The Chinese comrades, Liu Shao-chi, in particular, if I am not mistaken, in a talk with a delegation of ours which had gone to Peking, launched the idea that in order to fight imperialism, and especially American imperialism, we must work to create a broad anti-imperialist front, including even the modern revisionists. Chou En-lai also mentioned such an idea in passing, when he was here nearly a year ago. We opposed his idea of collaborating with the modern revisionists for such a thing, but with the creation of an anti-imperialist front we are in agreement, naturally, and we are working for this. However, Chou En-lai did not retract or develop this idea, but left it in silence. He cast the stone and let it lie.

This very important matter was raised at certain particular moments which seem quite inappropriate. This idea was thrown in when our ideological and political struggle

1 The vacillating stand of the CP of China in its struggle against revisionism became more clearly obvious in June 1962. At that time the PLA sent a delegation to Peking to talk with the leadership of the CP of China. In the talks the Albanian delegation clashed with the very mistaken view of the Chinese leaders according to which the anti-imperialist front must, without fail, include the revisionist Soviet Union. The delegation of the PLA opposed and rejected this view of the Chinese leaders.
with the modern revisionists had become extremely acute, and especially when the Khrushchev group was up to its neck in serious, concrete collaboration with the American imperialists. Without any hesitation, it was putting into practice its whole anti-Leninist policy of Khrushchevite «coexistence», making concessions to the American aggressive policy, prettifying American imperialism, weakening the peoples’ liberation struggle and activizing and sharpening the struggle against Marxism-Leninism, against the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania.

When the group of Nikita Khrushchev, at the head of the modern revisionists, was weakening the struggle against imperialism, the Chinese comrades launched the idea of the creation of an anti-imperialist front including even the modern revisionists. Astonishing!!

However, we did not see any concrete action in this direction on the part of the Chinese comrades, with the exception of the fact that their propaganda against the Khrushchevites was not developed at the necessary rate the moments demanded, although signs of softening in their anti-Khrushchevite polemic did not appear. We thought that this idea launched by the Chinese was not well-considered, like many of their ideas which later, with the passage of time, they return to and think over again. However, for a long time no more was said on this question.

But three or four days ago this idea of the Chinese came out openly, publicly, in the leading article of the organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Japan, which, while condemning the meeting proposed by Khrushchev for next December, proposed a meeting of 81 communist and workers’ parties to discuss and decide on the creation of an «anti-imperialist front».

As it appears, the Chinese have worked out their idea
with the communist parties of Asia and have come to the conclusion that this idea should be made public and discussed among world opinion and international communist opinion. If a «son» is born then its father becomes recognized, if nothing results then there still remains the «good», «kind intention», because the front had the word «anti-imperialist» in its title.

This is no minor matter, but one of the most important. This is the laying of a revisionist turn of policy and ideology on the table for discussion, regardless of the fact that this has been dressed up as an «anti-imperialist front».

We must look a little deeper into what is hidden behind this ideological-political action of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Japan, and who benefits from this «new line» which is emerging in international policy and the international communist movement.

In broad outline, what is the objective of our policy and actions in the international arena? The struggle against world imperialism, against colonialism, old and new, in whatever form it appears, the struggle for the consolidation of socialism and the spread of it throughout the world, unceasing aid, with all our means, for the peoples' national liberation struggles to break the chains of imperialist, capitalist and colonialist slavery, the provision of all-round aid to new states to consolidate the independence won, to consolidate the people's democratic state power, and to raise their economic and cultural level. Our struggle in the international arena consists of effective disarmament of the imperialists, who are preparing a nuclear war, preparing new chains for the peoples, preparing a new catastrophe for them.

To fight for our triumph in these fields implies that we must defend world peace, or more precisely, must struggle to establish world peace. The imperialists, their military and economic strength and their ideology are hin-
dering this world peace. We must fight and destroy them through repeated battles on a world anti-imperialist front. The world anti-imperialist front is based, naturally, on the building of some alliances by our side against imperialism, on the defining of certain stands on our part with objectives, more or less remote from one another, according to the targets which we attack and the progressive or backward political potential of the forces running these targets, etc. But in all this labyrinth of alliances and stands we must not for one moment make concessions over principle, and at no time should our actions be fortuitous, arising from hasty judgements and based on passing circumstances.

On the other hand, none of us should proceed from the idea that «since I have prestige, authority and strength, I judge more correctly, I am in a position to judge more correctly, and the others must support me, follow me, and contribute themselves, in their own spheres where they have the possibility, but always following me.» Such a thing is neither correct nor fruitful. In such important actions, at the start of each new common action, with an international, general character, we must always be guided by the Marxist-Leninist principles and Marxist-Leninist analysis of the situation. And for this to be done properly, it is not sufficient simply to «launch the idea» and let whoever wants follow you, but you must throw in the idea and discuss it long and thoroughly with the comrades. The way the Chinese and Japanese comrades are operating is incorrect and is unacceptable.

To launch the idea of an «anti-imperialist front including even the modern revisionists» is politically and ideologically inconceivable, bearing in mind the stage the situation has now reached. If you base this «idea» on the «experience of the past», and deliberately overlook the result, or better, the fact that this «experience of the past» suffer-
ed defeat when social-democracy voted for the war budgets in the First imperialist War and was transformed into a social-chauvinist means «for the defence of the Homeland», then this is open betrayal. The open betrayal by social-democrats, social-chauvinists, brought about as a logical consequence the split with the Marxist-Leninists, brought about the creation of the revolutionary 3rd International, which opposed the traitor 2nd International.

Now the idea is launched of the «anti-imperialist front even with the modern revisionists». But what is the policy and ideology of this modern revisionism, with which we are supposed to unite to create this anti-imperialist front? A policy and an ideology precisely the opposite of our Marxist-Leninist ideology, a policy and ideology which are actively in struggle to sabotage the fundamental issues of our struggle against imperialism and colonialism, for the triumph of socialism and Marxism-Leninism, for the real solution to the problems of general and total disarmament, etc., etc.

Since we are in fierce and open struggle with modern revisionism on these main questions of principle and practice, how can we conceive an alliance or a political and ideological front against imperialism and the world bourgeoisie with the agency of the bourgeoisie and its ideology?! The anti-imperialist front means a political front, first of all. The question arises: Is it possible for us Marxist-Leninists to create a common front with the modern revisionists? Apparently, to the Chinese and Japanese it is possible. To us no, this can never be! But is it possible for the Marxist-Leninists to form a «political» front with the modern revisionists against American imperialism, while continuing the «ideological struggle» with them, or by «putting aside the questions which divide us ideologically», as the Japanese comrades say? We say: No, in no way!

For the Marxist-Leninists there is no policy without
ideology. With Egypt, with Mali, with Burundi, and with many other national states, an anti-imperialist front can be formed. Here there is policy, but there is also ideology. However, even in this case, we make no concessions or deals over principles with them. They know our principles, because we do not conceal them. On the contrary, it is those principles which constitute our strength and the success of this alliance, from which a number of bourgeois national states want to benefit in their struggle against imperialism. This is of interest to us, because in this way we weaken imperialism, and this is of interest to them, too, because by weakening imperialism they strengthen themselves. However, the struggle against imperialism automatically strengthens the revolutionary popular forces, first of all, hence, the revolution, socialism, reap all-round victories. At the same time, amongst the bourgeois national states which are fighting on this anti-imperialist front, too, a differentiation will take place, the class struggle and the revolution will develop, here more quickly there more slowly, but nevertheless always with struggle and efforts.

But the modern revisionists, Khrushchev, Tito, etc., with whom we are asked to form such «alliances» and «fronts» as those proposed, what are they fighting for? Are they fighting for socialism, for the revolution, for Marxism-Leninism? You have to be a revisionist to say yes. Marxists say that the revisionists are and always will be anti-revolutionaries, anti-Marxists, that they are fighting against socialism and communism, fighting to extend the existence of capitalism. Then, to form an «anti-imperialist front with the modern revisionists», means that the Marxist-Leninists must turn into Don Quixotes and wage a «stern struggle against windmills», that is, wage a struggle against the «imperialist wind», a «struggle» against imperialism, which has no Marxist-Leninist flavour either politically or ideologically. Only the modern revisionists wage
a Quixotic struggle against imperialism. If you have a mind to wage such a struggle then, of course, «the anti-imperialist front with the modern revisionists» is possible and realizable. This is the ideal of the Washington chiefs, Tito, Khrushchev, the modern revisionists, social-democracy, and so on. If you have this idea, that means you are no longer a Marxist, but a revisionist. The Marxist-Leninists cannot take this course of betrayal, and must fight such an idea, which is utterly revisionist and treacherous from start to finish.

The revisionist traitors, Khrushchev, Tito and company dream of an idea, a «stroke of genius». This idea gets them out of their difficulties, pulls them from the grave, which we Marxists have dug for them, and it is the Chinese and Japanese comrades who are holding out their hand to pull them from this grave!

Khrushchev wants to hold the meeting of the 81 parties and expel us. In acting in this way he is committing suicide. This is precisely what we want and are fighting for: to bury modern revisionism. We are acting correctly in refusing to go to their meeting and we want the meeting to be held without us. The Chinese and the Japanese are opposed to Khrushchev's meeting, but their desire is that the meeting which they themselves proposed should not be held without our participation. For the meeting to be held without us is a defeat for modern revisionism. As usual, Khrushchev has got into a trap, into an adventure. His revisionist associates held back, opposed the meeting, some vociferously some in a low voice, but all of them in order to save modern revisionism from this predicament. The revisionists are able to do many things to extend their existence. Hence, Khrushchev's meeting was compromised, reached an impasse. And instead of working to deepen the crisis in which modern revisionism is wallowing, to exploit this success, the Japanese comrades, with their proposal of
a «new 81 parties' meeting with the aim of creating an anti-imperialist front» did the modern revisionists the favour of holding out a branch to pull them from the grave. This is an «olive branch», a typical example of a completely anti-Marxist act.

What does the proposal of the Japanese comrades mean in practice? «You, Soviet comrades, give up the idea of the meeting which you have raised, allegedly to iron out the ideological differences and bring unity to the ranks of the international communist movement. Preparations are needed (until the printing of the 10 articles of the Communist Party of China, this famous series, is complete!). Let us prepare another meeting, which we propose for the creation of an 'anti-imperialist front'. This is very interesting, very much needed today and urgent. It is 'acceptable' to all parties. Let us put aside what divides us, and look at what 'unites us'. (And this is what you Nikita Khrushchev have said and want.) At this meeting we should not speak about our differences, but only about the 'anti-imperialist front' (which you are in favour of and talk about, too, Nikita).

«Hence we are to go to the meeting and grind away like a mill without grain, make a noise and come out in struggle against windmills. (We think that you Nikita have no objection to the roar of artillery with blank charges.) But we shall come out of the meeting with something 'important', with a 'steel unity' against imperialism. This is a colossal success on a colossal issue. (This automatically, dear Nikita, softens the polemic and smooths over the other disagreements.)» This is what the Japanese want to say with their «brilliant» proposal about a new meeting.

And Nikita Khrushchev, if he is not entirely an ass, will say to the dear Japanese comrades: «But where have you been up to now? We want this, too, this has been my aim, to cease the polemic (after all, let the Chinese fire
their last shot\textsuperscript{2}), and let us kiss and make up, bring out a statement, even with a bit more bite than the Moscow Statement, and put an end to this difficult situation that has been created for us. As to how things will go after the meeting, that is up to me, or are you going to accuse me again of violating the second statement as I did the first? In that case, I shall reply that you are slandering me, that you have violated the second statement and not I.»

In other words, the «Chinese idea», concretized by the Japanese in the proposal for a «new meeting of communist and workers’ parties of the world», is a revisionist deviation from the Marxist-Leninist positions of the struggle against modern revisionism, a revisionist compromise with the anti-Marxists. We must reject, oppose and fight this because it will have evil and dangerous consequences for Marxism-Leninism, socialism and communism. We must be vigilant towards the ways and methods which the Chinese and Japanese comrades will employ to develop this «brilliant idea». Are they going to consult us? In principle this should be done. If they act in this way, we shall tell them of our opinion. If they do not act in this way we shall still tell them of our opinion. If they act publicly, without seeking our opinion, or while refusing to discuss our opinion, then we shall be obliged to make our stand on this problem known publicly, too.

\textit{«Reflections on China», vol. 1}

\textsuperscript{2} This refers to the tenth article of the CP of China against modern revisionism which was never published.
IN NO WAY CAN WE RECONCILE OURSELVES
TO THESE VIEWS OF CHOU EN-LAI

October 31, 1964

Yesterday Comrade Nesti Nase communicated to us what Chou En-lai, on behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, told a group of ambassadors for the central committees of their respective parties. The same day, all the comrades of our leadership were informed of the exact content of Chou En-lai’s statement. He pointed out to the ambassadors that what he was telling them, he had also previously told Chervonenko, the Soviet Ambassador in Peking.

The views expressed by Chou En-lai are entirely unacceptable to our Party, both in essence and in form, because they are profoundly opportunist, capitulationist towards the Khrushchevite revisionists, fraught with aims dangerous to Marxism-Leninism and the further struggle against modern revisionism, and are utterly provocative towards our Party.

Chou En-lai’s views, expressed in the name of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, about the fall of Khrushchev, about the people who replaced him, about their aims and future policy, about the unity of the world communist movement, about the unity of the socialist camp, and about the method and the line which we must follow in the struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism, in all the key directions of this new
situation which has been created, in my opinion, are very unclear, vacillating, conciliatory and opportunist from start to finish (not to use stronger terms for the time being). These opinions indicate a capitulation to modern revisionism. We cannot reconcile ourselves in any way to these views of Chou En-lai, because they are revisionist from start to finish, anti-Marxist, capitulationist, and lead to the road of betrayal of Marxism-Leninism.

In presenting such views, the Chinese comrades are making very grave mistakes, and are and will be bringing colossal harm to communism.

The views which Chou En-lai expressed and the manner in which he expressed them to the ambassadors are full of anti-Marxist «great state» and «big party» sentiments, which must be condemned, of the feeling of scorn and disregard for the personality of a Marxist-Leninist party, which, according to the activity and judgement of Chou En-lai, does not need to be convinced after serious Marxist-Leninist discussion, but must be driven with a stick, according to the «conductor's bâton», a term fabricated by them appropriately against Khrushchev, which it is quite obvious that they themselves are now using against our Party. There is no trace of Marxist honesty, or political maturity, let alone ideological maturity, about the hidden aims of the actions which the Chinese have in mind.

Such an immature, vacillating stand of the Chinese, with frequent, marked and astonishing oscillations, sometimes to the left and sometimes to the right, comes as no surprise to us. We have encountered such a stand on their part during our common struggle, especially against the Khrushchevite, Titoite and other modern revisionists, although we cannot say we have observed such a thing in regard to their stands on principle and in practice against imperialism, and especially against American imperialism. What they will do later is another matter. Let us hope they
don't have oscillations and let us make our contribution to this end.

From all these observations we can reach a conclusion (and this declaration of Chou En-lai's further confirms our opinion) that the Chinese comrades did not want to go so far in the struggle against the modern revisionists, and had not envisaged such an extension of the struggle against them, such bitterness with them. This comes about because they had probably not thought out and understood the danger of modern revisionism, its ferocity, in all its real extent, and therefore were not spiritually armed for such a struggle. The Chinese had thought that matters would not become so acute with the modern revisionists, nurturing the idea that the modern revisionists would prove reasonable, that the article entitled «Long Live Leninism!» and some internal articles and debates would suffice «to convince» Khrushchev and his associates to return to the line which the Chinese would show them. However, this did not and could not occur. Our Party foresaw such a thing correctly. It was prepared from every standpoint for a resolute struggle to the end against modern revisionism. Thus the Chinese comrades found themselves on the defensive and not on the offensive. They began and continued on the defensive, while the revisionists attacked us openly and we, likewise, attacked them openly.

The stand of the Chinese, even after the public attack of the Soviet revisionists on us, was that «the open polemic must be stopped». Later this polemic went too far and could no longer be stopped. But during this struggle, hesitation, temporary halts in the polemics, were apparent among the Chinese comrades.

From the assessment which the Chinese make of the struggle against revisionism in this situation, and from the way Chou En-lai expressed himself to the ambassadors, it is clear that they are tired of this struggle, which was
a heavy burden for them, that they want to pull out, and that is why they judged the downfall of Khrushchev as the most appropriate moment for them to retire «with honour». And in the most anti-Marxist, unfriendly, uncomradely way (formally, at least, they ought to preserve the forms of friendship with the ally with whom they have fought shoulder to shoulder), the Chinese comrades took their own decisions (and what sort of decisions!!) and tried in the most brutal way to impose an impermissible meeting on us, too.

How did the Chinese comrades judge the new situation? In the most deplorable way. They have not thought with their heads, but with their feet, if we are still of the opinion that they are Marxists. But, however they have thought, with their heads, their hearts or their feet, this is revisionist thinking to achieve revisionist results.

In short, for them the fall of Khrushchev is everything. According to them, the major thing has been achieved, and now it is only a matter of time for everything to be put right. The Chinese comrades say: We must hold out our hand to the «Soviet comrades», the associates of Khrushchev, must forget the past, it’s over and done with, we must be understanding with the «Soviet comrades». Hence, according to them, we must assist these fine Soviet comrades. Khrushchev died, Khrushchevism died. There is no one left who must acknowledge the mistakes made, there is no one who ought to make self-criticism. Of course, the «dear Soviet comrades» made the self-criticism they had to make with the bringing down of Khrushchev. Now, continue the Chinese comrades through the mouth of Chou En-lai, indeed before all the ambassadors, nothing remains but to pack our bags quickly, because time does not wait, and set off for Moscow, to kiss one another on the day of the celebration of the Great October Socialist Revolution. And the gesture is solemn and theatrical (because Chou En-lai also speaks about the theatre which they made of their National
Day, the 1st of October), but then the celebration is a solemn day as well. Hence, we are to go to Moscow, as the revolutionaries we are, and steel our unity together with the «great revolutionaries» that we find there. What a comedy!!

As if this were not enough, Chou En-lai rose to his feet, and in front of all the other ambassadors, said to our ambassador: «I know that you don’t have even diplomatic relations with the Soviets because they broke them off. But now there is no one to make self-criticism because Khrushchev has been removed; therefore, Mehmet Shehu should pack his bag quickly and set off for the celebrations in Moscow.»

And he added further: «When I leave you, Chervonenko will come to a meeting with me and I shall tell him that the Supreme Soviet should invite the 12 socialist countries to the celebration»! What infamy!! He did not forget to say to the ambassadors also, and this certainly addressed to the Rumanians (as they told me, they had reached agreement with the Rumanians earlier), «If one of you has any special proposal, I could make it directly to the Soviets.» In other words, «You may propose that the Yugoslavs should be invited to the celebration, and we have no objection to this, indeed, between ourselves, this would please us». What a treachery!!

This whole decision, this whole idea, this whole way of raising this question of such importance for the future of communism, has nothing Marxist about it, is anti-Marxist, opportunist, revisionist treachery in its entirety. This is absolutely identical with the action of Khrushchev when he went to Belgrade for the first time to embrace Tito, to beg his pardon for the «crimes of Stalin» against him and to rehabilitate this traitor.

Such a thing proves all that I have said above about how the Chinese conducted the polemic and how they understood the struggle against revisionism, but at the same time this proves that they are idealists, fatalists, and
see the question of the struggle against modern revisionism from the angle of the "struggle against the individual", from the individualist angle, not the principled angle, see it from the chauvinist position of domination, prestige, etc. How undignified they show themselves towards the class enemy, the enemies of the revolution, the enemies of our ideology!

On the other hand, and apart from what I said above, from this scandalous performance of Chou En-lai's we must draw other logical conclusions which, regrettably, confirm their betrayal.

What are they?

1 — To assemble the ambassador of Rumania, and finally even the ambassador of Cuba, together with us, means to say to them: «You, Rumanian comrades (who up till yesterday were on the road of betrayal), and you, Cuban comrades (although you never failed to pour all those praises on Khrushchev), fully deserve the honour of being called those who brought down Khrushchev. We, the popes of Peking, consider you as such. Amen!»

2 — «As to you Albanians, we do not even ask your opinion about these situations, or what you think about the proposals we are making. You must do as we say immediately. Put aside any claim you have on the 'Soviet comrades', it doesn't matter that the 'Soviet comrades' have done all these things to you for five years on end, up to the point that they called you spies of imperialism and broke off relations with your state, but you should bow your heads and hurry to Canossa!» What a dirty feudal, fascist mentality! No bourgeois could speak in such a way. Even bourgeois dignity and standards do not permit such disgraceful arrogance. As is known, we immediately slapped back our reply, scorching their faces like a branding iron.

3 — All this was a provocation against us, and on the other hand, it was a scene prepared to tell the Soviets, the
Rumanians, the Cubans and others of this ilk: «From now on, I am breaking with the Albanians, I am no longer in solidarity with them, on either the political or the ideological issues. From now on, the Albanians are acting on their own, and they must bear the responsibility for everything they do!!» This is evident, because the Chinese comrades knew very well that we would not proceed on this road of betrayal, as they are doing, that we would reply to them, therefore they gave their reply on this issue to the Soviets and others in advance.

4 — From the haste with which they acted in connection with this so important a question, without previously consulting us (and this demand of ours is lawful), and without waiting at least for our reply, we are obliged to think that they created a fait accompli, because they might have been afraid lest some part of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, impelled by our reply, would react, and consequently, this treacherous action would be stopped.

5 — Regardless of the servility, the lack of dignity which they display in begging the Soviet revisionists to invite them to the celebration of the October Socialist Revolution or to meetings (as the Soviet renegades please), their begging to go to the celebration of the revolution in Moscow conceals in itself a base aim, hankering after «fame». Their intention is to go to Moscow and say to the world, say to the Soviets: «See, we have come as the cosmonauts of Peking, as the victors who brought down Khrushchev, we are the 'brilliant', 'infallible brain' of the communist movement. All have been brought down, all were wrong – Stalin, Khrushchev and the others. Mao, alone, saw and sees things correctly. Hence, now it is completely right to say: Marx, Engels, Lenin, Mao!»

However, if the Soviet revisionists, who are always amongst the worst revisionists, are intelligent, they will
hardly fall for this clumsy trap of Chou En-lai's (unless they consider they will gain more than they lose from this). It is possible that they will not act as Chou En-lai wishes. They may invite him, or someone else, later, not as the «victor», but as the «vanquished» to Canossa.

Briefly, this is the situation, a grave situation, very dangerous and harmful to the international communist movement. The Communist Party of China has a colossal weight in the international communist movement. This weight has been increased by its stand against modern revisionism, but many of its wavering and mistakes, which we know, the others do not know yet. The weight of China in the international arena and its role in the world is great. Whether or not the Communist Party of China is on a correct and resolute Marxist-Leninist line means whether the revolution will advance or will be slowed down, delayed and damaged. But in the end, whatever occurs, the revolution, Marxism-Leninism will triumph.

The course on which the Chinese comrades want to set out and are setting out, is very dangerous, very harmful. Chou En-lai declared: «The polemics ceased on the 16th of October, we declared an armistice. We shall have some contradictions and the polemic might flare up again, but again it will die down,» and so on. This is precisely the tactic of the revisionists towards their comrade Tito. This is just how they acted with Tito: kisses, while not forgetting to say, «We have some contradictions», sometimes they engaged in polemics with the Titoites (but always reluctantly, because if they had failed to do so they would have been exposed more rapidly), and then kisses and more kisses, but not only that. During this period Tito was inspiring them, one might say, in policy, in ideology, in organization, and degeneration. And in the end, even the famous «contradictions» disappeared from their vocabulary, and unity was achieved.
Chou En-lai's «theory» is a forewarning of the same tactics and actions. We must be very, very vigilant, and continue to struggle resolutely. We shall encounter many difficulties, they will isolate us, but with struggle we shall break out of the encirclement, because Marxism-Leninism cannot be isolated or suppressed. We are Marxists, the Party of Labour of Albania is a glorious Marxist-Leninist Party, therefore we shall break out of any encirclement, any isolation. It will tell the truth with force, and the Marxists everywhere in the world will hear it. Justice will triumph.

In no way will we accept the revisionist views and actions of the Chinese. On the contrary, we must expose and fight them. The bridges connecting us with them are collapsing, but we shall strive to the end to influence them with our correct stands.

We must do the maximum which principle permits to avoid coming out openly against the Communist Party of China, but indirectly, after a time, there is no way to prevent the split from becoming obvious. This has its harmful aspects, but also its good aspects. The just struggle we have waged up to now against revisionists has opened the eyes of many people in the world, and they are able to understand quickly who is on the right road and who is not. We must use both methods, to the Chinese we must openly express our views on everything, we must point out clearly our disagreements, everything about which we are not of the one opinion with them
d1, while in the press we must publicly maintain an open stand on every problem, without mentioning the Chinese and regardless of whether it will be understood that it is directed against the Chinese views and

---

1 On November 5, 1964 the CC of the PLA sent a letter to the CC of the CP of China in which it explained patiently and with Marxist-Leninist correctness that the assessment which the Chinese leadership made of the changes which occurred in the Soviet Union with the fall of Khrushchev was mistaken and that their proposal to go to Moscow was unacceptable.
stems. This is the only correct, Marxist-Leninist course. Wherever our opinions on certain actions are compatible, we shall be in accord, wherever we are not of one opinion, we shall never be in agreement. If things reach the point of the breaking of relations and for our differences to come out in the open, let the Chinese do this, let them use even the Khrushchevite arsenal, if they want to. Then our fire will reply to them differently.

Cautiously and progressively, we must make the Party aware of this new situation, must strengthen and temper the Party and the people, and arm them for possible dangers in the future, and must strengthen our management of the economy. We must re-examine the draft-plan more closely in connection with the existing situation. It will be impossible to prevent the disagreements with the Chinese, which have begun on ideological and political questions, from influencing our economic relations with them. Perhaps the effect will not come immediately and brutally, as Khrushchev acted, but the coercion, delays and pressures will come gradually. Therefore, we must not go blindly into investments and constructions, into an extensive development, because such a thing could break our backs; we must not become dependent on the credits they might grant us, because they might slow them down and cut them off at the moment they find most appropriate.

We must follow events and situations with great care, must be cool-headed, must always preserve our aplomb. If up till now we have had to be patient and cool-headed ten times over, from now on we must be much more so, because the dangers will be more numerous, the situations more complicated, and the enemy cunning, strong and powerful. Our responsibility to our own people, as well as in

1 See the article in this volume «The Fall of Khrushchev Does Not Put an End to Khrushchevite Revisionism» (November 1, 1964), p. 657.
the international arena, to the international communist movement, will become even greater. It is not a matter of giving ourselves importance. We must preserve our Marxist modesty. Although we are small, a small party, a small people, we must perform the role and the task that belong to us honourably, courageously, valiantly, and to the end, to victory.

We leaders have colossal responsibility and we shall do our duty to the end, until victory, because the Party is with us, we have a strong Party and we shall make it even stronger, because we have an heroic people, linked to the Party like flesh to bone; Marxism-Leninism is our ideology which guides us to victory.

A new epoch full of even sterner battles is opening to us. We are not afraid of the struggle. The people’s song says, «The Albanians are fighting the Seven Kings». For us, as revolutionaries, it is a glory to fight and continue to fight until final victory. If the total victory is not achieved in our time, we must hand on the torch to, and leave the banner of Marxism-Leninism unsullied in the hands of, communist and patriotic generations of our country and it will always wave unsullied in Albania, and the name of our heroic Party will be unsullied and glorious for ever.

«Reflections on China», vol. 1
THE FALL OF KRUSHCHEV DOES NOT PUT AN END TO KRUSHCHEVITE REVISIONISM

Article published in the newspaper «Zëri i popullit»

November 1, 1964

Khrushchev, the principal representative of modern revisionism, the renegade from the great cause of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union founded by V. I. Lenin, the splitter of the socialist camp and the international communist and workers' movement, or as the imperialists used to call him, «the man most 'suitable to the West in Moscow», has been ousted from the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and discharged from his functions as First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union.¹

The inglorious end of Khrushchev is a result of the resolute, courageous and principled struggle of all revolutionaries, Marxist-Leninists against modern revisionism from the positions of proletarian internationalism, of the struggle of all revolutionaries to defend the purity of Marxism-Leninism, a result of the open and merciless exposure of the activities of this renegade from communism. His

¹ Khrushchev was discharged from these functions on October 14, 1964 allegedly «because of his advanced age and deteriorating state of health.»
end is a great victory of Marxism-Leninism over modern revisionism.

In the ousting of the person of Khrushchev from the leading posts in the party and the Soviet state, the Marxist-Leninists and all the revolutionaries see the failure of the political and ideological course of modern revisionism formulated at the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU. The casting out of Khrushchev like a squeezed lemon shows the decay of Khrushchevite revisionism, its degeneration, the irreparable discredit its practical activities have suffered and are suffering every day. It bespeaks the fact that complete and sure defeat is the natural result of the present revisionism. It testifies that the days are numbered for whoever dares raise his hand against Marxism-Leninism, against socialism. Marxism-Leninism, the revolutionary forces have triumphed and will triumph over their enemies under whatever name or guise they may appear.

The elimination of the traitor Khrushchev from the political scene proves once again what our Party has always emphasized, namely, that the truth is on the side of the Marxist-Leninists, that our cause is just and will triumph. Marxism is invincible. Revisionism is doomed to failure. At the time of the Statement of October 20, 1961, a few days after Khrushchev and his revisionist group launched their anti-socialist and anti-Albanian attacks at their

2 This statement of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania was published in the newspaper «Zëri i popullit» on October 21, 1961.

The statement was an immediate, resolute and courageous reply to the base anti-Marxist and anti-Albanian attacks made publicly by Khrushchev and his lackeys on the PLA at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU. It stressed that, in face of Khrushchev's organized attack, the PLA, with facts and documents, will make the truth about the relations between the Party of Labour of Albania and the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union known to the entire communist and workers' movement, as well as to the world public so that they may
22nd Congress, the Central Committee of our Party expressed the conviction that «the fight imposed on our Party and people will be protracted and difficult. But difficulties have never frightened our Party and people... They will never bow or fall to their knees before the slanderous assaults, blackmail and pressure of Khrushchev and his followers. Party and people, in steel unity, will, as always, forge ahead with determination and will triumph on their right road, the road to the victory of Marxism-Leninism and the cause of socialism and communism.»* Experience, time, and facts have proved that our Party was right, that our Party was on the right road and that on this road it scored victory over the Khrushchevite revisionists. It will march on this road, resolute and unflurting, until the complete and final defeat of modern revisionism.

The ousting of Khrushchev is a clear expression of the fact that revisionism is being eroded by numerous contradictions which the revisionists will never be able to resolve. It is another confirmation of the old teaching that whoever departs from Marxism-Leninism, whoever makes common cause with the enemies of the proletariat, with the enemies of the peoples, of socialism, will be ruthlessly crushed by the wheel of the revolution, by the wheel of history. It is a vivid proof that whoever follows the road of revisionism, whether that of Kautsky, Tito or Khrushchev, will be utterly defeated.

Khrushchev is the principal representative of the revisionist line worked out at the 20th Congress and developed at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU. By planning and working to put this anti-Marxist line into effect, he branded see which side is right, and will expose the anti-Marxist and anti-Albanian actions of Khrushchev and his group». This statement is also included in the «Principal Documents of the PLA», vol. 4, pp. 153-155, Tirana 1970 (Alb. ed.).

* «Principal Documents of the PLA», vol. 4, p. 154 (Alb. ed.).
himself as the most dangerous traitor to and enemy of Marxism-Leninism, of the Soviet Union itself, of the socialist camp, of the revolution, and the peoples.

Through this line, under the guise of the so-called struggle against Stalin's cult of the individual, or the struggle for «de-Stalinization», as their Titoite friends and imperialist allies called it, the Khrushchevites opened the doors to opportunism and revisionism, to betrayal and degeneration. The Khrushchevites undermined the unity of the socialist camp and the communist movement, thus becoming the greatest splitters known in the history of the revolutionary communist movement, made approaches to and united with the US imperialists and the other enemies of the peoples and socialism, united ideologically with Titoism, with this aggressive agency of US imperialism, and wrecked the cause of the revolution and opened all the doors to the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

The history of the Soviet Union knows no agent more rabidly anti-Soviet than Khrushchev. No one has discredited and disgraced the land of the Soviets as much as he. No one has slandered the Soviet state, the Soviet socialist order more than he. By attacking J. V. Stalin and concocting the most monstrous calumnies against him, Khrushchev cancelled out the most glorious period of the history of the Soviet peoples, the period of the reconstruction of the country, of the transformation of the Soviet Union from a backward country to a powerful colossus with advanced industry and agriculture, the glorious period of the struggle to defend the achievements of the October Revolution from the imperialist enemies and renegades of every hue, the heroic period of the Great Patriotic War, when the great Soviet people, under the leadership of J. V. Stalin, vanquished the most savage enemy of mankind — German fascism, thus becoming the liberators of the enslaved peoples of the world.
Pursuing his line of betrayal, Khrushchev raised his hand against the thing most sacred to the Soviet peoples, against the dictatorship of the proletariat and its Communist Party, the guarantee of the triumph of socialism and communism, under the demagogic revisionist slogans of the "party of the entire people", the "state of the entire people", a blow which was intended to bring about the degeneration of the Bolshevik Party into a bourgeois social-democratic party, and of the socialist state into a bourgeois state.

He belittled and poured scorn upon the heroic work, the abilities of the Soviet people in building socialism, and set up America, raised and fattened on the blood of the proletarians and the oppressed peoples of the world, as a model for the Soviet Union.

Khrushchev pursued the line of wrecking the fraternal Marxist-Leninist unity of the countries of the socialist camp and the international communist and workers' movement. He isolated the Soviet Union from its true friends and brothers and linked its destiny with that of the most rabid enemies of socialism and peace, of the freedom and independence of peoples — with US imperialism, with the Tito-clique of renegades and with all the reactionaries of the world.

As a consequence of this treacherous line, the Khrushchevite revisionists launched savage attacks against the PLA and the PRA, against a fraternal party and a fraternal socialist country. Khrushchev personally made open calls for counter-revolution to overthrow the leadership of the Albanian Party and state; the economic blockade was established against the PRA; hostile plots were organized with the collaboration of the Tito clique; diplomatic relations, and all other economic and political relations were severed with the PRA.

From these anti-Marxist and counter-revolutionary positions, Khrushchev and the Khrushchevite revision-
ists hurled themselves with the fury of the class enemy upon the CP and PR of China. Thus the friendship of the Chinese and Soviet peoples and their fraternal collaboration were undermined.

Brutal interference, violation of sovereignty and independence, pressure and blackmail for subjugation and submission to his dictate, violation of the national interests of socialist countries, sowing dissension and organizing plots, breaching of all Leninist norms in relations between socialist states and fraternal parties, great-state chauvinism, — these are the typical features of the revisionist line of betrayal that inspired all the deeds and attitudes of Khrushchev towards socialist countries, towards fraternal peoples, towards Marxist-Leninist parties and all revolutionaries.

His rapprochement with US imperialism and all the reactionaries and enemies of socialism and peace is the other side of the medal of the revisionist line followed by Khrushchev. Under the demagogical slogan of ensuring peace and implementing the policy of peaceful coexistence worked out by the revisionists, Khrushchev capitulated to US imperialism, to its nuclear blackmail, not hesitating in the least to betray the interests of freedom and independence not only of other peoples, but also of the Soviet Union, for this purpose. Cuba, the Congo, the signing of the Moscow Treaty, the German problem and that of Berlin, etc., remain grave indictments of the betrayal by Khrushchevite revisionists, and are crimes against peoples' freedom, sovereignty and independence and in favour of US imperialism. Under the slogan of the «peaceful way» and «total disarmament», Khrushchev and all the modern revisionists, not only abandoned the revolution themselves, but they hampered the revolutionary struggles and movements of the peoples, the working class, and the proletariat of various countries in every way, thus ensuring peace for imperialists, colonialists and blood-sucking exploiters.
The list of Krushchev’s hostile deeds is very long. The roots of his betrayal are deep and fraught with lethal consequences for the future of socialism and the revolution. Therefore, while the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists consider Krushchev’s end in disgrace, his disappearance from the political arena, a very important victory over modern revisionism, a proof of the failure of the political and ideological course of modern revisionism, at the same time they consider that their fight is not over.

Despite the fact that Krushchev was the head of modern revisionism, his political liquidation as a person does not mean the liquidation of his political, ideological, economic and organizational course, which has brought so much evil and harm to the Soviet Union, to Marxism-Leninism, to the socialist camp and the communist and workers’ movement, to the cause of the revolution and of the freedom and independence of peoples, to the cause of peace. With the expulsion of Krushchev from the leadership of the party and Soviet state, Krushchevite revisionism is not dead, his ideology and policy expressed in the line of the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU are not liquidated. It has deep roots and in order to eliminate the danger, to cut off the possibility of its recurrence, revisionism must be wiped out root and branch. This is the only remedy.

We should not create and nurture illusions. We should not be deceived by demagogy and disguises. Marxism-Leninism teaches us to judge not by words but by facts, by the concrete, practical attitudes towards great essential issues. For the Marxist-Leninists the fight against Krushchevite revisionism will end when its course has been liquidated politically and ideologically, when the Krushchevite revisionist spirit, practice, and stand have been liquidated, when every party, in its policy, ideology and practice, proceeds from and bases itself only on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, consistently implements
the revolutionary principles of the Moscow Declarations, resolutely fights the common enemy — imperialism headed by that of the United States of America, and its agents of every hue, fights persistently, as for a sacred duty, to consolidate the Marxist-Leninist unity of the socialist camp and the communist and workers' movement, defends the principles of proletarian internationalism and puts them into practice, supports the cause of the revolution, of the freedom and independence of peoples, the cause of peace, without reserve. Every step taken in this direction will be considered positive and will have support from the PLA.

Without resolutely condemning Khrushchevite revisionism and its whole ideology and consequences with bolshevik courage, unimpressed by the troubles and threats made by the imperialists, by the tears and pressures of its most determined friends who are not only the enemies of Marxism-Leninism in general, but rabid enemies of the Soviet Union in particular, any genuine return to Marxism-Leninism, any genuine return to the Leninist norms of relations between parties and socialist countries, so brutally trampled upon by Khrushchev, is unthinkable.

The Party of Labour of Albania, like all the true Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries, will resolutely continue its just struggle until the final destruction of modern revisionism. Without falling victim to illusions, without falling into the trap of demagogy and bluffs, however camouflaged they may be, after the victory they have scored against the head of modern revisionism, Khrushchev, the revolutionary communists will tighten their ranks even more, strengthen the great anti-revisionist front, raise the banner of Marxism-Leninism even higher, sharpen their revolutionary vigilance against the enemies of the people, the imperialists, and intensify the fight against Khrushchevite revisionism which constitutes the main danger in the communist and workers' movement in our days.
We are fully convinced that in the great battle against imperialism and the offspring of bourgeois ideology — modern revisionism, Marxism-Leninism, socialism, will triumph completely. The days of revisionism and betrayal are numbered and their approaching defeat will be decisive.
The Chinese comrades are not behaving like Marxists and with modesty towards our criticisms. They are angry and their stands towards us are neither Marxist nor correct. They are displeased that we are not following them in the actions which they have decided to undertake as to the Soviets. The Chinese want and are trying to impose their mistaken opinions and actions in this direction on us. They do not even agree to prior discussions with us about the common stands that should be maintained in the common interest.

In the new situation which was created after the fall of Khrushchev, a consultation at least between the communist and workers’ parties of China, Albania, Korea, Vietnam, Indonesia, Japan and New Zealand was absolutely essential. This was not done. The Chinese comrades avoided such a meeting earlier, and despite our repeated insistence, they are avoiding it again now.

Before any change, the leaders of the communist and workers’ parties meet, discuss, define their stands and take decisions. This is essential. The problem is of a general character for the world communist movement, it does not have the character of a specific interest for a particular party, therefore it was essential to hold a joint consultation at which the views of our parties would be put for-
ward and discussed so we could come out with a common stand.

It is absurd and unacceptable that, without such a preliminary consultation, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China should come out and say to us: «This is how I judge matters, this is what I have decided, therefore you must follow me like a pet lamb»!

These are anti-Marxist methods which they themselves have condemned when others have wanted to impose them on us through the «conductor's baton». Now they are forgetting these evil actions of others, are adopting them without the slightest shame, and using them as if there were nothing wrong in this.

Of course, the refusal on our part ever to accept these wrong methods and stands leads to quarrels, disagreements, splits, and differences, and if errors are not caught in time, and if they are not understood and corrected immediately by those who make them, they get worse and gradually the road of Khrushchev is adopted.

What is impelling the Chinese to fall into this error of principle which is so simple and easily understood, but which has grave consequences for them and the international communist movement?

Petty-bourgeois conceit. This shows that the Chinese leadership is not so essentially modest as it pretends to be and as it says it is.

The spirit of great-state and big-party chauvinism. There is no speech and article in which they don't «denounce» these dangerous anti-Marxist views as such. They are constantly accusing the Soviet revisionists of this sin. But how can you describe their disdain for the other parties, for their opinions, individuality and dignity, such as Chou En-lai displayed, when in other words, he said, «Pack your suitcase and go to Moscow — to Canossa». These things cannot be described as anything but great-state and
big-party chauvinism. Chou En-lai's outlook must be no different from that of Kosygin, when the latter tried to convince me not to express our opinions at the Moscow Meeting in 1960, by saying to me: «You must bear in mind the prestige of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union». And I replied to Kosygin: «I love the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and I am protecting its prestige which you, yourselves, are violating. However, you, too, must consider the prestige of the Party of Labour of Albania».

The Chinese leaders consider, unrealistically, that the whole «victory» and «glory» in the exposure of Khrushchev and his elimination from the political scene belongs to them, that the others have been, as you might say, their «drummer-boys». Thus, they have made their judgements and decisions, prompted not by Marxist modesty, but by big-party chauvinism.

Nobody can deny the contribution of the Communist Party of China to this battle, but there are others who have not twiddled their thumbs and who «have not beaten the drum for nothing», but who have fought and made sacrifices, possibly proportionally even more than the Chinese. To underestimate the struggle of others is impermissible, but the others do not allow this, either, and are not concerned at all about your anger, which is unjust and out of place.

If the Chinese comrades do not stop their career down this course towards the Soviets, which was wrong from the start, if the Chinese comrades do not consult, discuss, and decide with the other communist and workers’ parties, which have fought shoulder to shoulder in this struggle, if the Chinese comrades do not show themselves to be realists who judge events and their stands from a sound Marxist-Leninist platform, but are impelled by egoism, megalomania, or aims of domination, they will certainly slip into grave errors and will end up the losers.
Why did the Chinese comrades, who in words pose as models of «patience» (they had set 20 years for bringing down Khrushchev and they have set three hundred years for the triumph of socialism in China), not wait at least one month, until the «Soviet comrades» could have said at least two words about Khrushchev and two words about their line? Why this impatience to embrace the Soviets?! Why this great haste and zeal to go to Moscow «in order to help the Soviet comrades and the Soviet people»?!

A few months before Khrushchev was overthrown, and at a time when our struggle with him was at its fiercest, the Chinese comrades sent a telegram to «Dear Comrade Khrushchev» and wished him a «long life». «We did this,» they said, «because of our friendship with the Soviet peoples, in order to strengthen this friendship.» A fine way to strengthen it, by wishing him, who was digging the grave for the Soviet people, a long life!!

Today the Chinese comrades are rushing to go to Moscow as quickly as they can. Why? To assist the revisionist «dear comrades», the closest collaborators of the traitor, and «through them to help the revolutionary forces in the Soviet Union», etc., etc. Astounding views!!!

For us Marxists these reasons don't hold water. Behind them there are other, unhealthy, non-Marxist aims.

We do not bring down the Soviet leaders, it is up to their party and people to do or not to do such a thing. Our correct militant stands should assist the Soviet revolutionaries to make the right decision.

The question arises: Can it be that by assisting the revisionists with such zeal you have assisted the Soviet revolutionaries?! To accept this means that you are not a revolutionary. Or is it a revolutionary gesture that, when the enemies of the revolution suffer a heavy defeat, precisely in these moments favourable for the revolution, you rush to offer your hand to counter-revolutionaries to help
them, at a time when not only are they giving no sign of any change but, on the contrary, are declaring loudly that they will continue on the treacherous course of the 20th and 22nd Congresses?! No, this is counter-revolutionary, anti-Marxist and revisionist.

After all, it was not required of you, Chinese comrades, to hurl yourselves into «major attacks», because you had broken off these polemical attacks long before, but could you not have been patient at least a few months in order to see what these «Soviet comrades» would do?! Wouldn’t it have been in order, legitimate and worthy of your party and state for the defeated enemies to have asked to come to you, to have been obliged to come to you? All these things are ABC.

Why are you so generous, to the point of opportunism, towards enemies, now at these moments, when yesterday you demanded from the Soviet Union the «territories which it had seized from you», and «Mongolia which it had cut off from China», when you said the Rumanians were right to «demand Bukovina», etc., and said that «Stalin made mistakes over the borders», and that you did all these things and set about conciliating the Rumanians, Poles, Germans and other revisionists like these, as pressure to isolate the Soviet Union? What are these stands? How can you change them so quickly in a matter of months? Why were you angry with us when we criticized you in a comradely way over these wrong stands? Your anger with us, who told you the truth, remained, while your incorrect «leftist» stands, your sectarian, even hostile stands towards the Soviet Union have turned completely round to the right, and you describe them as Marxist, and at the same time, you still bear us a grudge because we say to you: «Let us discuss matters, don’t be hasty».

It is evident that the Chinese comrades are making mistakes. They have no stable line. There are waverings in
their line, as far to the right as to the left, and their policy, likewise, cannot have a principled Marxist-Leninist stability.

Finally, let us also judge the Chinese stands by the *par l’absurde* method. Let us say that the Chinese comrades had full knowledge of the putsch against Khrushchev beforehand. They had been secretly informed by the Soviet «comrades». The Chinese comrades kept the secret from their Marxist-Leninist comrades in the struggle for no other reason but for security (here we are judging all the time *par l’absurde*). Being aware of this impending putsch, the Chinese comrades slowed down the polemic, and left us to continue it, because this is what their secret tactic required. Fine. Now the putsch was carried out. Khrushchev was eliminated. This phase was over. The Chinese knew, we did not.

The second phase begins (always by the *par l’absurde* method). The Chinese comrades are informed about the future plans of the Soviet «comrades». They have told the Chinese: Today we shall do this, tomorrow that, the day after tomorrow something else, and so on; they have reached agreement with each other, and this plan is very good (I am still continuing by the *par l’absurde* method). But this new phase can no longer be a putsch phase. It is a constructive phase (always *par l’absurde*) which requires the co-ordination of actions by Marxist-Leninist parties.

In the first phase of the operation of the putsch, the Chinese comrades did not inform us of it, and they are continuing not to inform us even in the second phase, that of the «consolidation». Does this reasoning worked out by the *par l’absurde* method hold good? Not even this method can explain the wrong stands of the Chinese. It (the Communist Party of China) cannot deceive us for long, and cannot lead us, the other parties by the nose, blindly, and say to us, «Come this way, because this is what I want, I know what I am doing. Yours is not to reason why». This is absurd!
Are the Chinese comrades fully convinced that the two biggest parties, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, are going to solve and ought to solve all the problems in international communism, and the others ought to follow them meekly? Previously, there was one conductor's baton, and this did not please us (the Chinese). Now there must be two conductor's batons and they must act à l'unisson*. Previously, you the Soviets with Stalin (continue the Chinese) walked all over us (the question of the pupil and the teacher). Stalin died. You the Soviets discredited him, meanwhile this opened up great expectations for us the Chinese. Khrushchev came, we applauded you, we were happy, but Khrushchev became a conductor with a heavy stick, who not only did not accept us (the Chinese) in the leadership of the world, but attacked us with his big stick.

Now Khrushchev has been liquidated. Great joy. We forget all you Khrushchevites have done to us, as long as you accept that the two of us, the Chinese and the Soviets, should conduct together now, and this, you the Soviets must accept, because Stalin made mistakes, Khrushchev made mistakes, only Mao has not made mistakes. It is «legitimate», «Marxist-Leninist» that in case you do not agree that I (the Chinese) should conduct and give leadership, we must at least agree that both of us should conduct, therefore if we two come to agreement, everything in this world will be put right!

But how will it be put right? We are the conscience of the world. But Marxism-Leninism? We are Marxism-Leninism.

However, Marxism-Leninism does not teach us to act in this way. Just as Marxism-Leninism struck one «conductor's baton» an iron blow to the head, it will strike an

* In unison (French in the original).
equally powerful blow at another «conductor's baton», or at two «conductor's batons» together, or a combined clique of other conductors.

No, Chinese comrades, I am convinced that you are wrong, terribly wrong, and you should pull back from these mistakes, which will become dangerous, very dangerous, later. We, as Marxists, are greatly interested that you should not make mistakes, but although we are small, although our Party is a small party, although our people are a small people, no one has the power to shut our mouths, to stop us telling the truth, defending the truth, defending Marxism-Leninism.