



MARXIST - LENINIST JOURNAL

**THEORETICAL JOURNAL OF THE REVOLUTIONARY
COMMUNIST PARTY OF BRITAIN (MARXIST-LENINIST)**

Vol. 3, No. 1

Price £1.00

February 1990

- **Raise High the Banner of
Marxism-Leninism!
Intensify the Party's Work!**
 - **The Road of the 1917 October
Revolution Remains the Way
Forward for the Working Class**
 - **The Crisis in Eastern Europe
is the Crisis of Capitalism
by Hardial Bains**
 - **Always in the Vanguard of
Society, Bearer of Progress
by Ramiz Alia**
-
-

MARXIST-LENINIST JOURNAL

**THEORETICAL JOURNAL OF THE REVOLUTIONARY
COMMUNIST PARTY OF BRITAIN (MARXIST-LENINIST)**

ISBN 1 872782 00 0

Printed and published by
WORKERS' PUBLISHING HOUSE
170 Wandsworth Road
London SW8 2LA

CONTENTS

Raise High the Banner of Marxism-Leninism! Intensify the Party's Work!	5
The Road of the 1917 October Revolution Remains the Way Forward for the Working Class.....	17
The Crisis in Eastern Europe is the Crisis of Capitalism, by Hardial Bains.....	31
Always in the Vanguard of Society, Bearer of Progress, by Ramiz Alia.....	72

Raise High the Banner of Marxism-Leninism!

Intensify the Party's Work!

Comrades and friends,

We have gathered this evening to see in both the New Year and a new decade, a decade which holds great dangers for the people as well as very great possibilities for the advance of the people's struggles.

If one goes by the bourgeoisie, a new decade of freedom and democracy is being ushered in, particularly in Eastern Europe. In our view, of course, as we have said in speeches and articles, what is being said about Eastern Europe is a very big lie. What is being created there is a very dangerous situation, linked with the crisis in the whole capitalist-revisionist world, but a particular danger in which the very grave problems that the people have had there for several decades can only increase. The great economic hardships they have had, we cannot see these will get anything but worse. The crippling foreign debts which have bedevilled their economies for 30 years or so, the policies of all these new forces coming into power are simply to increase these foreign debts. The national

Speech delivered by a representative of the Central Committee of the Party at the New Year celebration, London, December 31, 1989. Edited for publication.

and ethnic strife, which is reaching very alarming proportions, everything is there for it to get worse. We see other ugly things raising their heads again. All sorts of old quarrels – like over the boundaries in Europe, which have caused terrible strife throughout this century – are surfacing again. Ministers in the West German government talk about reunifying Germany according to the boundaries of 1937, which means they want part of Poland, and so forth. Very reactionary forces are coming to power in these countries, forces which are the descendants of the forces which were in power in pre-war years, semi-fascist powers backed by reactionary forces such as the Vatican. One can see also increased superpower interference in these countries, as they go over completely to western-style capitalism. A tremendous squabble even now one can see arising for control of the raw materials, of the labour, and so on, between the United States and the Soviet Union, with all the dangers that gives of collaboration against the interests of the people, of contention, of renewed war.

All these things are very ominous. All the possibilities exist that in old Europe, which was the seat of two world wars earlier in this century, further strife could break out in this continent, the most heavily armed continent in the world.

Nobody points out these dangers. They say all these developments are very good. "The Times" editorial yesterday said that with these developments in Eastern Europe what should have happened after Yalta at the end of the Second World War is now going to come to pass. As we have explained, this sort of thing is a complete distortion of what happened. The Yalta agreement, the Potsdam agreement, agreements which were made supposedly rounding off the Second World War and ensuring that Nazism never rose again in Europe, these agreements in fact were never carried out. Every provision, particularly of the Potsdam agreement which set out that Germany should

be unified, should be neutral, should be democratic, the old monopolies which had backed the rise of Hitler should all be broken up, the Nazis should be dismissed from public office, and so on – the western powers violated every one of these agreements. They recreated a German army with generals who had served under the Nazis. They allowed the great monopolies which had backed Hitler – the Krupps, the Farbens, and so on – to reconstitute themselves exactly as they were before. They then created unilaterally a separate state, West Germany, in absolute violation of the agreement made by the victorious powers at the end of the Second World War, which meant that a West German state came into being with all the elements which had led to the rise of fascism – the elements in the economy, elements in the civil service and judiciary, elements in the army, in education and so on. All the things which had been agreed at the end of the Second World War – so that militarism and fascism would be smashed and never allowed to rise again – the western powers for their own interests in order to oppose the then socialist Soviet Union, in order to further their own profit-making interests, violated all of those agreements. What we read now is a complete falsification of what happened then. It is not just a dangerous thing in the sense that someone is falsifying history, but they are actually making new history on the basis of these falsifications and creating very great dangers for the people.

For instance, they say what a great thing it is that the Berlin Wall has come down, this is the end of "Stalinism" in Europe. But as anyone knows who looks at the facts, of course it was not Stalin who built the Berlin Wall. Stalin's policy was that which is in the Potsdam agreement, which is that Germany should be neutral, unified, de-nazified. It was the western powers who violated all of those things, and then after Stalin's death in 1953 Khrushchev capitulated to the western powers, and it was on his instructions the Berlin Wall was built

in 1961. This created what we have in Europe now – Germany as two armed camps, the place with the most armaments in the whole world, with two great military superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, facing each other in this Germany, in which the post-war situation has never been resolved, no peace treaty has been signed, Nazism and all its elements have never been eliminated.

Rather than the Berlin Wall's coming down being a great thing, we consider the building of the Berlin Wall was a bad thing, and the bringing down of the Berlin Wall is also a bad thing, in the sense that with the situation as it is, the reunification of Germany on the basis of the powers there are in West Germany, backed by the United States, is a very dangerous thing.

As another example of the dangers, we have what has been happening in Romania just in the last few days. Romania is different from the other situations – for instance, East Germany, Czechoslovakia and so on – in that there was not a big popular movement before the regime fell. And if one looks at the actual facts, everything points to what happened in Romania being a coup by the army backed by the Soviet Union. It is a very strange thing that within hours of this thing beginning the entire army is on the side of the new power. The most prominent people in this new force which has come to power have very close links with the Soviet Union. Strangest of all, with these forces coming to power, with Ceausescu being overthrown, tried, executed within a few days, the United States issued a statement from James Baker, Secretary of State, saying that if the Soviet Union sent its troops into Romania to ensure that this National Salvation Front carries through its seizure of power, the United States will support them, will agree with it. So what it appears to be is a coup by the army, incited and organised by the Soviet Union, and with the connivance of the United States. This happened just a few weeks after Bush and Gorbachev met in Malta, and at exactly

the same time as the US sends its troops into Panama, with the Soviet Union making just a token protest. So in our view, it is clear connivance between the two superpowers, and in both of their interests, and against the interests of the people. While no one would say that Ceausescu was anything but a repressive revisionist – practising nepotism on a bizarre scale – at the same time it is a fact that he had eliminated the foreign debt, he had closed off the possibilities of both the Soviet Union or the United States making large amounts of money there by this means. So with this coup that has taken place now, the new regime have spelt out that they are going to encourage foreign investment, they have said they lack expertise so they are going to need lots of advice, lots of advisers, and so on and so forth. We can see a scenario developing of Romania a prey to foreign investment, foreign control, and with both the Soviet Union and the United States having a hold there, with all the resulting dangers of squabbling over how much they control. In our view it is a very dangerous situation which has been created.

To carry on about Romania, we do not think it is a progressive development there. At a recent meeting we had on Stalin, a person stood up and said that it is very good what is happening in Eastern Europe, particularly in Romania. He said it means that from now on they can have meetings like ours. He was arguing that the present developments in Eastern Europe – he was mentioning Romania – mean there will now be freedom for the Marxist-Leninists, that there is democracy there now, bourgeois democracy of course, but the Marxist-Leninists will be able to give their views. It seems to us an entirely mistaken view, in the sense that in such a climate where, although the communists have nothing to do with what happened there, there have not been communists in power in Romania for 35 years now, one of the main features is the most vicious anti-communism which one can imagine

is going to make life difficult for anyone progressive in Romania to put forward any sort of views or carry on any activity now. There are some people around who give a theoretical interpretation, in the sense that they say that previously there was social fascism in Romania and now there is bourgeois democracy, and as everybody knows bourgeois democracy is better than fascism. But in our view again this is very mistaken, applying a formula without regard to the particular conditions, bowing to sentimentality and bourgeois pressure.

We do not consider what is happening in Romania or the other countries of Eastern Europe as a move towards democracy and freedom. On the other hand we do not consider that it is a very great disaster. We do not think it is something we should be pessimistic about. It is not a set-back in the people's struggles. It would be wrong to say that this is a great victory for capitalism what is taking place in Eastern Europe, because the great victory for capitalism came 35 years ago, when the leaders betrayed in the Soviet Union and capitalism was restored. That was the victory for capitalism. What has happened now is simply the logical conclusion of that. So we do not agree with people – and there are people around – who feel very bad about what is happening there, and say that it makes life very difficult for us, the Marxist-Leninists, because of what has happened there. We do not think that at all, and in our view one can only think that if one had illusions about modern revisionism, if one did think there were elements of socialism left in the Soviet Union, in Hungary, in Poland, in Romania and so on. We did not think that. And we do not think it is a set-back because in no way can you say that Marxism-Leninism has failed in those countries. They have not had Marxist-Leninists in power, there has not been socialism there, for nearly 40 years now. And all the bad things that have happened, including the present dangerous developments, are all a result of giving up Marxism-Leninism.

On the contrary, these present developments show that this modern-revisionist colossus which was created all over Eastern Europe, it can be defeated. There is clearly a quite genuine sentiment of the masses of the people there against the corruption and so on of the revisionist regimes – but of course these sentiments have been manipulated by imperialism and reaction. There has been a mass movement of the people, but these sentiments have been taken over. So you would not say this is a progressive movement in Poland, in Hungary, and others.

As well as that, one could say that it is an exposure of modern revisionism. What is happening there is an exposure of what happens, all the difficulties that are created for the people, if the Marxist-Leninist road, if socialism is abandoned and capitalism is restored. And in fact one can say that what has happened there is a vindication of what the Marxist-Leninists have said right from the beginning. What Stalin warned about before he died when he was waging very fierce class struggle in the Soviet Union against the complacency which had followed the war, against the various manifestations of bureaucracy and other problems, has come to pass. It is a proof of exactly what Stalin said. It also proves exactly what Enver Hoxha said when he stood up at the Moscow meeting of 81 parties of 1960 and denounced Khrushchevite revisionism and defended Stalin. All the things he predicted in that speech in 1960 have come to pass in Eastern Europe.

What the Marxist-Leninists have said ever since – what our Party said from the day of its founding – all these things have been vindicated and proven. So why should the Marxist-Leninists take any of the blame or feel at all bad? Of course, they should be concerned, but should not feel in any way responsible for what has happened there. It was not we who supported Khrushchev. It was not the Marxist-Leninists or any Marxist-Leninists in power who sent huge amounts of finance into the Soviet

Union and the Eastern European countries. It was not we who heaped honours on Ceausescu like the Queen did and President Nixon did. The Marxist-Leninists did not support the building of the Berlin Wall, they did not support the Soviets going into Hungary, they did not support the Soviet Union going into Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union going into Afghanistan, any of those things. We condemned them all! It was not us, it was not the Marxist-Leninists who were the apologists for what was happening in the Soviet Union or Eastern Europe.

It is also a fact that the things which are happening there now, the regimes which are coming to power, and the policies they have, they will not solve any of the problems that the people have there. In no way will what they are doing, what the United States is backing, what the Soviet Union is backing, in any way satisfy the needs and demands of the people any more than a similar system satisfies the needs, the demands of the people in our country and other such countries.

It is inevitable that through all this euphoria which has been created, reality will shine through. People will see by their experience. It is quite scientific to say that things will develop in Eastern Europe which will prove that these are not developments for democracy or prosperity or freedom or peace.

So as we go into the 1990s, we the Marxist-Leninists can hold up our heads. We have never changed our line right from the beginning, we have never betrayed the principles of Marxism-Leninism. We have always upheld the true interests of the working class and the people in Britain and in all the other countries. We go into the 1990s more determined than ever to raise the banner of Marxism-Leninism, to speak boldly of what we know and believe to be the truth, and recognising the importance of intensifying our work tenfold, a hundredfold, recognising how even more important than ever it is for the Marxist-Leninists to speak out, to be even more active, to step

up our activity immeasurably, to win the working class and people over both to the democratic demands which only the Marxist-Leninists can formulate in an all-round way and to the Marxist-Leninist perspective, to the road of socialism and revolution.

We go into the 1990s, therefore, not with any pessimism, but with very great optimism. Of course we have no illusions, no illusions about the very great dangers there are, particularly coming from the situation in Eastern Europe, which are very ominous for the future of Europe, for the future of the whole world. We have no illusions as to the extent of the anti-communist offensive and the dangers that this presents for the working-class movement. To do with Eastern Europe, everyone is saying communism is finished, Marxism-Leninism has been disproved. In Hungary they are tearing down the red star from the government buildings. In Romania they cut out the red star from the national flag. But one can ask, what has the red star got to do with any of the problems that there are there? The red star was the symbol of the anti-fascist partisans in the Second World War, those who upheld Stalin. What has happened in Romania, what has happened in all these countries, has got nothing to do with the red star, with the genuine fighters against fascism, with the genuine followers of Stalin. But nevertheless it is a fact that, illogical as it is, this situation is being used to mount an immense offensive against Marxism-Leninism, against communism. And also, of course, against Albania. Yesterday in "The Times" they said that one of the features of the present situation is that although a lot has been achieved in this past year there is still much to achieve, and that this bastion in the Balkans, Albania, this still has to be dealt with.

So clearly there are very grave dangers and very great pressure is going to be exerted on Albania as well as on all the Marxist-Leninists. There is a very, very virulent anti-communist offensive, under the pretext of what

has happened in Eastern Europe.

The other thing we have no illusions about and which we think is very important is that modern revisionism remains as a major weapon for the bourgeoisie. So while the CPGB here is talking about dropping the name communist, although in these Eastern European countries the ruling parties, if they are still in power, are dropping the name communist, this does not mean that modern revisionism is finished as a weapon for the bourgeoisie. In fact, the opposite. The bourgeoisie knows very well that, say, here there is such a hatred of Thatcher's policies. In Eastern Europe one sees on television the East German worker saying, we do not want Honecker but on the other hand we still want socialism. So even though these groups may drop the name communist, the argument is still going to be put forward, which is put forward by Gorbachev, that the sensible communists now are for a hybrid between capitalism and socialism, in other words social democracy. Modern revisionism is still a very major danger to the working-class movement, advocating social democracy as the way out for the workers. This ties in with the big promotion there is now of the Labour Party, having changed their policies. All of a sudden the Labour Party which a year ago they said would never come to power again, was finished, all of a sudden Neil Kinnock is acting like a statesman, they are clearly a party of government, and so on and so forth. So these things – modern revisionism, social democracy – are still very grave dangers to the working-class movement, and we should not have any illusion about these things. As one knows, there cannot be a hybrid between socialism and capitalism. The fact is that there are only two systems, there is only socialism and there is only capitalism. Any hybrid they put forward like social democracy is not halfway between the two, it is capitalism under another name.

So as we go into the New Year, it is with us, the Party, the Marxist-Leninists, that the honour and the joy lies

to be the ones who can cut through all these lies, and put forward the only road there is for the working class and people to solve the very grave problems that they have, to combat the very grave dangers of war and strife which exist in Europe. We go into 1990 with great optimism, very inspired by the great victories in Albania, which has not deviated one iota from the socialist road. While we know Albania is going to come under very great pressure, one thinks with very great confidence that they will resist these pressures as they have resisted every other pressure in their 45-year history. We are inspired too by other great victories of the people throughout the world, the workers struggling in the capitalist countries, in the underdeveloped world people fighting for their national and social rights.

We recognise the very great importance of strengthening the Party and its influence, of being very active, and recognising that it is only the Party which can solve the problems that the working class and people have here, that can put forward the correct policies. We call on all the genuinely progressive and revolutionary-minded individuals to rally round the Party and its positions.

We recognise the importance of developing the politics, developing the political positions of the Party and taking them deep among the working class, the youth and other sections, all the time acting in a political way, not being diverted by sentimentality, by intellectualism, by subjectivism.

Our Party enters this new year with its militancy reinforced by the recent events. We extend our congratulations to all the comrades and friends on their work throughout the year. We give our best wishes to all the comrades and friends and their families, for success in their life and in their struggles. We send our greetings to the Marxist-Leninists throughout the world, to the PLA and Comrade Ramiz Alia and to all the fraternal parties, to all those millions throughout the world

struggling for their rights and freedoms.

In that light, we wish all the comrades and friends a happy New Year, and we raise our glasses to the Party and Marxism-Leninism. Happy New Year!

The Road of the 1917 October Revolution Remains the Way Forward for the Working Class

Comrades and friends,

We meet today to commemorate the October Revolution. With all the dramatic events going on in Eastern Europe, with new things happening every day, there has never been a time when the October Revolution and what it stood for has been under such attack. Of course, from the capitalist and imperialist powers it has always been under attack, right from the very time it occurred, but at this present time it is under attack also from the powers in the East, and from the very country in which the October Revolution occurred. Hardly a day goes by when it is not proclaimed to the world that socialism as a system has failed, that communism, or Soviet-style socialism, has been tried, it has not worked, and all over the world the countries which took it up are giving it up and going back to capitalism. The ideas of Marx

Speech delivered by a representative of the Central Committee of the Party at the meeting to commemorate the anniversary of the October Revolution, London, November 10, 1989. Edited for publication.

and Lenin are archaic and invalid and the 1917 Revolution, that world-shattering event, is a source of evil. This is even said in the Soviet Union itself.

The October Revolution even moved Margaret Thatcher to make one of her pronouncements on world history. A few months after she dismissed the French Revolution and compared it very unfavourably to a coup which took place in Britain 300 years ago which they call the "Glorious Revolution", but which was simply a change of kings, she made the great announcement that the revolution of 1917 was not a real revolution at all, it was simply a coup, and the real revolution happened in Britain in 1979, led by the Conservative Party, and is spreading out all over the world, to the Soviet Union, to Hungary, to East Germany, and becoming a world revolution.

Leaving aside Margaret Thatcher and her astonishing brand of chauvinism for the moment, it has to be said that socialism is not being abandoned in Eastern Europe now because the fact is that genuine socialism was abandoned in the Soviet Union, was abandoned in all of what were then called the people's democracies in Eastern Europe more than 35 years ago, and they very quickly lost all their features of socialism. Of course, there are other countries as well. Yugoslavia abandoned the principles of socialism even earlier, and in China they never fully took up the socialist principles. But socialism in its true sense was given up in a very wholesale way nearly 40 years ago. And all the problems which exist in Eastern Europe now, and obviously they are very serious problems - very grave crisis in the economy, very great hardships for the people, national strife on a quite horrific scale which is increasing all the time, corruption in the system, moral decay - in our view, these things come not from socialism, they are not a result of socialism, they are the result of giving up socialism nearly 40 years ago, from the point of Stalin's death and coming to power of Khrushchev.

The fact is that when true socialist principles were applied, they actually did work. They worked in the Soviet Union from 1917 up to the point of Stalin's death, and they work at the present time in socialist Albania, which is the only genuinely socialist country in the world and has been for more than 30 years.

If one looks at this revolution which we are commemorating today, the October Socialist Revolution in 1917, what did it achieve? It established for the first time in world history a workers' state. The working class had taken power in Paris in 1871, the short months-long period of the Paris Commune, but in terms of a whole country, and as it happened a very vast country, this was the first time the working people had come to power, and a democracy was established there which truly gave the workers and the peasants and other working people a voice and control over what happened in their country. Political institutions were set up unlike the type of political institutions in our country and other similar countries, where a parliament exists which is no more than a talking shop, with all the real decisions, all the real power being somewhere else, in the board-rooms of the major industries, and increasingly not just board-rooms in this country, but boardrooms in Detroit and Tokyo and so on.

The revolution established in the Soviet Union a true democracy, a system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which was not a dictatorship as it is maligned today, a dictatorship of a handful of individuals, but the dictatorship of a whole class, of the majority, with the express purpose of making sure that the previous exploiters and oppressors of the people, the financial oligarchy, the big landowners, the foreign capitalists, had no rights and were prevented from coming to power.

They fought great struggles to preserve this system, especially after Lenin's death when Stalin became the leader. They waged great struggles inside the country against various backward influences, they talked about

the force of the old habits, the remnants from the past, the pressure from the outside world, from the imperialist countries, who from the outset tried to destroy the first socialist state. They fought bureaucracy and liberalism inside the Party, and they dealt justly and maturely with the oppositional forces intent on sabotaging any advance, many like the trotskyites in the service of foreign hostile powers. The result was that such unity was created, such productive forces were released, that advances were made in industry and agriculture in a very short time, which had never been seen in the history of the world before. From a very backward country, a country beset by famine and poverty, within the space of 20 years, a modern industrial state was created, and contrary to what one reads, was all done voluntarily and with the unity of the people. They talk now about people being forced into collective farms, for instance, but if you go back and read the actual documents of the time, while there were some excesses by certain regions this was never the policy of the Party and whenever it happened it was severely criticised. Those great movements which took place, of the development of heavy industry, of the development of the collective system in agriculture, were carried with the great support and enthusiasm of the people, and it could not be otherwise.

Also, in a country of more than 100 different nations, a country which had been known as "the prison of nations", in which the Russian nationality had dominated and subjugated the other nations of the old Tsarist empire, in a country of the most terrible chauvinism, of rampant anti-Semitism, within a very short space of time national oppression was stopped, unity and equality were created among all these different nations, the different nations were given the opportunity to set up their own republics, given the right to self-determination, up to secession from the Soviet Union if desired. The national languages were encouraged, education in the national languages was estab-

lished, national cultures were supported and they carried out a policy which they called "naturalisation", i.e. that people from the nationality itself would as quickly as possible, take all the leading posts in the Party, in the economy, in the different institutions.

A foreign policy was adopted which for the first time in world history gave a country which was opposed to imperialist aggression, was opposed to annexations of smaller countries by bigger countries, which truly stood up for the rights of the peoples and of the nations. Because of all these things, the Western capitalist powers brought into being, encouraged and incited the Nazis in Germany, as a deliberate measure to turn them against the Soviet Union and wipe it out, as can be seen from the Cabinet papers of the time, from the speeches given by government representatives of Britain and France. The Soviet Union made very great efforts to get these different countries to come together and sign a collective security pact against the danger of fascism, but at every stage the western powers refused and eventually the Soviet Union was forced as a move to buy time, to sign a non-aggression pact with Nazi Germany and then when, as was inevitable, Nazi Germany finally did invade the Soviet Union, had enough strength, enough unity among its people to drive the Nazis back and play the main role in smashing the Nazi menace. The Soviet Union suffered very great losses in doing so, but then restored their country in quite remarkable fashion. Through the liberation of numbers of countries in Eastern Europe, they gave the possibility to the people there to set up people's democracies, which were not as was later to become the case, puppets of the Soviet Union, but countries with which they had equal relationships.

For all these reasons, one could say that the Soviet Union truly stood for the rights of the peoples and nations, it truly stood for peace and security in the world, and as such, it was loved by the workers, by the peoples

throughout the world who were striving for their independence, fighting for their freedom and sovereignty. All these things were accomplished following very definite principles. In the economy, they followed the principles of self-reliance, of not allowing, apart from the temporary period of NEP, foreign investment or any sort of foreign interference in their economy; of the liquidation of private property and the setting up of socialist property; of a planned economy serving the well-being of the people.

So what happened afterwards? By 1985 a situation existed where Gorbachev could say when he came to power that the economy was in the most terrible crisis, there was a very great backwardness, there was stagnation, there was rampant bureaucracy and corruption in the Party, in the economy, in the state institutions, there was great moral decay in the country.

Gorbachev put the source of all these problems down to the leadership of Stalin. But how can the problems of the 1980s in the Soviet Union, how can these be blamed on somebody who died more than 30 years ago, and in whose time the very opposite was happening, the Soviet Union was thriving, was advancing, was able to fight a world war and smash the Nazi menace? How could this be blamed on the leadership of Stalin? It would seem to us that if one wants to see where all this backwardness in the economy came from, where did the bureaucracy come from, where did the moral decay come from, one has to go back to Khrushchev's time. Khrushchev and his henchmen, coming to power by a putsch, first secretly and then later openly, said that they were going to undo everything that Stalin stood for. Taking advantage, among other things, of the complacency in the Party resulting from the Soviet Union's great victories, by giving various privileges to the top stratum in the Party, in the economy, in the various state institutions, created a new ruling class, they changed the economy from a socialist one to what became basically a capitalist economy, one based on profit

with the new bourgeoisie amassing wealth by virtue of their positions in the Party, state or economy. Most importantly, and in direct contradiction to the principles of genuine socialism, they encouraged foreign capital into the country and made the Soviet Union part of the world capitalist market. In foreign policy they changed the policy to one no different in essence to the policy of the United States, of the various imperialist countries, interfering in other countries economically and if necessary militarily. The Soviet Union, under Khrushchev, sent troops into Hungary. Their efforts and the efforts of the Yugoslavs had brought to power various elements who were also against socialism. But when these elements openly said they were going to take Hungary into the Western bloc, the Soviet Union sent in its troops to crush the forces in Hungary and to make sure it was kept in the Soviet camp. They sent their forces into Czechoslovakia later when Czechoslovakia threatened to do the same thing. They changed their policies towards the East European countries to policies which meant that the Soviet Union controlled these countries and exploited them. This was even raised to a point of theory when Brezhnev put forward the theory of "limited sovereignty". And of course the Soviet Union signed various treaties with other countries like India which can only be seen as enslaving treaties.

In 1984-85, Gorbachev came to power. He says there needs to be a qualitative change and institutes his policy of perestroika in the economy and glasnost in the political field. But if one looks at these actual policies, they simply carry the Soviet Union even further down the road on which Khrushchev, Brezhnev and the other leaders had taken it. It was no reversal, it was no qualitative change. Profit became absolutely openly the main index of production in the Soviet Union.

Contrary to the socialist system, the enterprises are now completely dependent upon the fluctuations of the market. Wages depend on the fluctuations of the market.

If firms do not make a profit they go out of business. If an enterprise does not succeed the workers are fired. Private property has been reintroduced in the countryside, going back to family farms, to farms owned by individuals. The Soviet Union has been opened up to foreign investment and joint enterprises are being set up with western concerns. The Soviet Union has gone completely into the capitalist world market to the extent now that they are talking about applying to join the IMF and the World Bank.

Similar changes are taking place at a very rapid rate in the other countries of Eastern Europe.

But if this perestroika which is hailed so enthusiastically by the Margaret Thatchers, the Bushes, the Neil Kinnocks, by virtually all the political parties in this country and the other western countries is such a marvellous thing, surely it should result in some benefit to the people of those countries. But if you look at the actual results, the opposite is happening. Has it brought more prosperity to the people of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe? The fact is, and this is by their own statistics, the standard of living has dropped drastically in the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe. The gap between rich and poor has become greater. Great unrest is taking place among the workers. Strikes are increasing.

Are these new policies bringing prosperity, taking away the hardships of the people? Take, for example, Poland. Poland has a very major problem in its economy and that is that it has a huge foreign debt. But the moment the new government got into power, the Solidarity government, the first thing they did was send Lech Walesa to Washington and other western capitals to ask for more money, for the banks, the IMF and so on, to lend Poland more money. If the foreign debt has had a crippling effect on the economy and therefore on the livelihoods of the

people, how is having the debt even bigger going to solve any problems?

As to the unity of the different nations, the freedom of the different nations, one can see all the time the most terrible national strife developing, in Armenia and Azerbaijan, in numbers of other places there is strife between people of different origins, which one can now speak of in terms of pogroms. The chauvinism of the Great Russians, of those of the Russian nationality against those of the other nationalities, is returning to the scale of Tsarist times. In the outlying republics the national languages are being suppressed, education in the national language is being restricted, national cultures are not being given the encouragement they were before, control in many posts comes from people outside the nation.

In recent months, when in the Baltic states, in Lithuania, they openly said that they were going to ask for secession from the Soviet Union, Gorbachev immediately said this is not allowable, secession is not allowable in the Soviet Union and he backed it up with what were quite clear threats, that if they tried to go ahead, the central powers would use military force to put this secessionist move down. It is a fact that last year for the first time since 1917, an amendment was put forward to the Constitution of the Soviet Union taking away the right of secession of the republics. Meanwhile, noises from the Central Government about the "rights of the Russian nationals" in the Baltic states awake memories of similar noises by the Nazis about German nationals in pre-war Czechoslovakia.

Thus one cannot say that the unity between the nations has been enhanced by perestroika and glasnost, in fact the opposite. It is reaching disastrous and highly dangerous proportions.

As to the question of peace, they are claiming that perestroika and glasnost are bringing world peace nearer, but one just has to look at the situation. In Afghanistan,

it is true that the Soviet Union has withdrawn, but is there peace in Afghanistan? The fact is that there is still the most vicious civil war, with the Soviet Union giving arms to one side and the United States giving arms to the other side. If one thinks of the INF treaty, the much heralded "disarmament" going on, one thing of course is that disarmament is somewhat fraudulent in that many of the arms which they are destroying and eliminating are simply being substituted with other arms. For instance, in Britain they withdrew the cruise missiles, but just in recent months it was announced that they were bringing into the American bases here a new type of bomber with an aircraft-based missile of which there will be more than there were the previous cruise missiles.

That aside, one comes to the conclusion that the reason behind these disarmament talks and these agreements is that in fact both the Soviet Union and the United States are interested in cutting down the arms production, that they cannot afford the arms race at the level it has been, particularly because of the competition which they now feel from West Germany, from Japan, which are both rising to challenge the hegemony of the US and the Soviet Union in the world economy.

In our view this lull in the arms race is simply for those economic reasons, in order to be able to compete with each other at a higher level, after having sorted out their economies. But one knows if one looks at history that it is this competition for markets, competition for spheres of influence, which has led to the previous imperialist wars. These moves are thus not a guarantee of peace, in fact with fiercer competition the danger of war at a later stage with even more sophisticated weapons is still there.

In addition, the present developments in Eastern Europe are creating a dangerous instability, while in countries like Hungary and Poland, very reactionary, backward forces are coming into power. One cannot forget that

Poland before the war was a semi-fascist country. One of the greatest backers of the semi-fascist powers was the Catholic Church. You now have a government, Solidarity, whose greatest backer is the Catholic Church and the same anti-socialist, anti-people, dangerous elements are coming to power.

In these countries they are now bringing in complete western-style parliamentary institutions, replacing even the pretence of socialist-style institutions. But then this seems to us a very strange thing, because in the West there has never been a time when the parliamentary politicians have been held in such low regard, there has never been a time when people have been so fed up with the parliament, considering that none of these parties actually seem to be presenting anything in their interests, thinking that our political institutions do not serve the interests of the people here, that particularly the workers have no voice in the running of the country through these parliamentary institutions. So it seems a very strange thing to hail the adoption of similar institutions in the countries of Eastern Europe, particularly when you think of the great sacrifices, the heroic efforts that the peoples of those countries made in order to get rid precisely of that type of institution.

The present problems in the Soviet Union, in Eastern Europe, they are not the result of socialism. In fact the opposite. All the present problems which are faced there are the result of deviating from the socialist principles nearly 40 years ago. They do not signify that socialism has failed at all. They signify that giving up the socialist road, going back onto the capitalist road is what fails, and it gives the people no more guarantee of prosperity, of liberty, of peace, than it does to people in our countries in the West.

All this euphoria, this great enthusiasm for the changes, we think is a big lie which is being perpetrated on the people. Through it the whole history of the 20th century

is being re-written. Who was it who actually brought the Nazis to power? Which force was it which actually defended the Nazis? All this is in the service of trying to wipe out socialism altogether and wipe out the socialist ideology, distorting what has happened up to the present time, and distorting what actually are their plans now for the people. One only has to think of Margaret Thatcher applauding what she calls her revolution in 1979. One does not have to convince anybody what the results of that revolution are; in terms of what Thatcher's revolution has done to the economy, to the rights of the people, to the stability and unity of the people in the country, to peace and security. The fact is that on a world scale, led by the US, led by the Soviet Union, allied with Britain, and the other imperialist countries, there is a counter-revolutionary offensive going on against the people. These reactionaries think they have the working class on its knees, they think they can carry on their own way irrespective of the consequences, irrespective of public opinion.

It is not a time of great upsurge in the struggles of the people, but at the same time just because there is an ebb tide in the struggles of the peoples in the world, that does not mean to say the laws of socialist development have changed in any way, it does not mean to say the capitalist system is not decaying any more and it does not mean to say that the revolutionary path, the path of the national liberation struggles, is not still the way forward for the working people, who will never reconcile themselves to exploitation and oppression.

In our view this euphoria about the end of socialism, the confusion it can create among large numbers of people, this is a thing which is temporary. With capitalism in crisis in the West, how is capitalism in the East going to be any different? People will see through their own experience the results of these various changes.

But at such a time, it is never more necessary than that the Marxist-Leninists should stand firm and proclaim

their principles and policies and explain them to the people, there has been never more necessary a time to hold high the banner of Marxism-Leninism and to stand up for what the Great October Revolution stood for, the great leaders of the Great October Socialist Revolution stood for, and to put these principles and policies into practice.

At a time of such great anti-communist offensive when, although it is not the genuine Marxist-Leninists who have caused the disasters in Eastern Europe, these disasters are being used to mount a virulent campaign against Marxism-Leninism, we consider it more necessary than ever to defend the lessons of the October Revolution. The October Revolution teaches the need of the working class for a party of the new type, the Leninist Party. It teaches that there can only be one such party and all genuinely progressive and revolutionary people should rally around this party. It teaches that such a party must be continually strengthened and its influence spread among the workers and other sections, with the strictest application in its ranks of the Leninist norms, of democratic centralism. It teaches that there is a continual battle to combat alien manifestations in the Party, to struggle against the various outlooks and habits brought into the Party from other classes, backward ideas on the family, preoccupation with private property, lack of awareness of the dangers coming from class origin. It teaches the need for the Party to be always active among the masses of the people, participating in their struggles and giving a lead to them. It teaches that it is not possible to mix the bourgeois and the proletarian ideology. At such times as these, the need of the Marxist-Leninist Party, the need to strengthen it and develop its influence is greater than ever.

On this commemoration of the 1917 Revolution, we consider that all the events going on in the world at the present time, particularly in Eastern Europe and of course

in China as well, they do not show that socialism has failed, they do not show that Marxism-Leninism as a theory – philosophic, political, economic – has been tried and has not worked. We do not think that the era of the leadership of the working class by a single Marxist-Leninist party, the striving for the working people to seize power and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, we do not think any of these things have changed. In fact, we think all the events of the present time show the opposite. They show that the 1917 Revolution and all it stood for are the only way forward still for the working class, for the working people of this country and other countries and we think all these things bring home the necessity to raise the banner of Marxism-Leninism even higher, to strengthen the Party and its influence, to remain true to the lessons of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The policies of Lenin and Stalin which were instituted in the Soviet Union after the Revolution, policies which are instituted now in socialist Albania, the policies which all the genuine Marxist-Leninists uphold, these are the only policies which give a guarantee for the prosperity of the people, for their rights and their unity, for peace and security in the world.

The Crisis in Eastern Europe is the Crisis of Capitalism

by Hardial Bains

Comrades and friends:

First of all, I would like to welcome you to this social evening organised by the Central Committee of the Party on New Year's eve and the eve of the new decade.

1989 was one of those years which saw very specific changes in the international situation. And of course these changes were not unpredictable from our point of view. Our Party and all the fraternal Marxist-Leninist communist parties had actually predicted that this would happen. But the particular form in which all these events unfolded covers up – in a way, it conceals – the real essence of the events. The real significance of the events lies in the deepening and broadening of the crisis of the capitalist system on the world scale, and 1989 witnessed its further deepening. This crisis, of course, is first in the economic field, which is the basis of crises in the other fields. For

Speech delivered by Hardial Bains, First Secretary of the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist), to the New Year celebrations, Hull, Quebec, December 31, 1989 - January 1, 1990. Edited by the author for publication.

example, if there were no economic crisis, that is, crisis of capitalism, there would have been no crisis in the Soviet Union or Eastern Europe politically or in any other field. This crisis in Eastern Europe is a crisis of capitalist restoration, a crisis of the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, a crisis of retreat from revolution and socialism. This has shaken all the capitalist countries, and has especially shaken imperialism and social imperialism, the bourgeoisie and world reaction. They try to rejoice at the developments. They are trying to turn these events into an offensive against communism. They try to assert to the world that communism has failed. But if your house burns down and you say that this is a disaster for your neighbour, well, this is all the worse for you. It is the direct result of the sharpening of all the contradictions of imperialism and social imperialism, to the extent that we saw the violence of the bourgeois system in crisis as exemplified in Romania, or in the invasion of a small country in Central America, Panama, by the US. All this shows the failure and deepening of the crisis of the capitalist system, and that the two superpowers are the ferocious enemies of the freedom and independence of the peoples of the world. It also shows that whenever the two superpowers speak of relaxation of tension between them, it is also detrimental to the interests of the people.

Within this situation, there is also the failure and the deepening of the crisis of the social-democratic and left wing of the bourgeoisie and reaction. The developments in Eastern Europe, besides anything else, show the bankruptcy of the ideo-political line which led to this disaster there, the line of a hybrid society: that there is a new system which has socialism as well as capitalism, that there is such a thing as a mixed economy, etc., a kind of hybrid society which in actual fact and in essence is a capitalist society with some of the forms resembling socialism in the superstructure maintained for the sake of appearances. This bankruptcy is coming on the heels

of the exposure and crisis of the social-democratic and left wing parties of the bourgeoisie in Western Europe. The crisis of these parties is insurmountable, to the extent that the social-democratic parties, whether in Greece, Italy, France, Britain or any other country do not in any way differentiate themselves from the other bourgeois parties. They are willing to enter into alliance even with the devil, so long as they maintain their power.

This development also shows that the working people in these countries, the capitalist and revisionist countries, do not trust them. One of the features of 1989, or generally of the 1980s, has been revolt of the people against all the illusions which the bourgeoisie was creating. The latest developments in Eastern Europe saw tens of millions of working people going into the streets and demanding changes, both in the political superstructure and most importantly in the economic field. Those who manipulated this discontent are calling it the victory of capitalism, and there is no dearth of present-day Neros who are applauding and happy to see Rome burning. Capitalism and its agencies are rejoicing at the sharpening of its own contradictions. This situation is not a debacle for communism. It is not a failure of communism. It is actually the predictions of Marxism-Leninism coming true, that the workers will not be satisfied with their situation, that this is the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution, that the bourgeoisie is at the end of its rope, that the working class is the gravedigger of the bourgeoisie.

The demands which have been put forward in various countries on the world scale do not indicate that these are demands for the resurrection of the bourgeoisie or of the capitalist system, or that the people have accepted the tutelage of the two superpowers. Of course, this situation is manipulated and taken advantage of first and foremost by internal reaction, as well as by imperialism and social imperialism. Eastern Europe is a good example of this. It is an important area for imperialism,

for it hopes to weaken its rival, expand its zones of influence and protect world capitalism. Soviet social imperialism, which poses as a champion of "restructuring" and "rethinking", which amount to the consolidation of the old order, uses it to subvert other countries and keep those under its thumb while the US is trying to do the same under the guise of defending "freedom" and "democracy". In actual fact, the two enemies of the world's peoples, one a false communist and the other openly anti-communist, are threatening freedom and democracy in their own right. The two superpowers and the "democratic west" manipulate and use internal reaction for their own ends, while internal reaction needs them to retain its power. Internal reaction in Poland is led by the Vatican, the Catholic Church. Internal reaction in East Germany is led by the Protestant Church. Internal reaction in various countries in Eastern Europe is taking advantage of the discontent with the revisionist bourgeois system which exists there. What exists is counter-revolution within revisionist counter-revolution. This shows the necessity for the workers to have their own Party, to have Marxism-Leninism as their guide. It does not prove the opposite. The example of Poland where Solidarity is leading the government proves beyond any shadow of doubt that it is a reactionary government at the service of internal reaction and world imperialism. It cannot be called a pro-worker government by any stretch of the imagination.

The propaganda of the bourgeoisie and world reaction that these developments favour the working people is directed toward the gullible and the banal, towards those who do not want to see clearly, the vacillators. A vacillator feels that everything is lost. His communism is lost. We have been told everybody is waiting to hear our opinions. Well, we have been giving these opinions since 1963-4. Where have you been? You can have our opinions, but as I just said, you could have had them 25 years ago and

every year since. So what is so significant and important that you want to know now? The pressure is exercised by those whose convictions are those of a dodo bird, somebody who is on the verge of extinction. We Marxist-Leninists are not agnostics in terms of attitude towards revolution, or ideology, or our class, or our Party. We are loyal to our aims, and for this reason we look at the present-day world developments not as if all of a sudden the earth has stopped going around the sun and now the sun has started going around the earth. In our opinion, it is extremely foolish to turn one's head away from science, away from truth, away from reality, and to listen to what is said by the bourgeois press, which is generally known as being against the interests of the people, especially against the interests of the working class. So these "well-meaning" people who have this question in mind are playing into the hands of the bourgeoisie, into the hands of the worst reaction. The words they use and the words of those who have been and are dyed-in-the-wool fascists have become the same. These are people from the middle strata, and they have to be very careful. When the bourgeoisie makes some advance, some headway against revolution, some in the middle strata feel that everything is lost. And instead of siding with the working class, they side with the bourgeoisie. Instead of siding with revolution, they say that revolution is finished, that it is a thing of the past.

How many of these people from the middle strata, from the petty bourgeoisie, were excited about the Berlin Wall! I was asked the question: Do you think that the German people have the right to freedom, the right to their unity, etc.? Comrades and friends, this question is posed deliberately in a misleading fashion. Those who commit crimes against humanity should be punished. Germany was an aggressive Nazi nation, and today under the tutelage of the world's worst reactionary state, the United States, that reaction has been re-organised in

the name of West Germany. Can you believe that those who have committed such crimes have not even signed a peace treaty that vows to the world that they will not carry on such activities again? And today, the same press is talking about the rise of a semi-fascist movement in East Germany and elsewhere as if this were the hallmark of freedom! Those people who are celebrating the fall of the Berlin Wall should remember that the Berlin Wall came into being as a betrayal of the freedom of the people, and its falling is exactly the same. What freedom has anyone achieved? It is to falsify and to fool the people about the aims and programme of world reaction that such events are organised, and these people are celebrating their greater freedom - "we have better chances for peace at this time", that "Gorbachev is a man of peace", that "George Bush and Gorbachev, when they get together, are talking about how to build harmony in this world", etc. This Malta conference, their get-together, is only three or four weeks old. Already Romania has fallen with blatant interference by imperialism. Panama has been invaded and occupied by the US. Is this the example of freedom after the Berlin Wall fell! This Brandenburg Gate, the symbol of German reaction, is being presented as a symbol of freedom in the style of Ronald Reagan laying wreaths at the Bittburg Cemetery! Baker openly incites and talks about West Germany never leaving the aggressive military alliance, that it will always be part of the NATO military alliance. The agreements in Yalta and elsewhere stipulated - and the Soviet Union under Stalin stood for - the immediate reunification of Germany, but Germany as a democratic Germany, as a Germany which would never militarise, a Germany which would not be aggressive or be part of any aggressive military bloc and would not pose any danger to anyone, a Germany with borders decided by those against whom aggression was committed.

Now they are telling us that this policy of American

imperialism to re-organise world reaction, including neo-nazis, is a policy of freedom and democracy. This is not the case. US imperialism has never stood for freedom or democracy. These apologists of imperialism and social imperialism, these apologists of Mussolini, Hitler and others, want us now to believe in the new Hitlers of the present time. In the 20th century, the USA and Britain were behind Italian fascism. They sat together with them. In the same fashion, they were the ones who provided the economic support for Hitlerite Germany. After 1945, there is not a single reactionary state in the world which did not get full support from Anglo-American imperialism. Now they are telling us that this imperialism is for freedom and democracy, and they are pointing to the Berlin Wall!

Comrades and friends, on the one hand there is the advance of this reaction against the interests of the people, against the interests of the working class, against the interests of communism. On the other hand this is the heyday of a vacillator, who says: look, all this is for the well-being of mankind, all this reflects the advance of higher ideals, etc. This is not the case. Nothing has changed, either objectively or in the sphere of ideas, which should tell us that we should change our opinions and views. Nothing has changed which should warrant re-analysis and re-thinking of the situation, whether we are speaking nationally or internationally. The conditions, both objective and subjective, remain the same. At the same time, there are increasing dangers to the working class and people. Because of these increasing dangers, of course, reaction is nestling everywhere, and there is a broad support for fascist and Nazi movements in the ruling circles of all these so-called civilised and democratic countries. Not a single person from the ruling circles in Western Europe can be called a democrat or has emerged as a democrat. We do not need "restructuring", but an anti-imperialist and anti-fascist revolution, the revolution of the working class to overthrow the conditions which

enslave mankind.

What is a democrat? A democrat was defined by the Second World War. A democrat is one who is anti-fascist, and who permits the existence of communism. Without being anti-fascist, without permitting the communists to organise, one is like a bloody Shah. Or one is like these tin-pot dictators established by imperialism. Which one would we say is champion of freedom for communists? Which one says that the Nazis and fascists should be punished and should not be permitted to organise? Revisionists and turncoats and traitors have the habit of calling these kind of elements democrats, and push for a-class democracies and freedoms in order to assist the Nazis. There is no such thing as a real democracy without the content which helps the working class and people. Is Brian Mulroney a democrat? Is George Bush a democrat? Of course, these people who conspire and intrigue against the interests of the people every day are going to present themselves in the image of democrats, of those who stand for freedom. Brian Mulroney's democratic ideal was tested when he unabashedly supported the US invasion of Panama!

Democracy in the 20th century has a very specific meaning, and we should not forget this. For example, in the second decade of the century, there was the overthrow of the tsarist feudal aristocracy, and that was the greatest advance for democracy, where reaction was brought to its knees, where the people were given the chance to build their future, their own lives, where a brand new system came into being, a system called socialism, which makes it possible for the working class to really express itself, to show the stuff it is made of. And that stuff is what brought Russia out of medievalism into the modern world in the shortest possible time, by ending the exploitation of man by man, not by enslaving anyone, and prepared the condition for the crushing of Hitlerite reaction, which was a threat to the very existence of

mankind. This was and is an advance for democracy. All the oppressed people on the world scale looked towards this great exploit of the working class, and took courage and inspiration from it. A vigorous anti-colonial struggle developed on the world scale and changed the map of the world. Anti-colonial people stood for their dignity, for their freedom, for their progress. The old system of colonialism came crashing down, and a new world came into being. This is an advance for democracy. The working class and intelligentsia of the world looked toward that Soviet Union for the highest ideals mankind could ever espouse, defend, elaborate and fight for. In opposition to this, the entire world reaction got organised. Fourteen western countries, led by Britain, France, the US, etc., tried to wipe out this great exploit of the working class. They tried to end the gains of the Great October Revolution. This was not the first time, nor the last time either.

From the second decade of this century to the present time, these countries have harboured the most reactionary, most deadly enemies of freedom and progress. These US reactionaries talk about democracy, but they have the most reactionary state which ever came into being. The reactionaries in France and elsewhere also speak of democratic traditions. Where were these democratic traditions when they collaborated with Hitlerite Germany and carried the onslaught against the people in Europe and the people on the world scale? They are trying to suggest to us that we should call these countries democratic because there are some people there, that we should make differentiation between the state and the people. Comrades and friends, this differentiation cannot be made just as an idea. People have to show themselves, that they are against the ruling classes, that they stand for democracy and they fight. Many struggles in Europe, such as the resistance movement and the anti-fascist movement which developed, expressed a true movement for democracy, for freedom. Where

did all these movements end up? They were betrayed by these people who are talking about "democracy". In the forefront of this were the Eurocommunists. Each one of these parties refused to take power in favour of the people, in favour of democracy. Each one of these parties betrayed the principles of Marxism-Leninism. So what was achieved? The consolidation and strengthening of the anti-democratic system in these countries.

Comrades and friends, when we look at these developments, we look at the mentality of a vacillator. He comes to us and says: I am an ignorant person, I don't know what is going on, could you enlighten my mind now and tell me where we stand? He demands that we should just stand by while he raises objections and creates doubt about our stand. Meanwhile, he is supporting everything rotten and filthy, chauvinism and fascism, demanding that the whole world should acknowledge that reality is really a matter of definition and interpretation, a matter of one's whim. The viciousness and rottenness of these vacillators is such that they claim that they are for democracy and freedom, but when it comes to taking a stand and fighting for democracy, then they are seen on the other side of the barricades. As the 20th century has repeatedly shown, democracy and freedom is not a catchphrase. Democracy and freedom is the expression of what people have achieved by shedding their own blood. But in various countries, the differentiation between democracy and otherwise is presented not as a life-and-death struggle, but merely as the outcome of a talkshop and as a matter of taste! This is not how democracy is won or can be won for the working class and people of the world. Democracy is not a catchphrase and was not designed to be a catchphrase. It is determined by the course of the life and death struggle, whether it will end for the benefit of the people, or be detrimental to the interests of the people. For us, democracy and freedom are not questions which are merely discussed for the sake

of pleasure, to conjure up the best system in the world.

Comrades and friends should understand that while this period is a period of the deepening and broadening of the crisis of capitalism, of imperialism and social imperialism, of the world bourgeoisie and reaction, at the same time it is a period of great betrayals and great treachery. This means that we have to be careful. We have to be vigilant. We should be sober-minded. Today's traitor looks at us and says, well, you have been organising for 20 years – what did you accomplish? And this traitor wants to show himself up as a great champion of Marxism-Leninism, as the paragon of virtue, and so on and so forth. Are we ready to put such a traitor in his place? Are we ready to not divert from our agenda and to stop such elements from setting agendas for us? The world bourgeoisie says that on the agenda today is the fall of communism. What fall of communism? Who can inscribe such a thing on the agenda of the international proletariat, on the agenda of the people's struggle for their freedom and progress? How is it possible? The vacillators suggest that the fact that there are desertions, that there is treachery and betrayal, must indicate that something is wrong with communism. Well, maybe something is wrong with them, because communism is objectively the condition for the complete emancipation of the working class, so what can be wrong with that? But those who betray are the ones who should give their accounting, not those who have marched on the road of Marxism-Leninism. In this situation, the position of the Party has always been a principled position. The position of the traitor has been always unprincipled. Let us hold steadfast with the utter contempt in which we hold these suggestions and positions. The essence and the nature of a traitor cannot change – a dog cannot transform itself into something else. Some are very "upset" that communism has failed, that communism has no hope because of developments in Eastern Europe, that the people fought there and achieved nothing.

Such individuals do not understand that massive contradictions arose in the ruling circles there, and they are trying to hug and cling to one another in order to rescue their man-eating capitalist system. They do not understand that the world bourgeoisie knows that after the collapse of false socialism, the working people will go for real communism. Then why not, the bourgeoisie says to itself, raise a clamour that it is the failure of real communism? Panic-stricken, having no solution to any problems, being a superfluous class, it is calling upon the workers and begging: Please do not turn towards real communism. Don't you know that it has failed? Don't you know that J.V. Stalin was a dictator? Ad nauseam. It does not require a genius to know that in Poland, Solidarity, which presented itself as the greatest enemy of the revisionist party there, finally hugged and kissed and had a reconciliation, at least for the time being, and vice versa. Does Solidarity need the revisionists? The revisionists need Solidarity. One anti-communist, the other false communist, both together against real communism. At one time, the contradictions between them were so sharp that there was a possibility, if there had been a Party there, if the class had been imbued with Marxism-Leninism, that this would have been the end of this old system. But they are telling us that the preservation of the old system is the fall of communism! A vacillator, a traitor, somebody who has another thing on the agenda, is telling us that the workers have lost faith in communism. Well, if workers have lost faith in communism, fine. Let the workers have faith in anti-communism! Let the workers from now on come in the morning with a rose in their hand and give it to the capitalist and say: Thank you sir for the living you are providing for us. Let us see how far this relationship of capitalist and worker lasts. Let us see how far this system will satisfy the workers. We know very well that it will not satisfy a worker, even for one second. In other words, a traitor is trying to tell us that the workers are

confused. Far from it, workers applauded these developments in Eastern Europe with joy. But the vacillator is unhappy and is sitting there with folded arms and doing his calculations, that let us see now who will win and which side would be most beneficial personally. What else is there to see? The whole working class - whether in Canada, the US, or anywhere - cheered: very good, one after another these cliques have fallen. But, they are saying these things with the eye of those who manipulate them, those who tell them that this is communism which has fallen.

In other words, the working class, which is rejoicing at the fall of revisionists and these reactionary cliques, has to go further now. Workers learn from their own direct experience. For years on end, we have been telling them, listen, the Soviet Union is a revisionist country, it's not a socialist country. They "listened" to us and said, well, it is a socialist country... Now they themselves say, at least this much, "So, they have abandoned communism". We can live with this - we have no objection to a worker saying this. On the other hand, if a worker says that communism has failed, well, we will educate him. We will tell him no, communism has not failed, but these people have given up communism. Very well, if you want to say it that way, that is good enough for us. But the vacillator, the opportunist, he is on the coals: no, no, no, no. He wants to have this world of illusion intact. He does not want the illusion to be shattered. Well, sirs, history has another plan. It shatters all the illusions. History does not base itself on an illusion. History is the representation of what is really the most objective and the underlying basis of development. History never takes into consideration the whims and ideas of individuals. Those who want to wait till they have understood everything, history does not take their feelings into consideration. It unfolds in spite of them. Our great leader Karl Marx, who initiated the present movement for the complete emancipation

of the working class, says that we should not judge anyone by the words they utter – we should go by their class background. The class background can never conceal itself.

The working class does not need sentimentality. The workers have had enough of it. They do not need a preacher to console them when they are being exploited to the bone, just as they do not need an exploiter who speaks the other way – "we will do more terrible things to you if you do not carry on". This worker who is born in the sentimentality of bourgeois exploitation, who is told by the bourgeoisie that this exploitation is established for the worker's own benefit and pleasures, so that he can have a job, so that he can have a livelihood and all this – this worker does not need any more sentimentality. What this worker needs is the tools of his own class emancipation. He needs organisation and the ideological basis of his thinking. He needs a real Party like ours. He needs the Marxist-Leninist ideology by which our Party is guided – not sentimentality.

As I said before, they are asking us what the Party has achieved in the last 20 years. They are trying to suggest to us that our numbers are going down, and so on. You know, when I was the only communist at UBC, they were saying even at that time that numbers were going down. [Laughter] And now we have many times more communists, and the numbers have been increasing since that time. There has never been a time when they have not said that our numbers are going down. I don't know where the numbers are going down. I was reading just recently some of the work we had done in the Institute about Karl Marx's doctrine in terms of economic, philosophical, etc. I was surprised that in just six years, we are far better theoretically than what we wrote in 1983. In other words, communism has deepened and broadened. Our ability to deal with the problems has increased manifold. This is dialectics. It is only natural that with dialectics, consciousness will also deepen. Our abilities will

increase. If individuals doing research in the Institute are better, it is because the Party itself is much better, because it is not possible for the Party not to strengthen itself on an uninterrupted basis in the course of revolutionary class struggle. We are today far stronger than the communist movement in this country ever has been. Do you know that this year's development has brought to the fore the purging of all false claimers of being Marxist-Leninist, communist, from the past? Today they say no, they stand with bourgeois ideology, they stand with social democracy, and say so openly. Today the communist movement has purified itself within a far shorter time than ever seen before. And today, these revisionists are all talking about having re-thinking, that collectivisation or state property is Stalinism. They are all becoming champions of the free market economy. These new thinkers cannot claim that they are communist. They are claiming, like social democrats, that they are real socialists. Very well, you claim to be a real socialist. Hitler also claimed to be a real socialist. So did Mussolini. That is your business, but now you do not claim that you are a Marxist-Leninist, right? We are Marxist-Leninist, you are not, and that is the difference. And this is no small difference and is irreconcilable.

* * *

Comrades and friends, we are entering the New Year and the last decade of the 20th century under the condition that the all-sided crisis of capitalism has deepened and broadened, with the crisis of capitalist restoration in Eastern Europe as one of its most pronounced features. Other pronounced features are the global debt crisis and the crisis of raw materials. There is also the crisis of credit which is fuelling recession in the US.

The situation has also brought forth the role of the two superpowers in deciding the affairs of other countries,

the dangers which they pose, their interference in Eastern Europe, Panama, and the most grotesque example of Romania.

There has been a marked intensification and sharpening of struggle between the two opposite ideologies and the two opposing systems, that is, between Marxism-Leninism and all shades of bourgeois and revisionist ideology, that is, between the two opposing systems of socialism and capitalism, with the offensive against communism and the struggle of the peoples for their liberation being the main feature.

When we look at everything which is going on nationally and internationally, then we see a very dangerous situation for the working class and the people of the world.

History marches through zigzags. We see a great march backward since the advent of Nikita Khrushchev, but we also see great advances, the rise of people's consciousness about their national rights and their right to freedom, progress and prosperity. We see the strengthening and further development of socialism in Albania and the strengthening of the Marxist-Leninist movement on the world scale. We see the positive and negative marching side by side, and revolution and counter-revolution, with counter-revolution threatening to undo the gains of the 20th century and leave the world at the mercy of international monopolies and conglomerates and of imperialist and social-imperialist marauders. What is at stake today is the defence of all the achievements of the 20th century, and to score new victories. Nothing can be handed to us on a silver platter, or just by wishing it or by formulating the wish in the most beautiful way. No, we have to create the conditions for it. We have to work for it and we have to create this beautiful new reality, as has been the hallmark of the 20th century, the beautiful new reality created by the October Revolution, ushering in a new era, the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution, the era of the victory of socialism on the world scale.

The ugliness of the old world found its most grotesque form in the assassination of Nicolae Ceausescu and his wife Elena on Christmas Day. Here we have the entire old world calling for his blood, and he, defiant, not even for a second regretting the revisionist course which has led to this disaster. The vultures calling for the blood of one of their own, hoping to convince the world that they have some compassion, humanity, and care. The two superpowers led this lynch mob, and you could hear the voices: "Kill, kill, kill!" Here you have those who are for democratic methods, for peaceful transition, who do not mind assassination if it serves their goals. Then, they accused Ceausescu that he was maniacal about paying back the debts, that he collectivised agriculture and built huge apartment blocks. But they did not accuse him that he was at the head of a state which was administering the capitalist system, which has brought disaster to Romania. They did not accuse him of the crimes of capitalism. They accused him of socialism. They accused him of starving the people, but did not say a word about the International Monetary Fund. The real architects of this disaster were gleeful in Washington, smiling in Moscow and full of joy in London, Paris, Bonn, Tokyo, Ottawa, etc. The tragic figure of Ceausescu lay alongside his wife's as an offering to the treachery against Marxism-Leninism, the betrayal of the cause of the working class, of revolution and socialism, to history which judges everyone and everything ever so severely. He accused his executioners of plotting and organising the coup d'etat with the help of a foreign hand. But he still did not name the foreigners. He did not raise his voice, even in his death, against the two superpowers, did not concede that he was also one in the line of traitors who danced to the tune of the foreigners for their own vain-glory. Nobody wanted to claim Ceausescu in his catastrophic fall. But there still is a space to hoodwink, fool and cover up, through the "regrets" that he was not judged

fairly. Yes, these imperialists and their apologists can never admit that they are the greatest fascists and tormentors of every democrat and democratic ideal. They had qualms about how Ceausescu was led to his final end? What a laugh. They are saying "how", but not "why". Already a bullet has gone through his heart and history has given its verdict. Now the judgment will fall on those who were in a haste to get rid of him. While Ceausescu's regime spoke in the name of the working class, and acted against its interests, his executioners spoke in the name of democracy and established their power by chopping its head off. On December 25, the day of goodwill amongst men, it was not just Ceausescu executed, but also any democratic ideal. What Ceausescu received was not just a severe punishment for betraying Marxism-Leninism, but also and necessarily the taste of the summation of his own line, the logical conclusion. The end of his betrayal was his execution by those who betrayed him. Betrayal has now become the means of obtaining power and of retaining it, the old habit of the slave-owning classes. What his executioners received was a blow, the consequences of which are yet to be seen. More heads will roll. Traitors will become more ambitious and treachery will become more broad. The appetite of foreigners will also increase, especially that of the two superpowers and others. The slumbering working class will have to awaken, will have to rise. The rule of treachery and betrayal will crumble.

The workers are saying that it is a good thing that a dictator is gone. Well, there is always joy at such revolts. The motive of the workers for saying so is pure, but the motive of their manipulators, those who carry banner headlines, are not so. They murdered Ceausescu because he was an obstacle to their plans for Eastern Europe and the world. Was he principled in his opposition? No. Was he a Marxist-Leninist? No. Was he acting in the interest of the working class of Romania? No. Even though we

were ideological enemies of Ceausescu and opposed to his system, we would never accept that Moscow or Washington or anybody else was favouring democracy in organising his execution. The workers must understand that the US and Britain did not fight Germany, Japan or Italy, that is, the Axis powers, in order to oppose fascism and militarism. They fought in their own narrowest national self-interest. It is for the same narrowest national self-interest that they have been protecting and installing military and other forms of dictatorships, from Italian fascism to Hitlerite and Japanese militarism, to Franco, Salazar, the Shah of Iran and all the rest all over the world. The Somozas, Marcoses, Pinochets, etc., found their protection in Britain, in the US, in Canada. The US may have fought Germany, but not Nazism. Britain may have fought Germany, but not Nazism. France cannot be accused of fighting Nazism. The same is the case with others who call themselves democrats, including the Canadian government, which alongside the British and American governments gave refuge and protection in one form or another to those who sided with Nazism, whether in West Germany, the state which they established, or in the US, Canada, Britain, Australia, South Africa, Argentina, Brazil, and all over the world.

The workers must understand that their pure sentiments about freedom and democracy are not the same as those who are shouting from the rooftops about these things these days. These governments are promoting fascism in the name of freedom and democracy. The main content of the ideology of Nazism and fascism, basing itself on the narrowest possible national self-interest, on the most reactionary sections of finance capital, was anti-worker and racist. In order to mete out severe blows to the workers' cause, the Nazis had to hunt down communists and accuse them of being responsible for every ill of the society. Now, in broad daylight, we Marxist-Leninists are being accused of all the ills of capitalist restoration

in the style of the Nazis! There was no criterion of truth for the Nazis except their own narrowest self-interest. Thus, they did not bother very much with the truth, as is the case with the official circles in the US, the Soviet Union, and others today. They all deny that capitalist exploitation and imperialist domination are at the heart of workers' and peoples' discontent, whether in Eastern Europe or in Western Europe or on the world scale. The workers rose in Poland not to put Solidarity into power, but to voice their discontent with the revisionist betrayal and the capitalist system. Solidarity, supported by the US, the Vatican, and world reaction, took advantage of the situation. But this manipulation will not end the workers' discontent. They will not be satisfied until their demands are met. The overthrow of revisionist parties and cliques in Poland and elsewhere also involved the hand and the narrow national interests of the Soviet Union. But the causes still are to be found in the internal situation and in the interference by the two superpowers. The fact that these cliques are toppled does not mean that those who replaced them will work in the workers' and peoples' interests.

The motive behind blaming the Marxist-Leninists is to deceive the workers and organise them against their own interests, in order to ensure that workers do not turn to Marxism-Leninism. It is the same motive when Jews are blamed for all the ills of the society, and this clamour has re-started, all the blame is put on the immigrants, aliens, etc. We Marxist-Leninists have been telling the workers that these countries are not socialist or communist. The ruling circles called them socialist and communist in order to fool the workers. First it provided them with a feeling that they had a hope. That is, the ruling circles wanted the workers to have an illusion, a false hope, in this hybrid system which is called socialism in Eastern Europe. When the time was ripe, they told the workers that it does not work. When they created

an illusion, it was about something false, and when they are talking about its overthrow, they are talking about something real, that is, they want the workers to be disillusioned about real socialism, about Marxism-Leninism. We Marxist-Leninists fought for decades against this illusion, and now we must fight this disillusionment. This is not the time to be disillusioned. On the contrary, it is the time to go further. We should tell the workers in Eastern Europe just as we should tell the workers in Canada or elsewhere, that now they have gotten rid of this illusion, they should go further. Very well, well done. Now you have overthrown one clique of revisionists and reactionaries. Now go further. Overthrow the whole lot. Establish your own system. Establish a system which is led by the working class, which has the hegemonic imprint of the working class. The 20th century has shown, the workers must be told, that only the working class can establish a system without exploitation of man by man. This is scientific socialism, led by the communists, Marxist-Leninists, at the head of the working class, for a system which refuses to recoil, which responds to the demand of history, that lets all the things of the past not be permitted to come back. We are talking about the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism, the new system belonging to the 20th century. Let the new advance! Let the old be buried! Let all the workers and the broad masses of the people not only have no illusions, but let them condemn the ruling classes of the so-called Western democratic countries, the labour aristocracy and the trade unionist chieftains, revisionists and opportunists of all hues, for first fostering illusions and now working to create disillusionment about Marxism-Leninism, about real socialism, about the fate of the working class itself. It is they who are causing disillusionment about socialism and communism, and it is they who must be denounced. We must distinguish ourselves, our politics, from them, from theirs. We must lay the accusation where it belongs.

They have evil motives when they are spreading disillusionment now, as they had evil motives when they were spreading illusions before. This evil motive is to develop a fascist movement, which will destroy any democratic ideals, which will bring the world back to medievalism.

Anti-communism, anti-workerism and racism are a blight on a healthy body, an obstruction to the realisation of truth, and in the service of the most reactionary sections of finance capital. Here the workers must appreciate that anti-communism hurts them, because it makes them distrust the very ideology and organisation which can emancipate them, which can lead them to establish their power and end the exploitation of man by man. To defeat anti-communism is not just a programme of the communists. The workers must realise that anti-workerism has its basis in its attack on communism, accusing the workers when they fight for their rights as being unpatriotic and dupes of communists. It finds its echo in the backward worker and a refuge for a Nazi and a fascist, a war criminal amongst the workers. How many such individuals are hiding behind this veneer of opposing communism? Racism makes the workers hate one another, and is the basis of beastly hatred towards each other, instead of commonness of interest and fraternal unity.

This offensive against communism must be the concern of not only the communists. It must concern not just the workers. It must concern all the people, because when reaction attacks the communists, when it attacks the interests of the workers, it is putting a block to the development of history, it is telling the world that it will never let revolution succeed, it will never let the highest ideals of mankind be realised in practice and create a society fit for human existence. We must present this aim of fighting anti-communism as one of the most important political programmes of our time, of the 1990s. Post world war experience has shown that the states of

various countries have spent millions of dollars and made great efforts to install anti-communism as a block in the minds of the people, in the minds of the workers, who cannot see what is the objective situation, what are the causes of their exploitation and oppression, what is the way out. Universities and think tanks and institutes are filled with all those who breed anti-communism, all those who give justification for false socialism, all those who create illusions. It is in the interests not merely of the workers, but of all people, that they should oppose anti-communism, because it is designed to prop up and give credibility to everything which is reactionary and goes against the interests of the people. It is the duty of all progressive and democratic forces to fight anti-communism and to forge a broad political united front in order to lead the working class and people in this great anti-fascist, anti-capitalist struggle.

The workers should ask the capitalists now that, yes, we know that Nikita Khrushchev attacked the name and work of J.V. Stalin, in his secret speech to the 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956 – and you applauded him and you have been carrying on propaganda against J.V. Stalin. But today, you say that Nikita Khrushchev was a Stalinist, that the Brezhnev regime which followed after Khrushchev was Stalinist, and that all the revisionist cliques which came into being in Eastern Europe are Stalinist. Now sirs, if these were Stalinist regimes as you claim, tell us how come you financed them? How come you gave billions of dollars in order to prop them up? How come you were in alliance with them in their establishing what you call bureaucracy, in their dictatorial methods, in their snuffing out of democracy? How come the US and other countries supported and financed the entire line of the 20th Congress and fully cooperated with it? The Queen of England went even further, bestowing a knighthood on Nicolae Ceausescu of Romania. He was received by the highest organs of the government

in the US, Britain, France, and other countries. When his heart was being shattered with bullets, the Queen also decided to take his knighthood back. What wrong did he do at that time? The workers should ask the capitalists this question: how come during the Second World War you were the ally of this man J.V. Stalin, whom you call the greatest dictator, the greatest enemy the 20th century could ever produce? What was your motive? To give the whole of Eastern Europe to this dictator for his pleasure?

Comrades and friends, the workers must be told the truth about the infamy which is called Western democratic governments. The infamy which is called these labour aristocrats and the trade union chieftains. The infamy which has been perpetrated after the Second World War. It should be exposed within the context of history before the Second World War. We Marxist-Leninists are not to be blamed for anything. If you go just from the 1960s – because we are still very young, so let us not talk about ancient times – we never supported Brezhnev. He used to go to Washington, and they used to give him Lincoln Continentals as gifts. Apparently when he died they found 20 of them or more collected from all over. They received Gorbachev there. We did not support him. We did not support the agreement between Johnson and Kosygin in 1966 at Glassboro or those that followed. In fact, we Marxist-Leninists did not even support them, that is the US, Britain, Canada, etc. We can be accused of opposing all these imperialists and revisionists, but we cannot be called their supporters. You tell the workers, comrades, and also these middle strata, that we were right for 30 years and we will be right for the next 30 years as well. Don't be foolish, listen to us. [APPLAUSE]. Don't listen to these vacillators, these opportunists, those who do not feel very well. At every turn of history, instead of facing the situation, they look at their souls. They begin

searching there while they ignore what is happening in the real world.

* * *

Comrades and friends, a delegation of our Party visited Albania at the time of the 45th anniversary of the liberation of Albania. There our delegation, as with other brother Parties, had the opportunity to engage in discussion with the PLA, with Comrade Ramiz Alia, the First Secretary of the Party there, and with other Parties, to discuss the present-day situation. Most importantly, the delegation came to know about the developments in Albania, the progress which is being made in the strengthening of socialist democracy, the construction of socialism, advance of revolution there, and so on. First of all, I would like to say with pride that the PLA has no plans whatsoever to deviate from its Marxist-Leninist road. [APPLAUSE] Anybody who wants to speculate, let them speculate, that is their business. At the same time, the comrades there briefed us on the problems of the construction of socialism, some questions about the Soviet Union and its development. From all these conversations and discussions, it was clear that the Albanian communists, led by the Party with Comrade Ramiz Alia at the head, are fully aware of the internal situation and the international situation.

Allow me to speak about one of the major problems of present-day socialist construction. The PLA is the Party which led the national liberation war, which established the people's power, which led the construction of socialism and the development of revolution. It was not the Soviet Party or the Soviet army or any other party or army. In doing this, the Albanian Party and communists have developed vigorously the habit of using their heads to deal with the situation there. Having this glorious past of more than 48 years now has made them very strong

in dealing with the internal and international situation. Their Party stands as a brother party of all the other parties and equal to all the other parties, but neither more nor less. It is not a party which has pretensions of leading everyone, at the same time it is not a party which is aloof from the problems of others. It has opinions, which it gives. This Party has analysed, under the leadership of Comrade Enver, as to why capitalist restoration took place in the Soviet Union. Besides other things, one of the problems, and the main one, was the rise of bureaucracy in the Soviet Union, in terms of the state power and in terms of the party. There is a misconception as to what is bureaucracy. Of course, according to anarchists, any state, any administration is bureaucracy – they do not want anything, that is why they worship what goes on here. And according to the trotskyites, bureaucracy also is equated with administration. Bureaucracy and administration have nothing to do with one another. Administration is very necessary in the development of socialism, in the development of revolution. Bureaucracy is entirely unnecessary and a block to the working people running their own affairs. Bureaucracy means isolation from the interests of the people. A bureaucrat says, I have my laws, I have my rules, I can show you where it is written – otherwise, he is not going to budge. And bureaucracy means denial of the interests and the aspirations of the masses in whose name it operates. Here exists the Canadian bureaucracy, a huge bureaucracy. It says it is organised to provide service to the Canadian people, and it is organised in its name, but this bureaucracy does not serve the interests and aspirations of the Canadian people. It works for capitalism and for the capitalist class. No bureaucracy can work for socialism and in the interests of the working class. So in Albania, they have been fighting both this attitude and liberalism, which stops the class struggle from developing against alien class manifestations. But in terms of bureaucracy, you may have read in the

newspapers after Ceausescu was killed, they said that he used to give wrong data on agriculture and industrial production. The bourgeoisie which is accusing Ceausescu of these things should just look under their own table and see what goes on there. You must have seen all the great accusations – that he had a fixation about gold and so on. For these Blacks and Desmarais to say these things is really laughable. Lord Thompson, who is running this empire, presents himself as the great champion of proletarians: "While the workers were starving in Romania, Ceausescu ate every day, led a comfortable life". When the workers in Canada are living in luxury, the media barons are starving somewhere for them!

I read in "Zëri i Popullit", as well as hearing from various comrades, about the symptoms of bureaucracy. Bureaucracy means depriving the work of its aim, a task or a plan of its essence and using it to subvert socialism and corrode it from inside. Capitalists do not mind bureaucracy at all. They take pride in having created it in the modern conditions. A bureaucrat may gleefully declare that he has fulfilled the plan, but he would not want to see whether or not the people have been provided with all they need. All the grain which is necessary may have been produced, but is it in the homes of all the people who need it? There is efficiency in individual enterprises under capitalism, and there is even overproduction of food, etc. But still there are homeless and beggars on the streets. Does the capitalist care? In other words, the plan has been fulfilled, but the needs and interests and desires of the people have not yet been met. What kind of plan is it which is not based on fulfilling the needs and desires of the people? A bureaucrat says, well, I can show a directive of the 9th Five-year plan to produce so many quintals of grain per hectare – I have done so. But this is not the issue. In socialist Albania, which has been very conscious because the Party has analysed the negative and positive experience of the construction of

socialism in the Soviet Union, and their own experience, they know that the broad participation of the masses in the state affairs, in the party affairs, the profound implementation of the line, the motive of production to fulfil the needs of the people, is a guarantee for socialism.

Such a socialism can survive any situation, any problems which may be created for them, either by weather, which happens there many times, or by the class enemies, internal and external. Our delegation was very inspired that here we have comrades with whom we can empathise, and who are not agnostics in any way, and who are constructing socialism. When the bourgeois press talks about the fall of socialism, it acknowledges that there is socialist Albania, and that it is different from other so-called socialist states. And socialist Albania – I can tell, as history is going to tell – is not going to fall. Anybody who thinks that socialist Albania will fall will show his own failure in speculation, but not the failure of socialist Albania.

The healthy atmosphere which exists in socialist Albania and amongst the brother parties, where the unity has further deepened and broadened, the activities of the parties have assumed great dimensions, as can be seen in Brazil, as well as in Portugal, as well as in Denmark, Britain, other countries, in India, especially during the elections this year, as well as our own activities, they are assuming broad mass proportions. Sure, it may not please someone, they may not see our numbers, but the communist movement is steadily on the advance, and the traitors and opportunists are falling by the wayside. The 1980s brought to the world one of the greatest evils – reaction, led by Ronald Reagan, and its collaboration by Mikhail Gorbachev, and their alliance together against the revolution, and every kind of perfidy. But there were also the Parties, with socialist Albania, withstanding all the attacks and emerging as the only real

Marxist-Leninists in the world, and socialist Albania as the only real socialist country in the world, as we have been saying all along. And rightly so. These Marxist-Leninist communist parties, these organisations, will go further. The names and works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin will be all the more enshrined, and their impact will increase. In this respect, we always have been proud Marxists, proud Leninists, and proud Stalinists, and we will remain so, always carrying forward this banner of victory. Stalin means the Man of Steel – and this is what the working class, its Party and its ideology is. The ideology of the working class, its Party and its ideology is. The ideology of the working class, Marxism-Leninism, is made from a single sheet of steel. And anyone who in any way acts as an agnostic or tries to find fault with J.V. Stalin, then his ideology will be made of quicksand, fine particles which though you try to put them together, they will never cement, they will always come crashing down.

* * *

Comrades and friends, on behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist), I take this great honour to declare to you the coming of the New Year and coming of the new decade, the ushering in of great new victories. Cheers! [APPLAUSE]. I would like to wish all of you good health, happiness, and successes in the revolutionary work in this year and in this decade, in which, as I already mentioned to you last year, the enlarged plenum of the Party is meeting, and besides other things is deciding to intensify our activities, to multiply both in terms of quantity as well as quality. Our Party is working within the conditions when the question of communism is being presented as a question which "sensible" people have given up. You may meet some people who will say to you, well, why are you Marxist-Leninist when everybody else has become wiser? I say to you that once in a while, it is not

a bad thing not to be wise in this sense. Because wisdom is not a matter of consensus. Wisdom is not a populist ideology. We are living in the 20th century, when wisdom is connected with Marxism-Leninism. Try to connect it with anything else. Some other ideology may have a particle of wisdom. Something else may have a couple more particles. But beyond that, it is not possible to have wisdom. So we disregard their proposal or suggestion. We can thank them that, yes, you have given up, it is very bad for you that you have given up Marxism-Leninism or don't want to take it up, and we will thank you anyway for asking us to do the same, but we will not do this. We will stick with our class wisdom.

This year, comrades and friends, is going to be the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist). We want that every day of this year is full of activities which celebrate this anniversary and show what material this Party is made of. We should make use of the Party to make advances in every important aspect of its work. In Quebec, we must ensure that the work started in 1989 is taken forward, that those thousands of people who signed their support for us, their numbers should be increased; at the same time the level of these people, their participation in the affairs of communist work, communist revolution, should be further developed. In this respect, the utmost attention should be paid to the organisation of workers. The raising of the ideological and political level of the working class is one of the key questions. As you know, the 5th Congress of the Party passed a resolution that we should professionalise the work of the Institute and open the Party School. This year, our Party School will begin. First of all, I would like to announce to you that the Institute is already professionalised. The work of the Institute will also see its expression at the Party School, which all of you are welcome to attend. We will be inviting ten or so individuals to come for a two week course, and they will be given

formal training in the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the situation in Canada and internationally, the problems of the Party, its tactics, its strategy, the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism, both economic, philosophical, the theory of scientific socialism. These courses will be held once a month starting from the first two weeks of the second half of this year. You can talk to the local comrades or the regional committees or you can apply directly. A person does not have to be in the Party to come to the Party School. Of course, we have our own rules on this question which must be complied with. Only those who are serious in learning Marxism-Leninism are encouraged to apply.

This New Year also is going to see the giving of membership cards. These membership cards are going to be issued to those people who are worthy to be called communists. The 20th century saw the rise of the new, and its reflection in the 1960s in Canada. When the Internationalists were established, they were not organised on the basis of a phrase. We did not sit down and say, here is the menu, a grocery list, this is Marxism-Leninism, and you all study it, and let us have agreement on this. We disagreed with such a thing, we never organised on the basis of agreement on a document, because Marxism-Leninism should not be a phrase, it should be a guide to action. We mobilised men and women of revolutionary action. So, if somebody just keeps on talking about the revolutionary guide, and we never see revolutionary action, we never mobilise them. Somebody recently sent me notes from New Times, which is a publication from the Soviet Union. A Soviet scribbler writes: "Logically, first came the word, the basis, the guarantee of the irreversibility of the process." One wonders what would have happened if this person was not logical! Natural scientists know very well that action came first, that is, the matter. Social scientists also know this. This is the old debate and story, which came first, the chicken

or the egg. The chicken came first, believe me, not the egg. For us, this is not a controversy. In nature, as well as in society, things exist not because a word came before their existence. In this world, there is only forms of matter. These forms of matter exist in infinite forms. It is always in motion. Matter by its inherent character is in motion. We cannot have motion without matter or matter without motion. In fact, we come to know matter only in its forms. Otherwise, if somebody says I'm not going to recognise the forms of matter, produce me some matter - what would we give him? Can we now start a controversy, which came first, the form of matter or matter? This view that first came the word has been the basis of the organising of all the revisionists and opportunists. Every kind of charlatan had his word, and then said now, everybody should come around, and we will organise. We Internationalists, and the Party later on, never agreed with this. We do not agree with this today either. Because action is something sensuous, real. One can feel. Word is what? Nothing? If word comes out of action, then it reflects something. Then word assumes the profundity and the essence of that action. But if the word is detached from that action then it is vulgarised. We want communists who are activists, in a profound sense of the word, who irresistibly come forward where the work is the most difficult. They are not schemers, they are not those who do their calculations, that well, which way is it better for me and my family, and which way is it harmful for me and my family. Communists at the same time are not adventurists, they are not those who have given up worldly possessions and have now enrolled themselves in some nunnery, and now they are going to achieve the final word of Marxism-Leninism. The first quality of a communist is his devotion to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, his principled attitude all the time; at the same time, to stand firmly when there are turning points, when things are difficult, when it looks

like the path may not be so bright, when it seems that the difficulties are far greater than the possibilities of making an advance. Communists must always in their actions be one with the masses, in the sense that they must take actions which serve the interests of the masses. There is no other programme, no programme of the Party which is divorced from that. Communists must be humble, modest and militant. Not modest in the sense of being liberal, not modest for the purposes of effect, but communists must have the imprint of what they stand for, that is, of the new, in every action of theirs. Most importantly, they must be loyal members of the Party, always pay attention to keep the Party direction clear, stick to the interests of the working class and defend it, even at the cost of their lives.

We had the rise of such communists in the 1960s. The experience of the Internationalists and the work carried out is one of the great assets of the Canadian working class. It is the most valuable experience. The history of the past over a quarter of a century has proven this to be the case. Slowly and slowly, all those to whom Marxism-Leninism was just a phrase, while in actual fact they did not grasp that it is a guide to action - they either never took off, or they took off and crashed. The Party never had such a fate, and it will not have such a fate. Our Party has never bowed down to spontaneity, it has never bowed down to any individual whims, comforts, etc. As a result, it has steeled itself in historic battles which took place. In the '60s, besides anything else, the Internationalists fought to have a Party of the working class. It did not deviate from this task. It established the Party. From the time of the founding of the Party, the defence of the Party and the defence of its ideology went on for a long time, first against the coordinated state and opportunist attacks, and later on against the attacks from Maoism and its henchmen in Canada. The 3rd Congress was a great occasion for the celebration

of the victory of Marxism, and the Party was able to get rid of and overcome the adverse consequences of Maoism. This gave rise to the programme of the Party to develop its leading role, established at the time of the 4th Congress. Such actions are quite crucial in the development of the life of the Party. The 5th Congress saw the further development of the aims, the call for the development of the Party's activity in terms of its mass character, to draw in the masses of the people in its political action. Since that time, work has been carried out in terms of the Mass Party Press. It is this that has given a very specific quality to our member. Anyone, it does not matter when he or she joined the Party, if they did not involve themselves in any of these struggles then their communism, their Marxism-Leninism, their membership in the Party is a bit shaky and will not be that durable.

In the 1990s, which have just begun, other problems will come to the fore. One is the defence of the positive and healthy advance of the people that has taken place in the 20th century, the defence of the road of the October Revolution. This is one of the very important points on the agenda, both in theory and in practice.

Everyone, of course, is going to be scrutinised by the proper bodies of the Party, and the membership work will further develop. We are very confident that this work will increase the ranks of the Party. In Quebec, there was experience to develop what was called mass membership. We think it was a good development in terms of tactics, and this work of mass membership will also further develop. A mass member is really a member, but in the present conditions, the membership for which the Party has called is really a demand set by the Party on the communists at a very high level of activity. Thus, as the work develops, there will arise just one kind of membership. So this mass membership will also further increase. All the comrades, all of our friends and supporters, sympathisers, should present themselves to receive

these cards, not look at what I said as if we are looking for some very pure and perfect characters, those who are made of some whitest marble, any dark spot never appearing – this is not the case. Every communist is tested, and the work summed up according to the conditions, the way the work was carried in the local areas, what were the problems, etc., and not in any idealistic sense, not in any abstract way. This work will increase the influence of the Party. Most importantly, it will increase the activity, it will make the basic organisations and regional committees more active.

* * *

Socialism, as you know, is a new system. When I said that action came first and not the word, and in the 20th century you see this whole new coming into being. Now if you say that some egg came first, then when the Bolshevik Party came into being, where was the egg for it? Talking in terms of social phenomena, there was no blueprint before – only the working class and the toilers and their aspirations for emancipation. The Bolshevik Party came into being from their bosom. Then came the Bolshevik Revolution, then came the construction of socialism, and so on. These are all new things. And the Party's experience, or that of the Internationalists in the '60s, is also a new thing according to these conditions. In this society, which is filled with every kind of degeneration and crime, where the official ideology prides itself in being pragmatic, that the end justifies the means, where the motive of production is the making of maximum profit, where distrust of your own neighbour or workmate is considered a normal thing, where individual pursuit is the be-all and end-all, in such a society, to have an organisation, a Party like ours, starting from the view that "we are all in it together", that we should fight together, and we should defend the aims of the class – this is a great

achievement. In Romania, we hear some hooligans declaring that they will never call each other comrades. In the Soviet Union, the use of the word comrade was a great achievement of mankind, that a whole people called each other comrades, including people from very different national backgrounds. Now what are these Romanians going to call each other? Sir? Dear Lord Sahib? This comradeship was very precious, it reflected the new relations of production, that they are not between inferiors and superiors, those who are owners and those who own nothing, between the exploiters and the exploited. No, these were relations between people who owned their destiny together. Within that, production in the final analysis was carried out for the benefit of the individual. If a collective does not make you as an individual or your family happy, then what is the use of your collective? If we look at the life in our families around the Party, the confidence, the trust which prevails, it is not for some abstract "collective". It gives us all the sense of belonging to something which is lacking in the whole of society, fighting for the highest ideals. In this way we have peace of mind, we are not worried that somebody is going to run away and leave us in the lurch, or do some other terrible things, all the immorality which prevails in the society does not exist. I am not suggesting that we are a sort of hermetically sealed organisation. Yes, there are pressures, there are things which come, but the Party resolutely fights those. So there are all the individuals, the whole people, in whose benefit the whole collective life is organised. When an individual becomes wayward, goes away from that collective life, then all the evils of the old society hit him. This shows that it is not the way the bourgeoisie sees. It sneers at this view and taunts that in our Party, or in communism, an individual is the servant of the collective. But in reality, in socialist Albania, as it will be in any real socialist country, it is the collective in the service of the individual. But that

individual should have sense, that if this collective does not exist, he has nothing. So he had better work for that collective. If he does not act this way, thinking that because everything is for the individual then to hell with the collective, he will be acting foolishly. The opposite is true in a capitalist system. Those who say that there is a ratio between collective interest and individual interest and that it is not a class question are only mincing words. They are giving vent to a bourgeois prejudice. This is not the way the world is. It is not a matter of ratios here and there. It is a principle that the collective must work for the happiness of all, that is all individuals. All individuals – not capitalists, but workers. All individuals – not some overlord, but peasants. All intellectuals, not in the old sense of these overbearing intellectuals, but people's intelligentsia. Socialism, when it works for them, becomes invincible, as it is in socialist Albania. This new, this comradeship also has developed here, but it is limited only to Party circles, because we live and work in a dying capitalist society. Our life has the hallmark of that collective spirit. In our constitution, the method of work we gave rise to is called collective work, individual responsibility. The capitalist promises a paradise for the individual and beckons him to be individualist and ends up ruining him under the collective weight of the capitalist class. The Marxist-Leninist calls for collectivity and the creation of a real life of happiness and profound freedom for the individual. Our mottos are ALL FOR ONE AND ONE FOR ALL! and AN INJURY TO ONE IS AN INJURY TO ALL! A capitalist can neither promise nor tolerate this.

This new or all this spirit has its expression, its concrete manifestation in the existence of our Party and its work. So when we say, defend these new developments of the 20th century, then we are calling upon everyone to use their creative energies and to develop the new. Don't look into books, or stare into the sky, hoping that

all the tactics which had to be developed for our movement have all been developed, that somebody else has done the job, that we have nothing to do now. Tactics cannot be copied from anyone.

In 1965-66 in the development of our work, the Internationalists established a law that not only must members implement the decisions, but they must also participate in arriving at decisions. Only those who are in action can have words. So if we are acting, if we are carrying out work, we also will sit down and carry out summation, will decide and work out further plans. Only those who participate in decision-making will implement them, because if one is indifferent, even in working out a line, one will be very much more indifferent in implementing a line. In this respect, it is very essential and important that each basic organisation can develop only from its concrete conditions, there is no ideal state. The definition of basic organisation is that it is established where the work is. The basic organisation is one of the great achievements of the 20th century. Lenin, once and for all, put individualism to rest, and any kind of resistance to have your "own" positions became a thing of the past. The basic organisation is not a forum for fighting amongst ourselves. A basic organisation is not a basket where we can fight like crabs. A basic organisation is where problems are put on the table, where everyone contributes to the solution, and they carry on the work, and they do not in any way reflect that this is "my line" and this is that. The issue is not what is your line, or what is somebody else's line. The issue is that there is a problem. It must have a solution. We should together find a solution for it by pooling our creative energies in the interests of the working class. A basic organisation is an instrument of class struggle at that level.

The future of mankind lies in those people who will work in such an organisation. A basic organisation is the most democratic organisation there is. At the same time,

as the basic cell of the Party, it is the foundation of the most democratic centralist organisation, our Party. Only those who cherish real democracy see the necessity of class centralism. Democracy and centralism cannot exist in isolation from one another. We can work together in order to strengthen our general line. We can work together in order to implement the tactics and policies. And with this the Party will be strengthened, and our links with the masses will increase. This is a dialectical work - there is no perfect state. By practising criticism and self-criticism, always paying attention to the interests of the class, in terms of our work, whether inside or outside the Party, is the way we will build a new society. This is the most democratic way of doing things in the interests of our class.

Comrades should pay utmost attention to the work of the basic organisation. In this respect, it is very important that the method of the Internationalists, carrying out action in close contact with the masses, must be strictly followed. The main thing is that comrades should pay attention to the creation of the subjective conditions for revolution, and this can only be achieved through revolutionary actions. Action, and then words. Not words in isolation from action. We must learn from the experience of the Internationalists and the Party. Nothing can be achieved just through some words. We are faced with this life of ours, not the lives of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. As they often repeated, Marxism-Leninism is a guide to action. In various religions, usually some books are written, then they say, from now on, no other book. This is not what Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin said. Marxism-Leninism is not a religion. As history unfolds, more discoveries are made, and social science further develops. This has been proven repeatedly since the time of J.V. Stalin's death. We Marxist-Leninists do not believe in "the first word" or "the last word". Marxism-Leninism is neither the first nor the last word. Marxism-Leninism

is the experience of the working class movement taken in general form. As we also have experience in organising the class, a lot of things which were done before help us now. At the same time, we contribute new things to this treasury. The principles, of course, remain the same, and we master these principles through revolutionary actions.

* * *

Comrades and friends, one of the ugliest faces of Anglo-American imperialism, the thing which is most despicable, is its hypocrisy. They are all so virtuous. They never forget to remind how good they are, how democratic, how humanitarian. If this is all they are, then why are they opposing communism? For that is what is most democratic, humanitarian and good. But they call it a thing which nobody should do. They are trying to establish this as a taboo, that people, the working class especially, living in these conditions of capitalist exploitation and wage-slavery, should not respond to communism, but should respond to fascism, militarism, anything but communism. They say that everybody's nature basically is fascist. Militarism, they say, provides jobs. So they are trying to say everything should go on, but not communism. This is their hypocrisy, their deception. All our comrades should pay utmost attention to make communism a question of discussion everywhere, and especially in the working class, to show how various things are going on in the world and the achievements of this century. In the 20th century the most important is not what capitalism has achieved, as it has achieved only the accumulation of wealth at one pole and poverty at the other, and perpetual all-sided crisis, anarchy, upheavals, imperialist wars, etc. It remains the most exploitative system there is. The most important achievements of the 20th century have been the achievements of the

working class. Real socialism came into being with the Great October Revolution. It was overthrown later in the Soviet Union, but it still exists in Albania. The greatest aim of mankind is to end exploitation of man by man. This has been achieved in socialist Albania. Should this experience not be brought to the working people? Should we not talk to them, should we not discuss these matters with them? Should we not call upon them to aspire and fight for the same? Should we not dissociate ourselves from Anglo-American hypocrisy and deception and raise the prestige of communism in the eyes of the masses? We should.

Comrades and friends, we have ushered in the New Year, and the first hour of the New Year has been put to the cause of communism, of the working class. Let all the hours be dedicated to this cause!

[SUSTAINED APPLAUSE AND SHOUTING OF SLOGANS:

VIVE LE PARTI COMMUNISTE DU CANADA
(MARXISTE-LENINISTE)!
GLOIRE AU MARXISME-LENINISME!
VIVE L'INTERNATIONALISME PROLETARIEN!]

Always in the Vanguard of Society, Bearer of Progress

by Ramiz Alia

Comrades,

In all the historical development of our country during the last half century, both in the war for national and social liberation and in the great battles for the socialist construction, the leading role of our Party of Labour has been decisive. All our victories have their basis in the Party, in its revolutionary ideology and in its correct and far-sighted leadership.

We have a strong Party tempered from every viewpoint, a Party loyal to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, the interests of the people and socialism, a Party which is characterised by the steel unity of its ranks and its militant spirit.

At the present meeting of the Central Committee we are discussing the further strengthening of the Party

Speech delivered by Ramiz Alia, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, at the 8th Plenum of the CC of the PLA, September 25, 1989.

and its leading role. Our aim is to maintain its level always at that required by the tasks of the time, always revolutionary and capable of solving the problems which emerge in the process of our advance. We must always keep in mind the teachings of Comrade Enver Hoxha, who pointed out that there is a direct link between the tasks of the social and economic development of the country and the leading role of the Party: the greater, the more difficult and complex the objectives of socialist construction, the more the leading role of the communists increases and the more decisive the leadership of the Party becomes.

We consider the experience of the all-sided leading activity of the Party, the successes of its line and the honoured position which it enjoys in society as a powerful basis for new achievements, but never as something perfect. Its history and experience are a source of strength and inspiration, but, if they are not understood correctly, dialectically, and in connection with the Party's concrete historical responsibilities, they can lead to self-satisfaction and stagnation.

I am in agreement with the report which Comrade Lenka delivered. In my contribution to the discussion I would like to draw attention to some problems which have emerged at the present stage of the socialist construction in our country or which result from current international developments and, especially, from those which have engulfed the countries of the East.

We are living in troubled times. External appearances can create the impression that the winds of peace are blowing, that the problems preoccupying mankind have been solved, that the contradictions and conflicts are being moderated and that, through a number of measures for the reduction of armaments, the danger of war is being removed. Indeed, the great powers, the most wealthy ones, are saying that they will loosen their purse-strings to help the poor. Never before has the demagogy about

freedom, democracy and human rights been so intensive as it is today. But the other side of the coin, that which constitutes the essence of imperialism, must not be left unexamined. The material and spiritual exploitation of the working class has become more ferocious. The surplus value which is appropriated by the bourgeoisie is increasing to ever greater proportions, even subjecting the development of technique and technology to this aim. Similarly, the exploitation of the undeveloped countries by the metropolitan countries has assumed unprecedented proportions.

The debts, which amount to colossal sums of hundreds of billions of dollars, have been turned into modern means of enslaving the peoples. If in the past the colonisers used their armies and weapons to invade and exploit countries and entire continents, now they use dollars and loans as a means to attain the same end, to dictate their policy and to draw maximum profits. Capital no longer needs territory, it needs markets. This is quite apparent in many states of Asia, Africa and Latin America, but is also clear in some countries of Europe such as Yugoslavia, Poland, Hungary and elsewhere.

At the same time, the danger of war and aggression has not been removed. A number of hot-beds of war have been extinguished, but still there is no peace in the Middle East and people are still being killed in Southeast Asia and Africa. Now the national questions and ethnic problems are being revived and becoming explosive in the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, in the relations between Bulgaria and Turkey, or Hungary and Romania.

For our country, the situation in the Balkans, the danger which it presents, is especially important. It is already clear that tempers have been raised and contradictions have increased on our peninsula, especially in recent times. Sinister forces have been revived and old conflicts are being rekindled.

As the Yugoslavs themselves admit, the situation in Yugoslavia is grave. The deep economic crisis and the

political crisis have upset the balances which have kept the Yugoslav Federation on its feet. The relations between republics have become tense. The quarrels and polemics are accompanied with threats of individual republics to secede from the Federation. Serbian chauvinism is working to establish its hegemony over the whole country. Its aggressiveness is expressed openly, especially in Kosova, against the Albanians. They have been subjected to real terror: there have been more jailings, the discrimination against the intelligentsia has increased, and the Albanian language and culture are being attacked on a broad front.

Recently, also, there has been increased tension in the relations between a number of countries of our peninsula. As a consequence, we can say that the process of Balkan collaboration, which began last year, is now facing difficult tests. Our country has been and is interested to ensure that the spirit of good neighbourliness prevails in the Balkans. This policy is constant, therefore in the future we must increase our efforts so that the process of Balkan collaboration is not inhibited.

The revisionist betrayal, which with Gorbachev's perestroika and the current upsurge of counter-revolutionary reformism is carrying through to the end the process of the passage of Soviet society and the Eastern countries completely onto capitalist rails, is increasing the arrogance of the bourgeoisie and imperialism. Gorbachev and his associates negate Stalin and the initial achievements of socialism, but they do not hesitate to criticise Lenin and the October Revolution too, presenting them as the source of the present evils of the Soviet Union. They no longer speak about communism or the communist movement, about the peoples' national liberation struggle or the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. And this is logical: they are part of the counter-revolutionary forces.

It is a fact that the revolution and the peoples' war have been struck a heavy blow by the bourgeoisie and

reaction. Today the opportunist tendency pervades all the ideopolitical life of the world, it dominates at international conferences and meetings, and various events are judged and evaluated on the basis of this criterion. This is a reality which must be taken into account, but must not reduce the vigour of the revolution. This reality is temporary.

It is common knowledge that the revolution, like any social phenomenon, has its ups and downs, but its ebb-tide, the opportunist trend, cannot alter the laws of social development, cannot stop the process of the decay of capitalism and its general crisis, and cannot smother the revolution. The revolution advances because it is impossible for the proletariat and peoples to reconcile themselves to exploitation and oppression. The bourgeoisie and imperialism, however, cannot live without exploitation and oppression.

Our Party and Comrade Enver Hoxha condemned modern revisionism and warned the communist movement of this danger when its first symptoms appeared. And time has shown that these criticisms and forecasts were correct. This has been confirmed by Yugoslavia's miserable end, the first country to set out on the course of revisionism and, with its repeated failures, the first to show where reformism leads; it has been confirmed by the all-round crisis which has engulfed the Soviet Union, not to mention Hungary or Poland, which are not only immersed in debt and experiencing numerous economic, social and political difficulties, but after 45 years are even handing over state power to the most rabid anti-communist forces.

Now reaction is presenting the catastrophic consequences of revisionism in the Soviet Union and elsewhere, and the complete political, ideological, economic and moral degeneration of the countries where the revisionists are in power, as the failure of communism. Its most prominent emissaries are speaking about "the cancelling out

of the motive forces of socialism", about its "bankruptcy", about the "death of Marx", etc.

It is our duty to resolutely oppose these reactionary theses, the purpose of which is to discredit socialism and the ideology of the proletariat, and to turn the working class and the oppressed peoples away from the road of the revolution. We must emphasise what our Party predicted long ago, that the source of the evils which are appearing in the Soviet Union and elsewhere is their departure from the socialist course. In those countries it is not communism and the doctrine of Karl Marx which have failed. On the contrary, denial of communism and the replacement of the proletarian ideology by the bourgeois ideology have brought about moral and economic decadence and all-round disintegration.

While exposing what is occurring in the Soviet Union and the other Eastern countries, it is our duty to carry our criticism of revisionism further, to deepen it and enrich it with new arguments. In particular, further studies must be made into the question of what were the conditions which facilitated the work of revisionism, what economic, ideological and social factors it exploited in order to undermine socialism. It is essential that we dwell on these questions because the phenomenon of the emergence of revisionism has to do not only with the subjective factor, as it is sometimes presented: a Khrushchev, a Brezhnev or a Gorbachev emerged or a leadership turned traitor, and the working class and the people were deceived!

Of course, the subjective factor has very great importance, especially when we speak of the leadership of a country. But the very fact that a leader or a leadership is apparently able after 40 or 50 years of socialism to reverse the process of social development, to replace a more advanced order with an outdated order, shows that, in the process of the construction of the new society and its economic and social development, something was not in order, shows that the control valves did not function

well, that particular individuals or leading organs had too much power, that the role, control and participation of the masses in the management of affairs was not effective, not to say merely formal.

The developments in the international situation and the trend of opportunism, as a consequence of the revisionist betrayal, bring about changes in the ratio of forces; they influence the relations between states, alliances and military blocs; they upset the equilibrium established in one zone or another. These developments are reflected also in economic relations and elsewhere.

Our Party cannot ignore these phenomena, especially when they are going on around us and, in various forms and to different degrees, exerting influence on us, too, and on the relations of our country with others and on our struggle for socialist construction. Therefore, we must watch these processes carefully, must study them and try to envisage future developments so that we will not be taken by surprise at any time or in any direction and can work out a stand which responds to the defence of the interests of the homeland, the defence of socialism and the cause of the peoples' struggles and the revolution.

It is our duty to be active in the field of foreign affairs, so as to strengthen the political position of our country. We must have keen vigilance, a high political level of the masses, progressive rates of economic development, high defence capacity and skilful diplomatic activity. The Party must inspire and guide all these things.

In the 45 years of socialist life, our Party has successfully coped with its historic tasks. It has emerged triumphant because at each stage of the revolution it has applied the teachings of Marxism-Leninism faithfully and in a creative way. That is what it did during the National Liberation War and that is how it has acted in the socialist construction. In our country the transformations in all fields, such as the socialist industrialisation, the collectivi-

sation of agriculture, the policy on investments and the development of education and culture, have been carried out in a natural way, avoiding stereotypes and ready-made schemes, while taking into account the characteristics of the country, its economic and social situation and the traditions and psychology of the people. The principle of self-reliance has been the basis of our whole development.

Socialism has proved to be the social order with the highest effectiveness in the history of our people. With this mode of production and living, the economic power of the country has grown, the life and the well-being of the people have changed radically, and exemplary economic and political stability has been created. Of course, we are not wallowing in plenty. But we are happy. We owe debts to nobody. Everything which we consume we secure through our own toil. We look to the future with optimism because we have confidence in the work and strength of the people. We are proud that we are free, independent and sovereign.

The road we have trodden has not been strewn with flowers. It will not be a broad boulevard in the future either. We are aware also that not everything has been or is being solved to perfection. This is natural, because the socialist society which we are building is a relatively new society, which is guided by a clear strategy and lofty ideals, but the road towards these ideals is full of unknown hazards.

Our socialist construction is accompanied with difficulties and obstacles which result from the backwardness we have inherited, from the rigorous requirements of independent economic development, and also from the imperialist-revisionist encirclement.

I stress the imperialist-revisionist encirclement, to which Comrade Enver Hoxha continually drew our attention, because for a number of reasons this factor seems to be underrated. Perhaps, because of the fact that

our political and economic activity abroad is increasing, that our relations and contacts with the world are being intensified and extended, the illusion has been created in some comrades that this encirclement has been weakened. This is a mistake, and an extremely dangerous one. The Party must not allow such a psychosis to become established.

The imperialist-revisionist encirclement is permanent: it is a political, ideological, economic and military encirclement. The enemies are fighting to wipe socialism from the face of the earth, to isolate us and to force us to deviate from our course. And to this end they create difficulty after difficulty for us. We do not expect the pressure from our enemies to abate. World capitalism does not like the fact that Albania is building socialism, that it is fighting revisionist reformism, that it shows the peoples that the revolution is alive and advancing, and that reliance on the internal forces is a principle which is proving its effectiveness. Therefore we must never forget this reality, but must counteract resolutely and consistently by strengthening the unity of the people around the Party, by accomplishing and overfulfilling the plans for economic and cultural development, by reducing the demands for import and increasing export, by strengthening our fighting readiness and sharpening our vigilance.

In the difficulties of socialist construction, lack of experience plays no small part. We have to understand that the numerous problems which emerge will be coped with, as has been done up till now, by seeking more effective ways. From this point of view it is necessary that the Party encourages the creative spirit and the method of analysis everywhere. Each step which is taken must become a subject for discussion by the masses and cadres, the specialists and experts.

Discussion in order to find ways for the progress of the revolution on the basis of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism is not taboo. Likewise, the changes which our

socialist development and the conditions created impose do not constitute sacrilege. Let the bourgeoisie speak of the "opening up" of Albania whenever our country is active in the field of international relations and extends its contacts with the world; let them interpret according to their liking the changes we make and the measures we take in order to strengthen the economy and culture and to improve the life of the people. This does not worry us, because Albania and our Party of Labour are what they have been, and are advancing resolutely on the course which the Albanian people have chosen through their people's revolution. We do not make and never have made any "changes", have not "opened" or "closed" the country under the influence of anyone. Every activity of ours is dictated by our conditions and needs, and is subject only to the interests of the Albanian people and socialism.

The fundamental task for us is to successfully carry socialism forward and to close off any path which could lead to its distortion. From this the task emerges that we must advance rapidly in all our affairs, must make improvements, additions and adjustments when and where necessary, but if we take some step more quickly than the existing possibilities allow, we must not hesitate to retreat. Only in certain directions must we never move in any circumstances: we will never permit the weakening of the socialist common property, just as we will not allow the opening up of the way for the return of private property and capitalist exploitation; we will never allow the weakening of the people's state power and the dictatorship of the proletariat, just as we have never shared and never will share power with any anti-people force; we will never relinquish or permit the weakening of the leading role of our Marxist-Leninist Party for the sake of the so-called pluralism the bourgeoisie dishes out to us; we will never permit our national freedom, independence and sovereignty to be infringed. These questions we consider sacred. For them our Party has fought and will fight con-

sistently; for them our people have shed their blood and sweat, and for them we have made and must be ready to make any kind of sacrifice.

Bearing in mind the situations and tasks which are mentioned above, how should the Party be, how should it work in order to lead the socialist construction successfully and give new impulses to the development of the country?

Today more qualified and more scientific work, persistence and creativeness are required from the organisations of the Party and from the communists. The Party must respond to the problems of the time in all directions, therefore it must always be fresh in its ideals and aspirations, a bearer of the most advanced thinking of our society.

As always, the strengthening of the links of the Party with the masses remains the main factor for coping with these tasks. The communists are a great revolutionary force, but it is the people, the masses, who play the decisive role in socialist construction. The communists are advanced people, but without consulting the most qualified opinion of the broad working masses, workers and scientists, the country cannot embark on a new stage of development.

The Party has gained its leading position and its vanguard place in society because its policy and activity have always responded to the interests of the people. Therefore, it must keep its eyes and its mind on the people, taking into account that the people, the working masses, are not only those who carry out directives but, above all, those creative forces which enrich and develop the orientations of the Party. This idea has been synthesised best by Comrade Enver when he pointed out that "socialism is built by the masses, the Party makes them conscious".

The enhancement of the role of the masses is closely linked with the encouragement of their initiative and the creation of conditions for the broad development

of this initiative. The bureaucratic and technocratic tendencies to standardise and centralise everything alienate the masses from creative activity and inhibits their initiative. They violate our socialist democracy, so they are not and must not be in the style of our Party. The communists, the organisations and committees of the Party must bear this well in mind.

In our country, in the conditions of the people's state power, socialist democracy has been developed on a broad scale. Our people have never been as free and independent as they are today. Every citizen of the country is assured under the law and guaranteed in practice the right to work, to education, to state care for their health, the right to national equality, and so on. Our people themselves discuss and decide on the plans for the economic and cultural development of the country, elect their representatives to the organs of state power, and build and defend their own future. This is an indisputable reality which is also the main factor of the moral-political unity of our people.

Is there room for improvement in this field, so that the role, the initiative and participation of the masses in socialist construction be enhanced? It would be neither correct nor dialectical were we to assert that everything responds to the requirements of the time. For this reason, the problems which have to do with the revolutionisation of the life of the Party and the cadres, with the struggle against bureaucracy and alien manifestations, with the strengthening of the role of the masses and their control, and with the struggle against despotism, arrogance and formalism, are always on the order of the day.

Rigidity and narrowness in these fields have dangerous consequences. They foster the administrative methods of management, leaving out the masses and their creative thinking. In such conditions there is room for careerists, despots, bureaucrats and incompetents, who constitute a contingent which can become extremely dangerous for the fate of socialism, which can easily be manipulated

by the ideology of the revisionists, a contingent which, with its tendency to show that it has power, atrophies and paralyzes the creative ability and the role of the working people in the economy, culture, politics and defence. Administrative methods of leadership enable individual cadres and even leading organs to escape from the control of the Party, the control of the working class and the masses.

The struggle against such phenomena and the struggle to enhance the role of the masses are directly linked with the strengthening of our social order, with the strengthening of our socialist democracy.

In the world today the bourgeoisie is striving to take the banner of the struggle for democracy and human rights into its own hands. Indeed, it seeks to present its own norms and concepts about democracy and human rights as the only yardstick and criterion of the truth on these matters. This diabolical tactic of capitalism to impose its standards, which has found support among the revisionists as well, in fact, serves reaction as a way for ideological diversion and interference in the internal affairs of others.

In reality our democracy is beyond any comparison with bourgeois democracy; similarly, human rights in our country are beyond any comparison with those formal rights which the worker or peasant has in the capitalist countries. Democracy and human rights and respect for them are attributes of socialism, are the content and essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the power of the people and not the power of the bourgeoisie, which in its essence and content has exploitation, oppression of and injustice towards the masses of the people.

Precisely because democracy is a fundamental principle of socialism, we must develop and perfect it continually. The encouragement of the initiative and the strengthening of the control of the masses, their active participation in the discussion of every problem that has to do with the progress of the country and with the application of

the line of the Party, causes problems for and upsets only bureaucrats, people who want to establish authority through orders and imposition. But the enhancement of the role of the masses and their active participation in the construction of the country is good for socialism.

Comrade Enver pointed out that one of the important factors for the birth of revisionism in the Soviet Union was bureaucracy, the indifference and passivity of officials, the apparatchiki, who had the slogan "Znajet nachalstvo" (the leadership knows) on the tip of their tongues! It is the duty of the Party to reflect more deeply on the concrete circumstances which foster these phenomena and how they should be combated. But one thing is quite clear: the struggle against bureaucracy must be continued. In connection with this, it is incumbent on the organs and organisations of the Party to go back again and again to the documents of the Party and the teachings of Comrade Enver Hoxha on this question. In particular they must study and restudy his speech in Mat in 1972 and that to the cadres in Gjirokastra in 1978. These speeches contain many ideas which must be thoroughly analysed to improve the existing mechanisms and create new ones, and there are questions which must be re-emphasised and solved with determination. One of them is the problem of workers' control and control in general. Without strengthening control, the actions of the bureaucrats and careerists that create a gulf between the people and the state cannot be checked. Not for one minute must we forget Comrade Enver's teaching: if the Party in its leading organs prefers commandeering methods, this gives rise to conformism and opportunism at the grass-roots.

Our socialist society has advanced greatly, the economy and culture have grown and developed rapidly, the level of the cadres and the consciousness of the working people have been raised. It is a great pleasure to listen to the cooperativists on television or directly

in free meetings. They speak without any hesitation about production, the cost, expenditure, supplies, the brigade leader, the management of the cooperative, etc. In the work centres, too, the working class speaks openly and with responsibility. But is it possible for the voice of the masses to be more effective? Because there are more than a few cases of damage and misuse, absenteeism and failure to fulfil norms, breaches of discipline and favouritism. Who does these things? Cooperativists, workers and other unformed working people do them, but they also come about through the weakening of work and laxity of brigade leaders and directors of factories, managers and others. In these conditions, can we say that the organisations of the Party, trade unions, or the organs of control are doing their work well? What sort of communists and what workers' organisations are those of the "Ali Kelmendi" Combine, the Cigarette Factory in Durrës, the Meat Combine in Tirana, and elsewhere, where products and raw materials are stolen, where there are misuses and ugly manifestations of favouritism and indiscipline?

Without arousing the masses, with the working class at the head of them, without giving them possibilities and prerogatives to act, without their properly exercising the right they have to revoke or dismiss anyone who breaches the norms and does not perform his tasks, whether he is a brigade leader or a high cadre, regardless of which organism has appointed him, these problems cannot be solved. All the cadres without exception must feel that they are subordinate to the masses of the cooperativists, workers and other working people, who assess the performance of cadres. Therefore, they must try to be on good terms with the working masses, on the basis of their conscientious work, and not just with the organs and "comrades" above them!

The organisations of the Party must not close their eyes to certain phenomena which can be seen: the state

and party apparatuses have been inflated with salary employees. Many specialists have been drawn from the sphere of production. The worst of it is that, in many cases, in the jobs which they have gone to, they are not engaged in the solution of weighty problems, but in general and frequently academic studies. Such a situation should no longer be permitted.

The Party has continually stressed that the communists should always be in the forefront of the work. But is this so in practice? The organisations of the Party must reflect deeply on the fact that there are many communists with fixed salaries in the agricultural cooperatives, in the economic enterprises and the state apparatuses. This is not in accord with the spirit of militancy which the Party demands from its members.

Comrade Enver in his speech at Mat deals forcefully with the question of the ratio of communists to non-party people in the organs of state power and in leading positions. As early as 1972, he presented the question that the majority should not be party members. Today, almost 20 years later, when the political and economic situation is even stronger, when the overwhelming majority of the population has been born in the epoch of socialism, and brought up and educated from the cradle with the teachings of the Party, there is no reason why his being a Party member or not should influence the appointment of a cadre to a certain position. Any post – even that of a minister, a military commander, or a diplomat, even a post in the leading organs of the state – can be entrusted to a son or daughter of the people, irrespective of whether or not he or she is a Party member, as long as he or she is honest, loyal to the cause of the homeland and socialism, is capable and cultured. And the absolute majority of cadres are like this. Then, what is required? More energetic activity is required from the organs of the Party, which should base themselves more firmly on the opinion of the masses in the appointment of cadres and abandon some regulations

and staff appointments which in many cases are unnecessary, replacing them with competitions for the acceptance of people in certain sectors and categories of work. The solution of these questions automatically helps to combat the tendencies which may be displayed by some unformed individuals who regard admission to the Party as a way to make a career and to gain a post of responsibility.

The struggle against bureaucracy and the strengthening of socialist democracy require the establishment of a correct relationship between the elected organs and their apparatuses. The tendency of party and state apparatuses is to monopolise the work, to exceed their role and functions, pushing aside the elected organs. It seems to me that this occurs because the elected organs have left them many competences.

It is common knowledge that the apparatuses do not have the right to make policy decisions. They are organisms to assist the elected organs in detailing directives and checking up on the application of decisions, to study different problems and to make proposals and suggestions for their solution. Only the elected leadership has the right to take decisions. However, on the most vital needs of the people such as employment, housing, schooling, qualification, etc., it is not unusual for the section heads or other workers of the executive organs to decide. The problem is not put forward so that the executive organs are exempted from their rights. The thing is that the elected organs, the councillors and deputies have full powers, and we must make this felt everywhere. This makes our socialist democracy more effective and creates conditions for the masses, both directly and through their elected representatives, to exercise control and guarantee the proper application of laws and respect for socialist norms.

The growth of the active role of the masses in strength-

ening the people's state power is reflected, too, in the democratic elections, which in our country are universal, direct and with no limitation for any citizen who has reached 18 years of age. In our system the candidature for a councillor or a deputy is not put forward by the interested person, as happens in the capitalist countries, but is proposed by the masses at meetings of the Democratic Front, in precincts or villages. This is very democratic, because it gives the people the possibility to reject a candidate who does not enjoy the trust of the masses before they go to the polls.

Nevertheless, the mechanism of the electoral system could be improved to further strengthen the role and control of the masses. In the election of the councillors and people's judges this year, proposals for candidates were presented directly by the organisations of the masses, the youth, the women, the trade unions and veterans, and after a broad popular discussion in the organisations of the Democratic Front more than one candidate was proposed for each seat, and this was a good thing. It created conditions for a better selection of candidatures. Could this procedure be improved? Could it be applied to the elections in the Party, too, beginning from those in the basic organisations and their bureaux? Would it not assist in the preparation of each communist as a leader if the term for the re-election of secretaries of party basic organisations and those of bureaux were limited, say, to no more than four to five years, as Comrade Lenka said in the report she delivered?

All these and other questions must be carefully studied by the Party; the question of staff appointments and competences must be examined, just as the question of the role of commissions of the people's councils and the People's Assembly, the question of enhancing the role of the organisations of the masses and, especially, of the Democratic Front, and so on, must be studied. The problem is that the best and most capable individuals, those

who enjoy the respect and love of the people, should be elected to the organs of the Party and the state, so that the working masses should use to the full their right to exercise power and have their activity under control.

In the struggle for the construction of socialism, each organisation and each communist must be militant. Today the Party is faced with many new problems, some difficult, others less so, which require appropriate solutions. Such questions emerge in the field of economic development, in foreign relations, in the fields of defence, education, literature, culture, etc. Communist militancy is reflected in the efforts each organisation and each communist makes to fulfil and overfulfil the targets, in their active attitude to find ways to overcome problems which emerge, and in the struggle against difficulties, against taking things easy and passively.

More must be demanded from the basic organisations and the communists in every field of social activity. Let us take the class struggle. This phenomenon exists in the most varied forms. The Party has said this and proved it time and again, and practice has confirmed and confirms it every day. The class struggle is reflected in foreign relations, just as it is reflected within the country in a whole range of social activities. I do not mean only the physical class enemy, but also alien class concepts, incorrect interpretations of various phenomena, the influence of foreign ideology, the underestimation of the imperialist-revisionist encirclement and the danger it can present to socialism. It is not rare for these manifestations to affect our people, who either underestimate the danger of the influence of alien ideologies, or don't see it at all.

Communist militancy is expressed in the clear and active stands the basic organisations and the communists ought to take in ideology. No concession must be made to bourgeois ideology in any field - in politics, in art,

in culture or in economic relations. No concession must be made to religious ideology. We take this stand not only as convinced atheists but also to defend our unity as a people, who through the centuries have suffered from the divisions and splits which the churches and mosques have inspired. We must make no concession to alien manifestations which run counter to our socialist morality, our customs and national characteristics.

All these things require the raising of the ideo-political level of the communists, but, above all, they require resolute struggle against indifference and passivity which are diseases dangerous to socialism. At all times the communists and cadres must be concerned about the accomplishment of tasks, must be ambitious in the revolutionary sense of the word in order to reach new frontiers. He who responds to his duty with honour and ability deserves the title of communist. The Party does not need anyone who remains indifferent when they see that the line of the Party and the interests of socialism are damaged, he who flinches in the face of difficulties and obstacles, he who tries to secure favours for himself, abusing the title of communist.

The creative abilities of the Party and communist militancy should be displayed more than ever at the present time, when we ought to give new impulses to the all-round development of our society. In particular, they must be expressed in connection with such a key problem as the strengthening of the economy, because the continuous improvement of the life of the people which constitutes the main aim of the Party is linked with this. I am not going to dwell on the numerous questions which have emerged in this field. Here I shall simply express some ideas about the social productivity of labour.

If the social productivity of labour were to be judged by comparing its present level with that of the earliest post-liberation years, the conclusion would be very positive. What then took a year to be produced is now

produced in a matter of three or four days. But what is the level of the productivity of labour in comparison with the possibilities of the present-day level of the development of production? It must be said that it is low, that it does not respond to the demands of the time, and, especially, to those of the future. At present, the productivity of labour in some sectors creates minimum resources for the extended reproduction. This is a matter which causes concern. We must not forget Lenin's statement that, in the final analysis, the level of the social productivity of labour will be the gauge of the superiority of this or that social order.

Why is the situation like this in our country? Is there something in the mechanism of the organisation or administration of affairs which hinders the rise in productivity? If so, of what nature is this obstacle: material or moral, objective or subjective? And, more important, how should this key problem of our development be overcome? That is a major question which requires study, but, especially, it requires the finding of solutions in conformity with our conditions of development and our ideological principles.

Apart from the need for improvement in the utilisation of equipment, it is a known fact that in our present conditions it is the work of man, his level of consciousness and qualification, which is decisive in raising productivity. Are there problems which should be examined from this stand-point? The task of the Party and the state and study organs is to examine them with competence, in a creative spirit and with revolutionary militancy.

There is need, first of all, to step up the efforts for the education of the working people to raise their consciousness. Here, too, the organisations of the Party, the trade unions, the state and all the organisations of the masses have major tasks. They must seriously re-examine the work they are doing, because there is monotony, dry moralisation, slogans and formalism, which are out of date. These criticisms apply both to the forms

of education and the qualification courses, to forms of figurative agitation and socialist emulation, to the propaganda by word of mouth and through the press and television.

But is this in itself sufficient? Despite the exceptionally great importance of consciousness, and I stress that the work of the Party must be radically improved in this direction too, it cannot be expected that the productivity of labour reaches the qualitative levels which modern production requires through consciousness alone. Measures are also needed in the field of the administration and organisation of production. In this direction, is there a need for the improvement of various mechanisms and levers which link the remuneration of the workers more closely with production, which make the workers, specialists or managers more interested in raising the productivity and quality of the work?

In capitalist society, competition, the danger of bankruptcy and insecurity exert powerful pressures both on the worker and on the employer. The mechanism of bourgeois economy is blind and merciless. In socialism the opposite is the case. In our society there is no anxiety about the future. But whereas each individual worker benefits directly from its superiority, the shortcomings and difficulties, which are reflected in the decline of the productivity of labour and the effectiveness of production of enterprises are unloaded on society as a whole. The individual feels them in an indirect way. For this reason it is necessary to study the implementation of certain changes in our economic mechanism, which will ensure the rights and the direct joint responsibility of the society, the collective, the group or the individual for the fate of production.

The harmonisation of the general interests of society with those of the individual is one of the most difficult problems of socialism. The negative example of the Soviet Union and the other former socialist countries proves

this. There they were not harmonised so as to make the working class, the peasantry, and the broad masses of working people interested in increasing production. In those countries the concern was to create favours for bureaucratic apparatuses, some strata of the intelligentsia, the military castes, etc., and this has led to great differentiations and social conflicts on the one hand and the encouragement of passivity and indifference on the other.

A major problem which is linked with the level of the productivity of labour is the strengthening of discipline. I am referring both to technical and scientific discipline, and to the one which is called labour discipline. In the state enterprises, not to mention the administrations, there is a great deal of absenteeism, meanwhile almost one third of the workers do not fulfil their norms. This damages production as a whole, especially there where the processes of work are in a chain. Is this something to examine in the Labour Code, which today envisages that the worker who absents himself without reason has only his pay for the day or the hours he was absent deducted? Even in the case when the worker commits some grave breach of discipline, if after many troubles, protests and court sessions he is dismissed from his job, he goes to another enterprise without any real harm. Who needs this big-heartedness? Is the worker protected by damaging socialism?! Why should society suffer from the carelessness and absenteeism of an individual? Would it not be fair that such a person, whether a worker, a specialist, or a cadre, if he is dismissed for incompetence, grave breaches of discipline or misuse of his position, goes to work in another place and, for a given time, with a reduced wage?

In our country the opinion prevails that the state leaves no one unemployed. This is true, but we should not allow the lazy, the careless and the shirkers to benefit from this superiority of socialism. Let them remain jobless; they bring the evil on themselves. In the university, accord-

ing to the regulation, if the student is absent without reason for 24 hours of lessons, he is expelled from school for one year. Is this fault graver than that of a worker who leaves his job in the chromium mine, in construction, in the factory or elsewhere, in order to stay three, four or five days at the wedding of his cousin in the village?

There are more than a few cases in which machines and production lines are imported, but take years to be put to work. Indeed, campaigns are undertaken for this purpose. Our press calls them revolutionary initiatives and praises them. How do these anomalies come about? Who creates them? Do they speak of financial discipline, order, good management and communist responsibility, or of the opposite? Should this matter be left only to the sphere of consciousness? Do not these things and others like them show a lack or non-proper functioning of the mechanisms of economic and financial control over the machines which are imported and the assets which enterprises have at their disposal? Is there not room to study and issue additional regulations about the role of the bank and financial discipline, while stressing the importance of the economic aspect and control by means of money?

These problems are vital for the development of our economy. It is precisely here that the creative, mobilising and organising force of the Party must be reflected. To solve these problems, the organs and the organisations of the Party must set innovative thought in motion, encourage the vanguard workers and activate the organisations of the masses, the scientific institutions, and so on. The militancy of each cadre and communist and their revolutionary spirit must be expressed in this great work, in the struggle to raise productivity and to strengthen discipline.

We must call for militancy and the spirit of initiative and encourage them strongly, also, in the development of the internal life of the basic organisations of the Party.

The party meetings must always be militant, free from formality and officialdom. In the party organisation, all are and must be equal without any distinction. Any inferiority complex or feeling of superiority, any manifestation of hierarchy, anything which inhibits the free expression of opinion and debate in them must be condemned and rejected.

Some days ago I received a letter from a woman communist who complained that one of the secretaries of the Party Committee of the Lezha District had made what she considered an improper suggestion in connection with the attitude the meeting of the basic organisation was supposed to adopt about the mistake of a communist. From this letter one question attracted my attention: why is it necessary for the secretary of a party committee to summon a secretary of a basic organisation and suggest what attitude it must take on the mistake of this or that communist? Is the basic organisation not capable of judging such a thing? Why this distrust towards the base? Who needs this kind of paternalism?

The problem becomes even more serious when intervention on such matters has to do with cadres, with directors, as was the case referred to in the letter I mentioned. I am not saying that the concrete case is one of favouritism, or that the writer of the letter is right. The question is: why should not the cadres, too, be subject to the same rules as any communist, so that when they make mistakes, the matter is discussed and decided in the basic organisation? As I said above, the respective organs have the right to make appointments, but when it comes to judging the work of the cadres, to taking disciplinary measures and to revoking or dismissing cadres of any rank when they make a mistake, the collective and the basic organisation also have rights. It is important that this be understood properly, so that each cadre or leader tries to win the respect of the collective and the people by working with a high level of consciousness, and does

not strive to be on good terms only with the committee and the organ which has appointed him, thinking that, thus, he is under their protection.

The internal life of the Party, the militant spirit and debate are frequently weakened not only by intervention from above but also by confounding of the notion of unity with that of unanimity. Many comrades think mistakenly that if they do not vote unanimously for a communist or a cadre on a problem or stand, this is a breach of unity. No, comrades, this is not so. Unity is a notion with a political and ideological content, it has to do with the line and the principles. We have unity of opinions and actions for the cause of socialism, for the general interest, for the principle of remuneration according to work done, for the independence of the homeland and reliance on our own forces, and other such problems of principle. But it is another matter that, in the struggle to achieve these aims and to apply these principles, there will be a variety of opinions, a number of proposals for solutions, and complex measures, which support one another, will be taken. The question of unanimity arises here. It may not result on an absolute scale in every concrete case on which discussions are held, opinions are exchanged, studies are carried out and decisions taken. This expresses and should express the internal democracy, the spirit of initiative, the freedom of opinion and action to put the socialist ideals into practice.

In essence, to distinguish clearly the concept of unity from that of unanimity means to distinguish what is a matter of principle from what is not so, to distinguish that which has to do with the laws from that which has to do with the concrete measures and ways to put into practice the demands of the laws. This makes the work of the Party more flexible and gives logic to its activity.

An ideological homogeneity has been created for a long time now and is ceaselessly intensified in our country. We must use this great achievement of our social order

to further develop our socialist democracy in all fields of social activity. In these conditions, debate and confrontation of opinions, solutions, variants and practices is completely normal. Amongst us there is no social basis for these things to assume the form of a social antagonism. On the contrary, they develop in line with the interests of our socialist society and express our common efforts for socialism and progress.

Comrade Enver Hoxha has said:

"At various meetings it is noticed that some leading comrades are afraid of discussions 'which are out of tune', which go beyond the stereotyped formulas. They think that everything ought to proceed smoothly. The result of such a method is that the opposing opinions are expressed outside the meeting. In this case, the alarm is sounded about something which is said to have been understood 'theoretically', but which, in fact, has been neither understood nor applied correctly."

He continues:

"Listen how neatly and correctly an engineering worker has expressed this dialectical law of the clash of opinions, as a great motive force of our society: 'We mechanics like these frictions,' he said, 'because when two metals are rubbed together they produce heat which is transformed into mechanical energy.' Similarly, with ideas: the more ideas are thrashed out, the more heat and energy they will generate, and, as a consequence, production and the well-being of the workers will go ahead'."

Comrade Enver concludes:

"Just from the one example I mentioned we ought to think: why should we be afraid of discussion, of the clash of ideas, why should we be afraid of

criticism and why should we confine self-criticism to a few personal things, and should not develop it on a still wider scale. Discussion and criticism does not, in any way, lower the authority of the institution or the department, but stirs them up to resolve the contradictions that emerge in life, correctly and promptly."

The proper development of debate and confrontation requires noticeable progress in the work of the Party, especially in its activity of propaganda and education. It is essential to break away from the stereotypes, the repetition of known truths, ready-made phrases, dogmatism and metaphysics, which atrophy thinking, do not see society in movement and do not follow the process of development in its dialectics. We need more scientific treatment of the problems we encounter in objective reality, more critical analysis and more creative thinking. In our state and party schools, in the institutes of study, in the forms of education and in the press, and in the work with the masses, we need to dwell deeper on the present ideological, political, economic and social phenomena; we need analyses based on the present-day developments and courage to face up to the problems which emerge from them.

In particular, increased care for the youth and improved educational work with them is required. This is a task not only for the Labour Youth Union of Albania, but above all for the organisations of the Party and the state organs, for the schools and the cultural institutions. We must not forget that the absolute majority of our population is under 30 years of age. This mass has its own demands and numerous interests which result from its age, but also from its cultural level, which is continually rising.

The youth of our country are pure ideologically, ardently patriotic and militant for socialism, are intelligent and active. They live with the problems of the country and are outstanding in the work to solve them. From this stand-point, those forms of work which in essence are

limited to some general moralisations about how they ought to behave, what they should do and what they shouldn't do at work, in school and in the street must be considered paternalistic and outdated. Is it not the time for the youth organisations and the Party to think about and find appropriate forms of work in order to respond to the broad interests of the youth as a whole, and to particular sections of them, in order to encourage their initiative and self-action and their creative capacities?

The youth are the future of the homeland. They will carry socialism forward. Therefore the duty of the Party is to educate a youth knowledgeable from every standpoint, a sincere, courageous and skilful youth, who will at all times defend the country and socialism, and consequently cope with the difficulties and obstacles. The secretaries of the Party, from the highest organs down to the base, must make contact with the young men and women in forms as unofficial as possible, must explain to them the situations we are going through and the problems the Party is solving, report to them, seek their opinion and consult them. The young men and women must not be treated as children, but as fighters, indeed as the most outstanding fighters, because that is what they are.

Today the youth have numerous requirements in regard to art, culture, literature, sports, etc. Therefore, the Party and the respective organisations must take care to ensure them more publications, more artistic performances, more songs, more sports activities, and so on. The youth have very warmly welcomed a number of literary works by our outstanding writers, some "New Albania" Film-studio productions, some translations of famous authors of world literature, the series of concerts of folk songs, the exciting matches of our junior girl volleyball players who are the Balkan champions, etc., etc. Hence, they appreciate quality and, indeed, seek to measure their strength with the world. Why should we consider a normal

duty the demand that we measure our strength with the world in production, and not consider it so also in the other spheres? A sports complex was built in Tirana. This was a very good thing. But the needs of the youth for recreation are not fulfilled just with this. Would it not be better if, in a number of districts, instead of spending money on fountains which have no beauty, do something for the youth, build swimming pools, sports grounds and reading-rooms, encourage alpinism, culture, and so on? This, too, is the work for the organisations and organs of the Party.

Strengthening the leading role of the Party and communist militancy are closely connected with admissions to the Party and the quality of communists. This was treated in the report, so I will not expand on this question. I want only to stress that we should always bear in mind that our Party is a party of the working class. This is determined not only by its proletarian ideology, but also by its social composition. For this purpose, the Central Committee has taken special decisions to establish such ratios of admissions as to maintain in its structure the priority of worker communists, as regards their social status and origin. This is correct and should be implemented in the future too. Rules have been set also about the age of the candidates to membership.

The quality of the people admitted to the Party has fundamental importance, as the 9th Congress, also, has pointed out. Constant care must be devoted to this problem. We must always maintain the Party pure. And it remains pure if all its members are dedicated fighters for the cause of the people and put the interests of society above everything. Every Party member, from the rank-and-file communist to the member of the Central Committee, should be clear that people judge the Party from the behaviour and stand of the communists: whether they are correct and honest in life, set an example at work and in society, are modest, have well-behaved, well-

educated and unpretentious families and children, and so on and so forth.

Some problems have emerged over admissions from among the ranks of the intellectuals in production, education and culture, science, etc., as well as over the age of those admitted. Certainly, these problems should be studied, because conditions have changed and, as a consequence, some rules must be changed too. For example, is it right that in reckoning the age of admissions to the Party, we should take into account its whole membership, including the pensioners? Would it not be more appropriate if, in admitting people to the Party, we should reckon the average age of the Party without including pensioners? They have given much to the Party and will continue to do so to the extent of their possibilities, and they will keep high the name of the communist as long as they live. The active strength of the Party, however, will be made up by those communists who work in production, in work centres, in the countryside and at various institutions. Here we need our Party to be young, active and dynamic.

Apart from workers and cooperativists, other working people, who come under the category of employees, are also admitted to the Party. Here are included workers of state and economic administration, regardless of their level of education: watchmen and warehouse keepers, academics and officers, teachers, doctors, controllers and others. Is there room for corrections here? I think there is. The Party is interested in having in its ranks more outstanding men of our intelligentsia, people engaged in creative activities, doctors, engineers, scholars, economists, teachers and others, and less watchmen and warehouse keepers or office employees. Whether this problem will be dealt with by making the present denominations more precise, or in some other way, this should be studied. However, one thing must be emphasised: those whom we consider intellectuals today are the sons and

daughters of the people; they are workers, peasants, officers, employees, and fighters for socialism, for which all of them have fought and been consistently working for 45 years. These are the intellectuals who have been created, raised and educated by the Party and according to its teachings.

The effectiveness of the work of the Party calls for the further strengthening of the role of the basic organisation, because there, among the communists, the workers and peasants, lie the foundations of our entire society. All problems are coped with and all directives implemented only if the communists and the masses of the people struggle to this end. If the basic organisation does not discuss these problems and if it does not decide what should be done about them and the ways of dealing with them, we cannot solve either the problem of raising the social productivity of labour, or that of strengthening discipline, developing agriculture, strengthening small herds and plots, improving education, and so on. Irregularities, injustices and favouritism cannot be combated if the basic organisations and the working masses do not analyse and do not decide for themselves about these problems. All the others, any committee, any commission, any organ, be it even the Central Committee of the Party, are more liable to err on these problems than the base.

Comrades,

The strength of our Party of Labour and its health are the basis of the vitality and continuity of socialism in Albania. By working to enhance the leading role of the Party and to strengthen the militant character of its activity, we actually impart a fresh impulse to our economic and social development on the road of socialism according to the teachings of Comrade Enver Hoxha, prepare ourselves better for the implementation of the

new plans the Party is working out for the 9th Five-year Plan, and create the conditions for increasing the prosperity of the people and the glory of our socialist homeland.

Long live the Party of Labour of Albania!

Glory to triumphant Marxism-Leninism!

ISBN 1 872782 00 0

**Printed and published by
WORKERS' PUBLISHING HOUSE
170 Wandsworth Road
London SW8 2LA**
