NOT CAPITULATION, BUT STRUGGLE AGAINST REVISIONISTS

July 29, 1963

In short articles the Chinese continue to inform their people and party about the various insults and attacks of the modern revisionists on the Chinese leadership. They are also pointing out the praises which world capitalism is heaping on Khrushchev and his treacherous line. This is their business. But on the other hand, they are not informing the Chinese people about the views of the Party of Labour of Albania, which is defending Marxism-Leninism, exposing the treacherous line of Khrushchev and company, and defending China and its Communist Party. The Chinese comrades are not right on this question. They are sticking to their old tactic, to the stand which they maintained at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This tactic is no longer valid, it is an anachronism and harmful to the communist movement. The failure of the Chinese comrades to publish articles from the newspaper «Zëri i popullit» in their press shows fear on their part. Thus, they are displaying vacillation on this question, and this is neither right nor principled. The Chinese comrades are not advancing in step with events and the times.

If they think that they should not publish our articles allegedly to avoid Khrushchev’s slander that the Albanians are tools of China, this is absurd, because the Khrushchevite revisionists are not hesitating at all to use this action of
the Chinese as something to their advantage, by trying to discredit us and, especially, to present our correct stand as isolated. China is assisting them in this direction with the stands it is adopting. If China is not publishing our articles in the belief that it would place in a difficult position the other fraternal parties, like those of Korea, Indonesia and Vietnam, which are still not maintaining a public stand in defence of China, this, too, is not right tactically.

According to the Chinese tactic we ought to retreat, to go back to the stands of the Koreans, the Vietnamese, or even worse, of the Indonesians. No! This we shall never do! They must move forward, and so must China. Marxism must be defended, and defended strongly, against traitors and renegades. All these comrades know Khrushchev; amongst themselves they say that he has betrayed, that he is linking up with the Americans, that he is causing socialism to degenerate, that he is attacking them openly, but on the other hand, they are delaying their struggle, waiting. What are they waiting for? This is strange. There is a question mark about the future in this. Either struggle with the revisionists or capitulation! We shall press on with the fight.

The line Khrushchev is following conforms to and serves the policy of the American imperialists. The treaty «On the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons», which was signed recently in Moscow, is conceived and dictated by the Americans and accepted without any alteration by Khrushchev. The American imperialists wanted the monopoly of nuclear weapons, Khrushchev gave it to them. The Americans talk about «peace», and so does this lackey of the bourgeoisie, Khrushchev, but meanwhile the Americans are preparing for war, increasing the stocks of atomic bombs for themselves and their friends, while Khrushchev is disarming his own friends, and, with his pacifism, is disarming the peoples. This means to assist the Americans. One side is armed — the
Americans, one side is disarmed — Khrushchev's friends, and the two are jointly attacking China, Albania, accusing them of being war-mongers, etc. It is clear even to the blind, let alone to the Marxists, where and in what direction the modern revisionists, with the traitors Khrushchev-Tito-Ulbricht-Gomulka-Novotny-Zhivkov, etc. at the head, are going with their efforts.

«Reflections on China», vol. 1
A few days ago Khrushchev concluded his visit to Yugoslavia. Both the propaganda machine of the revisionists and the Western press tried to give this visit the maximum «international political significance». It is now clear to all that Khrushchev did not go to Yugoslavia for a vacation, as stated at first. He went there to complete the process of the full rehabilitation of the Tito clique, to unite openly with this band of traitors long condemned by all the communist and workers' parties, to hatch up new plots against the socialist camp, the international communist movement and peace, and to take another step in his rapprochement with US imperialism.

These aims of Khrushchev's visit became immediately obvious from his endless statements boosting the «successful building of socialism in Yugoslavia», the «correct Marxist-Leninist line and the outstanding merits of the present Yugoslav leadership», headed by «my friend and comrade Tito», the contribution of the Tito clique to the «development of the principles of peaceful coexistence», to the «strengthening of the world socialist community», to the «consolidation of the unity of the communist and workers' movement», to the «creative development of Marxism-Le-
ninism», the contribution of the Yugoslav leaders to the «strengthening of the anti-imperialist front», «the good points of the Yugoslav road to socialism», and particularly the «workers' self-administration», which, allegedly, is worthy of special attention and study by other socialist countries, in order to copy it, and the «great role which Yugoslavia should play in the Balkans», and so on.

Tito, on his part, pointed out that certain differences of points of view which still exist are losing their significance in the face of their great common goal. He expressed his satisfaction at Khrushchev's high appraisal of his own activity, of his struggle for «socialism» and the spreading of «communist» ideas and spirit in Yugoslavia, at the attacks which Khrushchev has launched against the communist movement, the Communist Party of China, the Party of Labour of Albania and other Marxist-Leninist parties.

The first main conclusion to be drawn from Khrushchev's visit to Yugoslavia is that, by completely rehabilitating the Tito clique and uniting with it, the Moscow revisionist group has committed itself even more thoroughly to the camp of the enemies of Marxism-Leninism, socialism and peace, and plunged even deeper into the mire of betrayal.

In his August 24 speech at Split, Khrushchev publicly declared: «We note with satisfaction that, on the absolute majority of international problems, the views of the USSR and Yugoslavia are similar... The unity of views and actions of the USSR and Yugoslavia in the international plane is a very important factor in world politics. This unity contributes to the promotion of the principles of peaceful
coexistence in relations among all states.» This, and many other statements of this kind, not only show a complete unity of views between Khrushchev and Tito on matters of foreign policy, but also demonstrate that Khrushchev has made Tito his equal partner in the leadership of world policy. But what role has Khrushchev assigned to his other partners? Apparently, they are to follow the «Yugoslav star» of the revisionist caravan blindly, like puppets.

In the field of ideology Khrushchev himself several times admitted that complete unity had been achieved on the fundamental issues. «For us Soviet communists,» he stressed, «there can be no basic contradictions with the Yugoslav communists.» While at Brioni, on August 28, he told foreign journalists: «We have the same ideas and are guided by the same theory.»

There is no need for a guide to a village in sight. It has now become quite clear to the whole world, even without these public confirmations, that both Tito and Khrushchev are inspired by the same out-and-out revisionist ideas, which have always inspired all the renegades from Marxism-Leninism, and that in their disruptive anti-Marxist practical activity they are guided by the same objectives, namely to extinguish the revolutionary spirit in the international communist movement, to bury Marxism-Leninism, to liquidate socialism and re-establish the domination of imperialism.

Apart from their unity of views and actions in the fields of politics and ideology, Khrushchev also laid the foundations for closer collaboration with the Tito clique in the economic field. The purpose here is clear: he wants to make a contribution, along with the imperialists, to keep this clique on its feet, not only through his all-round political and ideological support, but also through economic aid, in order to make Yugoslavia a showpiece or model of revisionist «socialism». At Rakovitsa Khrushchev stated, «Good economic relations, too, are being established between our
countries. Compared with 1955, the volume of trade turnover between our countries has risen nearly six fold. In 1963 the mutual exchange of goods is 50 per cent up on last year.»

In Velenja on August 30, Tito, for his part, confirmed that, «It is in the interests of both sides that we should extended even further.» Yugoslavia has agreed to participate do this. We have, for instance, already reached an agreement about co-operation in certain branches of the economy, which through our further collaboration will be extended even further.» Yugoslavia has agreed to participate in the «socialist division of labour». Finally it was accorded observer status in Comecon. Tito, of course, has every reason to be satisfied with all this; he is like a horse with two or more mangers to feed from.

During his visit in Yugoslavia, Khrushchev also revealed his determination to support the revisionist course of the Belgrade clique and, naturally enough, this was one of those matters that received the greatest publicity and most enthusiastic welcome from the Western press. Khrushchev revealed himself as a supporter of the Yugoslav road to socialism. In order to do this, he did not even hesitate to come out against the Soviet Union's road for the construction of socialism and communism, to openly criticize Soviet methods of management of the economy while eulogizing the Yugoslav system of self-administration. Are there no limits to his treachery! This is how the Tanjug news agency describes Khrushchev's meeting with the managers of the Rakovitsa combine in the neighbourhood of Belgrade: «While stressing that in the Soviet Union they stick to the principle of a 'single manager', Comrade Khrushchev said that he liked the form of workers' councils and that such a thing was progressive. 'We, in our country,' Khrushchev continued, 'are now seeking new forms of management, in which the public can find its full expression, and therefore,
your experience interests us...’ He emphasized once again that the experience of Yugoslavia in regard to the workers’ self-administration could also prove valuable. A study should be made of things which time had already confirmed. In connection with this, Khrushchev added that he would certainly send a group of functionaries of the party, the trade unions and the economic organs to make a detailed study of these matters in the Yugoslav practice.

It strikes the eye that through its detailed stories and reports, the Yugoslav press highlighted Khrushchev’s opinions and remarks at his meeting with the managers of the Rakovitsa combine, especially emphasizing his high appraisal of «self-administration» and «workers’ councils» as «progressive forms», when, as is known, they are the links to the restoration of capitalism in the Yugoslav economy. However, precisely at the time the Yugoslav and Western press was making a great fuss about these utterances of Khrushchev’s, the Soviet press, which specializes in extolling the «genius» of Khrushchev and which allows no chance to go by without singing praises to his «wit» and «sagacity», for once became surprisingly mute on that day, and published not one word about this meeting. Apparently, the Moscow revisionists do not feel secure, and dare not come out openly before their own people in praise of those revisionist forms of management of the economy, which have nothing in common with socialism and which they themselves, not very long ago, criticized and rejected as anti-Marxist and anti-socialist, and as a variant of the theories of anarcho-syndicalism.

Tito once again strongly proclaimed the superiority of the Yugoslav road to socialism and stressed that it should no longer be specific to Yugoslavia alone, but become the foundation of the work of every party in the socialist countries. And the first successes, according to Tito, have become apparent in the Soviet Union during these last ten years.
His exact words are: «When we speak of workers' self-administration, we are not referring just to the problems and needs of one country in particular. Social self-administration is founded on the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin. That is why Comrade Nikita Sergeyevitch Khrushchev, quite correctly, always attaches very great importance to it. When we were in the Soviet Union we had the opportunity to convince ourselves that extraordinary development in all fields has been achieved there during these last ten years.»

Western observers have found it difficult to conceal their enthusiasm over Khrushchev's approval of the Yugoslav type of «socialism». In Yugoslavia they saw «a Khrushchev prepared to make many concessions, to take many steps forward». They have long regarded Yugoslavia as «a transmission-belt» to carry counter-revolutionary ideas from the West to the East. This is how the BBC expressed it on August 30: «Many observers consider Khrushchev's interest in the 'workers' councils' in Yugoslavia as the most important result of his visit to the Adriatic coast. These councils are nothing else but a symbol of Titoite communism, and constitute one of the main parts of the revisionism which the Soviet Union and the entire communist world officially condemned less than three years ago. The system of workers' councils in Yugoslavia is half communist and half Western. The only danger is that it may fall between two stools. This system, based on two models, is still holding its own. Apparently, that is why Khrushchev is eager to do something similar in Russia. And if he does this he will be acclaiming not only Tito but also the Western economic system.» Meanwhile the mouthpiece of the big US monopolies, «The New York Times», wrote: «The most interesting aspect... is the very friendly attitude of the Soviet Premier Khrushchev towards the Yugoslav system of implementing orthodox communism. This could give rise to big changes in Moscow's economic organization. Yugoslavia has
adopted so many ideas from the West that it can play the role of a transmission belt carrying Western economic ideas to the East.»

Under these circumstances, is there any reason for the imperialist West to have the slightest worry about the results of Khrushchev's visit to Yugoslavia? None whatsoever.

Khrushchev’s demagogy cannot continue for long to deceive the Soviet people, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other communist and workers’ parties with his tales that allegedly changes have been made in Yugoslavia towards socialism, that the Yugoslav leaders are correcting their former mistakes, and consequently, that Yugoslavia is a country which «is building socialism».

Everybody knows how matters really stand, what «changes» have been made there. Daily life brings out many facts which prove that nothing has changed in Tito's Yugoslavia. Only the grave can straighten a hunchback. Tito himself has stated repeatedly that he will discard nothing from his program, that «there is no question of any concession» and that he has not made and has no intention of making any change whatsoever.

He repeated this once again to Khrushchev's very face. Once again publicly reassuring his friends in the West, Tito said: «In connection with the visit [of Khrushchev] rumours are already circulating in the West, conjecturing as to who will make concessions, 'will Tito and the Yugoslav communists enter the camp, or will Khrushchev make concessions to the Yugoslav communists on behalf of the communists of the Soviet Union?' This is altogether out of the question,» Tito emphasized. «There is no question of any concessions. These matters will not be taken up in the talks.» («Pravda» August 23, 1963.)

Tito's words are really meant for other ears. For his part, his assurances are the truth. And the facts show
this: Tito has made no concessions to Khrushchev, but Khrushchev has made many concessions to Tito. The newspaper «The Washington Post», which is very close to the US government and especially to the Department of State, expressed the idea on August 24, that in the present state of international relations, especially «in the Sino-Soviet conflict, Khrushchev stands in greater need of Tito than Tito of Khrushchev. Premier Khrushchev is trying to get on good terms with the Yugoslav leader again.»

Khrushchev’s demagogic tales about the Tito clique’s having changed and corrected its mistakes are intended to prove that Yugoslavia is a socialist country and that socialism is being built there successfully, in order to justify his complete unity with the Tito clique, its final rehabilitation and the inclusion of Yugoslavia in the family of socialist countries and that of the LCY in the ranks of the international communist movement. But this is one of the crudest and most blatant violations of the 1960 Moscow Declaration, unanimously approved by all the fraternal parties, in which the Yugoslav revisionists were branded as traitors to Marxism-Leninism and as agents of imperialism, as splitters and underminers of the socialist camp, the international communist movement and the peace-loving forces and states.

But the course of full unity with the Tito clique shows clearly once again down which road the Khrushchev group is rushing. As the popular saying goes, «a man is judged by the company he keeps». To unite with the Yugoslav revisionists means to unite with the enemies of socialism, the renegades from Marxism, with the splitters of unity and the agents of imperialism, who are conspiring against the socialist countries and the entire world revolutionary movement. Not only has the Khrushchev group united with the treacherous Tito clique but it has launched frenzied attacks on all those parties and communists that, standing
loyal to the Moscow Declaration of the 81 communist and workers' parties, carry out their internationalist duty and expose the Yugoslav leaders, their revisionist ideas and anti-socialist activities. This means that the Khrushchev group has obliterated any distinction between friends and foes, between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism, between defenders and disrupters of unity, and between anti-imperialist fighters and agents of imperialism, and has gone completely over to the camp of the enemies of Marxism-Leninism, socialism, the peoples and peace in the world.

The second main conclusion to be drawn from Krushchev's visit to the Tito clique, from their talks and public statements, is that they have co-ordinated their dangerous undermining activities against the socialist camp and the international communist movement, first and foremost, against the Marxist-Leninist parties which are struggling, in a resolute and principled way, in defence of the purity of Marxism-Leninism and against modern revisionism. This is clearly borne out by a series of incontestable facts.

It is now no secret to anyone that, for some time back, Khrushchev and his propaganda agents have ceased to use the term «socialist camp». This was especially noticeable during his tour of Yugoslavia. In no address, in absolutely no published speech or conversation, can one find such an expression, except at the August 21 banquet, when Tito made a scornful reference to it. The question here is not just that Khrushchev tries to avoid saying anything that might prejudice his «cordial relations» with the renegade Tito, through the use of such «unfashionable» and «unnecessary»
terms as «the socialist camp», towards which, as everybody knows, the Yugoslav revisionists maintain a completely negative and hostile attitude. The fact is that Khrushchev supports and fully agrees with Tito’s hostile attitude towards the socialist camp. When a journalist asked him at Brioni whether «the fact that Yugoslavia does not belong to blocs hinders the Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation,» Khrushchev answered, «No,» and added, «historically all the socialist countries take the same Marxist-Leninist position, for we are linked by common ideas and are guided by a single theory, while other manifestations like 'blocs' and so on are temporary.»

What does this mean? To what blocs is he referring? It is publicly known that the Yugoslav revisionists consider the socialist camp as a «bloc», that when they speak about the so-called «neutrality» or «non-alignment» of Yugoslavia, they pretend that they stand not only outside military blocs and organizations but also outside camps and above camps. Under these circumstances Khrushchev’s statements against so-called «blocs» inevitably give rise to two conclusions:

On the one hand, it is clear that Khrushchev fully accepts Tito’s reactionary position, regarding the socialist camp as «a military bloc», as a negative phenomenon that has led to the aggravation of the international situation and as something «temporary».

On the other hand, in this way Khrushchev supports and justifies the demagogic manoeuvres of the Tito clique about the so-called «neutrality» and «non-alignment» of Yugoslavia. But how can there be a country which is socialist and at the same time «neutral» in the great historic struggle between the two camps, the socialist and imperialist camp? There was a time when Khrushchev himself condemned and rejected this absurd pretension of the Tito clique. «The Yugoslav leaders,» he declared at the 21st Congress of the
CPSU, «claim that they stand outside blocs, above camps, although, in fact, they take part in the Balkan bloc, which consists of Yugoslavia, Turkey and Greece... The leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia consider themselves highly insulted when we tell them that they are sitting on two stools. They assure us that they are sitting on their own Yugoslav stool. However, this Yugoslav stool seems to be largely supported by the US monopolies! And precisely for this reason this position 'outside blocs', the neutrality to which the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia are so attached, has a strong smell of the US monopolies, which are fostering 'Yugoslav socialism'. The history of the class struggle still knows of no example in which the bourgeoisie has supported its class enemy materially or morally, and assisted it to build socialism.»

Thus, Khrushchev has now decided to cancel out the existence of the socialist camp and does not hesitate to come out openly against it. Here we have to do not only with a major concession of principle to Tito's revisionist and anti-socialist positions, but also with a real betrayal of the vital interests of socialism, with an attempt to undermine the socialist camp itself and to liquidate it.

In the context of his activities to undermine and split the socialist camp, the international communist movement and their unity based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, Khrushchev deemed it necessary to revive the idea of pan-Slavism during his visit to Yugoslavia. From the very first day he spoke of «our traditional friendship», «our common historical destiny» and «our common final goal», in this way implying and stressing the special links between peoples of the same ethnic group. This is not the first time that the Khrushchev group, departing from the Marxist-Leninist class position, has tried to build its political platform regarding the relations between states and parties on such ethnic, racial, and
even religious grounds, even going so far as to make one effort after another for rapprochement with the Pope of Rome in order to win the support of Catholics. But to replace the class principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism with pan-Slavism or with other similar non-Marxist criteria means to undermine the very foundations on which the workers' international solidarity and unity, and the relations among the peoples of the socialist countries and the communist and workers' parties are based. It means to degrade and seriously damage the cause of socialism. This is one of the many proofs of the complete and hopeless ideo-political degeneration of the Khrushchev group.

Moreover, Khrushchev did no fail to assign a special, if not a decisive, role to Yugoslavia in the Balkans and even in the world(!).

It was for this purpose that in his speech at Velenja, he extolled in a one-sided way the fight of the Yugoslav peoples against the fascist invaders, while deliberately denigrating the great contribution of the other Balkan peoples to the anti-fascist war. Of course, the peoples of Yugoslavia waged a really heroic war for the liberation of their country, but the other Balkan peoples, also, were in the thick of it and shed a lot of blood in that war. The setting of one people against another, the tendentious praising of the fight of one people and the deliberate ignoring of the contribution and the struggle of other peoples, which Khrushchev resorted to, reveals once again his aims of disruption and provocation by inciting the nationalist and chauvinist passions of his friends whom he supports. Khrushchev also took the opportunity to encourage Tito's old dream of a special role in the Balkans, of his hegemony in some sort of «Balkan Federation». Thus, during this visit Khrushchev revealed himself nakedly to be the complete Machiavelli, politically and morally.
Khrushchev and Tito puffed themselves up by posing as «masters of the fate» of the Balkans. When a foreign journalist asked them about this in Brioni, observers could not fail to notice Khrushchev’s angry reaction, when he said: «Why do you stick your nose into our affairs?» Just what lies hidden behind the phrase «our affairs» was revealed by the British news agency Reuter, which wrote on August 18: «The possibility of new Balkan projects, in which Yugoslavia would play a primary role, cannot be ruled out.» The peoples of the Balkans are justified in asking: Since when have the affairs of the Balkans become the «private business» of Khrushchev and Tito? Who gave them the monopoly of the right to speak and act in the name of the Balkan peoples, to make deals and divide the roles behind their backs and to their detriment?

But what is this Tito clique to which Khrushchev wants «to entrust the fate of the Balkans»? And what is the «special role» which Khrushchev has assigned to it? Like the other peoples of the Balkans our people are very well acquainted with the features of this gang of renegades and agents of imperialism; they are well aware of their intentions and role. Are we perhaps to forget the active role of the Tito clique in the Hungarian counter-revolution? Can it be that the subversive and conspiratorial activities of the Yugoslav revisionist agents, which have been discovered and exposed time after time in Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania and Rumania, have been forgotten so soon? The Albanian people will never forget the betrayal and plot by Koçi Xoxe and others, the plot hatched up by the Yugoslav revisionists in collaboration with the Greek monarcho-fascists, the US 6th Fleet, and some traitors against the sovereignty of our country, nor will they forget the numerous acts of provocation and hostility against the PR of Albania and our people. Tito accompanied his «dear» friend to the vicinity of the northern borders of our Homeland in a de-
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monstrative way. Khrushchev did not go to Titograd to pay a «flying» visit to the ethnographic museum of Cettigne and see the relics of Nyegosh. He inspected the Albanian-Yugoslav border in order to express his support and approval in this way for the profoundly hostile stands and intentions towards our people of the Yugoslav revisionist leaders, who are notorious for the attempts they have made on the freedom and independence of our socialist Homeland.

It is clear that «the special role» of Titoite Yugoslavia in the Balkans, indeed in the world (!), is directed against the vital interests of the socialist camp and the international communist movement; that its aim is to undermine and split them; and that this is a component part of the campaign of the Khrushchev-Tito revisionist united front against those fraternal parties which firmly uphold the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism. The clearest evidence of this is the fact that Khrushchev’s entire visit to Yugoslavia was accompanied by a frenzied campaign of monstrous, co-ordinated attacks launched by Khrushchev and Tito and others against the Marxist-Leninist parties.

The third main conclusion to be drawn from Khrushchev’s visit to Yugoslavia is that he has moved closer to the imperialists, particularly to the US imperialists.

It is a publicly known fact — and Tito has more than once confirmed it by his own words — that «socialist» Yugoslavia has become a «bridge between the East and the West». Khrushchev is now openly using this «bridge» not just to make approaches to, but actually to cross over to the West.

A direct communication line between the Kremlin and
the White House was inaugurated recently. This line, the «Red Teletype», will serve Khrushchev to engage in direct talks and strike new bargains with Kennedy to the detriment of the peoples. However, Kennedy and Khrushchev also have a «live teletype» — Tito, who is serving their common aims well and «in a creative way».

Expressing his great satisfaction over the conclusion of the tripartite Moscow agreement, which is another capitulation of the Khrushchev group to the imperialists, a fraud and a betrayal of the cause of socialism, Tito said in his speech at the banquet given by Khrushchev on August 21, «Of course, this is still insufficient. Much still remains to be done.» Tito, the inveterate agent of imperialism, is not satisfied with the results achieved, he wants further steps to be taken along this road which he long ago made clear to his revisionist colleagues. This is the road of the «economic and political integration of the world», in other words, the road towards the gradual and peaceful integration of socialism into capitalism, about which Kennedy has also spoken.

In analysing Khrushchev’s public utterances in Yugoslavia, everybody notices that he not only refrained from attacking US imperialism openly, but did not refer to it even once by name. He confined himself to the usual terms of the revisionists regarding «the most aggressive circles of imperialism» and very rarely at that. The AFP news agency pointed out: «This moderation of language can be explained, of course, by Khrushchev’s desire to maintain the tone of ‘peaceful coexistence’, and also to avoid placing the Yugoslavs in an embarrassing position with regard to Washington.» But this is not all. Khrushchev did not make any open attack against the imperialists, because his views regarding imperialism in general, and US imperialism in particular, are the same as those of Tito, and because he has now set out on the road to full reconciliation and rapprochement with the
imperialists. Western observers point out on this occasion, not without justification, that while awaiting the decision of the US Congress on the re-establishment of the «most favoured nation» clause in the trade relations with Yugoslavia, Tito will have something to report and bring as compensation to President Kennedy at the White House on the occasion of the trip he is to make to Latin America soon, that is, the new and more moderate attitude of Khrushchev.

The attitude of the Tito clique towards US imperialism and the attitude of US imperialism towards the Tito clique is no secret to anyone. Their relations are like those of master and servant. It is clear that the approach to and unity with the servant and agent of imperialism, who is nurtured and kept on his feet by US dollars, is a big step towards approach to and unity with his master — US imperialism. Everybody sees this. People see and condemn this open betrayal by Khrushchev who, by uniting with Tito, is rolling out the carpet in anticipation of the not so distant day when the imperialists and the revisionists will celebrate Khrushchev's complete rapprochement with Kennedy. The facts are now so clear that it is difficult even for those who, for some time, have made it their habit to follow Khrushchev in his great betrayal, to refuse to see it. A truly great responsibility towards their parties, their peoples and the international communist movement falls on those leaders who have had and still have their reservations about Tito, particularly, and about what Khrushchev and Tito are doing, and yet who keep silent, who are afraid to say what they think and dare not express their opinion. Embracing Tito leads to embracing Kennedy as well. Are all those leaders who call themselves communists, but who remain silent, in favour of this, too? The Khrushchev group is trying to persuade the communists and the peoples that unity with Titoite Yugoslavia means unity with socialist and anti-imperialist forces and is in the interests of the
socialist camp and the international communist movement.

In order to judge whether this union really has such a character or not, let us look at how the West reacted to Khrushchev's visit to Yugoslavia and whether the capitalist world was perturbed by this «new rapprochement» of Belgrade with Moscow.

The facts show that, far from being disconcerted, the West and the imperialist powers received this visit with lively interest and welcomed it. In one of its reports from Belgrade, «The Washington Post» said: «Western diplomats are pleased with the tone and results of the talks between Tito and Khrushchev.» Therefore, Washington did not cut off its credits to Tito over his «rapprochement with Moscow», but, on the contrary, is taking steps to increase them.

This fact alone is sufficient to prove how false is Khrushchev's demagogic prattle that unity with Tito allegedly means unity with the socialist and anti-imperialist forces. If it were so, if this unity were spearheaded against imperialism, then we would not be hearing praises and congratulations from the imperialists for the Yugoslav road and the rapprochement of the Tito clique with Khrushchev, but would be hearing those anti-socialist and counter-revolutionary attacks which the imperialists usually aim against their class enemy — the proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist party and the socialist and anti-imperialist forces of the world.

From this it is not difficult to understand who will benefit from such rapprochement and unity. The imperialists have good reason to welcome and support it, because they see in this unity the establishment of a united revisionist front against socialism and all the world revolutionary, anti-imperialist forces and movement.

The fact that Khrushchev's visit to Yugoslavia ended with no big rally in Belgrade or final statement or com-
munique must attract attention. This is by no means accidental, because, although it was officially announced that Khrushchev went to Yugoslavia for a holiday, Khrushchev and Tito themselves stressed more than once that this visit had been turned into a working visit. In reality, this was the only possible conclusion to be drawn from the talks between Tito and Khrushchev in this situation.

Both Tito and Khrushchev are very fond of publicity. They would have liked to consecrate their complete unity publicly, but at the same time they had to restrain themselves to avoid openly disclosing their cards and damaging their position.

Tito, of course, was also the more interested in holding a rally and having an official document published, because he would have liked to see the Moscow Declaration torn up officially, to see the final seal put on his complete rehabilitation, Yugoslav «specific socialism» given the «right of citizenship» and the LCY finally included in the ranks of the international communist movement as a «Marxist-Leninist party» and to have their joint views on present world development and the problems of the international communist movement sanctioned. In other words, Tito would have liked everything Khrushchev said in secret talks and publicly in support of the Yugoslav leaders and about their common concepts to be proclaimed in a joint official document.

But Khrushchev still feels obliged to keep up his disguise, because however carefully a joint official document were drawn up, it would still be in flagrant opposition to the Moscow Declaration. Khrushchev is obliged to resort to manoeuvre and deceit while still trying to hide behind the Moscow Declaration. He calculates that the work must be done, that is, Tito must be rehabilitated, the Moscow Declaration violated, his activities co-ordinated with the Yugoslav revisionists and plots hatched up together with
them, but all this cannot yet be sanctioned by any official
document, which would be another powerful weapon in the
hands of the Marxist-Leninists.

Tito's dissatisfaction on this issue could be clearly
understood from his farewell speech at the airport. While
Khrushchev confined his speech to generalities, Tito con-
cretely defined the results of the visit and the talks with his
guest. He enumerated the points on which they agreed,
and did this in such a way as to leave no doubt that he
intended to remind his friend of the pledges he had made
during his visit and to advise him not to forget them.

These are the main results of Khrushchev's visit to
Yugoslavia and his talks with the Tito clique.

The whole world is becoming more and more convinced
that with his policy of unity with the Belgrade renegades
and his rapprochement with imperialism, Khrushchev is
betraying the Soviet people and the other peoples of the
socialist countries, the international communist and workers'
movement and the national liberation and anti-imperialist
struggle of the peoples of the world. Khrushchev had the
audacity to say at Brioni: «I have something to boast about!»
True enough. Khrushchev does have what to «boast» about.
He can «boast» that he is carrying out the aims of the rabid
class enemies of socialism and the Soviet Union, he can
boast that he is seriously endangering the achievements of
the Great October Socialist Revolution, that he is wrecking
the socialist camp and splitting the international communist
movement to the benefit of international reaction and US
imperialism.

But the peoples and history neither forget nor
forgive. The Soviet people who have emerged trium-
phant from many severe trials in their history, their
Communist Party, the other peoples, the communists of the
world and all revolutionaries will not forget and will never
forgive Khrushchev for his high treason to Marxism-
Leninism, the international working class, the peoples, socialism and peace.

Keeping their revolutionary vigilance, their spirit of proletarian internationalism and unbounded loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and the interests of the proletariat and the people at a high level, the true Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries will fight with determination and selflessly against modern revisionism, for the preservation of the purity of the Leninist teachings, and against imperialism and reaction for the triumph of socialism, communism and peace in the world.
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THE STRENGTHENING OF THE PARTY MUST BE A CONSTANT CONCERN FOR ALL ITS MEMBERSHIP

From the closing speech delivered at the 11th Plenum of the CC of the PLA

December 14, 1963

The plenum we have held was necessary and will be of great assistance in further strengthening the work of the Party.

As was correctly stressed, we have achieved successes in our work, but we also have shortcomings. And the shortcomings are not only at the base, they are shared by the whole Party, at the base and in the leadership. Therefore, the criticism made here of the leaderships of the party basic organizations, the state organs and party committees in the districts was quite correct. Likewise, there was no lack of criticism of the leadership, that is, us, the comrades at the centre, whether of the apparatus of the Central Committee or the government, and it was very correct, reasonable and necessary. And when the apparatus of the Central Committee was criticized, this implies automatically that not only the directors, chiefs and instructors and others, but all of us who work here, from me to the other secretaries of the Central Committee, were criticized. When the ministers and other government organs were criticized, the Government and all the comrades working
there were criticized, too. The criticism made at this plenum has a very positive and Marxist aspect; here shortcomings, which we must correct, were pointed out in a Marxist-Leninist spirit.

But can it be said that these are mistakes of line in ideology or political or organizational distortions of principle? We are sure that there are no mistakes and distortions of this nature in our Party, because our Party stands firm on the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, whether ideological or organizational, defends them and keeps them unsullied. And taking its stand on these strong theoretical and organizational foundations, the Party has always been able to orientate itself correctly in defining its internal and external general policy for the development of our economy, the building of socialism, because it has always had an unerring compass...

Albania does not live isolated, it has to do with friendly and enemy states, which pursue various policies towards it. There are people who yesterday posed as Marxist-Leninists, but who were traitors and are now in power. They have changed their entire political, organizational and ideological orientation and are in open struggle against Marxism-Leninism. While our Party, always standing firm on the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, has been able to adapt its tactics in a Marxist-Leninist way, according to the situation, so that they conform to the interests of the construction of socialism and our people, to the interests of the independence and sovereignty of our country, of proletarian internationalism and the struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism. This is a great success for our Party, and it will continue on this road, because ours is a revolutionary party, which has been, is and will always be the vanguard of the working class and all the masses of the working people in Albania, because it bases itself firmly on its close ties with the masses of the people. This is one
of the decisive Leninist-Stalinist weapons. I emphasize Leninist-Stalinist, because it is known that Stalin has said: «Cadres decide everything.»¹ In the opinion of our Party such a thesis is correct. In the work of Stalin, in no instance can one find the cadres being opposed to the masses of the people. On the contrary, one will find stressed there the thesis that the party must link itself as closely as possible with the masses of the people and rely on them, because if it is cut off from them, it dies. What is more, to emphasize this question, J.V. Stalin referred, by way of example, to the figure of Anteus. Therefore, if it is claimed that Stalin said that «cadres decide everything», while ignoring the masses of the people, this is incorrect.

But why is the party called the vanguard of the working class? Because those who take part in the party are the most conscious people of the working class, those to whom it has entrusted the leadership on the basis of its ideology. The party has complete trust in its members and they are cadres. When we speak of the party we mean that the people in its ranks are at a higher level than the masses as regards their Marxist-Leninist world outlook and communist consciousness. Khrushchev's thesis that his is «the party of the entire people» is a fraud. To the revisionists, this means the party of a new bourgeois capitalist class which is formed in the new conditions. It is a party which will bring to power new Kerenskys, who have emerged and are forming a stratum there.

Which is that Marxist-Leninist party that does not fight for its cadres? We threw ourselves into the National Liberation War, but if we had not created the Party, if the people had not had confidence in a handful of people who began to do the work of the Party, if within the great mass of people who hurled themselves upon the enemies, arms in hand, individuals had not stood out, cadres who won

¹ See note 2 on p. 362 of this volume.
the confidence of the people and the partisans, who led them in the glorious battles, if these individuals from the ranks of the people, who led our glorious army and liberated the country through war — if all of these factors had not existed, would it have been possible to imagine that such a situation could have been created in our country? How can anyone think we can go forward without cadres? If today, tomorrow, or the day after tomorrow, the Party were to think of running the metallurgical combine, for example, without first training cadres, this project would never be carried out. How can socialism be built, or all these projects be run without cadres?

Neither in life nor in his works did J.V. Stalin say that the cadres' path should be paved with gold, that they should be given privileges and become bourgeois. It is an important issue that all the cadres should live and work in the revolutionary spirit of the Party, not cut themselves off from the masses, that they wage a persistent struggle against all the pressure of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois mentality, which they bring in from their lives and which still exists during the building of socialism and will continue to exist during the stage of transition to communism, too. It is another matter, and would be extremely harmful, if cadres were to be granted such favours which put them in privileged positions, above the masses, if they were to behave arrogantly towards them, and to underestimate the masses.

We are convinced that our line on these questions is correct and Marxist-Leninist. The Party and our cadres have never forgotten the great cause of the masses. It is the masses who create abundance, who change the situation and move the mountains. But the masses are led by the Party, by the cadres who, themselves, have come from the masses. It is the task of the Party to keep these cadres clean like the people, the working class and our revolutionary
peasantry, to temper them as modest people, not megalomaniacs, not as exploiters seeking power and wealth. In this direction our Party has done and is doing a colossal job.

Let us now return to our question. The work of the Party is many-sided, great, arduous, but glorious. When we speak about the work of the Party we should not set limits. There cannot be two ways about the question of leadership by the Party. The Party is in its apparatuses, in the state, in the ministries, the army, the organs of justice, and everywhere. The Party decides. All the party members, in the forefront of the struggle of the masses, express the great interests and desires of the people, who, under the leadership of the Party, have created possibilities for a better life, for advance. A great patriotic, revolutionary, socialist consciousness must be aroused. This is done and should be done better among the people on the basis of the work of the Party by everybody — by him who works in the Party apparatus, as well as by him who works in a plant, enterprise, in the government or in a ministry, etc. To this end ceaseless work in a revolutionary spirit should be carried on by everyone in the sector to which the Party has allocated him. Expertise in these sectors should in no way be utilized for personal, subjective interests.

The Party has trusted its member to modestly put all he knows in the service of the masses wherever he works, to be more militant and ready to sacrifice himself more than anyone else. Neither he who works in the state, nor he who works in the Party can say that his work is more valuable to the Party. Perhaps a worker in the party apparatus may say, «My work is much more valuable.» Or a worker in the state or an enterprise may say, «It was I who raised this question», «I accomplished this task while those people of the Party only talk, only hold meetings». Those who think so are on the wrong road, they are-
thinking in a subjective way. In both these instances it emerges that neither one nor the other understands what the unified, universal leading role of the Party in all its links is. On this issue, it would be good that all the party comrades, and especially those whom the Party has elected, should understand that the people in the administration are appointed.

In the Party, in party committees or basic organizations, the communists elect their leaders to carry out an exceptionally big task. We have explained what this is, but let us say once again: this does not mean that the party comrades should not concern themselves with economic questions, for without this, all the work with which a party worker is charged is baseless, it is up in the air. The problem is that the party worker, instructor, or secretary should engage in economic matters, but not through figures and statistics, since they can be found within two minutes and the Party has appointed special persons to deal with them. The thing is you must know all about the economic tasks allocated to you, the method of organizing them through the ideological, political, and organizational work, and encouragement, and the technical aspect, from the small enterprises right up to the biggest ones, which the member of the Party must know how to handle as a party worker. Hence, he has extremely great tasks, first, to uplift the political and ideological work, to strengthen the organizational links, as defined by the Party and the state, and through these links, to exert an influence on the spirit of the communists. This is a colossal undertaking. Then why do the party workers displace the state organs, their comrades who are just as loyal and capable as those who work in the party apparatus? The chairman of an executive committee may very well become a party secretary, since he has all the qualities of a secretary, while a secretary may very well become chairman of the executive committee any time
you like. These are all cadres which the strength of the Party has brought up and educated. They are able to do their work, and do it very well. But they need the help of the Party, because without its help, without the mobilization of the Party and its mobilization of the masses nothing can be done. Everybody in the Party is clear about this. Therefore, in view of this great task laid down by the Party, here I am referring to the party workers especially, it is impermissible and unacceptable that the party committees and meetings of party activists should be involved, for example, in deciding how many drums of water should be gathered to water the vines or how many picks and shovels are required to dig holes, etc.

I interrupted a comrade at this point in his contribution and interposed when he said, «Willy-nilly, we, too, get involved.» But why should we get involved and neglect the main question without which the state power cannot carry on? The build-up of industry, agriculture, work in the army, the organs of justice, etc., call for great mobilization, for without this mobilization, which the Party brings about, nothing is done. Each sector will proceed on the road of the Party only if people are tempered as they should be from every viewpoint. The Party, the basic organizations and the party members themselves will do this tempering. This is achieved through continuous ideological-political work. We must never forget that the pressure of the bourgeois remnants, the capitalist pressure, and now the great revisionist pressure, influence people in our country, who are inadequately tempered, whether party members or not. This means that the class struggle continues in these forms, and it should be waged with the greatest severity against this pressure, as the Party has done up till now.

I shall make a criticism of you, comrade secretaries. We know that you work hard and do not spare yourselves but if you and your comrades have in mind the political
and ideological work, in all its complexity, the strengthening of the organizational links with and the mobilization of the masses, you should drop the minor things immediately, go thoroughly into problems and work with people. This is how things were done in the time of the war. Experience is experience. During the war I was for some time in Tirana, where Comrade Gogo Nushi, Comrade Figret Shehu and others were my collaborators. We all know that those were very difficult times because the enemy was close on your heels, but we did not fail to visit every basic organization and left no family without contact. The leadership of the Party knew everything about people’s lives, knew what each of them thought. The Party also knew that they were not all pure gold, there were people with wrong ideas, there were heroes, convinced and disciplined people, reliable people, but there were also intriguers, windbags, cowards, etc., etc. In those difficult times the Party displayed great patience towards these people. Take the case of Anastas Lulo; the Party tried for a long time to correct him, but when it saw that he and his associates were becoming dangerous in their activity, it crushed them. But, as a result of the work and care of the Party, many people were corrected and tempered.

Now times have changed, the Party is in power, therefore our tasks today are great. However, there are many cadres, too, and they have now made great progress, so our possibilities are colossal. Compare for yourselves what a low cultural and educational level you had at that time, but your spirit was revolutionary, you fought the enemies without compromise and mobilized the people and inspired them with the ideas of communism. This persistent work enabled the Party to advance. Therefore, today, just as at the time of war, this practice of work should be kept alive, the good method of work, the great importance of man for us, should never be forgotten, because man will
build the factories, dig the canals, and make inventions. But man is man, he meets difficulties in life, has feelings, shortcomings and strong points. We know very well how all these things are going to be channelled on to the right road. Only correct, collective and individual work, day by day, by the Party with these people will make everything go well. But we still have shortcomings and the blame for this falls; first of all, on the people who work in the party apparatus.

Life inside the Party should be militant and dynamic...

Then, we follow the principle that the basic organization should show initiative, but if the instructor of the party committee keeps it constantly under his tutelage, even if he were a «prodigy» he could not always attend every meeting of every organization, and we would be departing from the principle of promoting the initiative of the basic organization. In this direction we have many shortcomings, which we should put right. We have established forms of work, instructors, but what accounting do we demand from them, what instructions and advice do we give them? We should recognize that these are not thorough and complete, are not a diet containing all the calories they need. We are capable of doing the work better, but we must put aside those things which are not our concern, we should know how to share out the work well, then know how to teach the instructors so that they can teach others, and must create a synthesis of work that will be clearer and more mobilizing for the masses of the Party.

We always go to the base during campaigns. We are not opposed to this, we have to go there during campaigns, but when a campaign is conducted, the impression is left that something new is under way. For 20 years we have been carrying out campaigns. But does it always require a whole lot of people to go to the basic organization to get it out of the mud? This is not right. This does not mean
that we should not go to the base at all. Now the basic organization is not in that former situation. We should have more faith in it, but this faith should be real, well-based, Marxist-Leninist faith. And this work is not done in a hurry, or with one word. No. The work of the Party is difficult and tiring. Therefore, the rank-and-file of the Party, who have elected us, trust us to do it, and we bear great responsibility before the people. We must do this if we want to really strengthen the work. By this I do not mean to say that we are doing nothing, but the proceedings of this Plenum must bring about a great change in all aspects of the work of the Party.

Comrades, we must fight bureaucratic leadership, and this struggle should be carried out first at the top, since the danger exists, and then right to the end at the base. I am not referring only to the problem of letters and memos, because there is bureaucracy in this direction, too. All of us are clear about the ideological, political and organizational principles. You have to be a dogmatic, bureaucratic secretary if you cling to forms alone, considering them unchangeable when in practice, even though the Central Committee has established them, they have begun to fail to justify themselves.

In this direction, the Party comrades who are linked with the masses should create new forms of work, therefore, we should not ring up to ask whether we should implement this form or not. When it yields results it should be put into practice immediately.

Hence, we should not be bureaucrats when something is good and worth putting into practice; it is a very good thing that ideas emerge from below. We should always be full of initiative in a correct way, but we should educate the people to be prudent because even initiative is harmful if it is overdone. People well-educated by the Party consider the general interest first, and then personal interest.
Revisionism, about which we spoke, is a dreadful disease and we must profit from the struggle which we wage against it. We should not simplify the issue, but when we say we must profit on the basis of the teachings of Lenin, Stalin, our experience, and so on, this requires, above all, that we carry out the fight against bourgeois and petty-bourgeois remnants, against all negative, sometimes hostile, manifestations even of some members of the Party, etc. We must not forget this, because the revisionists base all their activity on these remnants. They and their parties have degenerated because they no longer base themselves on Marxism-Leninism, on the Leninist principles, in the organization of the party, the economy, and policy. The Titoite. Khrushchevite, Czech, and other revisionists are working furiously to bring about the degeneration of their parties into bourgeois, capitalist parties and to completely transform their countries from socialist into capitalist countries; they are working to create strata of the new bourgeoisie in their countries, made up of people with degenerate views, not with party views. The Khrushchev and Tito regimes have created extremely favourable conditions for functionaries; first of all. With his treacherous revisionist transformations in agriculture, Khrushchev has also created exceptionally favourable conditions for all leaders of the kolkhozes; and to the intelligentsia, first of all to intellectuals of high calibre, not only within the country but abroad, too, he has granted exceptionally great privileges in order to have them as support for his own ends.

You know about the question of factory management in Yugoslavia which is capitalist in nature. A generation of new capitalists has been created there. Hence, all factory management is capitalist, which, under today's conditions, gives the workers a crust of bread, too. But the capitalists at the base are the support of capitalists at the centre. Khrushchev is applying this method of work, by crea-
ting new capitalists in the Soviet Union, too. In the industry of the Soviet Union, Khrushchev has begun and continues to create managerial councils, composed of degenerate and corrupted, anti-Marxist, bureaucratic leaders, who are gradually becoming a basis for the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. Concerning agriculture in the Soviet Union, this, too, has begun to go downhill, and it will continue to do so. In all directions there is not a shred of party work with sound Marxist-Leninist criteria; revisionism prevails in the country, the masses are being fed a constant diet of anti-Marxist ideology and the Western way of life. You should bear in mind all the demagogic propaganda carried out by radio, press, etc., and should not think that it does not influence our people too. Do not forget the Tirana Conference\(^2\), the anti-party elements, agents of the Yugoslav Legation and revisionists, who rose against the Party. They accused the people of the party and state leadership of allegedly living in luxury. But such a thing does not exist in our country, and if there are individuals with such tendencies, the Party must educate them and

2 The 3rd Conference of the Party of the Tirana city was held in April 1956. At this conference, enemy elements, who had managed to be elected as delegates, attacked the Marxist-Leninist line and leadership of the Party. They put forward their anti-Marxist platform, the aim of which was the revision of the political line of the Party in the spirit of the 20th Congress of the CPSU. This whole hostile affair had been hatched up by the revisionist forces and was guided by the Belgrade revisionists through the Yugoslav Legation in Tirana.

Misusing the internal democracy of the Party, the anti-party elements created a tense situation at the conference. The Central Committee assessed the situation as very serious and sent Comrade Enver Hoxha to the conference. He exposed the aims of the revisionists and put forward the resolute stand of the PLA for the preservation of the purity of its revolutionary policy and practice. The delegates to the conference fully supported this stand of the Party and condemned the attempts of the enemies to divert it from its Marxist-Leninist line. The revisionist plot failed.
cure them. This is an important task, and if we go to sleep over it then we have committed the gravest crime. We should be working for today, for next year and for the centuries to come. We have laid good solid foundations, on which we can rely to keep our Party pure in the future. Our responsibility on this question is great, therefore alien manifestations must be combated by all of us. Our Party does not follow the revisionist course.

Had we based ourselves on the principles of the revisionists, or those of the Tirana Conference, and increased salaries, things would have been different. But we did not see anything abnormal as regards salaries. Our task, and that of party members is and should be, first of all, to make proper savings, to safeguard the wealth of the people, and especially people's consciousness. If we protect people's consciousness, we shall successfully overcome the difficulties we meet, we shall be able to fight them more successfully than up till now.

As to the disease of revisionism, we should not forget that in the Soviet Union the rot began at the top. We should bear in mind that the tendency to seek personal comfort, to want more than your fair share, the tendency that «I deserve more and before someone else» is not expressed among the working class and the revolutionary peasantry, but among the people of the administration and the intellectuals. Therefore, not only should the Party work very hard, with vigilance and justice, with the working class and be inspired by it, but it should work carefully especially with the office cadres, so to say, with those who run things, with all the intellectuals. I do not like the expression, which I have heard here and there, and does not seem right to me, when someone asks a cooperation...

3 In the PSR of Albania differences between high and low rates of pay have been steadily reduced. Thus in 1976 the ratio was 1 to 2.
tive chairman: how many head of sheep does «your» cooperative own? Why the «your»? Say: how many head of sheep does «the» cooperative own? This is very important. What I mean is that if this seed falls on suitable soil, bad things may happen. Naturally, a great deal depends on the leadership of the cooperative. It is bad for the cooperative if it does not have a good chairman, but if only the chairman is good he cannot do anything on his own. Therefore the strength of the Party, of the collective, is everything, and any other viewpoint is wrong. We have chairmen of cooperatives who are swell-headed. Perhaps the cooperative chairmen take high salaries, and we must look at that particularly, and then there are also chairmen who never get mud on their shoes or have a pick or a shovel in their hands. In such a chairman, willy-nilly, the view of private property may be created, as though the cooperative is his and he is the bayraktar*. If you say to the chairman that it is thanks to him that things are going well here, or that there is nobody like him, then the collective is underestimated, the chairman speaks arrogantly, becomes swell-headed, becomes despotic, thinks that he alone knows everything and that nobody can do better than he. If such a thing may happen once with someone from the working class, or twice with a poor peasant, with those of intellectual origin it is ten times more likely to happen.

That is why more extensive ideological work should be done with everybody in order to implant the feelings and general interests of the collective, which ennoble the individual. The collective works in close connection with and under the leadership of the Party, therefore everyone should march in step with the collective, nothing is outside the collective, and any sort of interest outside the collective should be eliminated, especially for intellectuals...

* Chief of the clan.
We should bear in mind that we have an enormous amount of work ahead of us in the agricultural cooperatives. We have many weaknesses and shortcomings in the basic organizations in the countryside. The question of why there are no admissions to the Party in this or that village should concern us. The comrades put it well, and it is correct that where there are no admissions, the party basic organization is like stagnant water breeding mosquitoes and disease. In the basic organizations where there are no admissions there cannot be a healthy spirit, a feeling of taking it easy is created, cliques come into being, and some people form the idea that they are competent, irreplaceable, and that there is no need for others. People who think like this are wrong.

Therefore, young people must always be coming into the basic organizations, in the enterprises, administration, the village and suburbs, since the youth bring into the Party their great willpower and energy, their pure love for and faith in the Party. The older party members must educate and temper the young communists for the future. It has taken over twenty years on the anvil of the Party to make us Marxists and enable us to work more or less well and without mistakes. So many years will not be needed for the youth; but the older communists should think of the morrow and prepare cadres.

The question of admissions to the Party is of great importance. This should not be done in a stereotyped manner and through campaigns. The principle of admissions to the Party, as defined in the Constitution must be respected, but even this is not sufficient, because not all the problems can be included in the Constitution. We would be making a mistake if, now, proceeding from what we have said, we were to go all out to have admissions to the Party from the countryside. We have to examine this question organization by organization. When we see that the
basic organization of a cooperative is militant, there is criticism and self-criticism, young and old are in the forefront of the struggle, and there is nothing unhealthy there, why should we rush to admit young people to the Party, with and without criterion, simply because we have a directive? If we have such a basic organization, it should create a group of non-party activists, from whom new elements can be admitted to the Party at any moment. Whereas in another basic organization, where no admissions to the Party have been made for a long time, the basic organization should make the effort to work with the best people, with the most revolutionary cooperativists, in order to admit new elements to the Party, and, you might say, «stir up the stagnant water there». It is not the secretary of the organization, who has grown accustomed to this situation, who will do this, but the members of the Party and with the vigorous work of the party committee, with the aim of bringing new people into the organization, thus creating a healthy Marxist-Leninist spirit.

So, if two or three new party members are needed in a basic organization of village, let them be brought in. Or in some other village where the peasants turn out to be very conservative towards women, work should be done in the basic organization of this village to admit young women to the Party, to shake the communists and the whole village free of their conservatism towards women. In another village where the question of women is advanced we need not do such a thing in particular.

Therefore to carry out sound party work for today and for the future, we should study and analyse every directive «bit by bit», examine it in all its aspects, then set about the work in an organized manner.

In this way we shall always have a true Marxist-Leninist party just as we, ourselves, and the people want it to be.
which will cope successfully, as up to now, with these situa-
tions we are living through for the construction of socialism
in the conditions of our struggle against imperialism and
revisionism. Much depends on the work the whole Party
carries out wherever it works, much depends on the me-
ths for the improvement of the activity of the party
workers, party committees, but much depends also on the
organization of their work by the state organs...

We say and will go on saying that the basic organiza-
tion should be militant. But there are hundreds of prob-
lems like these we have mentioned which should be
brought up in the basic organizations, where such things
should be criticized severely because they obstruct
the work, and we should not occupy ourselves with
trifles. It is not a case of come along, we are going to
criticize you because we saw you drinking three glasses of
raki today, or because you spoke angrily to your wife, etc.
This may be done, but not just this. The trade union organ-
ization should not concern itself with why someone has
not taken his wife to the cinema. This is not the main thing
the basic organization should concern itself with, but
it should take up the problem over which the Party is
most worried, while as to him who did not take his wife
to the cinema, which has made an impression on you, you
could go on a comradely visit to his house and invite him
and his wife to go with you to the cinema.

Therefore the most important problems should be raised
in the basic organization and then we shall see
how it will become militant, how decisions will be taken;
since there are all sorts of forms. The party leadership in
the enterprises, factories, etc., is not bad, on the contrary,
it is very good. The Party takes part directly in the man-
agement of factories, because the plan which comes there
is discussed with the party members and with the
workers, and the Party, for its part, mobilizes the masses
to carry it out. Therefore, to make everything go as it should, the basic organization should mobilize the people, educate them, combat their shortcomings, and it must become consistently militant. Not only the secretary of the basic organization, but the party committee and the secretaries of party committees should take a great interest in this problem. They should be experts. First of all, the secretary of the party committee who is in charge of the industry should be an expert, so that when he goes to a factory, he can say to the party comrades of the textile mill, for instance, that they have worked very badly, because the twill has come out so and so, can stress that they must be more careful, more conscientious, that is, he can speak in such a manner as to mobilize the people and not simply jot down figures. Therefore, comrades, efforts must be made in these directions.

Then the question of letters, both in the Party and the state, is a great problem. Every day I receive many letters, let alone the other secretaries of the Central Committee. These letters are very important. One hour each day I devote to reading the letters I receive. All of us understand their importance, but the reason that all these letters come to us is that the people of the Party and the state, in ministries or enterprises, are not doing their job properly. There are letters with unfounded complaints, but there are also things which should be set right and are, in fact, put right when the letter addressed to us is sent by us to the base. But why are things put right after the matter comes to us? These people have gone to the base, first of all, but have not found the solution to the problem. This should make us think.

There are too many people in the ministries, and they should be reduced. Just one fact: thousands of letters have come in and gone out of 17 central government departmental offices in a matter of 9 months, especially in the Minis-
try of Agriculture and that of Industry. Why so many letters and so much red tape? We have to take into account the time spent by those who write all these memos. Three-quarters of these letters have to be dealt with by the Party and the state. Imagine how many people are needed to read these letters, to write the necessary notes for us, and finally to reply to the people concerned. Three-quarters of these letters should be avoided, therefore let us take measures to fight the bureaucracy which obstructs the activity and creativity of the working people. The bureaucracy of paper work must be combated. If we have fewer people in the apparatus, the work will go better. We must make improvements in this direction.

I believe that this plenum will be very helpful. We must put the work on a better course, this is indispensable, necessary for our Homeland and for the victory of our Marxist-Leninist cause in general.