



# **MARXIST - LENINIST JOURNAL**

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

---

**Vol. 4, No. 1**

**Price £1.00**

**January 1991**

- **Seminar on Party Policy**
  - **Public Lecture by Hardial Bains  
on the Occasion of the 25th  
Anniversary of the  
Internationalists in Ireland**
  - **Trinity  
by Hardial Bains**
  - **The Consolidation of the  
People's Power and Perfection  
of the Entire Political System  
Stimulates the Democratic  
Developments  
by Ramiz Alia**
- 
-

# **MARXIST-LENINIST JOURNAL**

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

ISSN 0960-4502

## CONTENTS

Seminar on Party Policy.....	5
Public Lecture by Hardial Bains on the Occasion of the 25th Anniversary of the Internationalists in Ireland.....	17
Trinity, by Hardial Bains.....	42
The Consolidation of the People's Power and Perfection of the Entire Political System Stimulates the Democratic Developments, by Ramiz Alia.....	53

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

## Seminar on Party Policy

THIS is one of a series of seminars which we are holding in all the different regions and areas to explain the Party's views on the present situation and what are its priorities. The reason we are holding them is that clearly the situation, internationally and nationally, is very complicated. There have been very dramatic changes. It is a time when the communists and all progressive people have to give very serious thought to what is going on. Particularly in Party circles, we should have a lot of discussion as to what is going on.

The first thing, which is obvious, is that the changes in the world over the past year have been extremely dramatic. The political map of the world has changed considerably, and you would never have thought only a year and a few months ago when things were beginning to happen in East Germany that just over a year later there would simply be no Soviet bloc left. The regimes in every one of these regimes in Eastern Europe have fallen. This needs looking at. Our conclusion is that the ratio of forces in the world has changed quite radically. The political situation internationally has gone through quite a dramatic change and there is a new situation.

---

*A talk by a representative of the Central Committee of RCPB(ML) given at a seminar on Party policy held in Birmingham on December 3, 1990. Edited for publication.*

The main thing about the situation is that the bipolarism which dominated world politics over the last several decades, where every country was either in one of the two camps, the Soviet or the American, or its politics was dominated by contention between the two camps – for example, countries like India – that has come to an end. It is not that situation any more. It is not that the US and the Soviet Union are not still mighty superpowers who want to dominate the world. But their ability to do that, to impose their will, is gravely weakened. It is true of the US, they are the largest debtor state, they are going into a very serious recession, their ability – though not for want of trying – to order people around has become a lot less than it was before. With the Soviet Union it is even greater, in the sense that quite obviously it is in terrible economic trouble. The situation is chaotic, very unstable, and there is the possibility that the whole Soviet Union may disintegrate. If Russia goes then the whole thing has come to an end, because Russia is the biggest republic and binds the thing together. You have these extraordinary things, Gorbachev was supposed to go to Moldavia last week, and they stopped him going. They said they could not guarantee his safety, this is the President of the Union! And he could not go to Stockholm to collect the Nobel Prize for Peace because of the danger of war, civil war, in his country! The Soviet Union is really weakened. And its bloc has simply disintegrated. There is no longer what there was just over a year ago and has been for several decades, a Soviet bloc. The Warsaw Pact met only in the last few weeks and decided it had no purpose any more, wrapped up its organisation.

So they are greatly weakened. And then two other major powers have come up to challenge them economically and politically, and clearly at a later stage will challenge militarily as well. That is Japan and the European Community, mainly in the shape of Germany, in the sense that the European Community is totally dominated by

Germany. Those two powers have come up to rival the United States and the Soviet Union. So rather than there being two major powers, now there are four main poles of contention in the world.

Things have changed quite radically. The Cold War has come to an end and bipolarism has finished. It creates a new situation. One of the features of the new situation is that it is a fact that there is less tension, speaking in general, and the detente which they have spoken about so much is a real thing. At this CSCE the document they signed about armaments reductions and so on, it is actually very big cuts they have made, their spending on military production, and so on. Not that they have stopped being warmongers. It is simply that what were the two superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States, were losing out in economic competition with the European Community, in the shape mainly of Germany, and Japan, because their emphasis was so much on the military spending, and Germany and Japan did not have vast military spending. There are other things as well: the fact of the destructiveness of nuclear war, the fact that the domination of countries is done more through the form of credits and debts, and so on, and not necessarily by physical occupation or the threat of physical occupation. So one can say in general terms that there is a less tense situation in the world because of this end of the cold War, end of the confrontation of these two blocs, which is positive. There is a situation where, while the sources of war have not gone away – there is still imperialism – because of this situation there are definite possibilities for progressive countries and the progressive forces to push for a democratisation of international relations, for respect for the sovereignty and independence of countries, for cooperation between the poor countries and the rich countries. There is the definite possibility of solving disputes internationally by dialogue rather than military threat or war itself. There is a possibility for more of a role for the United Nations.

There is the consolidation of this CSCE, the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe, which was done at this summit in Paris last week, and has taken on, you could say, some of the features of a United Nations for Europe.

It has created definite possibilities in that direction. At the same time, it is a contradictory situation in the sense that there are things going against that, in that the big powers are trying still to act in the old way. So while we think it is true to say that there is less tension in the world, you actually have the possibility of a catastrophic war over the Gulf. And it is clear that, say, the United States and Britain are simply trying to act in the old way, completely in contradiction to what is generally considered to be the way of dealing with things now, to impose their will by military force. George Bush even talks of a "new world order", which a number of people talk of, but he says that the only guarantee of a new world order is that the United States should lead it and act as a sort of general policeman for the world. New warring blocs could emerge. Already there is open talk of trade war.

Then you have in the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe very positive features in that they agree they will solve disputes by peaceful means, they will respect each other's territory, they have signed to reduce arms, and so on. At the same time, written into it now, which was not in the original Helsinki Agreement, is that they support, and they consider it is in the interests of all, the development of pluralism and the market economies, which they are having in Eastern Europe, which is out of key with respect for the sovereignty of countries and the right of peoples to choose their own system. So while you have the possibilities of democratisation of international relations, and so on, more respect for sovereignty of countries and peoples, you have at the same time forces working against that,

and trying to carry on in the old way and to impose their will by military force, to impose on peoples the system they the big powers wish.

This is how we see the world situation. It is one in which there are definite possibilities to demand and to work for some very positive things in this new situation. At the same time, it has very big dangers.

Speaking about Europe, what one can say is that, considering Eastern Europe, things have gone full cycle in the process which started at the time of Khrushchev. It has gone back to capitalism, fully-fledged capitalism. But it has happened in such a rapid way that it has left a very unstable and dangerous situation where there is very terrible hardship threatening the people, and there is even talk of famine in the Soviet Union, they cannot even feed their people. There is terrible ethnic and national conflict, dangers of civil war, the rise of fascist organisations, and so on. It leaves a very unstable and dangerous situation.

Where previously West Germany was far and away the most powerful country in Europe, now there is a united Germany, even more dominating. As far as German unity goes, we consider the German people have a right to unite if they want to. That is their right. But bearing in mind that Germany was the source of two terrible world wars, one has to view it with some caution. Of course we hope a new united Germany will be a factor for peace and stability in Europe. At the same time we have to view it with some caution.

The third point to make on Europe is that the European Community is very much a fact of life, and we have to consider it in that light. We opposed Britain entering the European Community. Our view on it has not changed in that it is a club of the monopolies to exploit the peoples of Europe and the rest of the world. But the fact is Britain happens to be in it. If we simply continue to say, Britain out of the European Community, it is not very helpful,

because it is a fact of life that Britain is in, whatever the controversies over monetary union. The fact is that Britain is part of the European Community, and it is taking on new powers, and we have to look much more at what are the effects of the European Community on the lives of the working class and people here, and how does one deal with the situation in which Britain is part of the European Community.

Those are some views on Europe. In this situation in the world and in Europe, the question arises, how does the revolutionary movement respond, how do we respond to this situation?

Thinking of Eastern Europe, as we have said before, we do not consider these developments disprove Marxism-Leninism, or signal the end of socialism, because it was not socialism there. It was not capitalism either. It was a sort of hybrid between the two. But we would not consider that the fact these things have happened in Eastern Europe disproves socialism as the way out of the people's problems. At the same time, we do not wash our hands of it. We do not simply say, it's not our fault, it wasn't Marxist-Leninists who did it, we're not responsible, or it's nothing to do with us. Firstly, we are concerned about what has happened and concerned for the fate of the peoples in those countries. The second thing is that we as Marxist-Leninists have to look at what happened there. How come that these things happened? Why was it that industry was so backward, how is it that when Khrushchev arose the people allowed these things to happen? Why didn't the working class take a hand? So it is not that we simply say that they went against Marxism-Leninism, the leaders, and that is the end of it. As scientists we have to look at what can be learned from the fact that those countries went revisionist, so that in the future the same things do not happen again, not necessarily in the sense of criticising the leaders in the Soviet Union, but simply seeing whatever it was — the

circumstances of the rise of the Soviet Union, the problems which as the first socialist state they had not got round to solving, or whatever. What lessons can be learned from the fact that socialism basically was destroyed in those countries. That is in fact what we have to accept, that while it was not Marxism-Leninism which caused the problems, at the same time it has been a set-back. The whole process, if you look at it — you had the first socialist state, it had a very high reputation at the end of the war, you had other countries after liberation joining the socialist camp, now there is nothing, apart from Albania. Viewed historically, revolution has suffered a set-back. Certainly you could also say that reaction has the initiative at the present time. If you compare it, say in this country, with the '60s and '70s, the working-class movement is not at the same level. If you compare the student struggles, there are not the same type of struggles of the students. It would be wrong to say there is no struggle, or they have given up struggling. That is not the case at all. And in many ways the students and the workers may well be more serious these days than before, more anxious about what is going on. One cannot mechanically say that the movement is at a lower level. The consciousness of the people is different now. And certainly on some things it is higher than it was. But in terms of the numbers involved, the number of strikes, the actual things the students are doing physically, it is not the same. And certainly reaction has the initiative at the present time in general. That is not to say that in all countries there are not some extremely positive developments. Regarding Albania, as our Party has stated, we consider the process of democratisation which is now under way as a new and significant development in socialism, and we have expressed our confidence that while the Party and people there are facing great difficulties — including those of the particular stage of development, of drought, of bureaucracy and of pressure from abroad — they will

weather the present storms as they have those in the past. But as a general phenomenon, reaction has the upper hand at the present time. At the same time, that is no cause for pessimism, in the sense that the revolutionary movement is bound to go through zig-zags, is bound to have its ups and downs. The most one can say is that one battle has been lost. It would be unrealistic not to face up to the fact that the battle has been lost, and face up to the consequences of that. At the same time, that is what it is, one battle has been lost. It in no way invalidates socialism and revolution as the way out of the people's problems. And even if one says that reaction has the upper hand, one cannot say, for example speaking about this country, that the working people are reconciled and happy with the capitalist system. There is no way you could say that. That Thatcher disappears in such an undignified way is an indication of that. She was simply hated so much, and the policies identified with her, they simply had to get rid of her in order for her party to have any chance of continuing in power, for the bourgeoisie to carry on with its plans. She had simply become a liability. The opposition of the people was the main factor. There were other factors of course, but that was the main thing. But you could not say that people are happy with capitalism. And that is in a country like Britain, and other countries of Western Europe, where in the main people have a reasonable standard of living. But then if you look at the majority of people in the world, even less could you say they are happy, in the sense that for the vast majority the capitalist system means starvation, outright military fascist suppression, and so on. If you look at Eastern Europe, in no way could you say the restoration of capitalism has solved the problems people had there, even the great problems they had under revisionism; with the poverty, the rise of fascism, the instability, the loss of all the social services, and so on, in no way has it solved these. And if one looks at the long term, there are

problems in the capitalist system, such as the robotisation in industry, which they have to do to compete, but raises the issue of what happens to all the people who are out of work; the problem of debts. There is the question that the wealth, the technical-scientific means are in the hands of a tiny minority of countries, whereas the vast populations and the sources of raw materials are in the other countries. These are anomalies which cannot be solved under capitalism. So both in the short-term and the long-term one could not say that in any way capitalism is unchallenged and accepted and not in danger of people rising up against it, however long it takes for a new situation to arise. People are not happy with it, and in the end will begin to look, and already are looking, for some way out of this situation. But it certainly is a situation in which reaction has the initiative, and in the minds of the people, and in reality as well, socialism has suffered a big set-back.

So the question is how does the Party act in these new circumstances, what are the tactics it adopts. We think that it means that for us to simply say and propagate the idea that only Marxism-Leninism will solve the problem, only socialism, that all the workers should join the Party and this will solve their present problems – we have never actually made that our main thing – but any tendency towards that will be more disastrous now than ever. And our interest is not to try and get people, as a main emphasis of our work, try to persuade people to join the Party. Certainly, if people come forward we will join them up. And people will. It is a fact that under the present circumstances there is actually more interest in the Party than before. There will be people who come forward like that. But that is not the main emphasis of our work. Of course, this is not a new thing. It is what was decided at the 2nd Congress and what we said at the Anniversary last year. The main emphasis of the Party's work must be to apply our science to the actual situation,

involve ourselves in the problems facing the people, problems of poverty, problems of rights, problems of environment, of peace and security, of rights of nations, of national minorities, all these things which are on people's minds, which worry them very much, and stage by stage give a lead in how people will solve these problems. In a climate in which all the talk is of freedom and democracy, people must demand: How about it! You're talking about freedom and democracy all the time, where is it? Through their experience, through their own struggles, people will see that under the capitalist system these things cannot be solved, as well as making gains under the capitalist system to alleviate the problems.

This is not a new thing. It is simply that under the present circumstances it is even more important that we act in this way. We have to bear in mind that one feature of the present situation is a massive campaign against communism, which is unprecedented. So while all the talk is about democracy, in that democracy they talk about they do not include democracy for the communists, the right of the communists to speak. You can see it in the Paris Summit, where Albania had demanded that it be a full member of this Conference. All the Balkan countries had agreed, the Soviet Union had advocated it, Finland and various other countries had advocated it. But in fact Albania was still there only as an observer, although they met every condition that was in the Accord as it stood before the meeting. So in this new European "democracy", some countries clearly did not consider that it was democracy for Albania as well, and managed to use their influence to stop Albania getting in. But it is the same for the Marxist-Leninists everywhere, we should not be under any illusion that they are not working very hard to destroy the influence of the Marxist-Leninists. To further the cause of the people in the present circumstances, it is essential we communists get more involved in the struggles of the people, take up as the

main thing the questions of rights, democracy, the environment, peace, sovereignty, national rights and so on.

We consider it is a time when we have to be very vigorous among the people, to act in a very mature and cool-headed way, a time when we have to pay a lot of attention to analysing the real situation. We never made phrases and dogma the main thing and in fact have fought great battles to ensure the Party does not act in that way, simply putting forward formulas and phrases and "revolution will solve all workers' problems", and so on. But there has never been a time when to do so would be more unhelpful. It is very much a time when we have to actually analyse very scientifically every situation in its particularity and act on that basis. We consider that it is a very exciting period. With the breakdown of revisionism – the demise of the regimes in Eastern Europe, the parties who called themselves communists dropping the name – it is a good thing, in the sense that a lot of the garbage has been swept away. When people gravitate, look towards communism, it is the true communists they will see, who are still proud to uphold the name. It is a good situation. It is a time when, while phraseology was never any good, it is even less good now. You get nowhere with phrases now. We have to work very hard, get more involved with the people, analyse very carefully what is going on and then formulate our plans for action in the most mature, careful way. We think that we are in a position to do that in a way that we never have before, both through the general activities of the movement, but also from our own experience, which we should not minimise. We, through our own efforts, as well as supported by the efforts of the other Parties, overcame Maoism and made sure it never got a hold in our Party. We ourselves overcame the efforts of various elements to make us into a dogmatic, phrase-mongering organisation on the sidelines of the people's struggle – we did that

ourselves. And through those battles, we have reached a situation now where, in cooperation with the fraternal parties, our ability to look at things undogmatically, to analyse the real situation, has never been so great. The Party is more mature than it has been before.

The situation puts a great challenge to us, to the Party. We must use the dialectical, historical materialist outlook – analyse the real situation and present ways forward for the people, whatever it is, at the local level, in the families, in our circles, and of course as a Party nationally to the class and the different sections of the people.

(to be continued)

## Public Lecture by Hardial Bains on the Occasion of the 25th Anniversary of the Internationalists in Ireland

Comrades and Friends:

Coming to Dublin after twenty-five years, on this important occasion for the Irish Marxist-Leninists, during this period of the collapse of the revisionist regimes in Eastern Europe and the change of the map of Europe, raises the question which remains always in the forefront: **What have we achieved during these twenty-five years?**

Of course, when we met here on December 9, twenty-five years ago, in a very enthusiastic and vigorous atmosphere, talking about the impending revolution, our views were not so clear as today. And it couldn't have been otherwise, because history does not develop on the basis of the wishes of some individuals with ready-made ideas. At the same time, it is the unfolding of history which is the basis of development of these ideas. Ideas, if they are consistent with the laws of the objective world and

---

*Delivered in Trinity College, Dublin on December 9, 1990 by Hardial Bains, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist). Reprinted from "The Marxist-Leninist Daily Faxogram", Organ of the Central Committee of CPC(ML), of December 19, 1990.*

if applied dialectically, will effect changes. History has its own logic, and we all must submit to that logic. That logic of history asserted itself in 1965, and the Internationalists were organised. That idea, that feeling, the enthusiasm of that day was of such great energy and significance that its very momentum has brought us to this day, to this celebration.

This great attraction, this force which presented itself to us in those heady days had a very objective character. At the same time, it had something subjective as well. In the objective sense, the founding of the Internationalists changed the situation here for the next three years and in the years to come. In the subjective sphere, in the sphere of consciousness, in terms of development of theory, ideology and organisational forms and methods, the progress has indeed been not only dramatic but extremely challenging. We faced that challenge and emerged successful.

These views are not conclusions about the work of this or that individual, because history does not move in that way. History reflects the gravitations and tendencies of a particular period. And the tendency and gravitation of that period of 1965 was to assert the ideology of Marxism-Leninism, but by dealing with the conditions of our times, the conditions which presented themselves. The theory of dialectical and historical materialism was adopted in order to deal with these conditions.

The progressive movement which we represented at that time had something very fundamental within it, and giving it this or that name does not change its objective essence. There have been many philosophers, pedants and noted writers over the last twenty-five years who have written about this movement. Some have spoken with deep love, highlighting the positive features. Others have focused on the negative, real or imagined, and expressed utter contempt. These latter were prepared

to recognise anything else except the existence of the theory of dialectical and historical materialism. Either they spew forth their hatred for it, or like various economists, they dismiss it in one or two sentences by saying that Marx was disproved a long time ago.

In spite of all the poison which can be heard against this theory of dialectical and historical materialism, there is a kind of veneration which exists in the whole of mankind, and they look at it with great respect. The respect for this theory, and for socialism and communism, has a natural place in the hearts and minds of all those who are discontented with the present situation. But what infused us on December 9, 1965 was more than this. Besides confidence and enthusiasm, we represented what was the most advanced thought of that period, the gravitation toward the solution of problems facing mankind. The phrases socialism and communism only came later. For some, they remained phrases, but never for us. In our estimation at that time as well as today, socialism and communism do not exist in books. If it were the case, then the problems would have been solved long ago. We were not those who believed that first comes the Word (or you could just as well say education, or ideological clarity) and everything stems from that. If we had looked at theory in that way, then we would also have become mired in obscurantism, in dogmatic and fanatical thinking.

What we saw twenty-five years ago was a world filled with strife, and within this world we were not satisfied. This was the starting point of our work. Our dissatisfaction, our discontent with all the conditions existing at that time, later assumed a political, ideological and organisational character as we were to pursue our work. It is suggested that some individuals joined for personal reasons. Whether true or false, this is not the issue. The issue is that an organisation grew and developed, because this movement reflected the answer to that dissatisfaction and that discontent. And all these political and ideological

problems concentrated themselves and presented themselves as organisational matters. This is not to say that the problems of individuals did not arise as well. The transformation of the individual within a party or organisation is very essential, because our Party is not a mere conglomeration of individuals with old thinking. All of us are brought up in a society which is pervaded, spontaneously as well as through education, with bourgeois thinking, especially in the sphere of looking at the world. Thus the question of transformation of the individual's world outlook also assumes an important character.

The times of 1965 were inspiring times indeed. I remember walking along the cobblestones of Trinity College, surrounded by the earnest, ever so serious faces of the youth, reflecting their continuous and unending preoccupation with change. Events and things assumed the kind of profundity which is characteristic only of the times pregnant with change. Now we can look back and see what kind of pregnancy that was: the opening up of the whole world to capitalist plunder on the one hand, and the rise of the anti-imperialist revolution and the new communist movement on the other. Slowly and steadily, both spread everywhere, with the former achieving historical victory while the latter suffered a historical setback.

These developments did not come to a halt with the events of 1989-90, but they had already drawn clear lines for what was to come. A contradictory process which started in the 1960's gave rise to a contradictory process in the 1990's. In the sixties, those who claimed to be socialists, especially the Soviet Union, were against socialism, while today, those who say they are in favour of democracy are against democracy. Why did these contradictory processes assume this form and develop in this way? Because of the discontent of the masses. People were not satisfied with the situation then, and they are not satisfied with this democracy now. Thus, any one-sided victory of one trend or the other was impossible.

Is there a change today from that time? Yes. What has changed is that the working class has to produce its own leaders in each country who base themselves on their own efforts in their own conditions to carry out their activities. This is not to be mixed up with workerism. When we say that workers have to produce their leaders, we have in mind the broadest organisations of the working class. Communist organisations, on the other hand, belong to all people, not just to the working class. The communist party exists as a section of the working class, but it doesn't have merely the working class in it. The working class has to reaffirm the truth that it can only emancipate itself. What this means today is that no matter how many liberators of various kinds arise, like these Lech Walesas who speak in the name of the working class and so on, all of them will be negated when the working class asserts itself. There is a role for the Communist Party and a role for the organisations of the broadest section of the working class. Here we have in mind, besides other roles, the political role. The building of the Party and its strengthening cannot be carried out without the building and strengthening of organisations of youth, women, professionals, etc. The building and strengthening of the organisations of the broadest section of the working class is essential as well and must be given first-rate importance if the working class is to play its historical role as the builder of socialism.

In the sphere of objective conditions in 1990, it is positive that the bipolarisation of the world has ended, that is, the division between Soviet and American blocs. It is also positive that the democratisation of international life has begun, and that military alliances and the arms race are no longer looked at in a positive fashion. There are grave dangers too, because while the subjective factor at this time is still very undeveloped, the US, Britain and others continue pushing for solutions of problems between states through force. What Saddam Hussein has

done can only be condemned, but what the US has done is equally condemnable. The use of the UN Security Council for the ends of the big powers is also condemnable. What is decisive to ensure that this positive process develops and comes to a conclusion is the activity of the working class, its leading role, the role of the enlightened and democratic forces. Our Party has analysed that the building of the broadest unity of the working class, starting with the industrial working class, is the most important task. Different parties of course set their tasks according to their own conditions in their countries.

What were the conditions when we began our work? It is only natural that different forces look at the significance of 1965 and the developments since that time in different ways. Of course, all our enemies want to look at the developments in an a-historical manner, by presenting the events out of the context of history, without regard to the times in which they unfolded, the conditions which prevailed, the significance they had at that time, and what was achieved within those conditions. To appreciate what really happened, we must briefly review the historical context into which the Internationalists were born and in which they carried their work.

The 1960's were a period of relative expansion of capitalism after a brief period of decline. It began in the 1962-66 period and carried on. Its temporary revival made the new affluence of this period possible. This expansion was based on three main factors: first, the Khrushchevite betrayal and the consequent opening up of Eastern Europe for investments by various capitalist countries; second, the use of consumer credit and of the state as the instrument of creating money by incurring huge fiscal debts; and third, the intensified neo-colonial exploitation of the rest of the world.

In addition to the increased domination of Asia, Africa and Latin America, American capital in particular flooded into several advanced capitalist countries as well, paving

the way for increased domination and interference in various spheres and the all-round encroachment on national sovereignty. In Canada, for example, foreign control of assets in the non-financial sector climbed steadily throughout the sixties, reaching a peak of 37 percent in 1971, with 28 percent in American hands. This period witnessed the biggest expansion in the history of Canada in various spheres, especially in education, culture, health care and so on. Capital flowed into other countries as well, including Britain, and the penetration of Ireland was just beginning. Hand in hand with American capital came cultural aggression on a broad scale against various peoples and countries. This aggression was to become one of the most significant points of discontent amongst the youth and people of these countries.

The result of all this temporary expansion was a general euphoria, a feeling that capitalism had become young again and invincible. This euphoria was based on a fleeting prosperity and the artificial creation of money through consumer credit and the use of various other mechanisms. Virtually the whole world was embroiled in the snares of this phenomenon of modern capitalist society, dominated by the US at that time.

Despite all the talk of rejuvenation, however, capitalism did not regain its youth in the 1960's. On the contrary, it became more aggressive and parasitic. An arms race ensued of dimensions unknown in previous history, as well as open aggression against a series of countries. Even the economic successes did not last long. Already by 1973-74, the onset of crisis was undercutting the expansion, and capitalism never regained that pace of growth from that day to the present.

Nonetheless, the growth of this period led to an actual increase in the standard of living in the Anglo-American world, in various European countries, and in Japan, etc., which reached an unprecedented level in the 1980's, but right from the outset, this expansion was accompanied

by popular discontent, especially among the youth. They did not consider the achievement of affluence and a high standard of living as the be-all and end-all, as more important than the aim of ending exploitation and imperialist domination. The standard of living, of course, was no minor matter; the issue is that we wanted these high standards on every front. And this could only come about through revolution.

Another condition which played a crucial role in those days was the state of the International Communist Movement. Nikita Khrushchev had arisen in the Soviet Union and proclaimed the emergence of new conditions, a new ratio of forces between capitalism and socialism. His reply to these new conditions was to attack J.V. Stalin, and by doing so to call into question all the Marxist-Leninist teachings. He declared that US imperialism had changed and could be negotiated with, at the very time when it was showing its most rapacious and ugly features, while peaceful competition would demonstrate the superiority of socialism within the foreseeable future. We rejected and condemned Khrushchevite revisionism at that time and have done so ever since.

Besides Khrushchevism, Maoism also came into being, presenting itself as anti-revisionist, as the greatest fighter against Khrushchev revisionism and other revisionists. There were other trends in the international communist movement also. But the most harmful feature in the international communist movement was the pressure that the people should not deal with their own conditions in their own countries, that there was some grand communism and some grand communist somewhere, in China or elsewhere, and that the work which we did ourselves had no meaning or consequence whatsoever. In other words, there was a very big pressure that we should abandon the important work carried out, especially here during the 1965-67 period, and that we should borrow instead various alien ideas, ideas emerging from this conception that there

was a communist movement "out there" somewhere, that this communist movement was glorious, but that we were just some inconsequential people.

Twenty-five years have passed since those times. Those who were pushing and imposing these conceptions on us, including the need for "recognition" by someone other than our own working class and people, have long since departed. Many of them have disappeared entirely from the political scene. A few of them try to resurrect some conceptions and ideas which history itself has rejected, that is, to carry out debates and ideological struggle up in the air, without paying attention to the concrete conditions of this time or any other time. As for those who carry out gossips and slanders on a personal basis, they need not be mentioned at all. But let us look at what happened to these great Marxist-Leninists, that is of China and of the Soviet Union.

There is a very curious parallel between 1990 and 1960. At that time, which was a period of crisis in various countries, there was a great deal of enthusiasm and propaganda about what is called destalinisation. It was being advertised on the world scale that the Soviet Union and its satellites were carrying out destalinisation quite well, and everybody was very satisfied, but that Albania was dragging its feet. Thirty years later, they are telling us that all these regimes were still Stalinist - they don't even mention all this hard work of destalinisation - while Albania is still dragging its feet!

Stalinism is being presented in the narrowest sense as an ideology and practice of coercion, of genocide, of violence against the people, and unbridled dictatorship. The Internationalists during, before or after 1965 never accepted such Stalinism. As our practice has shown in the past, and at the present time, democratic centralism, arriving at decisions through vigorous discussion, and listening to everyone's opinions, has remained the characteristic of our Parties. We ourselves have never

committed any violence against anyone, nor do we preach such violence. On the contrary, there has been violence committed against us for over twenty-five years, besides character assassination and other attacks of various kinds.

In case those democrats who attack Stalinism have forgotten recent history, let me remind them from this rostrum that from 1960 to 1990, if all the world is taken together, several million communists were massacred. Everyone knows what the fascist regime in Indonesia did to the Indonesian communists. Everybody knows what Pinochet did to the Chilean communists and democratic forces. Everybody knows what various African dictators did to the progressive and democratic forces in Africa. And one can give examples of coercion and all-round pressure and violence in all the countries which claim themselves to be democratic. Even today, in such "civilised" countries as Britain and Ireland, we are looked at as criminals. This is a period where they are talking about the democratisation of international life. How is it that fruits of this democracy are not available to us?

I have not come here to defend the kind of Stalinism which they talk about. I am here to point out to you that the basic reason that the Eastern European regimes fell last year was that they were not interested in dealing with the problems of the working class and people of these countries. They had become parrots of great philosophers of other countries, and they carried on repeating phrases and copying various experiences, while at the same time coming under the pressure of imperialism.

One of the accusations levelled against these countries is that they had become heavily indebted. This accusation is made by the same ones who called those countries socialist. How is it that the banks of the so-called Western world were giving money to socialism all those years? Was it just out of love for socialism? With a small country called Albania, they are not interested even in having equal and mutually beneficial trade, not to speak of invest-

ing to help Albania rejuvenate its economy. But in various other countries, billions of dollars were spent.

The answer to this paradox is that all that communism was sham communism. It was communism in name only, and it couldn't survive. It doesn't matter where such communism is put forward to the masses, it will remain counterfeit, it will be rejected by the people, and it will have no place whatsoever in the lives of the working class and broad masses of the people. It may carry on as a sideline, but only to the extent that the bourgeoisie has a use for it.

Today, for example, the Communist Party of Great Britain, which is split into many parts, still receives headlines from time to time. Lately it is said that they are going to change their name, because they don't like the name "communist". There is a purpose, an ideological motive in keeping such organisations alive. At the same time, our Parties, no matter how much work we carry out and what progress we make, will receive no mention whatsoever. The tactics used in the 1920's against the old communists are being used against us. They want people to laugh at these revisionists, to say "these are communists whom nobody follows, nobody understands", and to smear us by implication. In other words, they do not want to deal with communism of the present time. The old communism of the past, of the year 1965, was easier for them to handle, because that communism had the Western spirit, if you want to use that word. It was as mesmerised by the glitter of capitalism as any other gullible person. It actually set a programme for itself, to create a capitalist kind of society in those countries. It preached the commonness between Christianity and communism, it set the Western democracy as a standard, and tried to present itself according to these standards. The Helsinki "Final Act" of 1975 was a very good example, where all these "socialist" countries of Eastern Europe got together and applauded all the prejudices of the capitalist countries.

This old communism, which was turned into a phrase everywhere, had forgotten that as the old productive force comes close to departing from the scene of history, it leaves behind what is best in it. And the only thing which the capitalist mode of production has brought forth and will leave behind is the technical-scientific revolution. The revisionists did not understand that the technical-scientific revolution does not end the exploitation of man by man. It does not eliminate the tendency whereby the rich become richer and the poor become poorer. It does not change in any way the basic and fundamental contradictions. At the same time, it creates something new, and that new has to be recognised. This new is the subjective preparation for socialism, and the rise of the new class whose destiny it is to bring it about.

The negative consequences of turning our theory into a phrase and dogma was that views which were applicable and necessary at certain times were no longer applicable in the same form to our conditions, but the revisionists applied them in that form anyway. For example, the thesis of Lenin that Marxism has to be brought to the working class from outside, was an extremely detrimental and injurious thesis within the new conditions after the Second World War in the advanced capitalist countries. Such views exaggerated the role of the revolutionary and Marxist intellectual while downplaying the role of the working class. These views replaced the genuine working class movement with the "labour movement" in the hands of the labour aristocracy in order to ensure the continuation of the capitalist system. Lenin worked in conditions where workers were illiterate, where they lived and worked at the beginning of the century in conditions far different from those of the working class in the sixties and after. Today's worker is an educated worker, educated in the sense of being able to read and write and know some arithmetic, and who has accumulated far more experience than his or her predecessors. Within these conditions,

there is another thesis of Lenin, if one wishes to speak this way, which should have been vigorously applied. That is the thesis that the working class must emancipate itself. In other words, it was the duty of all the communists, of all the Marxist-Leninists, to analyse various real phenomena, raise problems which present themselves and draw the appropriate conclusions from them.

As I mentioned before, one of the continuous phenomena since the sixties until the present time, which is in a way dissipating itself today, is the rise in the standard of living of the broad masses of the people. In Canada, for instance, the disposable income of the working class rose steadily until about 1978, since which time real income has remained relatively constant or fallen in some years. But if you compare the home of a worker in 1990 with one of the 1960's, a radical transformation has taken place. Besides this, there is a broad stratum in the Canadian society, anywhere from 12 to 20 percent of the people, which is poor. Less than one percent can be characterised as rich, while the vast majority are in between. The question arises, what pressure does the fact that 12 to 20 percent are poor exercise on the rest? When the number of poor increases, it doesn't do so merely because of natural reproduction. It increases because of the constant pressure on all the others to be pushed into the ranks of the poor. In other words, there is a widespread insecurity amongst the broad masses of the people. This produces feelings of discontent, which have to be channelled and should have been channelled to raise the question: In whose interest is it that this insecurity for all of us continues to exist? Who is responsible for this tendency of the rich becoming richer and the poor becoming poorer? Who is responsible for this tendency of one sector of the economy booming while another falls, whereby 30,000 new jobs may be created, while 100,000 disappear? What happens to the people within this mechanism, which is common to all of the capitalist countries?

The revisionists never addressed these vital questions within the conditions of this period. They were content to parrot Marx, Engels and Lenin and they became very terrified of Stalin, so they stopped using his name. The actual analysis of the conditions did not matter to them.

When we sum up the overall developments since 1965 to the present time, then we have to come to the conclusion that the old communism is dead, and it is very good that it died. If something is not historically useful, it will rot and die off, while something which is useful will always remain vibrant. Its youth will express itself in every way, even though the laws of society and nature continue to apply. But something which is new does not lose its fervour. Our theory of dialectical and historical materialism is new, and far from dying off, it is becoming even more necessary in order to deal with the conditions of our time. We arose in the 1960's, as part of this new force on the basis of actual analysis of the situation. This analysis has now further matured, in a manner of speaking, over the period of twenty-five years. If in 1965 or in 1963, the problems of culture became the most important problems, then in the 1990's the problems of economy, politics and culture have assumed the first position. The times are crying out for a revolutionary solution to the problems of the natural and social environment.

There were some individuals who dismissed the Internationalists as a serious ideological and political force, saying that all the Internationalists were just petty bourgeois and they were just talking about things for the purposes of illuminism. Many times we were accused of being existentialists and other things as well. This was the dogmatic rendering of the forces which were emerging at that time. The issue, however, was not only what were the initial features of the new force, but more importantly, what did it become? What is it now, and what was it during this period of a quarter of a century? What changes did it go through?

In 1965, the discontent of the youth took the specific form, first and foremost, of opposition to imperialism. It took two years of work from 1965 to 1967 for this consciousness to take shape. After the founding of the Internationalists in 1965, the second most important change took place in October 1966, when the questions concerning organisation were taken up. The decision was taken that a disciplined organisation would be established. When we deal with the questions of organisation, and I am speaking in a very broad way, then really we are talking about which theory we are going to follow, which motivation we should have, which class we are going to favour. Organisational forms are not independent of such factors, but are dependent on them. The character of a form will be determined by the motives and the ability of those who have created it.

There are not a few who are willing to have some general progressive opinions while opposing organisation tooth and nail. And there are not a few who recognise organisation only in the formal sense, but are not willing to accept it on a day to day basis and to develop the various forms of struggle consistent with the objective developments in a dialectical fashion. Organisation is not a question of only formal recognition. Organisation really is the self-expression of that social force which wants to assert itself in the present circumstances. And it is not merely a question of form, of rules and regulations. It is really a question of theory, outlook and motivation, and the aim for which the organisation is created. In 1966, there were various people who said that they agreed with us, but they wouldn't join the organisation. Later on, this was turned into an accusation against us, that if you have an organisation which is disciplined, which is based on democratic centralism, then you are sectarian. We have similar kinds of individuals and similar accusations today too.

In those days, our theory and our principles came under

broad attack by those who called themselves "anti-revisionist". We fought to defend this theory, and this fight was crucial for the development of our movement. But today it is said that even our theory has failed. The task now, as in the past, is to show the working class and broad masses of the people that our theory is alive and well. And we can do so only by dealing with the major problems of our time, the questions relating both to society and nature, as we did at that time. The international communist movement which we strove to defend is not lost. There has been a setback, but there is a positive experience as well. Our enemies have succeeded in liquidating "communism" in Eastern Europe. But this does not mean that the problems have also disappeared with it.

Here, I would like to emphasise that we did not begin in the 1960's with a ready-made programme of action. We had to develop the general line through revolutionary action, and in the course of that we had to develop our action programmes. We learned how to do various things. Defence of theory and of our principles emerged as one of the most important questions of the period, and we performed quite well on that front.

It was the defence of our theory and principles which taught us how to organise the Party and imbued us with the unshakeable conviction that the founding and building of the Party are absolutely necessary to prepare the subjective conditions for revolution. The defence of our theory and principles meant that all our work had to spring from our own conditions. In this respect, struggle against conservative opinion and old set ways of life, especially on the question of organising the youth, assumed decisive importance. The youth, like the workers, could not be organised by lecturing to them, by remaining aloof from their lives. The values which we promoted had to be developed out of their real-life conditions, always keeping in mind our strategic aims.

Twenty-five years later, the issue is the same but

the form is different. While in those days of economic expansion cultural questions appeared as the key, today it is the economic questions. During those days, we needed theory to deal with the problems of culture and politics in order to achieve our aims, and the situation has not changed very much in this respect. We need our theory to deal with the economic problems and our politics to achieve our short-term and long-term aims. We need organisations both of the communists and the broad sections of workers, youth, women, etc. We need to have the social forces organised to create a new society through revolution so as to be capable of dealing with the problems of economy and culture, in other words, of the social and natural environment.

The form in which ideological struggle is waged has also changed. Today, we use our theory, our way of looking at the world, to deal with problems on both the national and international plane. The question is not just of elaborating the general line, but of actually bringing about the political unity of the masses through action. As in the past, when progress was connected with the defence of our theory, so too is the case today. But this defence, at the present time as in the past, can only be carried out through application. Whether to remain smug and feeling quite comfortable about knowing something, or to be at the forefront of various changes—this was and remains the line of demarcation. It is not a matter merely of re-asserting the truth of Karl Marx's philosophy that "the point, however, is to change it". It is a matter of paying attention to the concrete conditions, to the solution of the short-term and long-term problems of our time.

One of the characteristic things about the Internationalists was that their views originated from their struggle, and not in any narrow sense. These views were quite alien to dogmatism, and they constituted that vital force which could continue for a quarter of a century. Today's communism derives its inspiration from the work of Karl Marx

and the Marxists of the nineteenth century, from the work of Bolsheviks, of Lenin and Stalin and all the others of the twentieth century, from those who actually waged the class struggle and dealt with the conditions of their countries. Inspired by them, we should deal with the conditions of our own countries.

In 1990, as in the sixties, the condition of the younger generation is the same as that of everyone else, but their very youthfulness leads them to question that condition. Where can the concerned youth go? Towards the bourgeoisie and the capitalist system? No, that is the source of their discontent in the first place. Thus, they have to gravitate towards the new and to throw in their lot with the working class. The dissatisfaction felt by the youth is deep, and it carries on for life. Thus, the precise form this discontent takes is the starting point of the development of their consciousness. In the same way, the objective condition of the workers spontaneously leads to the deepening and broadening of their consciousness.

The form which consciousness has taken today is not the same form as existed in 1965. Today, for example, there are millions of youth who are preoccupied with questions of the environment. They worry about the problem of poverty. They raise the questions of peace, disarmament and various other questions. Why do they do so? Because they are mistaken? Because they do not want to follow what we did in 1965? Far from it. Because as capitalism reaches further and further its end, besides leaving behind what is best, it shows all the worst which it can do to the masses as well. In addition to the creation of poverty, just see what it is doing to the environment. Just see how the questions of peace and disarmament are being dealt with. From the early sixties on, an unprecedented arms race took place, financed by trillions of dollars and rubles. Should this not have its echo and response in the consciousness of the masses, especially in the consciousness of the younger generation?

As we deal with the questions of both nature and society, we see that today's youth is far more excited and clear about various questions of democracy than those who paid lip service to it. Take, for example, the current developments in Eastern Europe. According to some, these developments are all negative. According to us, they are positive in the sense that they put the question of democracy in the forefront. Today we can tackle these problems. We can see the positive phenomena, the end of Cold War as they call it, the signing of various treaties pledging not to solve their disputes through war and so on. These are positive things. At the same time, when it comes to the situation in the Gulf region, do the same people say they will deal with it peacefully, without going to war? Or are various threats issued against other countries which do not agree with what these governments preach? In other words, the question of democracy, the question of environment, of peace and disarmament, the question of poverty, such questions have become the most important questions of our time, and they have entered into the consciousness of the youth. We should deal with them by being in the forefront of the struggle.

Our Party believes that those who throw values at the youth, who lecture and moralise at them, don't understand what the youth are facing. We as the youth of the 1960's built everything out of our conditions. In a steadfast manner, without the use of any formulas, we created a political, ideological and organisational situation for ourselves, and a political programme. Should the youth of today not be assisted to do the same thing? Comrades and friends, if any lesson is to be learned from this work, then the lesson is that we must not be conservative in looking at the youth, because youth naturally are going to decide which way the world is going to go. Any political force which does not take into consideration the attitude of the youth is bound to fail. The same is true for problems of workers and women, or for the national question in

various Western countries as well as the East, the Soviet Union and so on. These questions cannot be solved by merely expounding some correct views. And no force can be helped by preaching some principles at it, by insisting from the sidelines that it reject everything which is evil and embrace everything which is good. We can only assist if we begin from the advanced consciousness of the workers, youth, women, etc., about contemporary developments and build their organisations by taking that as a starting point. The work of the Party must not be merged with nor incidental to this important work.

After twenty-five years, we are once again in a situation where the consciousness of the working people is developing on several important questions. These questions, as I mentioned, involve not only the problems of peace and disarmament, the environment, etc., but also the quality of life, of relations between people, and the attitude towards the poor. There is a similarity between the consciousness of 1965 and the present period. It is a form of class consciousness in its undeveloped form which needs to be developed, in the same fashion as the questions relating to culture had assumed such a great significance twenty-five years ago. After everything is said and done, it is the working class and its allies which are to be organised. The basis of any problem has to exist objectively, and it is this objective world which we must theorise about. The central thing in dealing with the problems of culture in the sixties was theory, just as today the central thing in dealing with all the problems is the same. The battles of the sixties were not fought in vain, and those achievements which guided us through the sixties, seventies and eighties are guiding us now. Nothing has changed which could convince anyone that the ideals for which we fought are now lost, or that our theory has been proven wrong, or that theory can be defended without its application.

At the same time, the situation has changed. This

is why the creation of the subjective conditions for revolution can only be assured by working out our theory on the basis of dealing with real problems as they exist at this time. Of course, it is not possible to begin from some a priori notions. It was not possible in the 1960's, and it is not possible today either. We must begin with the analysis of the new situation, nationally as well as internationally, and set our tasks consistent with the times.

Let me give an example from the work of our Party. In 1985, we analysed that various indications on the world scale, as well as nationally, were pointing to an imminent change of vast proportions, in which nothing would remain the same and no force would be able to continue acting in the old way. Of course, when we announced our conclusions, some people said that this was just another of those things which we repeat from time to time. Five years later, no one can deny that our analysis was correct. But for us, in terms of our organisation, the impending changes meant we must respond to the changed conditions. We saw the necessity of building a movement for enlightenment and for the mass press. We had to smash the isolation imposed on us by the capitalists and the media by waging the class struggle. We put forward the thesis that there is a necessity for a movement for enlightenment, a movement for Renaissance, but with a much deeper and broader content and at a more profound level than at the time of the bourgeois democratic revolution; a movement not based on it, but actually bringing forward what was best from that period.

If anyone wants to understand the events of the 1960's, they should look carefully into what I am saying: **We brought forth what was best from the past into the sixties.** And in the 1990's we are doing the same, but on a much deeper and broader scale. Of course, there are difficulties, we are not very wealthy people, we do not have enthusiastic support from those who have financial means and so on, and for us it is a very big and difficult task. But in

certain places, the views of the Party reach tens of thousands of people on a regular basis. In those areas, it is no exaggeration to say that this work enjoys general sympathy and support from all the enlightened people, all the people involved in the cultural field, in environmental questions, in the field of education, generally speaking all those who are concerned about the society. We have taken up the task to create these institutions where broadest masses of the people can actually come forward and work for them. And this work is being carried with the same audacity which was the hallmark of the Internationalists, only at a much higher level.

Anyone who wants to learn something from 1965 should learn this much, that there were these people who had confidence, who dared to speak their minds and organise, and who were fearless in this respect. They were not afraid that somebody might come along and say that "your ideas are wrong". They never suffered from any feeling that they must first cultivate these ideas, make them as correct as possible, and only then take them to the masses. Their watchword was revolutionary action, based on analysing the prevailing conditions, and imbued with the partisanship of doing what was necessary to move the society forward.

The year 1965 was a very important year in my life because, among other things, I came to know the Irish people at first hand. I came to know the Irish working class and the struggles which they waged. For us Canadians, the Irish people hold a great significance. The Irish constitute the vast majority of the first industrial workers in Canada, and today too, they play a very important role. Thus, to see the situation first hand and to sympathise with the Irish people's struggles without any reservation whatsoever was the source of great confidence and happiness. Twenty-five years later, my opinion on this matter has not changed.

When I say we supported their struggle, and continue to do so, without any reservation, I draw a contrast with

those who gave it "critical support". To wage an armed struggle is not a simple matter. There are problems which arise and mistakes which are made. But to carry forward this patriotic struggle has great significance for the world. The British have historically divided many countries. Yet, they made a lot of noise for the re-unification of East and West Germany and shed a lot of crocodile tears. But what about Ireland, which is still divided? The Irish people, by carrying on their struggle, are not recognising this division which is being imposed by imperialism. If, in 1965, we had not supported the Irish people's struggle in this fashion, we would not have achieved anything. For the first time in Trinity College, it was we who sponsored and pushed forward various Irish things. Those who criticise the patriotic movement or the armed struggle from various angles are making a very serious mistake. In my opinion, if you want to criticise them, join them. It is by joining that you can correct them, not by sitting on the sidelines.

Our Party also has had its share of critics. Right from the sixties, we never listened to any idle criticism from those who stood on the side. Do you want the right to criticise? Then either join, or there are civilised ways to voice your criticism. Criticism is not a matter of proclaiming that "these are my views, and that is that". Those who carry on in this way will divide the people under any pretext.

Our Party says that it is ideologically united. But it is ideologically united only because it pushes forward its political aims and discusses its ideology and the analysis of the situation all the time. Within this framework, it has to listen to the views of everyone all the time and not permit divisions over these views. There is no shortage of pretexts in this world under which division can take place. One can divide on the basis of nationality, language, religion, colour, etc. To this, our revisionist and opportunist critics have added: dividing on the basis of ideology. Had we not rejected such criticism, our work would never

have got off the ground, and more importantly, the people's cause would have been damaged and suffered setbacks.

Comrades and friends, we organised the Internationalists in Vancouver in March 1963. It is now twenty-seven years from the time when the Internationalists were established. Today, two generations – the generation of the Internationalists, and the generation to which they gave birth – have to coordinate their activities. This co-ordination can be realised only by pushing forward what was best from the past. Our enemies, all of our critics, want to push what is worst. Were there mistakes in the 1960's? Yes, quite a few of them. What did we do with these mistakes? Did we enshrine them? Did we put up temples and start worshipping them? Or did we correct them, rectify them? As far as our Party is concerned, we rectified these mistakes.

Thus, there were mistakes in the 1960's, as a result of the bourgeois pressure and as a result of our own inexperience. It is interesting that in several cases, the very individuals who manifested these negative tendencies were the same ones who later on tried to use them to create splits. Our response, as I pointed out, was neither to ignore our mistakes and claim that we were so great, nor to enshrine them. Instead, when we gathered in 1988 to celebrate twenty-five years of the Internationalists in Canada, the issue for us was to realise and enshrine that enthusiasm and fervour which has brought us this far, and which will carry us for many years to come. Hence, when we look back at 1965, we look back as Marxist-Leninists of 1990, not as some confused elements of 1965 (as there is pressure on us to do) nor of any other year. We draw out what was best in that period and carry it forward.

In conclusion, comrades and friends, I would like to express my deepest feeling of gratitude and appreciation to the Irish Party, first, for having founded and built their Party, and second, for inviting me to return here today.

The spirit of the work which was started in Canada in 1963 was brought to Ireland and planted here in 1965. This is a sure sign of the profound internationalism of all those involved in those events. It shows how all of us, coming together from different backgrounds and different stages of development, gravitated towards the same aim. And beyond that, there is a lesson for us, in that what happened in Ireland had its own unique character. It should be analysed by deriving from it what was best.

Our comrades in Canada, all the members and sympathisers, are imbued with the spirit of love for the Irish Party. We do not look at the Irish Party from any critical angle. In the same way, we cherish great love and enthusiasm for the other Marxist-Leninist Parties.

In my view, when all is said and done, what 1965 signified was proletarian internationalism. Only this can be the banner of any society which is to have a future. Any society, no matter what it calls itself, if it is not proletarian internationalist, will degenerate, will become chauvinist and reactionary. As Parties of our countries, we are independent of one another. But this independence is not one of indifference or of chauvinist disregard. Our independence from one another means that we fight on our front, while you fight on yours, and together, we share experiences, we sympathise with and support each other.

In this spirit, I consider it a great honour for our Party at this very crucial time of its development that the Irish Party has invited us and organised this public lecture. On a personal note, I am thrilled to be here, I think this is the first time I've actually set foot in Trinity College since 1968.

Thank you very much.

[APPLAUSE AND STANDING OVATION.]

# Trinity

by Hardial Bains

**PAST, present and future** – this is the idea which struck me as I got out of the car and saw the familiar faces which greeted me at the front gate of Trinity College.

I was setting foot in Trinity after more than twenty years. I had left Ireland on May 1, 1968, and if my memory serves me, I had returned three times since, twice in 1978 and again in June, 1984. But this was the first time back on the soil of Trinity College itself, after all this time.

It was raining, a sort of fine mist dancing in front of your face and gently landing on it. Sometimes it gave the definite impression that it was raining, while other times it was just there, a demeanour of Dublin when the sun just sits back and the clouds hang and the rain holds back. All this, just to remind me that I had been here some twenty years ago. I couldn't think of anything but the weather, as the reality of coming back to Trinity was far more exciting than I had thought it would be.

Here I was, standing, my hand emerging from the past,

---

*Reprinted from "The Marxist-Leninist Daily Faxogram", Organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist), of December 20, 1990.*

stretched out quite consciously to clasp the present. One handshake after another. I couldn't believe it was all there: the quadrangle, the clock-tower, the hall with the Book of Kells on the right, and the faculty club on the left with the newly-constructed Buttery jutting out the side. And these familiar faces from different periods. There was at least one from 1965. She introduced herself, giving both her married name and her maiden name just to ensure that I hadn't forgotten about her after so many years. But I had not forgotten. I remembered both names, but especially her face. The same face, looking always as if on the verge of a smile. A bit aged by time, but still the same face. I am quite sure that my politics and the politics of some of the people I met that day were not the same. But this was not the important thing. What was important was that they were there – not in the past, but in the present. What they would be in the future I do not know.

Seeing the past assuming the airs of the present so suddenly, without any warning, and seeing the present turning into the past with such a speed, and all at once the future becoming the reality of the present. . . I think we forget that the present is the continuation of the past and the beginning of the future. The delicate departure of the past from the present, and the subtle continuation of the present into the future. There is an inseparable relationship between the three, but at the same time, the boundaries seem so finely demarcated, so clearly defined. Past, present, and future – the trinity. It came to me in such precise terms on December 9, 1990 as I stepped out of the car parked by the front gate.

I taught at Trinity College in Dublin for a very brief period of time as part of enhancing my understanding and ability in my chosen field of science. I was very young, relatively speaking, less than half my present age. Everyone I met there was younger, a whole host of students. Some of them became my ideological and political fellow-

travellers, some for quite long, some only for a short while. But what I remember about them, this emotion coming from the past and melting into the present, is something which I consider very precious. We were not satisfied with the present of 1965. Young and full of confidence, we wanted to create a new world through revolution. Even though we did not believe it would happen overnight, we saw the urgency of doing our work to bring it about.

The year 1990 is the future of that present which could now justifiably be called the past. As I took my second step, I felt as if I had slipped back into that past. Trinity College contained something for me, something of personal emotional value, but there was an objective basis for it. The fact that I came to Trinity in 1965 remains an objective fact. Another fact is that I met all these individuals and we got together in November, 1965 to form a discussion group. It is an objective fact too that the first discussion, to which all interested were invited, was held on December 9, 1965. It is these objective facts, and many more, part of the positive and negative experience, which were in my mind, but I had no inkling that all this would come forth in such sharp relief when I was asked to deliver a public lecture on the significance of this day. What happened when I took that first step into Trinity College was an experience of this past of such dimensions that I could not have imagined before.

Facts and thoughts, past and present, fine drops of rain and the mist, the cobblestones – a march towards the future. When I entered the hall to deliver the lecture, it seemed as if it was already finished. There is no need for a lecture. If I could just give an extremely tight embrace to the past, sit down and have a chat with all those who had come to hear . . . this would be more than I could think of then.

Before my arrival, I had been very curious to know

what those who would attend the public lecture would want me to say. I had more time to think this over when the plane I was on had a pre-takeoff accident. The next scheduled flight was three hours later, and it was late arriving and departing. This meant I would be late for the public lecture. What would they want to know? The thought persisted, even though I had already made my notes and written the substantial part of the lecture. Once I enter the hall, I won't have to worry about this any longer. I will have no choice but to speak. This was the only thought which kept me from lapsing entirely into the past and just disappearing into it. No present? An impossibility. No future? An impossibility again, but the lines have to be drawn somewhere. And the lines cannot be drawn on the basis of the past alone. It requires the present and the future as well.

My past in Trinity was an open book. There was nothing under the table. My convictions – my ideology, my politics, and my overall aim – were well known to all. It was this which attracted others. When I arrived in Dublin, I knew absolutely no one at Trinity. At that time, the fall days could go on for a long time without meeting anyone I could relate to. It was not so pleasant to be alone sitting on the antique chair, staring at the formidable walls of the guest house with a book from the library firmly set on my lap between my hands. Then, a chance meeting with someone at the cinema. This meeting ended my visits to the cinema. There was no longer any reason to go there with the same intensity or anywhere near it. I had another chance meeting, this time in the "digs". This was the end of my stay in the digs. This is how I came to know the people together with whom I would shape a part of the prime of my life.

The relations that were struck, which began with chance meetings and were of a social character, were soon to become ideological and political, and even organisational in nature. Twenty-two years later, confronted

with Trinity anew, I had to wonder about the character of my relationship with Trinity, not to speak of all the individuals I knew. In the same vein, I thought of the people of Ireland, whom I came to admire, whose struggle for the unification of their land and the end of British domination I worked for, and where I supported the working class in its struggle for socialism.

This is the past confronting the present in order to let the future in. Or is it the other way around? I think it is both. It is the past and the future confronting the present, like the guns of the "Aurora" demanding that what is best in the past should be brought forward into the future and that what is worst should become a thing of the past – the demand which the future makes of the present. The present, in turn, demands of the future that what is best must not remain a thing of the past, otherwise the present will be devoid of a future. The future must assume the character of this past, but strictly in accordance with the needs of the present. With all the tussle going on of past and present versus future, and of the present with all the demands of the past and the future, what is an individual supposed to do? This is what I was confronted with when I took the first step out of the car and clasped the first hand. I had no choice, I could not go back. I had to deliver a public lecture. I came face to face with reality – the reality of the past, the present and the future.

Of course, 1990 is not 1965. But it is not enough to just keep this obvious fact in mind; it is also a matter of appreciating that the present of 1990 is putting pressure on 1965, and is doing so with full force. A dark period, 1965 – a period when all the mistakes were made. Is it the case that as we look back from the present to the 1965 of the past, we can see one mistake piled on top of another, while the correctness of the present, be it 1990 or 1989 or 1979 or 1969, or all the years in between, is measured against the mistakes of the past? I am quite

sure that a past may appear correct if we look at it with the eyes of that period, and it may seem wrong if viewed from the angle of the present. But the present comes forth not just as an angle, but as a reality too. The darkness of 1965 is only the reminder of the womb in which the Internationalists were born. This organisation continued in the form of the Party, founded in July of 1970, and its glow can be seen on the faces of those who came to attend the public lecture of December 9, 1990. This is reality too, far more powerful than all the lamentations of the waverers and turncoats about the past. What was and what was not, and what should and should not have been, was clearly a thing which those who were brimming with enthusiasm for their ideological, political and organisational legacy could have discarded like trash. On the contrary, the twenty-five years have brought to the fore the positive and the negative in their true colours, and this differentiation will go on. December 9, 1965 shall remain the historical milestone from which we will continue to draw our inspiration, on the one hand, and continue to express what was then embryonic and now exists in full-blown form, on the other. The present will never lose track of its past, nor will it detach itself from the future.

That day, December 9, 1990, while I was putting the final touches on my notes for the public lecture, I was quite conscious that I would need the eyes of the past as well as of the present and future, and all the eyes of every fraction of time past and of the distance between the past and present of all those fractions. How can one fix one's eyes on all this, when the past, present, and future, and all the distances between them and the fractions thereof, taken as a whole, do not stand still? What comes into being must pass away, and it must leave behind its mark. The front gate of Trinity College, the fence, the cobblestones, and all the faces – are these the eyes I need? These surely are not the marks that history has

left behind. Can I touch and feel these eyes? Will the past and the future show themselves in their brilliance in the present?

Our theory tells us that knowledge about nature and society is only relative, but does this mean that such knowledge is not possible? Or that any knowledge which is relative is the mistake of the past and the wisdom of hindsight? Is the dialectic of living so feeble that every step becomes a nightmare for the next, and life comes to an end? No, the very spirit of December 9, 1990 was the testimony that what came into being twenty-five years ago has continued to live. The relative has consummated itself in the absolute of fact. This absolute lives too. If it does not, then the dialectic will be up in the air. It will not be real and full of life. Is there an absolute somewhere where we can see it? Yes, it is there - in the relative. Yes, the eyes are relative too, animate and inanimate, past, present, and future. This realisation made the work of drafting my lecture easier. I could write it down now in the form of a guideline, just for myself - I am going to look at 1965 with the eyes of 1990 and with the needs and desires of 1990. On this basis, I will draw the conclusions for my lecture. I am going to bring out what was best in that period, and in order to do so, I will stick to the facts. The coming to Trinity, the chance meetings and the conscious decisions. . . One thing following another, a momentum set in the Ireland of 1965, which was on the verge of further awakening of its national and social consciousness, on the one hand, and ready for further penetration of foreign capital, on the other.

Ireland of the first part of the sixties was a quiet place. The only rumble was of the thousands of young feet rushing madly to Dun Laoghaire, the point where the ferries leave for Britain. A tragedy for Ireland, but still a fact. These days filled with the silence of yesterday ended with the blasts of explosives at Lord Nelson's statue at the head of O'Connell Street. It was carried out meticulously and

with precision in the early morning, around 4.00 am. If I remember correctly, I was woken by that blast, and from then began the period of free-for-all and confusion. Within this confusion there arose, from time to time, clarity. Our discussion groups were such a clarity. This is a fact, too. The rise of the national consciousness for the re-unification of Ireland in the form of another struggle, the rise again of the gunfire and action of the patriot, is another clarity which still overwhelms every kind of confusion. There is also the clarity of social class consciousness. The Party which came out of all these clarities works to ensure that such clarity remains, that it deepens and broadens. But I, as a foreigner, could not speak of this or that view of this or that Party. I could only give our Party's views. Naturally, our Party must speak of the past as well. It must deliberate. Thus, I decided that not only would I look at the past with the eyes of 1990, but more specifically and importantly, with the eyes of the Party of 1990.

As I walked across the quadrangle towards the Lecture Hall, I encountered a person whom I had met in 1982. She reminded me of this, but I could not remember her face. She looked agitated, and complained that the organisers would not allow her and her friend into the meeting. I did not know the reasons, and I came to know only later that there had already been some disturbance about the matter. "Why not, you come with me, if you want to hear me speak. And bring your friend along too." I said some such thing and kept on walking towards the meeting hall along with friends and members of our delegation.

I gave my lecture and then sat down to have discussion with a group of people. In the course of all this, I had completely forgotten about the incident in the quadrangle. Besides, another person from 1965 had come to see me, and it was quite a thrill indeed to see a face from that period. I had not seen her for over twenty-two years.

I was exchanging information with her about her work, her child, my family and so on, when someone said: "Do you know what they said, the individuals you let in?" "What?" My curiosity was aroused. "That the Canadian Party and what you say are right, and the Irish Party is wrong."

"What?" I could not believe it. Their aim in coming to the meeting was to bad-mouth the Irish Party? But why? Are there not enough splits and divisions already? Do we need more? Why such a comparison? Why not join in to build the Party and then criticise from within, as I had said generally in my speech? I was engrossed in my thoughts and couldn't hear what the others were saying for a while. My mind went back to the first disturbance at the end of the summer of 1967, and the conflicts afterwards – the gossips, the character assassination, and so on. But now, in 1990, still? Are there really individuals around who want to bring forth the worst from that period? Are there those who will not look at 1965 through the eyes of that period, nor through the eyes of 1990, but through their own desires? Evil motives, I told myself, and wished that this person would pay more attention to the fate of the people of Ireland than worry about such comparisons. Each Party works in its own conditions. Those who have progressive motives should cherish their own Party and must not compare it with others in this manner. See what happened to the old movement, I was still thinking. They did not have heads of their own. They did not love their own people enough to build up their own parties on the basis of their own efforts. And if they could not love their own people enough, then they could not love anyone else either.

I came out of my reverie and back into the discussion. It went on a while longer until the order came that we had to vacate the Junior Common Room. Our time was up.

On the way to Dublin, the pilot had announced that

it was "bitterly cold – +3 or 4 Celsius". My companion and I shared a good laugh. Coming from Canada, we couldn't take anything warmer than -10 very seriously, and to consider above-zero temperature to be "bitterly cold" was a real joke for us. But after the public lecture, standing for just a few seconds in the rain while waiting to be picked up, I felt my teeth begin to chatter. I had never experienced such cold before, even though the temperature was still above zero. The past could not help and the present was not so pleasant, as I waited for the future. The driver came and we got in. He turned on the car heater. The hot blast from the blower calmed my jaw as we drove around Trinity, the Moyne Institute, the new buildings and the surrounding streets, and the Pub O'Neill which we used to frequent. I was not at ease. I had visited Trinity and was preparing to leave the next morning. On thinking it over, I felt a kind of relief and satisfaction. Like the first time in 1965, so again twenty-five years later. I had not thought the visit would be special. I thought it would be just one of those lectures about the past, without any other significance. Relief and satisfaction followed this special experience which made me fall in love with all the best that was that time from 1965 onwards. It was refreshing to be back.

During the dinner and afterwards, we did not discuss Irish politics very much. We went from one thing to another, but nothing specific. In fact, I had not talked about Irish politics in my lecture either. In any case, that was not supposed to be the topic of discussion. The Aer Lingus flight next morning was packed. I struck up a conversation with a fellow passenger, and we discussed politics. This person had gone to university in 1968 and it seemed to me that he knew quite well what those times meant for the Irish people. Any discussion about Ireland naturally raises the question of emigration, which apparently is again getting worse, as well as the foreign companies, the northern campaign, and to a certain extent

the general well-being of the people. While exchanging opinions on this aspect and the other, I recalled with a lot of feeling and pride that what makes a movement is far more than discussion on this or that issue. It is really a question of direction, the orientation that comes from putting the fundamental questions on the agenda and dealing with them. One such question is of the past, the present, and the future, and how we look at them. Here I was in Ireland, twenty-five years after, and all the issues had remained basically the same, while the consciousness and organisation to deal with them is increasing. I saw this consciousness in exchanges with the Irish Party comrades and also in discussions with some Party sympathisers.

What happened in 1965 was clearly the result of our discontent with the existing conditions, and besides agitating for the immediate demands, we were concerned about the past and the future. We needed a complete outlook coming out of these conditions, both national and international, to carry us forward. Along with outlook, there also developed culture consistent with it, the modesty and confidence, the striving for unity and the strengthening of organisation. We have gone on in Canada this way for twenty-seven years. In the course of this period, some went for this path and some for another, but what was decisive was that thread which linked the past and the future with the present, that striving for an outlook, for an organisation, for a new world. It is this red thread which I saw when I came back to Trinity. Coming to Trinity, or going into the present from the past and future, or the opposite, whatever the case may be, we are on the verge of another 1965, another period of consciousness and organisation, another period when all those who are discontented with the present situation will push forward on the basis of the best the past has brought forth in order to secure still better for the future.

## **The Consolidation of the People's Power and Perfection of the Entire Political System Stimulates the Democratic Developments**

**by Ramiz Alia**

THIS is the 4th meeting of the Party Central Committee this year. It is incumbent upon it to analyse the road traversed, to assess the changes that have occurred and to set the further tasks on the road to socialist democratisation. This meeting will discuss and decide in particular what should be done to perfect the political system, as a decisive link to guarantee the sound progress of all the social and economic life of the country.

### I

Only 9 months have elapsed since the 9th Plenum, which provided us with a more or less complete platform of the actual and perspective developments of our society. But the changes that have occurred are numerous. We may say that there is no sphere of social activity that

---

*Report by Ramiz Alia, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, to the 12th Plenum of the CC of the PLA, November 6, 1990.*

is not being revolutionised. Prior to taking further steps on the road to democratisation it is indispensable to make a general survey of the changes made.

The introduction of the new economic mechanism, the enhanced role of the cooperativist farmyard through giving the peasants cattle and land, the reorganisation of services and handicrafts, the encouragement of cooperativist trade and allowing the peasant market and private work in services, progressive remuneration for overfulfilment and consolidation of material incentives; consolidation of business and social responsibility of the enterprise; the acceptance and guarantee of foreign investments – all these are a group of measures, an entire economic reform aiming at encouraging initiative and enhancing the responsibility of those involved in production, a great transformation in all structures.

The positive changes carried out in the field of relations of production offer us the opportunity to draft a more scientific economic policy. They make up a realistic political-economic programme we should carry further and the Party should explain it continually.

Actually, the new economic mechanism is being experimented with in about 100 enterprises. About 7,000 units of public services, handicrafts, the fruit and vegetable trade, of public food enterprises are now working on their own account. As a result of the increase in low pay, citizens get a supplementary payment fund estimated to be about 500 million leks a year. The cooperativist families now possess an area of land three times larger and double the number of head of cattle. Work is going on to create a specialised bank for economic relations with foreign countries and concrete steps are being taken for cooperation with foreign firms in new forms.

Qualitative developments have been made in the field of social relations as well. Appointment of cadres by the collective or by competition; limitation of the duration of holding the same high post and of the mandate of re-

election to the supreme Party and state organs, the creation of the Ministry of Justice, establishment of advocacy from the stage of investigation to the court, the amendments to legislation which better adjust the relations of citizens with the state, their rights and freedoms, the granting of passports and the increase of contacts between citizens and foreign countries, are achievements of an extraordinary importance which have promoted the processes of democratisation.

The free participation of the collective in the meetings of grass root Party organisations has placed the activity of communists under the control of the masses and has brought to the fore their responsibility. The collective is now the highest authority with the right to make decisions not only on the choice of cadres, but also on the students' admission to the higher school and also on the appointment of new cadres and on the most vital questions of citizens. It is only the collective which judges such matters now.

In the domain of legislation too, we have acted in a dialectical way. Development has brought about development. A state which had just carried out the revolution, poor and always the target of the cold war, we started realising the rights of our citizens from the foundations of the dignity and personality of man, from political and social equalities.

This correct policy of the people's power guaranteed a job to everyone and liquidated the exploitation of man by man, it brought the cultural and educational emancipation of the people and the radical improvement of their health. This policy established an equal political status for all citizens with no distinction of race, region, belief or nationality, it achieved national unity as an indispensable condition for the freedom, independence and sovereignty of the homeland. The realisation of these fundamental freedoms and rights created the conditions for the realisation to a higher degree of those freedoms

and rights widely recognised as universal freedoms.

We have also taken measures regarding the perfection of the political system, aiming to enhance the role of the elected organs and masses of the people. But there arises the need for a profound study to better define the relations between the Party, the organs of state power and the mass organisations, and to examine the possibilities for a more efficient functioning of all the political structures of our society. Likewise, it is indispensable to perfect the system of elections to the people's councils and the People's Assembly so that they become further democratised and ensure a broader representation of various strata of the population in the organs of power. Since this matter is the main object of this Plenum, we shall dwell on it in detail further on.

Concerning foreign policy, the aim has been a greater integration in the Balkan processes, in those of Europe and the world. To this end we require the status of member of the CSCE with full rights and ask for greater contacts with the EC, the normalisation of relations with the United States of America and the Soviet Union and others. So far, relations have been established with the Soviet Union, talks have also been completed on the normalisation of relations with the USA and only the public announcement on the part of the US administration is now awaited. The successful completion of the Meeting of the Balkan Foreign Ministers in Tirana testifies also to the greater contribution of our country to the consolidation of cooperation on a broader scale.

Concerning the Common Market and the CSCE, we have nothing new so far. As it appears, certain circles and governments use their consensus regarding Albania as pressure to dictate to our country various political recipes and conditions. Naturally we have done and will do nothing under somebody's dictate. Everyone should be clear that the Albanian people have never put up for auction their freedom, independence and national sovereignty.

Our attitude on foreign questions responds to the changes occurring in the world. It makes a broader active participation of our diplomacy indispensable, the main goal of which is to safeguard and consolidate the country's freedom and guarantee the victories attained.

In the future too, we shall consistently follow the line we have defined. We are aware, at the same time, that different forces will try to hinder the promotion of democracy and to distort the image of the Albanian state in the international arena. Therefore, we shall adopt resolute stands and courageously defend the cause of the homeland, the cause of the people, the cause of socialism. In order to defend our free life we shall respond with all the means at our disposal to anyone who dares touch these sacred things of ours.

The programme of the Party is strategic, hence it cannot be realised within a day, nor even within a year. Naturally, this does not justify either awkwardness or haste. The training of the Party and people from the ideological point of view should be to a higher level. Moreover, it has become indispensable because, as reality shows, the social psychology, the cultural and technical level of the cadres and the working people is not to a sufficient level as to respond to the demands set by the measures adopted in various fields.

Experience shows that practical results in every field have been defined by the level of preparation of the Party, state organs and the working masses. Let us dwell on the events of July 2. It is a fact that the decision for granting passports to citizens was not understood well and in time by those who were to implement it, and by many working people alike. A contingent of youths rushed into the embassies without receiving the necessary documents. Some of them were lured by the promise that the foreign world would welcome them. But soon they realised that not paradise but disillusionment was lying in store for them there.

Four months have elapsed since these events; but, strangely enough, complete unique rules have still not been established for granting passports: working people are going abroad without permission from their work centres, they return beyond the time limit without thinking that they may lose their place at work, they do not arrange the period of their travel so that they accomplish the tasks that they have to, something which runs counter to the law, etc., etc.

There were misinterpretations also with regard to the cattle and land given to the members of agricultural cooperatives. The Party instructed that these matters be solved by the peasants themselves, so that justice and order prevail. But in some cases, it was not solved correctly and efforts were made to damage the common property and the cooperative itself.

Neither the Party organisations, nor the cooperatives' presidencies' organs of power should sit with folded arms if someone tries to distort the directives and decisions. They should act more powerfully if someone tries to damage the common property and ruin the cooperative. These elements should be punished taking into consideration the opinion of the peasants and through a strict observation of the statute. The cooperativist peasantry itself should safeguard its gains, life and future.

The measures we adopted for the democratisation of the country's life and the society were considered by some individuals as concessions, therefore they gave themselves the right to violate discipline at work, the rules, to stir up anarchy in production, to ask for blessings without increasing productivity, etc. It is a fact that there were many absentees from work, especially during the summer. The working class, the Party and organs of power should make more efforts so as to put an end to such phenomena. Democracy means order and work, it means discipline and culture. There can be no democracy without

production. No one has the right to abuse to the detriment of society.

It is precisely this experience that convinces us to map out certain steps in proper time and our entire propaganda should be more active so as to make clear to the working people the ideological and political content of the decisions, whereas the executive, state and economic organs should adopt the necessary technical-organisational measures in time. But we ought to stress forcefully that to plan mature steps does not mean slowness and procrastination. In the context of the measures we are adopting it is necessary to encourage creative initiative, revolutionary action.

The new concepts on economy, interests, on the working people-collective-state relations, are of no value without the new practices, without a general psychological and juridical technical and organisational training. Herein should the Party organisations start their work. This seems to be a simple job, but it should not be taken so easily; because, of all transformations, that of psychology is the most difficult. The transformations in this field have to do with the formation, conviction and education of our people, with their customs; with everyday life and work; with the traditions established for whole decades. A correct political decision can be adopted simply through the Party leadership, but the old psychology and practices cannot change without the commitment of the whole people.

The old conservative mentalities become dangerous because of the fact that they often appear under the guise of principles. They leave traces and have their impact on public opinion because they cherish the idea that "we are making concessions and are diverting from the line", "are giving up socialism", etc. They consider the economic mechanism and decisions on the cooperativist farmyard, the measures in the field of social relations and some steps in our foreign policy, etc., not as a necessity of

the time, linked with the development of the situation at home and abroad, but as changes in the Party's strategy. Consequently the spirit of non-confidence is enhanced, the importance of current developments regarding the safeguarding and heightening of the attained victories is underrated.

It is clear that for those who cherish such ideas, economy, culture, politics, social life and everything is static, unchangeable, set once and for all. But the Party has never been nor will it be dogmatic. It has triumphed because, being loyal to socialist ideals, it has succeeded in coping with the situations and circumstances that have arisen, it has been dialectical.

The implementation of the task set for us calls for a consistent fight against red tape. Despite the measures adopted, there are procrastination and bureaucratic stands in the work of the state and economic apparatuses. There are many clerks who not only are not distinguished for initiative and dynamism, but hinder the implementation of decisions. The Party and the organs of power must condemn such stands and must avoid them. It is not the power organs which procrastinate on the solution of problems, it is not the state organs that are bureaucratized, but some fusty clerks of the administration, who with their vices have nothing in common with the servant of the people that our clerks should be.

The programme of the Party is no less hindered and damaged by liberal concepts, whose bearers, having in mind the circumstances of the country, are inspired by foreign recipes; they consider the development of democracy and its process as denial of the class struggle, they consider the development of the market and the application of the law of value as an infringement of the unique functioning of the economy and do not take into account how and to what extent the people's power or the freedom of the homeland are endangered.

All the communists and patriots must exert their

endeavours to the process the Party is leading, so as to promote the decisions we have adopted regarding democratisation. There is no set-back. Neither will one occur in the future. This is the motto we should work with. The Party will not allow the adoption of outdated stands, but at the same time it will never put at stake the freedom, independence, the power of the people and socialist victories. We will forge ahead on the road we ourselves have chosen and are convinced that this road will lead our country to fresh victories.

Another factor that is hindering the process of the implementation of our programme is lack of knowledge. The truth is that we pay much tribute to ignorance. The law on private work and the market was issued. This should by all means be accompanied with the imposition of taxes, as an economic factor and means of control on the part of the state. But our economists, particularly those of the Ministry of Finance, have forgotten to reckon accounts and are delaying with regard to the fiscal aspects of the market mechanism. Likewise there is inexplicable awkwardness and hesitation to get to know the contemporary forms of cooperation with foreign countries, etc. It is a fact that the state organs are spending much time in formulating laws and the necessary rules after decisions are adopted by the Party and People's Assembly. At present this is one of the major contradictions hindering the initiated work.

Laying the stress on the need to implement the decisions we have adopted, there is naturally room for improvement and further progress. With the new economic mechanism the enterprise will undertake a series of social problems, which so far have been tackled mainly or only by the state. Within them, with unified criteria, according to their economic potential, the enterprises will succeed themselves in solving such major questions of the relations of work as the increasing of working people's incomes, the employment of new able bodied forces, the granting

of incentives for innovations and rationalisations, etc.

The new economic mechanism affords the enterprise the possibility and the necessary conditions for profits. Every enterprise too must grant this opportunity to its own workers. Therefore we must proceed on the road that the workers' wages depend on the profit of the work centre. At the same time legal conditions must be created so that self-financing is not formal but fully implemented, not only in value as it is today, but also for investments, the structure of production, foreign currency, etc.

Everywhere we must inculcate the conviction that self-financing is an alternative which can lead to profit but also to loss. This depends on the results of work. The new economic mechanism has a double character, for the producer and the consumer, the enterprise and the state, for the individual and the others. Here too in general there is unity of interest, but there might also be confrontation, especially in the case when profit derives not from the increase of the productivity of labour but from the redistribution of the same values.

At present our economy is under pressure from three powerful factors: the state operates on it with its social policy, the people's consumption with growing demands, and the enterprises and systems of production with the needs for investments and material and technical supplies. They have been and will be financed by the economy. But it is of importance to determine as objectively as possible the demands which should be given priority and the scale of the fulfilment of their demands. In this way, the self-financing rules, although having a simple economic aspect, have a profound political and social content.

The fulfilment of the tasks we are faced with calls for the mobilisation of all the forces of our society. Here is where the work of the Party should concentrate, that is on the correct understanding and enhancing of the

mobilisation of the people. It must explain that the reforms the Party has already undertaken in various walks of social life are determined by the state of development at present. They became possible due to the great transformations that have taken place in these 45 years of people's power, the incomparable progress in all fields, the completion of the structure of the economy, the raising of the level of education and culture of the working people, the emancipation of their modes of thinking and living. They are a necessity for the further development of the country, for the technical and technological renovation and the promotion of the process of intensification of production.

The establishment from scratch of a multi-branch industry imposed the need to concentrate the accumulation and investment resources, whereas their concentration mainly for renovations in technique and technology makes it necessary to use the financial incomes to a larger extent and directly where they are created. A small economy could be administered effectively and in a centralised way, but when its systems enter into multiplied and independent links amongst them, the enhancing of the initiative and possibilities of the base for self-management become indispensable.

The current initiatives of the Party have also been inspired by the lessons we have drawn from our road. A retrospective glance on the road travelled enhances our belief in the achievements, but it makes us realise that, because of lack of experience, historic circumstances and insufficient knowledge, we have not always hit the mark and chosen the most valuable alternative. We have said that our Party has not made mistakes regarding its line, and this is true when speaking of its strategic line. But there has been haste, even mistakes.

Allured by the desire to speed up the steps towards the future, we have implemented the policy of nationalisation without fully and naturally making use of the advan-

tages of the property of the group, underrating them. In this way the cooperativist farmyards were reduced to a minimum, whereas handicrafts on the basis of group and individual was nationalised. In both cases the ideological motives were more dominant than the economic factors, which as life proves were not mature enough for such an action. In the name of planning the operation of the law of value was artificially narrowed and such objective economic categories as amortisation, self-management, etc., were considered as a relic from the past opposed to socialism and as phenomena of the right wing.

Combating red tape, paperwork and formalism, we considered the fiscal system as alien to us, diminishing the possibility for society to exercise its right, as owner of the means of production, to control over the incomes of groups and individuals.

Through making the traditional relations between the means of production and those of consumption absolute we have made extraordinary investments, especially on heavy industry. Often the principle of self-reliance has been conceived narrowly in concrete actions, something which has had its impact in the limited economic cooperation with foreign countries.

Undoubtedly, some of the shortcomings and hasty actions derive from practical solutions of the problems of socialism in the Soviet Union, China or elsewhere, which have been considered as universal laws.

Recognition of these defects has long ago made us correct what has not been right. But the events in the Eastern countries made us reflect. The question arises: has the world historical experience of socialism which we have considered as the reference point in our practice been and is it now completely pure?

In the '60s we tried to find the factors that led to the distortion of the system in the Soviet Union and laid stress particularly on the bureaucratic manifestations in the Soviet Party and state, etc. This enabled us to adopt

measures so as to prevent such phenomena in our country.

But as it appears this is insufficient. It is necessary to go deeper into the analysis, so as to draw as many lessons as possible from the developments in the Soviet Union and the Eastern countries.

On the theoretical plane too, there are still problems pending, not completely explained. Such are: the relations of the state organs with the economy, the plan with the market, conviction with constraint, the class struggle with the national and people's unity, phenomena that do not deny each other, but evolve reciprocally from time to time. The theory of socialism is always in development and in the process of verification.

We should not fear free discussion on these matters. A Party which instead of discussion prefers to conceal the problems, a Party without a genuine inner democracy, without constructive debate, is doomed to failure. Likewise, our socialist society cannot develop without voicing its opinion freely. Our Party has followed and will resolutely follow this way. But work and education, patience, creativeness and militancy are needed so as to always attain positive results.

## II

Without a political order embodying democratic development it would not have been possible to conceive and offer for application all those directives and decisions of a profoundly progressive character with regard to the economy, culture, social life, legislation and foreign policy. As ours has been and is precisely such a society, the Party of Labour was capable of programming and leading the new stage of the all-round democratisation of the life of the country, of initiating new reforms.

We have dealt with the role of the political factor at other times, too. The 8th Plenum of the Central Committee, as we know, was devoted particularly to the democratisation of the relations of the Party with the

masses. This Plenum reiterated the idea that the leading role of the Party in society is preserved neither through orders nor decrees, but through work, militancy, advanced thinking.

Our Party has won and preserved its leading role since its founding, devoting all its activity to the interests of the people, to the mobilisation and organisation of the masses in the Anti-fascist National Liberation War and in the construction of the new life, socialism. Our Party is the only political force that put forward a clear programme, elaborating the ideas and perspective of development of new Albania. This is the reason the people accepted and recognise the Party as the leading force, considering its line and directives as guidelines in every field.

In the current stage, the further strengthening of the Party, through its emancipation, the enlivening of debate and democratic dialogue, the broad and effective drawing out of the opinion of the masses regarding all the problems and tasks set by the time are fundamental tasks. The democratisation of the Party's life should include the communists themselves, who should set an example, through work and not words, in leading the democratic processes that are taking place in our country, including the organisational structures and the apparatuses, from the grass-roots to the highest organs, which should be freed from the erroneous concepts and practices which often lead them to consider themselves as competent organs in every field.

Precisely because it was aware of such a danger, our Party has continuously worked to place all its work under the public judgement of the masses. The resolute struggle against red tape, the persistence to strengthen militancy and the moral values of the communists, the conduct of open meetings of the grass-root organisations, etc., are the result of this resolute struggle against red tape. We have spoken extensively on these aspects of the democratisation of Party-people relations. This struggle continues and should continue vehemently. But the danger of abusing

power is eliminated when in practice correct relations are established and preserved in the Party's concrete activity with the other political and state subjects, the working class and working masses as a whole; when the question of what are the legitimate prerogatives of the Party, what are the functions belonging to it in our social system, are taken into consideration.

In 1972, in the Mati speech, Comrade Enver Hoxha underscored the thesis that the Party does not enjoy unlimited rights. The communists are a minority, whereas the people are the majority; the Party is a part, whereas the masses are the whole, he said in that speech. The Party is duty bound to further elaborate this thesis, which is fraught with the democratic idea of dialogue, pluralism and thinking.

What should we bear in mind and apply resolutely in practice? The Party should not give orders and commands, it should not concentrate in its hands the prerogatives belonging to other organisms. It should not and cannot exert state power directly. This is exercised by the competent state organs, especially the representatives ones elected by the people themselves and which, according to our constitution and our laws, are bearers of the sovereignty of the people and state. The Party's leadership and strength lies in its putting forward ideas, programmes, perspectives and growth which, being correct, well-studied and in the interests of the people, are reflected in the whole state activity. Actually, in order to determine what the Party should do and what the power organs should deal with and what the economic organs should do, we must be orientated by practice, by tradition. This is in part due to the fact that the tasks, functions and attributes of organisms making up the country's political management are not determined by law as they should be. In part this happens because the erroneous method of seizing the competences of others is followed, instead of asking everyone to carry out their tasks well and in time.

The Party orientations and directives outline the principled framework on certain problems and domains. Proceeding from this the path is opened up for broad discussion, initiative, concrete proposals by the communists and others. This is how to express democracy, diversity of opinions, pluralism of ideas, the concrete contribution of every citizen to decide the destiny of the homeland, the fundamental questions of its present and future.

Pluralism of opinions with us has existed even in the past. The actual endeavour of the Party aims to ensure for it a sounder organisational base. To this end we should transform the existing social organisations into complete pluralist subjects, reconstructing their links and relations with the Party and state. The social organisations should freely air their opinions, the opinions of the masses on every problem, whether associated with social or economic questions, with internal or foreign policy, on everything that has to do with the country's development. Making them subjects of elections too, according to the new law to be adopted, conditions will be created for the social organisations not only to voice their opinions, but also to uphold them and defend the interests of the masses they represent in all the organs of power, up to the People's Assembly, through their deputies.

At present, when our society is swept up in a process of major democratic transformations, when the social organisations have gained major political maturity and enjoy a specific authority among the masses, any practice and mentality which aims to establish a tutelage on them, treating them simply as instruments of the Party, has a restraining effect, therefore we should strive resolutely to uproot it. The mass organisations, the Democratic Front, the Trade Unions, the Youth Union, Women's Union, etc., as socio-political organisations have their own individuality and personality, closely linked with the interests and aspirations of the masses they represent.

The enhancement of the role of the mass organisations,

the assertion of their individuality and independence, is an immediate task. The social organisations should open up the way to constructive debate and the free expression of opinions. The discussion in a cultured way of various political and economic problems concerning the country will lead to more rational solutions and the formation of the democratic education of the people so necessary in the current developments in our country.

All these questions should be the object of discussion and study of great responsibility. But, without waiting for the studies to be concluded, we should take measures to adapt ourselves to this spirit in the political activities we are heading for.

The Plenum is informed that the new elections to the People's Assembly must be conducted soon, taking into consideration the fact that the mandate of the current legislature expires next February. The elections might be held during February of 1991, or at another time, as decided by the People's Assembly in its meeting scheduled to be held in a few days time.

Of special importance is the content of the law on elections. To this end, many consultations and discussions have been made with the participation of the working people of production, lawyers, representatives of the Party and social organisations, state organs, etc.

The general opinion has been that the new law better reflects the level of political development that the current structures of our social system ensure, and further instigates the participation and concern of the masses in running the country.

According to the draft law worked out by the Presidium of the People's Assembly which will be submitted for final approval to the next meeting of the Assembly, a higher and more efficient degree of political democracy than previously will be guaranteed.

It comprises full conditions so that every citizen freely exercises his right to elect and be elected. The new law

guarantees the secrecy of elections not only as a possible right, but also as an obligation.

The fact that the country's political and social organisations, such as the Party of Labour, the Democratic Front, the Youth Union, the Trade Unions, the Women's Union, the Writers' and Artists' League and the associations recognised by law, are proclaimed equal election subjects, ensuring a more pluralist representation of the masses in power, speaks of the deepening of the people's democracy. Each of them enjoys the right to forward its candidate in every precinct. The law does not recognise a privileged place for any organisation, the Party of Labour and Democratic Front included. The preference will be determined by the electors in the elections directly. All this will make the renovation of the whole legislative power in Albania possible. The new elections to the People's Assembly will serve simultaneously as a practical verification of the authority of every political and social organisation.

The draft law envisages and sanctions the presentation of more than one candidate for every polling centre and precinct, granting to the citizens the right to decide freely the moment they go to the polling box. According to our tradition, the electors enjoy the right to propose candidates directly in the meetings with the people, having no need to be introduced by a certain organisation recognised by law. On the other hand, this is the first time that every citizen has enjoyed the right of forwarding a candidature as an individual, in case he himself requires such a thing. Certainly, several conditions foreseen by the law must first be fulfilled, conditions which have to do first of all with the character and goals of the programme, which should comply with the national interest.

The stage of the promotion of democracy is measured by the possibilities of the individual to express his viewpoints freely with the conditions guaranteed to him to this end.

Our country has its own experience and traditions. With us democracy has been and is realised through the entire numerous subjects existing in our political system, through the Party of Labour, but also the mass organisations and various associations, through the economic organisations, such as the agricultural cooperatives, but also through the discussions of the political, economic, social problems, etc., by the assemblies on a village scale.

Now we are taking a new, very great leap forward. Augmenting the election subjects, affording the social organisations the possibility to forward their candidates for deputies, granting to every citizen the right to appear as an independent candidate, as well as preserving the tradition that the electors may propose candidates for deputies directly in the meetings of the people, creates real complete conditions for the expansion and implementation of democracy.

All the comrades are acquainted with the draft law which has also been issued in the press. I am confident the Plenum of the Central Committee will endorse it, being convinced that the new People's Assembly to be elected will be a clear expression of the democratic tendency and culture of our people. Being a platform of the new democratic changes in this domain of the political system, the current election draft law will accelerate the processes led by the Party and will create new conditions for good developments in all fields.

The election campaign we are faced with aims to consolidate the people's character of the state power; it should bring about such a transformation that will respond to the transformations we have programmed in the field of the economy, culture and other fields.

In order to strengthen the work of the state it is indispensable to undertake concrete actions in order to put the relations between the elected organs and the executive ones and the apparatuses on a new basis. Although the indispensability of enhancing the status

of the representative organs, their effective superiority over the executive ones, is raised time and again, we cannot say that this goal has been realised.

It is indispensable that the role of the People's Assembly, as the supreme organ of power in our country, be further enhanced. The main direction of the Assembly's work should be the increase of its law-making activity, which today is relatively limited, because the majority of the Acts, especially of those in the form of decrees, are examined and approved by the Presidium. Likewise, the need arises for a broader activation of the permanent commissions and for the increase of their role, as well as for the strengthening of the Assembly itself, enlarging its competences over the whole activity of the Government. The mode of the Assembly's work, as well as a clearer definition of the place and function of the Presidium of the People's Assembly, as a collective presidency of the state, should be studied and materialised through special decisions, laws and regulations.

Besides these, it is necessary that actions be taken to overcome the practices that have curbed the role of the representative organs in relation to the executive ones and their apparatuses, both in the centre and at the base. Hence, it is indispensable that the question of the competences be re-examined with great responsibility, especially in order to guarantee the integrity of the grass-root people's councils, to protect their competences from the interferences of the supreme organs, and even from the administrative interferences of the economic organs.

The Party, the organs of power and the whole of social opinion is aware of the need to put their entire activity on a fully defined legal basis. In other words, this means that we should strengthen the juridical state. The law stands above all. No instruction, decision, order or authority exists above the law. The law might be incomplete, it might even have errors. Such weaknesses, which can be repaired, pave the way for orders, arbitrariness,

and subjectivism, phenomena that cultivate injustice and chaos and cause great social damage.

On the other hand, for the normal functioning of the legal state, state activity needs to be conducted only by the authorised state organs, be they elected or appointed for this aim. Our society should observe to the end the exclusiveness of the rights and competences the law gives to the steering organs.

Stressing the need to strengthen the juridical bases of the state activities, we should point out that in general our society is not short of laws, but they should conform to the new conditions and above all should be made known to the people, to make it possible for them to fully exercise their control. Those regulating norms and acts which define the responsibilities and rights of the state organs which remain in drawers or in closed circles impede this control. Experience shows that where the competences are made public, the abuse of rights has been more limited. A very important question we should discuss in this Plenum of the Central Committee is the necessity for some changes to be made to the fundamental law of the state, to the Constitution. This is linked with a number of factors. Firstly it is linked with the developments of our country in the past and in the future, with the objective changes occurring in the field of the economy, culture and politics, with the improvement and promotion of democracy in all spheres of the state and social life.

Bearing in mind the experience gained during the years that have elapsed since the approval of the existing Constitution, we draw the conclusion that the majority of the norms sanctioned by it have been fruitful and correct. They have contributed to carrying forward the socialist construction of the country. Fixing the fundamental achievements of our social order at that time, they represented the future and therefore they are relevant even today.

But at the same time it should be said that some norms

of the Constitution did not justify themselves and no longer respond to the requirements of development.

The amendments to the Constitution are dictated also by the developments in the international situation. The need to broaden cooperation with the world, the participation on a broader scale in the various regional, European and global political processes, the ever-larger economic agreements and exchanges, the participation in the various international organisations, which involve our country in some political and juridical engagements, demand that the respective articles of the Constitution match contemporary developments.

It is necessary that some new provisions be formulated in the Constitution or that existing ones be completed so as to better define the questions that have to do with the state and social organisation, with the relations between the organs of power and those of the administration, between state and economic activity, etc. Likewise it is indispensable to re-formulate those provisions we have amended by special laws. Such are those articles that have to do with credits and joint ventures, those articles related to citizen's freedoms and rights, etc.

The need for amendments to the Constitution should be forwarded to the People's Assembly, which has the right to decide on such a question. To this end, it will certainly go so far as to appoint a special commission to make the necessary amendments, so that the Constitution with the respective changes can be submitted for approval in one of the first sessions of the new Assembly that will emerge from the elections next February.

The commission that will make the amendments to the Constitution will be faced with many problems. The masses of the people will discuss them as well. At this meeting of the Central Committee I wish to air some thoughts on at least three questions:

1. On the leading role of the Party. This question has been and is of specific importance for the country's development on the socialist road. Therefore we have always worked and will continue to work in this direction.

But this is realised neither by orders, nor by the force of the law. We all witness the fact that our Party, both in the past and at present, has won its leading role and its great political and social influence amongst the people not through legal norms, but in practice through struggle, work, self-denial and adherence to the interests of the people and the Homeland. The leading role of the Party responds to our concrete reality. It is a fact that our first Constitution contained no article to juridically express the status of the Party, but this did not prevent it having an indisputable leading role in the society for many decades on end.

We said above that we should strengthen the legal state. This not only does not negate, but on the contrary it strengthens the leading role of the Party in our society, because the laws on which the whole activity of the state organs depends are a synthesis of the Party's policy.

Therefore the article that has to do with the Party as "the only leading political force of the state" should be defined more precisely in the new Constitution. Defining the leading role of the Party in our society more correctly one should also take into account the traditions, the originality of the development of our country. In the struggle for national liberation and during the whole period of great transformations, the Party has been and is the political subject which at any time has represented the most active, the more progressive, more patriotic force, closely linked with the interests of the people and the Homeland. Hence the new Constitution should reflect the status of the Party, which with its programme and line, with the work for the education and mobilisation of the masses, is the fundamental backing of the state for the flourishing and progress of the Homeland.

The status of the mass organisations and the social ones should also be defined together with it in the Constitution.

2. By special law we have decided to allow investments and cooperation with foreign firms and capital. This makes the amendment of Article 28 of the existing Constitution imperative.

The aim of this Article has been and is that no one be allowed to put chains on national freedom and independence, that the sovereignty of the people over their soil and underground assets are not infringed upon. We should preserve this great aim in the future too.

Therefore, making amendments to this Article, cooperation with foreign firms, financing of projects and receiving of the respective credits should be made only if they are not associated with political conditions and do not violate the sovereignty of the people and the freedom of the Homeland. It is imperative to bear this in mind when reformulating this Article.

3. Another important question the Central Committee might discuss is that of defining the attitude to religion more accurately in the Constitution. Since the beginning, our people's state has been secular, that is separated from the church. As a concept we have adhered to the idea of the Renaissance patriots that the belief of the Albanian is the Albanian national spirit, putting on the highest plane the cause of national unity. This stand has been and is correct.

But the Constitution of 1976 contains formulations which go so far as to declare atheism as a state norm. Hence the freedom of conscience is violated because, just as it is anyone's right to be an atheist, so he must not be prohibited from believing.

Through the amendments to our legislation, we treat the question of religious belief or its opposite as a question

of conscience for every man. But the Articles 37 and 55 of the Constitution prohibit the existence of religious institutions, which as is known were closed down upon the initiative of the masses, especially of the youth. Hence, there is a contradiction to be settled, bearing in mind the principle that it is the people that decide upon such questions. We cannot oppose the opinion which is for closing down the religious institutions just as we should not ignore those that might want their opening. In any case, as until now, let the people decide.

Making this stand more accurate in the Constitution does not mean that the communists and others give up atheism and the right to do atheistic propaganda. The right to atheistic propaganda is as much a democratic right as the right of those who want to believe in religion.

Raising the above questions, which have to do with the improvement of the political system, I wish to say that these problems need special attention. The Party and various organisations have to carry out a great explanatory and convincing work for the constant education of the people so that they understand every decision correctly, so as to avoid haste, passions, anarchy.

Naturally, care does not mean clumsiness, marking time and worse, setbacks. Care means explanatory work, it means organisation and revolutionary action to implement the directives of the Party. We should march step by step, but always looking forward. Having attained the first goals, we have to prepare to attain fresh objectives. We must never march too far ahead of the masses or slower than them so as to lag behind them. In both cases there are dangers, which could bring about grave consequences for the people, for the freedom and independence of the homeland, for socialism.

We must not forget that the key to success is linked with the economic situation, with the progress in this field, with the results in production. Without the necessary economic base neither democracy nor universal rights

can be realised. Therefore, the greater the results in production, the better the fulfilment of the plans, the firmer the discipline at work, the stronger the Homeland, the more the democratisation of life advances.

For this reason at this moment we cannot but throw a glance at the situation and developments in the economy. We are on the eve of closing the year and the whole five-year plan, we are on the eve of full application of the new economic mechanism.

If we make a full analysis of the present economic situation of the country we should admit that it is on the limits of an extraordinary state. All the main indices of the economy are below last year's levels, except for the fund of wages and retail goods turnover. We had to curtail investments and other expenditures estimated at hundred millions of leks so as to prevent the disequilibrium in the state budget, something that has never occurred in our finances.

Such a psychology has been created, propaganda included, where all speak of and reckon accounts as to how they will profit from the application of the new rules, but few are those who preoccupy themselves with the ways to augment production for society.

It is not worth seeking reasons when it is clear to everyone that the economic results of this year are not good. Drought had its impact, it brought about the energy crisis, it seriously damaged agriculture and brought about great losses in foreign trade. But this factor has its impact irrespective of our desire, as is the case with other factors, such as the delays and hindrances the foreigners impose on us, often out of political motives, etc. The question is what are we doing, how should we work, at what rates, mobilisation and organisation, how do we cope with the new situations. We should admit that a demobilisation of the forces is noticed in the work centres and in the countryside; to put it mildly, there is an unpardonable lack of discipline, and liberalism.

Why should these shortages, these weaknesses which are entirely subjective be added to the objective difficulties? What do the state and economic organs do, why do they not strengthen control, why do they not rigidly apply the laws and the Labour Code when they come across cases of weakening discipline?

Why do the Party Committees stand with arms folded? These times more than ever ask for the consolidation of the work of the Party organisations and of the mass organisations to mobilise the people in order to lead various processes and tendencies of economic development in a positive direction.

Every worker, in the town and in the countryside, must understand very well that the country's progress depends on our work. Nothing comes by itself, as a present donated by someone else.

Therefore, let us mobilise all our forces to improve the work in every sector. Alongside the traditional factors favouring the process of improving the work, the freedom of self-activity in enterprises, business, the share the working people have in the enterprise's profit, as well as a series of other possibilities offered by the levers of the new economic mechanism, should prove the concrete economic superiority in production and services.

The Party Central Committee should bear the responsibility for this situation and must set to work with a new drive and confidence in our own forces. This example, the militant commitment of all the communists, will be the guide for the implementation of the current tasks, for translating into life the decisions of the 12th Plenum. The economic and political problems in our reality are more and more interlaced with one another, therefore let us consider and solve them as a whole.

Long live the Party!

The last two issues of Marxist-Leninist Journal are still available.

Vol.3, No.1, February 1990, includes the following:

- \* **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**

Vol.3, No.2, July 1990, includes the following:

- \* **On the 100th Anniversary of  
International Workers Day**
- \* **Report to the Internationalist Rally, Montreal  
by Hardial Bains**
- \* **The Deepening of the Revolutionisation of the Life  
of the Party and the Country – A Permanent Task  
by Ramiz Alia**
- \* **Democratisation of Socio-Economic Life Strengthens  
the Thinking and Action of the People  
by Ramiz Alia**

Available from John Buckle Bookshop  
price £1.00 each + 45p p&p  
(Make cheques and postal orders payable to  
Workers' Publications Centre)

## JOHN BUCKLE BOOKSHOP



### Opening Hours:

Monday – Friday 12 pm – 6 pm

Saturday 1 pm – 6 pm

*Works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin*

*Works of Enver Hoxha*

Revolutionary publications from Britain  
and around the world

170 WANDSWORTH ROAD, LONDON SW8 2LA

Tel: 071-627 0599

## TO CONTACT

REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY OF BRITAIN  
(MARXIST-LENINIST)

Write to

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

170 Wandsworth Road, London SW8 2LA

ISSN 0960-4502

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

---

---