ALBANIA'S

Incorrect Line EXPOSED

The two most recent issues of Class Struggle, international bulletin of the Workers' Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) of Norway (AKP(M-L)), dated September 1978 and October 1978, contain a detailed, scientific exposure of the political errors of the Party of Labour of Albania (PLA).

The AKP(M-L) points out that for over a year before they released these documents they refrained from publicly attacking the PLA despite the existence of major disagreements between the two parties. This position is no longer tenable since the PLA leaders have developed their polemics from an attack on the Communist Party of China and other Marxist-Leninist parties to an endorsement of social-imperialist aggression against other socialist countries. The clearest example of this is the June 24, 1978 Zeri i Popullit editorial, "Imperialists, Hands Off Viet Nam", which supports Viet Nam's war against Kampuchea and denounces "Chinese imperialism" for its interference in South East Asia. The article gives support to the Soviet Union's hegemonism in Viet Nam and was favourably cited by Pravda, the Soviet party paper.

In the sixties and early seventies official PLA propaganda on international questions largely followed the same lines as the Communist Party of China. At the 7th Congress of the PLA in November, 1976, the Communist Party of China was openly criticized for the first time, although this was in the form of a criticism of the three worlds theory. On July 7, 1977 a Zeri i Popullit editorial entitled, "The Theory And Practice Of The Revolution", not only stated that the three worlds theory is wrong but branded supporters of this theory as counter-revolutionaries and revisionists. On July 29, 1978, the Central Committee of the PLA sent a letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China which viciously attacked the Communist Party of China and Mao Zedong.

Since the autumn of 1976 the focus of attack of the Albanian leadership has changed. Previously they mainly attacked the Soviet Union and modern revisionism. Now they direct their heaviest blows against the Communist Party of China, and the advocates of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. As Soviet aggression has escalated, Albanian criticism of it has decreased.

From August 14 to 29, 1978 Klassekampen, organ of the AKP (M-L) printed large excerpts, amounting to 40 of 54 pages, from the July 29 "Letter of the CC of the Party of Labour and Government of Albania to the CC of the Communist Party and Government of China." Each excerpt was accompanied by an article explaining the views of the AKP(M-L) on the questions raised. Class Struggle reprinted these explanatory passages refuting the erroneous charges laid in the Albanian letter. AKP(M-L) clearly states: "We consider that the Letter' of the Albanian leadership is an attack on the communist world movement and on Mao Zedong. In our opinion, this 'Letter' is politically completely wrong."

The AKP(M-L) continues: "In our opinion, not printing what is against oneself is an expression of lack of faith in one's own arguments as well as a depreciation of one's readers as if they were not mature enough to judge for themselves." For this reason the letter was printed. This method stands in sharp contrast to the methods employed by the Albanian leadership. For example, the Albanian leaders attack Mao's three worlds theory, yet no Chinese defence of this theory has been made available to the Albanian people. On the contrary, Chinese publications have been withdrawn from sale in Albania. On the other hand, the Albanian criticism of the three worlds theory has been published in China.

The Albanian letter violently attacks Mao Zedong and serves to



clarify contradictions and lines of demarcation. It shows that today it is impossible to take a stand in favour of both Mao Zedong and the Albanian leadership.

In the letter the Albanian leadership asserts that China broke off economic aid to Albania in July, 1978, (see Alive 124, page 2) not because of the Albanians' lack of willingness to cooperate, but to exert political pressure. This is clearly ridiculous since China openly provides aid to a number of countries whose policies are opposed to those of China. The Albanians also claim that China has expressed boastfulness and great power chauvinism in her aid to Albania. In fact Albania received assistance while the Chinese people themselves lived poorly and lacked many necessities. This is an expression of the true proletarian internationalism of the Chinese. The issue of Chinese aid was only raised because of Albania's attacks on China. The Chinese themselves never made this an issue.

The Albanians claim that the Chinese overestimated the amount of aid given and state that this aid has not significantly contributed to Albania's economy. In fact Chinese aid has involved cornerstone projects in Albania's economy.

Class Struggle states: "There can be no doubt whatsoever that Chinese aid changed the overall structure of Albanian production, and contributed decisively to the very extensive industrialization of the sixties and seventies. This signifies a great historic advance for Albania and constitutes the basis for an increased standard of living and a firmer fundament for the struggle to safeguard national independence."

In the letter the Albanians also state that the struggle waged by the Communist Party of China against Krushchevite revisionism was reluctant and poor and that the Chinese vacillated in this struggle. In contrast, the leadership of the PLA is portrayed as exceedingly consistent, and as a "lone" opponent of Krushchevite revisionism until 1963 when the Chinese reluctantly joined the struggle.

In fact Mao Zedong's struggle against Krushchevite revisionism began long before 1963. In 1956 he wrote, "On The Correct Handling Of Contradictions Among The People", and "On The Ten Major Relationships", which are important articles analyzing the errors and weaknesses in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe at the time. In the same year the Communist Party of China openly fought the Krushchevite thesis of "peaceful and parliamentary transition to socialism" and "peaceful coexistence" between the people and imperialism. In 1960 the Chinese published the polemical article, "Long Live Leninism" and collections of quotations from Lenin. In this way public criticism of the USSR was avoided but correct, anti-revisionist and anti-Krushchevite lines were presented to guide communists in their work.

After 1960 there appeared various public polemical articles against Krushchevite revisionism. Among the most significant of these were the open letters of 1963. These were notably "A

Proposal Concerning The General Line Of The International Communist Movement" and "On Krushchev's False Communism" which constitute a systematic criticism of Krushchevism and an analysis of the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

What of the Albanians? In 1956 Enver Hoxha gave a speech in which he subscribed to Krushchev's thesis of peaceful and parliamentary transition. By 1960 the Albanian line had changed and they gave support to the Chinese in the struggle against modern revisionism. After 1960 the PLA published many polemical articles which were valuable in the exposure of Krushchev but they are mostly lacking in more extensive analysis of what the causes of revisionism are, and how the modern revisionist system in the USSR functions. The Albanian leaders never presented any thorough analysis of the errors of the Soviet Union comparable to Mao's contributions after 1956 but adhered to the theoretical criticism made by the Chinese, praised it and applied it. The Albanian contribution in these polemics was valuable, but to characterize it as more consistent and thorough than that of Mao Zedong and the Chinese Communist Party is to turn truth on its head.

After 1963 the Albanian leadership displayed a significant lack of tactical clarity on the question of modern revisionism. In 1968 Enver Hoxha wrote: "In all the countries where revisionists are in power, the dictatorship of the proletariat is being smashed and replaced by the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, the socialist regime is being replaced by the capitalist bourgeois regime." So in 1968 the Albanians claimed that there were countries in which the revisionists had seized power, but where the restoration of capitalism had not been completed. This implies that it is possible to consider the existence of a type of, albeit degenerated, socialism. Many similar statements show that this was no accidental formulation. The Albanian leadership has continued to create the illusion that remnants of "socialism" survive in the revisionist countries.

These and other mistakes in analyzing modern revisionism could previously be considered minor. Today they are significant. Albania today maintains good relations with Cuba's Castro and Ethiopia's Mengistu, and characterizes Viet Nam as a "socialist country". Clearly it is the Albanians, not the Chinese, who have been inconsistent in their criticism of modern revisionism.

The Albanians also accuse the Chinese of wanting alliance with the USSR against the U.S. in the early sixties. Yet Albania was a member of the Warsaw Pact in the early sixties and did not formally relinquish membership until after the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

Class Struggle analyzes the overall situation with regards to modern revisionism by stating: "Mao's works from this period are classic theoretical works of Marxism-Leninism. They are basic for the comprehension of modern revisionism. They initiated a powerful advance of the new Marxist-Leninist movement, which has learned that it cannot combat revisionism without relying on these works of Mao. The PLA leadership never accomplished, either in the fifties, the sixties or the seventies, any criticism of the same depth and value.

"It is this class contribution of Mao Zedong, today part of the fundamentals of the communist world movement, that the Albanian leaders reject."

In 1964 the Albanian leaders criticized Mao Zedong for raising the question of the border problems that many countries had with the Soviet Union, claiming that this smacked of "the chauvinistic spirit and the great state and bourgeois nationalism" on China's part. Yet Lenin himself stated that the Sino-Russian border had been drawn by the Russian Tsar on the basis of unequal agreements. Five years later the Soviet Union conducted armed attacks against China. This should have convinced the Albanians that they were wrong and Mao was right. Instead they reiterated their criticism of 1964, shamelessly supporting Soviet social-imperialism. These criticisms are again presented in the recent Albania letter.

The Albanians were afraid to raise the issue of border problems

because they feared this would imply criticism of Stalin. Mao Zedong, on the other hand, clearly stated that Stalin had made the error of tending towards hegemonism in certain aspects of foreign policy. Class Struggle points out: "It is precisely because Mao could show what hegemonistic tendencies could lead to that he formulated the thesis 'Never seek hegemony' as a guiding line in China's foreign policy."

In 1964 the situation was not so clear. Today, 15 years later, it is clear that social-imperialism has developed and Mao Zedong was right. If the Albanian leaders had taken a Marxist attitude, they would have made a self-criticism for their wrong criticism of Mao in 1964. Instead, they do the exact opposite, taking pride in repeating their mistake. Class Struggle stresses: "The position of the Albanian leaders is therefore no longer a mere error; it is a counter-revolutionary and pro-imperialist act."

The Albanian letter also claims that the Communist Party of China vacillated in their attitude towards the USSR. The basis of this slander is the fact that China sent a delegation to the Soviet Union in 1964, headed by Zhou Enlai, right after the deposition of Krushchev, to take part in the celebration of the October Revolution.

At this time the split in the world communist movement had been consummated in the main. The Soviet Union was trying to create the illusion that the Chinese had been promoting this split. It carried great strategic and tactical significance to show those who were still wavering in practice that the Soviet leadership was lying about China's aim. By calling off the polemics and travelling to Moscow the Chinese were able to demonstrate to the whole world that they were willing to extend a hand of friendship, and did not favour splittism. Polemics were resumed shortly, as soon as the Soviet leadership had demonstrated to the world that they were mere successors to Krushchev's ideology and policy. China achieved a tactical advantage which the USSR lost, and China did not retract even an iota of principled criticism of revisionism.

Class Struggle states: "To be sure, the Albanian party made some important contributions to the struggle against Krushchev's modern revisionism. Even though the Albanian leaders today trample over these contributions by furthering large-scale revisionism on their own, we will not forget them. But when the Albanian leaders claim that Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai 'vacillated' towards modern revisionism while the Albanian party allegedly defended a correct line, it is our duty to expose those who truly vacillated."

On November 2, 1957, on the 40th anniversary of the October Revolution, Hoxha spoke in support of the "peaceful road": "It will be known that the 20th party congress, a significant event in the history of communism and of the international Communist movement, has not only developed a great number of Marxist-Leninist theses, such as the thesis of peaceful coexistence, the thesis of the possibility of averting wars, on the roads that will assure the conquest of power by the working class etc., but it has also elaborated the grandiose program for the transition from socialism to communism, the task of catching up with and overtaking the per capita production of the developed capitalist countries within a short historic period, for demonstrating the superiority of the socialist system over the capitalist by way of peaceful economic competition."

In a speech on the 20th anniversary of the liberation of Albania on November 28, 1964, Enver Hoxha said: "Our Party and our people are well aware of the leading role of the Soviet Union in the socialist camp. We never have and never will underrate its leading role in the international arena."

Clearly it is the Albanians who vacillated and spread illusions on the question of the Soviet Union and modern revisionism.

In the course of their letter the Albanian leadership attacks Mao Zedong for almost all components of his revolutionary activity. They claim that before 1949 the Communist Party of China was characterized by unprincipled factional struggle. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is slandered as a factional dispute

which led to the bourgeoisie seizing state and party power in China. In 1972 Nixon's visit to China signified China's betrayal of truly socialist countries, the Marxist-Leninist movement, the revolution and the liberation movements. The list of attacks on Mao Zedong and China made by the Albanian leadership is long and the Albanians continue to create the illusion that the Chinese have changed their position while the Albanians remain staunch. In fact, even after 1972, the Albanians have called Mao Zedong the leader of the world communist movement and have published extremely positive appraisals of China's international policy after 1971. They conceal the fact that they themselves have maintained positions identical or very close to those they now denounce in vehement terms.

In the autumn of 1977 the AKP(M-L) wrote a letter to the PLA in response to, "The Theory and Practice of the Revolution" published by Zeri i Popullit on July 7, 1977. This letter was not published by the AKP(M-L) until July 17, 1978. The PLA has yet to reply to this letter.

The letter rejects the criticism of the three worlds theory, and criticizes important mistakes committed by the Albanian leaders. These include their incorrect assessment of the relative strength of the superpowers, disregard of the threat of third world war, and disregard of the significance of the struggle of the third world. It emphasizes the importance of Mao Zedong's role and upholds him as a great Marxist-Leninist. The letter stresses that to disregard Mao Zedong is to disregard one of the sharpest weapons against imperialism, social-imperialism and modern revisionism.

The letter from AKP(M-L) also denounces the recent series of international meetings of communist parties, supported by Albania, which have been used to attack China and further factionalism and disruption. AKP(M-L) states: "We have observed that the organization of Hardial Bains, the so-called 'Communist Party of Canada (M-L)' has propagated these meetings. We will therefore once more draw your attention to the fact that we are utterly convinced that Bains operates as an agent for an imperialist



superpower."

Class Struggle concludes its series on the question of Albania's current position in the world polemic by stating: "The current situation is such that we must be prepared to cope with sharp contradictions and rapid and surprising fluctuations. To study the main contradictions, to learn from them, to improve our ability to distinguish correct and incorrect lines: all this is essential. Then we will be able to turn bad things to good things. Ruptures and struggle can make us work out a clearer policy, and help us find the right path to victory.

"In our opinion the present contradictions must teach us to improve our studies of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and Mao's three worlds theory, and to improve our ability to wage struggle against the two superpowers and in particular the more dangerous: social-imperialism."

BITING THE DUST

Nelson Morgan Davis — a capitalist, came to Canada with only fifty dollars in his pocket, self-made during the early years of the Depression saved some relatives' chain of variety outlets, a cut-throat turning revenue reds to ledger black, early ensuring his place as a business figure.

Nelson Morgan Davis — a bird of prey, making the eagle his personal trademark, like the eagle of the U.S., his birthplace, sinking talons into Canadian flesh, drawing blood and with evil alchemy turning blood into gold, though he never drank alcohol or smoked cigarettes.

Nelson Morgan Davis — a Cornell mathematician, knew the shortest distance between two points was capital's straight line to profit-making, knew logarithms that employed tax legalities to gobble up tiny companies one after another, creating the vast Nelson M. Davis Corporation.

Nelson Morgan Davis — a puritan megalomaniac, exploited his way into the oppressors' circle, though he never spoke profanities.

He saw his personal measure in his gold and his reflection in the U.S. national symbol, even having an eagle's image printed on the wallpaper of his corporate office's toilet.

Nelson Morgan Davis — a classic bourgeois, lived the recluse life, chasing affluence and the sun's rays, flitting from Muskoka to Rosedale to Arizona to purchase arable land, dam its rivers, terrace its land, just to create his own, personal golf course! Just for the sake of arrogance.

Nelson Morgan Davis — a clinically clean exploiter, did not like the dirt, buying a meteorite which was crushed and laid in his driveway because it was "dirt-less", guaranteeing his clothes, his furniture, his cars and his collection of eagles would all remain in their store bought condition.

Nelson Morgan Davis — Argus Corporation Board Chairman, a leading exploiter of Canadian working class people, bit the dust on Thursday, March 15, 1979. "Good!" the people say and struggle on. No one cried. Corporate associates auction off his reptiled shoes and stored away fedoras. A new Board Chairman tomorrow.

Nelson Morgan Davis — the dirt beneath our feet, yes, now you have become the dust, Nelson Morgan Davis, just a speck of dust on one of the pages of history. For society's advance, working people are determined to sweep such dirt from the stage of human development. Nelson Morgan Davis was lucky to die a natural death.

George Steffler