Dear Comrades,

Today you are happy to receive your new party cards. I, too, am very happy that I am here in Shkodra amongst you, at this solemn moment of the distribution of new party cards to some members of the party organization of your district.

Naturally, you are happy to get the new cards, but you have some regrets at parting with your old cards, because you have a series of memories linked with them. Together with them, carrying them next to your hearts, you have fought with self-sacrifice during the Anti-fascist National Liberation War, have carried out the major post-Liberation tasks, have made so many sacrifices, which have seemed to you as no more than your simple duties, and you have put all your energies into carrying out the great tasks with which the people have charged you with honour. Hence your old cards have accompanied you in your daily struggle.
But all the same, you are happy to receive your new cards, because although the cards are changed, the work of our Party goes on uninterruptedly, in a single brilliant line.

It has great importance for us Albanian communists that the party cards are not distributed every year as occurs in some parties of other countries, as well as the fact that they are not distributed while carrying out a re-examination of the political and ideological revolutionary activity of the communists, as occurs in many other parties. The re-examination of the situation of party members in our country has been carried out once, and then it was essential, in order to temper the Party, to purge it of those elements who had managed to sneak their way into the Party by concealing their past.

The Party of Labour of Albania follows a correct revolutionary Marxist-Leninist line, a political, ideological and organizational line such that admission to its ranks has become one of the most ardent desires and aims of every Albanian. Every communist must know that admission to the Party does not bring personal advantage, does not allow him to gain even a pin-prick more than the others, but on the contrary, charges him with serious tasks, demands sacrifices, demands that he is always in the forefront of the struggle and, when the need arises, is the first on attack and the last to retreat, requires that he is honest and studies continuously.

When he joins the Party, every communist feels that he is one of the members of a great, strong family, closely linked with one another by the lofty aim of the triumph of true freedom, not only for his compatriots, but for all the freedom-loving peoples of the world. Admission to the Party develops the communist’s mind, makes him strong as steel, with pure feelings, makes him kindly and generous, but not pacifist, makes him feel for his people and all who suffer from oppression and enslavement, and stern against
THE COMMUNIST IS THE FIRST ON ATTACK

those who seek to deceive the people and lead them on a wrong road.

He who joins the Party sees that it is not a sectarian Party, shut away, or a corrupt, unprincipled social-democratic party, which struggles only to gather votes, to deceive the working class, with the objective of prolonging the existence of capitalism and keeping the people in bondage. No, our Party is a quite different sort of party. Our Party differs, also, from the revisionist parties, which have no conscious discipline in their ranks because their aim is to divide the proletariat in its struggle against capital and imperialism, while our Party is a Marxist-Leninist proletarian party, tempered in battles with the class enemy. The proletariat knows that it is faced with a savage enemy and that it can triumph over it only by organizing and uniting its forces and having a conscious discipline. The proletariat has learned this discipline in struggle, with bloodshed and toil. This conscious discipline has become the line of our Party.

Hence the communists enter the Party knowing that here are certain rules which they must apply with high political consciousness, because only in this way can the triumph of the revolution and the construction of socialism and communism be assured. Since our Party is such, and since it educates its members with a lofty revolutionary spirit, it has not been necessary to make frequent changes of documents in our Party or to re-examine the whole life and activity of the communists. This is a great victory.

Of course, this does not mean that all the Albanian communists are cut from the one pattern, have no shortcomings, or never make mistakes. No. There are comrades in our Party who do not fully understand the great tasks with which they are faced, do not carry out the tasks with which they are charged as they should, are not always in the forefront of the work and an example of everything,
or do not make sufficient efforts in regard to their communist education, although the overwhelming majority fight self-sacrificingly on the correct line of the Party. But the norms of our Party are such that the communists assist one another to successfully perform the tasks for which the Party is responsible; the Party tries in various ways to ensure that even those who have a low cultural level or other shortcomings are corrected, become part of the vanguard and true communists.

Our Party is a steel party which has gone through great tempests and has withstood them successfully, triumphing over savage and cunning enemies. The Party has educated its members politically and ideologically to advance on the revolutionary road and to know how to discern the enemy and his methods of work, to distinguish those who make mistakes out of ignorance from those who consciously try to damage the cause of the Party and the people. The Party has educated the communists to criticize anybody who is not following the right course without hesitation. We still have a great deal of work to do in the direction of raising the level of consciousness of the communists so that each of them will look with a critical eye at the daily work everyone does, to see whether or not it serves the general interests of the people and the Party. If something is being done in the interests of the people and the Party it must be carried out. In the opposite case the communist must be vigilant.

Good criticism and self-criticism takes place not only in meetings but also continually, in the course of work. When a communist talks with his superior and considers that he is wrong, after listening attentively he should tell his superior of his opinion. In other words, this is a criticism. In this case the director or party secretary must not say that his word is law because he is superior, therefore his order should be executed even when he is wrong; this would not be
a correct stand. If he is wrong, the director or party secretary should admit his mistake there and then. Those communists who act in this way will always carry their work forward. Thus there will be less official criticism and self-criticism.

Official criticism and self-criticism have greater importance than the critical comment which might be made to the director or party secretary in the course of the work, because he might accept this but then continue as before. It is a different matter, however, when the question is raised in the party basic organization because here there are not two or four eyes, but many, which see whether he makes self-criticism just to pass the matter off, or whether he has understood his mistake and feels the proper responsibility for it. Your comrades in the party basic organization, looking you right in the eye, understand whether or not the words you say are sincere. If you are sincere the Party understands you. There are people who are not very free with words, but with those few words they have they say, «Comrades, I made a mistake and I give you my word that I will not make such mistakes again,» and the others understand that this communist says these words sincerely. In this case there is no need to say, «Go into matters more deeply, comrade!». However, there might be another communist who is very sharp with his tongue, who speaks for an hour and a half justifying himself and there might be some short-sighted individuals who say, «What a wonderful self-criticism!» Therefore, comrades, wherever there are shortcomings and mistakes we must strengthen our work, not only to carry out the tasks which the Party puts before us, but also to carry out our duties to the international communist movement to the best of our ability.

Our Party of Labour, which stands in sound Marxist-Leninist positions, has not only successfully faced up to the struggle against imperialism and revisionism, but has become an example to all the other parties and revolution-
aries of the world, showing them that, for the revolution to triumph and socialism to be built, requires a party constructed on the principles of Marxism-Leninism. The parties which are guided by these principles must defeat the demagogy of the modern revisionists who, to conceal their own treachery, raised the question of the cult of the individual of Stalin. Khrushchev's aim under the disguise of criticism of the cult of the individual was to discredit not only the figure of Stalin, but also the work of Lenin, the construction of socialism and communism in the Soviet Union. That is why our Party has a major duty to expose this gang.

The modern revisionists see clearly that there is a sound revolutionary situation in the Party and among the people in Albania, that all have set to work together for the construction of socialism, and at the same time, they keep the rifle handy. The modern revisionists know that the Party of Labour of Albania and little Albania itself have become a spark of Marxism-Leninism. This spark, which seems like a pin-point in the ocean of capitalist and revisionist Europe, is causing the revisionists exceptionally great damage, therefore they are carrying on a great campaign of slanders and intrigues against our Party and our country, but their weapons have been broken and always will be.

In the countries and parties where the revisionists are in power, the pot has begun to boil and the lid is bound to blow off. Both in the Soviet Union and in the former countries of people's democracy, the dictatorship of the proletariat has been turned into a bourgeois dictatorship. It is no longer directed against kulaks and foreign agents, who enter their countries from abroad in tens and thousands, but against the people and communists, who do not accept the betrayal. Thus, in the Soviet Union and the former countries of people's democracy, the prisons and concentration camps are being filled. The revisionists make a
spectre of the Party of Labour of Albania and accuse it of imposing terror, while in fact there is terror in their countries, and this they have even written in the Constitution of their parties. What Tito does secretly, Zhivkov, who is the most servile lackey of Khrushchev, declares openly in the Constitution of the Communist Party of Bulgaria, where it says that those who do not follow his line are «dogmatic» and «sectarian», and therefore must be immediately expelled from the party, regardless of whether they have fought and their chests are covered with medals. Thus the Bulgarian revisionists have begun to carry out purges in the party. This shows that they are in a bad situation and weak, therefore they cannot use the just weapon of the party to educate and convince people, but they arrest, imprison and banish. Hence the dictatorship of the proletariat is used by the modern revisionists against genuine communists and to open the way for bourgeois ideology to enter their party and countries. However the demagogy of the revisionists knows no limits. If earlier there were few who understood the betrayal of the revisionists, today there are thousands, while tomorrow they will become hundreds of thousands, irrespective of the furious terror. The communists have known terror in the struggle against capital and fascism and they are not intimidated.

With the exposure which the Party of Labour of Albania has made of it, things are not going well for the Khrushchev group in any direction. Faced with the defeats it has suffered, the sound communists and those who were deceived at the start are rising, the cause of the revolution is steadily advancing, because the more repression there is, the more the revolution mounts. Thus the revolution will begin again in the Soviet Union because the revisionists, just like the capitalists, never voluntarily give up their power. Now the revolutionary elements are finding one another, becoming acquainted and are organizing.
Although Khrushchev's secret agents are being strengthened day by day in the Soviet Union, leaflets are being distributed under the name of «the Communist Party (Bolshevik) of the Soviet Union». In the other countries such as Bulgaria, not only the people, but even some of Zhivkov's men are speaking openly against his policy.

At these moments we are faced with major tasks. Our Party has always carried a heavy burden on its shoulders and it will do so until these traitors are completely defeated, because the modern revisionists are allies of imperialism and their purpose is to bring about the degeneration of Marxism-Leninism and communism. This is the main direction which American imperialism has given Khrushchevite revisionism. Khrushchev is in accord with imperialism on many major questions and will continue to link himself ever more closely with it in order to discredit socialism. He has thrown mud at the Stalin era; he alleges that terror and murders characterized that period, while today socialism is being built everywhere — in India by Nehru, in Egypt by Nasser and in Iraq by Aref and even Guy Mollet is fighting for socialism in France, etc. This means to discredit socialism and to preach the construction of socialism within the framework of capitalism.

All Khrushchev's talk about disarmament is a bluff. American imperialism is well aware of this. With his talk Khrushchev wants to tell others, «You disarm while I'm going to have weapons and bombs.» He thought he would force our Party and country to surrender through his actions, but his plans failed, because our Party has long experience in struggle against enemies.

Hence you should be happy to receive your new party cards today. This card is small but it sums up and symbolizes all the stern struggle waged by our people whom the Party has raised to their feet. The Party taught the people how they must fight and unite, what ideal must lead them
and what spiritual and moral means were needed to fight and conquer the external and internal enemies. In this great struggle, in which the communists were the standard-bearers, our Party wrote glorious pages. Here in Shkodra the first communists such as Qemal, Vasil, Vojo, and hundreds of others fought to spread communist ideas and it was they who threw themselves into the liberation war right from the first days and gave their lives in the flower of their youth. Their names, and those of all of our comrades have been written in this small card, and it includes the villages which were burned, the places and crags where the war was fought. In this card have been written the great deeds of the Party: the creation of partisan fighting units, brigades, divisions and army corps, the creation of our cadres from the ranks of the working class and the working peasantry, who were not trained like the enemy officers in schools and academies, but whom the Party taught how to fight, to encircle the enemy and wipe it out and made them capable of defeating it.

The Homeland was liberated. Those who fought with weapons came down from the mountains, but those who did not take up the rifle and go to the mountains also fought, in the city. The whole people fought. Even a small act of sabotage, any hindrance, however small, inflicted on the enemy in its work was a great assistance to our just struggle. After Liberation, the country was devastated, but those who had fought and those who had not taken up arms were mobilized immediately for the reconstruction of the country, which changed its appearance within a short time. Many enemies were put in their place. They got their due desserts. The Party was severe with the enemies of the people and understanding to those who obeyed the people's laws and the laws of the Party. On the one hand, socialism was built and, on the other hand, those who had made mistakes were educated.
Thanks to the correct policy of our Party, a great love was inculcated for the Soviet Union, for Stalin and for all the other communist parties which fought against fascism and began the construction of socialism. Through the correct line of our Party we achieved the successes and blessings we enjoy today. Hence all these things, beginning from the Anti-fascist National Liberation War, the old things it smashed and the successes that we achieved in the socialist construction of the country, are written in these small pages of the party card.

Twenty years have passed since the time of the liberation of the country. How few factories we had then and how many we have today! And we shall have many, many more in the future. You will see more because you are young, but even those who are 50 years of age now will live to see that within twenty years an amount of building will be done in our country far greater than can even be imagined today. The five-year plan which is being drafted is a majestic plan. When we carried out the 1st Five-year Plan, on some maps we showed the factories built during that time with lights, one here one there. If you take the map of Albania now, however, you will see that it is filled with lights, while with the factories which will be built during the coming five-year plan, the map will be completely filled with red lights.

Major successes have been achieved in agriculture also, in collectivization, in draining swamps, in irrigation works and in mechanization. If we compare these things with the past, the situation is as different as day from night. The investments of the coming five-year plan will be exceptionally high and increased yields in agricultural products will ensure that the people are supplied even better. With the building of the chemical fertilizer plant alone we shall give agriculture a great boost. The number of tractors and bulldozers as well as other means will be increased in order
to exploit the irrigation possibilities everywhere, and so on.

Our successes in the cultural revolution have been written in the party card. Today there are schools all over the country, ranging from the elementary schools to the University. In the past you could count the cadres with higher education on your fingers, while today, in every factory and zootechny station we find a great number of cadres with higher education, graduated from our University or institutes. This has been made possible because the Party gave people the opportunity to learn, because without learning, without knowledge, there can be no progress.

It's a great joy to go to the factories because one sees that they are in the reliable hands of people who love their profession. Friends who come to Albania are astonished at the work of our people and they tell the people in their countries: learn from the Albanians because they are doing marvellous things. They see the skill and determination of our cadres in their work. The education of cadres in the spirit of serving the people is an important problem. When they complete their own schooling, these cadres must set to work to raise the workers, too, to the highest category by teaching them theory. Such are the people that our Party educates.

The time has come when each year more than a thousand cadres graduate from our higher schools, both day and night schools. However, this is insufficient. Recently the Political Bureau took the decision to set up a series of higher scientific research institutes which will give a great impulse to the development of our science. The duty of our schools is to train higher cadres trained in theory and practice for the great front of production, while the best of them, those who are most outstanding in mathematics, physics and chemistry, will go to the scientific research institutes, where they will be assisted by specialists with greater experience. We have such specialists, both old and
young. There the Party will open perspectives to them so that they make efforts to extend production in all branches of the economy and to solve many problems which arise in the development of our country. For example, how much of what fertilizer you should apply to improve land which has high acidity must be known, but this cannot be done in a mechanical way. Therefore our scientific institutes will study in a scientific way how much nitrogenous or phosphate fertilizer must be spread on this land so we will get from it not just ten quintals of wheat per hectare but much more. These institutes will also study many other questions, for instance, in regard to rare minerals, will do research, prospecting, etc. In the future, other scientific institutes will be set up and they will serve as the basis for the creation of the Academy of Sciences in our country.

Hence, in the party card has been inscribed the brilliant future of Albania, the construction of socialism and communism, the struggle which we have to wage against imperialism and modern revisionism, as well as the struggle which we must wage against alien remnants which exist in people's consciousness, which when the work of the Party is weakened, raise their heads, are encouraged by the enemy element within the country, by the clergy and foreign radios. In the face of this situation, the work of the Party must be greater, more wide-awake and more organized.

We must not rest content with the successes we have achieved but must hurl ourselves into the offensive to strengthen the Party even more, to raise the glory of our people even higher, and to carry out in the best possible way all the tasks with which we are charged by our glorious Party and this will bring our people great joy and a state of plenty.

To be a member of the Party of Labour of Albania is a great honour, because it has borne and bears a great burden on its shoulders, but difficulties do not overwhelm
the communists. On the contrary, they make them more courageous. Tempering its members with the immortal principles of Marxism-Leninism the Party says to them: Forward, always forward!
THE EDUCATION OF THE WORKING PEOPLE WITH THE COMMUNIST MORALITY IS A KEY PROBLEM

Closing speech at the 13th Plenum of the CC of the PLA

(Extracts)

July 9, 1964

HOW WE SHOULD UNDERSTAND AND APPLY CRITICISM AND SELF-CRITICISM

Unlike other weapons, the weapon of criticism and self-criticism cannot only kill you (in this direction we should never use it), but can also cure you, and save you from evils (in this direction and only for this purpose we should use it).

1 The plenum heard, discussed and unanimously endorsed the report of the Political Bureau of the CC of the PLA «On the Further Strengthening of the Ideological Work of the Party for the Communist Education of the Working People». Comrade Enver Hoxha also made a speech at the plenum, in which he dwelt at length on the problem of the education of the working people with the principles of communist morality. He dwelt in particular on the question of work and the socialist attitude towards it: on mental work and work in production, on the question of criticism and self-criticism, which appears in this volume.
Whether this good aim is achieved depends on how this weapon is used by everybody. This is not so easy, we must learn how to use it and perfect it. Criticism and self-criticism is not a «material» weapon, like the rifle with which you learn the mechanism, train your eye, put in the round, and pull the trigger. No. The weapon of Marxist-Leninist criticism and self-criticism is something else, entirely different from the former, very complicated, since it has to do with many moral, psychological, political and economic factors, closely interconnected with one another, because it is linked with various periods of time and moments, etc. You must orientate yourself correctly in this labyrinth, among these factors, circumstances and moments, which in most cases are not material, are sometimes clear from facts and sometimes not, and then pull the trigger. People say that in order to pull the trigger you should have two yoke of oxen. In that case we should keep in mind how serious the question of criticism and self-criticism is for us Marxists. The difficulties met in this direction are not an insurmountable wall, we can and should overcome them, and there are many ways for us to overcome them. I shall enumerate some of them from the experience of the life of the Party which have served us to improve this powerful weapon.

We should always be careful to preserve the educative essence of criticism. Criticism should never have a devastating retaliatory character, it should never be made with ulterior motives or evil intentions, to denigrate or offend, especially on the basis of falsification and slander. Criticism should always be comradely, not mainly in its tone, but especially in its content, in the purpose for which it is made.

Criticism should be well considered in order to have an effect on the person being criticized and the entire collective which hears it, which should also be educated through this criticism. It should be substantiated with concrete, con-
vincing and correct facts and always be accompanied with educative, moral, political and ideological conclusions.

The question is that the criticized should not come out of the meeting crushed, humiliated, and completely discouraged, but come out strengthened, clear, warm and convinced that the criticism has done him good and that he will correct his mistake. The question is also that the criticism made of one comrade should have an effect on everybody. It should serve as an indirect criticism also of some others who have made mistakes, who, in this case, should come forward with spontaneous, honest, Marxist self-criticism, regardless of the fact that the criticism made was not aimed directly at them. In this way the criticism of one assumes, in essence, a comradely, educational character. Apart from this, the correct comradely form of criticism (and this has nothing to do with feeble, mild, merely formal criticism) really gives the Party the role of a strict mother, but with a generous heart, with a deep love for her children.

He who criticizes should not proceed in his criticism from his position in the Party or the state but from his party stand; he should not proceed from conceit and the feeling of his own intellectual superiority, or of someone who knows everything, who is infallible in his views. He who criticizes should know how to preserve the party spirit in criticism, to preserve his communist modesty, to keep a cool head, to combat hasty judgements and use a powerful Marxist logic on the basis of the facts, his maturity and experience, should know how to make proper use of these data, in order to make criticism with a truly Marxist content, with a Marxist form and truly educative.

The use of criticism in and out of place, of weak criticism when it should be strong, and strong when there is no occasion for it, instead of educating, very often has the opposite effect. This powerful weapon of education for the
people must be used correctly, must be perfected, given the
greatest attention by the cadres, and we must not go into
it without a care in the world as though we were going
to a wedding party, must not allow it to become a harm-
ful or demoralizing routine, oppressive and embarrassing
for the people, but it should be one of the educative,
mobilizing and of the most revolutionary weapons of the
Party.

Measures, party measures, strong measures of criticism
should be taken against those sick critics, who have «cri-
ticism» on the tip of their tongues, who use it out of place
or who slander; those who misuse this weapon should be
sternly criticized.

The correct understanding of self-criticism is also of
great importance. Marxist-Leninist self-criticism has nothing
in common with or similar to «confession» to a priest. The
honest man, whether a communist or non-party member,
who can and does make mistakes in life (there is no immu-
nity from this) is not afraid to acknowledge his mistake
provided he has confidence in the justice of the collective, in
the justice of the Party, in the justice of the state laws,
provided he has confidence in the fairness of the judgement
of the comrades, of the forums, in their love and continuous
care for man, provided that conditions have been created
there where he works, lives and militates, such that he can
speak freely about the mistake or the fault he has committed.
These conditions are essential if we want self-criticism to
become a powerful weapon for educating the people. Ge-
nerally speaking, the Party has created these conditions,
but we should improve them, perfect them everywhere, in
the party organizations, in the leading organs, in the
work and production centres, in the administration, and
so on.

Bolshevik self-criticism takes place where criticism is
also bolshevik. Each of those two things influences the
other for the better, but also for the worse, when they are not bolshevik.

If criticism is based on unconvincing facts or on slanders, if criticism is made from a position of superiority or in anger, etc., then he who has to make self-criticism will either be left not knowing what to say, or be revolted and lose his patience, or will instinctively try to defend himself, under the influence of some petty-bourgeois hang-overs, such as indignation, the defence of his personality, and so on, which precisely have impelled him to violate the law and communist morality. Since a person has committed a mistake or a fault, something is not in order in his consciousness, in his world-outlook, and in order to correct it, to purge him of this something, we cannot and must not use those somethings that are wrong, we should not proceed from those same positions that have impelled him to fall into errors.

Both after the criticism made of a person and after the self-criticism he makes, the Party must stay closer than ever to him, everybody should stay close to him, since the person in question needs to feel the care and warmth of the Party, its justice, the justice of the criticism. He needs this more than ever, and we should not forget that he is in the process of convalescence. The criticism and self-criticism is the first step of the cure, but it is not complete recovery, and if we leave it at that, or to its own fate, confine ourselves simply to recording these things in his documents of a communist, thinking that thus the matter is ended, we can be sure that we are not acting correctly and this may have bitter results.

The Party and every communist should know the nature of the comrades, their feelings, character and abilities, because these things play a great role in the correct use of criticism and self-criticism. We may and certainly will be faced with various types of people, since not everyone is cut
to the same pattern. For example, we have before us an honest man who has made mistakes, but is not able to analyse his mistakes profoundly; it is not his way to speak freely and at length, but he feels the criticism deeply and confines himself to a frank, honest and simple admission of his mistakes. But there is no lack of those who persist in demanding that he «goes more deeply» into his mistakes, that he «has hidden» things, even when he has not hidden anything. Or we have before us not an honest man, but one who knows how to hide his mistakes, a smooth talker, and when he is caught in a mistake, he does not fail to make a long, detailed, cunning self-criticism, but he himself does not believe anything of what he says. There is no shortage of wool-blind people who are satisfied with his «brilliant» self-criticism. And thus unhealthy suspicion lingers on towards the former and he is given little support, whereas harmful trust is placed in the latter and the people are not vigilant towards his evil actions, which, without doubt, he will carry on in the future, too.

Therefore the question of criticism and self-criticism is not a simple thing and should not be understood narrowly. By this I mean that people should be criticized or they should make self-criticism not only when they make mistakes and not only in special meetings. This is one aspect of criticism and self-criticism, but it is not the whole of it.

The fault should be avoided. This is a major problem, and if the fault is to be avoided, people must be taught to make proper use of this weapon, and criticism and self-criticism must be developed at work, during the work, in various forms. Such an education should be carried out on an extensive scale. How can this education be carried out? In the process of work, wherever work is done and struggle is waged, people, communists or non-party people may make mistakes. Therefore, all should freely express their critical opinion about the work, and in the interest of work,
courageously and without any hesitation; they should have the courage to make their criticism, whether right or wrong, to anyone at all, to their superior or to their subordinate; they should criticize the deficiencies and not wait for a meeting, should give their opinions before and after the carrying out of the tasks. The superiors should listen to these criticisms with attention, without arrogance and without the idea that they know everything; and not only must they listen attentively to the suggestions and advice of subordinates, but when they are right, they should say so there and then; they should admit, there and then, that they were wrong (at this point the superior should make self-criticism) and the subordinates were right.

In such work criticism and self-criticism are combined, mistakes are avoided in this way, people are corrected and educated in the process of work, such evil hang-overs as servility, fear of the superior, fear that someone might have a score to settle or take a jaundiced view of whoever dares to criticize, are combated, and on the other hand, arrogance, conceit, bureaucracy, etc., are also combated. All these vices are alien to the communists and the source of many evils. Only in this way can that sound education in the correct and proper use of the weapon of criticism and self-criticism, which is necessary to us communists to wipe out many of the shortcomings and vices, be created.

But to indulge in abuse under the disguise of criticism and self-criticism, as happens in many cases, must not be allowed. Many people try to escape responsibility for their crimes and the heavy damage they inflict on the economy, for their flagrant violation of state laws, rules of society, and the norms of communist morality, by making a perfunctory «self-criticism». In such cases, we should have no hesitation at all about bringing the culprits to justice, where they should receive the sentence they deserve. No lenient attitude should be allowed; likewise, all those who invent a
thousand and one mitigating circumstances for thieves, for those who damage or misuse socialist property, should also be punished, because, consciously or unconsciously, they do the work of counter-revolutionary elements, are a support for the foreign and internal enemies, serve the remnants of those hostile classes and that ideology against which we are waging the class struggle, and put in action the weapons of the dictatorship of the proletariat.
The views which Chou En-lai expressed to the Romanian ambassador in Peking are very alarming.

Chou En-lai is making a grave mistake that he is inciting the Rumanians to make territorial claims on the Soviet Union. This is not the right way to bring the Rumanians close to our line. This is neither the time nor the occasion to raise such problems which provide Khrushchev with a weapon to accuse us of being chauvinists. The ideological and political struggle against Khrushchev must not be diverted into delicate questions of territorial claims. From the ideological and political positions which they adhere to, as well as from the military angle, the Rumanian leaders, for their part, have not raised the question of territorial claims on the Soviet Union and neither will they do so. If the Rumanians do this they will lose in all directions, because others will raise more claims on them. Therefore, the raising of claims and the way Chou En-lai has done it is not right, either in principle, or as a tactic of the moment.  

1 Respecting the Leninist norms, in an absolutely correct spirit and a comradely way, the CC of the PLA openly expressed its views on the question of territorial claims to the CC of the CP of China and personally to Mao Tsetung in a letter sent on September 10, 1964.
The Rumanians will certainly not approve of the problem raised by Chou, they will judge this as a naive idea of the Chinese leaders and, moreover, will form a bad opinion of them over this.

Even more important is the fact that Chou En-lai does not raise the question of territorial claims simply as a tactic, but as an issue of principle. **The claims of the Chinese have been built on a dangerous platform and from a nationalist position, to the point that they themselves have pretensions to Outer Mongolia. This platform has nothing in common with the struggle against Khrushchevism and Khrushchev.**

The Chinese want the re-examination of all borders with the Soviet Union by all states.

The raising of this problem at these moments is not correct. On the contrary, it is a grave error of principle. Even if we suppose they are just, the territorial claims cannot be settled at these moments, on the contrary, they strengthen the chauvinist positions of Khrushchev and, at the same time, assist Khrushchev in the unprincipled, treacherous struggle he has waged and is waging against Stalin.

This is scandalous. In no way can we accept it.

The territorial integrity of the Soviet Union must not be touched at this time, notwithstanding that history may have left problems to be tidied up. Today the whole struggle must be directed against the Khrushchevite renegades, but not with such arguments and methods as the Chinese are using.

Mao has made a great mistake in raising the question of claims with the Japanese socialists.

These actions are not correct. When Chou En-lai was here he did not raise these things at all and in these forms that we are hearing of now. Had he raised this problem with us, we would have opposed him, but regardless of this, we
must find the way, the most suitable time, and quickly, too, to tell them of our opinion on these major issues of principle.

Comrade Stalin was very correct, prudent, and principled in these delicate and complicated problems. At the period of the gravest crisis in relations with Titoite Yugoslavia, when the hostility between us and the Titoites had reached its culmination, when all of us were in struggle against the revisionists of Belgrade, who had set themselves against socialism and the communist movement, in a talk which I had with Stalin he said to me, among other things, that from the formal aspect the Yugoslav Federation, as a union of different republics, was progressive. Seen from this viewpoint, there was no reason for it to be broken up, but Titoism and the Titoites must be fought ideologically and politically as betrayers of Marxism-Leninism. The struggle against them must not be waged from the positions of chauvinism and territorial claims or against the peoples of Yugoslavia, but the nations which comprise it must be assisted so that they enjoy the right to self-determination up to separation from the Federation. We must not harm or attack Yugoslavia or the Yugoslav peoples, but must convince them that they have a treacherous leadership which is leading them to disaster. Let the Yugoslav peoples speak for themselves, let the Yugoslav communists speak for themselves.

This was the principled stand of Stalin, and we were and are completely in agreement with this stand. The questions of territorial claims for all those countries which the Chinese comrades mention can be raised only when revisionism has been routed and Marxist-Leninist bolshevik parties have come to the head of those countries. Then the problems of disputed borders can be raised and discussed, as amongst Marxist-Leninists, in the spirit of proletarian internationalism, and just solutions found in favour not only
of simple national interests, but also of the interests of international communism.

There is no other road. Any other road is wrong, and I think that the Chinese comrades have fallen up to their ears into this grave error.
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THE CHINESE STAND: «THEY TAKE THE FIRST STEP, WE TAKE THE SECOND»

September 15, 1964

This slogan of action launched by the Chinese comrades against modern revisionists is not correct for all periods, as they wish to apply it in the struggle against modern revisionists. In my opinion, there is nothing revolutionary about it, it is a slogan of waiting, restraint and the «building of militant revolutionary actions» adjusted to the moves of the opponent. In other words, you should mark time until the opponent makes his move, and adjust your move, naturally with exasperating delay (as the Chinese comrades are doing), according to the way the enemy beats the drum. The tactic of the Chinese is that, if the enemy beats his drum loudly, they beat theirs a little more softly, if the enemy muffles his drum-beat, their own drum should not beat at all.

Throughout the development of the struggle of the Communist Party of China against modern revisionists, and mainly against the Khrushchevites, some «astonishing» vacillations have appeared in its tactic. In my opinion, this tactic can only originate from pronounced lack of clarity on principles over the struggle which must be waged against modern revisionists. Even on stands of principle over basic issues we must say that the Chinese comrades have not always had mature opinions. It cannot be said that this has resulted mainly from their efforts to
visionist report; which took the greatest care to avoid attacking American imperialism and the modern revisionists even with one word; which have very friendly links with the major renegade Tito; which are establishing friendly relations with and receiving credits from American imperialism and the other imperialists.

What will the communists throughout the world think when they see that the Rumanians have pride of place at China's celebration, and the Marxist-Leninist parties do not figure anywhere? It is good not to imply in any way, even from the surface of things, that the Communist Party of China approves the centrist line of the Rumanians and has cooled towards its loyal Marxist-Leninist allies.

The Rumanians do not base their struggle against the renegade group of Khrushchev on Marxism-Leninism, but only on economic contradictions, or certain national chauvinist considerations. We must show ourselves very prudent and cautious in the steps we take with them. This is our opinion, which can change only to the extent that the position of the Rumanians changes positively.

It is right that you have invited many delegations of non-communist friends to the celebration. But to invite only these and the Rumanian Party and Government to your celebration, and not invite our Marxist-Leninist parties and governments is not acceptable to these parties and world opinion.

Second, we wrote that we consider incorrect the decision that, at the great celebration of the 15th anniversary of the proclamation of the People's Republic of China, in which many friends of China will take part, the official representatives of peoples most faithful to the Chinese people, the official representatives of communist and workers' parties which take a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist stand and which are fighting the most ferocious enemies, world imperialism and its modern revisionist agents, are
excluded. This is an action which, at these moments, no tactical considerations, or especially the internal tactics amongst our parties, can justify. Neither our people nor our Party will understand this. Even in the extreme case, if we tell them the «reasons» which impel you to take this decision, we assure you that they will still not understand.

We think that neither the fraternal Chinese people, nor the Chinese communists, will be pleased when they see that their closest friends are not present at their great celebration.

On the other hand, we think that this will be an astonishing thing, beyond understanding, for world opinion and will be interpreted at will, in many ways.

Third, we wrote, you have taken this decision so that the revisionist renegades should not accuse you of holding a meeting before them, and hence accuse you of being splitters! We think that such reasoning is not correct. The meeting which Khrushchev is organizing for the 15th of December has another character and aim, while the celebration of the People's Republic of China is the 15th anniversary of its founding and nothing else. The delegations which are invited to your celebration are not coming to hold special secret meetings, but to celebrate the 15th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China. It is natural that delegations of our parties might exchange opinions. This is our right and we are not afraid of anybody over this. The modern revisionists are holding hundreds of meetings on every possible occasion, and have not waited for us to hold meetings. In fact, we have not held any meeting which they could use to accuse us of being splitters. Despite this, the enemies have not failed to accuse us every day, but however they slander us, they do not frighten us. Slanders are second nature to them.

They long ago decided on and announced the meeting
which they are preparing to hold in Moscow on the 15th of December, and did not wait to see what we would do at the celebration of the 15th anniversary of the People's Republic of China. The revisionists know, also, that we shall not take part in this meeting in Moscow. Hence, the Moscow meeting is not brought about by our going to China for the celebration. They will accuse us who go to China's celebration not only of being splitters — because this accusation is their main leitmotif — not that our going to the celebration brought about the Moscow meeting as a reaction — because, as we said, they had decided on the meeting previously — but they will say that in the last analysis, we met in Peking to re-emphasize our steel unity in further actions against them. What harm is there in this for us? None. But one thing is true: they will tremble at our going to Peking. It is a good and desirable thing that they should shake with fright.

Hence, even if the tactic that «the revisionists must take the first step» is accepted, we do not take this «privilege» from them on this occasion by coming to your celebration. We are not holding any meeting in Peking. We have no knowledge of such a meeting and are not prepared for it. In conclusion, we think that the celebration in Peking is in no way analogous to the Moscow meeting of renegades from Marxism-Leninism.

We think that with the decision you have taken about your celebration, you are creating a difficult situation for our celebration of the 20th anniversary of Liberation. We have thought to invite you, the Koreans, the Vietnamese, the Japanese, the New Zealanders, the Indonesians, the leaders of Marxist-Leninist groups, and the Rumanians to our great celebration. If we do not invite you, who are we to invite? If you come to us, then what you sought to avoid at your celebration, you will not avoid at all at our celebration. The modern revisionists will say that they
met in Tirana in November instead of meeting in Peking in October, and so they will still accuse us of being splitters, since their meeting will be held in December.

If, for tactical reasons, you, the Korean comrades and the Vietnamese comrades, do not come to the jubilee celebration of the 20th anniversary of the liberation of Albania, at a time when you have taken part in the celebration of the 20th anniversary of the liberation of Rumania, world opinion will interpret this act of yours to the detriment of our common cause.

If we adopt the tactic of not inviting you, the three allied and friendly countries and parties, and invite only the Rumanians (a thing which we will not do, even if you don't come), to our celebration, and if tomorrow or the next day the Koreans and the Vietnamese do not invite us, but for reasons of tactics and protocol invite only the Rumanians to their celebrations, then the matter will be interpreted as if our parties and countries have turned out the sound horse (which is our correct Marxist-Leninist line) and are trying to mount a lame horse. Thus, unwittingly, at our political manifestations it will appear as if our political pivot is Rumania. We think this is a mistake which must not be made.

Why should we create complicated situations for our parties and countries with our actions when the issues are clear?

We shall never stop our sacred ideological and political struggle against the modern revisionists with Tito and Khrushchev at the head. If we were to act differently, this would be a colossal mistake for us. We made our tactical stand clear to the Rumanians in the talks which our comrade Manush Myftiu had with Gheorghiu Dej in Rumania, and we are sure that he and his comrades have no illusions at all that we have shifted or will shift from our principles. And this is a very good thing and may
benefit the Rumanians if they still have any good in them. We approach the Rumanians from the principle that telling the truth may taste bitter to them, but the truth is always the truth and must be said.

We tell the Chinese that we are convinced that the opinions which we express to them are sincere. We tell them what we think in an open and comradely way, because for them and for us, the great, sincere, Marxist-Leninist friendship between our parties and peoples stands above everything. We guard and shall always guard this friendship as the apple of our eye. True friendship is based on the great sincerity which exists between friends.

Possibly the Chinese comrades will not be at all pleased with our criticism, but we can't help that, because, I repeat, it is a mistake that only Rumania should be invited to their celebration. This means to publicly take a centrist position.

To invite states and parties to a national celebration is a political question and not a private matter, as if Mao were to invite a person, say, because his son was getting married. This action of the Chinese comrades does not appear to be fortuitous and unconsidered. There is more to this than meets the eye. We must wait and see.
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This slogan of action launched by the Chinese comrades against modern revisionists is not correct for all periods, as they wish to apply it in the struggle against modern revisionists. In my opinion, there is nothing revolutionary about it, it is a slogan of waiting, restraint and the «building of militant revolutionary actions» adjusted to the moves of the opponent. In other words, you should mark time until the opponent makes his move, and adjust your move, naturally with exasperating delay (as the Chinese comrades are doing), according to the way the enemy beats the drum. The tactic of the Chinese is that, if the enemy beats his drum loudly, they beat theirs a little more softly, if the enemy muffles his drum-beat, their own drum should not beat at all.

Throughout the development of the struggle of the Communist Party of China against modern revisionists, and mainly against the Khrushchevites, some «astonishing» vacillations have appeared in its tactic. In my opinion, this tactic can only originate from pronounced lack of clarity on principles over the struggle which must be waged against modern revisionists. Even on stands of principle over basic issues we must say that the Chinese comrades have not always had mature opinions. It cannot be said that this has resulted mainly from their efforts to
find or to apply some appropriate tactic for the events which were developing, or because the Chinese were not fully informed of all the facts which impelled the revisionist enemies to come out against Marxism-Leninism.

To be noted are the moments at the Moscow Meeting in 1957. Comrade Mao publicly praised and supported Khrushchev; in fact, he approved his action in denouncing Stalin; approved the condemnation of the «anti-party group of Molotov», etc., and advocated complete unity with the Khrushchev group.

Of course, the Chinese comrades must have been in agreement, in general terms, with Khrushchev over his actions following the death of Stalin even before 1957, because, when I met Comrade Mao in Peking in 1956, in our presence he criticized the «incorrect» activity of Stalin, and especially «Stalin's actions towards Yugoslavia», because according to Mao, Stalin «had made mistakes» and the Yugoslavs were «good Marxist men», and in order to support this «idea» it was precisely the Chinese who were the first and the only ones in that period to invite the Yugoslavs to the Congress of the Communist Party of China.

Why did the Chinese comrades display such shortsightedness towards these events? Can it be said that they had no facts on which to base a stable, principled stand about these things?! Perhaps this might be true, but however few the facts to prove the betrayal of the Khrushchevites, still this could not have been the whole reason which made the Chinese «soft», because there was one major fact, the great work of the bolsheviks led by Stalin over a long period.

If the Chinese comrades had any faith in the work of the bolshevik Stalin, their confidence in and élan towards Khrushchev would have been more reserved and moderate. But the Chinese comrades must have had pent up dissatis-
faction towards Stalin, because this was apparent in Mao’s statement to the Moscow Meeting, when he said that when he first met Stalin in Moscow, he was «in the role of the schoolboy, and though ours were fraternal parties, we were not equal.» Then Mao added, «Now that we meet Khrushchev, we are like brothers.» On Mao’s part, these remarks in themselves were a «condemnation» of Stalin, condemnation of the «cult of the individual» and approval of Khrushchev’s line. This was wrong on Mao’s part.

A respectful stand towards Stalin cannot be identified with that disparaging concept of Mao’s. Stalin earned that respect and love which all, including Mao, showed for him, with his deeds, and he deserved this for his colossal work, for his glorious struggle in defence of Marxism-Leninism. I don’t know how Stalin treated Mao, but, I, personally, met Stalin many times and he always tried in every way to give me the feeling of an equal comrade, to create an intimacy. He received me in his home and himself handed me the dish, he sent away the waiters, and we got up and served one another, as in our own homes; Stalin has taken me by the arm and walked with me in his garden, tired himself on my behalf many times, taking the greatest care of me, even over the hat I should wear to avoid getting a cold, and going so far as... to show me where the toilets were if I needed them.

Could you call this stand of Stalin’s the stand of «a teacher towards his pupil», when in fact we were his pupils, and young pupils, before him? Perhaps Mao was an older pupil, but still he was a pupil before Stalin. Since Stalin adopted the stand of a proletarian comrade towards me, imagine what a friendly stand he must have adopted towards Mao, as the leader of the Communist Party of a big country like China.

Therefore, what Mao said about Stalin at the Moscow
Meeting seems to me astonishing, suspect, and said for the occasion, in connection with the new situation created in the Soviet Union.

Could it be that, with what Mao said, he wanted to say to Khrushchev that now, after the death of Stalin «our two countries and two parties are on an equal basis and we two, hand-in-hand, should lead the revolutionary movement»? (This did not suit Khrushchev because, regardless of the bouquets they threw at him, he sat glowering and worried.) Or did he want to say to Khrushchev: «You are a new boy, and I am going to help set you on the right course»?

Despite Mao's «modest tone» at the Moscow Meeting, still «his reasonable and correct speech» gave you the impression of a «far-seeing», «infallible», «direction-giving» speech.

However, it is true that the Chinese comrades did not take the question of Stalin any further. They quickly drew in their horns, and in the end (with reserve) maintained a stand pro Stalin and against the Khrushchevite traitors. This change was good and correct.

The Moscow Meeting in 1960 put the Chinese comrades, one might say, soundly on the rails on all those capital problems prior to the meeting about which they were not completely clear or had illusions, or on which their tactical stands were wrong, irresolute and hesitating. At any rate, at Bucharest and the Moscow Meeting the disguise was torn from the Khrushchevite revisionists.

It must be said that even after the Meeting, the Chinese comrades did not have a real thorough understanding of the problems. They did not assess the danger of the disruptive anti-Marxist activity of the Khrushchevites in its entirety. The Chinese comrades nurtured illusions and hoped for «some correction». After the Meeting they concentrated more on preventing Khrushchev's attacks on us
and on themselves later, than on direct and incisive attacks on the treacherous views which impelled the revisionists to act. Hence, in this way, the Chinese took more notice of the acts (and these they tried to soften or stop) than of their content and aims (which they ought to have fought and exposed).

Hence, after the Moscow Meeting and after the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, together with a certain «principled defence» of the Party of Labour of Albania by the Chinese comrades (Chou En-lai), we see an orientation, more of advice, that this kind of «open polemic with the Party of Labour of Albania» should be stopped. In this period, though we were convinced that the Chinese were with us, they did not take open stands directly in defence of the Party of Labour of Albania, for principled and militant solidarity with it, against the Khrushchevites.

In principle, could this be considered to be a wrong tactic of the Chinese for those moments? No, this tactic was not completely wrong, but in our opinion, it would not yield results. Therefore, let them adhere to such a tactic, but not for long, and let them not build up hopes that it would bring the movement good results. Thus, for a long time the Chinese comrades struggled and stood in the position of «stopping the open polemic against the Party of Labour of Albania». However, the attacks on the Party of Labour of Albania by the whole of modern revisionism continued for years on end, and the Party of Labour of Albania, likewise for years on end, struggled heroically alone.

The modern revisionists attacked us furiously, but at the same time, they were fighting Marxism-Leninism, fighting to spread their revisionist ideas, to consolidate their positions, fighting to intimidate the waverers, and indirectly they were blackmailing the Chinese.

China, one may say, did not engage directly in the
struggle against revisionism. It fought when it was prompted, and precisely during this period of exaggerated sluggishness, the Chinese slogan came out, «The revisionists take the first step, we take the second».

As to how far the revisionists had gone, what point the betrayal by modern revisionists and the Khrushchevites' aims had reached, all these things had become so extremely clear that the static tactic of the Chinese comrades in the «struggle» became exasperating and absurd. We can say that their struggle against the revisionists has been stepped up, has become more emphatic, mostly indirectly, and in the end directly, but it has taken a long time, a great deal of time has been lost, and the slogan of «the first step...» has been applied rigorously on their part. And to bring about this first step, so greatly desired, has required many unnecessary, tiresome stratagems, and why? Over a formal issue: «Who began the attack first, you or we,» when the modern revisionists had begun the attack not just against our Party or some other party, but especially against Marxism-Leninism.

It was of great and special importance for the Chinese comrades that the modern revisionists should name the Communist Party of China first, and only then should the finger be put on the great sore spot. This tactic is still being applied at present by a number of other fraternal parties of Asia, at a time when the world is on fire. Naturally, this stand is an anachronism, something stale. Even for these parties which have entered the struggle, to a greater or lesser degree, this stale tactic is like a «fig-leaf».

The slogan of «the first step...» which seems «attractive» superficially, and is considered so important for public opinion, allegedly because «he who starts it is to blame», becomes very harmful when the criminal has unsheathed his sword and is wreaking havoc, while you maintain the forms lest they «accuse you». But what are
you afraid they will accuse you of? Of defending Marxism-Leninism? Our struggle is being waged precisely in defence of Marxism-Leninism.

Hence, this slogan is holding back the struggle for a great cause for the sake of a formality, which has long been a thing of the past. The importance of our struggle has not been and is not based on whether «you attacked first and I second», but on that you attacked Marxism-Leninism and I am defending Marxism-Leninism, and public opinion must distinguish as soon as possible, as quickly as possible, and as clearly as possible, who is attacking and who is defending Marxism. This is the main, decisive, capital issue, and not, «I hit back at you after you attacked me first».

But even if we take the obvious case of the Party of Labour of Albania, which was the first to be attacked by the Khrushchevites, did we close the mouth of the Khrushchevite propaganda, which slanders us and has raised to a theory the idea that we attacked them first? No, they are doing their work. Or we want this to go down in history like the famous words of the French officers at the Battle of Fontenoy: Messieurs les Anglais, tirez les premiers! This is absurd when it is a matter of fighting the great enemy in the ranks of the international communist move-

Under the influence of this slogan the «forecast» was made by the Chinese comrades that «the struggle will be protracted», that «this struggle will have its ups and downs». They also decided on ten basic theoretical articles about which they told us that they would print one every fifteen days. Fourteen months have gone by since then and the tenth article has not yet come out, while the modern revisionists, without exaggeration, have written thousands of articles.

* «English gentlemen, you shoot first!» (French in the original).
Hence rigid, hieratic, olympian tactic, according to the moves of the enemy, but in fact, they don't even follow the moves of the enemy.

Why is this? For tactical reasons? For objective reasons? For subjective reasons? Because the Chinese comrades have failed to define a consistent line?! This is astonishing! Many actions are carried out for form, in order to put the blame formally on one or the other. The Chinese comrades contradict themselves in many of their attitudes. On the one hand, the Chinese comrades have picked up the final stone against Khrushchev, and say to him, «We are going to put you in your grave», on the other hand they say to him, «Dear Comrade..., many happy returns!»?! When they address him as «Dear Comrade...», the Chinese comrades justify this as done «to get closer to the Soviet people». (Interesting, to try to approach the Soviet people by addressing this traitor as «Dear Comrade...»!)

Today they say: «We must struggle for the creation and consolidation of the anti-imperialist front including even the revisionists»! Tomorrow Mao makes the famous statement about border claims on the Soviet Union (!!) (with which they want to form an anti-imperialist alliance), and he draws a reply from Khrushchev who tells Mao: You are a Hitler, and if you lay a finger on our borders, I have invented a new bomb which will wipe you out completely.

Yesterday Tito was a traitor to the Chinese, later he was rehabilitated, then he became a traitor again, and now, according to Li Hsien-nien, this great traitor has become a «minor devil».

There are many things like this. The Chinese are very slow to react, and also understand things very slowly. To reflect deeply and to take a correct decision, even though a late one, this is very good, and how it should be, but
to put off things for later consideration, and fail to come out with a mature decision, that is very bad. Good decisions must serve for today and tomorrow. Hence, they must foresee the morrow, and tomorrow’s decision must be consistent with that of yesterday, and linked with that of the day after tomorrow, that is, all the decisions must be like links in a single chain. Some link in the chain may be weak, and this, naturally, damages the chain, but does not ruin it, but if there are gaps and splits in its links, then it is no longer a chain.

The Chinese comrades say that they have a correct appreciation of time, but they consider it something endless, from positions of passivity, in the sense that it can pass freely, quietly, thinking that «it is working for us». Therefore they are not concerned about any delay, hence, for them it will be very good if others, too, move at their pace.

It is said that the Chinese comrades are not very pleased to be criticized, although they always say, «Criticize us.»

The Chinese comrades are very shut off. They have the capacities and possibilities to extend their horizons, and this they must do. This is absolutely essential. You must know the peoples, their lives, their development and feelings thoroughly, in order to build up a correct Marxist-Leninist policy with them. Otherwise, you will make mistakes or build a stereotyped or schematic line based on formulae and chance happenings and events. And consequently, you will not understand the crucial moment of the situation, the main link you must grasp to build a far-sighted and correct Marxist-Leninist strategy and tactics.

Although Chou En-lai tried to belittle my opinion that imperialism and revisionism are trying to isolate China and that we should break this isolation, I think that the Chinese comrades ought to have this question constantly
in mind. They have to break not only their political and ideological isolation, but also their cultural, commercial and other isolation. All this must be done on the Marxist-Leninist course, without violating principles, without weakening the security of the homeland and the general line, but also without exaggerating the «world» value of Chinese culture and without underrating the culture of other peoples. This cannot have results if it is done in a one-sided way, that is, «If you like what I have, adopt it if you wish, but, on the other hand, I don't like what you have and I shall not allow my people to taste what you have, that is good.» These views are not correct, they are not Marxist, they are harmful.

We must find suitable occasions to raise and discuss these and other questions of this nature in a comradely and fraternal way with the Chinese comrades. Perhaps there are some things related to them that we still do not know well enough to understand them in all their extent, therefore, comradely internationalist discussion to the benefit of our common work is always fruitful and advances the work.

Not only we, but the Chinese, too, have great need to thrash out our ideas, to exchange experience with each other on these capital issues, and to more or less define the way we will act, or the methods of work which may not be identical in form but must be correct in essence, must be aimed at one or more definite objectives for our great, wide-ranging, complicated cause.

Marxist-Leninist seriousness comes first on the order of the day. Any mistake costs dear; hence fewer mistakes will be made if we consult each other, if we coordinate our actions seriously and correctly.
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