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

From the letter to the CC of the CPSU and the CC of the CP of China

August 27, 1960

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

The Party of Labour of Albania has the most profound respect for all the communist and workers' parties of the world and expresses its great regret that, for the first time in its revolutionary history, it was obliged to take such a stand as it took at the Bucharest Meeting, which is in

1 A copy of this letter was also sent to the parties of other former socialist countries.
opposition to the stand of the majority of the delegations of the communist and workers' parties. Our Party, like any other Marxist party, has the right to express its opinion according to its conscience and to adopt the stand which it deems correct.

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

As we know, Marxism-Leninism teaches us that not only when the mistakes of a party, which has millions of members in its ranks and a long period of activity, are being examined, but even when the mistakes of a single communist are examined, we must be very careful, very cautious, we must thoroughly analyse all the causes of the mistakes this communist has made, we must strive to convince him of his mistakes, take his case to the party basic organization or to the appropriate forum of the party, where the case should be examined with the greatest objectivity on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles, aiming at the attainment of a single end: the improvement of this communist and putting him on the right road. If we make such great efforts in order to analyse the mistakes of one communist and save him from these mistakes, then it is self-evident what great efforts should have been made before «exchanging opinions about the mistakes of a party» at an international communist meeting, such as the Bucharest Meeting. Regrettably, however, this was not done.
The Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania proceeds from the Marxist-Leninist principle that, in order to express its opinion about the ideological and political mistakes of another Marxist party, it must first be convinced with facts about the existence of these mistakes, and this conviction must be established by analysing them in the plenum of the Central Committee of the Party, without passion and on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist method, all the relevant arguments concerning this question, that is, both the arguments presented by the side making the criticism and the arguments presented by the side which is being criticized. After this Marxist-Leninist analysis has been made by the plenum of the Central Committee of our Party, then and only then, shall we be in a position to express our objective opinion about the mistakes of another party. We think that this is the fairest method of examining the ideological mistakes of a fraternal party. The Central Committee of our Party will use this method to reach its final conclusions about the «mistakes» which the Communist Party of the Soviet Union attributes to the Communist Party of China, and will express its own opinion on this at the coming meeting of the communist and workers' parties in November this year. We think that to act otherwise, to act as was done at the Bucharest Meeting, would mean to condemn a fraternal party without thorough and dispassionate analysis of all the facts in order to arrive at a conclusion as to whether the said party has made mistakes or not. In these cases haste is harmful.

For these reasons, at the Bucharest Meeting the delegation of our Party declared that these disagreements had arisen between the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, and that efforts for their solution should have been made through discussions between the two parties and, if no solution were achieved,
then the case should have been brought before all the other fraternal parties to hear their opinions; that the Bucharest Meeting was premature and not in conformity with the Leninist norms; that in regard to the disagreements between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, the Party of Labour of Albania would express its view at the coming meeting of the communist and workers' parties in November.

Of course, the disagreements between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China are of great principled, ideological and political importance, and the solution to these disagreements is of vital importance to the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement. Not only are all the Marxist parties, including the Party of Labour of Albania, interested today in the solution of these disagreements, but, moreover, they are duty-bound to make their contribution to the solution of these disagreements, in as much as these disagreements have now gone beyond the bounds of relations with the Communist Party of China and have assumed an international character.

After the Bucharest Meeting, some communist and workers' parties of the countries of the socialist camp, including the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, have sent the Central Committee of our Party copies of the letters which they have addressed to the Communist Party of China. These letters contain assertions which convince us even more strongly that our stand at the Bucharest Meeting was completely correct and Marxist-Leninist. In our view, these assertions prove that the Bucharest Meeting was not confined simply to the «exchange» of opinions about the «mistakes of the Communist Party of China», and that the Communist Party of China has been condemned *de facto* by the parties which sent us these letters.

In addition, it is stressed in these letters that at the
Bucharest Meeting the «complete unity of all the communist and workers' parties» in the criticism they made of the «mistakes» of the Communist Party of China was confirmed. Such an assertion implies that the Party of Labour of Albania, too, has aligned itself with the majority of the other communist and workers' parties in regard to the «mistakes» attributed to the Communist Party of China. If this refers to the approval of the communiqué of the Bucharest Meeting, we agree that there was unity of all the parties, for the communiqué was approved by our Party, too. But if this refers to the «unity of all the parties» concerning the disagreements between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, this does not correspond to the truth, at least as far as our Party is concerned, because the Party of Labour of Albania did not associate itself with the majority of the other parties, and it will express its view about these disagreements at the coming meeting of the communist and workers' parties in November this year, as it has many times declared. To affirm that there was «complete unity of all the parties» at the Bucharest Meeting in the criticism of the «mistakes» of the Communist Party of China means to distort the facts and the truth.

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

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

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

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

For the Central Committee
of the Party of Labour of Albania

Enver Hoxha

Works, vol. 19
September 29, 1960

Dear Mehmet,

1) We are carefully following the speeches of everybody and can describe them with Shakespeare’s words: “Much ado about nothing.” In fact, the ado is great, especially when the “self-ado,” if we may adopt this term, is deafening. Long live the echoes and the variety shows, because that is all that will come out of it, and we are of the same mind as you, that it turned out as we had predicted. Of course, in the end, as a conclusion, it will be said that the meeting was positive and, as “Rrapo Lelo” has already expressed it at lunch, “we did well to come”.

2) These close negotiations with the Belgrade arch-revisionist are shameful. Their continuous and open talks are certainly cooking up new disastrous actions...

“Rrapo Lelo’s” admirers and lick-spittles consider this terrible capitulation a great success. I think that as to those who you think are worried about this situation, but who haven’t the courage to speak up about it, you should tact-

---

1 Comrade Mehmet Shehu, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the PRA, had gone to New York to take part in the proceedings of the 15th Session of the General Assembly of the UNO.

2 An ironic reference to Khrushchev. Rrapo Lelo, a kulak from the Mallakastra region, enemy of the people.
fully let them know our views on these manoeuvres. Why should we keep our correct views so much to ourselves? Maybe one of them will tell «Rrapo Lelo» our views, but so what! «Rrapo» will understand that we do not talk with him about these questions, so let him jump up and down if he likes.

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

4) ...  
5) ...

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

My regards to Behar. His boy is well. Tell him to look after Lukanov³ well lest the breeze carry him away.

Affectionately yours,

Shpati⁴

³ At that time Minister of Foreign Affairs of the PR of Bulgaria, whom they were about to dismiss, as they did later.
⁴ One of Comrade Enver Hoxha’s pseudonyms during the National Liberation War.
October 1, 1960

Dear Comrade Hysni,

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

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

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

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

---

* Useful (Russian in the original).
** Ironical diminutive for Zhivkov.
In no way must we fall for the tricky manoeuvres of the Soviet revisionists. We must give the Soviets and others to understand that we agree to work on this material, to remove from or add to it but this material will be put together as a conclusion of all-sided discussions which will be held in November and will show how the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the decisions of the Moscow Meeting [1957] have been carried out, who has departed from and who has implemented them consistently. A reassessment of Bucharest will be made not only on the basis of the Soviet «facts», but also on the basis of facts that the other parties, too, will bring up on this question.

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

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

Regards to Ramiz [Alia] and the comrades.

I embrace you,

Enver

I am writing to you in haste because the plane is about to leave; therefore you will find it difficult to read. Yesterday we were at the Chinese comrades and in my speech I fired the first «warning shots».¹

¹ On September 30, 1960 Comrade Enver Hoxha delivered a speech at the Embassy of the PR of China, in which the Marxist-Leninist stand of the PLA towards the urgent problems concerning the international communist movement was made clear.
RADIOGRAM

TO COMRADE MEHMET SHEHU IN NEW YORK

October 1, 1960

Dear Mehmet,

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

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

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

---

1 The preparatory commission of the 26 parties.
carefully, and I will make suggestions to Hysni about its essence.

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

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

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

I embrace you,

Shpati

Works, vol. 19
Dear Comrade Hysni,

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

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

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

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

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

...The Khrushchev group has lined up on its side a large number of parties, which it caught on the hop, and is taking advantage of their trust in and love for the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It will be difficult for these parties and these communists to have the courage to adopt a clear-cut stand immediately. This is true. But it becomes very dangerous to leave this matter to drag on, because revisionism will do its own dreadful work, will compromise people and parties, will carry on large-scale demagogy with propaganda and with large material funds. Within ten years the Tito clique completely disintegrated the party, and threw the genuine communists and patriots into jails or killed them. Therefore the most correct stand is that at this meeting we should carry the matter through to the end, as Marxists. It must come out nakedly who is on an anti-Marxist road, who is betraying Marxism-Leninism and violating the 1957 Moscow Declaration. This is the Khrushchev group. Therefore the meeting should dot the i's. The i's must be dotted about Bucharest, and those who have made mistakes must admit them at the
meeting like Marxists and go back to their parties to correct them. The Khrushchev group will not admit its mistakes, then it is responsible for splitting the ideological unity of the international communist movement. We are on a correct Marxist-Leninist road. The Khrushchev group has deviated into revisionism, therefore our struggle and time will expose it. But there is one other thing, the threat of a split and the split itself will speed up the process of the bankruptcy of the Khrushchev group and its isolation from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other parties, which will be shocked and reflect on the matter better and sooner. Otherwise, these parties pretend to be outside the conflict, indeed, they consider it a success that it did not come to a split, and it was left to time to prove whether the Soviet line or ours is correct. The slogan «let time verify the line», as some advocate ... is to the liking of Khrushchev, and is an opportunist, revisionist and anti-Marxist slogan. It contains in itself the fear of carrying things through to the end and radically curing the mistakes. This idea serves to preserve the Khrushchev status quo with a bit of patching up, which Khrushchev has not, does not, and will not take any notice of at all. This slogan helps the revisionists to go further, to spread revisionism. In a word, if this slogan is adopted, we can be sure that great dangers will follow.

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

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

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

Vito is well. She and Nexhmije are toiling at their lessons. Your son is well, too. On Sunday he had lunch with us.

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

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

I embrace you,

Enver

---

1 Comrades Vito Kapo and Nexhmije Hoxha, members of the CC of the PLA, at that time were taking a correspondence course at the Faculty of History and Philology of the University of Tirana.

* Uncle (Russian in the original).
Dear Comrade Hysni,

Today we opened the Plenum. Things are going well, the discussions about the school reform are continuing. The contributions to the discussion are good. We shall continue to discuss this problem tomorrow, too, and then we shall examine the draft-directives of the five-year plan.

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

1) In regard to your speech, I liked it. The problems were dealt with well and its tone was correct. If the opportunity presents itself, either to you in the plenary meeting, or to Ramiz in the commission, you should defend the Communist Party of China more strongly, since the main assault is against it, the main batteries are aimed at it. They hate us just as much as the Chinese, and there is no doubt that they will attack us, but their main attack will be concentrated on the Communist Party of China, since they estimate, and with reason, that the greatest potential danger to them is the Communist Party of China, and they think: «if we can defeat it, the Albanians will be no problem». Therefore, for the time being, our positions are not
being attacked, **but we will be attacked**, especially when we turn our volleys on Khrushchev they will accuse us, too, of being «dogmatic» because we take the side of China. We must show the Soviets and their supporters that ours is a Marxist-Leninist line, that we are fighting the revisionist and right opportunist views, as well as the slanderers and falsifiers.

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

Apart from those parties that we know have taken wrong positions, don’t attack those that hesitate, that lack the courage to say what they think, those that say nothing about our Party or only something of little consequence. Don’t push them into open conflict with us, but manoeuvre. The attack should be concentrated on the main enemy, on those who have caused the opportunist deviation and who attack our correct line. Apart from the Soviets, Bulgarians, Poles and others of this ilk, if these parties make some half-hearted attack on the Communist Party of China, because they cannot do otherwise, don’t put the pressure on them. Leave it to the Chinese to judge the best tactic to follow.

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

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

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

I would say you should have another look at the formulations about the «transition to socialism» so that the spirit of our point of view comes out better. I remind you once again of the question of the «cult»; which should be formulated in another way, because in November we are going to take it up in connection with Stalin and the attitude of Khrushchev. There is a passage about «factions», have another look at it to see whether it has been put there as a trap. One last remark: on page 27, 2nd paragraph of the draft-declaration typed in Tirana, or on page 14 of your text, Lenin's idea should be brought out more clearly: «... as long as the bourgeoisie does not impede the workers' movement and its vanguard in its ideological, political, and economic struggle...» (this is a quotation from Lenin). But the idea, that the Soviets have introduced subsequently, should be made more precise, because there they moan Nehru and others, to justify the aid they provide them.

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

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

Do not hesitate to give the Bulgarians and Poles their due, for they are hand in glove with the Soviets. The others, too, are not much different, but see what you can do. You should go easy on the Czechs if they do not attack us. I am telling you this because in New York Novotny behaved towards Mehmet as usual, as if nothing had happened. The Hungarians, too, to our knowledge, are not very active, regardless of their speech there.

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

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

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

The comrades went to the priyom* given by the Germans. I did not, as I wanted to write you this letter I will

* Reception (Russian in the original).
send tomorrow by plane. I did not go to the Germans’ reception also for the reason that I wanted to make them realize that we did not take it kindly that their delegation did not return our official visit, although they had decided the date and the composition of the delegation. The reasons they gave for not coming were unconvincing, but the real ones are those we know and over which you are fighting there.

«Fiasco» in the UNO! With a capital F. Mehmet leaves New York on the 11th of October and arrives in Tirana on the 20th or 21st.

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

Yours affectionately,

Enver

Works, vol. 19
October 13, 1960

Dear Hysni,

Reading the second speech of the Chinese delegation reinforced the belief which I expressed about the first speech. The Chinese are not for carrying the matter through to the end, they are for regulating matters by means of phrases in resolutions or declarations. They want to «correct what can be corrected and let time correct the rest». It seems to me that they do not understand what a threat the Khrushchev group represents to the world communist movement and are ready to coexist with this group. It does not depend on us whether or not this group will remain in power, but it is essential for us to expose this group, headed by Khrushchev, as it deserves.

The Chinese leaders are doing nothing in this direction, they are doing the opposite: they attack Stalin and compare Khrushchev with Lenin.

They agree that we must make a good or somewhat good declaration, agree that the Soviets must retract the accusations and slanders which they have made against China, but is this sufficient? I have the impression that the Chi-

---

1 In volume 19 of the Works of Comrade Enver Hoxha this letter was published in an abridged form to avoid making public the disagreements with the CP of China at that time. In this volume the letter is published in full.
nese will be satisfied if we get half-way. We cannot be satisfied just with this. In their two speeches in the commission not a word is said against the main culprit, Khrushchev, but on the contrary, they speak well of him, because «he criticized Stalin correctly». I have the impression that the Chinese comrades are hesitant and, if the draft-declaration turns out more or less good, I foresee that their contribution at the meeting will be even more academic, like their speeches in the commission. It seems to me that the Chinese comrades do not realize that the Khrushchev group has very weak positions, both ideologically and politically. Then should we be satisfied to defend ourselves or should we go on the attack? In my opinion the Chinese are defending themselves and not attacking and are not going to attack later, either. The Chinese comrades are worried about the impression and atmosphere that might be created by their attack among the delegates of the commission or later in the meeting. This is not good. I have told you once that if I were in the skin of the Soviet revisionists, I would accept the field that the Chinese are opening to me, because there I find good grass and could browse freely. However, the determined revisionists do not change so easily, they will not accept everything. Just as Tito «assisted» us by going from treachery to treachery every day, Khrushchev and company will do the same thing. But they will do great damage. I think that the speeches of Teng Hsiao-ping in the commission indicate a seeking for compromise with the Soviet revisionists: they must withdraw the accusations (this is a kind of retreat and exposure) and we must refrain from attacking them and exposing them to the end.

I am preparing my speech for the meeting as we have decided, but, as you can guess, it cannot be equated with the form, the tone and the content of the speeches of the Chinese in the commission. As things are turning out, at
the meeting, too, we shall be alone in our stand. The majority will be angry with us and will abuse us, but we shall be right and time will prove us so. You can be sure that at the meeting no one will dare to agree with us. But we shall do our duty and defend Marxism-Leninism. The Chinese hesitate to separate the Khrushchev group from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union itself and put themselves on a course which naturally hinders them from saying what they feel and openly denouncing those who are at fault. If you don't put your finger on the culprits and sort out the wheat from the chaff, then you bind your own hands and harm yourself. No, those who say, «How could the glorious Soviet Union or the great Communist Party of Lenin be attacked for the fault of a few bastards?» are not going to make an impression on us. If you do not make a division between them, then of course, you are obliged to soften your criticism and the fault is not revealed. We say: «It is precisely to defend the Soviet Union and the Party of Lenin that these 'bastards' must be exposed and the criticism must not be softened and deviators covered up.» In that case, irrespective of whether an «отлично» declaration is brought out, the danger remains, indeed it becomes more threatening both for our camp and the communist and workers' movement.

But we shall see; and, as Khrushchev says, «God grant» that I am mistaken in my judgement. You have not told us when you expect the first act to be over, because it has been going on for about three weeks!

There's nothing fresh from here (there are plenty of the usual things with the Soviet people here). Mehmet left New York on the 11th and will arrive in Tirana on October 20-21.

Best regards to you and Ramiz,

Enver

* Brilliant (Russian in the original).
P.S. I think that before you return to Albania you should talk with the Chinese delegation about how they intend to present these matters in general at the Moscow Meeting, will they put them forward in an «academic» form, or will they give the thing a bit of fire. It will be good if you could put forward our opinion in general terms, but don't say, this is what we are going to do, but this is what should be done.