



OPEN
FIRE ON
REVISIONIST
BETRAYAL!

OPEN FIRE ON REVISIONIST BETRAYAL!

(Articles reproduced from the Zëri i Popullit daily — organ of the Central Committee of the Party of Labor of Albania)

The «Naim Frashëri» Publishing House
Tirana, 1969



REVISIONIST TRAITORS SPEAK OF UNITY WHILE DEEPENING DISUNITY

(June 8, 1969)

The ill-famed meeting of the revisionist parties began its proceedings at last in Moscow in an atmosphere laden with divergencies, disputes and dissension.

The chiefs of international revisionism, the big Soviet wolves and the little jackals of the other countries, shut themselves inside the high walls of the Kremlin castle so that, away from the eyes of the world and from public opinion, they might fight and squabble among themselves, some for the purpose of domineering, others for the purpose of ridding themselves of the hegemony of the Kremlin tsars, some for the purpose of selling themselves out and still others for the purpose of having themselves bought at the highest possible price.

The five-year long preparations for this meeting brought to the fore all the rottenness and disintegration of the revisionist front, all the hideous degeneration of the scandalous relations among its various sections. First, Khrushchev and, later, his

successors, Brezhnev and company, resorted to all means and left no stone unturned to organize the masquerade which is taking place in Moscow. They stuck to this meeting as to a barge of salvation which would pull them out of the quagmire in which they found themselves as a result of their betrayal to Marxism-Leninism and of the principled and consistent fight waged by the Communist Party of China, by the Party of Labor of Albania and the revolutionary forces the world over. On the charter of this international revisionist meeting the Moscow ruling clique placed their dream of setting up, under their own leadership, a united front against the Marxist-Leninist Movement, against revolution and socialism in the world, pinning their hopes on setting up a fender to ward off the outburst of anger and resentment of the people.

But how did this meeting of renegades start and how is it ending?

In 1964, Khrushchev hatched up plans to call together the representatives of modern revisionism in order to «exclude» China and Albania from communism, to isolate and do away with them. In 1969, Brezhnev is striving to hold together the revisionist «mafia», to ward off its final disintegration in order not to be left alone. Now, Brezhnev's foreign legionaries do not only refuse to wage war for the Moscovite tsar but, disintegrated and worn out as they are, are abandoning the front one after the other and leaving irreparable cracks behind.

What the present Moscow meeting will be and what can come out of it is not difficult to surmise.

Innumerable meetings have been held within the framework of this general conference. But the truth is that while they were being held to «strengthen unity» and the official communiqués loudly proclaimed that this end was reached, new and deeper splits took place after each meeting, contradictions kept increasing and divergences kept growing. This occurred also after each of the last two meetings of the preparatory committee held in March and May this year. They had been convened to draw up a document which would be captioned, neither more nor less than, «The tasks of fighting imperialism at the present stage and the unity of action of the communist and workers parties and of all the anti-imperialist forces». They picked the theme of «anti-imperialism» because, being the only field in which they all can resort to demagoguery and the principal guise under which they can deceive the rank and file of their members and people, they could easily accumulate their usual stale slogans and conceal, at the same time, the many divergences that exist in matters concerning the relations among parties, the assessment of the present-day world events, the attitude to maintain towards the actual Soviet policy, etc.

But even on this «unharmful» theme, the theoreticians of the revisionist parties could in no way come to terms at the preparatory commission. The document drafted at the March meeting could not take its final form, so it decided to refer the material to the parties to make their remarks which would then be re-examined at a later meeting of the preparatory commission. When the latter re-assembled in Moscow from May 23 to 30, the par-

ticipants, far from levelling their differences, deepened them still further. As reported by well-informed foreign press correspondents in Moscow, the parties which oppose the basic document advanced about 450 amendments.

The period between the two sessions of the commission has been replete with repeated mutual visits of the revisionist chiefs running posthaste from one capital to another, with frequent exchanges of letters between the leading forums and with frequent meetings of central committees to map out the stand they would be maintaining at the Moscow meeting. These feverish movements bespeak the efforts of the various revisionist groupings to find supporters of their theses and to create a backing in favor of the viewpoints they will uphold at the general meeting.

The revisionist press has published many official materials which clearly show that, far from unity among the participants of the meeting on what should be taken up for discussion and decision, there exists a fierce battle between the main group led by the Soviets, which persist on establishing their own imperialist hegemony over others, and the other, not less significant, group including mostly the West European parties which are striving to ward off the tutelage and brutal dictatorship of the Khrushchevite chiefs of the Soviet Union. The efforts of these parties are openly aimed at undermining the attempts of the Soviet chiefs to impose on them a «common line» or a «unanimous decision» which would allow them to interfere into the affairs of others and, what is more, to compel them to become an appendage to

the Soviet foreign policy. They want to have their hands entirely free to ingratiate with their own national bourgeoisie and to be unencumbered by any mortgage in Moscow regarding not only their home affairs but also their foreign policy.

The attitude of the Italian revisionist party, which is now followed by most of its West European fellow parties, clearly expresses this tendency and this battle. The speech delivered by Longo at the plenary session of his central committee «on the attitude the Italian Communist Party will maintain and defend at the meeting of the communist and workers parties» is totally at variance with the views expressed by the Soviet revisionists and the objectives they want to achieve. The Italians reject almost entirely the main document of the meeting advanced by the Central Committee of the revisionist Party of the Soviet Union and seek to make such amendments and corrections which the Soviets cannot accept since they are open condemnation of their policy. «It seems impossible to us,» Longo says, «that the Moscow conference would refrain from taking up and examining with full responsibility such problems that have interested and disturbed so deeply the world communist and worker's movement and public opinion, as those raised by the Czechoslovak events». But to speak of Czechoslovakia in Moscow is tantamount to mentioning rope in the home of the hanged. On the other hand, the Italians and the other revisionists of Western Europe cannot help doing so. For the time being, Czechoslovakia is the strongest card to play against Soviet tutelage and interference in their parties, denunciation of aggression in Czechos-

lovakia is the trump card by which they can boast to their bourgeoisie that they have won independence from Moscow, it is the means by which they can bring pressure to bear on the Soviets for various leniencies and concessions.

The other major problem is the stand towards China. The unprincipled battle the revisionist parties have been waging for years, obeying the conductor's baton, against the People's Republic of China, against the glorious communist Party of China and Comrade Mao Tse-tung, against their correct Marxist-Leninist line, has placed them in a quandary, has badly shattered their ranks and has discredited them before public opinion. To further proceed along this path at the pace set by Soviet revisionists means to speed up their further disintegration and bring about their complete collapse. Herein lies the origin also of their insistence not to place on the agenda and not take up for discussion «the issue of China and Albania». But this attitude is not at all to the liking of the Soviet revisionists. Opposing China and fighting against her lie at the roots of their policy, they are the mainstay of the Soviet-U.S. alliance, the justification of their counter-revolutionary activity towards the communist and national-liberation movement. They have long been trying to persuade the Soviet people that the danger not only to communism but also to the Soviet Union itself comes allegedly from the People's Republic of China. Therefore, they will do their uttermost to have their closest revisionist friends gathered in Moscow speak about this «danger», as Gomulka and Waldeck Rochet actually did. But many other revisionist parties do

not want to be dragged into the adventures of the Soviet clique, they do not want to walk blindfolded to the abyss to which they are leading them.

One cannot even say that all the East European revisionist parties give hundred per cent support to the Soviet leadership on all issues. Although they preserve the appearance of friendship and «everlasting alliance» and are at one with the Brezhnev-Kosygin clique in their fight against Marxism-Leninism, they, too, have their own divergences and try to take advantage of the situation to make the Soviet revisionist yoke less unbearable. There are also other parties which come out more in the open against the hegemony of the Soviet revisionist chiefs.

The various divergences the representatives of the revisionist parties have brought with them to Moscow are deep. They have now taken a clear-cut shape, having become integral parts of the political and organizational line of each party and, therefore, irreconcilable. Brezhnev's theory of «limited sovereignty» has not been propounded by accident. It is an expression of the new stage of development of Soviet Khrushchevite revisionism when it has crossed over to social-imperialism and social-fascism; it is the consequence of the aggression against Czechoslovakia, of the provocative acts on the Ussuri, it is the logical consequence of the Soviet-U.S. global strategy to divide zones of influence and dominate the world. Such other theories as that of «socialist community» or of «the new proletarian internationalism» are of the same kind. They express the attempts of the Soviet revisionists to perpetuate their imperialist domination over the

revisionist countries and to preserve their complete hegemony over the revisionist parties, their attempts to use the world communist and workers' movement as an agency for expansionist and colonialist purposes. On other issues, the chiefs of the revisionist parties might be willing to remain true to the Kremlin tsars right through to the end. But they are not free to act as they like. Servile and unconditioned subserviance to the Khrushchevite leaders of the Soviet Union, who have come out in the open as claimants to world domination, would utterly discredit them before the masses and would speed up their downfall. They want to fight Marxism-Leninism and revolution but they want to do it their own way in compliance with their own specific conditions and possibilities.

The Soviet revisionists have still some very powerful cards in their hands and they will do their uttermost at the Moscow conference to impose their will, in one form or another, on their partners. They began this right from the start at the first sitting of the meeting with Brezhnev's speech, filled with both cajolery and threats. If there is anything the revisionist excel in, it is in base compromises and concessions. In order to save the large capital they have invested in the Moscow meeting and safeguard the prestige of another, they may agree to issue a scrap paper filled with insults and maledictions 'pro forma' against imperialism upholding «unity of action» and similar demagogical slogans. What the Soviet revisionists are after is a joint statement by the conference no matter on what basis of compromise it is reached. But, as practice has

always shown, the revisionist compromises and concessions are short-lived. The cracks and contradictions dividing them after this conference will not only remain but they will become deeper. The Moscow meeting resembles a basketful of lobsters.

Its shameful failure has long been predetermined, ever since the revisionists betrayed Marxism-Leninism and embarked on the road of the dirty war against revolution, the freedom and independence of the people.

The revisionists may hold not one but a thousand general meetings. They will not succeed in turning the wheel of history backward. They represent a reactionary force which, no matter what efforts it may make, will never be able to breast the irresistible tide of revolution which is rising throughout the world. Under the blows of the Marxist-Leninist parties, the renegades and agents of the bourgeoisie will be definitely crushed. The future belongs to Marxism-Leninism, it belongs to the all-conquering socialist revolution.

OPEN FIRE ON REVISIONIST BETRAYAL

(June 10, 1969)

The development of the Moscow revisionist meeting is clearly laying bare its anti-Marxist character. It is obvious that its organizers aim at setting up a counter-revolutionary block, a yellow Internationale to be at the service of the Soviet revisionists, in collusion with imperialists and against revolution and communism, against the freedom and independence of peoples. The present conference of the revisionists will seal their betrayal to communism, the final separation of the Marxist-Leninists from the revisionists. By doing this, the revisionists assume a grave responsibility before the international working class, before the world revolutionary and anti-imperialist movement. They lay themselves open to the severe and merciless condemnation by history.

The anti-Marxist nature of this meeting of the revisionists, which the latter liked to call the meeting of international communism, is proved also by the fact that neither Brezhnev nor any of the other twenty or more orators who have taken the floor so far has made any mention whatsoever of the 1957 and 1960 Declarations. A real

communist meeting can not escape from making an analysis as to who has and who has not abided by the principles of these Declarations or of making an earnest Leninist self-criticism or criticizing those who have violated them.

Many things have happened since 1957 and 1960: Khrushchev's and Khrushchevites' betrayal has spread and caused a lot of harm to international communism. The Soviet-U.S. imperialist collaboration, the Cuban events, the fascist occupation of Czechoslovakia, the anti-China and anti-Albania designs and campaigns, the betrayal to the struggle of the Vietnamese and Arab peoples, diversion in the communist movement, the sabotage of the revolutionary and national-liberation struggle of peoples, and so on, are some links of the chain of revisionist betrayals. Why are these events not taken up and analyzed? Are they not of an important character to the communist movement?

This is not to the interest of the revisionists who have betrayed communism, who are rabid anti-Leninists. They want to bury these documents which are a stumbling block on their way to treason. If an analysis were made of these documents, it would lay bare the revisionist filth, the Khrushchevite treason both in the Soviet Union and in the world communist movement.

The revisionists gathered in Moscow like to call themselves Leninists. But how can such men be Leninists when they dare not analyze why the communist movement was beset by contradictions, the source of which lies in the betrayal by the Khrushchevites, in their violation of the 1957 and 1960 Declarations, in their hostile activity towards

the Communist Party of China, the Party of Labor of Albania and towards all the revolutionaries who remain true to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and to the Moscow Declarations?

How can these men be Leninists when they lack the courage to openly criticize mistakes and betrayals? So far, only the so-called leader of the 300 Australian revisionists had «the courage» to say that the conduct of the Soviet revisionists towards Czechoslovakia was a «mistake». But only that much. He did not only fail to speak of other «mistakes», but even about the one he mentioned he did not say what the reason was that compelled the Soviet revisionists to dispatch a red soldier to Czechoslovakia to occupy and suppress the freedom and independence of a fraternal people. May be that, after the Australian revisionist, some one else may speak but, certainly, «within the rule», to the extent of not risking the loss of rubles. And these «Leninists» who lack courage to even criticize their companions, swear that they will be lions in the fight against imperialism! No one lends credit to the imperialist thesis of the revisionists. The participants of the revisionist meeting themselves can hardly believe in it. But the Soviet revisionist leaders stand in need of this thesis in order to cover up all the filth of their treason, their collusion with the U.S. imperialists as well as to make their acolytes fall in line with them regardless of the fact that many of them represent only themselves.

How can one call «Leninists» the participants in the Moscow meeting of traitors who, admitting that there exist divergences in the communist movement, uphold the false theory: «Let us put

aside what divides and stick to whate unites us»? This is a clear expression of opportunism against which V. I. Lenin fought with persistence all the days of his life. What can unite Marxist-Leninists with traitors to communism? Nothing! Everything divides them. The upholders of this alien thesis themselves are aware of this fact both in practice and in theory. The situation will not be saved through acquiescence. Those who think this way, will sooner or later feel the consequences when the hard fist of revisionist social-imperialism will fall on their shoulders.

Before calling the representatives of the revisionist parties to Moscow, the Khrushchevite chiefs of the Soviet Union swore by god that the aim of the present meeting would be to discuss in a democratic way «how to fight against imperialism», to strengthen «unity» and to coordinate the «joint» activity of their so-called communist parties, and not to raise any questions on the home and foreign policy of any party not taking part in the conference and, in particular, the question of China.

But having penned them up, the Soviet revisionists have now laid their cards on the table showing that their promises and assurances were a bluff, fraudulent tactics in order to draw into their trap those parties which wavered or which did not approve all the aspects of the foreign policy of the Kremlin chiefs. They remained true to the plans and designs of Nikita Khrushchev who, five years ago, took the initiative to call a general meeting of the revisionist parties.

Brezhnev's Saturday speech confirmed once again what the Party of Labor of Albania has been

saying from the very outset, that the real aims of the revisionist meeting, organized by the Khrushchevite chiefs of the Soviet Union were to establish and strengthen the Soviet hegemony over the revisionist parties and to turn them into mere tools of its foreign policy, to draw them into the anti-China chauvinist campaign and to intensify the fight against Marxism-Leninism, socialism and revolution.

What strikes one most in Brezhnev's speech is his intention to force his own dictate on the other partners, to hitch them from top to toe to the imperialist aggressive policy of the Soviet revisionists. Although the speech delivered by the Secretary-General of the revisionist party of the Soviet Union touched on many problems of the present international situation and the relations among revisionist parties, it was an unrestrained attack on China, replete with base slanders and insults against the glorious Communist Party of China and its great Chairman Mao Tse-tung, against its Marxist-Leninist revolutionary line. Being unable to find suitable arguments to uphold his thesis, he resorted to worst warmongering terms filled with threats and sabre-rattling which would have made John Foster Dulles green with envy if he had been alive. He threatened the People's Republic and people of China with «conventional as well as with a big nuclear war» bragging about the military potential of the Soviet Union. This anti-China hysteria is not fortuitous and is not aimed at propaganda alone; it is a component part of the imperialist line to establish a joint domination with the US imperialists over the world.

The Soviet revisionists have long been threatening also Yugoslavia, Albania and Rumania. To this aggressive end, they have amassed armed forces in Bulgaria which has become a dangerous 'place d'armes' of the Brezhnev-Kosygin clique in the Balkans, they have stationed an increasing number of military troops along the Rumanian border and have anchored their fleet on the Mediterranean.

But our enemies cannot intimidate us. The Albanian people are endowed with steel-like nerves. They are capable of coping with any danger wherever it may come from and smash any foe daring to attack them.

The anti-China aspect the Soviet revisionists are seeking to give their Moscow revisionist assembly is a broad-scale maneuver involving many plans through which they seek to take given positions both within and without the meeting. In fact Brezhnev did nothing but reiterate that the sharp edge of the sword of the social-imperialist policy of the Soviet revisionists is spearheaded mainly and entirely against China, that all their actions and initiatives on the international arena are subjected to this objective. Today, only those who endorse this line can be allies of the Soviet Union. No alliance can be concluded with and maintained by it except within this framework. Therefore, the anti-China direction the Kremlin chiefs are seeking to give the meeting of the revisionist parties, the mobilization of the latter in the anti-China adventures which they are preparing for, is a corollary of their imperialist line, conditioning its implementation. The anti-China aims

of the revisionist conference was confirmed also by nazi Walter Ulbricht who, in his yesterday's speech at this conference, proposed that the revisionist meeting should pass a resolution to condemn the Communist Party of China.

True that there exists a common hatred against Marxism-Leninism and that all the revisionist parties are zealously engaged in sabotaging revolution and the liberation struggle of peoples. But this, as it turned out in practice, was insufficient to preserve their cohesion under Moscow's leadership. Not even the demagogic and false slogans like that of «unity of action» against imperialism can do this. Inasmuch as no war is actually being waged against imperialism there can exist no «unity of action» against it. Only a concrete action in which all the partners be interested, only mobilizing them for a major joint adventure can keep the revisionist parties hitched to the Moscow charriot.

The anti-China outcries at the world revisionist meeting are necessary to the Brezhnev-Kosygin clique to provide a proof to the U.S. imperialists of their authentic loyalty to the Soviet-US alliance and to assure the ruling circles of the international bourgeoisie that no danger whatsoever comes to them from the «revolutionary» phraseology of the speeches which are being delivered now at the Georghievskaya Hall of the Kremlin. This was seen also in the praises he sang to U.S and world imperialism sparing no words to exalt their economic and military potential «their powerful, highly organized mechanism of production».

In his speech, Brezhnev gave vent to his desire to attack the People's Republic of China and

to his aim of rallying supporters for the campaign the renegade Khrushchevite clique has launched against it. But in reality he exposed the real diabolic countenance of this anti-Marxist clique and their criminal imperialist designs.

Brezhnev's speech was filled with general principles detached from reality, from day to day events. These are familiar tactics of the Soviet revisionists. Through their Marxist phraseology they want to conceal their counter-revolutionary activity and to hoodwink the uninformed, particularly, the Soviet people whom they keep under strict quarantine preventing them from getting in touch with the truth. Thus, for instance, while speaking at large about the whole world, the chief of the renegade clique kept silent about Czechoslovakia, as if nothing had happened there. He glossed over the discreditable activity of the revisionist-imperialists in Czechoslovakia.

Brezhnev made the hypocritical statement that he had, allegedly, not intended to dwell on the «Chinese question» but that he was obliged to do so because of the decisions adopted by the 9th Congress of the Communist Party of China. This is an absurdity. The principled struggle of the Communist Party of China to expose Khrushchevite revisionism did not begin at its 9th Congress. It is a long heroic struggle which has begun since the birth of Khrushchevite revisionism and has dealt blows at all the treacherous activities of the renegade clique of the Soviet Union. It is precisely because of this determined and consistent struggle, just as the principled struggle of the Party of Labor of Albania which is also neither fortuitous nor of

recent days, scaring the Soviet revisionists that they cannot keep silent about.

Brezhnev was compelled to speak in furious terms against China by the difficult situation and the ideological crisis in which the Kremlin chiefs find themselves, and this situation was not created by China, by the 9th Congress of the Communist Party of China or by the Party of Labor of Albania, but by the revisionist betrayal, by the occupation of Czechoslovakia, by the indignation and revolt these things gave rise to the world over. By raising the Chinese problem at the Moscow meeting, Brezhnev seeks to kill two birds with one stone: to cover up his dirty linen, to turn away people's attention from the Czechoslovak occupation and to point his guns on China engaging also his revisionist allies in this combat.

The Soviet press sings praises to and devotes much space to the speeches of those participants in the meeting who rise against China while describing those who would dare criticize, even so slightly, the armed intervention of the Soviet revisionists against the Czechoslovak people, as leg-pullers of the national bourgeoisie. Apparently rubles and gifts were ineffective in compelling everybody to keep silent about Czechoslovakia.

The turn is now coming to Husak, this faithful servant of the Czechoslovak revisionists, to take the floor and sing hossanas in Brezhnevian terms to the occupation of his country. This will provide the new Kremlin tsars with «arguments» to tell those who raise the Czechoslovak question that it is useless for them to do so since those concerned have nothing to say about it.

The perseverance of the Soviet revisionist clique to pursue their hegemonic and expansionist policy right through to the end was also seen in the obstinancy by which Brezhnev defended the well-known theory of the so-called «limited sovereignty». Because of the ill-fame this criminal policy has won for itself, he was obliged to camouflage it carefully, but, even that, did not succeed in covering up the aim of the Khrushchevite rulers of the Soviet Union not to give up their intention of subjugating foreign peoples and countries and of keeping them under their yoke. Brezhnev spoke a lot about «nationalism» and about the principles of «proletarian internationalism» but it is now clear what the Soviet revisionists mean by nationalism and internationalism. Nationalism for them is every effort of the Eastern European peoples, whom they hold under their sway, to defend their freedom and national independence of which they are robbed, any opposition to their colonialist exploitation. For them, a «nationalist» is any one who opposes the occupation of Czechoslovakia or denounces their aggressive and expansionist policy, every honest communist who rejects revisionism and upholds Marxism-Leninism.

But the demagoguery and pharisaism of the Soviet revisionists can deceive nobody. Their «theories» that they intervene, allegedly, to defend socialism and peoples from the «activity of the imperialists» are clumsy lies. The intrigues they are up to about Vietnam and their sabotage of the struggle of the Arab people are two concrete examples one can see every day and at every hour.

Therefore, both the words uttered by Brezh-

nyev and his allies about Vietnam as well as the resolution which was adopted at the meeting about the Arab countries are bluffs, maneuvers to conceal the manipulation of these issues within the framework of the Soviet-U.S. alliance to divide spheres of influence. But do the Soviet revisionists think that they will down the struggle of the Arab people by that resolution signed by persons like Larbi Buhali who, when his Algerian people were shedding streams of blood for freedom and national independence, was skiing and crippling his legs on the picturesque Tatra mountains?

The tactics pursued by the revisionist clique of the Soviet Union during the preparations for the Moscow meeting and the attitude it is maintaining in it show that they are dead set on aligning the cliques in power at the revisionist parties who have sold themselves out body and soul to the new Kremlin tsars, with their counter-revolutionary adventures. Their attitude at the Moscow meeting will show once again to what degree they have become Brezhnev's servants. These cliques are leading those who follow them blindly onto a road fraught with risks. The members of their parties are faced with the dilemma to either fight against Marxism-Leninism, against China, against Albania and against all the revolutionary forces or open fire on revisionist betrayal.

The Party of Labor of Albania and all the Marxist-Leninists of the world will always perform their internationalist duty. They will fight up to the complete destruction of modern revisionism. We shall return again and again to the problem of exposing the criminal schemes and activities of the

Soviet revisionists and their allies such as those which are being hatched up now at the Moscow meeting. We shall never allow the Soviet Khrushchevite leaders hoodwink the international working class by their demagoguery. And we are convinced that public opinion everywhere and, first and foremost, the revolutionaries themselves will rise to a man against modern revisionism, overthrow it and bury its high treason. Right is with us and, therefore, victory will also be on our side.

WHY ARE THE SOVIET REVISIONISTS AFRAID OF HAVING CZECHOSLOVAKIA SPOKEN OF AT THE MOSCOW MEETING?

(June 14, 1969)

It was known and expected long before the conference of the revisionist parties began its proceedings in Moscow that the Kremlin chiefs would pursue there the tactics of silence about the fascist aggression they undertook against Czechoslovakia in August last year. Well-known was also the brutal pressure they brought to bear on their revisionist partners to refrain from saying anything about or making any allusion to one of the basest acts of international banditry which shocked the minds of people and filled the hearts of the real internationalists the world over with deep indignation. They wanted «the Czechoslovak issue» to be glossed over as if it had been an ordinary affair, a simple episode in the relations between «fraternal countries» and «sister parties», an event without consequences or commitments.

The very fact that the Soviet revisionists failed to frame up anything better than this cowardly attitude, is the most eloquent proof and an indirect

admission of the rotten foundations on which they base the whole of their official «argumentation» of the «necessity» and «indispensability» of intervening in Czechoslovakia, of the alleged «internationalist aid» they gave the Czechoslovak people against the «class enemies» etc. In reality, the matter stands, in plain unequivocal terms, between these two alternatives: the intervention has **either** been really «indispensable», a really «fraternal aid», therefore, a positive thing for which the authors can face the meeting and the whole world with head up and chest out and a clear conscience, **or** it has been a barbarous aggression against a socialist country, a flagrant violation of its sovereignty and independence for which the culprits must be confronted with their dirty act, with their shameful gesture. By seeking the fig-leaf, the Kremlin revisionists seem to admit with their own lips that they are set in a pillory.

At the conference, the Soviet leaders would like to give a pompous spectacle of «proletarian solidarity» with the Czechoslovak issue as its background, turning it a festival of panegyric hymns to raise the «merits» of the «guiding» State and of the «mother» party to the skies. If they decided to recoil like a band of inveterate gangsters who commit a crime and try to wipe out the traces, they did not do it out of their pleasure.

As a matter of fact, the Czechoslovak adventure cost them dearly. From the political point of view, their invasion turned into a disastrous defeat for the aggressors. The Czechoslovak people's resistance foiled the plans of the invaders: The list of the nominees for the «revolutionary workers govern-

ment» which had been drawn up beforehand, was discarded. Willy-nilly they shut themselves in the Kremlin halls with the Czechoslovak captives and staged the farce of talks «between equals» behind an iron curtain. Instead of ousting the Dubcek-Swoboda team, a thing which they themselves had even proclaimed on the first day of occupation, the Brezhnev-Kosygin clique felt obliged to beat a retreat and content themselves, for the time being, with their capitulation.

Another surprise, closely connected with the first, was the echo the Czechoslovak events aroused among the ranks of the revisionist parties in other countries. A big tide of confusion swept over them and the revisionist front began to give dangerous signs of disintegration. The false slogans of the «diversity of roads to socialism», of «liberalization», of «humanism» gave birth to a number of illusions and tendencies to break away from the tutelage of the big boss. But Soviet revisionism would not be revisionism if it gave up the struggle for hegemony. This is indeed one of the most characteristic features of the process of crossing over to capitalism. The new Moscow bosses showed clearly that they have made up their minds to settle the differences with their partners, wherever they can, by means of a «dubinka» (a cudgel).

The Soviet revisionists had a hard job of turning the flock back to their fold. The conference, which had been planned to be held last year, was dropped and was replaced by unilateral contacts, talks between groups, exchange of opinions at preparatory commissions which gradually led to a compromise agreement not to re-open the Czechos-

lovak wound. But all the mise-en-scene ran the risk of being smashed to smithereens if the Czechoslovak «normalization» had not been ensured. The stubborn resistance of the working class and youth not only to foreign occupation but also to the capitulation of the Czechoslovak revisionist party made any agreement that might be reached outside and at the expense of Czechoslovakia practically impossible.

Under these circumstances, the Kremlin chiefs made up their mind that Dubchek was no longer doing their bidding, that he proved to be incapable of establishing «order» in the country and of carrying through the post-August revisionist-fascist «normalization». Nailed down as he was to the boat that kept swinging between the tides of the people's resistance and the pressures of the occupiers, he was giving no assurance whatsoever of the stand he would maintain at the coming Moscow conference. Thus, another squeezed lemon was hurled into the waste basket, and Brezhnev's choice fell on Husak. This, of course, does not mean that Husak is hundred per cent safe for the Kremlin rulers. But he is the man of this stage, the person who has undertaken, among other things, to play the delicate role of keeping silent at the Moscow meeting. If he is willing to carry out the task assigned to him, he may very well be allowed «to taste power». What about later on? «Spare parts» are at hand to make the necessary adjustments.

It is now clear that the change of guards in Prague two months ago was included in the preparatory measures of the conference which is now

taking place in Moscow. It is now clear that the only speaker authorized to refer to the «Czechoslovak issue» at the conference, the Soviet sponsored agenda of the proceedings has it, is the new chief of Czechoslovak revisionism, Husak. It goes without saying that this «right» of his was granted on two previously laid conditions: on the one hand, he was to open his lips only if any of the undisciplined participants showed any signs of life and, on the other, he was allowed to raise his voice not to complain about the plight of his people fallen victim to aggression but to justify the Soviet tactics of aggression.

Even before the meeting, the Prague revisionists, kneeling obeisance to their occupationists, had already issued statements and resolutions describing any attempt to raise the Czechoslovak issue at the conference as an «act of interference in the internal affairs» of Czechoslovakia.

The Soviet paper «Pravda», on its part, warned, in rather a threatening tone, the delegates to the conference not to allow themselves «to be drawn by the temptation to increase popularity in their own countries by adopting an anti-Soviet stand». Allusion to those who had intended to mention, no matter how slightly, the Czechoslovak issue was more than obvious.

The overwhelming majority of the revisionist parties made haste to respond to the «call» and their representatives at the conference, to their shame and to that of the conference itself. Despite the fact that they spoke at length launching slanderous attacks on the Communist Party of China, they abided by instructions and uttered not a single

word about the Czechoslovak issue. Only now and then one heard «dissident» voices, but even these were in a subdued tone and faint. Thus, the Australian, the Swiss, the Norwegian and some others had the «courage» to say that the aggression against Czechoslovakia was a «mistake». The Italian revisionists, preoccupied as they are to give proof of autonomy within the framework of their whole campaign to take part in their bourgeois government, expressed once again their «utter disapproval» of the intervention in Czechoslovakia. This was enough to set in motion all the mechanism long prepared for. There are reports to the effect that a procedural fight has been going on behind the scene all these days between the Italian and the Czechoslovak delegations contending the right to have the last word. The Soviet organizers of the conference had, of course, anticipated this and, as expected, the struggle of procedure ended in favor of Husak.

Husak's speech at the conference gives an accurate picture of the whole abyss which the betrayal and degeneration of modern revisionism can lead to. This unprincipled lackey who, within a short time, has made a lightning career, passing from jail to the throne, accepts to serve his Kremlin bosses.

«What surprises us most,» the Czechoslovak Quisling said, «is that certain fraternal parties, even of those here, having superficial information about our affairs, draw immature conclusions about the Czechoslovak issue. . . : a thing which is contrary to our interests». «Therefore,» he added, «others should be more patient and show better understand-

ing». In other words, they should keep their mouth shut and join in the conspiracy of silence without reserve.

Thus, according to revisionist logic, the Soviet army divisions tanks and aircraft stationed on Czechoslovak territory are, allegedly, «superficial information». The invaders are throttling the Czechoslovak people and are continually ruining their country in every direction turning it into the status of a simple colony, while Quisling Husak exclaims at the conference that there exists no «Czechoslovak question!» According to this logic, it turns out that some parties must not make haste in drawing «immature conclusions» about the affairs in Czechoslovakia while certain others must hurry to dispatch troops to occupy Czechoslovakia militarily. «Do not interfere in our internal affairs, they are our own business,» shouts Husak in compliance with the formulae he has learned by heart. How can such an admission be taken in earnest when all the world see that Czechoslovakia has been reduced to the level of a country without «internal affairs», that the Czechoslovak people have been turned out into the street and that the Soviet revisionists can do what they please with them? Who does not know that, under the present circumstances, the Brezhnev-Kosygin clique can pull the strings in Czechoslovakia to suit their own interests: they can even dissolve parliament, they can even change governments, they can even organize party plenums and they can even issue statements and communiqués?

Thus, Husak's speech is not nor can it be the expression of the will of the Czechoslovak working class, of the feelings and aspirations of the Czechos-

lovak people, of the frame of mind of the Czechoslovak youth who are all writhing under the heel of the invader.

One further service did Husak want to render to his bosses by the way he treated the ill-famed thesis of «limited sovereignty». From the hodge-podge he served this is, in short, what came out of it: each socialist country enjoys internal sovereignty; as regards relations with the outside world, especially, when it is a question of defending this sovereignty, the notion of sovereignty is indissolubly linked with the hegemonic policy of the Brezhnev-Kosygin clique.

In order to come to his aid to make this anti-Marxist and counter-revolutionary thesis more «persuasive», the revisionist chiefs ushered in an actor held in reserve, the ill-famed chief of Hungarian revisionism, Janos Kadar. This inveterate revisionist who, having been released from jail, joined fascist Imre Nagy and, together with him, led the 1956 criminal counter-revolution in Hungary and liquidated the Hungarian party, is now the «ideologist» of the Brezhnevite theory of «limited sovereignty» and of the fascist aggression against Czechoslovakia. «We should realize», he said, «and experience has gone to show that when the destiny of a socialist country is at stake, then everybody intervenes».

And what other words can one expect from an inveterate counter-revolutionary who has sold out not only Marxism-Leninism but also the sovereignty of his own country where capitalism is now in full bloom, who owes his position of authority to the bayonets of the forces of occupation of his Moscow

bosses and who, like a professional mercenary, dispatched Hungarian troops to rob the Czechoslovak people of their freedom? Not that veteran Quisling Kadar is better qualified to defend the Hitlerite theories of the Kremlin chiefs but, as the saying goes, «half a loaf is better than no loaf at all».

As days roll on, it becomes ever clearer to the participants themselves that according to plans drawn up by the Brezhnev-Kosygin clique who organized the Moscow revisionist conference, the latter's duty is to legalize their counter-revolutionary policy of conspiracies and aggressions, of hegemony over the revisionist front and of imperialist-revisionist global strategy.

A conference of genuine Marxist-Leninist parties would not have failed to put Brezhnev, Kosygin and company in the dock for the crimes they have committed to the detriment of the great cause of communism, for the capitalist degeneration of the political, economic and social life in the Soviet Union, for their collaboration with U.S. imperialism, for their traitorous stand towards the major problems of the times, namely, Vietnam, the Middle East etc., for their hostile policy towards the People's Republic of China and the People's Republic of Albania. A real communist conference would have turned into a tribunal to pass a severe sentence on the Soviet aggression against Czechoslovakia. Because, for the conference, too, the question is raised in plain terms in the form of the above-mentioned alternative: the intervention in Czechoslovakia was **either** a good act to deserve praises and

support, or it is a crime, in which case, it becomes the duty of the communists to forcefully stigmatize it as an act incompatible with Marxism-Leninism and with relations among communist parties and socialist States. And the truth cannot be found by lending credit to Husak who is but an unscrupulous butler, but lending ear to the Czechoslovak people who are groaning under foreign yoke. A real communist conference would never keep silent about so serious a problem but would place the brand of treason and crime on the aggressor and imperialist Kremlin clique.

Despite all efforts of the Moscow revisionist clique, despite all «international» conferences and statements the Czechoslovak people's cause cannot be buried. The fascist aggression against Czechoslovakia stands out like a strong and smashing indictment against the Moscow clique and all those who have hitched themselves to their chariot. No conspiracy of silence whatsoever can absolve the Soviet revisionist aggressors from their responsibility before the Czechoslovak people, before Marxism-Leninism and the working class of all countries, before the living revolutionary forces that express the real aspirations and interests of the people. The Soviet occupationists of Czechoslovakia are seated on the volcano of the anger and revenge of a people who are fighting in defense of their basic rights. The Czechoslovak people will succeed in winning these rights in a revolutionary way. It was by armed violence that they were oppressed and it will be by the force of arms that they will get

rid of the odious yoke of the fascist-revisionist invaders and local traitors and re-establish the dictatorship of the proletariat under the leadership of the working class and of the real Marxist-Leninist vanguard which will emerge from their ranks while fighting.

DIVERGENCES, SQUABBLES AND DISUNITY PREVAIL AT THE MOSCOW MEETING OF RENEGADES

(June 17, 1969)

Despite all efforts of official revisionist propaganda to waylay public opinion by claiming that the conference proceedings were being conducted in an allegedly «comradely spirit» and that «unity of views» prevailed there, and so on and so forth, one can very clearly see the various revisionist trends and groups wrangling and coming to blows with one another.

The course of the proceedings of the conference of renegades shows that things are not all too well for the hosts. The Kremlin revisionist clique did every thing in its power to concentrate all the discussions on what it has fought for years in succession, namely, the «unity of action» of international revisionism in their fight against the Communist Party and the People's Republic of China, against the Party of Labor and the People's Republic of Albania, against peoples, Marxism-Leninism and revolution.

But the tone Brezhnev wanted to give the meeting and which was very clearly expressed in

his speech was disturbed by numerous jarring dissonances not very much to his liking. They again confirmed the existence of profound divergences bringing to light the indissoluble contradictions the areopagus of international revisionism is coming up against.

It was not yesterday and in Moscow that these clashes and divergences broke forth for the first time; they had long been boiling in the revisionist cauldron and deal with Soviet hegemonism, with the dictatorial tutelage the Kremlin clique are seeking to establish on all the sections of the revisionist front, they deal with the endeavors of the individual sections of this front to get rid of this suffocating tutelage, to have their hands free in their bargainings to ingratiate themselves with their local bourgeoisie.

News-agencies and the press announce that a number of delegates did not keep in step with Brezhnev in his round of dancing. Such were those from Australia, Norway, Switzerland, Italy, Sweden, England etc. Nevertheless, these divergences and squabbles took place within the framework of anti-communism, based on betrayal to Marxism-Leninism, to revolution and freedom of peoples, based on opposing great China which represents the invincible bulwark of socialism and revolution in the world.

The main issues on which divergences arose were the attitude toward China, towards the occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union, towards the relations of the revisionist parties with the Soviet Union, etc.

The revisionists of the opposition agreed that

China should be attacked, otherwise they would not be revisionist renegades, and by this, they fulfilled the principal demand of the Moscow Khrushchevite chiefs. They drew up a whole list of «crimes» and «sins» attributed to Socialist China. All this has been drawn out of the arsenal of the Soviet revisionist propaganda and re-echoes the anti-China hysteria of the Kremlin clique. According to them, one of China's «unpardonable sins» is, allegedly, that it «takes advantage of the tension existing between the U.S.A and the Soviet Union in order to attack the latter». It is in the nature of revisionists to distort things, to call black what is white. In the first place, eversince the Khrushchevite revisionists came to power, the only tension between the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union has been running one way — in vying with each other to deepen and extend friendship, good understanding and counter-revolutionary collaboration between them for world domination. Secondly, it is the Kremlin revisionist clique which attacks Socialist China, not only by words but also by bullets, it is this clique which has escalated the anti-China hysteria up to the fascist armed aggression against Chinese territory, carrying out, even now, during the conference sittings, border provocations in the Amur and Singkiang areas, continuing their large-scale military preparations by stationing troops and means of warfare all along the border with China. What this clique did by their bloodshedding provocations against the Chinese territory of the Chenpao island area last March in order to wrest a decision to condemn China as «aggressor», as «warmonger» etc. from the Budapest summit meet-

ing last March, it is now repeating during the meeting of the renegades for the same provocative and criminal purpose. But the demands of the Soviet clique to unite in the anti-China campaign was met only half-way by their partners.

The Western revisionists do not want to resemble the ostrich which hides its head in the sand to avoid seeing reality. They agree, at last, as pointed out by the representative of the Italian revisionist party at the meeting, E. Berlinguer, that China exists objectively, that «it has a great international weight». So obvious a fact cannot be ignored even by the revisionists. 700 million people cannot be wiped out of the map, nor can they be stuck into some one's pocket. The Italian and certain other revisionists are not in favor of China's «excommunication», as demanded by the Soviet leaders, for they feel that this would be an unrealizable folly. They do not want to go to the extreme in their fight against China — and they also advise the Soviet revisionists to this effect — for that would lay open their anti-Marxist cards.

One of the main objectives of the organizers of the Moscow masquerade had been to keep silent on or stifle all criticism of the imperialist occupation of Czechoslovakia at all costs. But on this issue, too, the hopes of the Kremlin chiefs were blasted. The Western revisionists did not submit to these pressures and in spite of threats and blackmail in conference lobbies and, publicly, in the press, they took up heart and expressed their criticism of this occupation. Of course, this stand was not nor could be taken from a correct, principled and revolutionary position. It looks more like the liberal,

social-democratic criticism of the events of last August circulating far and wide in the West and dictated by the ideological platform and the political course of these parties themselves. Had they kept silent, as Brezhnev and Husak wanted them to do, they would have lost all the political capital they had amassed as parties of compromise and class collaboration with the bourgeoisie striving to substantiate their «specific way to socialism», etc. One should not lose sight of the important fact that the occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet imperialists and their Warsaw Treaty lackeys has dealt a hard blow at the whole so-called liberal wing of international revisionism, at their entire pseudo-opposition game and aspirations to occupy a government post in the days to come.

The chiefs of most of the Western revisionist parties responded to the efforts of the Kremlin revisionist clique to force their hegemony on others by stating: «there can be no guiding party or State in the world communist movement». They spoke of the greatest «independence» possible from any kind of guiding center, which means independence from the fascist dictate of the Soviet revisionists. The political conjuncture, class needs and interests of the local bourgeoisie with which they are ingratiating themselves, demand that these parties should keep at arm's length with the possible defeat of Soviet Khrushchevite revisionism and with the conjunctural needs of its foreign policy. Such tendencies towards greatest independence possible from a «guiding center», from a «leading party» or a «leading State», that is, from the Soviet hegemony and dictate, exist not only in the

West but also in Kremlin's satellite countries. This is a sign of the times pointing to the decline and dissolution of the Soviet revisionist empire.

The most conspicuous representative of this opposition trend at the Moscow meeting was the head of the delegation of the Italian revisionists, Enrico Berlinguer, who formulated and presented in a systemized way their differences and disputes with the Soviet leaders and their satellites. It is not by mere chance that the representative of the Italian revisionist party adopted this attitude: its political line expresses in a concentrated way and more openly those autonomist and centrifugal trends for greater independence of action and detachment from Kremlin tutelage which have begun to increase in the fold of the revisionist front. This political line takes into account, first and foremost, the international interests of the Western bourgeoisie which do not coincide and often even clash with those of the new Soviet bourgeoisie. For this reason, therefore, and regardless of former waverings, the Italian revisionists and the revisionists of many other countries as well, went to Moscow with a given political mandate of their own bourgeoisie and, more precisely, to further weaken the positions of new Soviet imperialism. This complies in full with Togliatti's «testament» and with his familiar theses on polycentrism.

Nevertheless, Berlinguer tried to tone down the divergences and criticism he submitted at the conference. Thus, he declared that these divergences «should not be the cause for bringing about a breakdown in the relations between parties». Ap-

parently, Moscow rubles continue to preserve their value for Longo's friends.

Any way, the Italian revisionists proved to be less servile than the French ones. The latter, through Georges Marchais, did some lip service to Czechoslovakia but at a press conference and not at the plenary session as the representative of the Italian revisionist party did. When the journalists asked him why Waldeck Rochet had not made mention of this in his speech before the other delegates, finding himself in an awkward position, Marchais referred to the Budapest decision not to raise this issue and to the Czechoslovak renegade's own warning that this would be an interference in their internal affairs! The truth is that the French revisionists were not so much afraid of violating these criteria, nor that they would risk losing their rubles, but they were afraid of the growing revolutionary activity of the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party of France which Marchais calls «the Maoist group» which he vowed he would suppress by force. The French revisionists are also afraid of the rivalry of Jeanette Vermeersch's faction which associates its servilism to the Kremlin tsars also with Maurice Thorez' name.

Berlinguer's flagrant opportunism was clearly seen also when he stated that he would not sign the basic document of the conference while, on the other hand, he praised some of its aspects. Thus, he expressed satisfaction that the main document of the conference had included «no condemnation or excommunication whatever of any party or country». Of what significance is it whether the main document of the conference of the renegades condemns China and Albania or not, so long as,

during the whole proceedings of the conference, almost all the delegates, obeying the conductor's baton, attacked, accused and slandered the glorious Chinese Communist Party and Socialist China, so long as the Gheorghievskaya Hall of the Kremlin was transformed, as Brezhnev wished, into an anti-China meeting hall with false witnesses raked together from all over and paid by the Moscow clique to sing to their tune?

What does the attitude of the Italian revisionists and of their supporters at the meeting of the Moscow revisionist renegates signify? It clearly signifies the process of deepening the split and of further decomposing the international revisionist front. It testifies to the ever threatening challenge and opposition of many other revisionists, to the increased pressure of centrifugal trends towards the Moscow dictate. It finally testifies to the fact that the Moscow renegade leadership is no longer the Almighty Zeus on the revisionist Olympus, to the fact that their hegemonistic positions have been further weakened.

The nature of the relations among the revisionist parties came quite clearly to light also during the recent few days in Moscow. Collaboration among revisionists is based on selfish interests and is characterized by squabbles among degenerated and prospectless sects. Their contradictions are insoluble. The parade of oratory in the imperial atmosphere of the Gheorghievskaya Hall is coming to an end. The disputes and divergences have now passed to the Kremlin lobbies, to the «ideological and financial» commissions. The results of these clashes and bargainings will be seen in the final do-

cument when the persuasive power of the ruble and of Brezhnev's «tank diplomacy» will come to light.

The conference of the revisionist traitors is thus taking place under the sign of divergences, disputes and splits. And it could not have happened otherwise. There can never be unity among revisionists. Modern revisionism is an ideological and political product of the imperialist bourgeoisie and its important ally in the fight against the international working class, against the freedom of the people, against Marxism-Leninism and revolution. It will share the fate of all the agents of the bourgeoisie, it will end under the merciless blows of the working class, of triumphant Marxism-Leninism. This doom is sped up also by the cancer of divergences, contradictions and disunity gnawing at its organism. The Moscow meeting testifies to this. It is a wrangle of wolves and like all wrangles it did not mitigate the strife, it did not level the differences but it brought them more to the fore, it further deepened contradictions and disunity. These cannot help lead, as they have led, to violent outbursts going as far as disintegrating and decomposing the whole revisionist front.

The revolutionary peoples of the world, the international working class and, especially, the working class of the countries where the revisionists are in power or at work, recognize and will recognize still better the real countenance of renegades and hated traitors, of all those gathered these days in the Kremlin. The working class must fight with might and main to expose and make short work of them in order to bring about the triumph of its cause, of the cause of revolution and socialism.

SHAM ANTI-IMPERIALISM — A COUNTER- REVOLUTIONARY OUTWORN MASK OF KHRUSHCHEVITE REVISIONISM

(July 15, 1969)

It is not long since the rhetorical speeches of the heads of the revisionist parties at the Georgievskaya Hall came to an end and their decisions to «strengthen unity» and «to fight imperialism» were made public. Now the Soviet revisionist leaders are trying to persuade the world that, after five years of strenuous effort and struggle, they seemingly scored a major success in gathering in Moscow their much desired revisionist concilium and forcing the majority of the minor rulers of the participating parties, either by the whip or the ruble, to sing to their tune.

But no blast of trumpets nor the dithyrambs of the Soviet press can conceal the bitter truth that the Brezhnevite troika drew very little dividends from all that capital it had invested in that revisionist meeting.

It lagged far behind in realizing the objectives the Soviet revisionist leaders had sought to attain through that meeting. First, the meeting failed

to sing in unison in support of the chauvinist Great Russia policy of the Soviet social imperialists. The obvious difference between what is said in Brezhnev's speech and what is not said in the closing document of the meeting proves that the Moscow revisionist patriarchs were unable to impose all their theoretical theses and their own political concepts on their conferees. The failure of the efforts of the Kremlin leaders to preserve the ideological, political and organizational cohesion of the revisionist front under their control and management became quite evident.

In spite of its pronounced anti-communist and anti-revolutionary trend, the final document has not succeeded in patching up all the cracks and warding off the collapse of the pen within which the Soviet revisionists seek to enclose the revisionist herd. It is a fact that the scrap of paper the inveterate opportunist chiefs of the revisionist parties signed in Moscow is already being interpreted in quite different ways by its participants. And it could not happen otherwise. It is the result of mutual compromises and concessions couched in a lump of acrobatic formulae that satisfy everyone and commit no one. The only clear obligation they assumed voluntarily is to intensify their fight against Marxism-Leninism, revolution and socialism, to wreck the revolutionary and liberation movement of the people and to speed up their ultimate integration with the bourgeoisie. As regards the question of choosing which imperialism they will link up with, with that of the West or with that of the Soviet, that was left to their own discretion.

The theses contained in the so-called «principal document» of the revisionist meeting aim at distorting in a very refined way the glorious teachings of Marxism-Leninism on revolution and revolutionary dictatorship of the working class. It seeks to provide a theoretical support for the renegade and capitulating stand of the modern revisionist scabs towards the great issues which have assumed priority today as a result of the revolutionary struggle of the international working class and the major anti-imperialist and liberation battles waged by the peoples of all continents. What the revisionists are after is to bring about class reconciliation at all costs and to recoil in a fawning way before the threats and pressures of the bourgeoisie. Through their document, they beg of the bourgeoisie to recompense their treason with certain concessions, so that they may meet half-way to safeguard together the system of capitalist exploitation, to suppress the proletariat and keep revolution at bay.

It does not take much effort to see that the Moscow revisionist paper does not speak of fighting imperialism but of sabotaging this fight, not of spreading the flames of revolution but of extinguishing them. The blatant theme of «tasks of fighting against imperialism at the present stage and unity of action of the communist and workers parties of all the anti-imperialist forces» the Soviet revisionists have taken great pains to hit upon is an awkward bluff that can not cover up their counter-revolutionary intentions.

Political parties, the various social forces, the policy of States itself are sized up and evaluated

not by words said, nor by statements made but by deeds, by their practical acts. What do facts point out?

The essence of the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism has been and continues to be linked with the attitude maintained towards imperialism, particularly, towards U.S. imperialism, the greatest and most ruthless enemy of the people of the whole world. The reactionary character of Khrushchevite revisionism is manifested precisely in the line of Soviet-US collusion to dominate the world. Every step they take, every stand they maintain on the international arena are within the framework of this alliance and serve their counter-revolutionary objectives.

The antagonism and struggle between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism are a version of the antagonism and class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between the socialist and revisionist paths, between the course of fighting imperialism to bring about the triumph of revolution and socialism and the course of collaborating with imperialism to suppress revolution and destroy socialism.

Not only have the modern revisionists headed by the Khrushchevite clique given up launching any kind of battle against imperialism, but they are doing their uttermost to undermine all the anti-imperialist forces, to put out the flames of their revolutionary struggle. The positions of the revisionists, both as regards their general line as well as their stand on specific issues, are thoroughly counter-revolutionary and pro-imperialist.

In order to conceal their capitulation to and

collaboration with the imperialists, to draw the attention of the people away from the schemes and acts of imperialism and Soviet revisionism, the modern revisionists resorted to gross demagoguery, both at the Moscow meeting and in the document they approved there, about their «anti-imperialism» and made a lot of noise particularly about certain important issues of the present world policy as those of Vietnam, European security, the Middle East, disarmament and so on and so forth.

But while prattling about anti-imperialism, nothing prevents the modern revisionists from taking successive practical measures to strengthen their all-round ties and collaboration with the imperialist Powers, especially with U.S. imperialism and its chief Nixon. The two big nuclear Powers — U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism — are binding themselves closely through a nuclear military alliance directed against the revolutionary peoples of the world. The ill-famed 1963 treaty between the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. on a partial ban of nuclear weapon tests, the other treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons prepared jointly by the U.S.A and the USSR last year, and others — all these aim at preserving the nuclear monopoly of these two big Powers to be used as a means of blackmail to threaten and subjugate peoples for the purpose of establishing their joint domination in the world. The actual bargainings between the U.S. imperialists and the Soviet revisionists on limiting missiles and on other problems aim at coordinating and implementing their joint aggressive counter-revolutionary schemes. The Moscow revisionist meeting, which

left all doors open for maneuvers and agreements, was also overshadowed by their coming talks with Nixon. It is a fact that «the anti-imperialist» resolutions of this meeting caused no misgivings whatsoever on the other shores of the Atlantic. The Americans were fully aware of and informed in detail by the Soviets about the external and internal aspects of the Moscow farce.

The stand taken towards the struggle of the oppressed peoples and nations has always been the demarcation line between Marxist-Leninists and revisionists. This is raised more forcefully during our time. In final analysis, the revolutionary cause of the world proletariat depends directly on the outcome of the struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America which undermines from its very foundations the sway of world imperialism both behind the lines and in the metropolises. More actual than ever sound today Lenin's words that «the revolutionary movement in advanced countries would be a mere fraud without the complete and closest union of the workers in the struggle against capital in Europe and Latin America and of the hundreds of millions of 'colonial' slaves oppressed by this capital».

Although they consider the national-liberation movement as an anti-imperialist force in words, in deeds they undermine it.

What kind of aid can the Khrushchevite revisionists give to the cause of liberating Vietnam when they maintain closer ties and keep strengthening their alliance with the murderers of the Vietnamese people, when, in the interest of the U.S. aggressors, they strive by all methods and means

to compel the heroic Vietnamese people to capitulate and perpetuate the domination of the U.S.A. and the Saigon puppets in South Vietnam?

Let us take the Middle East for another example. In line with their global and counter-revolutionary strategy, Soviet social-imperialism is carrying out an all-round activity to conclude a political agreement with U.S. imperialism in order to suppress the liberation struggle of the peoples of that area. All their efforts aim at forcing the Arab people to capitulate to the Israeli aggressors, at extinguishing the flames of the armed struggle of the Palestinian people, at realizing the Soviet-U.S. criminal scheme of dividing their spheres of influence, at dividing and plundering the peoples of the Middle East.

The basic aim of the joint anti-imperialist actions, the principal document of the Moscow revisionist meeting has it, «remains, as always, to ward off the danger of war, the danger of a world nuclear war which continues to threaten the people with mass extermination, to fight for peace throughout the world». According to the revisionists, the socialist countries, the working class, the communist parties, the oppressed peoples and nations, which are the anti-imperialist forces of our time, must abandon all their revolutionary ideals, they must give up all kinds of struggle against imperialism and reaction and for national liberation and social emancipation, and make the struggle for peace against war as their supreme objective. And in order to persuade them, they say: «...the struggle for peace is integrated with the struggle of people for freedom, for the progress

of democracy, to get rid of foreign violence, of colonialism and neo-colonialism, reaction and fascist dictatorship».

Thus, it follows that the struggle for peace is the magic wand which will allegedly settle all the big issues harassing mankind.

The struggle for peace is inseparable from the struggle against imperialism. To direct the struggle for peace against the danger of war alone, as the modern revisionists do, is to fight the effect and leave the cause untouched. The danger of war does not drop down from the skies but comes from imperialism. War has been and is the result of the exploiting social order, its inseparable fellow-traveler. There can be no peace in the world as long as imperialism continues to exist. To proclaim the struggle for peace as the principal objective and to direct this struggle against the danger of war alone means to perpetuate the statusquo in the world.

The main objective of the anti-imperialist forces cannot be the struggle for peace against the danger of war but the struggle to smash and do away with imperialism. This is the only way to avert the danger of war. Therefore, the way of revolution is the principal one to defend peace and stop wars. And if the imperialists would dare to unleash a world war, the latter will not end with the destruction of mankind, as the revisionists claim, but will bury imperialism under the blows dealt by the revolution of the people. In contrast with the viewpoint of the revisionists who say «either peace at all costs or total destruction» the Marxist-Leninists adhere to the revolutionary

thesis that the salvation of the people, of the proletariat, depends on the break-up of the imperialist system of oppression and exploitation. At the 9th Congress of the Communist Party of China, Comrade Lin Piao said: «either war causes revolution or revolution prevents war».

«Peace», «anti-imperialism», «unity of action» and other demagogic and false slogans launched by the Soviet leaders sound much like a hue and cry to waylay people and detract their attention from reality, from the emergence of Soviet revisionist imperialism on the world arena, from its claims and threats.

The main characteristic of the present foreign policy of the Soviet leading clique is their taking recourse to fascist methods, to violence, to military adventures and armed aggression.

The recent events in Czechoslovakia have shown that the Soviet clique are no longer bothered by the principles of freedom and independence, of the self-determination and sovereignty of the people. For them there exists only one principle, that of trampling underfoot and discarding any principle, agreement, treaty or alliance. In fact, of what kind of freedom and independence, of what national sovereignty of the satellites of the Soviet Union can one speak when Soviet military forces are stationed in their countries and make law there?

But the appetite of Soviet imperialism goes beyond the borders of the area which is directly under its influence. The policy of military blackmail is now openly directed also against the other countries of the Balkans — Rumania, Yugoslavia and the

People's Republic of Albania. With his military plans in his briefcase, the Minister of War of the Soviet Union, Marshal Grechko, visits one capital after another — Cairo, Damascus, Baghdad, Rawalpindi and Delhi.

Regardless of the stream of words that flowed in it «against imperialism», regardless of the dissonances in the views of its representatives about certain conjunctural problems of the world situation, the Moscow revisionist meeting was subjected, in its main lines, to the objectives and intentions established beforehand by the Soviet leaders and of which we have often had the opportunity to refer to in the columns of this newspaper.

The chiefs of the revisionist parties who hitched themselves to the Soviet chariot assumed a great and grave responsibility before the working masses in their countries and before the entire international working class. They embarked on a dangerous road which will bring about very grave consequences for them.

The essential feature of the meeting was its anti-China character, its intention to line up all the revisionist parties in the campaign against China, Albania and the other revolutionary forces in the world. Of what struggle against imperialism can one speak when the whole Moscow revisionist meeting was turned into a rostrum of attacks and calumnies of the basest kind against the Communist Party and the People's Republic of China which are the principal bastion of the struggle against imperialism, of revolution and socialism? This meeting revealed once again that the basic orientation of the foreign policy of the Soviet leading clique and

of all its obedient allies is not the struggle against but the alliance with imperialism against People's China. This truth is not disproved by the fact that neither China nor Albania are attacked by name in the documents of the meeting. The latter is only a base maneuver of the sneak, who hurls the stone and hides his hand, and is aimed at giving a certain consolation to those revisionists who, in their attempts to guard against more dangerous adventures, are content with empty talk.

Of just what little value these documents are for the Kremlin revisionist chiefs and their obedient stooges is proved by the fact that all their propaganda after the meeting advertises mostly and mainly the speeches of the delegates who attacked China.

Now it has become obvious to the whole world that the main target of the warmongering and aggressive policy of the new Moscow tsars is the People's Republic of China. In collusion with the U.S. imperialists and the reactionaries of various countries, they are striving to conclude a military and political alliance to oppose China. The military aid the Soviet revisionists are giving to the Indian and Indonesian reactionaries exceeds that given by the U.S. imperialists. They are selling out the interests of their country by granting huge concessions to Japan to exploit Siberian tracts of land with a view to setting the Japanese militarists against China. They are strengthening their ties and collaboration with the reactionary regimes of Malaysia, Thailand, Burma and the Philippines in order to close the military ring around China. Following their bloodshedding provocations along the

Ussuri river, the Soviet Brezhnev-Kosigyn clique have stationed large armed forces along the Soviet-Chinese and Mongolian-Chinese borders.

In their anti-Chinese orientation the Kremlin chiefs have gone so far as to propose, at the recent Moscow meeting, the setting up of an «Asian collective security system», which means that all the puppets and servants of U.S. imperialism in that area, ranging from Japan, South Korea, Malaysia, Thailand, Burma and India, must unite in a military and political alliance, which would serve as a tool of aggression in the hands of the Soviet imperialists to jointly oppose China and suppress the revolutionary struggle of the Asian peoples.

But all these attempts do not by any means testify to the strength of the revisionists. On the contrary, they confirm the weakness of their positions, the failure of their unprincipled fight and of their demagogic tactics. By attacking China, the Khrushchevite revisionists attack Marxism-Leninism, the consistent revolutionaries who are fighting with determination against revisionism. It is a fact that the greatest obstacle the revisionists have come up against in achieving their objective has been and is the struggle waged by the Communist Party of China, by the Party of Labor of Albania and by all genuine revolutionaries. This struggle has exposed the treacherous countenance of and has caused a deepening of contradictions in the revisionist camp. It is a fact that by their anti-China policy and acts the USSR-led revisionists have exposed and isolated themselves. And the deeper they engage in the anti-China campaign, the more evident becomes their betrayal, their departure from Marxism-Leninism

and the principles of proletarian internationalism, the more are their counter-revolutionary intrigues and conspiracies revealed and stigmatized.

The Moscow meeting of revisionist parties, organized and presided over by the Kremlin renegade chiefs is another detestable act of diversion against the world Marxist-Leninist communist movement and revolutionary forces aiming at sabotaging the joint anti-imperialist front of the people, at undermining the national-liberation struggle in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It was used by the Soviet leaders as a means to conceal their rapprochement and collaboration with the U.S. imperialists, as a means to draw the attention of people away from the imperialist and revisionist plots to divide zones of influence and to dominate the world.

But the big game the leaders of the revisionist party of the Soviet Union organized is doomed to fail. Several times has our Party pointed out and the facts of daily life have confirmed that, whether with or without a general revisionist meeting, Khrushchevite revisionism can never ward off its complete and inevitable doom. It has already been proved that whoever has united with the bourgeoisie and with the other enemies of the working class, that whoever has betrayed Marxism-Leninism and has raised a hand against it, whoever has abandoned the sacred cause of revolution and of the freedom of the people and has united with imperialism and counter-revolution, is doomed to share the fate of all renegades, the fate of the regressive forces condemned by history.

The traitorous meeting in Moscow became a further evidence of the unprincipled conflicts and disputes existing among revisionist parties and countries, of the further rottenness and degeneration of the revisionist front.

Although the principal document is replete with «internationalist principles», allegedly existing in the relations among «sister parties» and «fraternal countries», in spite of its euphoria about «unity», it can not conceal the deep divergences, which have long been corroding the cracked revisionist cauldron. As a matter of fact, they do not even serve to camouflage the rotten, partial, temporary and unstable compromise which the revisionist cliques managed to reach at the present moment after much toil, mutual pressures and blackmail. Even among the revisionist chiefs there were those who complained at the meeting that, although on paper the principles governing the relations among the «communist parties» and the «socialist countries» are correctly stated and sound beautifully, in practice they are unscrupulously trampled under foot.

But whoever has more or less followed the preparations for and the proceedings of this ill-famed meeting can not help noticing that all the high-sounding statements of the revisionists about the unity which was allegedly attained and strengthened at the present meeting are an out-and-out bluff. The profound divergences that were manifested before and during the meeting on many of the most important issues. its lamentable results

(a number of revisionist parties refused to adopt the main document emerging from the meeting either partially or as whole) are facts which speak for themselves. The Italian revisionists said quite openly that while, on the surface, this document presents the aspect of unity, in reality it conceals thorough-going disagreements.

The Party of Labor of Albania has more than once emphasized the fact that there is not nor can there be real and stable unity in the revisionist sheep-fold. Of course, all the revisionists, Khrushchevites and Togliattites alike, who at the present meeting represented the most pronounced opposite poles, are united in a single counter-revolutionary front by their hostility to and their joint campaign against Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary forces that uphold it, first and foremost, against the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labor of Albania, although on this question, too, there have existed and still exist divergences of a tactical nature among the different revisionist groupings. But sharp contradictions and dissensions in the ranks of revisionists are unavoidable, they are inherent in the very class and ideological nature of revisionism. The meeting participants are now striving in vain to minimize the disputes and divergences, to conceal their real causes and to present them as temporary and easily surmountable.

These difficulties stem from the very social and class nature of revisionism which represents the narrow selfish interests of a bourgeoisified class or stratum: of the new «socialist» bourgeoisie in the countries where the revisionist cliques have usurped power, of the «worker» and «communist» aristo-

cracy and bureaucracy in the capitalist countries. This leads and it cannot but lead to bourgeois nationalist positions.

The revisionist cliques in the various capitalist countries have their interests intertwined with those of their own national bourgeoisie and of the imperialist groupings it belongs to, they are under the domination of their bourgeoisie, which cannot but lead to contradictions and conflicts with the revisionist cliques of other countries, in the first place, with those of the countries where the revisionists are in power. These contradictions and conflicts come to the fore particularly at moments of crises and tensions, when the revisionist cliques take sides more openly with their own bourgeoisie. V.I. Lenin pointed out that it was precisely the connections of the opportunist parties of the Second Internationale with the local imperialist bourgeoisie that, during the crisis caused by the First World War, led these parties to side openly with the bourgeoisie, made them slip to positions of social-chauvinism and of social-imperialism. The transition of Soviet revisionism to social-imperialism, which found its concrete and brutal expression during the Czechoslovak crisis, still further crystallized the contradictory positions on the revisionist front. Every new crisis will always further split and dismember the international revisionist front.

The contradictions in the fold of the revisionists stem from their lack of a common and clearly defined ideological basis. They are all united in their fight against the fundamental theses and principles of Marxism-Leninism. But, when it comes to the revisionist theory of this or that country and

area, there are felt strong influences of these or those trends of the bourgeois ideology, which, no doubt, leave their traces in the theoretical positions of the revisionists in various countries about these or those problems. Standing on positions of pragmatism, each one of these parties distorts the Marxist-Leninist principles in such a spirit and direction and to such a degree as to best meet the interests, needs and conjunctures of each revisionist group at a given moment. The clearest example of this is provided by the theoretical waverings of the Soviet revisionist leadership, ranging from the Khrushchevite liberal positions down to the present fierce pseudo-Marxist, social-fascist and social-imperialist positions.

The crystallization of the two main belligerent lines on the international revisionist front: the line represented by the Soviet revisionist leading clique and its supporters and the line represented by the Italian Togliattites and many others -- came clearly out at the Moscow revisionist meeting. Nevertheless, both of these lines have one thing in common: they are anti-Marxist and counterrevolutionary. They express the contradictions between the Soviet great Power chauvinism and social-imperialism and the narrow bourgeois nationalism of the other revisionist groupings, the contradictions between the new Soviet imperialism and the Western imperialist bourgeoisie.

The Soviet revisionist leadership aims, first and foremost, at uniting under its dictate the whole international revisionist front, at mobilizing all the revisionist forces without reservations and at imposing on them its tactics in their struggle

against the cause of revolution and socialism, against the Marxist-Leninist parties, especially against the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labor of Albania.

In particular, the Soviet revisionist leadership strives not to allow the other revisionist cliques, especially in the countries where they are in power, to pursue an independent policy of their own; it struggles to prevent their free rapprochement with the West, to keep them in the sphere of its own influence, as semi-colonies of Soviet imperialism and its obedient tools, to have them act in compliance with the conjunctures of Soviet policy, as a support for its expansionist and neo-colonialist aims.

Words such as «internationalism», «comradely collaboration», «respect for sovereignty» and «non-interference in the internal affairs of the others», of which Brezhnev's ill-famed speech and the document issued from the meeting were replete, can scarcely deceive anyone.

The opposite line, that of the Italian Togliattites and of many others, which is characterized by the efforts to get rid of the Soviet tutelage, was clearly crystallized during the meeting. The aim of this line is to ensure the largest possible independence both in the home and foreign policies, to have free hand in the manoeuvres to integrate with the local bourgeoisie and imperialism, to advance at these or other rates on the road of bourgeois degeneration without being committed to the conjunctures of the Soviet policy or compromised by the defeats of the Soviet revisionists, etc. At the Moscow meeting, the supporters of this line aimed at further weaken-

ing the domineering stand of the Soviet ruling clique on the international revisionist front.

In compliance with these aims and objectives, they insistently laid stress on the thesis that, at the present time, there could and should not be a leading party, State or center in the world communist movement, that all the parties should be equal and independent. «It is indispensable,» Berlinguer said, «to respect fully the independence of each Party not only to look for and map out its own way to socialism and to the building of socialist society, but also to take its own stand on the major problems of our movement». This was an open challenge to the hegemonic positions and the dictate of the Soviet leadership.

Fearing reprisals on the part of the Soviet social-imperialist clique, the Togliattites demanded at the meeting to sanction as a principle that «the disagreement that may be expressed during international meetings in discussing and voting on the proposed documents, as well as the non-participation in these meetings, should not have consequences in the relations between parties». This is a very clear sign of the nature of relations in the revisionist sheep-fold where the reigning Soviet clique tries to enforce its dictate by means of cudgel and ruble.

At the Moscow meeting, the Soviet revisionist clique was compelled to face the difficult Czechoslovak issue which has stuck in its throat.

At the beginning, the Soviet revisionist chiefs tried by all their means to pass it over in silence. As a matter of fact, they did not fail to exert pres-

sure and threats on those who would dare to raise this issue in a critical way.

But, inasmuch as these attempts did not succeed, the Soviet revisionist leadership was compelled to show down its cards and, with the support of its zealous servants, beginning with Quisling Husak and ending with Kadar, tried to justify its fascist aggression against Czechoslovakia, reserving itself the right to an eventual repetition of such acts in the future under the pretext of the «internationalist aid» to the «socialist countries» which are allegedly endangered by imperialism. «When the destiny of a socialist country is at stake», Kadar cynically said, «then everybody has to intervene». This very clearly shows that the principles of observance of sovereignty and of non-interference in the home affairs of one another, of which the revisionists speak, are a worthless scrap of paper, that the Soviet revisionist chiefs adhere, in respect to others, to the ill-famed Brezhnev theory on «limited sovereignty», that the relations of the revisionist parties with the Soviet social-imperialist, chauvinist clique cannot be but relations of submission, of servile obedience and blind implementation of its dictate.

If one sees the real essence of the issue behind the polished and rounded phrases, the main document adopted by the Moscow revisionist meeting is nothing but a temporary and unprincipled compromise between the various revisionist clans. It is a mirror of the present balance of power between the revisionist groupings of opposite tendencies.

The facts prove that the Moscow revisionist meeting by no means levelled the contradictions

on the international revisionist front, as the revisionist leaders are noisily trumpeting abroad. On the contrary, it made them still more manifest, it further crystallized and polarized them, preparing thereby new and still more deep-going divisions and crises between these renegades to Marxism-Leninism, to the cause of revolution and socialism. This is an inevitable objective process.

The revisionists gathered in Moscow are challenging the Marxist-Leninists and the revolutionary forces the world over. But this cannot scare them, on the contrary, it further increases their determination to fight through to the end against modern revisionism, to more forcefully denounce all its demagogical manoeuvres, to mercilessly expose its counterrevolutionary plots and plans. There is no doubt that the revolutionaries, the genuine communists, wherever they may be, will for sure know how to correctly analyze the present situation and draw the necessary conclusions. The meeting of the revisionists in Moscow, the decisions it adopted, the line it established, all this showed that they have unretrievably placed themselves outside the anti-imperialist front and the international communist movement. On all the fronts, both in the political and ideological field, the revisionists and the Marxist-Leninists are on the opposite sides of the barricade.

The world situation is today developing favourably for the revolutionary forces and unfavourably for imperialism and revisionism. The revisionist front is rotten, its cracks are wide, the disputes between its sections are increasing and broadening. But all these things must not set at

rest the minds of the Marxist-Leninists, of those fighting for socialism, for the freedom and independence of the peoples. The imperialist and revisionist enemies, as shown also by the Moscow meeting, have not yet laid down their arms. The fight of the Marxist-Leninist parties has dealt heavy blows at them and gives them no time to breathe, but it must be continued at an ever higher rate and intensity. The final victory over new opportunism will still require efforts and toil and it will be achieved through an ever greater determination, courage and maturity on the part of the Marxist-Leninists, through militant actions and clever tactics of struggle, so as to help every day and at every hour in realizing the objectives of our revolutionary strategy.

The great propaganda campaign which the Soviet-led revisionists are now conducting in order to advertise their opportunist theses and the documents of the Moscow meeting of traitors is obviously aimed at hoodwinking public opinion, at poisoning the minds of those strata of working people who are still under revisionist influence, at detaching attention from the imperialist revisionist criminal plots.

In these circumstances, the Marxist-Leninists and all the revolutionaries are faced with the great task of meeting the new demagogic wave unleashed by the revisionists on a world scale with an all-round revolutionary activity in order to expose and frustrate the revisionist offensive. Great tasks lie ahead for the Soviet people and for the Soviet Marxist-Leninists. They

must rise against the cynical demagoguery and the false propaganda of their renegade chiefs — Brezhnev, Kosygin and company — who are seeking to represent the Moscow meeting as an approval by the «communist parties of the world» of their treacherous line of restoring capitalism in the Soviet Union and of their imperialist foreign policy. The Marxist-Leninists must no longer tolerate the fraudulent claims of the Soviet clique of usurpers posing as fighters for socialism and the world communist movement, while carrying out everywhere and with all means their counterrevolutionary struggle against the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania. The Soviet revisionists feign to condemn imperialism and to defend the freedom of the peoples while themselves committing aggressions like the one against Czechoslovakia and threatening other countries with war. The interests of revolution and socialism in the Soviet Union demand from the Soviet revolutionaries and Marxist-Leninists that they should resolutely rise in arms and fight with courage and bravery to expose and smash the frantic anti-China campaign the new Kremlin tsars are fanning more and more with every passing day, with a view to justify their preparations for war against the People's Republic of China, the People's Republic of Albania and other countries.

A great responsibility devolves on the upright communists who still belong to various revisionist parties now that the revisionist cliques, advancing on the road of betrayal, deepened the split also in the organisational field. Every communist now is faced with the alternative: either with communism,

with revolution, against the revisionist betrayal, or with the revisionist chiefs on the road of betrayal. Now there must be no more room either for illusions or waverings. Accounts must be settled with the revisionist chiefs, with revisionism in general. Bridges should be cut with them not only in the ideological and political sphere, but also in the organisational sphere. Revolutionary communists and revisionists can no longer militate together in the fold of one party. No feeling of sentimentalism, no allegedly tactical consideration can any more justify their stay among the ranks of the revisionist parties. The real communists, all the revolutionaries must unite and establish new revolutionary Marxist-Leninist parties.

The Moscow anti-communist meeting is a farce organized by the Soviet revisionists for base aims of political and ideological speculation. Its participants could never raise and discuss openly their problems, they could not make a concrete analysis of their line and activity. It is incumbent upon the Marxist-Leninists, the revolutionaries, upon all those remaining true to Marxism-Leninism, to carry out their internationalist duty, to come out openly and courageously and expose the revisionist betrayals. To the plans and to the counterrevolutionary unity of the revisionists they must oppose the real Marxist-Leninist unity and wage an all-round, courageous and principled struggle against the revisionist cliques in power to overthrow them and lead forward everywhere the glorious cause of revolution and socialism, the struggle for the freedom and independence of the peoples.



CONTENTS

Revisionist traitors speak of unity while deepening disunity.	3
Open fire on revisionist betrayal!	12
Why are the Soviet revisionists afraid of having Czechoslovakia spoken of at the Moscow meeting?	24
Divergences, squabbles and disunity prevail at the Moscow meeting of renegades	35
Sham anti-imperialism — a counter-revolutionary outworn mask of Khrushchevite revisionism	44



