Sudoplatov's autobiography, **Sudoplatov's attitude to Beria** is characterized by the following words:

"Sudoplatov reveals the complex character of Lavrenti Beria, his mentor from 1939 to 1953. He was concerned with painting a full portrait of the Beria he knew: a man of vision and managerial brilliance who successfully presided over the creation of the first Soviet atomic bomb [which was about the same as "Hitler building the Autobahn" – editor's note]. Sudoplatov hoped that Beria would take over and turn his ruthlessness and drive to cleaning out the Augean stables of corruption [which he blamed Stalin for – editor's note]. He would raise the Soviet Union's world stature [by murdering Stalin???? - editor's note].

"(...) Beria, argues Sudoplatov, was an innovator [reformist – editor's note] who would have brought about the unification of Germany in the 1950s, avoiding the crises [as a capitulator in the service of the imperialists – editor's note] that led to the construction of the Berlin Wall. In

the few short months between Stalin's death and his arrest by Khrushchev's supporters. Beria had begun emptying the Gulag and urged that political prisoners [only the anti-communist prisoners placed by Stalin, not the Stalinist prisoners placed by Beria – editor's note] be released." (ibid. p.xvi-xvii).

So the "poor, good" Beria has been prevented by the terror of both Stalin and Khrushchev from doing good for the (imperialist) world. And Bill Bland awarded Beria the order of a "Marxist-Leninist" for this. Marxism-Leninism thus defines itself as a teaching against Stalinism on the one hand and modern revisionism on the other. For the Berianists, therefore, their anti-revisionist struggle consists both of the fight against modern revisionists (openly) and (covertly) against Stalinism.

People like Robert Conquest tried to systematically disillusion Stalin's friends in England and America and their sympathies for Soviet communism with their inflammatory writings and were honored at the highest levels. They worked directly as American and English agents of world imperialism, painting a grim picture of Stalin that could not be worse. And this is not only true of the falsifications about the circumstances that brought about Stalin's death. Bill Bland is hiding all this. Bill Bland's reference to the source is only neutral: "CONQUEST, Robert, British-born poet and political analyst specialising in the USSR (1917-); senior research fellow, Hoover Institute (1977-)". Why didn't Bill Bland comment critically and self-critically on his so-called "sources", why didn't he criticize Robert Conquest for who he was, a pen pirate - on behalf of the imperialists?

As an expert on Stalin, Bill Bland knew that the pen pirates never spread more lies about Stalin than they did about his death, and that therefore any speculation must be critically opposed, or at least have a healthy critical attitude of detachment. Is that too much to ask? Whoever reads the works of Stalin attentively will find enough explanations of Stalin to defend himself against forgeries and falsehoods, and it is no coincidence that most of the anti-Stalinist filth has been and continues to be poured out on the world public at the behest of the Anglo-American imperialists, apart from the revisionist runner-downs.

Let's take Volume 10 of the Stalin Works for instance. The last article in this volume is entitled: "Statement to Foreign Press Correspondents Concerning the Counterfeit 'Article by Stalin'"

In it, Comrade Stalin denies a series of alleged "interviews and articles by Stalin" that never existed and were purely invented by the West:

"Their aim is to counteract the effect produced by the U.S.S.R. delegation at Geneva by its declaration on complete disarmament.

"(...) The fact that in their struggle against the peace policy of the U.S.S.R. the agents of capital are compelled to resort to the assistance of all sorts of shady individuals and pen pirates is the best demonstration of the moral strength and soundness of principle of the stand taken on the question of disarmament by the U.S.S.R. delegation at Geneva." (Stalin: 'Statement to Foreign Press Correspondents Concerning the Counterfeit 'Article by Stalin' in: 'Works', Volume 10; Moscow; 1954; p.386; English Edition).

Nothing has changed in these journalistic criminal methods of the lackeys of capital, they have only been further refined. One of these refined methods is to sell the murderers of Stalin to the revolutionary left as "Marxist-Leninists".

We must give political reasons why we refuse to allow Bill Bland to make such remarks in parentheses every time the names of Beria and Malenkov and the names of other traitors to Stalinism are mentioned in his bourgeois quotes as ("*Marxist-Leninists*" - *the author Bill Bland*"). It would have been the duty of Bill Bland to give political reasons for his remarks, but he failed to do so for whatever reason.

In the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, there is not yet a sufficient, uniform and closed evaluation of the events that led to the death of Comrade Stalin, simply because of a lack of evidence. However, there are indications from Comrade Enver Hoxha, who himself regretted not having had enough information about this. It is astonishing that the "Hoxhaist" Bill Bland conceals Enver Hoxha's extremely revealing remarks such as:

"Such elements as Khrushchev, Mikoyan, Beria and their apparatchiki hid the truth from Stalin." (Hoxha: 'The Khrushchevites'; Tirana; 1984; p.19; English Edition).

How can "Hoxhaist" Bill Bland praise a Beria as a "Marxist-Leninist" who, according to Enver Hoxha, deceived and cheated Stalin? How can one pretend to be an honest Hoxhaist, a friend of Albania? One cannot accept Bill Bland's assessment as a uniform assessment of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, which is committed to Hoxhism. On the contrary, Bill Bland's assessment is to be rejected without *diminishing* the value of the material he has collected from bourgeois historians. However, we believe that Bill Bland made the mistake of overvaluing the bourgeois hacks he quoted. An overvaluation of these materials, as we can see with Bill Bland, is to be criticized because it complicates and hinders the uniform Marxist evaluation of Comrade Stalin's death in the camp of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement rather than actually clarifying it. And this cannot be any different with bourgeois historians. If they did not spread lies, they would not be bourgeois historians.

Finding out the truth about Stalin's death is a process that takes decades, and it lasts just as long as the process of its concealment and falsification. But there can be no doubt among us Marxist-Leninists that Stalin was not the only Stalinist in the Soviet Union or that with his death the Stalinists did not stop being and remaining Stalinists. The struggle of the Stalinists in the period of the seizure of power by the modern revisionists had, in our opinion, *objectively taken place*. This is a fact that must never be concealed or falsified. Here all comrades of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement agree, because it is the very essence of the Stalinists to never give up their struggle in defense of Stalin, but on the contrary to strengthen it.

The anti-Stalinist tactic of concealment has had its day. There is a growing number of bourgeois historians who openly admit that Stalin was assassinated. In its place, the alternative anti-Stalinist tactic of falsely rewriting the revisionists' competition among themselves as "*the struggle of the revisionists against the Marxist-Leninists*" is increasingly evident. We cannot fail to note that Bill Bland's article "THE 'DOCTOR'S CASE' AND THE DEATH OF STALIN" encourages this bourgeois tactic of historical falsification. This, in turn, has led us to find out WHO the then Stalinists really were and HOW they fought against the various revisionist factions, how they were organized, what actions they carried out, what victims were deplored, what crimes the revisionists committed against the real Stalinists, etc. One cannot solve the death of Stalin without solving the deaths of all Stalinists, without solving the struggle to defend the first dictatorship of the proletariat. If we have exposed the tall tales about the alleged "Marxist-Leninists" Beria and his ilk, we have only uncovered half the truth. The question inevitably arises: If the alleged "Marxist-Leninists" have been exposed, who were the true Marxist-Leninists? What was the real struggle in defense of the dictatorship of the proletariat at the time? Where did the Party stand? Where was the working class? Where were the masses? Stalin did not fight against the whole world alone?!

We are firmly convinced that a heroic struggle was waged here by heroes whose existence was swept under the table of history with the intention of pulling the anchor of Stalinism out of the Party, out of the working class, out of the toiling masses with the method of silence.

If we are deliberately kept in the dark on this issue, one thing is clear to us: Without the lasting effectiveness of the Stalinists' anti-revisionist struggle, the modern revisionists would have certainly not needed almost four decades to complete the process of the restoration of capitalism! It is no coincidence that today, far from the Russian metropolises, countless monuments, statues, and busts of Stalin and Lenin still stand upright and have not yet been overthrown. And it is also no coincidence that the Stalinist movement, despite the most severe persecutions, is more and more open with Stalinist demonstrations and pictures of Stalin. It is an overwhelming joy for us Stalinists, who have been fighting for Stalinism for over 50 years, to be able to witness this. The Stalinist movement has historically held its ground and continues to develop. Bravo!!!! Even the most hardened anti-Stalinists can no longer deny this.

We are further aware that the Stalinist movement in the revisionist Soviet Union and in other revisionist states (with the exception of the Stalinist movement in East and West Germany) had been isolated from the actually existing Marxist-Leninist World Movement outside the revisionist states, that there was no contact whatsoever "on either side". This has changed today. There is no longer a revisionist-bourgeois wall between the Stalinist movements of all countries of the world. The Stalinist World Movement today is in the process of uniting globally across all national and political borders and of bringing to an end Comrade Stalin's struggle for world socialism after his death. That is a fact.

Of course, the Stalinist World Movement is aware that the revisionists can continue to fish in the mud as long as we do not bring to light the class struggle veiled in darkness between the Stalinists and the revisionists just before Stalin's death, during the seizure of power by the modern revisionists and immediately thereafter. Here we are especially dependent on the support of the Stalinist comrades of the former Soviet Union, who are better able to assess the situation from within than is possible from without. Leading the struggle against revisionism, which today means not least of all to enlighten and document the whole physiognomy of the Stalinist struggle in the Soviet Union shortly before and after Stalin's murder, to learn from this struggle. Only in this way can we gradually dig up the water from the revisionists, can we chase them out of the trenches in which they took shelter and get them in front of our guns. The struggle of the Stalinists in countries where the revisionists seized power is one of the most important experiences of the international revolutionary workers movement, from whose victories and defeats we draw important lessons to prevent history from repeating itself in such a way.

So when we deal with Stalin's death, we do not do so without the intention of finding historical evidence of the existence and active survival of the Stalinist movement under the conditions of revisionism in power. Much of what Mielke, Beria's student, did against the Stalinist movement throughout Germany will surely have parallels in all other revisionist states. The KPD/ML in Germany has earned the merit of illuminating and bring revolutionary change to this chapter of history.

Now, the so-called "anti-Party Group" around Molotov, Kaganovich, etc. was emerging, but what does this prove? Everything we know about them indicates that they could never have been the leaders of the Stalinist movement after Stalin's death. On the contrary, we agree with Stalin that they deviated from the path of Stalinism, that they stabbed Stalin in the back, and that Stalin's death did not bring them back to Stalinism in remorse. Not only did they

capitulate to the power of the modern revisionists, but they even paved the way to power for them. They had already ceased to be Stalinists during Stalin's lifetime, and nothing changed after Stalin's death. Both Beria and Khrushchev used these corpses of Bolshevism to bury Stalinism.

Presumably this "anti-Party Group" would have been linked to the actual Stalinist movement, but the illegal Stalinists certainly did not follow this group into surrender. They had continued to fulfill their revolutionary duty in the struggle against revisionism in power, in defiance of all the reconciliators and capitulators without sacrifice, without the fear of death, a fact that is still hushed up today. We Stalinists of today will not be dissuaded from this firm conviction and we will provide the proof that we were not wrong. Testimony is, for example, the document: "Programmatic Proclamation of the Soviet Revolutionary Communists (Bolsheviks)", which was illegally distributed in the Soviet Union and which the Albanian comrades published in the late 1960s/early 1970s. This document can be read on the Internet.

Just as one cannot "de-Stalinize" Stalinism, this consequently means that one can neither "de-Stalinize" one Stalinist nor even the entire Stalinist movement. An essential point about the Stalinist movement is that the counter-revolutionary disorganization of the Stalinist movement has only contributed more to the revival and reanimation of the Stalinist movement both nationally and internationally, that the class enemy itself inevitably had to contribute to its expansion and consolidation and continues to do so. And the fact that the Stalinist movement still exists today shows that not only has the Russian bourgeoisie had to create 150 different "Stalinist" sham organizations with the intention of drowning the Stalinist core in them, but it has increasingly become a global phenomenon. It is no coincidence that such sham organizations have also been created in Europe, America and every other continent in the world to drown the core of the Stalinist world movement in the global reservoir of revisionism. But in the dialectical sense, this will inevitably lead to a process of ideological clarification where the wheat is separated from the chaff, where the truly Stalinist world movement has become ever more closely knit and strong enough to create hundreds of "Stalinist" sham organizations "from the throat" in the Stalinist sense. In any case, the Comintern/ML has concentrated all its work since 2000 on this ideological clarification process and we are sure that this effort will one day bear fruit, that the Stalinist World Movement will again become the leading political force in the world after Stalin's death. All our political efforts serve this goal!! This is the legacy that Stalin left us and which we will fulfill with honor! And it also means that we will fight against such views with which the murderers of Stalin can still be "honored" as "Marxist-Leninists" without ever having been called to account for them.

Now Stalin was not just any communist, but the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, the leader of the international working class, the builder of the world's first socialist state, the victor over fascism, the leader of the world socialist camp, the closest fighting companion of Lenin, one of the best and most important world revolutionaries in the history of mankind. You don't read about any of this in Bill Bland's work, not at all.

All the more serious is the world-historical crime of the conspirers who murdered Stalin in 1953. They all have the heaviest debt to the world proletariat. They all agreed to end Stalinism with the murder of the figure of Stalin. All members of the Presidium felt it was their "duty" that "things could not go on like this with Stalin", that the Soviet Union must be "liberated" from Stalin.

Beria and Malenkov were the most active organizers of Stalin's assassination. It was they who, one

day after Stalin's death, were able to take the **highest posts in the new Soviet revisionist leadership**.

Beria had the most optimal conditions for eliminating Stalin. He was the 4th in charge of the Department of the Ministry of Health, and thus had the doctors in his hands. That is why he was able to skillfully maneuver the tactics of the Doctor's Plot.

Immediately before Stalin's death, Beria no longer ranked fourth, but sixth, behind Bulganin, Kaganovich, Molotov, Mikoyan, Voroshilov and Andreyev who had each already fallen from grace. The latter two were also no longer invited to Politburo meetings.

Shortly before his death, Stalin lived a very secluded life in his sparsely furnished dacha of Kuntsevo, or in fact he had already been completely isolated from his conspirers. There he was visited only by Beria, Malenkov, Bulganin, Mikoyan and Khrushchev. The people who had belonged to Stalin's private circle for decades had been removed one by one by Beria and Malenkov. In his very last days, Stalin was treated as if the world no longer existed around him by this scum. The old jokes were tortured out, but politically there was an oppressive silence. It was like the peace of the grave that preceded his murder. A silence of gravediggers, who accompanied Stalin as if he was dying. Stalin must have been aware of this situation.

Beria wanted to appear as a "pure" Marxist-Leninist. But he goes down in history as the murderer of Stalin. It is the story itself that silences all the Beria's praise. With the MVD occupation of Moscow, Beria suddenly had absolute power in the Soviet Union. This coup with the help of security troops is a historical fact, which is proven by the events that immediately followed Stalin's death.

It would have taken the Red Army's military many days and fierce bloody street fighting to thwart Beria's internal military power over the Presidium, which he had locked inside the Kremlin walls and completely shielded from the outside world. No mouse, no Red Army soldier would have been able to get to Moscow at that moment, let alone get into Moscow. Beria's troops had overwhelmed the Kremlin guard. Proskronishev and all the other loyal Stalinists were shot on the spot. Beria's secret service did what it was ordered to do-to help the counter-revolution to victory. Everything went according to plan, but seizing power and maintaining power are two different things, as we know.

Beria was far too weak to rule alone and had far too many enemies. But he was already too strong for a triumvirate of himself, Malenkov and Molotov. He withdrew his troops after the members of the Presidium had to give in. But he had now challenged them to a counterstrike by acting on his own authority. Beria's "coup de grâce" could not end any other way than with a "coup de grâce" against himself. Even the outwitted Red Army had hatred for Beria. It had been harboring pent-up anger toward its own military of the internal apparatus since the October Revolution anyway. So the "punishment" followed on its heels. Beria could not kill the entire Presidium; he had to share power with it. But the presidium did *not want or need* to share power with Beria. So a few months later the Kremlin became a death trap for Beria, who himself had used it shortly before to occupy the entire Presidium - the very Presidium, which was now in the hands of the Khrushchevites. Khrushchev had cleverly arranged this, and all members of the Presidium agreed with his plan.

Beria would have needed support from the West, which he had previously tried hard to obtain through the secret service (see the order to Sudoplatov). But in the West they were still far too suspicious of him at first. They knew what to think of Beria. The Americans thus faithfully stuck to their old strategy: The more the Kremlin factions weaken each other in their power

struggle, the better it would be for the West. "Wait and see" was the motto of the English imperialists. And so time passed for Beria without the expected support from the West; and he now had to go to great lengths to pull something else, which he did. The hesitation of the West cost Beria his head and no one in the world could or would save him.

As mentioned earlier, Stalin had plans for a purge in his pocket, and it included the names of all the members of the Presidium. So this is where the end of the race began: What would it be? Liquidating the entire Presidium to save Stalin's General Line or assassinating Stalin and extend the arms of socialism to capitalism? The assassination was not unexpected, but there was no other choice for the traitors to socialism, it was either: Stalin or them? Here, as a Marxist-Leninist, one must make a choice: either continue the class struggle against the Restoration with the greatest efforts to courageously implement Stalin's General Line and consistently, thus accepting sacrifice, or capitulate and begin the withdrawal of socialism. As badly as the initial situation was historically painted on the part of counter-revolution, we on the revolutionary side could have relied on socialist forces as they were at that time unique in the young history of socialism. We do not see the situation of 1953 in a gloomy light, but in an extraordinarily positive light. With the right group behind him, Stalin would have ensured the victory of the world revolution, and if not him, then his successor would have been able to make this victory perfect. But for that, the worldwide wave of purges against the capitulators would have had to rush ahead. If Stalin had crushed the U.S. imperialists, we would enjoy the socialist, peace-loving and prosperous socialist world today. But that chance was thwarted and we must do the work without Stalin, wrest the rule of the world from the Americans, and raise the Red Flag on the Washington Capitol in America, just as Stalin had done on the Brandenburg Gate in 1945. (Incidentally, the man with the Red Flag on the Brandenburg Gate was a Red Army soldier from Georgia!)

The fact that the 1953 Conspiracy could happen shows that the slightest insincerity toward the Party, the slightest deviation from Stalin's General Line, was enough to land in the camp of counter-revolution. The departure from the positions of Bolshevism ends in political counter-revolutionary banditry. All of the world imperialists' anti-communist propaganda was able to draw on their anti-communism with the takeover of the modern revisionists, always mindful of revealing the secret that modern revisionism springs not from socialist but from bourgeois ideology.

Nothing had happened for 16 hours, no doctors were called, Beria strictly forbade Stalin's personnel to call for medical attention. With this act alone he was guilty of the crime of failure to provide assistance. No one dared to oppose Beria's orders. He had the power of life and death of Comrade Stalin, and Beria used this power to bring about the death of Comrade Stalin. In our eyes, he is the most insidious and cruelest murderer that ever existed in the world.

Rybin, a bodyguard who was an eyewitness, stated that Beria and Malenkov had arrived in a car on March 2nd at 3:00 a.m. Someone wanted to get medical help, but Beria and Malenkov forbade it. They left in their car and Stalin was left alone in his agony for dramatic hours without medical care.

Because of the bruises on his head and hands, manslaughter cannot be ruled out. As the latest documents show, the same bruises were found on other victims of Beria.

Lieutenant General Vlasik, who was responsible for the Kremlin Guard and Stalin's security, was sent to Siberia shortly before as a camp leader and was secretly imprisoned there!!! Malenkov had great power over Stalin's surroundings immediately before his death, for he had emerged strengthened from the elimination of the Leningrad Group. Malenkov stood at the highest level of

his power and speculated on Stalin's succession as the revisionists in the people's democracies would have liked, except for the Albanians, who hoped to count on Molotov as their successor. Vlasik remained in prison until 1955. There was a power struggle between the old and the young generation within Stalin's Kremlin environment.

One of the reasons why the Politburo rushed to take action against Stalin in February 1953 was that they were forced to avert the dangerously close purge at the top of the leadership. The "causing of Stalin's death" was the only solution for Beria, Malenkov and the other conspirers to pull their heads out of Stalin's noose. Beria was directly responsible for Stalin's death, Malenkov his accomplice, and Khrushchev, Bulganin and all the others as participants and beneficiaries.

If, according to Enver Hoxha, Khrushchev and Mikoyan were supposed to have bragged about their murder of Stalin, then it was certainly more for the intimidation of Enver Hoxha. No doubt they were all more or less complicit in Stalin's death. We Marxist-Leninists certainly credit these two revisionist conspirers with this cruel act, but we rather believe that they are adorning themselves with "foreign feathers", because there was another who was no more devious than they were: Beria. We see in him a person who systematically gained access to Stalin by all means, including violence, gained his trust, and behind his back had instigated the fight against Comrade Stalin's Marxist-Leninist General Line. He did the "dirty work" for everyone.

Let's listen to Enver Hoxha's 1979 view of the situation. Incidentally, Beria is not mentioned by name in it, but rather "Khrushchev and his associates" are mentioned:

"All this villainy emerged soon after the death, or to be more precise, after the murder of Stalin. I say after the murder of Stalin, because Mikoyan himself told me and Mehmet Shehu that they, together with Khrushchev and their associates, had decided to carry out a 'pokushenie', i.e., to make an attempt on Stalin's life, but later, as Mikoyan told us, they gave up this plan. It is a known fact that the Khrushchevites could hardly wait for Stalin to die. The circumstances of his death are not clear." (Enver Hoxha: 'With Stalin'; Tirana; 1979; p.31; English Edition).

Consequently, before the actual assassination of Stalin there must have been plans for murder, but their execution failed. When Enver Hoxha states that the circumstances are not clear, it does not mean that they are not clear, but he said this honestly from the state of his information. Enver Hoxha clearly spoke of murder, but was unable to comment on the circumstances due to a lack of information.

As for the "white smocks", Enver Hoxha continued:

"An unsolved enigma in this direction is the question of the 'white smocks', the trial conducted against the Kremlin doctors, who, as long as Stalin was alive were accused of having attempted to kill many leaders of the Soviet Union., After Stalin's death these doctors were rehabilitated and no more was said about this question! But why was this question hushed up?! Was the criminal activity of these doctors proved at the time of the trial, or not? The question of the doctors was hushed up, because had it been investigated later, had it been gone into thoroughly, it would have brought to light a great deal of dirty linen, many crimes and plots that the concealed revisionists, with Khrushchev and Mikoyan at the head, had been perpetrating. This could be the explanation also for the sudden deaths within a very short time, of Gottwald, Bierut, Foster, Dimitrov and some others, all from curable illnesses, about which I have written in my unpublished memoirs, 'The Khrushchevites and Us'. This could

prove to be the true reason for the sudden death of Stalin, too." (ibid; p.31-32).

We will talk about the doctors and the connection with Beria elsewhere.

Beria had Stalin spied on at every turn for years, isolating Stalin both within his family and political circle of friends, as also from other leaders in the state and Party. Beria eliminated everyone who stood in his way.

The Stalin murderer Beria died not by Marxist-Leninist but by revisionist hands!

The conspirers must have been working **for years** on a coup, on division, on taking power, but all attempts failed because of Stalin's concentrated attention. It was precisely the hopelessness of determining politics in the Soviet Union behind Stalin's back and past Stalin that drove them to despair.

If we assume that the top beast that was killed was Beria, then the reason why he was silenced was because Beria was involved in the murder up to both ears. Beria did not give the impression of being intimidated and fearful, but of an aggressive, quarrelsome, exuberant and boisterous working style. Handling power is one thing, which he had skillfully mastered this weapon, the other is the subjugation of power. Because Beria had not mastered that properly, power was forcibly taken from him.

The accomplices directly involved in the murder were physically destroyed. The Stalinists were to be removed from all Party and Soviet posts and replaced by "selected, reliable" people. In order to cover the tracks, one sat down at the head of "the fight against the enemies of the Party" in order to protect the enemies of the Party or, if necessary, to liquidate those who knew too much, for example, better, and to liquidate the best fighters against the enemies of the Party as "enemies of the Party", to imprison them in the camp, etc., or to degrade them. The art of the modern revisionists was to hide their true criminal physiognomy behind the proletarian worldview, behind communism, i.e., to praise the overt crimes as communist achievements and to commit secret crimes against the communists, against the Marxist-Leninists, against the workers and peasants, against the masses, if necessary with the pomp of the public inquisition to deter the masses from resistance. The modern revisionists conspired against the Marxist-Leninists in the name of "Marxism-Leninism" to annihilate them and thereby exploit and oppress the masses "in the name of socialism" unhindered.

It was advantageous for Beria's camouflage that he could blame others for the murder at every dicey opportunity. Khrushchev would have liked to expose Beria the murderer right away, if he could have done so, but exposing the fact that Stalin had been murdered in the first place would cause great indignation and readiness to fight among the masses and thus endanger his own cover, indeed the entire counter-revolutionary program of capitalist restoration. That is why this issue remained a strict taboo until the fall of the Soviet Union. Everyone thus agreed (along with the rest of the world) to keep quiet about Stalin's murder and make his death appear a "natural consequence" of illness and old age. They based the "legitimation" of their power on this.

The idea for the "palace revolution" of the conspirers of 1953 came from the right-wing conspirers of 1933 and thus matured for 20 years, but it was put into practice in a completely different way, because completely different conditions prevailed. Arrests and executions of Stalin's followers were carried out secretly and surgically before Stalin's murder, and a "natural death" was faked, precisely in order not to cause a stir, as if everything was in order and everything continued its usual "socialist" course. This was the new tactic of the "palace revolt" of 1953; Stalin's death meant the end of the Stalin Era, and power was now completely

in the hands of the modern revisionists, so further murders of Stalinists were no longer opportune, no longer inevitable among Stalinists whom the modern revisionists no longer seemed to consider dangerous. A "palace revolution" would have made sense if it had been about arresting the socialist government, but with Stalin's murder the conspirers already had power in their hands if the Presidium did not have to be "arrested", because the Presidium itself now consisted only of conspirers, or capitulators, who had no resistance in them and who submitted to the pressure of the revisionists. To this extent, Beria withdrew his military troops that had occupied Moscow with. With military force he was able to make the Presidium dance to his tune for a certain period of time. If the conspirers had killed Beria before Stalin, this would indicate that Beria was in the way of the conspiracy for some reason. But that was not the case. Rather, the fact that Beria was not shot until after Stalin's death suggests that, while he shared the same strategy of all the conspirers (and was thus needed in the capitalist transformation of the Soviet Union, which began immediately with drastic measures against socialism, that is, in the alliance of all the conspirers until Beria's death! He possessed the power to know about the crimes of the others and thus put them under pressure to follow his straight and rugged line to capitalism. Beria and Malenkov overestimated their own power and underestimated that of the Khrushchevites. That was their mistake, with which they ultimately punished themselves with.

Beria had never shied away from using extreme means to force his opponents to be servants of him. What guile one had to have in order to remain unpunished in the eyes of all, in such a responsible position, which has as its main task the struggle to preserve the life and protection of the socialist state, its citizens, its leaders, in the course of a number of many years, to be implicated daily in the destruction of the state and the murder of Stalin, indeed to hold the top of power in one's hands.

We do not know for certain whether Stalin's death was by poisoning. Beria and Co. were murderers who worked with poisonous substances for decades without being exposed. The poisonings should always be explained as natural death due to illness. Yagoda formulated the following horrible words:

"A person falls ill and everyone gets used to the fact that he is ill. The doctor can promote the recovery of the sick person, but the doctor can also accelerate the death of the sick person. This is the main content of the idea. And everything else is a matter of technology". That was the art of Beria's crime, an art in which he had become "master" in the course of his counter-revolutionary activity. Beria was one of the few powerful people in the USSR who had access to the toxicological institute, access to the poison. Mayronovsky was head of the research group of toxicology [!!!] that was subordinate to the NKVD from 1937. On direct instruction of the People's Commissars and Ministers for State Security Beria, Yezhov and Merkulov executed death sentences in addition to Mayronovsky's research work. Secret liquidations with poison were carried out from 1937 to 1947. Even high-ranking personnel of the NKVD were not allowed to enter the toxicological institute.

In 1951, Mayronovsky was charged with poisoning high-ranking Soviet politicians, including Stalin [!!!!], allegedly under the orders of Abakumov and Eitingon and Jewish doctors. Mayronovsky's confession would reveal the guilt of Beria, Molotov and Khrushchev. He was sentenced in absentia by a secret investigative committee in February 1953, immediately before Stalin's death [sic!!!], to 10 years in prison. Typical of this: People who were needed as witnesses later on were not executed!

The murderer was able to take advantage of his privileged position in relation to the victim. The main organizer of the poison killings, who was in the dock during the 1936-1938 trial, was

the Minister of the Interior, Yagoda. The main person responsible for the poison killings at the end of the 1940s and beginning of the 1950s was Beria. One anti-Stalinist was struck down by Stalin's bullet, the other by a revisionist bullet. On May 1st, 1953, the murderer blabbed the secret of the murder: "I did him in!"

Beria wore a mask for his entire life, pretending to be an irreconcilable Bolshevik, but in fact he was never a Bolshevik in the true sense. Beria did not know how the fight between Stalin and his adversaries would end and created for himself such conditions under which he could best follow his treacherous path one way or another. He wanted to join the side that would win, only pro forma. When Beria finally came to the conclusion that Khrushchev would eventually win as a real force, Beria declared that he was with him, but without failing to mention that he claimed a special position. Beria always went where the power, where the majority was. He was not the type of an autocrat.

All crimes of conspiracy were proven to have connections to capitalist foreign countries in a fundamental and concrete way. This is true of Khrushchev; his deal with the U.S. was to build capitalism unchecked and in return to be allowed to have a say in the circle of the great powers. This is also true of the criminal Beria. Beria presented the murder of Stalin as a "necessary act" that was "in the interest of the Soviet state and peoples". And the other conspirers endorsed this. The murder of Stalin was even under the pressure of the Cold War. The West offered peace to the Soviet Union if Stalin was eliminated, no matter how!

There were only two ways to keep the 1953 coup secret: either through "voluntary" silence through complicity and thus sharing the guilt for the crime, or through violent silence through liquidation. All conspirers chose the first way, and for Beria only the second way remained.

In September 1950, the Ukrainian security minister Drozdov was brought to Moscow by Stalin. This was Special Bureau No.2 "*The Surveillance and Kidnappings of the Enemies of Stalin (including alleged enemies)*". Beria's first official act after Stalin's death: Firing Drozdov because he knew too much about internal struggles against Stalin and Drozdov did not get along with Kobulov (Kobulov was Beria's deputy).

Immediately after Stalin's death, that is, that same evening, Beria was appointed minister of the expanded Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD), which included both the militia and the security apparatus! It was Beria who ordered the MVD's troops to Moscow!!! Within 24 hours after Stalin's death (!!!) Beria merged the Ministry of State Security and the Ministry of Internal Affairs under his sole leadership.

Stalin's death had an "oppressive" and "paralyzing" effect on some members of the Presidium, a guilty conscience on the part of Molotov, Kaganovich, Voroshilov and Bulganin . On others he had a "liberating" and "invigorating" (unscrupulous) effect, like on Khrushchev, Mikoyan, Beria and Malenkov.

The period, immediately after Stalin's death, was the period of Beria's highest power. This is the period in which he himself showed his true face openly. This is the period when we Marxist-Leninists can actually hold in our hands and show the world many of the decisive touchstones of Beria's crimes. It is no coincidence that it was during this period of all times that the Berianists had to protect the "Marxist-Leninist" Beria from us Stalinists by falsifying the elimination of Beria as an anti-Stalinist act of the Khrushchevites.

On the second day of his appointment as Minister of the Interior, Beria had already exchanged 82 of Stalin's officers and filled the posts with his own people, including

Sudoplatov, who on his behalf established secret contacts with the West, without the knowledge of the Foreign Ministry, without the knowledge of the Party, without the knowledge of the Red Army.

Above all, Beria had pulled his head out of the noose when on March 13th, 1953 (!!) he made all incriminating material against himself, all charges and preparations for the trial, with which Stalin justified his death sentence with, simply **disappear** and declared null and void by virtue of his office as Minister of the Interior, which he had snatched from Stalin's safe in his final hours.

Beria's arrest was the high point of the power struggle after Stalin's death, and Khrushchev was the mastermind behind the plot against Beria. Khrushchev's "best friends" had been Malenkov and Beria. Khrushchev had already exerted influence on Bulganin in the 1930s: Bulganin had the order to bring his armed generals to the Kremlin, where they, including the armed Brezhnev waited for Beria. Yet none of them knew beforehand why they should appear in the Kremlin with weapons. Even Zhukov was inaugurated only a few hours before Beria's arrest. This was an extremely delicate situation and a unique event in the history of the Soviet Union. Even under Stalin it was strictly forbidden to enter the Kremlin with a weapon. Anyone who tried to enter the Kremlin with a weapon would have been shot on the spot by Kremlin guards. Why did Khrushchev expose himself to this risk, why was entering the Kremlin with weapons part of his plan? He must have been very sure that his murder plan would succeed. He had to have connections with the Red Army leadership, he had to have sufficient power. Beria, on the other hand, lacked a sufficient basis of trust among his co-conspirers. He was feared because of his malicious unpredictability and was avoided by all others as much as possible. His initiatives proved that he could not realize his claim to sole rule and that he instead wanted to secure as much illegal decision-making power as possible, both in domestic and foreign policy. He took advantage of his long-standing personal relationship with Malenkov to go at it alone, but in doing so he put Malenkov in an unpleasant isolated position in relation to the other members of the CC Presidium, which Khrushchev knew how to use.

It turned out that Beria's position was entirely dependent on Malenkov's power and support. Beria had angered Malenkov by arranging for Ignatyev's removal in consultation with Khrushchev. Ignatyev was Malenkov's henchman and had supervised the party's security machinery. Malenkov, for his part, had overestimated his popularity; it had escaped his notice that Beria's support was crucial to his position because Beria, Pervukhin, Saburov and Malenkov represented the comparatively younger generation in the ruling Presidium. The Old Guard, Molotov, Voroshilov, Mikoyan, Kaganovich, in whom Stalin had long since withdrawn trust and curtailed their former power, was hostile to this young generation that had come to power after the purges of the 1930s. There was a delicate imbalance between the two generations; the older leaders were held in higher esteem than Malenkov, Khrushchev and Beria, who in the eyes of the public were Stalin's servants rather than their "beloved heroes".

Khrushchev successfully navigated between the two camps; he helped Beria weaken Malenkov when Ignatyev was compromised in the Doctor's Plot. Once again he supported Beria in relieving Malenkov of his powerful position as Secretary of the Central Committee. Today it is clear that Khrushchev took advantage of the dissatisfaction with Beria's new activism to initiate his dismantling. In 1952 the office of secretary general was abolished, making Khrushchev the primus inter pares; to become the supreme leader, he had to get rid of Malenkov as head of government. The best way to do this was to cut off Malenkov's true power base, namely his connection to Beria and control over the security machinery. As a result, Khrushchev's henchmen had to move up to decisive positions in the state security

service.

Beria wanted to occupy leading positions with locals, and in Ukraine as well so the clash with Khrushchev became inevitable. Khrushchev needed his Ukrainian henchmen for Moscow's power, while Beria needed them against Moscow, why else did Beria come closer to Yugoslavia? Revisionist levers from the outside against the Moscow center? Beria lobbied for ethnic minorities, rehabilitated the forces captured and condemned by Stalin, "in order to strengthen national consciousness". On Beria's initiative, ordinary criminals were released. A flood of riffraff poured into the cities. Riots spread throughout the country and street fighting broke out, which Beria had first provoked and then crushed. This diminished Beria's reputation among the Soviet people. This was not clumsy of Beria, but rather a clever tactical move: to have an alibi, to be able to put down political street fights as the "actions of criminals". He released criminals in order to have an excuse to get rid of the Stalinists, whom he criminalized. In our opinion, this was also one of the reasons why Beria had Moscow sealed off by MVD troops the day after Stalin was assassinated to be sure that operations that Stalin might have previously taken against the seizure of power by his enemies of the Party in the event of his death. In any case, Beria was rightly accused of having brought the MVD troops to Moscow to arrest the government. The Berianists are silent about this, or some, like Sudoplatov, claim "stiff and hard" that such a plan of Beria's did not exist.

The murderers write the obituaries. Why did the Party lose Comrade Stalin? The Party lost Comrade Stalin because the modern revisionists murdered him. The murderers, who had seized the post of their victim, wept for their victim, only to then "secretly" (Khrushchev at the XX Party Congress!) present themselves as victims of the victim.

The Izvestia reported that the Russian court once again dealt with the question of the rehabilitation of Beria. On May 30th, 2000 the following verdict was issued: **Refusal of rehabilitation, but shooting was wrong.**

Enver Hoxha and Stalins Daughter Svetlana defended Stalin against Beria

If anyone has analyzed and judged the background and the true extent of the conspirers' hypocritical coups against Stalin from a Marxist-Leninist point of view, it was Comrade Enver Hoxha, the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, on whose standpoint we World Bolsheviks essentially base ourselves and whom we defend in any case. For this we mainly recommended the study of his work "The Khrushchevites".

There is a very significant quotation from another of Enver Hoxha's writings: "**The Titoites**", in which Khrushchev expressed his anti-Stalinist rage against Enver Hoxha, and with which we want to begin before presenting the role and figure of Beria in the light of Enver Hoxha's view. This is because Enver Hoxha saw Beria as a member of Khrushchev's criminal gang, which had a common goal: To eliminate Stalin and to initiate the "de-Stalinization". So what did the horrified

Khrushchev say to Comrade Enver Hoxha?

"Where do you want to lead us, to Stalin's road?!" (Hoxha: 'The Titoites'; London; 1982; p.575; English Edition).

This basically says everything!!!

1. The path of Enver Hoxha was the path of Stalin. The path of Stalin was the continuation of the path of Lenin. And the path of Lenin was the continuation of the path of Marx and Engels. One can neither go forward nor backward halfway through communism, just as one can stop the clock but not the time; whoever says "A" must also say "B". This applies to both sides of the barricades. The path of Stalin leads to communism, the path of "de-Stalinization" led back to world imperialism.

2. Here, Khrushchev said the word "we", by which, of course, he meant the entire Khrushchevite criminal gang in the Presidium (including Beria!), which was engaged in a front against Enver Hoxha with provocative quarrels, curses, threats, blackmail and slander in Moscow in the manner of: "Who do you think you are? If you open your insolent mouth, we will crush you like a little louse." This throws a telling light on how these criminal gangs dealt with Stalin and the Stalinists in the USSR, in the People's Democracies and throughout the whole world, and how they have dealt and will continue to deal with them.

Here again are a selection of quotations from: "The Khrushchevites", from which we learned for the first time which anti-party elements had surrounded Stalin and with which elements he had to deal with.

Immediately, not even (!) one day after Stalin's death, the conspirers quickly distributed the new posts of power, driven by panic, not to be shortchanged or ripped off: Prime Minister Malenkov became Premier, Beria became First Deputy Prime Minister and Interior Minister, and Bulganin, Kaganovich, Mikoyan, and Molotov shared the other posts:

"Major changes were made in all the top organs in the party and the state within that day. The Presidium and the Bureau of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the party were merged into a single organ, new secretaries of the Central Committee of the party were elected, a number of ministries were amalgamated or united, changes were made in the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, etc." (Enver Hoxha: 'The Khrushchevites'; Tirana; 1980; p.14-15; English Edition).

On March 7th, 1953, in a joint decision of the Plenum of the CC, the Council of Ministers and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, the Stalinist organizational structure was abolished, namely the joint leadership of the CC and the Council of Ministers. The office of the Presidium of the CC and the office of the Council of Ministers were dissolved without further ado. The lost power of the "Old Guard", which Stalin had removed power from during its lifetime, was reclaimed as soon as Stalin made his final breath.

Less than a year had passed since the 19th Party Congress, which was still forced to show consideration for Stalin's General Line, when the dismantling of Stalin's General Line was hastily begun, which was expressed in the distribution of authority and in the new organizational structure of the Party that had long since been secretly decided upon. This shows the double-talk which the conspirers had already appeared at the XIX Party Congress with, only a few months before Stalin's assassination. They hypocritically pretended to follow Stalin's General Line at the party congress and, while they were making grand speeches there

about Stalin's "genius", they in reality had already divided all the new posts among themselves - one more reason to denounce the conspiracy against Stalin that had been planned long before and another reason to continue Stalin's General Line as the General Line of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement and lead it to victory.

These masters raided what was left of Stalin's organizational competence, greedily dividing it among themselves like legacy hunters. But not to strengthen the unity of the leading "collective", as one might have assumed, but to enrich their own power competence, that is, as a welcome enrichment of the tools with which they wanted to push through the restoration of capitalism. At the funeral service, they pushed their way in front of each other like at the chicken coop, a disgusting hypocritical spectacle. This was clear for Enver Hoxha "(...) that there was no unity in the Presidium of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union". (ibid; p.29). After the funeral service, the Presidium met in the Kremlin as quickly as possible to continue the "interrupted" distribution of posts. Enver Hoxha saw this as confirmation that the plot had been prepared long before. All previous conspiracies against Stalin were thwarted, except for the one in 1953. This suggests what power it had already united in its hands and how dangerous it really was - the greatest conspiracy in the history of Communism.

"One of the main directions of Khrushchev's strategy and tactics was to seize complete political and ideological power within the Soviet Union and to put the Soviet army and the state security organs in his service." (ibid; p.41).

With Malenkov's post as the First Secretary of the Central Committee, Khrushchev gained power in the Party, firstly by eliminating Beria and occupying its state security organs with Khrushchevites, and then to get his hands on the army (especially the GRU leadership) by eliminating Bulganin and Zhukov. In short: Khrushchev took over the Party still "in the name of Stalin" (at first) with the help of the apparatchiks of the Ministries of Defense and the Interior.

"In other words, in the name of Stalin, and by means of their apparatchiki, they suppressed criticism and tried to turn the Bolshevik Party into a lifeless party, into an organization without will and energy, which would vegetate from day to day, approving everything that the bureaucracy decided, concocted and distorted." (ibid; p.54).

Only in January 1956, on the occasion of a consultation of all socialist countries in Moscow, did Khrushchev openly say bad things about Stalin for the first time in a confidential conversation with Enver Hoxha. At that time Khrushchev had already prepared his secret speech at the 20th Party Congress. In February 1956, the Trotskyite conspirers and counter-revolutionaries, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Rykov and Pyatakov, were rehabilitated. Khrushchev was himself a disguised Trotskyite, posing as a "victim of Stalinist terror". In June 1953, Mikoyan proved himself to be a "victim of the Stalinist terror" in the talks with Enver Hoxha.

"Mikoyan, in particular, was the most negative, the most dubious element and the greatest intriguer among the members of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This huckster, who was constantly grinding and clicking his false teeth, was also ruminating on diabolical anti-Marxist, conspiratorial, putschist plans, as was proved later. This individual, with an unpleasant face and a black heart, behaved in a very menacing way, especially towards us Albanians. (...) The friendly, internationalist socialist feelings had been wiped out as far as he was concerned." (ibid; p.62-63).

"It seemed that the Soviet leadership based itself on the "great economic experience" of this

cosmopolitan huckster, who, as history showed, plotted with Nikita Khrushchev against Stalin, whom they had decided to murder. He admitted this with his own mouth to Mehmet and me in February 1960 [!!!]. After the putsch they linked up with American imperialism, and set about the destruction to its foundations of the great work of Lenin and Stalin, socialism in the Soviet Union.

"(...) In relations with us Mikoyan was not only the most miserly but also the most insulting. This anti-Albanian line of his was permanent, even when Stalin was alive." (ibid; p.63-64).

This can also be read in Enver Hoxha's memoirs "With Stalin":

"But will the Albanians themselves work?"

"I understood why he (Stalin) asked me this question. It was the result of the evil-intended information of the Armenian huckster, Mikoyan, who, at a meeting I had with him, not only spoke to me in a language quite unlike that of Stalin, but also used harsh terms in his criticisms about the realization of plans in our country, alleging that our people did not work, etc. His intention was to reduce the rate and amount of aid. This was always Mikoyan's stand. But Stalin accorded us everything we sought." (Hoxha: 'With Stalin'; Tirana; 1979; p.104; English Edition).

Let us now come to the picture that Enver Hoxha drew of Beria.

Who was Beria and what role did he play "at the side" of Stalin? There are not a few in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement who cultivate this "comrade" as the "most loyal Marxist-Leninist on the side of Stalin". Having to read these lines will of course hurt those people, and if they reach for the place where the pain comes from, we will point to their sore spot. Let us wait and see what they will do. We are ready to fight. Their cover is blown now and they have to come up with something. They are so dangerous because they hide their right-wing opportunist ideology behind a "very" "Marxist-Leninist", "anti-revisionist" line and "rely" on Enver Hoxha, among others. We think that the grace period that we have granted them to reconsider their wrong point of view has long expired and we openly say what we think and what we think of them as - traitors! May everyone form his own opinion about our hostile attitude towards the Berianists.

First of all, let us affirm that we defend Comrade Enver Hoxha's criticism of Beria in every way. As proof, we list the following quotations from Enver Hoxha against Beria:

As for the Beria, he is only mentioned in Enver Hoxha's last meeting with Stalin, together with Molotov, Malenkov and Bulganin and no longer with Mikoyan. That was in April 1951. Stalin saw through Tito's great power chauvinism towards Albania because Enver Hoxha had succeeded in advancing directly towards Stalin without Tito (and Beria?) being able to prevent it any further. When Stalin met Enver Hoxha personally, his friendship with Albania grew in the same measure as his animosity towards Tito. Stalin immediately took an interest in the meeting with Enver Hoxha in how Albania was preparing for its defense, for an impending war, which Tito had planned on behalf of the Anglo-American imperialists. Beria was very much present (!!!) when Enver Hoxha reported on the punishment of the anti-party Yugoslav elements in his own country, which Stalin expressly welcomed. Beria knew very well the Albanians' hostile attitude toward Yugoslav revisionism (through all his intelligence sources long before Enver Hoxha's meeting with Stalin!) when he sought reconciliation with Tito after Stalin's death in order to score points with the Anglo-American imperialists. In his

work "The Titoites," Enver Hoxha assessed the attitude to Tito's Yugoslavia as a:

"Touchstone to see who were the new leaders who seized power in the Soviet Union after Stalin's death, who were also the leaders of the other parties who changed course immediately after Khrushchevism came to light" (Enver Hoxha: 'The Titoites'; Tirana; 1983; p.638; Translated from German).

Enver Hoxha measured the figure and role of Beria against this. We World Bolsheviks have nothing to add to this. We were able to prove how good Enver Hoxha's nose was. From the critical attitude Enver Hoxha took toward Beria's treacherous attitude toward Yugoslav revisionism, we must draw conclusions about Beria's fundamentally treacherous attitude toward Stalin. We must take the General Line of Stalin as a touchstone for *Beria*, as Enver Hoxha did to *Tito*. A complete confirmation of Enver Hoxha's correct assessment of Beria will better protect our ranks against hostile influences, will strengthen us immensely in the fight against Beria, and will help wavering and insecure comrades to convince themselves.

Enver Hoxha did not allow himself to be intimidated and deceived by Beria's cunning and unanimously saw through him as an enemy of Albania and condemned him as such, because any reconciliation with Yugoslav revisionism inevitably meant an increase in the threat posed by revisionist Yugoslavia to Marxist-Leninist Albania. Beria knew very well that Tito had worked to eliminate Enver Hoxha, to overthrow the dictatorship of the Albanian proletariat, which did not prevent Beria from being the first (!) after Stalin's death to stop the struggle against modern revisionism in power and begin friendly relations with Yugoslavia (see his letter to Tito). The construction of socialism in Albania was systematically sabotaged by the new revisionist rulers in the Kremlin, a concerted effort by Yugoslav and Soviet revisionism against the only surviving disciple of Stalin. Enver Hoxha writes in the "Khrushchevites" that:

"The disdainful and insulting tone of the new Soviet leadership could not fail to hurt us. We could not fail to ask in astonishment: 'How can those people in Moscow know whether we have presented our problems rightly or wrongly, when it is we who live and work in Albania and not they?!'" (Hoxha: 'The Khrushchevites'; Tirana; 1980; p.74; English Edition).

Today we know that the Soviet revisionists had Albanian informants for this. Mehmet Shehu had, for many years, secret contact with the Soviet secret service without the CPA knowing about it. The Russian informant Major Ivanov most likely "knew" that the putschist Mehmet Shehu was both an Anglo-American and Yugoslavian agent. Ivanov must have been covered up by the GRU leadership, which hid its information from Stalin. If the secret services, whether from the GRU or the NKVD, had reached Stalin in time, Stalin would certainly have "informed" Enver Hoxha about it, and Mehmet Shehu (and not only he, but also Beria!!!!????) would have been exposed and punished sooner, and the murder of Stalin might have been prevented. This proves that the Soviet secret services knew more than Stalin, that they hid the truth from Stalin, that they must have worked against Stalin and for Tito against Albania and thus for the Anglo-Americans. And this also proves why Tito did not let Enver Hoxha get close to Stalin, because then Beria would have also been in danger. Beria was someone who had used his cogs to obtain secret information about the Marxist-Leninist struggle of the Albanians against the first modern revisionism in power and was therefore in the know. Thus Mehmet Shehu, without being covered by Beria, could not have continued any shameful malicious work until the 8th Party Congress of the PLA. Shehu then cowardly committed suicide when he was unmasked, pushed into a corner. Here is what Enver wrote about Shehu:

"The documents that have been discovered and incontestible evidence prove that since before the War he had been working for the American secret service. During the War and after Liberation Mehmet Shehu fought and worked in Albania as a mercenary in the pay of foreigners and under their orders. When he was in the 1st Brigade he was recruited by the Yugoslav secret service (OZNA, today the UDB) and then, by the Soviet KGB , and he served them all zealously. Acting on the orders and instructions of foreign espionage centres, especially the CIA and the UDB, he and the group of plotters linked with him, who are now in the hands of the authorities for full investigation, worked to destroy the Party and the people's state power and to put Albania under foreign rule.

"In order to carry through the subversive, gangster plans worked out by their patrons in Washington, Belgrade and elsewhere, Mehmet Shehu and his associates were prepared to commit grave crimes. Mehmet Shehu had received orders from the Yugoslav UDB to kill the First Secretary of the Central Committee and other leaders of the Party and state, as well as to use terrorist means to crush all those who would rise against this great treachery.

"If they were unable to act to carry out their criminal intentions, this was connected with their great fear of the people and the Party and their steel unity, which does not allow any enemy, however cunning and diabolical, to have his way. Mehmet Shehu was never able to alter or distort the line of the Party, because if he tried to do so he would be immediately unmasked." (Enver Hoxha: 'Work and Vigilance to Make the People's State Power Ever Stronger'; Tirana; 1982; English Edition).

Enver Hoxha gave this speech in 1982, 3 years before his death, when Ramiz Alia was the next to work on the betrayal. This shows how dangerous the enemy was before and after Enver Hoxha's death. Here many parallels can be drawn between the death of Enver Hoxha and Stalin - the murderers were the same - revisionists! It is no coincidence that the end of Albania coincided with the end of the Soviet Union. The threads can be traced back to Washington.

Ivanov was later the revisionist ambassador of the SU in Tirana in 1957. In other words, a Khrushchevite. The poly-agent Mehmet Shehu also worked on behalf of Khrushchev against Albania. Beria's security ministry had obtained his information from Mehmet Shehu's security ministry without the knowledge of the CPA or the CPSU, without the knowledge of Stalin or Enver Hoxha!

This was in fact the "information about the interior of Albania" that Beria had confronted Comrade Enver Hoxha with so brazenly and vilely in Moscow in June 1953. Beria may not have known in all details that from 1948 on, hundreds of diverse and criminal gangs, sent to Albania by Tito and the West together, were all exterminated by Albanian security forces, but as one of the leading security officers of the Soviet government, he must have been fundamentally informed about it, must have known, not least with the help of Mehmet Shehu, what he was doing there, and cannot be rehabilitated blindly as a "Marxist-Leninist" today, only with regard to his hostile attitude towards Albania and his pro-Yugoslavian attitude. We must most probably assume that Beria did not stop at "gathering information" but that he abused it, that he used it against Stalin, against Enver Hoxha and thus against the revolutionary cause of the world proletariat. In "The Titoites" Enver Hoxha wrote:

"After Stalin's death, the group that came to power sentenced the head of the Soviet KGB Beria for numerous violations of the law. We called on Mehmet Shehu to check whether there had not also been mistakes in the organs of our Ministry of the Interior, which he headed. Mehmet Shehu was afraid that his connections with the Soviet KGB or Western agencies would be exposed and that he would suffer the fate of Beria. He went to the Soviet

ambassador Levichkin, to whom he assured his devotion to the newly arrived Khrushchevites, demanding Soviet protection." (Enver Hoxha: 'The Titoites'; Tirana; 1983; p.634; Translated from German).

From 1952 to 1953, that envoy was ambassador to Albania and from 1953 to 1955 he was ambassador to Albania. In 1956, he headed the 5th European Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR. Since he was not replaced by Khrushchev, it can be assumed that in 1952 Levichkin could not have been "a rock-solid follower" of Stalin.

It may be interesting to note that there were astonishing parallels between the ministries of the interior in Albania and the Soviet Union. In both cases, conspirers used the highest posts in the ministries of the interior to overthrow the dictatorship of the proletariat and liquidate the party leadership not just once, but many times over a long period of decades! It is as astonishing as it is remarkable that not the Interior Ministries themselves uncovered and smashed all these conspiracies and conspiracies (for which the proletariat had actually set them up and which would have been their most urgent task!!!), but the Bolshevik parties, PLA and the CPSU with Enver Hoxha and Stalin at the head, and not without engaging in a dangerous fight with the moles of the Ministries of the Interior!

Returning to Enver Hoxha's last meeting with Stalin, if one keeps in mind the situation in the Soviet party leadership, Stalin's response to Enver Hoxha's report on the fight against the anti-party elements in the CPA is revealing: "'You did the right thing,' Stalin said to me, 'the enemy will try to smuggle himself into the Party itself, even into its Central Committee. But with great vigilance and a determined attitude, such attempts can be detected and thwarted.'" (ibid; page 187). And this was certainly intended directly for the ears of Beria, who was involved in the Mingrelian Conspiracy at the same time. Moreover, Beria, who had personally attended this meeting between Stalin and Enver Hoxha, deliberately concealed all the intelligence information he had received about the situation within the Albanian party. Beria deceived not only Enver Hoxha, but also Stalin at that meeting. According to Enver Hoxha's statement in 1981-1982, Mehmud Shehu supplied the Soviet secret service with secret information shortly after the liberation of Albania. Both Mehmud Shehu and the Soviet secret service are guilty of this, and there is no doubt that Shehu and Beria worked together.

Stalin addressed Enver Hoxha on the question of economic construction, "that you (...) must also pay more attention to strengthening the working class and training cadres. The Party must pay special attention to the working class" (ibid). From Stalin's desire to strengthen the unity between the Party and the working class it can be seen that this must have been of great importance for his struggle in his own Party and state leadership, especially for the Soviet post-war reconstruction of the economy. Enver Hoxha also reported Stalin's criticism that much in the Soviet Union had been morbidly idealized, and that the slogan "everything is 'in the best of order'" (ibid; page 196). was dangerous. We know today that the modern revisionists liked to operate with this slogan in order to hide behind it the path they were pursuing for the restoration of capitalism. "Everything is in order" was not the way to communism, but "everything is in order" was the way back to capitalism. This was the essence of the revisionists' "order".

Enver Hoxha must have seen Beria for the last time before Stalin's death at the 19th Party Congress in 1952. He only met him again in Moscow in June 1953, a few months after Stalin's death and a few months before Beria's arrest.

In the following we list Enver Hoxha's assessments, page by page, in the "Khrushchevites" here:

"If there were some excesses in the course of this just and titanic struggle, it was not Stalin who committed them, but Khrushchev, Beria and company, who for sinister hidden motives, showed themselves the most zealous for purges at the time when they were not yet so powerful. They acted in this way to gain credit as 'ardent defenders' of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as 'merciless with the enemies', with the aim of climbing the steps in order to usurp power later. The facts show that when Stalin discovered the hostile activity of a Yagoda or a Yezhov, the revolutionary court condemned them without hesitation. Such elements as Khrushchev, Mikoyan, Beria and their apparatchiki hid the truth from Stalin. In one way or another, they misled and deceived Stalin. He did not trust them, therefore he had told them to their faces, '. . . when I am gone you will sell the Soviet Union.' Khrushchev himself admitted this. And it turned out just as Stalin foresaw. As long as he was alive, even these enemies talked about unity, but after his death they encouraged the split." (ibid; p.19).

In June 1953 Enver Hoxha was received in Moscow when Khrushchev had not yet fully seized power, where Malenkov still ranked first and Beria was second:

"Beside him stood Beria, with his eyes glittering behind glasses and his hands never still." (ibid; p.21).

Enver Hoxha had hardly spoken for twenty minutes when:

"when I heard Beria, with his snake's eyes, say to Malenkov, who was sitting listening to me as expressionless as a mummy:

""Can't we say what we have to say and put an end to this?"

"(...) Beria, pleased that I had finished, put his hands in his pockets and tried to work out what impression their replies were making on me." (ibid; p.23-24).

"Malenkov and Beria seemed to be the two 'cocks of the walk'" (ibid; p.24).

"Beria began to speak, the movements of his hands and eyes revealing his embarrassment and irritation, and said that according to their information, we allegedly had unsuitable and dubious elements, not only in the army, but also in the apparatus of the state and in the economy! (...) Bulganin sighed with relief and looked around, not concealing his satisfaction, but Beria cut short his smile. He openly opposed Bulganin's 'advice' about purges and stressed that the 'elements with a bad past, but who have since taken the right road, must not be purged but should be pardoned.'" (ibid; p.26).

And Enver Hoxha responded to Beria's accusations:

""(...) not only do I not accept these accusations but I am telling you that your informers are deceiving you, are concocting slanders." (ibid; p.27). (That was for Beria!!! And it hit home!!!)

"My conclusion from this meeting was unpleasant. I saw that the leadership of the Soviet Union was ill-disposed towards our country. The arrogant way they behaved during the meeting, their refusal to give those few things that we sought, and their slanderous attack on the cadres of our army were not good signs.

"From this meeting I observed also that there was no unity in the Presidium of the

Communist Party of the Soviet Union: Malenkov and Beria were predominant, Molotov hardly spoke, Mikoyan seemed to be on the outer and spouted venom, while what Bulganin said was bullshit.

"It was apparent that the in-fighting had begun among the leaders in the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." (ibid; p.29-30).

"After he kicked out Malenkov, leaving him only the post of prime minister, Khrushchev made himself first secretary of the Central Committee in September 1953. It is evident that Khrushchev and his group of close cronies hatched up the intrigue in the Presidium carefully, by setting their opponents at loggerheads and eliminating Beria and apparently 'taming' the others.

"There are many versions about the arrest and execution of Beria. Amongst others it was said that men from the army, headed by General Moskalenko, arrested Beria right in the meeting of the Presidium of the CC of the party. Apparently Khrushchev and his henchmen charged the army with this "special mission", because they did not trust the state security, since Beria had had it in his hands for years on end. The plan had been hatched up in advance: while the meeting of the Presidium of the CC of the party was being held, Moskalenko and his men got into a nearby room unobserved. At the given moment, Malenkov pressed the bell and within a few seconds Moskalenko entered the office where the meeting was being held and approached Beria to arrest him. It was said that Beria reached out to take the satchel he had nearby, but Khrushchev, who was sitting 'vigilant' by his side, was 'quicker' and seized the satchel first.

"(...) This is what was said, took place and Khrushchev himself admitted it. Later, when a general, who I believe was called Sergatskov, came to Tirana as Soviet military adviser he also told us something about the trial of Beria. He told us that he had been called as a witness to declare in court that Beria had allegedly behaved arrogantly towards him. On this occasion Sergatskov told our comrades in confidence: 'Beria defended himself very strongly in the court, accepted none of the accusations and refuted them all.'" (ibid; p.30-31).

In June 1954 Enver Hoxha was back in Moscow, where he was directly confronted by Khrushchev for the first time, several months after he had become First Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU:

"'The party leads, organizes, controls,' he theorized. 'It is the initiator and inspirer. But Beria wanted to liquidate the role of the party,' and after a moment of silence he asked me: 'Have you received the resolution which announced the sentence we passed on Beria?'

"'Yes,' I replied.

"He left his discourse about the party and started to speak about the activity of Beria; he accused him of almost every crime and described him as the cause of many evils. These were the first steps towards the attack on Stalin. For the time being, Khrushchev felt that he could not rise against the figure and work of Stalin, therefore, in order to prepare the terrain he started with Beria. At this meeting, moreover, to our astonishment, Khrushchev told us:

"'When you were here last year, you assisted in the exposure and unmasking of Beria.'

"I stared in amazement, wondering what he was leading up to. Khrushchev's explanation was this:

"You remember the debate which you had last year with Bulganin and Beria over the accusation they made against your army. It was Beria who had given us that information, and the strong opposition which you put up in the presence of the comrades of the Presidium, helped us by supplementing the doubts and the facts which we had about the hostile activity of Beria. A few days after your departure for Albania we condemned him.

"(...) The "Beria" dossier had been closed. Khrushchev had settled accounts with him." (ibid; p.35-36).

"Khrushchev and Mikoyan were the bitterest enemies of Marxism-Leninism and Stalin.

"(...) Khrushchev and Mikoyan worked to a plan and after the death of Stalin found an open field for their activity, also because of the fact that Malenkov, Beria, Bulganin and Voroshilov proved to be not only blind, but also ambitious, and each of them struggled for power.

"(...) In a few words, they applied this tactic: split and divide in the Presidium, organize the forces of the putsch outside, continue to speak well about Stalin in order to have the millions strong masses on their side, and thus bring closer the day of the seizure of power, the liquidation of opponents, and of a whole glorious epoch of the construction of socialism, the victory of the Patriotic War, etc. All this feverish activity (and we sensed this) was aimed to create the popularity of Khrushchev inside the Soviet Union and outside it." (ibid; p.50-51).

"The truth is that in this initial stage of Khrushchev's revisionist assault, Beria was the appropriate card to play to advance the secret plans. As I have written above, Beria was presented by Khrushchev as the cause of many evils: he had allegedly underrated the role of the first secretary, damaged the "collective leadership", and wanted to put the party under the control of the state security apparatus. On the pretext of the struggle against the damage caused by Beria, Khrushchev, on the one hand, established himself in the leadership of the party and state and took control of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and on the other hand, prepared public opinion for the open attack which he was to undertake later on Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin, and on the real work of the Bolshevik Communist Party of Lenin and Stalin." (ibid; p.52-53).

"I have spoken above about the meeting in June 1953 with Malenkov, Beria, Mikoyan, and others in Moscow. Apart from other things, from the way they behaved towards us and how they handled the economic problems which we raised, I felt that now it was not only the body of the unforgettable Stalin that was missing in the Kremlin, but also his generous humane spirit, his attentive, friendly behaviour and his outstanding Marxist-Leninist thought." (ibid; p.67).

At a meeting with Soviet leaders on June 8th, 1954, Khrushchev's social-imperialist grimace on the Albanian oil question was fully expressed when he boldly declared:

"I know that your oil is not in demand, it contains many impurities, especially bitumen and a high percentage of sulphur, and processing it makes it even less profitable. Let us give you an example of what has occurred to us with our oil at Baku. We have invested billions of rubles there. Beria always sought sums for investment for the development of oil in Baku from Joseph Vissarionovich, since Stalin, having worked in Baku in the past, knew that there was oil there. However, from the discoveries we have made today, other places of our homeland and from the analyses we have made, it turns out that the exploitation of the oil at Baku is not profitable.' [An outrageous lie, especially when one thinks about the First and Second World War and the events of Georgia today!]

"After giving me a good lecture with figures about the 'profitability' and "non-profitability' of the extraction of oil, with the aim that I 'should not make mistakes' like Stalin(!), Khrushchev came round to the point:

"Hence we must make our reckoning economic questions very carefully, both in our country and in yours, and if you have profitable sources of oil, fine, we give you credits. However, reckoning things this way, it turns out that it is more profitable for us to supply you from our oil . . .'" (ibid; p.78-79).

Khrushchev's course was to limit socialist construction in Albania to the "cultivation of citrus fruits". Khrushchev wanted to turn Albania into an orchard of the USSR. And as an example he cited the restriction to fruit growing, which he had already forced on the Georgians immediately after he came to power. By 1954, Khrushchev's Russian social-imperialism had been put into practice as planned, even in the non-Russian Soviet republics.

In 1954, Khrushchev thought it was still too early to openly attack Stalin's Marxist-Leninist line on the Yugoslav Question and used one of his popular sleights of hand instead. He argued that Beria had only pushed Yugoslavia further into the arms of imperialism and that it needed to be embraced rather than forced in order to be better assimilated. Enver Hoxha wrote about this:

"And those who were to blame were found to be Beria among the Soviets, who with his actions had caused 'justifiable dissatisfaction among the Yugoslav leadership', and Djilas among the Yugoslavs (who had been condemned by Tito in the meantime), who 'openly propagated liquidationist views', was 'an active partisan for the orientation of Yugoslavia towards the Western countries', etc.!"

"Thus, according to Khrushchev, the problem turned out to be very simple. The breach with Yugoslavia was based not on real reasons but on fabricated pretexts, so 'we wronged you for nothing and the culprits have been found: Beria on our side, and Djilas on yours. Now we both have condemned these enemies, therefore, all we have to do is to kiss and make up and forget the past.'" (ibid; p.112).

Tito had placed four conditions upon Khrushchev, the fourth of which was as follows:

"Fourth, the causes of the conflict, said Tito, are neither Beria nor Djilas. The causes go deeper, therefore you, the Soviets, and the others united with you, must completely abandon the line of the time of Stalin, abandon your former principles, because in this way the true causes of the conflict are automatically overcome." (ibid; p.118-119).

This indirectly indicates that they did not want to get rid of Beria because he was an obstructive defender of Stalin's line on Yugoslavia from 1948/49. Both Khrushchev and Tito were in agreement against Stalin, but neither side justified Beria's guilt with Stalin's "defense" of him. We address this to the Berianists!

In the summer of 1955, Enver Hoxha arrived in Moscow to meet with the Khrushchevite Suslov, the greatest demagogue, who was a member of the War Council in the Caucasus from 1941-44, head of the partisan associations there, a member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU from 1952-1953, and a member of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Union Council of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR at the time of the meeting with Enver Hoxha:

"In his opening words he told me that we would talk about the Yugoslav problem and stressed in a dictatorial tone:

"(...) 'The main problem is that the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has examined the Yugoslav question in a realistic light, bearing in mind the traitorous work of Beria, and we made self-criticism about this. Our Central Committee came to the conclusion that the breaking off of relations with Yugoslavia was a mistake, that is, we were hasty.'" (ibid; p.135-136).

"'A number of mistakes have been made, but they must be examined carefully,'" said Suslov, and started to list a series of 'arguments' to convince me that the Yugoslav leaders were allegedly not on a wrong road. Naturally he also tried to lay the blame on Beria and Djilas and the efforts of imperialism 'to attach Yugoslavia to itself'.

"'Molotov, too, has maintained a very sectarian stand on this problem,' continued Suslov. 'He personally made mistakes in state relations with Yugoslavia while insisting that it was the Yugoslav comrades that made the mistakes. However, the Central Committee demanded that Molotov prove where the Yugoslavs had been wrong, and we criticized him severely for his stand. Finally he, too, expressed his solidarity with the Central Committee!'" (ibid; p.137).

In order to force the Albanians to reconcile with the Belgrade revisionists and thus force them to rehabilitate the Yugoslavian anti-party elements they had condemned, Enver Hoxha was woken in the middle of the night by a call from Mikoyan:

"Mikoyan began to deliver a standard monologue about "socialist Yugoslavia", about Tito who was "a fine chap", about Beria's mistakes and the sins they had allegedly committed (the Soviet Union and the Information Bureau), and then he concluded:

"(...) 'You, too, must help ensure that Yugoslavia does not go over to the imperialist camp . . .'" (ibid; p.141).

"Precisely after the death of Stalin we entered into conflict with the new leadership of the Soviet Union - Malenkov, Bulganin, Khrushchev, Mikoyan, and others. Three or four months after Stalin's death they attacked us fiercely and shamelessly...

"We took part in the meetings of the communist and workers' parties in Moscow, but did not go there with the views of Mao Tsetung. We did not speak out against the Soviet Union until the conditions for this were ripe, but within ourselves, we had great worries and doubts about its leadership. It did not show itself resolute, there was confusion there. We sensed the contradictions which existed within it, among the leaders, and especially over the line of Stalin, although we had no real knowledge of them.

"Our opinion is that Mao Tsetung knew about this situation and that he must have been in agreement with the line and actions of Khrushchev against Stalin and the line of the Bolshevik Party...

"(...) After the death of Stalin and regardless of his saying that 'Khrushchev is a great man', Mao (naturally, these are suppositions) put himself above Khrushchev and thought that he ought to have his place after Lenin as "a great philosopher" and the leader of a country with the biggest population in the world." (Enver Hoxha: 'The Chinese Revisionists are Attacking the

Party of Labour of Albania in an Underhand Way' in: 'Reflections on China', Volume II; Tirana; 1979; p.410-411; English Edition).

- End of Enver Hoxha's quotes dealing with Beria -

Now we have taken the trouble to carefully collect all the quotes from Enver in which Beria was mentioned. We think that it is more than clear that Enver recognized in Beria an enemy of Marxism-Leninism. May the reader judge for himself whether he wants to side with us on the side of Enver Hoxha or with the Berianists on the side of Beria. Bear this in mind: The Berianists pretend to base themselves on BOTH the Marxist-Leninist Hoxha AND on the "Marxist-Leninist" Beria? Who is the Marxist-Leninist, Enver or Beria? Whoever takes Beria's side is in our opinion an enemy of Enver Hoxha and Stalin. For us there can be no other conclusion! We of the Comintern/ML are of the opinion that Enver Hoxha is not only a Marxist-Leninist, but the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism and his word has all the more weight. His word is for us Marxist-Leninists law: The accusation and condemnation of the anti-Marxist-Leninist Beria, the accusation and condemnation of the Berianists and Berianism! This corresponds to the revolutionary spirit of Enver Hoxha - this is Hoxhaism! Today's struggle against Berianism is the development of Hoxhaism!

The Berianists are Hoxhaists in words and anti-Hoxhaists in deeds! And as such, we establish an irreconcilable demarcation line between them and us: A Marxist-Leninist can never defend Marxism-Leninism if he defends his enemies at the same time.

One need only look at how perfidiously the Berianists deal with the quotations of Enver Hoxha. From this alone we draw our conclusions that we are wary of them, because they accuse Enver Hoxha of exactly the opposite of what he said, as we will see in a moment.

And this is exactly how the Berianists have acted towards the Comintern/ML. They are hiding all of Enver Hoxha's assessments of Beria. The only thing the Berianists found in Enver Hoxha is not even from Enver Hoxha himself (!), but Enver Hoxha was writing there *about* someone who secondhandedly told him about how Beria had defended herself so cunningly in his trial that nothing could be proven against him. We take this quote from Enver Hoxha from the pro-Beria "red channel" on the internet where it can be found:

"When a general, whose name I think was Sehatskov, came to Tirana as a military adviser, he also said something about the trial of Beria. On that occasion, Sergatskov told us confidentially: *'Beria defended himself very well in court. He did not accept any of the accusations and refuted everything!'*" (red channel; Translated from German).

With your hand on your hearts comrades, can you seriously want to prove with this quotation that Enver Hoxha considered Beria to be a Marxist-Leninist?

"To support this," they add the anti-Stalinists Nikolaevsky and Lang. With them, you know that you can't believe anything they say. Even Sudoplatov, Beria's student, logically defended Beria when he spoke about the trial. Surely one must not believe people who are not Marxist-Leninists at all, nor must one conceal what the Marxist-Leninists believe about Beria. Stalin already had the death sentence for Beria in his pocket, the trial against Beria was scheduled for March 1953 by Stalin. Should the comrades then accuse Stalin as an enemy of Marxism-Leninism because he wanted to liquidate the "Marxist-Leninist" Beria?

Furthermore, the Berianists cite a quotation from Svetlana, Stalin's daughter. We have also

collected what Svetlana thought of Beria and then listed it here to prove that the Berianists used the same sleight of hand that they used with the quotations from Enver Hoxha. They made all of Svetlana's devastating judgements about Beria disappear into a drawer (and there's quite a lot!!!) and used only one single quotation (!) of her to "prove" the quotation of Enver Hoxha that they dug up. The quote reads:

"The trial was staged - without any evidence". We have taken Svetlana's quote here again from the Internet, again from "red channel".

The Berianists' intention is transparent. They claim that: If Beria was shot by the Khrushchevites without evidence, ergo Beria must have been a "Marxist-Leninist". Is that Marxist logic? How stupid do the Berianists actually think we are? Beria, as the most powerful man in the state, had enough evidence to have all the other members of the Presidium shot, because they were so dirty. Yes, he was so powerful that he could do whatever he wanted with them even without evidence. He occupied the Kremlin with his own troops and put his pistol to the chests of the entire Presidium, and they had to give in, had to do what he said. They had no other choice if they wanted to live. Yes, that was Beria! These are facts and that was Beria's death sentence. He knew too much and had them all in his hand. The members of the Presidium were blackmailed by him, paraded by him, had to dance to his tune. If they had not eliminated him, all the conspiracy groups would have been blown up and the whole coup against Stalin would have been in danger. If one of them talked, all of them were finished. Even if they had wanted to reveal everything about Beria's crimes at that time, they would only be digging their own grave. It was only with a trick that the Khrushchevites finally succeeded in luring Beria into a trap and letting him snap shut. This mutual putschism had nothing to do with the correct actions of a Bolshevik party. So for the time being they had no choice but to grit their teeth and wait for the 20th Party Congress, where they were well prepared to tell their tall tales about Beria, mixed with half-truths and truths, without burdening themselves with them.

Everything decisive about this was said in Enver Hoxha's "The Khrushchevites". We have examined these events again elsewhere. Just as we did with the Enver Hoxha quotes, we want to let Svetlana speak here in detail so that you can see for yourself. Everything that Svetlana wrote about Beria in Georgia we have listed in the chapter on the Mingrelian Conspiracy of Beria and left out here to avoid repeating ourselves.

Svetlana Defended her Father against Beria:

Svetlana loved her father, nobody in the world disputes that. Why should she lie after his death? Why should she hide anything, why should she wrongly accuse anyone? We Marxist-Leninists do not agree with everything she wrote about her father and socialism in the Soviet Union, but we believe what her honest childhood heart felt about Beria's constant presence, and so we studied her letters about life with her father with great attention and not without compassion for her hatred of Beria. One thing Svetlana said clearly: For her, there is no person in the whole world whom she had hated more in her life than Beria, and whom she, involuntarily, got to know personally better than others. She would have done anything to protect her father from Beria, and it was precisely this powerlessness against Beria, to have to watch her father run further and further into ruin, that had broken her heart. Confidants of Stalin's daughter suspect that Svetlana was only allowed to write her criticism of Beria in the "slave language". The first reason for this is that she had to publish her "Twenty Letters to a Friend" in the West, and thus under the possible influence of certain political circles, in

publishing and editing. The second reason for this is that Khrushchev had given her the order not to disclose anything about the murder of her father, because the official authorities in Russia have kept this secret to this day. But Svetlana's choice of words nevertheless made it quite clear that she could only hate Beria so deeply for one reason: She knew about it just like her brother, who was locked up in prison only because he, too, knew about the truth and unlike Svetlana had dared not to remain silent, but to openly speak out about the murder of his father, which he paid for with his life. What we see here is the social-fascist violence, namely to brutally invade the personal relations not only of the masses but also of the great leader Stalin, to destroy, torture and kill his family life and to exploit it in the interest of their power. Svetlana's wish was to leave forever the country where the murder of her father was officially hushed up. Khrushchev would hardly have let her leave the Soviet Union unhindered if she had not publicly and explicitly confirmed to him that she would keep the truth to herself. It is humanly comprehensible what burned in Svetlana's soul. She had to lighten her soul and revealed as much as she could to the public. Before Beria had entered the life of her family, she felt happily and lovingly cared for in her family, her relationship with her father was unburdened and carefree. Since Beria had appeared, she describes life as hell, for Beria wiped out half of Stalin's family and she had to go through all this at close quarters as a child.

Beria was, and no one disputes this, the person who had the easiest, most open, unhindered and temporally longest access to the most strictly guarded politician in human history. For this fact alone it is impossible to objectively exclude him as a perpetrator. We compile such statements of Svetlana, which seem to us to be revealing about Beria, here from her "20 Letters to a Friend", written in 1963 with the accompanying word: *"I should like the reader of these letters to feel that they were written for him"*.

On March 2, 1953, Svetlana was taken from school to her father's deathbed. She wrote:

"Everyone was tiptoeing around as quiet as a mouse.

"(...) There was only one person who was behaving in a way that was very nearly obscene. That was Beria. He was extremely agitated. His face, repulsive enough at the best of times, now was twisted by his passions - by ambition, cruelty, cunning and a lust for power and more power still. He was trying so hard at this moment of crisis to strike exactly the right balance, to be cunning, yet not too cunning. It was written all over him. He went up to the bed and spent a long time gazing into the dying man's face. From time to time my father opened his eyes but was apparently unconscious or in a state of semiconsciousness. Beria stared fixedly at those clouded eyes, anxious even now to convince my father that he was the most loyal and devoted of them all, as he had always tried with every ounce of his strength to appear to be. Unfortunately, he had succeeded for too long.

"During the final minutes, as the end was approaching, Beria suddenly caught sight of me and ordered: "Take Svetlana away!" Those who were standing nearby stared, but no one moved. Afterward he darted into the hallway ahead of anybody else. The silence of the room where everyone was gathered around the deathbed was shattered by the sound of his loud voice, the ring of triumph unconcealed, as he shouted, "Khrustalyov! My car!" [Editor's note: There were comrades, who had served at that time in direct proximity of Stalin, who were convinced of the fact that courtier of Beria had done the actual dirty work with the procurement and the administration of the poison!]

"He was a magnificent modern specimen of the artful courtier, the embodiment of Oriental perfidy, flattery and hypocrisy who had succeeded in confounding even my father, a man

whom it was ordinarily difficult to deceive. A good deal that this monster did is now a blot on my father's name, and in a good many things they were guilty together. But I haven't the slightest doubt that Beria used his cunning to trick my father into many other things and laughed up his sleeve about it afterwards. All the other leaders knew it.

"Now all the ugliness inside him came into the open - he couldn't hold it back. I was by no means the only one to see it. But they were all terrified of him. They knew that the moment my father died no one in Russia would have greater power in his grasp." (Alliluyeva: 'Twenty Letters to a Friend'; New York; 1967; p.7-8; English Edition).

When Svetlana held the hand of her dying father she noticed in his last conscious moment:

"He suddenly lifted his left hand as though he were pointing to something above and bringing down a curse on us all. The gesture was incomprehensible and full of menace, and no one could say to whom or at what it might be directed. The next moment, after a final effort, the spirit wrenched itself free of the flesh." (ibid; p.10).

In her "Twenty Letters to a Friend", Svetlana reported on the accusations that Stalin heard from his wife because he let Beria rope him in:

"I see no facts! But she just cried out, 'What facts do you need? I just see he's a scoundrel! I won't have him here!' I told her to go to hell. He's my friend. He's a good Chekist. He helped us forestall the Mingrelian uprising in Georgia. I trust him. Facts are what I need!"

"My poor, clever mother. The facts came later." (ibid; p.20).

[Parentheses by the editors: In 1929, Stalin had not yet convinced himself that Beria was the real leader of the Mingrelian uprising in 1924, but Stalin instead trusted Beria as a "Chekist", whom he incorrectly defended against the suspicion of his wife! Please do not confuse the Mingrelian uprising with the later Mingrelian Conspiracy, for the only thing the two had in common was Beria of course! Svetlana writes about the year 1929, when Stalin and his wife had quarreled over Beria, one of the reasons why Beria killed the very relatives of Stalin who had suspected him! The astonishing thing about this quarrel, which Svetlana has described here between her parents, is that Stalin's wife had in 1929 already foreseen the year 1951/52 that the mastermind of the Mingrelian Conspiracy was none other than Beria - after Svetlana's mother had been dead for over 20 years! Stalin had already been warned in 1929, but he had ignored the warning by his wife. There are things in life that one should not refrain from doing until there is "evidence" against them. Beria always had "counter-evidence" on all 10 fingers at hand! Stalin had finally collected enough evidence against Beria in 1951/52, but it was to become clear that it was already too late to condemn Beria on the basis of that evidence!]

Svetlana suddenly ends the sentence (in the German edition – translator's note) without it being completed. We do not find out why, but everyone can imagine: If Stalin had listened to his wife, he would have stayed alive in 1953. In a note of the German edition of her "Twenty Letters" there is a remark of the translator, which we do not want to withhold here. It says:

"The Mingrelian Affair of 1951/52, despite numerous results of investigations, remains unexplained to this day. It "resulted in a purge of the Georgian party and state apparatus whose extent almost eclipsed the bloodbath of the years 1936 to 1938." (note of the German translator).

"Unexplained to this day???" Because the murder of Stalin was concealed, and the exact opposite must have happened in Mingrelia than what was officially announced afterwards. The translator wanted (or had to?) lead the public on a false track in order to distract from what had really happened.

Svetlana further wrote:

"The very next day - it was well before the funeral - Beria had the whole household, servants and bodyguards, called together and told that my father's belongings were to be removed right away - no one had any idea where - and that they were all to quit the premises.

"Nobody argued with Beria. (...) Servants who had worked for my father devotedly for ten or fifteen years were simply thrown out. Every one of them was sent away. (...) Two of them shot themselves. No one knew what was going on or what they were guilty of or why they were being picked on.

"(...) In 1955, when Beria himself and "fallen", they started restoring the dacha. My father's things were brought back. The former servants and commadants were invited back and helped put everything where it belonged and make the house look as it had before. They were preparing to open a museum (...) But then came the Twentieth Party Congress." (ibid; p.23).

In this interesting tripartite division of the period after Stalin's death, Svetlana's statements reflect three positions on Stalin, and these are exactly the three moments that broke over socialism: the overthrow, the pausing moments of horror and emptiness after the loss of Stalin, a brief resurgence of Stalinism only to finally go out, to finally turning away from it.

Svetlana continues:

"My father could not have been cut off from life in those years (before Beria came along – editor's note). That came later, when he was isolated from all the sincere, honest, kindly members of the family who had been on an equal footing with him." (ibid; p.35).

"Beria, who was already in power in Moscow by this time (around 1938 – editor's note), made up various stories about Pavel's death and kept trying to put them over on my father. The most farfetched was that Pavel had been poisoned by his wife.

"(...) But that wasn't enough for Beria. A full decade later, in 1948, he had Pavel's widow accused of spying and poisoning her husband and she was thrown into jail. (...) Neither was set free until 1954." (ibid; p.55-56).

(This only happened after Beria's death. He granted the greatest amnesty immediately after Stalin's death, but why not in this case? Why not?).

"What my father didn't want to realize was that in the cellars of the secret police X, Y and Z could could be made to testify to anything. That was the domain of Beria, Yezhov and the other executioners, whom nature had endowed with a special talent for that sort of thing." (ibid; p.78).

"My father was astonishingly helpless before Beria's machinations. All Beria had to do was bring him the record of the interrogation in which X 'confessed,' or others 'confessed' for him, or worse yet, X refused to 'confess'. (ibid; p.79).

"(...) or whether Beria had simply made up his mind to get rid of those who knew about his crimes and had no trouble talking my father into it." (ibid).

"I speak advisedly of his influence on my father and not the other way around. Beria was more treacherous, more practiced in perfidy and cunning, more insolent and single-minded than my father. In a word, he was a stronger character. My father had his weaker sides. He was capable of self-doubt. He was cruder and more direct than Beria, and not so suspicious. He was simpler and could be led up to the garden path by someone with Beria's craftiness. Beria was aware of my father's weaknesses. He knew the hurt pride and the inner loneliness. He was aware that my father's spirit was, in a sense, broken. And so he poured oil on the flames and fanned them as only he knew how. He flattered my father with a shamelessness that was nothing if not Oriental. He praised him and made up to him in a way that caused old friends, accustomed to looking on my father as an equal, to wince with embarrassment.

"Beria's role was a terrible one for all our family. How my mother feared and hated him! And it was her friends - Alexander Svanidze, his wife Maria, his sister Mariko who was Yanukidze's secretary, to say nothing of Yenukidze himself - who were the first to fall, the moment Beria was able to convince my father that they were hostile to him.

"I have already said that in a good many things Beria and my father were guilty together. I'm not trying to shift the blame from one to the other. At some point, unfortunately, they became spiritually inseparable. The spell cast on my father by this terrifying evil genius was extremely powerful, and it never failed to work." (ibid; p.137).

"The years 1949 to 1952 were terribly trying for me, as they were for everyone. The whole country was gasping for air. Things were unbearable for everyone. The most orthodox Party spirit reigned in the house I lived in, but it had nothing in common with the spirit of my grandfather and my grandmother, my mother, the Svanidzes and all the old Party people I knew. It was all hypocritical, a caricature purely for show." (ibid; p.197-198).

"After the Nineteenth Party Congress in October 1952, he twice informed the Central Committee that he wished to retire. It was probably because he was ill. In any case the fact that he wanted to retire was known to everyone who belonged to the Central Committee at that time." (ibid; p.206).

Svetlana wrote of his 73rd birthday, December 21st, 1952, where she had seen her father for the last time:

"Toward the end the 'usual' people were Beria, Malenkov, Bulganin and Mikoyan. Khrushchev also appeared from time to time. Molotov was out of things after his wife's arrest in 1949. He wasn't even summoned even during my father's last illness. Shortly before my father died even some of his intimates were disgraced: the perennial Vlasik was sent to prison in the winter of 1952 and my father's personal secretary Poskrebyshev, who had been with him for twenty years, was removed." (ibid; p.208).

And Svetlana wrote about Stalin's son, her brother:

"(...) the death of our father, which shook him badly. He was convince that our father had been 'poisoned' or 'killed.' He saw that the world world without which he was unable to exist was crumbling all around him, and he was terrified.

"Throughout the period before the funeral he was in a dreadful state, and his behavior was

appalling. There was no one he didn't blame. He accused the government, the doctors and everybody in sight of using the wrong treatment on our father and failing to give him a proper funeral." (ibid; p.215).

This is where our quotes from Svetlana end and you should read them again and again to remember her image of Beria.

By the way, Stalin's son Vasily was put into prison by Khrushchev because he accused Khrushchev of being his father's murderer.

And finally, here's a quote from Svetlana's "Only One Year":

"Sometimes my father made fun of Beria, repeating the same old joke while directly addressing the 'Prosecutor,' who would never have taken it from anyone else. The joke was about a Chekist and a professor who lived in the same apartment. One day the professor, irritated by his neighbor's ignorance, exclaimed, 'Oh you! You don't even know who wrote *Yevgeny Onegin!*' The Chekist felt insulted (because he really did not know). Soon afterward he arrested the professor, boasting to his friends: 'I got him to confess it! He was the *author!*'" (Alliluyeva: 'Only One Year'; New York; 1969; p.386; English Edition).

Who was Stalin referring to?

- End of Chapter -